

**CHRISTCHURCH
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INTENSIVE PROGRAMME
AN EVALUATION**



**DR LESLEY MACGIBBON
MARCH 2006**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
<i>The need.....</i>	3
<i>The Christchurch ELIP.....</i>	3
<i>Student learning outcomes.....</i>	4
<i>Issues of sustainability.....</i>	5
INTRODUCTION	6
BACKGROUND	6
<i>Learning needs of NESB students.....</i>	6
<i>Successful Programmes.....</i>	6
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE INTENSIVE PROGRAMME (ELIP)	7
PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	7
<i>Key research questions.....</i>	7
RESEARCH METHODS	8
OUTLINE OF THIS REPORT	8
FINDINGS	9
DEVELOPMENT OF THE ELIP PROGRAMME	9
<i>ELIP school profiles.....</i>	10
MODELS OF DELIVERY	11
<i>Free standing ESOL Centre.....</i>	11
<i>Withdrawal teaching at students' schools.....</i>	11
SHELTERED INSTRUCTION	12
CHRISTCHURCH ELIP SHELTERED INSTRUCTION	13
<i>Quality teaching.....</i>	13
<i>Transition to Secondary School.....</i>	14
<i>Home School Partnership.....</i>	15
CASE STUDY: AN ELIP FAMILY	16
STUDENT OUTCOMES	18
<i>Learning outcomes.....</i>	18
<i>Social outcomes.....</i>	23
<i>Principals' perspectives.....</i>	24
RESOURCES REQUIRED	24
EXTENDING THE MODEL 'WHOLE SCHOOL'	25
<i>Student learning outcomes.....</i>	26
<i>End of Year report to the Ilam Board of Trustees.....</i>	27
ISSUES OF SUSTAINABILITY	28
CONCLUSION.....	29
<i>Impact on student achievement.....</i>	29
<i>Sustainability of the ELIP.....</i>	30
<i>Effectiveness of the ELIP model.....</i>	31
Appendix 1	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The need

For many Non English Speaking Background students, arriving in New Zealand after they have begun their formal education and are literate in their first language, the challenge is primarily to learn enough academic vocabulary and language to access and function well in curriculum areas; and to learn this as fast as possible. As their English language proficiency increases, at least some of their first language literacy language skills will begin to transfer into their use of English. Most NESB students become reasonably fluent in interpersonal English within two years, but take considerably longer to develop control of the academic vocabulary of written and spoken English in the school curriculum. These students' needs are not the same as those of English speaking students with literacy problems. Typically NESB students are not experiencing learning difficulties, nor have they failed to learn the basics in their first language/s. What they require is effective ongoing support so that they can catch up with their English speaking peers.

The ELIP is based on the understanding that for NESB students improved academic achievement requires explicit and direct teaching with sound teacher knowledge of the most effective teaching and learning strategies. It also requires teacher understanding of the literacy acquisition process in a new language, as well as in-depth knowledge of the background of the learner. The ELIP utilises specialist Resource teachers of ESOL who are able to use these strategies directly in their teaching, as well as modelling the approach to other teachers. There is no specific programme but a set of guiding philosophies and principles which inform teaching decisions.

The primary focus of this evaluation is to document the development of the Christchurch ELIP, assess the impact of the programme on student learning and achievement, identify issues of sustainability, and evaluate the effectiveness of the ELIP model. This evaluation used a number of qualitative and quantitative research strategies including, document analysis, interviews, and observations.

The Christchurch ELIP

During 2004 the ELIP was run with Year 7 and 8 students at Cobham Intermediate, Kirkwood Intermediate, and Riccarton Primary school. In 2005, the ELIP programme was based at Cobham Intermediate, Casebrook Intermediate, and Christchurch East School. These schools were chosen primarily because of the numbers of NESB students on the Year 7 and 8 school rolls. A secondary consideration was that the ESOL staff in these schools were qualified teachers.

The ELIP pedagogy is based on a 'sheltered instruction' approach. In sheltered instruction the emphasis is on teaching curriculum areas in a scaffolded way that enables students to access the curriculum at the same time as acquiring the relevant English language. The Christchurch ELIP focussed primarily on maths and science because these were areas that had been identified by the working party as particularly

problematic for students at Year 7 and 8 levels. Research has confirmed that students in sheltered subject classes accelerate second language learning as well as knowledge in the content area.

The characteristics of the Christchurch ELIP include:

- students are in their ELIP classrooms at their own schools for one and a half hours to two hours four or five days a week
- students participate in a very focussed and intensive teaching period with an emphasis on curriculum literacy, mathematics and science
- an emphasis on learning how to learn
- students are in a group of between 10 - 14 students
- curriculum links with the mainstream class are aligned and maintained
- additional individual support is given to students as required
- classes taught by specialist English Language Resource teachers who are qualified primary school teachers with TESOL qualifications and experience

The advantages of this partial withdrawal over a separate ESOL resource centre is that the ELIP programme is aligned to classroom learning with direct links between the Resource teachers and the classroom teachers. This approach encourages passing on ideas about effective teaching learning for this particular group, to classroom teachers. The partial withdrawal model allows students to maintain friendships with their mainstream classmates, while at the same time widening their social networks with students from other classes who attend the ELIP. The Christchurch ELIP has proved to be an effective model for home/school involvement, and transition to secondary school.

Student learning outcomes

One of the strengths of the Christchurch ELIP is that it is based on a 'best evidence synthesis' with all teaching focused on meeting assessed student needs. All students were fully assessed in February 2005 using a range of tools including asTTle and national exemplars. All students were retested in September 2005 for evidence of learning shifts.

Learning shifts in reading were evidenced by asTTle scores. In New Zealand students are expected to move one and a bit sublevels in a full school year. The scores for the ELIP students over the seven month period were significant. One student went down a sublevel, four students stayed at the same sublevel, nine students went up one sublevel, eight students went up two sublevels, two students went up three sublevels and one student went up six sublevels. Effect size is an indication of how strong or important the results are. With an average shift of 1.62 sublevels the Cohen's *d* effect indicates a **huge effect**.¹

The results from maths testing were similar to those in reading, asTTle test areas included number knowledge, measurement and geometric knowledge. In February the average AMS (asTTle maths score was 432 (2P), and in September the average

¹ Effect size is an indicator of how strong or how important the results are. Cohen's *d* relative size of the effect is: negligible effect (≥ -0.15 and $< .15$); small effect ($\geq .15$ and $< .40$); medium effect ($\geq .40$ and $< .75$); large effect ($\geq .75$ and < 1.10); very large effect (≥ 1.10 and < 1.45); huge effect > 1.45

AMS was 556 (3P). This is a whole level shift over seven months, and far exceeds expected rate of progress for this timeframe. Nineteen of the 22 students achieved a shift of at least one level and just over half of the students made a gain of two levels or more. The Cohens' *d* formula indicates that the progress of the students and the influence of the intervention shows a **very large effect** for mathematics. In September many of students were achieving at 'close to cohort' level in Maths, and mainstream teachers report improved results in their day-to-day work in this subject.

All the Principals, teachers, parents and students interviewed as part of this evaluation were very positive about the ELIP. They all recognised the value of a programme that accelerated the students' learning, not only of the English language, but also of maths and science. As one ELIP student stated:

First when I came I was in spelling group one but now my spelling is so good in the classroom. I can spell many words that children in the classroom don't know. They ask me how to spell words. We did a spelling test and my teacher said "Amazing" and when I did the reading test she said "This is so unbelievable because you have improved so much. We didn't expect you to, but you have improved so much."

