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“**I** truly see the benefit for our students and their futures. I was glad we were selected to be a part of the pilot program. It was very positive to be able to meet with Brian Schiffer [Director, World Languages] and feel that we could express our concerns about part of the implementation. The students enjoyed being able to meet [Superintendent] Dr. Dallas Dance who they knew was instrumental in making the Spanish program possible.”

Fourth grade classroom teacher
BCPS Spanish pilot elementary school

“**I** feel like [the Spanish class] is very interactive. It’s not like 'memorize pantalones.' It’s like ‘¡pantalones!’ [Pretends to hold up a pair of pants.] It’s very fun, it’s . . . kid-based!”

Fourth grade BCPS student studying Spanish

“**T**here are a few people in my class who speak Spanish and it’s fun that they know that we are enjoying their culture.”

Fourth grade BCPS student studying Spanish
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Center for Applied Linguistics
August 6, 2015

In an effort to promote proficiency in a second language for all its students, Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) is taking steps to implement a blended learning Spanish program in all elementary schools. A pilot program started in the fourth grade in the 2014-15 year in 10 pilot elementary schools. The program includes both classroom instruction by a qualified Spanish teacher once a week for 30 minutes and student access to online content 40 minutes a week through Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL). BCPS contracted with the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to conduct an external evaluation of the pilot program. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide independent feedback on the program components that can be used to inform revisions and guide BCPS as the program expands to fifth grade and includes five additional schools.

The evaluation identifies the strengths and potential areas of improvement for the Spanish program in the following areas: program scheduling, rollout and technology, curriculum planning and instruction, and satisfaction and outcomes. Data were collected and analyzed from observations of the face-to-face Spanish instruction and MIL sessions; classroom teacher surveys; administrator, principal, technology specialist, classroom teacher, and student interviews; review of the Spanish curriculum and related materials; MIL usage data; and school demographic studies. Results of a preliminary round of assessment data collected by BCPS are also discussed.

CAL evaluators observed dedicated administrators, principals, and teachers who are excited and supportive of the program. The following strengths were identified: strong vision and mission, strong districtwide support, well-organized 10 school pilot roll-out, enthusiastic students, excellent/dedicated Spanish teachers, weekly collaborative meetings, collaborative fourth grade teachers, and useful interactive technology.

The following recommendations for the BCPS Spanish program are designed to build on the successes of the current program:

1. Fine-tune Spanish program goals for grades 4 and 5 so that all stakeholders will know what the language and culture goals are.
2. Increase instructional time with the Spanish teacher to increase student proficiency by the end of fourth and fifth grade.
3. Increase coordination between the teacher-led and MIL components, focusing on curriculum content and proficiency based goals.
4. Adapt MIL activities to reflect best practices in teaching languages.
5. Plan for pilot teachers (Spanish teachers and fourth grade teachers) to train new teachers.

It is recommended that BCPS implement the proposed recommendations to increase alignment with best practices and adapt a more proficiency-focused program. The first year has gotten off to a strong start, and with this foundation, the program can be expected to expand and show marked progress in developing a rich blended learning (teacher-based and technology-focused) model, showing measurable success in increased student proficiency levels and district-wide collaboration.
Second Language Acquisition Initiative – Evaluation of the ¡Todos Adelante! Program
Baltimore County (MD) Public Schools
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I. Introduction

In an effort to promote proficiency in a second language for all its students, Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) is taking steps to implement a Spanish program in all elementary schools beginning in fourth grade. BCPS selected elementary school as the starting point because of compelling research on the benefits of early language learning and the desire for all BCPS students to be globally competitive, including proficient in a second language, by graduation. Fourth grade was selected because it allows the district “to build carefully and deliberately, while giving future students a three-year head start on current students who started learning a second language, at the earliest, in grade 7” (BCPS Elementary World Languages FAQ, 2015). Since research does not conclusively establish in which grade it is most advantageous to begin, BCPS decided that fourth grade was an appropriate starting point for their district’s long-sequence, proficiency-based language program.

The program that has been developed makes use of a blended learning setting that includes both classroom instruction by a qualified Spanish teacher and online digital content accessed either through computers in a computer lab or laptops/tablets in the classroom. The program goal is for students to be ready for Spanish 2 by the end of fifth grade. In 2013-2014, a steering committee of teachers, principals, assistant superintendents, and instructional and technology experts worked with the BCPS Office of World Languages to identify available digital language learning resources and an appropriate and sustainable instructional model for program delivery. The committee recommended an immersive approach: 100% of instruction in Spanish during the face-to-face component, and an online component that provides as intensive exposure to Spanish as possible.

Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL), a self-paced online children’s language learning platform, was selected for the digital component. The draft fourth grade curriculum for the classroom portion, consisting of 10 content-enriched units, was developed by Office of World Languages staff and designated Spanish instructors, who had been selected through a competitive application process that included submitting model lessons. The team revised the
curriculum during Year 1 based on instructional experience and the rollout of MIL. The revised curriculum consists of five units, and its content and format were streamlined and reorganized.

The first stage of program implementation was the piloting of the model. In 2014-2015, BCPS implemented the new program with fourth graders in 10 elementary schools: Bear Creek, Hampton, Johnnycake, Padonia, Pleasant Plains, Prettyboy, Reisterstown, Sussex, Vincent Farm and West Towson. Each week, the plan was for students to receive 25-30 minutes of Spanish instruction with a fluent Spanish-speaking teacher, along with approximately 40 minutes of additional instruction through MIL. For the 2015-2016 school year, the program will be expanded to five additional schools and include both fourth and fifth grade students at the 15 schools.

