## MEMORANDUM

## TO: ARLINGTON SCHOOL BOARD

## FROM: WORLD LANGUAGES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: October 17, 2018

## SUBJECT: RECOMMENDING YEAR REPORT

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. As part of the yearly official Monitoring and Evaluation of APS World Language programs, so as to monitor learning success and equity of learning opportunity, the national Standards-Based Measurement of Proficiency (STAMP test) should be administered to all students enrolled in language class in grade 5, in addition to continuing to test in $8^{\text {th }}$ grade immersion and High School levels IV and above. (Last year, only half of the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade FLES students were tested-in six schoolsand the current budget for this year would test the other half of five schools.)
2. Enhance and improve the learning of Spanish and English literacy and help close the achievement gap in elementary immersion classes through implementing increased Spanish instructional time in grades K-2 and transitioning subsequently to an evenly balanced 50-50 use of instructional time in grades 3-5. Begin this program at the kindergarten level. Start this year to assess baseline understanding of the concept of literacy in kindergarten and to assess progress in the development of Spanish reading skills in the second or third grade of SpanishEnglish immersion, for comparison with the third grade English Reading SOL.
3. Support the Social Studies Advisory Committee initiative to prepare globally competent APS graduates. World Languages and Social Studies should collaborate to create complementary lesson topics and joint activities for the curriculum that will prepare APS graduates for successful career and community engagement in a diverse world.

## REPORT OVERVIEW

The report includes the following sections:

| * Committee Activities | Pg. 2 |
| :--- | :---: |
| * Updated Status Report on 2016 Recommendations | Pg. 2 |
| Achievements In APS World Language Programs In SY- <br> 2018 | Pg. 3 |
| * Some Continuing Issues of Concern | Pg. 5 |
| New Recommendations with Rationale and Costs | Pg. 6 |
| * Committee Members and Student Representatives | Pg. 16 |
| * Appendix Tables | Pg. 18 |
| * Appendix 12. Selected References | Pf. 41 |

## CURRENT YEAR COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES:

The activities of the World Languages Advisory Committee (WLAC) for this school year have included the following:

- Inclusion and orientation of four new committee members and three new student representatives for Washington-Lee and Yorktown High Schools.
- Meetings and online discussion with APS and ACI leadership and submission to ACI chairs of WLAC responses to School Board requests for recommendations of action.
- Contribution of input to the ACI leadership regarding proposed new Rubric for evaluating AC committee recommendations.
- Meeting and online discussion with representatives of the Social Studies Advisory Committee to explore a shared vision for global international education for Arlington students.
- Communication with Student Services and other associated offices with the successful goal of incorporating official graduation seals, including the Virginia State Seal of Biliteracy, on students' final official transcripts.
- To enhance communication with the community, the WLAC supported the APS World Languages Office (WLO) in the annual celebration of World Language Week in March of this year, where representatives of APS elementary, middle and high schools demonstrated their talents and developing proficiencies in American Sign Language, Chinese, French, German, Latin and Spanish.
- WLAC representatives have participated in official APS meetings for the design of the Program Evaluation for World Languages, to be administered in SY-2019.


## UPDATED STATUS REPORT ON 2016 RECOMMENDATIONS

Five recommendations were put forward in December 2016. Their current status is:

| 2016-17 WLAC ACI | Status as of September 2018 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Recommendations | Achieved. APS has confirmed that the Seal of |
| 1. The earned Virginia Seal of Biliteracy |  |
| should be indicated on the high school |  |
| transcript. | Biliteracy (and other earned seals) will be printed <br> on final transcripts issued in the summer after <br> senior year, beginning this summer. |
|  | Still pending. There are a number of differences |
| 2. [APS should] implement consistency | from school to school in delivery of the world <br> land equity in implementing best <br> language Program of Studies. This is still <br> practices for delivering Program of <br> Studies components in the different <br> schools at each level of education |
| especially true for instruction among the six <br> middle schools. (See 4. below.) In addition, <br> beginning in Fall 2018, APS has granted |  |


|  | minimum recommended by ACTFL. Ten (of 21) schools are taking advantage of this opportunity and are offering one third less language instruction time than the 11 other schools as a result. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3. [In 2015-16], APS approved hiring a FLES Instructional Coach. Two additional positions need to be established and filled to support APS language programs. | Not implemented due to budget. In addition, the existing FLES Coach position was also eliminated due to the budget constraints, which reduced the ability of the WLO to foster the professional development of FLES teachers. |
| 4. Every $6^{\text {th }}$ grader needs to have the opportunity to enroll in a World Language course. | Some progress. Three middle school programs have added new $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ grade language options. Four schools report that more than $50 \%$ of 6 th grade students are enrolled in proficiency-based world language study, with two reporting language enrollments above $90 \% .{ }^{1}$ At the other two middle schools, only $36 \%$ of sixth graders take language. (Appendix 4.) In the present school year, $2636^{\text {th }}$ grade students are not permitted to take a language elective, because they failed their $5^{\text {th }}$ grade Reading SOL test and are required to take a full year of English Reading. |
| 5. Carefully investigate and address needs of the APS immersion programs in grades K-12 and the Spanish for Fluent Speakers program in grades 612. | Progress made. APS is evaluating its own immersion programs and studying other successful immersion programs as part of the program evaluation process that will culminate in an official report next year. A new SFS curriculum is also being created to focus primarily on developing formal academic Spanish literacy skills. |

## ACHIEVEMENTS IN APS WORLD LANGUAGE PROGRAMS IN SY-2018

- Credit by Examination: 412 students registered to take the proficiency test for language credits by examination, and 297 actually took it. Of those, 288 earned one or more high school language credits in one of 35 languages, and 177 (56\%) demonstrated sufficient proficiency to earn the full four credits, which also met the world language requirement for the Seal of Biliteracy. A total of $78 \%$ also met the language criterion for the Advanced Studies Diploma. ${ }^{2}$ Eighty-one percent of the

[^0]students tested were English Language Learners who were testing in a home language.

- Virginia State Seal of Biliteracy: APS has reported that 417 graduating seniors in 2018 demonstrated sufficient world language proficiency to qualify for the new and prestigious Virginia State Seal of Biliteracy. (See next bullet.)
- Number of students who took and passed IB or AP language tests. APS has reported that $91.1 \%$ of 112 students who took the IB test in Spring 2018 received a passing mark or better for Spanish, Chinese, French or Latin. ${ }^{3}$ A total of 382 students took an AP Language test in Chinese, French, German, Latin or Spanish, of whom $90.1 \%$ received a passing mark or better. Every student who received a passing mark on one of these tests qualified to receive the State Seal of Biliteracy.
- Students Met Language Criterion for Advanced Studies Diploma: $78.17 \%$ of the 2018 graduating seniors met the World Language criterion to earn the ASD, by earning three or more high school credits in a single language or two credits in each of two languages. ${ }^{4}$
- Immersion Students Demonstrate Strong Language Proficiency: The 94 8th grade immersion students at Gunston demonstrated strong Spanish proficiency on the STAMP 4 S test, with more than $50 \%$ of them scoring at the Advanced Proficiency Level on the ACTFL scale in Reading and Listening in both 2017 and 2018, and with $100 \%$ of students surpassing the established benchmark goal of ACTFL IntermediateLow Proficiency ${ }^{5}$ in Writing, and 99\% of the students in Speaking. (See Appendix 6.3.) Fifth grade immersion students also demonstrated proficiency that met or exceeded the benchmark goals of Novice-High for their programs, with more than $90 \%$ of students achieving the ACTFL Intermediate level in all four skill-modalities on the STAMP 4Se. (Appendix 6.2.)
- FLES Program Proficiency Results: The benchmark proficiency goal for FLES students to achieve in each skill is the ACTFL Novice-Mid level. (See Appendix 11 for descriptions.) In Spring 2018, more than $90 \%$ of students met or exceeded that target in Speaking and Writing Spanish. In addition, $60 \%$ or more of the students tested exceeded the benchmark by scoring at Novice-High or Intermediate on the scale in Listening, Speaking and Writing; $50 \%$ of students scored at that level in Reading. (See Appendix 6.1)
- Increased involvement of Teachers in Online/Blended-Learning Classes. Especially during the most recent two years, the World Language Supervisor has committed to making sure that classes where primary instruction is delivered online (see Appendix 5) are strongly supported by the active presence of professional language teachers for at least $50 \%$ of class time. In high school classes, a teacher is typically with the class $100 \%$ of the time. In this way, the students receive explanation

[^1]and constructive feedback when they need it and have opportunities for authentic spontaneous spoken interaction in the language with the teacher and with classmates.

- Strong World Language Enrollments. This fall, more than $96 \%$ of elementary school students are learning Spanish. In middle schools, almost $60 \%$ of $6^{\text {th }}$ graders and $80 \%$ of students in grades $7-8$ take one or more of six languages, and more than $61 \%$ of high school students are enrolled in one or more of eight languages. Indeed, the total number of students enrolled in a world language in secondary school has almost doubled since the 2009-10 School Year - an increase of more than 4,000 enrollments. (See Appendix 10.