[Student aged 11]

In addition to large gains in learning outcomes, the programme has had a big influence on the confidence of the students in the playground and in their mainstream classrooms.

Issues of sustainability

It costs approximately \$30,000 a year to keep an ELIP running in one school with a specialist Resource Teacher. This covers the salary, travel, and incidental costs of the Resource Teacher. Schools also need to allocate classroom space and cover the overhead costs of furniture, lighting and heating. In the pilot schools the ELIP was run in addition to the regular ESOL teaching of individuals and small groups of students. It is unlikely that schools will be able to find an additional \$45,000 from their operating budgets to continue the programme if funding is not found. It will be particularly difficult for the low decile schools to afford to run this programme.

The two schools that were involved in the programme in 2004, did not continue to use this model of teaching in 2005. However, the programme was introduced into Ilam Primary School in 2005 and operated very successfully as the main approach to ESOL teaching in that school. The school was in the fortunate position of having a fulltime ESOL teacher and considerable assistance from teachers' aides. The operation of the programme at Ilam Primary School demonstrates that it is a viable teaching model. The teacher at Ilam was one of the ELIP teachers from the 2004 programme, and was skilled at working in this model. If the programme was to be continued by regular ESOL teachers in schools, they would need considerable upskilling in the new pedagogy.

This evaluation concludes that the Christchurch ELIP is a very successful model of providing ESOL to students in a way that not only accelerates their language acquisition, but also provides them with a scaffold in other curricular areas to enable them to participate in their mainstream classrooms.

INTRODUCTION

Background

Recent data on international student achievement collected for the OECD Programme of International Student Achievement showed New Zealand's Pasifika and Non English Speaking Background (NESB) students performed at levels much lower than other countries. This study found that minority language students in New Zealand were more than twice as likely as first language students to be in the bottom quarter of performance in reading literacy. The results of this study, and others such as the National Education Monitoring Project, and Wylie, Thompson and Lythe (2000) sparked discussion in Christchurch as to how the outcomes for these students could be improved. (Franken and McCormish 2003)

Learning needs of NESB students

For many NESB students, particularly those who arrive in New Zealand after they have begun their formal education and are literate in their first language, the challenge is primarily to learn enough academic vocabulary and language to access and function well in curriculum areas; and to learn this as fast as possible. As their English language proficiency increases, at least some of their first language literacy language skills will begin to transfer into their use of English. Most NESB students become reasonably fluent in interpersonal English within two years, but take considerably longer to develop control of the academic vocabulary of written and spoken English in the school curriculum. These students' needs are not the same as those of English speaking students with literacy problems. Typically NESB students are not experiencing learning difficulties, nor have they failed to learn the basics in their first language/s. What they require is effective ongoing support so that they can catch up with their English speaking peers.

Successful Programmes

Stephen May (2002) argues that characteristics of successful programmes for NESB students include:

- An integrated approach to ESL within active, meaningful, authentic contexts.
- Language embedded, cognitively demanding classrooms.
- Taking a language across the curriculum approach and applying these ideas to second language learners.
- Avoiding 'ghettoisation' of ESL which occurs when separating/withdrawing NESB students outside a mainstream school context.
- Bilingual education until at least middle childhood, but where this is not an available option, greater lengths of time (at least 5 years) for NESB students to master the complexities and nuances of academic language.

The English Language Intensive Programme (ELIP)

There is an overall correlation between students' general academic attainment and literacy performance. The ELIP is based on the understanding that for NESB students improved academic achievement requires explicit and direct teaching with sound teacher knowledge of the most effective teaching and learning strategies. It also requires teacher understanding of the literacy acquisition process in a new language, as well as in-depth knowledge of the background of the learner. The ELIP uses specialist resource teachers of ESOL who are able to use these strategies directly in their teaching, as well as modelling the approach to other teachers. There is no specific programme but a set of guiding philosophies and principles which inform teaching decisions.

Purpose of the evaluation

The primary focus of this evaluation is to:

- Document the development of the Christchurch ELIP
- Assess the impact of the programme on student learning and achievement
- Identify issues of sustainability
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the ELIP model

This evaluation focuses primarily on the programme in 2005, but includes a retrospective component on the development of the project during 2004.

Key research questions

What impact has the programme had on student learning and achievement?

- What do test results (eg asTTle, running records, writing analysis) reveal about student achievement?
- What issues does the project identify about using standardised tests with NESB students?
- What observable difference is there in students' confidence and competence in the use of English in the ELIP and general classrooms over time?

How sustainable is the ELIP ?

- What resources are necessary to keep the ELIP running in a school?
- How sustainable is the model, once the ELIP resource teachers are no longer available to the school?

How effective is the ELIP model?

- What are the key features and processes of this model of teaching and learning?
- How well does this model meet the criteria of a good programme identified by Stephen May (2002).

Research Methods

This evaluation will be based on a number of qualitative and quantitative research strategies including:

Document analysis of

- Student test results
- ELIP milestone reports
- ELIP ESOL resource teacher reports
- Minutes of management meetings
- Relevant literature relating to the programme and the model of ‘sheltered instruction’

Interviews with

- ELIP ESOL resource teachers
- Principals, ESOL teachers, and teachers at schools in which the project operated in 2004
- Principals, ESOL teachers, and teachers at schools in which the project operated in 2005
- Other key stakeholders, for example, Principal of Branston Intermediate, College of Education ESOL Adviser, Ministry of Education Refugee Co-ordinator, parents of students in the ELIP.

Interviews with

- ELIP classroom programme
- Mainstream classroom observations of students who attend the ELIP
- ELIP information session with parents

Outline of this report

This report begins with a brief description of the development of the ELIP programme and discusses some of the decisions made by the management committee as to the type of programme that would best meet the needs of the target group of Year 7 and 8 students. The report then discusses ‘sheltered instruction’ in the context of the Christchurch ELIP. Student outcomes are then discussed, as are the outcomes from the expanded school-wide ELIP approach implemented at Ilam school. Finally, the report addresses issues of sustainability.

FINDINGS

Development of the ELIP programme

The Christchurch ELIP was developed by a working party consisting of MoE staff, ESOL Advisers, school principals and a representative from the Christchurch Refugee and Migrant Service, after a consultation process with local schools. Many of the schools stated that the refugee students in their schools had settled in well and were benefiting from being immersed in the life of the school. However, most schools were concerned about the achievement of Year seven and eight refugee students and a small group of new migrant students. Many of these students were working at Level 1/2 of the curriculum in maths and English and were having great difficulty with the more abstract concepts within social studies and science. These students lacked the reading and writing skills to do research and take part in enquiry-based programmes in their classrooms.

Most English language support offered in the schools in Christchurch was in a withdrawal situation for a maximum of two hours per week. Some teachers had concerns that the programmes were not being as effective as they could be. As one ESOL teacher who was involved in the ELIP stated:

I have been working in the area of ESOL for fourteen years, and I could see that the pull-out system of teaching individuals or small groups wasn't working. I saw it as 'band-aiding'. It was language focussed but might not relate to anything happening in their own classrooms. I thought that there must be a better way.

The working party concluded that an English Language Intensive Programme would be the most effective way to meet the needs of the following groups of students:

- Newly arrived refugee students.
- Some newly arrived migrant students with limited educational opportunities.
- Newly arrived NESB students with no previous instruction in English.
- NEB students who needed an intensive programme before going to secondary school.

The initial criteria for entering the intensive programme included:

- Aged approximately 10 – 13 years.
- Newly arrived refugee students for initial assessment.
- Other NESB students with limited education or no previous instruction in English.
- NESB students in Years 7 and 8 with Ministry of Education ESOL funding who had scores < 75; and migrants with scores of <90 after up to two years in a New Zealand school.
- Children who are achieving significantly below their cohorts.