Baltimore County Public Schools asked the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to conduct an evaluation of the pilot to help BCPS identify strengths as well as areas that could be improved prior to the start of the second year of the pilot. The pilot program in this report is sometimes referred to as the “pilot” program and sometimes referred to as the “Passport” program, both terms used by the district.

a. Methodology

The CAL evaluation study, conducted by a team of researchers from March–June 2015, addresses four major areas: program scheduling; rollout and technology; curriculum planning and instruction; and satisfaction and outcomes. Data were collected through classroom teacher surveys, school websites, principal and technology specialist interviews, spring 2015 classroom observations, Spanish teacher interviews, review of curriculum and other instructional materials, and review of usage data, demographic data, and assessment data. Appendix A1 contains a detailed discussion of the interviews with a sample of students at pilot schools as well as the methodology and scoring used. Appendices A2-A5 present verbatim classroom teacher responses to survey questions. Appendix B displays the data gathering instruments (observation protocol for online portion, observation protocol for class session, Spanish teacher interview questions, classroom teacher online survey, a letter to classroom teachers explaining the purpose of the survey, and student interview questions). Appendix C includes two examples of teacher-developed materials: a laminated sheet for each student that includes vocabulary and important expressions, and a “choice board,” which consists of activities the students select and complete.
when they have finished all MIL units and all of their “passport” assignments (a workbook based on MIL lessons).

The specific evaluation questions and data sources used to answer the questions are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program scheduling</td>
<td>Classroom teacher surveys, MIL usage data, school demographic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How much time was spent on the MIL and face to face components of instruction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What factors influenced time and scheduling?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rollout and technology</td>
<td>Principal and technology specialist interviews, classroom teacher surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What electronic resources were used for the online portion of the program (types and number of devices used in computer labs, classrooms, and at home)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What technological glitches did programs experience at the time of the rollout and throughout the year and how were these resolved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What (additional) technical training is required for staff who will be facilitating the use of MIL?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum planning and instruction</td>
<td>Site visits (classroom and computer lab observations, interviews with Spanish teachers), review of curriculum and other instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What is the nature of the MIL program and face to face instruction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How are face-to-face and online learning goals aligned?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What differentiation and grouping strategies are used during face-to-face sessions to account for varying levels of proficiency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outputs, satisfaction, and outcomes</td>
<td>Classroom teacher surveys, site visits (observations and interviews with Spanish teachers), student interviews, usage data, school demographic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How many units of MIL do students complete in a year? What program- or student-level variables account for any variability in completion rates?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How satisfied are teachers with the blended learning program and do they feel the students have learned Spanish over the course of the year and enjoyed the program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How satisfied are students with the blended learning program and do they feel they have learned Spanish over the course of the year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation can also be viewed as a review of the program in terms of four measurement constructs: mechanics, teacher practice, satisfaction, and early outcomes. Table 2 below shows the constructs and methods used to collect related data.

### Table 2. Measurement Constructs and Methodology (Data Sources)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>Classroom teacher survey items on program scheduling, rollout, and technology&lt;br&gt;MIL usage data and statistics&lt;br&gt;Document review: school demographic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Practice</td>
<td>Classroom observation&lt;br&gt;Document review: curriculum and other instructional materials&lt;br&gt;Interviews with Spanish teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Interviews with Spanish teachers&lt;br&gt;Survey of classroom teachers&lt;br&gt;Interviews with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Outcomes</td>
<td>Program effectiveness measured via MIL usage data and statistics&lt;br&gt;Student engagement measured via student interviews and MIL usage data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. About this Report**

This report presents the findings of the evaluation study followed by a discussion of program strengths and challenges, recommendations, and a summary. Survey and interview results, data gathering instruments, and examples of teacher developed materials are included in the appendices. The evaluators would like to express their appreciation to Drs. Julie Sugarman and Annie Calderon for their assistance, collegiality, and guidance in various aspects of the evaluation and report writing.

**II. Findings**

The BCPS Spanish program was piloted in 10 schools in 2014-2015, with both a teacher-based component (30 minutes of instruction per week) and an online component (minimum of 40 minutes per week with the Middlebury Interactive Languages [MIL] program). This section presents the findings of the evaluation study. First, some general technology issues will be
discussed, followed by specific aspects of program implementation, teacher practice, overall satisfaction with the program, and early measurable outcomes.

a. Technology Issues

The biggest challenges in the implementation of the first year of the pilot program related to technology issues with the MIL program. The main technological issues that hampered the use of MIL at the beginning of the year, according to administrators, technology specialists, and teachers, included:

- BCPS was not aware that the program was Chrome-based. Their default is Internet Explorer, so they needed to install Chrome and make a shortcut for students to open the program in Chrome.
- Some additional training was needed for teachers and students regarding headphones. Every time the students plugged in the headphones, Windows asked permission to use the microphone. Sometimes students would close the dialog box by accident without hitting “allow,” or hide it. If they closed the box or said “no,” they would have to close the program and open it up again. In addition, the MIL software also asked permission to use the headphones, so students needed to know to answer “yes” to those prompts.
- The initial login with laptops caused a problem for some – BCPS identified this as a problem on their side, not with MIL.
- Some classrooms had older laptops and older wireless systems that did not work as well as those in other classrooms.
- Sometimes when the students tried to record responses the computer would not record.

The technological issues (hardware and software) with the implementation of MIL that persisted further into the school year occurred mainly at schools that had older computers (six years or older). Occasionally there was a BCPS EnGrade online learning management problem, e.g., the student link to MIL would get moved, but the problem was not directly tied to MIL. There was also an issue with some devices that were too small, so the screen resolution was too small and the materials were difficult to read. For hardware, BCPS followed the MIL guidelines but some schools had slower processors – with 100 fourth graders logged onto the program at the same time, wirelessly, and pulling from MIL, it was sometimes a little slow.

The BCPS Office of Technology will be moving better devices into pilot schools as they are made available. This process will start in summer 2015, but may not be completed in time for the start of the school year. In addition, BCPS and MIL are exploring alternate ways to integrate
technologies (including Common Cartridge) which will improve service but may result in some early disruption of services. These steps will definitely help program implementation, and the new devices will have better antennae for the wireless and more RAM.

b. Program Implementation

The fourth grade teachers whose students participated in the Spanish program were surveyed online to gather their views of the program, including program rollout, scheduling, technology and training, and overall satisfaction. The survey was designed to provide information about how Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL) was implemented at the schools and what teachers’ successes and challenges were during the first year. Two or three teachers from each school responded, for a total of 27 teachers. This discussion of program implementation is informed by the teachers’ responses to the survey questions, as well as an interview with the Director of the Office of World Languages, and informal discussions with principals.