## ISSUES OF CONCERN IN THE WORLD LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

$>$ Loss of talented staff from the World Language Office. During the previous two school years, APS had approved the hiring of a full-time FLES Instructional Coach to work closely with elementary Spanish teachers in the ten schools that had begun to offer FLES programs since Fall 2014. The experienced teacher hired for this role was able to foster the professional development of the teachers in the support of the World Language Supervisor and to ensure consistency of instructional approach. Her work was extremely successful - so much so that our committee had recommended that APS hire another Instructional Coach to focus on secondary programs and immersion instruction. But the budget constraints led to the proposed new position not being approved and the existing position being terminated, effective this past July. The work of the former Coach is sorely missed within the World Language program.
$>$ Lowering of commitment of resources to develop students' world language proficiency in ten elementary schools. Reportedly at the request of several elementary school principals, APS agreed earlier this year to grant principals the discretion to reduce the assigned instructional time for elementary Spanish from the previously required minimum of 90 minutes per week down to a minimum of 60 minutes. Ten of the 21 FLES schools have adopted this reduced language learning schedule. (See Appendix 2.) The other eleven FLES schools are continuing to provide 90 minutes of instruction per week, as is recommended by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Since time-on-task is perhaps the most important factor in language learning, the result will surely be that students in the ten schools will not be able to learn as much Spanish as those in the eleven schools. In addition to the effects on student learning, this unequal treatment will, almost certainly, affect the ability of APS to provide well-articulated sequences of language instruction in middle school. The degree to which student achievement is affected needs to be monitored and analyzed. (See Recommendation 1.)
> Teacher positions that are formally allocated by APS for the instruction of elementary Spanish are instead used for other purposes at the discretion of elementary principals. Last spring, the WLAC learned that, although 73 teacher positions had been allocated in the budget to FLES instruction, only 61 of the positions were actually filled by teachers teaching Spanish. The other twelve positions were being employed, at the principals' discretion, for purposes other than language teaching. Having been advised of this fact by WLAC members, the Budget

Advisory Committee recommended greater transparency in allocations of teacher time, so that discretionary positions would in the future be labeled as such, rather than concealed as "FLES instructors." In the current school year, however, the practice of using some designated FLES positions for other discretionary purposes continues. As of this writing, only 56.8 of the allocated 69 "FLES positions" are actually filled by elementary language teachers, including 7.5 positions that are assigned to the two elementary immersion programs ( 4.0 and 3.5 positions to each immersion school.)
$>$ Continuing failure of three middle schools to offer proficiency-based introductory language instruction in the $6^{\text {th }}$ grade in languages in addition to Spanish. The H-B Woodlawn Program and Jefferson and Swanson Middle Schools have offered one-semester $6^{\text {th }}$ grade courses in French and Latin for the past four years, while Gunston, Kenmore and Williamsburg middle schools continue to offer $6^{\text {th }}$ graders proficiency-based instruction only in Spanish. ${ }^{6}$ It is almost certain that this explains most of the reasons why $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ grade language enrollments in the first three schools are markedly higher than in the others-with, for example, more than $90 \%$ of $6^{\text {th }}$ graders at HBW and Jefferson and more than $60 \%$ at Swanson taking a language, and fewer than $40 \%$ doing so at Williamsburg and Kenmore. (See Appendices 4 and 9.)
$>$ Inability of APS to provide dual-language immersion education to every student who wants to take it. The current school year was the first year that admissions into Claremont and Key immersion schools were determined by countywide lottery. In the event, 189 applicants were placed on the waitlist and ultimately denied admission. Parents increasingly want their children to enroll in the immersion program, but APS's current plans to transfer the Key immersion program to a facility with 100 fewer seats than at Key will inevitably mean that the numbers of students denied admission to immersion will increase.

## NEW RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RATIONALE AND ANTICIPATED COSTS

1. As part of the yearly official APS Monitoring and Evaluation of World Language programs, so as to monitor learning success and equity of learning opportunity, the national Standards-Based Measurement of Proficiency (STAMP test) should be administered to all students enrolled in language class in grade 5 , in addition to continuing to test in $8^{\text {th }}$ grade immersion and High School levels IV and above. (Last year, only half of the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade FLES students were tested-in six schools-and the current budget for this year would test the other five schools.)

RATIONALE: To effectively monitor the effectiveness of instruction the school district needs to assess progress of every student at established intervals. True for every program type, this is especially necessary when the delivery of instruction varies significantly from one school to another, as it does in Arlington, where elementary language instruction time is inconsistent from one neighborhood school to another. APS,

[^2]the Arlington School Board, and the broader school community need to understand the learning consequences of such inconsistency.

Critical Need APS has collected STAMP proficiency test scores for every school year since 2012 for FLES grade 5 students, except for Spring 2018, when, because of budget constraints, only six of the 11 FLES schools that had been providing FLES instruction for at least six years were tested. APS needs to return to assessing $5^{\text {th }}$ grade students in every school in order to monitor results and gain information for continuous program evaluation and improvement. This is particularly important for this year, because (1) the septennial evaluation of World Language programs is being conducted this year, and (2) ten of the 21 FLES schools have adopted a language instruction schedule that provides only two-thirds of the learning time that ACTFL recommends, which continues to be offered at the other FLES schools. As more FLES schools come online in the future, it will be important to test their students, as well.

| Proven | The STAMP test is a highly rated national assessment of performance- |
| :--- | :--- |
| Solution | based proficiency that reflects the Proficiency Standards established by |
| the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). |  |
|  | Both the elementary and secondary assessments are widely used by <br> school districts throughout the United States, making it possible to <br> compare Arlington results across the county and with other school <br> districts. (See: https://avantassessment.com/stamp4se) |


| Consistency | APS has used the STAMP test to assess language proficiency of <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Arlington students since 2007 for secondary schools and since 2012 for <br> elementary schools. It therefore provides a means for APS to continue <br> to assess consistency and improvement of instructional results. |
| :--- | :--- |

Equity Beginning this year, APS management has given discretion to elementary principals to deliver 60 weekly minutes of FLES instruction instead of the ACTFL-recommended minimum of 90 minutes. Ten of the 21 FLES schools are implementing this reduced schedule. It is important to learn what consequences for learner achievement will result from these unequal decisions.

| Academic | Administering the tests to all students will make it possible for APS to <br> Growth |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | provide teachers, students and parents with objective constructive <br> feedback on the students' learning in order to improve moving forward <br> and to make informed decisions about learning options. Parents, <br> especially, want to know objectively what their children are able to do in <br> the language. |

Achievement, Opportunity \& Excellence Gaps

In the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade STAMP tests that were administered in spring 2018, although the great majority of students in the six schools tested achieved or surpassed the learning goals, $20 \%$ or more of the students failed to meet the benchmark proficiency objective of Novice-Mid or higher in Spanish Reading and Listening. (See Appendix 6.1.) It is important to ascertain whether that result reflects a real achievement gap that also occurs in other schools or that will recur in the same schools in future years, or whether last year's results were a one-time
anomaly. If the gap is a real one, for one or more schools, it must be addressed in the approach to instruction for weaker learners. To determine that requires the administration of the STAMP test.

## Other Priority Alignment

Before learning gaps can be eliminated in any subject area, they must be identified through valid and reliable assessment, such as the STAMP. In addition, by testing every student and providing them and their parents with feedback on the results, the teachers are equipped to provide support that is appropriate for the learning needs of each student.

| Budget | The STAMP test is the least expensive of the small number of <br> nationally validated assessments of language proficiency. It is the only <br> valid and reliable instrument that measures the language proficiency of <br> elementary children. The cost is $\$ 15$ for each test battery administered <br> to a child. The cost for tests for all of the students in Claremont, Key, <br> and Gunston Immersion, Glebe, Patrick Henry, Jamestown, McKinley, <br> and Randolph elementary schools and all high school students taking <br> fourth year language and higher are already included in the 2018-19 <br> budget. Additional costs would be incurred to test the estimated 460 <br> students in $5^{\text {th }}$ grade at Ashlawn, Barcroft, Barrett, Campbell, Carlin <br> Springs and Drew Model School this year, for a total of less than <br> $\$ 7,000 ?^{7}$ |
| :--- | :--- |

Total assessment costs in addition to existing budget $=\mathbf{\$ 7 , 0 0 0}$


#### Abstract

2. Enhance and improve the learning of Spanish and English literacy and help close the achievement gap in elementary immersion classes through implementing increased Spanish instructional time in grades K-2 and transitioning subsequently to an evenly balanced 50-50 use of instructional time in grades 3-5. Begin this program at the kindergarten level. Start this year to assess baseline understanding of the concept of literacy in kindergarten and to assess progress in the development of Spanish reading skills in the second or third grade of Spanish-English immersion for comparison with the third grade English Reading SOL.


RATIONALE: Based on the results of $5^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade Spanish STAMP tests and $5^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade Reading SOLs, almost every student who completes a full sequence of the Arlington Spanish-English Dual-Language Immersion programs develops very strong reading and writing skills in both languages. However, the attrition of students between kindergarten and fifth grade is significant. For the last school year, the finishing $5^{\text {th }}$ grade immersion class of 191 students was more than $25 \%$ fewer than the starting classes of 257 students five years earlier. We do not currently know all the reasons for the loss of students, but, anecdotally, it has been reported that several of them dropped out because of problems completing the course work. This proposed re-alignment and gradation of instructional time would help enhance the early learning of every student.

[^3]
## Critical Need

The present elementary immersion curriculum does not provide enough time to focus on the development of Spanish Language Arts. It disadvantages all students, but, in particular, it disadvantages those of Hispanic and African American heritage. In contrast to the English writing system, the Spanish alphabet features consistent and transparent sound-symbol correspondences that make it easy for all students to learn to use. And research has consistently shown that once a child has learned to read in one language, transferring the skill to another language is relatively easy. ${ }^{8}$ Research has also shown that, by focusing earlier and longer on Spanish language development, particularly reading and writing, all students will have greater bilingual and biliterate outcomes by the end of $5^{\text {th }}$ grade and beyond.

In addition, APS currently has no formal assessment measures of literacy development in Spanish before the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade, even though letter grades are reported to parents. Students and their parents need to have their developing Spanish reading skills assessed before they take the English Reading SOLs in $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade, so that appropriate remediation may be taken, if necessary. Good and reasonably priced instruments for that purpose have been identified and are recommended below.

## Proven Solution

It is well known that children require extensive time to develop functional speech and literacy skills in a second language (Howard et al. 2018; Curtain and Dahlberg 2015; Linquanti \& Cook, 2015). ‘Time on task' is identified as perhaps the single most important variable in language learning. (Heining-Boynton 2006; DeKeyser 2007; Segalowitz 2010).

Research has also shown that using mostly partner-language literacy instruction in the foundational years of English language learners has a positive impact on how they perform on both English and partnerlanguage achievement tests, especially when compared to those who receive literacy instruction only in English (Lindhom-Leary 2016; Howard et. al., 2018). Native English speakers are not at risk of decreased literacy skills in English when participating in a program model that predominantly teaches literacy in the partner language during the early years. This has been demonstrated in the longstanding Canadian French immersion programs and in several U.S. dual language programs. "[lt also] holds true for low and middle income African American students," showing that literacy instruction in the partner language can effectively take place during K-3. (De Jong 2016; Haj-Broussard 2005; Lindholm-Leary and Howard 2008; Thomas \& Collier 2012).
The model that we are proposing, in collaboration with the World Language Office, assigns 90\% of instructional time in grades K-2 to Spanish Language Arts and to the delivery in Spanish of instruction of the other subjects, and 10\% of the instruction time to English Language Arts. In subsequent grades, the instruction time allotted would transition to $50 \%-50 \%$ between English and Spanish (Howard et al. 2018). When

[^4]literacy instruction is delivered in the partner language in grades K-2, as in a 90:10 incremental program, the probability of developing positive attitudes toward reading and writing in both languages increases. Overall achievement in both languages also is strong. The research continues to show that ... "students in dual language programs tend to do as well or better than peers in English mainstream programs." (Lindholm-Leary, 2011; Howard et al., 2018).

| Consistency | Recent informal conversations with some immersion parents and rereading the APS report on interviews of immersion parents that were conducted in 2012 both show that some families feel their children are not adequately prepared to perform independently on tasks, especially where Spanish literacy is required. Several current families have professed to having placed their children into outside tutoring for Spanish literacy enrichment in the middle of second grade, and another from the 2012 report stated that, "my son needed help academically ... on the Spanish side" after $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade. The current APS model is a 50:50 split between content areas. Math, Science and limited Spanish Language Arts are taught in Spanish, and English Language Arts, Reading and Social Studies are taught in English. Spanish reading and writing are introduced in Spanish Language Arts and also integrated throughout Math and Science. But in the current model, there is not enough time to regularly use instructional activities to build early literacy skills, such as guided reading groups, shared or interactive reading and writing, or extension literacy centers. In fact, in practice, it appears to be the case that, at present, comparatively little time is dedicated to the development of skills in Spanish reading and writing for an academic setting. |
| :---: | :---: |

## Equity

Research shows that a model of immersion education that transitions from an early $90 \%-10 \%$ Spanish-English model to a $50 \%-50 \%$ model in later elementary grades makes learning accessible to all children by providing an optimal learning environment for early literacy development (Howard et al. 2018; Curtain and Dahlgren 2015) and by strengthening the involvement of student families. It also develops lifelong habits of literacy among the children.