When funding was secured from the Ministry of Education, a management committee comprised of principals from the participating schools, ELIP resource teachers, Branston Intermediate School Principal, a Christchurch College of Education School Adviser, and a representative of the Ministry of Education. Branston Intermediate

School acted as the base school, employed the staff and administered the Ministry of Education grant. The school provided an office and resources for the two ESOL Resource teachers who worked with groups of Year 7 and 8 NESB students in three Christchurch schools.

During 2004 the programmes were run in Cobham Intermediate, Kirkwood Intermediate, and Riccarton Primary school. The programme operated on a model of 'sheltered instruction' where a group of up to 12 students at each school were withdrawn from mainstream classes for 1.5 to 2 hours a day for four or five days a week. During this time they were taught by the ELIP ESOL resource teacher. Teaching focussed on the maths and science curriculum, related to classroom planning, and the use of strategies that made the material relevant and interesting to the students. Research has confirmed that students in sheltered subject classes accelerate second language learning as well as knowledge in the content area. The programme in 2004 concentrated primarily on trialling and developing the programme with the students, and creating teaching and learning resources that were available to other teachers in the schools.

In 2005, the ELIP programme was based at Cobham Intermediate, Casebrook Intermediate, and Christchurch East School. These schools were chosen primarily because of the numbers of NESB students on the Year 7 and 8 school rolls. A secondary consideration was that the ESOL staff in these schools were qualified teachers.

ELIP school profiles

Christchurch East

Christchurch East School is an inner city school that provides education for students from Years 1-8. The school caters for a diverse student population, including a large transient population that result in over 60% of the total school roll turning over each year. The students come from a wide range of cultural backgrounds: Pakeha 42%, Maori 21%, Asian 15%, Samoan 3%, Pasifika 2%, African 8%, Other 9%. For part of 2005 Christchurch East had two fee paying students. Many of the refugee families that resettle in Christchurch live in the inner east of the city and send their children to Christchurch East. It is a decile 2 school with a school roll of 277.

Casebrook Intermediate

Cobham Intermediate School provides education for students in Years 7 and 8. Students come from over 40 contributing schools and have a diverse range of learning needs. Many of these students achieve highly. Casebrook Intermediate is a decile 5 school with 429 students. The ethnic composition of the student population is : Pakeha 66%, Other European 2%, Maori 14%, Pasifika 3%, Asian 6% Other 9%.

Cobham Intermediate

Cobham Intermediate with a roll of 725 is one of the larger schools in Christchurch catering for Year 7 and 8 students. Cobham Intermediate has a decile rating of 9. The school has a very high percentage of Asian students (20%) compared to other Intermediate schools in Christchurch. Other ethnicities include: Pakeha 64%, Maori 6%, Pasifika 2%, Other 8%. In 2005 Cobham Intermediate had 23 fee paying students.

Models of delivery

Initial discussions as to how to best meet the needs of these students identified two possible models of delivery of the ELIP in Christchurch.

Free standing ESOL Centre

The possibility of establishing a free standing ESOL Centre for Year 7 and 8 Christchurch NESB students was considered. While this was identified as a possible solution, there were many disadvantages to this model. The number of students in Christchurch could only support one such centre. The centre could be placed at a school with a high number of NESB students, but would still require many students to travel across Christchurch to attend. This model of delivery, if on a fulltime basis would remove students from their own schools, and from their English speaking peers. Franken and McCormish (2003) argue that a lot of English language learning takes place in the immersion situation where students learn social English from their peers in the classroom and in the playground, and for this reason it is important not to ghettoise the students. Although this model of delivery was considered appropriate for students arriving at school with little or no social English, it was not a favoured approach for the ELIP target students.

A centralised ESOL centre that students attended on a part-time basis, for example every morning or afternoon, or one day a week could partially overcome the problem of removing students from their peers in the regular classroom. The danger with this model was that the students may feel that they did not really belong in either setting. The practicalities of transporting the students to and from the centre made this option unviable. Another concern of this model of delivery expressed by an ESOL teacher was that it would be very difficult to ensure that the curriculum needs of the students was being met if the teachers at the centre were not in close contact with the classroom teachers. This would be much more difficult if classroom teachers were at a number of different schools.

Withdrawal teaching at students' schools

The ELIP management committee decided that the best model for delivery of an intensive programme in Christchurch was for the teachers to run the programmes in the students' school. This requires the teachers rather than the children to travel between schools.

This had the advantage of keeping the students in their own school environment, and recognised that many of these students had experienced a lot of change and needed a stable school environment if they were to feel that they belonged. Running the programme in the students' own schools did not disrupt the friendships the students were making with their classmates, but also gave them the opportunity to develop new friendships with other ELIP students from other classes.

Basing the ELIP in the students' schools also made it easier for the ELIP resource teachers to create direct links with the classroom teachers of their students. This was important in terms of ensuring that the curriculum was covered, and that the ELIP students were covering similar topics to the mainstream students.

Another plus of basing the programme in the host schools was that it enabled communication between classroom teachers and the ELIP resource teachers about pedagogy and sheltered instruction.

Sheltered Instruction

The ELIP pedagogy is based on a 'sheltered instruction' approach. Sheltered instruction is an important approach in the United States where it is most often taught by mainstream class teachers who have expertise in language teaching. Carrasquillo and Rodriguez (1996, p. 73), describe sheltered instruction as:

Sheltered subject matter teaching refers to an adaptive teaching strategy to present content area material through a variety of recommended second language strategies to make the material meaningful and interesting to students...Research has confirmed that students in sheltered subject matter classes acquire an impressive amount of second language and learn subject matter as well.

In sheltered instruction the emphasis is on teaching curriculum areas in a scaffolded way that enables students to access the curriculum at the same time as acquiring the relevant English language. The Christchurch ELIP focussed primarily on maths and science because these were areas that had been identified by the working party as particularly problematic for students at Year 7 and 8 levels.

There is a strong relationship between "Effective Instruction" and "Sheltered Instruction". Effective instruction is defined as "Practices that are described as 'good teaching' in research that correlates teacher behaviour and classroom practices with student achievement." (Franken and McCormish, 2003, p. 52)

Franken and McCormish identified that both approaches shared the following characteristics:

- Well planned lessons
- Time-on-task
- Use of student background knowledge and experience
- Variety of levels of delivery
- Grade-level content
- Checks for understanding
- Use of higher-order thinking skills
- Explicitly stated lesson objectives

However, Sheltered Instruction is characterised in particular by:

- Comprehensible input
- High levels of student interaction

- A student centered approach
- More hands-on tasks
- The selection of key concepts from the curriculum. (P 56)

Christchurch ELIP sheltered instruction²

The English language intensive programme (ELIP) is a specialised type of withdrawal programme with a specific curriculum focus that is a key aspect of this sheltered instruction approach.

The key characteristics of Christchurch ELIP include:

- students are in their ELIP classroom for one and a half hours to two hours four or five days a week.
- students participate in a very focussed and intensive teaching period with an emphasis on curriculum literacy, mathematics and science
- students are in a group of between 10 - 14 students
- curriculum links with the mainstream class are aligned and maintained
- additional individual support as required

The first assumption is that these 11-13 year olds are cognitively mature and ready for the complex curriculum relevant to students in Year 7 and 8, yet they are often overwhelmed in a classroom setting with the pace of curriculum delivery and the unsupported teaching cues. The ELIP teachers' mission is to teach cohort-level Science and Maths concepts using excellent and skilled levels of scaffolding. Expectations are high and supports and steps are made explicit for learning.