1. MIL Rollout by School

Figure 1, below, shows how the online MIL program was implemented at each school by minutes per week. BCPS recommended that schools offer MIL for at least 40 minutes a week. Of the 10 schools, two offered 60-80 minutes per week (Bear Creek and Padonia), three offered 40-60 minutes per week (Johnnycake, Pleasant Plains, and Reisterstown), four offered 40 minutes per week (Hampton, Sussex, Vincent Farm, and West Towson), and one offered 15-30 minutes per week (Prettyboy). For the most part, the schools were able to accommodate the minimum 40 minutes per week for MIL into their daily schedules, and five were able to offer more than the minimum.
Figure 1. Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL) Implementation by Pilot Schools

- Bear Creek: 20 min, 3-4x wk
- Hampton: 20 min, 2x wk
- Johnnycake: 10-15 min, 4x wk
- Padonia: 15-20 min, 4x wk
- Pleasant Plains: 20-30 min, 2x wk
- Prettyboy: 15 min, 1-2x wk
- Reistertown: 20-30 min, 2x wk
- Sussex: 20 min, 2x wk
- Vincent Farm: 20 min, 2x wk
- West Towson: 10 min, 4x wk

Minutes per Week

Bear Creek: 80 minutes
Hampton: 60 minutes
Johnnycake: 60 minutes
Padonia: 80 minutes
Pleasant Plains: 60 minutes
Prettyboy: 30 minutes
Reistertown: 60 minutes
Sussex: 40 minutes
Vincent Farm: 40 minutes
West Towson: 40 minutes
2. Implementation of Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL)

Schools offered the MIL program during the year in a variety of ways, and often in more than one way in a school. (See Figure 2 below.) Approximately 59% offered MIL in the computer lab with the whole class during scheduled MIL time; 11% in the computer lab at another time (not during a scheduled MIL period); 30% in the classroom in a whole-class setting (e.g., using laptops or tablets); 41% in the classroom during English language arts (ELA) rotations; 4% in the classroom during recess or free choice time; and 7% “other” (occasionally on one of the classroom computers). In addition, some of the students (and parents) logged onto MIL at home, but data were not collected on that usage.

![Figure 2. Ways Students Used MIL during the 2014-15 School Year (Teacher-Reported Data)](image)

Each of the pilot schools adjusted their MIL implementation to fit their school’s resources and schedule. Table 3 shows how each school provided MIL instruction, sometimes using more than one implementation method per school, and sometimes changing methods mid-year, as noted in the table. The pilot program is flexible enough so that schools can participate in the technology
component as best fits their schedule, and they have the leeway to adjust the plan as needed, e.g., moving from the computer lab to the classroom when the lab is needed for testing.

Table 3
Method of MIL Implementation by School
(Teacher-Reported Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Schools</th>
<th>In classroom whole class setting (laptop/tablets)</th>
<th>In classroom during ELA rotations</th>
<th>In computer lab with whole class during MIL time</th>
<th>In computer lab at another other time</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton*</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnycake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padonia</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Plains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettyboy*</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reistertown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex*</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Farm</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Townsend</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teachers in these schools used various MIL implementations; all are shown.
1 percentage used during first half of year
2 percentage used during second half of year

BCPS recommended that students use MIL for a minimum of 40 minutes per week. Table 4 below shows how consistently the students in each school, according to the classroom teachers, received at least 40 minutes a week of MIL time.
Table 4
Reaching Targeted Amount of MIL Instruction per Week
(Teacher-Reported Data)

*How consistently did your students have at least 40 minutes a week dedicated to MIL?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Schools</th>
<th>Percentage of time students received MIL instruction for at least 40 minutes per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>75-100% of time (because other grades needed the technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>75-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnycake</td>
<td>90-95% (except during testing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padonia</td>
<td>80-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Plains</td>
<td>75-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettyboy</td>
<td>10-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reistertown</td>
<td>80-90% (except during testing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>40% (fall) - 90% (spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Farm</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Townsend</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: When teachers at the same school provided different responses, all responses were included in the range.

3. MIL Scheduling

The majority of the responding teachers (22 out of 27) either agreed or strongly agreed that the MIL schedule at their school worked well. (See Figure 3.) Five teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that the MIL schedule worked well. All the responding teachers felt that they could voice their concerns about MIL scheduling. When asked about this feature for the next year, 22 teachers agreed or strongly agreed that MIL should be scheduled the same as last year, while 4 disagreed and 1 strongly disagreed.
For those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the first and third statements about MIL scheduling in Figure 3 above, most of the comments related to time issues or the unavailability of the computer lab during standardized testing. (See Appendix A5, Teachers’ Comments on MIL Scheduling, for complete responses.) One teacher felt that scheduling would be easier next year: “The computer lab schedule due to testing was an issue. I think next year will work better because three grades will have devices and other computers will be available for use.” Another teacher suggested students need more guidance on when to use MIL, and recommended offering a whole group session in the lab as well as the ELA option: “We should not allow students to make their own choice about time spent on MIL as we did in the beginning of the year. Many lost motivation and began not making the effort to choose MIL. We should have scheduled time for a whole class MIL session once a week in the computer lab. We can allow student choice during ELA as well, but not have it as the sole time for the program.”

Other teachers (who didn’t necessarily disagree with statements above) are looking forward to more time available next year for the lab: “[I] will be very happy to have more available time to use the lab next year. It will truly be needed with the addition of the fifth grade teachers also
needing lab time.” Lastly, teachers are looking forward to fine-tuning their programs by sharing scheduling patterns with other pilot schools: “It would be helpful to see how other teachers in different schools implemented the program.”