## Academic Growth

As noted above, the present elementary immersion schedule of instructional time provides little time to focus on the development of Spanish reading and writing, thus disadvantaging the half of the students who have Hispanic heritage. The Spanish alphabet presents transparent sound-symbol correspondences that make it easier for all children to learn than English. Research has shown that by focusing early and hard on developing Spanish Reading and Writing skills and transitioning over time to a schedule that puts equal emphasis on English Reading and Writing, students will become truly biliterate in Spanish and English by the end of 5th grade and be prepared to take content subjects in either language in middle school and beyond. Of course, they will also have developed functional control of two world languages.

Achievement, Opportunity \& Excellence Gaps

Long-term data have shown that all students of all backgrounds and from all demographics, including English language learners and the economically disadvantaged or learning disabled, perform better in twoway immersion programs than in traditional instructional models. This has been shown to be true despite earlier widespread assumptions that learning two languages would detract from the development of English language skills in English Language Learners. Research has proven that second language learners in well implemented two-way immersion programs will take up to six years to reach grade-level competence in both languages - a generalization verified in Arlington's immersion programs -- but it can take as many as seven to ten years if those partner-language students did not start in kindergarten or receive "the opportunity to be schooled" enough in their first language (Thomas \& Collier 2012, 2017). Very recent findings on reading show that "with a strong and consistent focus on partner-language literacy, all students can make significant progress in the development of reading skills" (Watzinger-Tharp et al. 2018). Frontloading more Spanish language arts time in the early grades will "level the playing field" by allowing for the partner-language to be used across a variety of content areas, while also giving greater exposure and time to developing "working knowledge of [the] native language to facilitate the transfer of language processes and function into English." Partner-language students and African American students appear to benefit the most from such a model, enabling them to begin to "close the gap" with the other learners. (Mitchell 2018; Watzinger-Tharp et al. 2018). Students with diverse abilities, English Language Learners and challenge-seekers will benefit as much as the benchmark-performing student from increased time to learn and practice speaking, reading, and writing in Spanish during the early childhood years.

Social and
Emotional

For a younger student, the partner-language and culture becomes naturally more accessible and a greater identity builder when larger amounts of quality time are spent using the language -- reading its literature, singing its songs, hearing its music, tasting its foods, playing its games and experiencing its art. Established analysis of the roles of cultural capital and principles of language equity in learning predict that in two-way immersion programs the dominant language will tend to cross over upon the partner-language much more than the partnerlanguage will upon the dominant language during learning time (De Jong 2016). Adding strengthened Spanish literacy through the gradual implementation of a 90:10 to a 50:50 model, with a heavy dose of Spanish language arts in K-2, will bring more language equity and cross-cultural competence to the two-way immersion program. It will create more opportunities for partner-language learning and building every learner's identity, which in turn will improve the feelings of belonging among heritage speakers while creating more culturally sensitive partner-language learners. In other words, students coming in already speaking Spanish will have more time to develop both languages and can be considered in class as "experts" in their home language and cultures, while other students will have more time "to be immersed" (Lindholm-Leary 2011).

Other Priority Alignments

Once implemented, this recommendation will be an important step toward further strengthening the development of literacy skills in both English and Spanish among elementary children in the immersion program. Research has shown that programs like this enhance the learning of all children and reduce program attrition. It will provide challenging and engaging instruction for every child and will help to reduce any gaps in learning skills as students move into middle school. In addition, this program may serve as a kind of "pilot" of an instructional approach that might be adapted for the benefit of Hispanic heritage students and others who are enrolled in the FLES program.

## Budget

To start implementing the 90:10 format of instruction in kindergarten in the next two years would not entail any additional teacher costs.
Additional instructional materials in Spanish, such as guided readers, would need to be purchased for use in the classroom and to have available in the school library. To provide Spanish materials for the instruction of approximately 250 kindergarten students at the Key and Claremont immersion schools should be possible for about \$3,000 for each school, a total of $\$ 6,000 .{ }^{9}$

There are two promising published instruments to assess students' early development of Spanish reading: the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), which costs approximately $\$ 450$ for 30 students (but with re-usable test booklets) and Aprenda! with an approximate cost of $\$ 15.00$ per student. There are typically about 240 immersion students in each of the second or third grade. Thus, the cost to administer either of these assessments to one grade level in both schools would be a total of $\$ 3,600$ per year. If begun in the present school year and repeated in SY-2019-20, the cost for the two years would be \$7,200.

## Total for materials and two years' $\mathbf{2 n d}^{\text {d }}$ grade assessment = \$13,200.

## 3. Support the Social Studies Advisory Committee initiative to prepare globally competent APS graduates. World Languages and Social Studies should collaborate to create complementary lesson topics and joint activities for curriculum development that will prepare APS graduates for successful career and community engagement in a diverse world. ${ }^{10}$

RATIONALE: The most recent recommending year report by the ACI Social Studies Advisory Committee spotlighted the need to develop global education for Arlington students. The APS Mission was cited in the report: Arlington Public Schools instills a love of learning in its students and prepares them to be responsible and productive global

[^5]citizens. Three reasons were cited for pushing global education: "to prepare APS students for $21^{\text {st }}$ Century careers, to prepare them for engagement with pressing global and social justice issues, and to use global studies to strengthen our own community." The report stated further, "We hope to partner with other committees ... and believe this focus offers tremendous opportunity for exciting interdisciplinary curricular work and integrated learning." The World Language Advisory Committee agrees completely, and we stand ready to work with SSAC to help make this vision a reality. As the SSAC report expressly observes, "World Languages instruction [already] includes a focus on world cultures, and world language knowledge is an essential part of global communication skill-building."

In addition to collaboration between the advisory committees and within the Department of Teaching and Learning, we suggest that at each school the Social Studies and World Language departments plan to meet up at least twice a year to discuss upcoming lesson topics and how they might build off and compliment each other.

## Critical Need The web-page of the U.S. Department of Education includes the following statement: <br> "The U.S. Department of Education's International Strategy lays out its commitment to prepare all U.S. students to succeed globally through international education and engagement. Today, more than ever, our students need to be equipped with the critical thinking, communications, socio-emotional and language skills to work collaboratively with their counterparts in the United States and all over the world. Understanding and appreciating other parts of the world, different religions, cultures, and points of view are essential elements of global and cultural competence." https://sites.ed.gov/international/global-and-cultural-competency/

APS's students come from 146 nations and speak 107 languages. Nationally as well as locally in the Arlington community, the need for globally competent citizens has been fully established. Study of world languages not only provides needed functional skills in the language and insight into the culture, it also has been shown to enhance other skills highlighted in the above quote, including learners' cognitive flexibility, creativity and executive functioning.

## Proven Solution Developed over fifteen years of research and practice, ACTFL's World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (2017) identifies five critical "goal areas" for language learning.

Communication (Interpersonal, Interpretive and Presentational communicative abilities.) - Learners communicate effectively in more than one language in order to function in a variety of situations and for multiple purposes. Learners interact and negotiate meaning in spoken, signed, or written interactions to share information, reactions, feelings, and opinions. [They] understand, interpret, and analyze what is heard, read, or viewed on a variety of topics.

Cultures (Cultural competence and understanding) - Learners interact with cultural competence and understanding. [They] use the language to investigate, explain and reflect on the relationship
between the practices and perspectives of the culture(s) studied.
Connections - Learners connect with other disciplines and acquire information and diverse perspectives in order to use the language to function in academic and career-related situations. Learners build, reinforce and expand their knowledge of other disciplines while using the language to develop critical thinking and to solve problems creatively. Learners can use those language skills to explore their own personal interests, whether their personal interests be in the fine arts, history, anthropology, medicine and sciences, engineering, or politics, etc. Students can further their knowledge base in any of these fields with resources that originate in the world language of their choice and choose to collaborate with others around the world in these fields as they advance themselves. Real-world applications focused on topics of personal interest challenge and engage all students.

Comparisons - Learners develop Insight into the nature of language and culture in order to interact with cultural competence. Studying world languages enhances the awareness of the sensitivity of language choice in communicating. ${ }^{11}$
Communities - Learners communicate and interact with cultural competence in order to participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world. Learners use the language both within and beyond the classroom to interact and collaborate in their community and the globalized world. Learners set goals and reflect on their progress in using languages for enjoyment, enrichment, and advancement.