All students are New Zealand residents, and are relatively recent arrivals from general migrant or refugee backgrounds. Students have variable levels of oral fluency in a range of other languages and a few students also have literacy skills in other languages. (Milestone 2 report to the Ministry of Education)

Quality teaching

While there was a range of English fluency levels in each ELIP setting, the teachers noted that they were able to maintain their individual monitoring of each student so that each student's engagement with learning was high. Improvements in student behaviour, organising for learning and motivation for learning have been significant outcomes. The students were expected to be 'on task' during the whole teaching session and time wasting was not possible with strong routines and clear boundaries in place.

Students were able to talk about the gains they had made and the value of the preparation for secondary school gained in the ELIP setting. Learning about timetables, time management for homework, skills for completing assessments as well as the accurate reading of instructions had assisted this. Where needed,

² This section of the report draws heavily on the expertise of Gaylene Price the primary ESOL/Literacy Adviser.

individual pathways and provision through individual learning plans were developed. Comments from students (reflecting on their ELIP goals) include:

ELIP has helped me become an excellent speller and a good writer.
[Student 10]

I am now a top group reader in English in my classroom. [Student 14]

I can now use the dictionary and some other references really well.
[Student 13]

The teaching programme was based on the maths and science curricula, and was cyclic. Skills became embedded in the learning, because they were revisited within new topics. Vocabulary teaching was a key focus with independent learning strategies specifically taught and vocabulary notebooks kept by all students. Key curriculum vocabulary was revised frequently to ensure retention. There were some similarities between teaching contexts at each of the three schools, but there was also variation as teachers responded to the needs of each group of students. They also aligned their teaching as closely as possible to whole school foci. The ELIP programme was supplemented by materials from the correspondence school *English in Focus* series, the ELIP folder, plus other Ministry of Education and school resources.

Teaching content covered in 2005 included:

- Mathematics units on measurement and geometry
- Teaching based on the Numeracy initiative, in which ELIP teachers have undertaken professional development during the year
- A science/language unit on animals, including mammals
- A science /language unit on Space
- A language unit on 'Looking to the Future'
- A daily language review programme and a Ministry of Education Phonological Awareness programme

Skills learned included, keeping individual reading logs, note-taking from oral and written language sources, reading hard copy and computer texts for research, vocabulary development and pronunciation activities. Students also engaged in regular guided reading and genre-based writing. Text types covered included biographies, recounts, information reports and an introduction to narratives.

During 2005 there were two activities in Education Outside the Classroom, with the ELIP classes from the three schools combined for the experience. The first trip, to Orana Park, was designed to fit in with some of the science curriculum and the second trip was to Jade Stadium, Sumner and the Port Hills. Both trips provided an opportunity for students to participate in a social and academic language experience. Interpreters, parents and the researcher accompanied the excursions.

Transition to Secondary School

The transition into high school for some new learners of English is not an easy or smooth process, and many diverse students find the change daunting. A significant element of the ELIP has been to aid the transition for each student to his/her relevant

high school. A model for the process of transition was established in December 2003 and was developed further in 2004 and 2005.

Even with an assisted transition to secondary school, not all students who thrived in the ELIP environment continued to succeed. At a social event, one student commented to the MoE Adviser “If I was back in a programme like the ELIP one I wouldn’t have failed at Year 11”.

Home School Partnership

Parent consultation meetings were held in term one at Christchurch East School and term two for Casebrook Intermediate and Cobham Intermediate, and were attended by the researcher. They were well attended by parents and caregivers, and translators were present at all sessions to explain the programme to parents. The approach of the programme, and expectations of the students and the parental support required were clearly stated. ELIP teachers reported a significant improvement in some student attitude for some students after these information and feedback evenings had taken place.

At all three schools parent contact continued in an informal and formal manner. At the end of term two all parents of ELIP students received an academic progress report. It was also arranged for bilingual interpreters to give a first language translation of reports to some parents, and parents had the opportunity to discuss their child’s written reports at the parent teacher interviews in term four.

Parents were invited to join their children on out of school trips and several parents took up this offer. On one trip one parent commented:

I come on these trips because my daughter has been quite dependent on me since we came to New Zealand. On the first trip she stayed close to me, but I am pleased that on this trip she is much more independent. As she has gained the language she has made friends and does not cling to me any more. I can see her regaining her confidence.

The link that the ELIP resource teachers were able to make to students’ families has been beneficial. In some cases home visits have been valuable, in other cases bilingual advisers and bilingual liaison workers have been used to facilitate the contact with families. As one of the ELIP teachers stated:

I was having some pretty major problems with [student] in term one. After we had the meeting with his family, his whole attitude changed, and he really started to co-operate and work hard.

This way of linking with families has provided a model that other mainstream teachers can emulate, and they have been more inclined to request the same sort of family contact when the ELIP teacher had generated the link.

Case study: An ELIP family

The Brishna³ family lived in Afghanistan, and the parents' opportunities for education were severely limited because of civil war. Maree the mother went to primary school for two years and Mansoor the father had three years education. Neither can read nor write in their first language, Farsi. The education available for their children was also limited, as Mansoor explained:

The quality of education in Afghanistan was not that good because of the circumstances. Our children should not suffer from the same fate. There were too many children in one classroom and a lack of resources, because of the ongoing war and civil unrest.

Because of the civil unrest and the ruling Taliban they eventually left Afghanistan. Mansoor was one of the Tampa refugees; he spent 8 months on the island of Nauru before coming to NZ to live in 2002. Maree and the four children went to Iran for two years and then under family the re-unification quota came to live in NZ in July 2004.

When Mansoor first arrived in NZ he worked as a labourer and butcher, similar work to that he had done in Afghanistan (mostly labouring). The parents have both been learning English; Mansoor has been going to classes at PEETO for the past 16 months, five days a week. Maree does not speak very much English. She goes to a group for mothers and elderly people through the ESOL Christchurch home tutors scheme. She attends this class four days a week, for 1 ½ hours a time.

Mansoor said that it has been difficult for him to assist his children in their studies because he cannot read or write, but that with the children learning to speak English this has helped the family's own education in the language and for them as a family to settle in NZ. The parents said they both want to be more proficient in speaking English and that they hope their children will go far with their education and go to University.

We are very happy because their English has improved and they have kept their progress in their studies. We have high expectations that our children should complete their education and become very useful members to the society.

The eldest children Asra (now 14yrs) and Nabila (now 11yrs) both had two years schooling in Afghanistan and then another two years in Iran, before coming to NZ. The two children both attended the ELIP at Christchurch East School in 2005. At the beginning of 2006 Asra began secondary school at Hagley Community College, where he is proud of being awarded a certificate of excellence for his work in maths. Nabila is attending the ELIP at Christchurch and is achieving well in the programme and in her mainstream classroom.

³ All names are pseudonyms. The parents were interviewed with the assistance of a Farsi speaking interpreter.

Nabila is top in her class for spelling and she says that the ELIP classes are more advanced than the lessons in class, that she is learning words through ELIP that her classmates do not know. E.g.: *precipitation* and *atmosphere* are two examples of the latest words she has learnt. She says that English is a more complicated language than Farsi, that at home in Afghanistan it was easy to communicate with anyone as she thinks there were not as many difficult words as there are in English. They both agreed that in Farsi you would know all the words by the time you left school and the use of a dictionary was unheard of, but that learning English it is hard to take in the fact that they could be learning new words for the rest of their lives and that using a dictionary is not an unusual practice.