4. Changes in MIL Scheduling During the Year

Over the course of the year, teachers at seven of the ten pilot schools needed to change their implementation of MIL. The major reasons for this were (1) lack of availability of the computer lab and laptops because of the schools’ need to use them for standardized testing (mentioned by 7 schools), and (2) the challenges of offering MIL during the English Language Arts curriculum rotation (mentioned by 2 schools). By the second half of the year, many schools had to decrease the amount of MIL instruction because the computer lab and laptops they had been using were needed for standardized testing. In addition, those schools with less technology in their buildings were more affected. At one school, for example, the fourth grade classes had to stop participating in MIL during testing times, because both the laptop cart and computer lab were needed for testing. One teacher commented, “It was difficult for us to stop using MIL because of testing. We wish we had adequate technology to be able to consistently complete MIL throughout the year.” Another teacher at the same school reported, “Having access to only one computer cart and computer lab makes it extremely difficult to have 75 fourth graders using the program during the allotted time in our schedules. When STEM fair and mandatory state testing arose, students were left with no technology to use.”

With the onset of spring standardized testing, teachers at another school lost access to the computer lab and were [not] able to get students to practice MIL as a group on a consistent basis after February. A teacher commented, “During the second half of the year, [students participated in MIL] approximately 2x per month in the lab for 30 minutes or so plus time in the classroom, as students rotated through their ‘Daily 5’ activities (various time allotments—depended on the speed of the student).” Another teacher remarked, “Some students were finished with the [MIL] program and were not as focused during the second time through the program. Additionally, as the year progressed, we needed to work on BCPS curriculum which sometimes took precedence over the Spanish program.”
Teachers at one school reported a challenge throughout the year to fit in MIL, and tried three ways of accommodating the program (20 minutes twice a week, September-January; 40 minutes once a week, January-April; and 10-15 minutes three times a week, April through June). One teacher expressed a sentiment echoed by others, “We are always so pressed for instructional time that it was very hard to sacrifice the time for MIL. Also, there are so many interruptions that come up during the school week, especially at the end of the year …, so it was hard to prioritize MIL over other crucial subjects. Scheduling MIL was definitely the most frustrating part of the Passport program, and I don't really have a clear solution on how to make it better.”

Another teacher discussed the challenges of using ELA small group time for MIL instruction and her solutions:

The ELA curriculum does not lend itself naturally to small groups, and it was exhausting to always change the curriculum to make sure we had small groups so that students could go on MIL. I also couldn't monitor the students and help them when they were struggling with MIL technology issues. So, we switched to the computer lab, whole class, for MIL. However, it was also difficult to sacrifice instructional time to go to the computer lab, as well as transition time. I also gained an entire tablet cart in April. So, I started doing a combination of using the tablets for MIL in a whole-class setting, and doing MIL during ELA rotations, depending on the ELA curriculum at the time.

5. Technical Issues with MIL

Teachers reported that the most challenging technical issue throughout the year was the malfunctioning of the headsets (See Table 5.) Eighty-five percent of the teachers reported that headsets were a frequent or occasional problem throughout the year. Eighty-six percent reported that computer crashes or freezes were a frequent or occasional problem (mostly occasional), 81% mentioned the inability to login as a problem (mostly occasional), 63% reported that internet connectivity was a frequent or occasional problem (mostly occasional), and 52% reported the problem of students forgetting their log-in information.
Table 5. Technical Issues that Caused Problems throughout the Year

*Which of the following technical issues caused problems for your class throughout the year?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Issues</th>
<th>This was a major or frequent problem throughout the year</th>
<th>This was a minor or occasional problem throughout the year</th>
<th>This was not a problem</th>
<th>I don’t know/Not applicable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet connectivity</td>
<td>11% (3)</td>
<td>52% (14)</td>
<td>37% (10)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students unable to log in</td>
<td>22% (6)</td>
<td>59% (16)</td>
<td>19% (5)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students forget log-in information</td>
<td>24% (6)</td>
<td>28% (7)</td>
<td>48% (12)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer crashes/freezes</td>
<td>19% (5)</td>
<td>67% (18)</td>
<td>15% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headsets do not work</td>
<td>41% (11)</td>
<td>44% (12)</td>
<td>15% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers developed confidence in facilitating the use of MIL as the weeks progressed. (See Table 6.) After a few weeks of working with it, 48% (13 teachers) reported that they felt confident in facilitating the program. Forty-one percent (11 teachers) said they felt confident a few months after working with it, while 11% (3 teachers) noted that they still don’t feel confident facilitating MIL.

Table 6. Teacher Confidence in Facilitating Use of MIL

*At what point did you feel confident facilitating the use of MIL?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time it took to feel confident in facilitating MIL</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediately after rollout</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a few weeks of working with it</td>
<td>48% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a few months of working with it</td>
<td>41% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After at least six months of working with it</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I still don’t feel confident facilitating MIL</td>
<td>11% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Teacher Training

The fourth grade teachers were asked to indicate their views on training and technology. (See Figure 4.) There was a fairly even split in opinions on whether the training on using the MIL...
technology was sufficient. Forty-eight percent agreed or strongly agreed that they received sufficient training on how to use the MIL technology/software, while 52% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Concerning troubleshooting technology issues, 26% agreed or strongly agreed that they received sufficient guidance on how to troubleshoot issues, while 74% disagreed or strongly disagreed that they did. With reference to receiving sufficient training on how to help students use the MIL content (outside of technology issues), 44% agreed or strongly agreed that they received sufficient training and 52% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

When asked if they felt that they could voice concerns about MIL technology, 92% agreed or strongly agreed that they could, while 8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Similarly, 81% of the teachers felt that they could voice concerns about other aspects of MIL implementation, while 19% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The vast majority of teachers were satisfied with their interactions with the Office of World Languages (OWL) (84%), agreeing or strongly agreeing that the OWL responded to their questions and concerns in a way that was timely, clear, and helpful. Fifteen percent disagreed. Similarly, 81% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the Office of Technology responded in a timely, clear, and helpful manner to their questions; four percent disagreed.
Those teachers who marked “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to statements above were asked to explain their views. (For complete teacher responses, see Appendix A2, Teachers’ Comments on Training and Technology.) Overall, the teachers felt that expectations for them were not clear and they did not receive enough training in the areas that they needed. One teacher explained, “Our training was very unclear. We watched videos, but were not really sure of what was expected of us. We were encouraged to take the [student Spanish] class as well, but it was impossible when the technology often did not work for several students. It was not appropriate for teachers.” Another theme in the teachers’ comments was their need for more guidance in troubleshooting technology glitches. “I did not receive any training on how to work the program...
or troubleshoot any problems. I had to learn this through trial and error and with the help of the Office of World Languages.” “I learned the content of MIL through watching the students use the program,” reports one teacher.