The implementation of these Standards in schools across the country has effected profound improvements in world language education and international education in the United States at every level. (See Abbott and Phillips 2011.)

| Equity | True global education, which fosters the development of <br> perspectives on many cultures and the ability to communicate with <br> representatives of other cultures, also has the effect of <br> demonstrating to all students that their languages, cultures and <br> ways of life are valued within the APS community. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Academic | Reading literature and non-fiction texts in another language as part <br> of the collaboration between World Language Arts and Social <br> Growth <br> Studies will expand vocabulary and enhance fluency in reading, <br> while it broadens perspectives on the culture and its history. <br> Reading in English about the cultures where the language is <br> spoken will also be accessible to children from those cultures and <br> will provide critical new perspectives for the other learners. Thomas <br> Jefferson Middle School already helps students strengthen their <br> reading by including reading comprehension tasks in subject area <br> classes. Students can be encouraged to do some of their reading |

[^6]in the Social Studies in the language that they are studying, including news and magazines, histories, biographies, travel guides, etc.
Current Programs in the immersion program, such as Vamos Adelante \& Abejas Lectoras, which enhance family and community involvement while supporting Spanish language arts through literacy inside the classroom and in the larger school community, have played a vital role in bringing students and families together from all backgrounds while balancing the scales between the dominant and partner languages. Students experience more time hearing other Spanish speakers during literacy activities, which in turn helps all students with confidence building by learning through interactions.

| Achievement, <br>  <br> Excellence Gaps | Research has shown that learning content through a world <br> language allows English Language Learners the opportunity to <br> capitalize on their existing knowledge. This boosts students' <br> confidence, as they can leverage from positions of strength. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Social and | We encourage both actual and virtual exchanges and participation <br> Emotional <br> in international interdisciplinary collaborations. This has been done <br> successfully in a number of ways, such as these: |
|  | - Creating robust partnerships with local organizations focused on |
| global issues; |  |
| - Having resources in the community of individuals with |  |
| information to be visited and/or invited into the classroom for |  |
|  | content presentations; |
|  | - Having APS students partner with students in other classrooms |
| around the world in information exchange by email, phone, or |  |
| video chat or individual pen pal assignments; |  |

Other Priority Interdisciplinary collaboration helps to reinforce student learning Alignment across the curriculum to achieve APS strategic goals.

Collaboration can foster partnerships among families, community, and staff to enrich the learning of our students. This develops civic competencies and community service and engagement.

Global collaboration encourages students to think flexibly and creatively and develop new perspectives that improve problemsolving capabilities.

Learning 'across the curriculum,' such as what is proposed here,
clearly would provide Challenging and Engaging Instruction that would create motivating choices for all learners.

## Budget

As this recommendation is implemented over time, it will be necessary to purchase access to additional audio-visual and written resource materials to help broaden the learners' perspectives on culture. It may also be desirable to establish a system of small honoraria or stipends for members of the community who are willing to share their experiences with learners. For the present year, however, no budgetary impact is anticipated.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:

Sara Aramendia grew up in a bilingual (English/Spanish) environment; she studied French and German at APS during middle school, Spanish in high school; and Chinese abroad in Nanjing during her graduate studies. She and her husband are raising their three children to be multilingual; this includes participation in the Spanish immersion program at Claremont Elementary School.
Eden Brown's son graduated in 2018 from Yorktown HS with the Seal of Biliteracy, and she has had two other children complete school in Arlington. Eden is a fluent speaker of French, with additional proficiency in Italian. She has studied Sinhala, Hindi, and German. She is currently taking Spanish on line at NOVA. She is on her second career, as a journalist. All three of her children speak good French, and one speaks fluent Bangla, after doing the State Department's Critical Language Study program in Dhaka.
Dr. Sylvia Chou is a scientist and administrator at the National Cancer Institute, NIH. She holds a PhD in Linguistics and MA in Applied Linguistics from Georgetown and a Master in Public Health from UC Berkeley. Born in Taiwan, her native language is Mandarin Chinese and she has an intermediate knowledge of German. Sylvia previously taught Chinese and ESL at the university and high-school levels. She currently has two children in APS (Washington-Lee HS and Williamsburg MS).

Dr. Frederick Jackson, Chair, has a Ph.D. in Linguistics and M.A. in Second Language Teaching. Rick speaks Thai and Lao and has studied Chinese, French, German and Micronesian languages. He was Senior Research Associate at the National Foreign Language Center of the University of Maryland and was earlier Head of Staff Development at the School of Language Studies, Foreign Service Institute. He has no young children.
Dr. Yun Kang has a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from Georgetown University. She teaches language at George Washington University. She has a child in the Immersion program at Claremont School.
Katherine McGwier has a sophomore at Wakefield in her 4th year of Latin, who is pursuing a Latin/Spanish bilingual diploma. Last summer, Kaitlin enjoyed participating in the Amigos Program in Panama, and has an interest in further pursuing her study of Spanish.
Adrianne McQuillian grew up speaking two languages and spending many summers in Latin America and the school year in the United States. She has a bachelor's degree in hospitality and tourism management and another in Spanish. She has a master's degree
in Spanish and Latin American Studies with dual concentrations in Language/Linguistics/ Translation and Literature/Culture, and a graduate certification in Spanish-English translation. She is raising her four children to be bilingual and multicultural global citizens. They are enrolled in Claremont Immersion and spend their summers in camps, courses, and schools in Latin America.

Stephanie Westerlund grew up bilingual in the U.S., in a multigenerational home where the primary home language was Spanish. Stephanie has a Masters degree in Early Childhood Education Curriculum and Instruction (Bilingual, Multicultural Inclusive Education) from George Mason University's Unified Transformative Early Education Model (UTEEM). She was a kindergarten teacher in Montgomery County Public Schools, where, as a Spanish teacher, she helped to pilot an innovative dual-language program. Her family maintains Spanish at home. Her family now has three children attending Escuela Key School.

Student Representatives: The schools represented are Wakefield, Washington-Lee, and Yorktown High Schools. The languages studied by the three representatives include American Sign Language, Chinese, French, German, Japanese and Latin.

* Radina Dancheva is Student Representative for Washington-Lee High School, where she is in $11^{\text {th }}$ grade, studying French IB-HL. Radina's native language is Bulgarian, and she has already passed the test to qualify for the Seal of Biliteracy in both Bulgarian and French. This is her first year on the WLAC.
* Kevin Farrell is Student Representatives for Yorktown High School, where he is taking Latin and German. He is in the tenth grade, and this is his first year on the WLAC.
* Jim Sharkey is the alternate Student Representative from Yorktown. He is taking Latin and Japanese. He is also in the tenth grade, and this is his first year on the WLAC.
* Shinmei Garrison is Student Representative for Wakefield High School, where she studies American Sign Language and has completed study of Chinese through Level 4. Shinmei is a senior. This is her second year serving on the WLAC,
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## Appendix 1. Participation in APS Elementary World Language Programs 2009-2016 (Grade 5)

All elementary schools have reported full World Language participation in SY 201617 and 2017-18, in either Dual-Language Immersion or FLES, so that nearly 100\% of elementary students in grades K-5 have been receiving instruction in Spanish language and culture, in addition to regular instruction in English. Beginning in the current year, students in the Montessori Program at Drew Model School do not study a language. Also as of this year (2018-19), there are differences in the intensity of the FLES Spanish curriculum from one elementary school to another.


Appendix 2: World Language FLES Instruction Time By School: 2018-2019
NB: Except for in the Drew Model School Montessori School, every
APS elementary school student is enrolled in Spanish language instruction.

| School | Days and Minutes Per Week Taught for each FLES class | Other Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools that provide every grade with at least 90 minutes/week of Spanish instruction-- |  |  |
| Arlington Traditional | 90 minutes @ $3 \times 30$ minutes | VPI-5th |
| Barrett | 90 minutes @ 3x30 minutes | K-5 |
| Claremont | Spanish used half-day 5 days/week | Dual language immersion |
| Drew | 90 minutes @ $3 \times 30$ minutes | No language in Montessori |
| Glebe | 90 minutes @ $2 \times 45$ mins (including 5 minutes transition time.) | K-5 |
| Jamestown | 90 minutes @ $2 \times 45$ minutes | K-5 |
| Key | Spanish used half-day 5 days/week | Dual language immersion |
| Long Branch | 90 minutes @ $2 \times 45$ minutes | K-5 |
| McKinley | 90 minutes @ $3 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Nottingham | 90minutes @ $3 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Patrick Henry | 90 minutes @ $3 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Taylor | 90 minutes @ $3 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Tuckahoe | 90 minutes @ $3 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Schools that provide fewer than 90 minutes/week of Spanish instruction-- |  |  |
| Abingdon | 90 minutes K-3; 60 minutes 4-5 | As noted |
| Arlington Science Focus | 60-80 minutes | K-5 |


| Ashlawn | 90 minutes K-3; 60 minutes 4-5 | Literacy support for <br> Spanish speakers |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Barcroft | 60 minutes @ $2 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Campbell | 80 minutes @ $2 \times 40$ minutes | pK-5 |
| Carlin Springs | 60 minutes @ $2 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Discovery | 60 minutes @ $2 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Hoffman Boston | 60 minutes @ $2 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Oakridge | 60 minutes @ $2 \times 30$ minutes | K-5 |
| Randolph | K-1: 90 minutes; $2-360$ minutes; 4-5 |  |
| one block @ 90 minutes | As noted |  |

Source: Information retrieved from World Language Office, August 2018.

## Appendix 3. Grade 6 World Language Enrollments for 2017-18 ${ }^{\mathbf{1 2}}$


N.B. Kenmore, Williamsburg and Gunston MS only offer proficiency-based courses in Spanish in $6^{\text {th }}$ grade and do not offer proficiency-based introductory courses in other languages, although Kenmore and Williamsburg do offer short-term "exploratory" courses within the "Wheel." Jefferson and Swanson MS and the H-B Woodlawn Secondary program offer 6th graders introductory instruction in French, Latin and Spanish. Jefferson also offers it for ASL, Arabic and Chinese, all of which attract students.