In the ELIP students were tested in January and September 2005 to determine their progress in reading writing and mathematics against the national norms using asTTle testing. In the asTTle framework students are expected to achieve one sublevel in a year or one full level in two and a half years. In the seven month period in 2005 Asra and Nabila achieved the following results.

Reading	Asra: down one sub level	Nabila: up two sub levels
Math	Asra: up one sub level	Nabila: up one sub level
Writing	Asra: up from 1ii to 1iii	Nabila: up from 1i to 3

Both children act as interpreters for their parents, and assist with filling out official forms and applications. Both commented on their role as family interpreters.

We need to help them because they have helped us too, they have been great. [Asra]

I go with my father to the WINZ Case Manager meeting and the Housing New Zealand. I feel nice to talk to other people and to learn something I didn't know before. [Nabila]

Both children love sport. Asra plays soccer, basketball and goes to swimming lessons. Nabila plays volleyball and tennis. She says that it took some time initially before she had the confidence to play these sports, especially volleyball because she did not speak English when she first arrived and it was too complicated to learn the rules. She did not have the English to explain that she was not allowed to wear shorts (in her Muslim religious tradition). Once her English language improved language she was able to have a conversation with the teacher is now playing volleyball wearing trousers under a skirt. She has learnt the rules and says that she enjoys both these sports very much.

It is a problem if you can't understand English but you are really good at something like playing basketball. My favourite sport is tennis and volleyball, especially volleyball. Like if you want to learn how to play volleyball I find it difficult, like playing volleyball I sort of have to wear, shorts, but we're not allowed to wear shorts. If you don't know any English, at all and like you can't understand the rules then you can't play it. You can't speak to your friends about the game. And while the game goes on, you won't enjoy it, you're just sitting there by yourself. [Nabila]

In addition to acquiring the English language Nabila talked about some of the challenges for her in making friends and fitting into a new culture.

I expect them to don't laugh at me if I make a mistake sometimes in speaking English. They are quite nice to us and friendly. If they are friends I expect them to sometimes at lunchtime, if you are having the traditional food or something, to not laugh at you. [Nabila]

They have enjoyed the ELIP programme and enjoyed their teachers. Asra described his time at Christchurch East School as "*awesome*". Both children talked about learning more than English, maths and science in the ELIP. They had been encouraged to read, and both enjoy books. They also identified that they learned lessons about life, including manners. Lesson they said they would remember all their lives included:

If you can't something nice, don't say anything at all" and "Use your ears more than your talk, that's why God gave you two ears and only one mouth".

Student Outcomes

Learning outcomes

One of the key aspects of the ELIP was the rigorous assessment processes undertaken throughout the year. This includes the specific collection of assessment data, as well as monitoring achievement as an integral part of the teaching and learning programme. Student assessments included: asTTle Mathematics, asTTle Reading, a writing sample (moderated against the written language national exemplars), and oral language focussed assessment.

While there were some difficulties relating to the assessment tools, such as the Eurocentric focus of some tests in asTTle, the results show big gains for a large proportion of these students. Student assessments reported below include baseline data and progress data for February 2005 and September 2005, a teaching period of approximately seven months.⁴ A summary of the results from the reading, writing and mathematics testing occurs below.

⁴ The following analysis of achievement data has been taken from the ELIP Milestone 3 report to the Ministry of Education (Gaylene Price). Test results have been verified by the researcher who has had access to all raw tests results data.

According to information provided from the Access to Learn Team⁵ ‘New Zealand students can be expected to move one and a bit curriculum sub-levels per year and a whole level every 2.5 years.’ These results show many ELIP students exceed this expectation by a considerable amount.

Mathematics

A maths asTTle test was created in February which met the teaching requirements of the ELIP teachers. It was decided to test in the areas of Number Knowledge, Measurement and Geometric Knowledge as this was the teaching focus for the first part of the year. Slider settings were set at (mostly) level 2. This combination produced 80% of items at level 2, but also included a limited number (20%) of level 3 and level 4 items. In September the slider settings were set at (many) level 2 and (a few) level 3. Thirty-five percent of the assessment items were then at level 3 and 4, with a small increase in the difficulty. The average AMS in February was 432 (2P), but by September a level of 556 (3P) was achieved. This is a whole level shift over seven months and well exceeds the expected rate of progress for this time frame. By September, many of the children were achieving at a ‘close to cohort’ level in this subject and their mainstream teachers report improved results in their day-to-day work in this subject.

Table 1: A comparison of T1 (Feb 2005) and T2 (Sept 2005) for asTTle Mathematics score

First name	Year group	Score T1	Level	Score T2	Level
Student 1	8	485	3B	431	2P
Student 2	8	384	2P	390	2P
Student 3	7	421	2P	618	3A
Student 4	8	499	3B	673	4B
Student 5	8	472	2A	519	3P
Student 6	8	371	2B	503	3B
Student 7	8	278	2B	417	2P
Student 8	8	396	2P	473	2A
Student 9	8	384	2P	553	3P
Student 9	7	344	2B	595	3A
Student 10	7	434	2P	644	4B
Student 11	7	459	2A	618	3A
Student 12	7	434	2P	706	3A
Student 13	7	590	3A	673	4B
Student 14	7	515	3P	742	4P
Student 15	8	358	2B	431	2P
Student 16	8	409	2P	445	2A
Student 17	8	313	2B	417	2P
Student 18	7	459	2A	536	3P
Student 19	7	446	2A	573	3P
Student 20	7	434	2P	618	3A
Student 21	7	499	3B	503	3B
Student 22	8	531	3P	618	3A

⁵ The Access to Learn Team (ATOL) is a specialised team working from the School Support Services Christchurch College of Education focussing on assessment and use of data in schools.

Students showed shifts in the sub-levels over the seven months between assessment periods. Many of the students well exceeded expected levels of progress, as indicated in Table 2 which shows the number of sub-levels shifts by each student. Nineteen out of 22 students achieved a shift of at least one level, and just over half of the students made a gain of two sub-levels or more in seven months. When the effect size is measured using a Cohens' *d* formula statistic⁶, it indicates that the progress of the students and the influence of the intervention shows a **'very large effect'** for mathematics.

Table 2: Shifts in asTTle sub-levels for Mathematics

Count of Student Name	AMS shift							Grand Total
Student Name	-2 SL	0 SL	1 SL	2 SL	3 SL	4 SL	5 SL	
Student 20						1		1
Student 15			1					1
Student 1	1							1
Student 7			1					1
Student 6					1			1
Student 14					1			1
Student 18			1					1
Student 16			1					1
Student 19				1				1
Student 11					1			1
Student 5				1				1
Student 9							1	1
Student 10							1	1
Student 23				1				1
Student 8			1					1
Student 13			1					1
Student 9					1			1
Student 2		1						1
Student 3						1		1
Student 22			1					1
Student 21		1						1
Student 4					1			1
Grand Total	1	2	7	3	5	2	2	22

The Cohens' *d* of 1.42 shows a **"very large effect"**.