Another fourth grade teacher dealt with her lack of knowledge of MIL technology by using the students as helpers and relying on the Spanish teacher for assistance:

  I was not really familiar with what was required by a student to complete MIL. . . I often asked other students to show me what they did to try and help those students [with questions]. They thoroughly enjoyed and looked forward to visits from [the Spanish teacher]. I allowed them to ask her questions and they went on and on. They wanted to please her and show what they did since her last visit. She made additional posters for troubleshooting and set up a simple reward box that students still use.

7. Need for Additional Training

The teachers expressed a need for additional training regarding the use of MIL, and their needs fell into the following categories: (1) guidance on helping students with troubleshooting technology issues, (2) hands-on MIL training for teachers before the program is implemented, (3) streamlining logon procedures, (4) helping students when they can’t record, and (5) monitoring student progress. (Appendix A3, Additional MIL Training Teachers Request contains a complete list of their suggestions.)

In reference to getting more guidance on how to help students with technology issues, a teacher suggested that, “Written procedural narratives would help to be able to troubleshoot student difficulties with the program as we are in the labs.” Many teachers suggested that hands-on training before the program is rolled out would be very beneficial to all: “I would have liked to try the program myself in a room with the MIL people so they could help me troubleshoot.” The logon procedures were a common glitch for many teachers and students: “I would like to be trained on how to teach my students the easiest way to get to the MIL program. I would also like training on how to troubleshoot problems when students cannot logon.” Trying to audio record their responses was another troublesome spot for students: “We had lots of problems with the students’ dictation and being able to hear what they recorded. We need more training with troubleshooting on this one!”
Lastly, one teacher mentioned the importance of getting a good sense of student progress throughout the year: “I would have liked to have a way to monitor student progress from the very beginning. I didn't know their true progress and students began to fall very far behind.”

c. Teacher Practice

The face-to-face component was evaluated through spring 2015 observations of Spanish classes, interviews with the Spanish teachers, and a review of the curriculum and related instructional materials.

1. Classroom Observations

Two Spanish teachers, Ms. Christy Reier and Ms. Conchetta Gallardo, provided face-to-face instruction to fourth students at the 10 pilot schools. Each Spanish teacher taught at 5 schools – a different school each day for 3-4 classes daily, depending on the number of fourth grade sections in each school. CAL evaluators observed each Spanish teacher at one of their five schools. Time allotted to Spanish instruction ranged from 25-30 minutes. During the observation, some classroom teachers participated in the Spanish lesson (learning along with the students) and/or helped with classroom management, while others worked quietly at their desks or left the classroom for a break.

Observed lessons were well planned and highly interactive, providing opportunities for large group and small group interaction. Students were engaged and eager participants. Both teachers spoke Spanish at least 90% of the time. Teachers made excellent use of PowerPoint slides, gestures, physical movements, examples, and modeling to enhance comprehension. Lively lessons opened with a whole group review and then focused on asking and answering questions as a large group and playing a question/answer matching game in small groups. The lessons generally concluded with a preview of the next lesson and “Simón Dice” (Simon Says).

All observed classes included some native/heritage Spanish speakers who participated along with other students: some were given supplemental materials to enrich instruction, some were asked to help model the language for other students, and others just participated in the regular instruction. The CAL evaluators observed that teachers adjusted instructional strategies and content to meet the level and needs of students which varied from classroom to classroom.
2. Teacher Interviews

CAL evaluators first asked teachers to provide background information and then asked them a series of questions concerning the face-to-face and MIL components of the program. Ms. Reier has taught for eight years, including one year in the pilot program. She has traveled extensively, particularly in Spanish speaking countries and is fluent (with excellent pronunciation, speaking readily and easily in Spanish). She is highly motivated and goes above and beyond her responsibilities to enhance the program. In addition, she meets with the heritage speakers of Spanish at lunch – they speak Spanish together and read and discuss books in Spanish.

Ms. Gallardo is in her first year of teaching, recently receiving her degree in elementary education (K-6). She speaks excellent, clear near-native Spanish – she is a great language role model for the students and provides helpful “teacher talk,” where she narrates clearly and uses easy to follow expressive gestures to explain meaning. Her native language is Italian; she learned Spanish at age 12 when her family moved to Spain, and learned English at age 15 when her family moved to Montgomery County, Maryland.

For both teachers the primary focus of instruction is on interpersonal communication, with limited reading. Students are immersed in Spanish and will be expected to be able to hold a 5-minute conversation in Spanish about themselves and their families by the end of fifth grade. One instructor commented that the biggest challenge was the limited amount of time (half an hour a week) for face-to-face instruction. She recommended increasing face-to-face instruction to 3-5 times a week, to be accompanied by 40 minutes a week of MIL.