[^7]Appendix 4. Middle School World Language Students by School, in 2016-18

| Middle School | Students Taking Language ${ }^{13}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018-19 |  |  |  | 2017-18 |  |  |  | 2016-17 |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | \% | 7+8 | \% | 6 | \% | 7+8 | \% | 6 | \% | 7+8 | \% |
| Gunston | 201 | 54\% | 545 | 83\% | 148 | 43\% | 549 | 85\% | 153 | 46\% | 513 | 83\% |
| Jefferson | 394 | 92\% | 565 | 79\% | 325 | 93\% | 550 | 79\% | 340 | 97\% | 467 | 77\% |
| Kenmore | 119 | 36\% | 417 | 67\% | 122 | 37\% | 389 | 66\% | 114 | 37\% | 463 | 79\% |
| Swanson | 296 | 65\% | 625 | 78\% | 234 | 66\% | 668 | 77\% | 311 | 71\% | 577 | 78\% |
| Williamsburg | 165 | 36\% | 745 | 86\% | 209 | 50\% | 700 | 84\% | 191 | 44\% | 648 | 84\% |
| H-B Woodlawn | 74 | 94\% | 160 | 97\% | 75 | 94\% | 154 | 91\% | 78 | 94\% | 158 | 97\% |
| Totals | 1249 | 59\% | 3057 | 80\% | 1113 | 59\% | 2983 | 79\% | 1187 | 60\% | 2826 | 81\% |

${ }^{13}$ For grades 7 and 8 our data only indicate course level, but not grade level of enrolled students. We thus combine data for these grades. Participation in WL courses shows the number of WL courses taken divided by total enrollment at that grade. Red figures indicate (a) $6^{\text {th }}$ grade language enrollments that are less than $50 \%$ of total enrollments, and (b) $7^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade language enrollments less than $75 \%$ of total enrollments

Appendix 5: Less Commonly Taught Language Enrollments by Languages and Levels 2010-19
With the exception of at Jefferson Middle School and the IB courses at Washington-Lee HS, where all language instruction is delivered by teachers, instruction in these four languages is delivered in a Blended format. In the last 3 years, the World Language Office has committed to providing instruction with the teacher present for at least $50 \%$ of class time in middle schools and $80 \%-100 \%$ of the time in high school. The only exception is Chinese at the high school level for Chinese I-Chinese 4 AP, which are taught using the Virtual Virginia online program.

|  | $2010-11$ | $2011-12$ | $2012-13$ | $2013-14$ | $2014-15$ | $2015-16$ | $2016-17$ | $2017-18$ | $2018-19$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intro to Arabic (MS) |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| Arabic 1 MS | 21 | 25 | 27 | 30 | 32 | 44 | 39 | 49 | 38 |
| Arabic 2 MS | 3 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 21 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 31 |
| Arabic 3 MS |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arabic 1 (HS) | 30 | 33 | 21 | 33 | 21 | 17 | 25 | 7 | 18 |
| Arabic 2 (HS) | 10 | 23 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 10 |
| Arabic 3 (HS) | 4 | 11 | 19 | 22 | 27 | 28 | 32 | 26 | 25 |
| Arabic 4 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 19 | 16 | 18 |
| Arabic 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| IB Arabic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 10 |
| Total Arabic | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 7}$ |
| Intro to Chinese (MS) |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 21 | 23 | 31 |
| Chinese 1 MS | 35 | 34 | 53 | 48 | 51 | 59 | 52 | 59 | 53 |
| Chinese 2 MS | 10 | 19 | 17 | 36 | 27 | 34 | 40 | 26 | 44 |
| Chinese 3 MS | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chinese 1 (HS) | 36 | 33 | 32 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 11 | 10 | 14 |
| Chinese 2 (HS) | 12 | 20 | 31 | 22 | 10 | 19 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| Chinese 3 (HS) | 12 | 11 | 26 | 32 | 35 | 22 | 28 | 43 | 27 |
| Chinese 4 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 19 | 14 | 27 | 15 | 17 | 24 |
| AP Chinese 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 6 |
| IB Chinese SL1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 12 | 10 |
| IB Chinese SL2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 9 |
| Total Chinese | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 3}$ |
| German 1 MS | 13 | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| German 2 MS | 36 | 10 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| German 1 (HS) | 38 | 43 | 41 | 29 | 31 | 33 | 25 | 23 | 25 |


| German 2 (HS) |  | 24 | 24 | 31 | 10 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 15 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| German 3 | 24 | 26 | 21 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 15 |
| German 4 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | N |
| German 4 AP | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Total German | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ |
| Japanese 1 |  | 22 | 28 | 41 | 32 | 34 | 45 | 29 | 31 |
| Japanese 2 |  | 14 | 7 | 17 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 16 |
| Japanese 3 |  | 17 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 7 |
| Japanese 4 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N | N |
| Total Japanese | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ |

Source: Compilation by Arlington Public Schools World Language Office, Sept. 18, 2013, and Nov. 10, 2014, by Information Technology Office, March 2016,
and by WLAC from WLO data September, 2018.

Appendix 6.1. Aggregated FLES Proficiency Test Results (2012-2018)
AGGREGATED FLES STAMP 4Se PROFICIENCY TEST RESULTS 2012-2018

|  | SPEAKING RESULTS |  |  |  |  |  |  | LISTENING RESULTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prof. Level | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| ADVANCED | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | N | 0\% | 0\% | 9\% | N | 9\% | N | N | N | N |
| INTERMEDIATE-HI/MID | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 8\% | 4\% | 7\% | 4\% | 25\% | 9\% | 18\% | 34\% | 34\% | 33\% |
| INTERMEDIATE-LO | 8\% | 11\% | 3\% | 3\% | 17\% | 16\% | 21\% | 16\% | 15\% | 34\% | 13\% | 20\% | 20\% | 15\% |
| NOVICE-HI | 24\% | 39\% | 23\% | 20\% | 19\% | 41\% | 22\% | 24\% | 19\% | 16\% | 23\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| NOVICE-MID | 56\% | 40\% | 53\% | 60\% | 45\% | 27\% | 24\% | 25\% | 23\% | 20\% | 28\% | 29\% | 29\% | 17\% |
| NOVICE-LOW | 11\% | 8\% | 21\% | 18\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 22\% | 18\% | 12\% | 17\% | 3\% | 3\% | 22\% |
| NO SCORE | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | N | 4\% | 7\% | 20\% | 0\% | 0\% | 24\% | N | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% |
| N STUDENTS | 98 | 149 | 366 | 550 | 465* | 512* | 469 | 118 | 177 | 385 | 627 | 512* | 512* | 475 |
|  | READING RESULTS |  |  |  |  |  |  | WRITING RESULTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prof. Level | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| ADVANCED | 7\% | 0\% | N | N | N | 8\% | N | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | N | 0\% | 0\% |
| INTERMEDIATE-HI/MID | 6\% | 18\% | 6\% | 15\% | 29\% | 13\% | 23\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 3\% | 4\% |
| INTERMEDIATE-LO | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 20\% | 14\% | 17\% | 49\% | 6\% | 3\% | 4\% | 6\% | 26\% | 20\% |
| NOVICE-HI | 13\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 18\% | 12\% | 9\% | 7\% | 48\% | 21\% | 23\% | 11\% | 37\% | 31\% |
| NOVICE-MID | 38\% | 40\% | 52\% | 43\% | 28\% | 42\% | 31\% | 2\% | 38\% | 46\% | 50\% | 53\% | 28\% | 28\% |
| NOVICE-LOW | 22\% | 17\% | 14\% | 12\% | 3\% | 11\% | 21\% | 6\% | 7\% | 30\% | 23\% | 16\% | 4\% | 10\% |
| NO SCORE | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | N | 3\% | 1\% | 0\% | 29\% | 0\% | 0\% | N | 9\% | 2\% | 8\% |
| N STUDENTS | 128 | 182 | 384 | 626 | 529* | 520* | 486 | 112 | 170 | 370 | 605 | 521* | 515* | 473 |

Data are from the World Language Office, Arlington Public Schools

## Schools tested had delivered FLES instruction to students for at least five years (e.g., Grades 1-5):

2012 Schools (2) Glebe Patrick Henry
2013 Schools (3) Glebe, Henry \& Barcroft
2014 Schools (6) Ashlawn, Barcroft, Glebe, Henry, Jamestown \& McKinley
2015 Schools (7) Ashlawn, Barcroft, Glebe, Henry, Jamestown, McKinley \& Randolph
2016 Schools (7) *Representative random samples of students from Ashlawn, Barcroft, Glebe, Henry, Jamestown, McKinley \& Randolph
2017 Schools (11) *Representative random samples of students from Ashlawn, Barcroft, Barrett, Campbell, Carlin Springs, Drew, Glebe, Henry, Jamestown, McKinley \& Randolph 2018 Schools (6) Ashlawn, Barcroft, Barrett, Campbell, Carlin Springs, \& Drew only -- all students who had completed 4 or more years of FLES ${ }^{1}$

Pink highlighting indicates proficiency results that exceed FLES goal of Novice-Mid proficiency.
Yellow highlighting indicates proficiency results that do not meet FLES goal.
**The tests administered in 2016 were the ACTFL Assessment of Performance toward Proficiency in Languages (AAPPL).

[^8]The benchmark expected results for Immersion K-5 students are level Novice-High and above. The yellow highlighting indicates the percentage of students in each school who did not meet the benchmark in a given year. Salmon highlighting shows the percentages of students whose level of proficiency significantly exceeded the benchmark. For 2018, the percentages of students who achieved Intermediate-level scores are as follows: Reading - 95\%; Writing - 92\%; Listening - 96\%; Speaking - 93\%.

| AGGREG | TED 5th | Grade Imm | rsion-Re | ults - 2016 | 18 Summ | ry Chart |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2018 R | esults |  |  | 2017 R | sults |  |  | 2016 R | esults |  |
| Level | Reading | Reading \% | Writing | Writing \% | Reading | Reading \% | Writing | Writing \% | Reading | Reading \% | Writing | Writing \% |
| Adv-Hi | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Adv-Mid | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Adv-Lo | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Inter-Hi | 65 | 37\% | 1 | 1\% | 61 | 29\% | 1 | 0\% | 78 | 42\% | 75 | 41\% |
| Inter-Mid | 85 | 48\% | 89 | 47\% | 96 | 45\% | 92 | 43\% | 73 | 40\% | 29 | 16\% |
| Inter-Lo | 17 | 10\% | 82 | 44\% | 20 | 9\% | 83 | 39\% | 15 | 8\% | 65 | 35\% |
| Nov-Hi | 3 | 2\% | 13 | 7\% | 2 | 1\% | 13 | 6\% | 3 | 2\% | 13 | 7\% |
| Nov-Mid | 4 | 2\% | 3 | 2\% | 5 | 2\% | 4 | 2\% | 3 | 2\% | 2 | 1\% |
| Nov-Low | 2 | 1\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| NR | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 17 | 8\% | 20 | 9\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| TOTALS | 176 | 100\% | 188 | 100\% | 213 | 100\% | 213 | 100\% | 184 | 100\% | 184 | 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2018 R | esults |  |  | 2017 R | sults |  |  | 2016 R | esults |  |
| Level | Listening | Listening \% | Speaking | Speaking $\%$ | Listening | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Listening } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Speaking | Speaking \% | Listening | Listening \% | Speaking | Speaking \% |
| Adv-Hi | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Adv-Mid | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Adv-Lo | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 1\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 2\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Inter-Hi | 128 | 67\% | 5 | 3\% | 117 | 55\% | 0 | 0\% | 105 | 57\% | 42 | 23\% |
| Inter-Mid | 41 | 22\% | 115 | 62\% | 51 | 24\% | 55 | 26\% | 57 | 31\% | 13 | 7\% |
| Inter-Lo | 13 | 7\% | 51 | 28\% | 20 | 9\% | 115 | 54\% | 16 | 9\% | 100 | 54\% |
| Nov-Hi | 7 | 4\% | 13 | 7\% | 5 | 2\% | 17 | 8\% | 1 | 1\% | 26 | 14\% |
| Nov-Mid | 1 | 1\% | 1 | 1\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 2\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 2\% |
| Nov-Low | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0\% | 1 | 1\% | 0 | 0\% |
| NR | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 18 | 8\% | 21 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| TOTALS | 190 | 100\% | 185 | 100\% | 213 | 100\% | 213 | 100\% | 183 | 100\% | 184 | 100\% |

## Appendix Table 6.3. STAMP 4S Proficiency Test Results for Eighth Grade Gunston Immersion Students in Spanish

The double line marks the minimum target benchmark of Intermediate-Low for $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade Immersion students. All scores above Intermediate-Mid meet or exceed the benchmark. It is particularly remarkable that in the receptive skill modalities of Reading and Listening, well more than $50 \%$ of the students demonstrated proficiency at the Advanced level on the ACTFL scale - three levels or more above the benchmark.