Reading

An asTTle Reading test was created in February which best met the requirements of the two teachers and covered a range of contexts that were thought to be suitable for this group of learners. It was decided to test in the areas of Finding Information and Inference as elements of deep features, and Punctuation as an element of surface

⁶ Effect size is an indicator of how strong or how important the results are. Cohen's *d* relative size of the effect is: negligible effect (≥ -0.15 and $< .15$); small effect ($\geq .15$ and $< .40$); medium effect ($\geq .40$ and $< .75$); large effect ($\geq .75$ and < 1.10); very large effect (≥ 1.10 and < 1.45); huge effect > 1.45

features. Slider settings were set as (mostly) level 2 in February. About 25% of test items were at level 3 and 4. In September (many) level 2 and (a few) level 3 items were set on the slider settings. The percentage of level 3 and 4 difficulty was similar. The average ARS in February was 400 (2P), and by September a level of 482 (2A) was achieved. **To achieve one sub-level increase (on average) within the timeframe of the testing is significant. Some students have increased by 2 sub-levels or more.** A spectacular gain was made by Student 6 of 3 sub-levels and by Student 23 of 6 sub-levels. When the effect size is measured using a Cohens'd formula statistic, it indicates that the progress of the students and the influence of the intervention shows a **'huge effect'** for reading. This statistic may be affected by the individual impact of two students' scores.

Table 3: A comparison of T1 (Feb 2005) and T2 (Sept 2005) for asTTle Reading

First name	Year group	Score T1	Level	Score T2	Level
Student 1	8	368	2B	432	2P
Student 2	8	378	2P	464	2A
Student 3	7	428	2P	499	3B
Student 4	8	388	2P	464	2A
Student 5	8	448	2A	475	2A
Student 6	8	368	2B	487	3B
Student 7	8	368	2P	368	2B
Student 8	8	368	2B	464	2A
Student 9	8	347	2B	475	2A
Student 9	7	388	2P	512	3B
Student 10	7	491	3B	555	3A
Student 11	7	418	2P	499	3B
Student 12	7	448	2A	487	3B
Student 13	7	448	2A	525	3P
Student 14	7	479	3B	540	3P
Student 15	8	266	<2B	344	2B
Student 16	8	347	2B	443	2P
Student 17	8	398	2P	475	2A
Student 18	7	378	2P	453	2A
Student 19	7	408	2P	512	3B
Student 20	7	418	2P	512	3B
Student 21	7	408	2A	475	2A
Student 23	8	398	2P	616	4P
Student 22	8	448	2A	512	3B
Student 24	8	418	2P	432	2P

Students showed shifts in sublevels over the seven months between assessment periods. Many of the students well exceeded expected levels of progress, as indicated in Table 4 which shows the number of sub-levels shifts by each student. Twenty out of 25 students achieved a shift of at least one level, and nearly half of the students made a gain of two sub-levels or more in seven months. When the effect size is measured using a Cohens'd formula statistic, it indicates that the progress of the students and the influence of the intervention shows a **'huge effect'** for reading.

Table 4: Shifts in asTTle sub-levels for Reading

Count of Student Name	ARS Shift						Grand Total
Student Name	-1 SL	0 SL	1 SL	2 SL	3 SL	6 SL	
Student 20				1			1
Student 15			1				1
Student 1		1					1
Student 7	1						1
Student 6					1		1
Student 23						1	1
Student 14			1				1
Student 18			1				1
Student 16			1				1
Student 19				1			1
Student 11				1			1
Student 5		1					1
Student 9				1			1
Student 10				1			1
Student 18			1				1
Student 8				1			1
Student 13				1			1
Student 9					1		1
Student 24		1					1
Student 2			1				1
Student 12		1					1
Student 3			1				1
Student 22			1				1
Student 21			1				1
Student 4				1			1
Grand Total	1	4	9	8	2	1	25

The Cohen’s *d* effect of 1.61 shows a **“huge effect”** for reading.

When examining student attitude with the asTTle assessment tool, the response of these diverse students show positive attitudes well above the NZ mean.

While some educators claim there is some cultural bias with the asTTle tool, it has proved to be extremely valuable for reporting mathematics and reading achievement for whole class comparative data as well as for analysis of individual and small group results. AsTTle results gave ELIP teachers precise details of the areas where a student was achieving well, and also identified gaps in learning. The ‘What Next?’ section of asTTle enabled teachers to design lessons specific to the learning needs of individuals.

Writing

Many students were writing at Level 1 of the curriculum on entry to ELIP and so the National English Exemplars and the relevant indicators were used to determine strengths, gaps and best-fit level for individuals in this group of students. The ELIP

teachers reported gains in students' writing that is supported by the close examination of the student scripts. One teacher reported:

At the beginning of the year students tended to write with a simple sentence and now they can use more compound and complex forms.

There was also a significant improvement in surface features such as spelling and punctuation. There was also an increase in the length of text produced. At the beginning of the year a lot of students needed prompting, "*Come on write a bit more here, there's not enough for us to evaluate.*" By September students wrote with confidence and needed little extra motivation.

In writing many students were achieving at Level 1(ii) in February, and some were achieving at Level 1(i). An analysis of the students' writing against the exemplar indicators shows that spelling was the strongest aspect of the group's writing. In contrast, the language features were an aspect that students had significant difficulty with. Vocabulary and ideas also showed lower levels of achievement at the February entry point. Only 3 students had achieved a best fit of Level 2, and 1 student had achieved a best fit of Level 3.

A comparison of the same students shows that by September no students were still writing at Level 1(i) for any aspect of writing measured by the exemplars, and there were 11 students achieving a Level 2 best-fit. Six students were achieving a best-fit of Level 3. See Appendix 1 for the range of scores for each student against each element of the National English exemplars. Student shifts are highlighted.

Summary

One of the difficulties in making claims for this project is the lack of national norms for expected achievement for NESB students. Although this data is not available to allow comparisons between the ELIP approach and other strategies for delivering ESOL to Year 7 and 8 students, the results from the testing of the ELIP students shows significant gains in achievement in all areas tested. The cohen's *d* rating of 'very large' in maths and 'huge' reading shifts in student achievement, indicate that the programme is very successful.

Social outcomes

Teachers, principals, and the ELIP Resource teachers all commented on social outcomes from the students' participation in the project. They noted that as the year went on the students in the ELIP class became far more confident in the ELIP class, but also in their own classrooms. Classroom teachers commented that their students were all joining in small group discussions in class, and many were contributing freely in whole class discussions.

When they first started at the beginning of the year it was very difficult to get them to talk in the class; now I can't shut them up! [ELIP Resource Teacher]

Teachers also noted that the students were making friends in the ELIP class and also in their own classes. Often ELIP friendships extended across several classes in the school. One teacher commented on friendships he saw developing in his classroom.

It is a bit of a paradox really. I see him developing socially and being included in this group of boys. Now he gets into trouble just as much as the others in the group do.

Principals' perspectives

The Principals of the three schools where the programme was based in 2005 were all extremely positive about the ELIP. They recognised that the programme contributed not only to learning outcomes, but also to social outcomes, and staff development.

The students are markedly more able academically and socially, their whole bearing changed from being subdued to confident. The real difference made has been in attitude. This must have set them up well for Secondary School and beyond, particularly in terms of the curriculum. I am a very strong advocate of the intensive programme. [Principal 1]

It is a wonderful programme that has made such a difference in our school, not only for the students, but for the staff too. The Resource teacher is very skilled and our ESOL teacher and classroom teachers have also learned a lot from him. [Principal 2]

Resources required

The ELIP Christchurch project was initially funded for the first three terms by the Ministry of Education Migrant Levy and the following six terms from the Ministry of Education Innovation Pool. This funding runs out in June 2006. The base school for the programme, Branston Intermediate, employed the two ELIP resource teachers and provided them with office space and administrative support. The three schools in which ELIP operated provided classroom space, and classroom furniture for the programme. In all three schools space was limited and the programmes operated in small rather crowded facilities which to some extent limited the amount of student interaction possible during sessions.