When asked about MIL, the Spanish teachers saw benefits and challenges. They reported that students can send messages to them through MIL that they can respond to and that they are able to listen to students’ recorded responses and give them feedback. The teachers reported that the MIL program is helpful, and would recommend offering the MIL program a minimum of twice a week or 10 minutes a day, four times a week during homeroom. At the same time, teachers reported that it has been very difficult to align classroom instruction with MIL units since students work at their own pace and are at different levels or have worked on different vocabulary. The Spanish teachers recommend that student access to and time spent on MIL units should be regulated either through giving the Spanish teachers the power to restrict access to modules or by rolling out units on set dates.
The Spanish teachers show a high level of commitment to the pilot program. Ms. Reier has been involved with it since the beginning and both teachers meet weekly to work on lesson plans and develop materials and activities. Both teachers will be involved in revising fourth grade materials and developing materials for fifth grade.

3. Curriculum and Related Instructional Materials

The draft curriculum for fourth grade Spanish was developed by BCPS World Languages office staff and selected Spanish teachers, including the current Spanish teacher, Ms. Reier, in the summer of 2014 before the pilot year began. The draft curriculum consisted of 10 content-enriched units, drawing from third and fourth grade math, social studies, and science curricula, and set within the broad framework of middle and high school Spanish 1, as well as MIL content. The team revised the curriculum during the Year 1 pilot based on instructional experience and the rollout of MIL. The revised curriculum consists of 5 units, and its content and format were streamlined and reorganized. Each unit identifies essential questions and enduring knowledge. Suggested vocabulary and connections to MIL units and curricular connections are listed side by side, enhancing awareness of the connections between face-to-face instruction, MIL, and content instruction for both the Spanish teacher and the fourth grade teacher. The units also include possible cultural connections, links to authentic resources, and suggestions for daily formative assessments.

Revisions of the curriculum also included adding periodic “mini projects” between units to ensure that students go back and review MIL and make the connections between face-to-face and MIL language and content. Spanish teachers worked with Office of World Languages staff to develop a “passport” and a “choice board.” The passport contains 16 pages of activities, one for each MIL unit. When students complete all activities in their passport, the Spanish teacher “stamps” it. During spring site visits, CAL evaluators observed students actively working independently on their passports, either at their desks or as they reviewed MIL units online. After students complete their passports and all 16 MIL units, they choose from a series of activities on their choice board that require them to review one or more MIL units and complete a creative project or activity to apply what they have learned.

In addition to the materials that the teachers and World Language program staff created to enhance students’ MIL experience, CAL evaluators saw colorful and engaging materials
developed by the teachers for classroom instruction. In some schools evaluators also saw signage in Spanish in classrooms, hallways, principal’s office, and bulletin boards.

Classroom observations, teacher interviews, and a review of Spanish curriculum and related instructional materials provide compelling evidence of best practices in curriculum design and face to face instruction throughout the program.

d. Satisfaction with the Program

This section includes views of the program from the perspective of Spanish teachers (from interviews), fourth grade classroom teachers (from online survey), and students (from interviews).

1. Spanish Teachers

The two Spanish teachers are enthusiastic about the program and say that students enjoy the high energy level of the face-to-face classes and the engaging games and activities. Ms. Reier and Ms. Gallardo created supplementary materials including passports, choice boards, vocabulary cards, activities, and tally sheets. The passports and choice boards require students to go back to MIL units and apply what they have learned. A major issue with MIL is that students can skip around in the units and thus some rush through the material. The teachers would like to see the units chunked together and rolled out on certain dates so access to units could be controlled. This would make it easier for MIL and face-to-face instruction to be mutually reinforcing. Currently, the face-to-face lessons are related to some MIL content, but materials in the two programs are not necessarily in the same order, because students self-select which MIL units they do.

When asked if there were things that they would change in MIL, they suggested adding more authentic reasons for communication, more vocabulary, finding a way to scaffold lessons, and adding sentences past Unit 3. All this said, they believe that it is helpful having MIL as a supplement to the teacher-led class. They would like to see it reliably implemented 40 minutes a week—10 minutes daily would be ideal—perhaps offered during homeroom or at least 20 minutes twice weekly. Although students work on MIL independently, the teachers access their recorded responses to assignments and get an idea of their progress.

The teachers also recommended that that the students be given more guidance on the MIL component. One teacher commented that the MIL units shouldn’t be self-paced – they should be
guided by the teacher. One of the reasons the passport component was added was to better tie MIL into the face-to-face component. She felt the MIL lessons focus too much on isolated vocabulary instead of how to create language by putting sentences together. It is difficult for her to reinforce in class what is being taught in MIL because all the students are at different levels. The students do send her messages through MIL and she responds to their questions and provides feedback and comments on their pronunciation. She also would like to work collaboratively with the classroom teacher during Spanish class to improve classroom management.

The Spanish teachers reported that the pilot schools are supportive of the Spanish program and that the principals are a huge asset to the program. The CAL evaluators’ interactions with enthusiastic principals at different pilot schools also suggest the pivotal role principals play in program implementation. Observed evidence of this support were bulletin boards in main hallways highlighting Spanish projects and vocabulary so the entire school could see what the fourth graders are learning in Spanish.

2. Fourth Grade Classroom Teachers

The following results on overall satisfaction with the program are from the online teacher survey. (See Figure 5.) The teachers responded that the students were very pleased with the face-to-face Spanish instruction: 85% strongly agreed that the students enjoyed the face-to-face instruction; 15% agreed. The majority of the teachers reported that their students enjoyed MIL (30% strongly agree; 67% agree); 4% reported that their students did not. Seventy-eight percent reported that their students enjoyed using the passport books; 22% reported that their students did not. All teachers (70% strongly agree; 30% agree) felt that the face-to-face instruction was effective in helping students learn Spanish. All teachers also agreed that MIL was effective in helping students learn Spanish (44% strongly agree; 56% agree). More than three quarters of the teachers felt the passport books were effective in helping learn Spanish (15% strong agree; 63% agree); while 22% disagreed that they were effective. In regards to the effectiveness of using MIL with native Spanish speakers, 63% agreed that it was effective; 15% disagreed; and 22% said they didn’t know. With reference to the effectiveness of MIL with special needs students, 51% agreed that it was effective; 30% disagreed that it was effective, and 19% said they didn’t know.
I think MIL was effective for students with special needs.