8th Grade Immersion Spanish Proficiency Results - Spring 2018

| SCORE | Reading | Percent | Writing | Percent | Listening | Percent | Speaking | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced-Hi | 1 | $1 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 3 | $3 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Advanced-Mid | 25 | $27 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 24 | $26 \%$ | 2 | $2 \%$ |
| Advanced-Low | 27 | $29 \%$ | 23 | $24 \%$ | 34 | $36 \%$ | 12 | $13 \%$ |
| Intermediate-Hi | 16 | $17 \%$ | 47 | $50 \%$ | 13 | $14 \%$ | 40 | $43 \%$ |
| Intermediate -Mid | 7 | $7 \%$ | 20 | $21 \%$ | 10 | $11 \%$ | 32 | $34 \%$ |
| Intermediate-Lo | 15 | $16 \%$ | 4 | $4 \%$ | 4 | $4 \%$ | 6 | $6 \%$ |
| Novice-Hi | 3 | $3 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 6 | $6 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ |
| Novice-Mid | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Novice-Low | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| No Score | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

8th Grade Immersion Spanish Proficiency Results - Spring 2017

| SCORE | Reading | Percent | Writing | Percent | Listening | Percent | Speaking | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced-Hi | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 4 | $4 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Advanced-Mid | 13 | $13 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 17 | $16 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Advanced-Low | 41 | $39 \%$ | 15 | $14 \%$ | 37 | $36 \%$ | 6 | $6 \%$ |
| Intermediate-Hi | 21 | $20 \%$ | 46 | $44 \%$ | 13 | $13 \%$ | 39 | $38 \%$ |
| Intermediate -Mid | 12 | $12 \%$ | 36 | $35 \%$ | 16 | $15 \%$ | 42 | $40 \%$ |
| Intermediate-Lo | 10 | $10 \%$ | 7 | $7 \%$ | 9 | $9 \%$ | 13 | $13 \%$ |
| Novice-Hi | 7 | $7 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 7 | $7 \%$ | 3 | $3 \%$ |
| Novice-Mid | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Novice-Low | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| No Score | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Source: Unofficial data compiled and provided by the World Languages Office in September 2018.
Pink highlighting indicates proficiency results that exceed FLES goal of Novice-Mid proficiency.
Yellow highlighting indicates proficiency results that do not meet FLES goal.

## Appendix 7. 2018-19 World Language Enrollments by School Type



Source: Unofficial report from Arlington Public Schools, September 2018.

Appendix 8. 2018-19 Middle School Language Enrollments

| Course Title | HBW | TJ | KN | SW | WBG | GUN | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sixth Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intro to ASL |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 36 |
| Introduction to Arabic |  | 18 |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| Introduction to Chinese |  | 31 |  |  |  |  | 31 |
| Introduction to French (French IA) | 26 | 132 |  | 98 |  |  | 256 |
| Introduction to Latin (Latin 1A) | 12 | 38 |  | 44 |  |  | 94 |
| Introduction to Spanish | 30 | 40 |  | 42 | 42 |  | 154 |
| Transitional Spanish | 0 | 50 | 69 | 103 | 113 | 78 | 413 |
| Span/FS (6th Grade) | 6 | 49 | 50 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 138 |
| Spanish Immersion |  |  |  |  |  | 109 | 109 |
| Total 6th Grade Lang. | 74 | 394 | 119 | 296 | 165 | 201 | 1249 |
| Overall 6th Grade* | 79 | 426 | 330 | 452 | 460 | 372 | 2119 |
| Percent in Language | 94\% | 92\% | 36\% | 65\% | 36\% | 54\% | 59\% |
| Grades 7-8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Sign Lang 1 | 4 | 36 |  |  |  |  | 40 |
| American Sing Lang 2 |  | 13 |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| Arabic I | 1 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 29 |
| Arabic I (Intensified) | 0 | 9 | N | N | N | 0 | 9 |
| Arabic II | 0 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 31 |
| Chinese I | 1 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 39 |
| Chinese I (Intensified) | 0 | 14 | N | N | N | 0 | 14 |
| Chinese II | 4 | 15 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 44 |
| French I | 23 | 23 | 75 | 56 | 88 | 66 | 331 |
| French I (Intensified) | 0 | 69 | N | 36 | N | N | 105 |
| French II | 19 | 75 | 47 | 78 | 65 | 39 | 323 |
| French III | 1 | 1 | N | N | N | 1 | 3 |
| German I | 1 | N | N | N | N | N | 1 |
| German II | 1 | N | N | N | N | N | 1 |
| Latin I | 14 | 6 | 18 | 24 | 43 | 4 | 109 |
| Latin I (Intensified) | 0 | 19 | N | 18 | N | N | 37 |
| Latin II | 9 | 25 | 3 | 54 | 53 | 4 | 148 |
| Latin III | N | N | N | 1 | N | N | 1 |
| Span/FS I | 10 | 25 | 58 | 18 | 12 | 25 | 148 |
| Span/FS II | 6 | 47 | 35 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 113 |
| Span/FS III | N | N | N | N | 5 | N | 5 |
| Spanish 1 | 36 | 31 | 73 | 114 | 177 | 62 | 493 |
| Spanish 1 Intensified | 0 | 62 | 17 | 44 | 64 | 18 | 205 |
| Spanish II | 29 | 74 | 61 | 156 | 201 | 86 | 607 |


| Spanish V (non-AP) | 1 | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | $N$ | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spanish Immersion 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 107 | 107 |
| Spanish Immersion 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 100 |
| TOTAL 7-8 Language | 160 | 565 | 417 | 625 | 745 | 545 | 3057 |
| Overall 7-8 Enrollments* | 165 | 712 | 627 | 799 | 862 | 653 | 3818 |
| Percent 7-8 in Language | $97 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $80 \%$ |

From enrollment data as of 09/13/2018.

Appendix 9. High School Language Enrollments

| 2018-19 HS Language Courses Enrollments (09/13/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Arlington | New | Grand |
| Course Title | HBW | W-L | WK | YT | Tech | DIR | Total |
| American Sign Lang I | 34 | 49 | 58 | 99 | 21 |  | 261 |
| American Sign Language II | 15 | 44 | 40 | 64 | N |  | 163 |
| American Sign Language III | 3 | 33 | 23 | 33 | N |  | 92 |
| American Sign Language IV | 1 | 0 | 5 | 11 | N |  | 17 |
| Arabic I | 4 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 1 |  | 18 |
| Arabic II | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 |  | 10 |
| Arabic III | 0 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 1 |  | 25 |
| Arabic IV | 0 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 0 |  | 18 |
| Arabic V | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |  | 9 |
| IB Arabic SL 1 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| IB Arabic SL 2 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Chinese I | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 |  | 14 |
| Chinese II | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 |  | 15 |
| Chinese III | 0 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 2 |  | 27 |
| Chinese IV | 1 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 2 |  | 24 |
| AP Chinese V | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |  | 6 |
| IB Mandarin Chinese SL 1 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| IB Mandarin Chinese SL 2 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| French I | 1 | 17 | 27 | 21 | 7 |  | 73 |
| French II | 2 | 25 | 20 | 17 | 3 |  | 67 |
| French III | 26 | 85 | 82 | 93 | 18 |  | 304 |
| French IV | 11 | 72 | 33 | 52 | 0 |  | 168 |
| French Lang/Culture, AP | 4 | 9 | 18 | 17 | 0 |  | 48 |
| Fr V (non-AP) | 11 | 7 | 23 | 18 | 0 |  | 59 |
| $\mathrm{IB} / \mathrm{fr} / \mathrm{lng} / \mathrm{sl} / 1$ |  | 17 |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| $\mathrm{IB} / \mathrm{fr} / \mathrm{lng} / \mathrm{sl} / 2$ |  | 25 |  |  |  |  | 25 |
| IB Fr Lang/hl/1 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| IB Fr Lang/hl2 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| German I | 1 | 7 | 2 | 15 | 0 |  | 25 |
| German II | 2 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 0 |  | 15 |
| German III | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0 |  | 15 |
| German Lang/Cult, AP | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| Japanese I | 0 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 |  | 31 |
| Japanese II | 0 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 0 |  | 16 |
| Japanese III | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 |


| Course Title | HBW | W-L | WK | YT | Tech | New Dir. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Latin I | 2 | 7 | N | 5 | 6 |  | 20 |
| Latin II | 4 | 6 | N | 9 | 10 |  | 29 |
| Latin III | 13 | 45 | 5 | 45 | 13 |  | 121 |
| Latin IV | 9 | 19 | 4 | 18 | 4 |  | 54 |
| Latin V | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| Latin, AP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| IB Latin SII |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| IB Latin SL II |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| IB Latin (HL) Part I |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| IB Latin (HL) Part II |  | 11 |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| Span/FS I | 0 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 |  | 34 |
| Span/FS II | 0 | 25 | 36 | 0 | 0 |  | 61 |
| Span/fs III | 0 | 80 | 54 | 0 | 0 |  | 134 |
| Spanish I | 3 | 45 | 46 | 53 | 12 | 2 | 161 |
| Spanish II | 6 | 66 | 77 | 100 | 12 | 3 | 264 |
| Spanish III | 24 | 211 | 139 | 238 | 39 | 0 | 651 |
| Spanish IV | 21 | 103 | 72 | 184 | 13 | 2 | 395 |
| Spanish V (non-AP) | 7 | 16 | 25 | 60 | 0 |  | 108 |
| DE Spanish IV/V; Int Spanish I/II |  |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Adv Studies in Spanish | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 13 |
| Spanish Language, AP | 13 | 58 | 103 | 90 | 0 |  | 264 |
| Spanish Literature, AP | 6 | 0 | 37 | 30 | 0 |  | 73 |
| $\mathrm{lB} / \mathrm{sp} / \mathrm{fs} \mathrm{(hl)} 1$ |  | 38 |  |  |  |  | 38 |
| lB/sp/fs (hl) 2 |  | 27 |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| $\mathrm{IB} / \mathrm{sp} / \mathrm{lng} / \mathrm{sl} / 1$ |  | 42 |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| $\mathrm{lB} / \mathrm{sp} / \mathrm{lng} / \mathrm{sl} / 2$ |  | 49 |  |  |  |  | 49 |
| IB/sp/Lang (hl/1) |  | 38 |  |  |  |  | 38 |
| IB/sp/lang ( $\mathrm{hl} / 2$ ) |  | 26 |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| Sp Immersion 9 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  | 49 |
| Sp Immersion 10 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL | 241 | 1477 | 1068 | 1333 | 175 | 7 | 4301 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Wakefield Latin classes are delivered at Arlington Tech. Students are bussed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix 10. History of WL Enrollments 2007-2018
*This report is an unofficial compilation by the World Languages Office and the WLAC. The Data from 2007-2011 are taken from WLO Document "Secondary Foreign Language Enrollment," dated 21 October 2010.