Between June 2003 and January 2005⁷, ELIP was funded from the Migrant Literacy Initiative, and from February 2005 from the Ministry of Education innovations Funding Pool. In 2005 the project received \$94 450 (including GST), and for the first six months of 2006 \$48 774 (including GST).

One of the issues that was raised by some interviewees was the amount of non-contact time the two ELIP resource teachers had, compared to the amount of non-contact time an ESOL teacher has. The full-time ELIP Resource teacher was employed for 25 hours, and had 21 hours of teaching contact time. Similarly the half-time teacher had 10 hours contact time. It is important to recognise that this was a pilot project operating in three schools and a base school spread across the city. Time was needed for travel, for establishing relationships within schools, for communication time with

⁷ 2003 \$101,250 (inc GST), 2004 \$101,250 (inc GST);

the ESOL teacher and the ELIP students' classroom teachers. Recognition that non-contact time for teachers is essential has been recognised with the move to release all classroom teachers for one hour a week.

Extending the model 'whole school'

One of the ELIP Resource teachers who worked full-time on the ELIP in 2004 returned to her position as ESOL Co-ordinator at Ilam School at the beginning of 2005. Ilam is a large suburban primary school (Years 1 – 6) with a roll of 559. Ilam School is adjacent to Canterbury University in Christchurch, and is a decile 8 school. The students at the school represent a wide range of nationalities including Pakeha 61%, Asian 20%, Maori 2%, Pacifica 2%, and Other 15%. In 2005 the school had 23 foreign fee paying students.

When the ELIP resource teacher returned to Ilam School she was very keen to implement this approach school wide. She described the benefits that she saw from her year working with ELIP.

With the ELIP you are working with a small group of students on curriculum areas, so they are learning vocabulary, for example in a science topic, so it has real meaning for them. They made huge jumps in language retention, and I was able to recycle the vocabulary through the topics we covered. Being in a smaller group also built their confidence because they were happier to talk in the small group, whereas they wouldn't do that in their classrooms – they were too unsure.

At the beginning of 2005, this teacher established an ELIP model of teaching and learning in Ilam School. While there was still individual instruction given to 30 students by teachers' aides, 31 students were included in the ELIP. Teacher Aides worked with students who had lesser needs, or needed to work one-to-one.

One of the criticisms of the ELIP was that when the students were removed from their classroom, they missed out on the subject taught at that time. For example an ELIP student may end up having two maths sessions per day, but miss out on other curriculum areas. Another criticism was that taking students out for ELIP was disruptive to the rest of the class. The school-wide approach to ELIP in Ilam School worked to overcome these barriers by:

- Having ELIP sessions within the natural breaks in the school day. For example Year one and two in the period up to morning break, Year three and four students between morning break and lunch break, and Years five and six students for 1.5 hours immediately following the lunch break.
- Students attending the ELIP worked on the same curriculum areas that they would in their own classes. For example Year one and two students worked on writing and oral language, Year three and four students worked on reading, writing and maths, and for Year five and six students worked on the same social studies/science topics covered in their own classes.

At the beginning of the year the teacher implementing the ELIP model talked of an increased work load setting the programme up in the school. However, when interviewed in term four, she found that the planning had reduced considerably.

I get the long term plans from the syndicates and that sets what areas we will cover. In the past I would have to plan for up to 7 groups in a day. Now I have to plan for 3 sessions each day. It makes it much easier to integrate with what is happening in the classrooms.

Student learning outcomes

Extensive testing was completed on all the students in the programme during the year. Eighty-five students were tested at the end of the year, including all the children still on the programme and those who had been discontinued during the year because of their results indicated that they no longer needed to be on the programme. A description of some of the test results follows.⁸

Writing Known words (10 minutes)

Throughout the year students were asked to write all the words they knew before studying a topic and then after the topic was completed. The results of this test clearly showed that although they had knowledge of a topic in their first language, they had no vocabulary to attach to it in the English language. For example, when asked to write all the words they knew about measurement the highest score was 6, and some of the students could only draw pictures. After the topic they were comfortably about to write 30 plus words. By the end of the year when students were asked to write all the words they knew about the topic, they surpassed their other tests either by writing more words than previously or by writing more words directly from curriculum studies. Some Year 1 and 2 students wrote more than sixty words..

Speaking Re-tell

Results of testing show that students made significant gains in this area throughout the year. The results of the tests show some of this movement, but do not show the gains in confidence and vocabulary extension that is apparent in the teacher transcripts of the tests. In some cases while the transcript was better, if for example it did not include the use of a variety of conjunctions, the student could not move up to the next level. Many of the students were using taught sentence structures in their re-tells.

Writing Personal Diaries

All Year 5 and 6 students (except one) whether they were back in the classroom or on the programme showed improvement in their writing. Because of the huge range with the writing exemplar levels, half the students stayed within the same levels but their writing was beginning to show changes especially in relation to adding detail and the correct use of tenses.

⁸ The following analysis of achievement data has been taken from the Ilam report to the Board of Trustees compiled by Ann Brooker. Test results have been verified by the researcher who has had access to all raw tests results data.

Although only two Year 3 and 4 students went up a level, all students showed improvement and most were able to use capitals correctly, make tense changes and add more detail to their stories.

Over half the Year 1 and 2 students went up a level. This is significant in that the initial levels are smaller steps so it is often faster for a student to progress from level 0 to 1iii, than it is to progress from level 2 to level 3.

At the end of 2005 the ELIP teacher at Ilam School talked about the job satisfaction she had from implementing this programme in the school.

The main job satisfaction for any teacher is seeing the children learn. I've been teaching ESOL for 14 years and this is the best year ever for me. I'm feeling that I am really making a difference with these children, and the data shows that. Our results give me real confidence that this is the right approach.

End of Year report to the Ilam Board of Trustees

Ilam school agreed for the ESOL teacher to pilot the ELIP approach across the school for six months and then for a further six months. The report concluded:

There is sufficient evidence to show marked improvement in the children's English in reading, writing, speaking and listening skills to warrant this format continuing in 2006. There has been significant improvement in the vocabulary acquisition especially in curriculum area. Skills for learning have improved and all the children are now able to use a vocabulary notebook, have better time management and the standard of their bookwork has improved.

The children are now aware of their on-going need to ask if they don't understand and not to sit passively in the classroom. There has also been increased social interaction among these children both within the ESOL classroom and their own classrooms.

The staff have been very supportive of the programme and have found it to be less disruptive with children coming at the breaks. They have also found that the children are more focussed in class and overall the children have made significant progress.

On the basis of the achievement data, Ilam School has decided to continue with the ELIP focus for the whole school approach in 2006.

Issues of Sustainability

Schools participating in ELIP in 2004

ESOL teachers/teachers aides and Principals from the schools that hosted ELIP in 2004 were interviewed in May 2005. Both these schools lost the ELIP from their schools because the numbers of NZ resident students had dropped. Both the ESOL teachers and the Principal said that they would have loved to have the ELIP operating in their schools for the second year. Both Principals were concerned that the conditions for the programme being based at their schools were not clearly stated at the start of the project. There was no formal agreement between the two schools and the base school or the Ministry of Education. They were concerned that they were told by the Ministry of Education at the end of the year that if they wanted the programme to continue they would need to fund it themselves. This information was presented at a time when the budgets for 2005 had already been set.

One of the aims of the project was to work with ESOL teachers in the programme schools to support them to explore working with/adapting the ELIP to their ongoing work. At the end of Term 2 2005, neither of these schools were using the ELIP approach in their ESOL teaching. The teacher at one school had been very impressed with the ELIP and the support the programme provided her with, but found that she was unable to sustain the programme.