- My students enjoyed the face-to-face Spanish instruction.
  - Strongly Agree: 85%
  - Agree: 15%

- My students enjoyed MIL.
  - Strongly Agree: 30%
  - Agree: 67%
  - Disagree: 4%

- My students enjoyed using the Passport books.
  - Strongly Agree: 11%
  - Agree: 67%
  - Disagree: 22%

- The face-to-face Spanish instruction was effective in helping students learn Spanish.
  - Strongly Agree: 70%
  - Agree: 30%

- MIL was effective in helping students learn Spanish.
  - Strongly Agree: 44%
  - Agree: 56%

- The Passport books were effective in helping students learn Spanish.
  - Strongly Agree: 15%
  - Agree: 63%
  - Disagree: 22%

- I think MIL was effective for native Spanish speakers.
  - Strongly Agree: 19%
  - Agree: 44%
  - Disagree: 15%
  - Strongly Disagree: 22%

- I think MIL was effective for students with special needs.
  - Strongly Agree: 7%
  - Agree: 44%
  - Disagree: 19%
Those teachers who expressed dissatisfaction with the above statements (either disagreed or strongly disagreed), as well as other teachers who had comments, offered opinions in four main areas: students with special needs, native Spanish speaking/heritage students, passport books, and MIL technology.

The teachers had the most comments on the appropriateness of the MIL program for students with special needs. While they appreciated the benefits for these students of learning a second language, many questioned the appropriateness of this particular program: “Students with learning needs struggle a great deal with the program. They don't have an interest and they cannot read well enough to navigate through the program on their own. I have a student who is struggling and is only in unit 2 or 3 at this point in the year.” Other teachers commented on the challenge of the technology: “Most of our students with special needs had an extremely difficult time logging onto the program. The program itself was very beneficial to our students but the log-in process made some students frustrated with the process.”

A few of the teachers commented on the different nature of the program and that the students’ usual aides were not necessarily available during MIL: “The students with special needs did not seem to be able to understand the program. Many have severe reading issues and could not understand the directions on their own. Some have severe attentional/behavior concerns and require daily assistance in their regular classes to persevere and make progress. Some students require an assistant for daily progress [and one-on-one adult assistants were not always available].”

Another teacher was pleased with how the MIL program was adapted during the year when it was realized that modifications were needed to enhance the instruction for different types of learners: “I was really impressed at how the needs of the kids were addressed. For example, the program started out completely auditory, but when we realized our visual learners were struggling, visuals were added to help them succeed.”

Some teachers were impressed with the Spanish abilities of their Spanish-speaking students: “The Spanish speaking students seemed to be very fluent in their ability to speak the language. From the beginning, they carried on conversations with the Spanish teacher while the other students watched in amazement. These students often are the translators for their Spanish speaking parents at conferences or with the office.” Other teachers, however, felt that their
Spanish speakers did not need Spanish classes: “The Spanish speaker that I have in my classroom does not need Spanish instruction. She is fluent in English and Spanish and was done with the program very quickly.”

In commenting on the passport books, one teacher found them quite beneficial and stated, “The passport books were an important piece. As my ‘rushers’ completed the program, the books slowed them down in order to focus on the lessons/videos.” Others suggested that students needed more guidance: “There needs to be more directions for the teachers when the students are completing the passport booklets. At times the directions were unclear to the students and I couldn't help them because I wasn't given any information about the passports.”

One teacher is looking forward to continuing the program next year when some of the obstacles have been removed: “I liked certain aspects of the program and I am eager to see it next year now that some kinks have been worked out . . . I enjoyed the in-class lessons and they improved a lot as the year went on. I think the biggest problem was with MIL – I was told that students weren't going on it, but I wasn't sure when to find extra time and a lot of times they weren't going on it but doing something wrong [during login]. I didn't know enough about the program to help them or see what they were doing wrong, so they kept falling further behind.”

3. Principal Interviews

Pilot school principals were enthusiastic about the Spanish program and discussed how the blended program fit the learning styles of a wide range of students. Principals mentioned that some schools have integrated the Spanish program throughout the school. One principal has made the program an integral part of the school by:

- Having Spanish students ask and answer questions on the morning announcements (e.g., what is your favorite color?)
- Including an update from the Spanish teacher in the school’s quarterly newsletter
- Posting the latest Spanish vocabulary words on the school Facebook page
- Posting Spanish labels in the classrooms and throughout the school (e.g., la oficina, la puerta, la ventana)
- Announcing a Spanish word of the week

Principals discussed the benefit of having staff from the Office of World Languages talk to parents about the program during Back to School Night – they reported that there was a lot of interest and enthusiasm for the program. One principal was interested in how best to include
special education students in the program, and wanted to discuss with other principals what their schools do in terms of accommodations for special education students. (Since the one-on-one aides are only scheduled to work with students during reading and math time, they haven’t been working regularly with the students during MIL time.)

The Office of World Languages reports receiving a lot of positive feedback from the principals about Spanish instruction and the teachers. “The principals see the children engaged in Spanish class and excited to get on MIL.” Principals also note that some of their more challenging students are very engaged in Spanish instruction.

4. Student Interviews

A sample of 38 fourth grade students participating in the pilot Spanish program was selected to participate in 10-minute one-on-one interviews that centered on their overall views of learning Spanish, their opinions of the teacher-based and computer-based instructional components, and their views on the topics they learned about. (See Appendix A1, Student Interviews at Pilot Schools, for a description of the methodology, protocol questions, and discussion.) The following summary of the results focuses on: demographic information, student attitudes toward Spanish, student views about the Spanish class with the teacher, student views about the Middlebury Interactive Languages Program, student attitudes towards learning and topics, comments about culture, perceived benefits of language learning, and heritage and native Spanish speakers’ views of the program.

Student Demographic Information

Demographic information revealed that five students in the sample were heritage speakers of Spanish while two students were native Spanish speakers. Eight students spoke a language other than English or Spanish at home so were learning Spanish in school as a third (or later) language.