| American Sign Language |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 2010 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2010- \\ & 2011 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2011- \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2012- \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2013- \\ 2014 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2014- \\ 2015 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2015- \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2016 \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2017- \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2018- } \\ & 2019^{15} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intro to American Sign Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 36 |
| ASL 1 MS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 16 | 40 |
| ASL 2 MS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 13 |
| ASL 1 HS |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 232 | 205 | 216 | 212 | 261 |
| ASL 2 HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 151 | 133 | 154 | 163 |
| ASL 3 HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 | 74 | 92 |
| ASL 4 HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 17 |
| Total ASL |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 232 | 356 | 425 | 502 | 622 |


| Arabic | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2008- \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2010- \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2011-2012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2012- \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2013- \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2014- \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2015- \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017- \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2018- \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arabic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intro to Arabic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| Arabic 1 MS | 22 | 17 | 23 | 26 | 24 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 44 | 32 | 38 | 29 |
| Arabic 1 Int |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 11 | 9 |
| Arabic 1 HS |  |  |  | 41 | 32 | 24 | 32 | 21 | 17 | 25 | 7 | 18 |
| Arabic 2 MS | 9 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 13 | 21 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 31 |
| Arabic 2 HS |  |  |  | 9 | 22 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 10 |
| Arabic 3 MS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arabic 3 |  | 4 | 13 | 6 | 11 | 19 | 22 | 29 | 28 | 32 | 26 | 25 |
| Arabic 4 |  |  | 3 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 19 | 16 | 18 |
| Arabic 5 |  |  | N | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| IB Arabic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 10 |
| Total ARABIC | 31 | 31 | 51 | 92 | 104 | 115 | 135 | 158 | 162 | 176 | 169 | 177 |



[^9]|  | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2010 \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2011- \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2012- \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2013- \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2014 \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2015- \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2017- \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2018- \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chinese 1 MS | 30 | 39 | 30 | 43 | 32 | 56 | 41 | 53 | 59 | 43 | 46 | 39 |
| Chinese 1 Intensive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 13 | 14 |
| Chinese 1 HS |  |  |  | 37 | 32 | 35 | 13 | 15 | 20 | 11 | 10 | 14 |
| Chinese 2 MS | 12 | 10 | 22 | 8 | 20 | 18 | 28 | 27 | 34 | 40 | 26 | 44 |
| Chinese 2 HS |  |  |  | 16 | 20 | 31 | 32 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Chinese 3 MS |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chinese 3 HS |  | 11 | 11 | 14 | 10 | 26 | 31 | 35 | 22 | 23 | 43 | 27 |
| Chinese 4 |  |  | 5 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 19 | 14 | 27 | 15 | 17 | 24 |
| AP Chinese 5 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 6 |
| IB Chinese SL1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 12 | 10 |
| IB Chin SL 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 9 |
| Total | 42 | 60 | 68 | 122 | 122 | 179 | 169 | 180 | 193 | 168 | 202 | 233 |
| French | INDIVIDUAL COURSE DATA NOT AVAILABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intro to French |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 184 | 223 | 205 | 256 |
| French 1 MS |  |  |  | 303 | 313 | 315 | 316 | 365 | 365 | 298 | 272 | 331 |
| French 1 Int |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61 | 109 | 105 |
| French 1-A MS |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 21 | 15 |  |  | 20 | N |
| French 1-B MS |  |  |  | 11 | 9 | 0 | NA |  | NA | NA | NA | N |
| French 1 HS |  |  |  | 75 | 89 | 89 | 55 | 68 | 72 | 65 | 59 | 73 |
| French 2 MS |  |  |  | 232 | 225 | 239 | 215 | 255 | 264 | 276 | 304 | 323 |
| French 2 HS |  |  |  | 116 | 96 | 98 | 97 | 77 | 102 | 77 | 62 | 67 |
| French 3 MS |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| French 3 HS |  |  |  | 266 | 243 | 254 | 256 | 213 | 252 | 275 | 262 | 304 |
| French 4 |  |  |  | 165 | 162 | 142 | 156 | 143 | 137 | 170 | 139 | 168 |
| French 5-AP |  |  |  | 28 | 34 | 18 | 20 | 41 | 17 | 32 | 44 | 48 |
| French 5 (non-AP) |  |  |  |  | 34 | 23 | 29 | 22 | 39 | 43 | 52 | 59 |
| French 6 (non-AP) |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0 | 29 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | N |
| French 6-AP |  |  |  |  | 17 | 25 | 20 | 0 |  |  | 0 | N |
| IB French SL 1-2 |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 29 | 39 | 65 | 53 | 47 | 42 |
| IB French HL 1-2 |  |  |  |  |  | 36 | 29 | 27 | 14 | 14 | 16 | 19 |
| Total | 1154 | 1260 | 1310 | 1196 | 1228 | 1282 | 1273 | 1383 | 1530 | 1587 | 1591 | 1798 |


|  | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2008 \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2010- \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2012- \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2013- \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2014 \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2015- \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2016 \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017- \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2018- \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| German | INDIVIDUAL COURSE DATA NOT AVAILABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| German 1 MS |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | NA |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| German 1 HS |  |  |  | 33 | 41 | 41 | 29 | 31 | 33 | 25 | 23 | 25 |
| German 1-A |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3 | NA |  |  |  |  | N |
| German 1-B |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0 | NA |  |  |  |  | N |
| German 2 MS |  |  |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | NA |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| German 2 HS |  |  |  | 33 | 23 | 23 | 31 | 10 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 15 |
| German 3 |  |  |  | 20 | 25 | 21 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 15 |
| German 4 |  |  |  | 8 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 2 |  |  | 1 | N |
| German 4-AP |  |  |  | 10 | 1 | 7 | 1 |  | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| German 5-AP |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  | N |
| German 6 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | NA |  |  |  |  | N |
| Total | 96 | 105 | 108 | 107 | 118 | 103 | 88 | 59 | 65 | 51 | 46 | 59 |
| Japanese | INDIVID | UAL COU T AVAIL | SE DATA LE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Japanese I |  |  |  | 18 | 21 | 28 | 41 | 32 | 34 | 43 | 29 | 31 |
| Japanese II |  |  |  | 26 | 14 | 7 | 17 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 16 |
| Japanese III |  |  |  | 2 | 17 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 7 |
| Japanese IV |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N |
| Total | 55 | 60 | 56 | 46 | 52 | 47 | 62 | 54 | 54 | 63 | 45 | 54 |
| Spanish | INDIVID | UAL COU T AVAIL | SE DATA LE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transitional Sp | NA | 30 | 84 | 129 | 130 | 161 | 209 | 195 | 338 | 309 | 291 | 413 |
| Trans Sp FS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Intro to Span |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 300 | 154 | 253 | 217 | 154 |
| Intro to Span FS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 134 | 108 | 86 | 138 |
| Spanish 1 MS |  |  |  | 517 | 608 | 618 | 657 | 722 | 760 | 510 | 560 | 493 |
| Span 1 INT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 269 | 252 | 205 |
| Spanish 1 HS |  |  |  | 222 | 222 | 228 | 196 | 194 | 232 | 208 | 172 | 161 |
| Spanish 1-A |  |  |  |  |  | 35 | 19 | 38 |  |  |  | 0 |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2007 \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2008- \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2010- \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2012- \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2013 \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2014 \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2015- \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2017- \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2019 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spanish 1-B |  |  |  | 22 | 27 | 0 | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish 2 MS |  |  |  | 364 | 328 | 432 | 390 | 484 | 514 | 532 | 538 | 607 |
| Spanish 2 HS |  |  |  | 341 | 325 | 314 | 327 | 318 | 305 | 302 | 277 | 264 |
| Spanish 3 |  |  |  | 546 | 549 | 516 | 575 | 520 | 623 | 609 | 650 | 651 |
| Spanish 4 |  |  |  | 256 | 249 | 271 | 268 | 315 | 309 | 360 | 376 | 395 |
| Spanish 5-AP |  |  |  | 59 | 80 | 88 | 82 | 221 | 230 | 279 | 263 | 264 |
| Spanish 5 (non-AP) |  |  |  | 29 | 48 | 23 | 39 | 69 | 7 | 13 | 82 | 108 |
| Spanish 6 (non-AP) |  |  |  | 13 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish 6-AP |  |  |  |  | 28 | 31 | 11 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Adv Studies Span |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 13 |
| Span/FS 1 MS |  |  |  | 100 | 80 | 93 | 124 | 108 | 84 | 166 | 169 | 148 |
| Span/FS 1 HS |  |  |  |  | 38 | 44 | 27 | 53 | 55 | 47 | 32 | 34 |
| Span/FS 2 MS |  |  |  | 47 | 42 | 68 | 71 | 79 | 9 | 72 | 97 | 113 |
| Span/FS 2 HS |  |  |  |  | 102 | 65 | 76 | 73 | 74 | 97 | 75 | 61 |
| Span/FS 3 |  |  |  |  | 116 | 161 | 156 | 161 | 167 | 171 | 147 | 134 |
| Span/FS 4-AP |  |  |  |  | 115 | 108 | 130 |  |  |  |  | N |
| Sp/FS/AP Literature 1 |  |  |  |  | 47 | 45 | 35 | 60 | 74 | 60 | 55 | 73 |
| Sp/FS/AP Literature 2 |  |  |  |  | 10 | 15 | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish Immersion 6 |  |  |  |  | 114 | 81 | 97 | 102 | 114 | 111 | 104 | 109 |
| Spanish Immersion 7 |  |  |  |  | 83 | 105 | 74 | 85 | 92 | 100 | 106 | 107 |
| Spanish Immersion 8 |  |  |  |  | 80 | 76 | 95 | 66 | 85 | 87 | 95 | 100 |
| Spanish Immersion 1 |  |  |  |  | 46 | 34 | 34 | 51 | 29 | 35 | 51 | 49 |
| Spanish Immersion 2 |  |  |  |  | 13 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SFS IB 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 34 | 38 |
| SFS IB 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 27 |
| Spanish IB SL1 |  |  |  |  |  | 44 | 41 | 39 | 35 | 34 | 52 | 42 |
| Spanish IB SL 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 41 | 25 | 35 | 32 | 36 | 49 |
| Spanish IB HL 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 13 | 6 | 41 | 38 | 26 | 38 |
| Spanish IB HL 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 24 | 24 | 33 | 37 | 37 | 26 |
| Total | 2850 | 3099 | 3228 | 2516 | 3353 | 3727 | 3683 | 4383 | 3934 | 4189 | 4909 | 5014 |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2008- \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2010- \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2012- \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2013 \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2014 \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2015- \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | 2017-2018 | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2019 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Latin | INDIVIDUAL COURSE DATA NOT AVAILABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intro to Latin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | 103 | 126 | 110 | 94 |
| Latin 1 MS |  |  |  | 122 | 97 | 114 | 130 | 150 | 156 | 128 | 115 | 109 |
| Latin 1 INT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 | 73 | 37 |
| Latin 1 HS |  |  |  | 60 | 56 | 63 | 58 | 35 | 38 | 34 | 34 | 20 |
| Latin 1-A |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 15 | 14 |  |  |  | N |
| Latin 1-B |  |  |  | 9 | 16 | 0 | NA |  |  |  |  | N |
| Latin 2 MS |  |  |  | 99 | 84 | 74 | 77 | 99 | 109 | 114 | 132 | 148 |
| Latin 2 HS |  |  |  | 64 | 50 | 49 | 49 | 47 | 46 | 27 | 23 | 29 |
| Latin 3 |  |  |  | 76 | 101 | 77 | 88 | 73 | 94 | 94 | 114 | 121 |
| Latin 4 |  |  |  | 7 | 34 | 11 | 27 | 42 | 39 | 51 | 42 | 54 |
| Latin 4-AP |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 3 | 34 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Latin 5 |  |  |  | 3 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Latin 5-AP |  |  |  | 5 | 11 | 17 | 3 |  | 18 | 18 | 21 | 0 |
| Adv Studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 6 | 9 | N |
| IB Latin SL 1 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 10 | 11 |  | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| IB Latin SL II |  |  |  |  | 4 | 16 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| IB Latin HL 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 9 |  | 6 | 2 | 12 | 6 |
| IB Latin HL II |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 11 |
| Total | 401 | 484 | 441 | 445 | 475 | 471 | 506 | 538 | 529 | 533 | 696 | 635 |