The Resource teacher was wonderful and dedicated. It was great that she took 12 students throughout the year; these were students I didn't have to worry about. I'm not so sure about the model though. I tried it at the beginning of this year, but wasn't able to keep it up. I had to split the group because of the levels and abilities and interests of students.

In this school, there was no distinction made between fee-paying students and New Zealand resident students, which may have contributed to the wide range of abilities. The teacher stated that it "Came down to what was best for the students, and in my view the traditional way of working was best for them."

The ESOL teacher and the Principal at the second school that hosted the ELIP in 2004 were also very supportive of the programme, which they described as:

It was a great programme for students coming in with not a lot of language. They spent a longer time in the programme which gave them the opportunity to work more in-depth, and establish good thought processes and vocabulary.

At this school there was no qualified ESOL teacher, and the ESOL programme was run by a teachers' aide who found that she did not have enough hours to run an ELIP type programme. At this school, a full primary, there was a very wide range of student ages and abilities.

Schools participating in ELIP in 2005

All three schools participating in the ELIP in 2005 were keen to have the programme continue in their schools in 2006 and beyond. There are questions about whether these three schools would be in a position to fund their part of the project after mid

2006 when existing funding runs out. The programme at Christchurch East School which is a decile 2 school is particularly vulnerable if external funding for the programme is not found.

Throughout 2005 the two ELIP resource teachers have worked within their schools making links with the students' mainstream teachers. This has involved formal PD sessions at staff meetings, and regular meetings with classroom teachers and the ESOL teachers. This has included discussions about a student's contribution or participation in class activities or around specific student progress. Feedback from staff during this process has been noted, and has been very positive.

An area that is developing, but has huge potential for further development are the skills of 'scaffolding teaching' that can be modelled to the teachers in their schools by the ELIP teachers. This provides an excellent opportunity for creating a learning environment where classroom teachers can explore pedagogy around sheltered instruction that they could utilise in their classrooms. This is a focus of the project that has not been fully developed due to the demands of setting up and running the student programmes. This is to be addressed by the programme in 2006.

CONCLUSION

Impact on student achievement

This evaluation of the Christchurch ELIP set out to answer a number of questions. The first question was: What impact has the programme had on student learning and achievement?

One of the strengths of the Christchurch ELIP is that it is based on a 'best evidence synthesis' with all teaching focused on meeting assessed student needs. All students were fully assessed in February 2005 using a range of tools including asTTle and national exemplars. All students were retested in September 2005 for evidence of learning shifts.

Learning shifts in reading were evidenced by asTTle scores. In New Zealand students are expected to move one and a bit sublevels in a full school year. The scores for the ELIP students over the seven month period were significant. One student went down a sublevel, four students stayed at the same sublevel, nine students went up one sublevel, eight students went up two sublevels, two students went up three sublevels and one student went up six sublevels. Effect size is an indication of how strong or important the results are. With an average shift of 1.62 sublevels the Cohen's *d* effect indicates a **huge effect**.⁹

⁹ Effect size is an indicator of how strong or how important the results are. Cohen's *d* relative size of the effect is: negligible effect (≥ -0.15 and $< .15$); small effect ($\geq .15$ and $< .40$); medium effect ($\geq .40$ and $< .75$); large effect ($\geq .75$ and < 1.10); very large effect (≥ 1.10 and < 1.45); huge effect > 1.45

The results from maths testing were similar to those in reading. asTTle test areas included number knowledge, measurement and geometric knowledge. In February the average AMS (asTTle maths score was 432 (2P), and in September the average AMS was 556 (3P). This is a whole level shift over seven months, and far exceeds expected rate of progress for this timeframe. Nineteen of the 22 students achieved a shift of at least one level and just over half of the students made a gain of two levels or more. The Cohens' *d* formula indicates that the progress of the students and the influence of the intervention shows a **very large effect** for mathematics. In September many of students were achieving at 'close to cohort' level in Maths, and mainstream teachers report improved results in their day-to-day work in this subject.

All the Principals, teachers, parents and students interviewed as part of this evaluation were very positive about the ELIP. They all recognised the value of a programme that accelerated the students' learning, not only of the English language, but also of maths and science. As one ELIP student stated:

First when I came I was in spelling group one but now my spelling is so good in the classroom. I can spell many words that children in the classroom don't know. They ask me how to spell words. We did a spelling test and my teacher said "Amazing" and when I did the reading test she said "This is so unbelievable because you have improved so much. We didn't expect you to, but you have improved so much."
[Student aged 11]

The results from the Year 1 to 6 students at Ilam primary school also showed significant gains in educational achievement and indicate that the ELIP model is appropriate for all levels of the primary school.

ELIP Resource Teachers and classroom teachers all commented on the observable difference in students confidence and competence in using English in the ELIP classrooms and the mainstream classrooms. Teachers stated that students were more willing to contribute to class discussions, and used more sophisticated language in these discussions.

Teachers and Principals all commented on the observable differences in the confidence of ELIP students as the year progressed. The programme also contributed to the social development of the students. With increased confidence students were able to make friends not only with the other students in the ELIP classroom, but with students in their mainstream classes. The combined out of school experiences also encouraged making friends with students from other schools. On second trips friendship groupings were clearly observable.

Sustainability of the ELIP

It costs approximately \$30,000 a year to keep an ELIP running in a school with a specialist Resource Teacher. This covers the salary, travel, and incidental costs of the Resource Teacher. Schools also need to allocate classroom space and cover the overhead costs of furniture, lighting and heating. In the pilot schools the ELIP was run in addition to the regular ESOL teaching of individuals and small groups of students. It is unlikely that schools will be able to find an additional \$305,000 from

their operating budgets to continue the programme if funding is not found. It will be particularly difficult for the low decile schools to afford to run this programme.

The two schools that were involved in the programme in 2004 did not continue to use this model of teaching in 2005. However, the programme was introduced into Ilam Primary school in 2005 and operated as the main approach to ESOL teaching in that school. The school was in the fortunate position of having a fulltime ESOL teacher and considerable assistance from teachers' aides. The operation of the programme at Ilam Primary school demonstrates that it is a viable teaching model. The teacher at Ilam was one of the ELIP teachers from the 2004 programme, and was skilled at working in this model. If the programme is to be continued by regular ESOL teachers in schools, they would need considerable upskilling in the new pedagogy.

Effectiveness of the ELIP model

The key features of the ELIP were that it was a partial withdrawal programme based on a model of sheltered instruction where the emphasis was on teaching curriculum areas in a scaffolded way, at the same time teaching English language acquisition in a structured way.

This model met the criteria of a good programme as identified by Steven May (2002). It was based on an integrated approach to ESOL within active, meaningful, authentic contexts of science and maths, taking a language across the curriculum approach and applying these ideas to second language learners. The programme based on the same curriculum as the mainstream classes was academically challenging, while at the same time emphasising English language acquisition. A major focus of the programme was explicitly supporting students to learn how to learn.

By basing the programme in the students' schools and withdrawing them for only one and a half hours a day, the programme avoided 'ghettoisation' of ESOL classes which occurs when separating/withdrawing NESB students outside a mainstream school context. The programme actually provided the students with opportunities to enlarge their social networks as they made friends with students from other classes who also attended ELIP, while at the same time maintaining their relationships with their mainstream classmates.

This evaluation concludes that the Christchurch ELIP is a very successful model of providing ESOL to students in a way that not only accelerates their language acquisition, but also provides them with a scaffold in other curricular areas to enable them to participate in their mainstream classrooms.

Lesley MacGibbon
March 2006
lesley.macgibbon@xtra.co.nz