World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

World Language Observations

Elementary

Table 1: Part of class observed

Program	% Beginning	% Middle	% End
FLES (n=33)	88%	100%	64%
Immersion (n=35)	83%	100%	40%

Table 2: Setting

Program	% Teacher's classroom	% Shared classroom	% Cart in another teacher's classroom
FLES (n=33)	42%	9%	49%
Immersion (n=35)	89%	11%	0%

Table 3: Seating arrangement

Program	% In groups	% Whole group	% In pairs	% Individually
FLES (n=33)	24%	82%	15%	54%
Immersion (n=35)	29%	69%	6%	54%

World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

Table 4: Is Spanish language arts being taught when scheduled?

Program	Yes	No
Immersion (n=35)	71%	29%

Table 5: Objectives for lesson are communicated in writing in student-friendly language.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	64%	12	8%	0%	58%	33%
Immersion (n=35)	51%	17	6%	0%	53%	41%

Table 6: Objectives for lesson are communicated orally in student-friendly language.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	49%	17	0%	6%	71%	24%
Immersion (n=35)	66%	12	0%	0%	42%	58%

Table 7: The teacher shares the sequence of learning activities with students.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	39%	20	0%	15%	60%	25%
Immersion (n=35)	40%	21	0%	0%	76%	24%

World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

Table 8: Students are engaged in activities designed to meet the daily performance objectives.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	0%	33	0%	24%	55%	21%
Immersion (n=35)	26%	26	0%	11%	50%	38%

Table 9: The pacing is such that students have an appropriate amount of time allocated for the practice of skills and processes presented in the lesson.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	3%	32	6%	30%	46%	15%
Immersion (n=35)	17%	29	3%	17%	38%	41%

Table 10: The learning experience addresses speaking.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	15%	28	0%	14%	71%	14%
Immersion (n=35)	37%	22	0%	0%	45%	55%

Table 11: The learning experience addresses listening.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	3%	32	0%	6%	69%	25%
Immersion (n=35)	14%	30	0%	0%	43%	57%

World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

Table 12: The learning experience addresses reading.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	12%	29	3%	7%	69%	21%
Immersion (n=35)	14%	30	3%	3%	33%	60%

Table 13: The learning experience addresses writing.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	55%	15	13%	7%	60%	20%
Immersion (n=35)	20%	28	0%	7%	46%	46%

Table 14: The students participate in activities that allow for physical movement.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	52%	16	0%	6%	75%	19%
Immersion (n=35)	57%	15	0%	0%	73%	27%

Table 15: The teacher returns student attention to the targeted learning objectives to affirm what they can do now that they couldn't do at the beginning of the class.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	100%	N/A				
Immersion (n=35)	83%	6	0%	0%	67%	33%

World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

Table 16: The students use the target language at their proficiency level to communicate with each other and/or the other teacher.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	21%	26	0%	12%	69%	19%
Immersion (n=35)	14%	30	0%	7%	40%	53%

Table 17: The teacher engages learners in tasks that transfer to the real-world.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	0%	33	0%	3%	55%	42%
Immersion (n=35)	11%	32	0%	0%	38%	59%

Table 18: What is the cognitive complexity of the tasks or assignments?

Program	% Remember	% Understand	% Apply	% Analyze	% Evaluate	% Create
FLES (n=33)	100%	110%	100%	88%	0%	0%
Immersion (n=35)	91%	91%	69%	26%	9%	6%

World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

Table 19: Students engage in cultural observation and analysis of both the new and the students' own cultures.

Program	*% Not observed*	*Number observed*	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	94%	2*				
Immersion (n=35)	97%	1*				

*Sample sizes less than 5 are not reported

Table 20: The teacher embeds grammar as a tool for communication, avoiding meaningless rote drills and ensuring that all practice requires attention to meaning.

Program	*% Not observed*	*Number observed*	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	46%	18	0%	6%	67%	28%
Immersion (n=35)	34%	23	0%	0%	35%	65%

Table 21: The teacher embeds vocabulary as a tool for communication, avoiding meaningless rote drills and ensuring that is in the target language.

Program	*% Not observed*	*Number observed*	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	9%	30	0%	3%	50%	47%
Immersion (n=35)	20%	28	0%	4%	32%	64%

World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

Table 22: Percentage of what the teacher says that is in the target language.

Program	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-89%	90% or more
FLES (n=33)	3%	3%	9%	27%	58%
Immersion (n=35)	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Table 23: Percentage of materials the teacher shares with students that are in the target language.

Program	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-89%	90% or more
FLES (n=31)	0%	0%	3%	10%	87%
Immersion (n=30)	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Table 24: The teacher uses a variety of strategies to make language comprehensible.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	12%	29	0%	14%	48%	38%
Immersion (n=35)	43%	20	0%	0%	55%	45%

Table 25: The classroom display materials are culturally and linguistically significant.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	55%	15%	0%	7%	80%	13%
Immersion (n=35)	14%	30	0%	47%	10%	43%

Table 26: Technology is utilized to:

Program	%Technology not observed	Number observed with technology	% Substitute	% Augment	% Modify	% Redefine
FLES (n=33)	12%	28	0%	100%	0%	0%
Immersion (n=35)	54%	16	38%	94%	25%	0%

Table 27: Visuals used by the teacher can be seen by all students.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	0%	33	0%	3%	6%	91%
Immersion (n=35)	11%	31	0%	10%	26%	65%

Table 28: The teacher uses formative checks for learning during lessons.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	21%	26	0%	8%	65%	27%
Immersion (n=35)	26%	26	0%	8%	46%	46%

World Languages Program Evaluation (2015-16 to 2019-20)

Table 29: Students participate in activities appropriate to their proficiency level.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	0%	33	3%	3%	67%	27%
Immersion (n=35)	11%	31	0%	0%	55%	45%

Table 30: Students are self-assessing and/or goal setting.

Program	% Not observed	Number observed	% Ineffective	% Developing	% Effective	% Highly Effective
FLES (n=33)	100%	0				
Immersion (n=35)	97%	1*				

*Sample sizes less than 5 are not reported