| Total enrolled in world <br> language courses: | 4629 | 5099 | 5262 | 4524 | 5452 | 5924 | 5961 | 6987 | 6823 | 7192 | 8160 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix 11. Descriptions of ACTFL Novice and Intermediate Proficiency Levels

## Novice High: The Fighter



I can...

- Provide info using words, phrases and short sentences
- Confidently speak on practiced subjects like giving basic info about myself
- Describe surroundings and people
- Give opinions on things I like/dislike
- Use words like "is," "like" and "have" and connect sentences with "and" or "with"
- Ask simple questions
- Read/listen and understand main ideas

I'm working on ...

- Speaking in complete sentences
- Using correct verb forms
- Directing conversations into new directions
- Handling new questions or situations


## Novice-Mid: The Toddler



I can...

- Combine different words and phrases l've heard and memorized
- Introduce myself
- Greet others in different ways
- Name some of my likes and dislikes
- Name different activities
- Ask simple questions
- List things, like colors, animals, numbers
- Give time, date, and weather info
- Awkward wording like "Me like" is OK!


## I'm working on...

- Speaking in simple but full sentences
- Explaining words I don't know
- Asking more kinds of questions
- Hesitating less when I speak


## Novice Low: The Parrot

## I can...



- Repeat single words or short phrases l've heard and memorized
- Greet others
- Recognize some words that I have heard before
- Give my name
- Name a few things around me
- Answer questions with "yes" or "no"
- Count to 10

I'm working on...

- Learning more words and phrases
- Understanding more things that I read or hear
- Asking some simple questions


## Intermediate Low: The Creator



I can...

- Generally speak confidently in complete sentences.
- Create with language and answer open- ended questions
- Mostly use present tense verb forms correctly
- Describe things and people in detail and give opinions on various topics/situations
- Clarify my opinions with "because" or "but"
- Correct myself when I misspeak
- Ask some appropriate/pointed questions

I'm working on...

- Quantity and quality: using lots of different language and using it correctly
- Improving my use of present tense verb forms and adjectives
- Not hesitating too much when I speak


## Intermediate-Mid: The Explainer



## I can...

- Communicate with confidence
- Use extended, connected sentences
- Quickly access lots of vocabulary to describe many different subjects
- Mostly use correct present tense and begin to use future and past tenses
- Describe, explain and compare
- Ask pointed, relevant questions
- Use topic sentences and linking words like "even though" or "however" to bring structure to my language
- Talk around words I don't know and be understood
- Self-correct when I misspeak
- Recognize when a speaker uses different tenses


## I'm working on...

- Fewer pauses when speaking
- Using multiple time frames (past, present and future) Speaking in detail about specific interests or aspects of my life


## Intermediate-High: The

## Storyteller

## I can...



- Communicate with ease and confidence on any subject that relates to me
- Talk in depth about particular interests, aspects of life
- Narrate and describe in all major time frames (past, present, future) - often, but not necessarily all the time
- Tell stories using words like "then" and "later on"
- Handle everyday situations like getting/giving directions, making purchases, and even handle unexpected complications
- Understand the main idea and some supporting details or follow the storyline of a fluent speaker


## l'm working on...

- Speaking correctly in various time frames
- Participating in conversations that go beyond my everyday life
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## APPENDIX 13. Attrition of Students with Disabilities in Immersion Programs from Grades 5-8, 2015-1916

| School <br> Year | Grade | SWDs in <br> $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade <br>  <br> Claremont | SWD <br> Cohort <br> Enrolled at <br> Gunston | SWD Cohort <br> Enrolled in <br> Immersion <br> at Gunston | SWD <br> Attrition Rate <br> in Immersion <br> from <br> previous <br> year | Overall <br> Attrition <br> Rate in <br> Immersion <br> from Grade <br> 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2015-2016$ | 05 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| $2016-2017$ | 06 |  | 7 | 3 | $70 \%$ |  |
| $2017-2018$ | 07 |  | 6 | 3 | $0 \%$ |  |
| $2018-2019$ | 08 |  | 6 | 2 | $33.3 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $2016-2017$ | 05 | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| $2017-2018$ | 06 |  | 18 | 12 | $40 \%$ |  |
| $2018-2019$ | 07 |  | 18 | 11 | $8.3 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| $2017-2018$ | 05 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| $2018-2019$ | 06 |  | 11 |  | 10 | $23.1 \%$ |

Discussion: These data provide a small-scale snapshot of the extent to which dual-language immersion students at Key and Claremont elementary schools who have been identified as having a learning disability have continued in the immersion program once they are in middle school. For example, the table shows that there were ten identified SWDs in the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade immersion at Key and Claremont in SY-2015-16, that seven of them enrolled at Gunston middle school in fall 2016, but only three of those 7 in fact continued in the immersion program. The other four, presumably, took a non-immersion course of studies at Gunston. Thus, the one-year attrition in the immersion program between fall 2015 and fall 2016 at Gunston was $70 \%$. The rate of SWD attrition between grades 5 and 6 in the next two years was lower, which may possibly indicate that the recent collaborative efforts of the World Languages Office and Special Education staff to encourage SWDs to study a world language have had an effect. A fuller picture of SWD attrition in the immersion program would track the number of SWD enrollees in kindergarten immersion through the $8^{\text {th }}$ grade over several years.

[^10]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Enrollment data (see Appendix 4) would appear to indicate
    2 The World Language Office has reported that 1050 students have participated in the Credit-by-
    Examination program since SY-2015-16, and 802 of them (76.3\%) met the language requirement for the Advanced Studies Diploma.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ It has just been reported that an additional 38 students earned a passing score on IB language tests (total $=140$ ), but the number of examinees taking those tests has not yet been made public.
    ${ }^{4}$ In the event, however, only $66.2 \%$ of the 2018 seniors met all the criteria to receive the Advanced Studies Diploma. Several met the world language criterion but failed to meet the criteria in one or more other subject areas, such as Mathematics.
    ${ }^{5}$ Appendix 11 provides a simplified summary of the meanings of the ACTFL Intermediate and Novice levels.

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ Kenmore and Williamsburg provide $6^{\text {th }}$ graders with the elective of enrolling in the 'exploratory wheel,' which provides brief instruction in a number of elective subjects, including one or more languages. The 'wheel' is not designed to develop functional proficiency in any language.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ In subsequent years, the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade students in the other FLES schools will also need to be tested, starting with those at Nottingham, Oakridge and Tuckahoe in SY-2019-20, and adding the remaining seven schools that began offering FLES in SY-2015-16 for tests starting in 2020-21.

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ The World Language Office reports that the large majority of non-Hispanic heritage students entering kindergarten and first grade in the immersion program have already developed fundamentals of English literacy.

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ The World Language Supervisor and the principals of Key and Claremont will attend this fall the Las Cochesas conference on Spanish-English bilingual immersion education, where publishers and educators will display state-of-the-art materials for such programs. They can identify the needed materials at that time.
    ${ }^{10}$ A partial list of research articles and other references for the importance of learning about other languages and cultures in effective International Education for Americans appears in Appendix 12, on pages 41-43 of this report.

[^6]:    ${ }^{11}$ Studying world languages may improve a student's knowledge of word origin and deducing meanings of words to which they may not have had prior exposure. For many students, this helps them score better on exams such as the SATs.

[^7]:    ${ }^{12}$ Data for the present school year (2018-19) are not yet available as this report is being completed.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ In Spring 2018, the STAMP was administered to $5^{\text {th }}$ graders in only half of the qualifying FLES schools, because of lack of funding to test every school.

[^9]:    ${ }^{15}$ Green print indicates an enrollment increase over the previous year; red print indicates a decrease in enrollment.

[^10]:    ${ }^{16}$ From analysis provided by the office of IT, October 2018.