---

1 The five Spanish heritage speakers are defined here as those who reported home languages as both English and Spanish. Typically they said that at least one parent “sometimes” speaks to them in English and the child typically either answers back in both English and Spanish or mostly in English. The two native Spanish speakers had arrived in the US within the last year and were enrolled in ESOL classes. Both spoke only Spanish at home and all parents speak to them only in Spanish. Neither of those two spoke enough English to complete the interview in English. Languages spoken by the other eight students included Uzbek, Russian, Amharic, Farsi, Nepali, and various Indian languages.
Six of the above mentioned 15 students were either currently in ESOL classes or had been within the last two years. Only seven students of the 38 reported formal Spanish instruction prior to the 2014-2015 school year: one had had years of private tutoring while the remaining six had limited exposure in elementary programs and shared that they remember little from those programs.

**Student Attitudes toward Spanish**

All (100%) of the sample responded that they liked learning Spanish and wanted to continue with their Spanish studies. (See Table 7.) A total of nine students from non-Spanish-speaking homes (29%) volunteered that they share new Spanish words they have learned with family members. One student shared that, “nobody from my family knows Spanish. So it is fun that I can teach them it.”

![Table 7. Student Attitudes toward Spanish](image)

A total of 29 students (76%) indicated that they want to learn another language; of the nine students who said they do not want to learn another language, three speak a language other than English at home. Regarding perceived level of difficulty, seven students (18%) said that learning Spanish is difficult, 12 (32%) said that it is easy, and 19 (50%) said that it is both difficult and easy. Ten students (26%) volunteered that remembering words in Spanish is difficult, however several students also mentioned learning techniques that they use when encountering difficulty. One student suggested that “finding words that are like it in English and just adding it in my mind makes it easier.”

**Student Opinions on Spanish Class with Teacher**

---

2 By saying that students “volunteered” information, it is meant that the interviewer did not specifically ask the student to provide information on a certain topic.
Regarding Spanish class with the Spanish teacher, 100% (38) of students in the sample shared something that they liked. Many students expressed that Spanish class is fun, citing examples such as games and songs. Some representative comments include the following:

[My favorite was learning] months because we also got to do a song and it’s easy to memorize and it has a dance too. We danced and sang it over and over again and it’s catchy and then we remembered it and now it’s easy for us.

Señorita makes it fun by adding in games and she plays with us a lot. She plays different games like she plays a buzzer game.

A total of 16 students (42%) volunteered information on the Total Physical Response method and the general movement-based approach used by the Spanish teachers; all responses were overwhelmingly positive. One student explained, “I feel like it is very interactive and it’s not like ‘memorize pantalones!’ It’s like ‘¡pantalones!’ (Pretends to hold up a pair of pants). It’s very fun, it’s like kid-based.”

A total of 13 students (34%) volunteered information about “passports,” an instructional tool that the students use. One student said, “[The passport] actually helps you get much better at [Spanish]. [It] helps you be fluent and that, combined with the online program and our Spanish teacher, makes the words really easy to come to your brain.” Furthermore, eight students (21%) volunteered information regarding the useful and fun nature of the pictures used in class: “She has the pictures of the things like a sun and it helps us know what it is better, compared to if she just said the word. If we just did it without the pictures, it would be a lot more confusing.”

The responses of six students (16%) who shared something that they do not like about class with their Spanish teacher were of varied content. Two students mentioned frustration, one said that students do not get out of their desks enough, and another said that the teacher did not learn student names until the second semester. Two students shared that they want more Spanish classes each week. One said, “I didn’t like that it was only one day in the whole week. I think it should be two or three days a week so we can learn more.”
Opinions on Middlebury Interactive Languages Program (MIL)

When questioned about the MIL program, all students in the sample who participated in this part of the class\(^3\) (100%) identified something that they liked. Common answers included the stories, games, quizzes, and the organization of information into units; representative comments follow:

I like the stories the best. They help me learn it because when you get a story, it shows the words. So if you can see the word it helps you figure it out. Basically it’s like closed captioning.

I like how [MIL] breaks it up. I like how it breaks it into units. I like that it helps us learn easier.

I like the games and the quizzes. They help me model the word in Spanish.

Furthermore, a total of 15 students (39%) volunteered information on the voice recording feature of MIL and all comments were of a positive nature. One student said, “I like when you have to do the speaking lab because I like speaking Spanish words. I can make up all my mistakes [because I can re-record] and it’s easier to learn it better.”

When asked if there is anything about the MIL program that they do not like, nine students (25%) mentioned technical issues such as difficulty with the recording feature, problems logging in, and long loading time. Seven students (19%) identified something content-related that they did not like about MIL, ranging from a high level of difficulty to long lessons and either too much or not enough time. The remaining 20 students (56%) said that there is nothing that they do not like about MIL\(^4\).

Student Learning and Favorite Topics

Almost all students in the sample indicated that they have learned something over the past academic year in Spanish class (36 students, 95%); the only ones who answered negatively were two student enrolled in the ESOL program who had had five years of formal education in Spanish-speaking countries. When asked what they learned in Spanish this past year, those who said they have learned something were able to list from one to 11 topics; the average number of topics listed was 4.7. Students commonly mentioned topics such as greetings, personal attributes,

---

\(^{3}\) Two ESOL students said that they were not allowed to participate in the MIL part of Spanish class because a teacher had told them that they were still learning English.

\(^{4}\) Two students shared dislikes, however they were unrelated to the MIL content, such as not having enough time for math class after Spanish class in the computer lab.
community places, animals, colors, activities, and clothes. Some students were able to verbalize the useful nature of the topics they had learned, e.g., “We [learned] general stuff, not things that people will barely talk about: activity, sports, body parts, clothes, a bunch more.”

When questioned as to their favorite topic in Spanish class, all students named at least one. A total of 16 students (42%) volunteered that a certain topic was their favorite because it either reflects a personal interest or has a real-life application. One student answered that his favorite topic to learn about in Spanish class is “sports and activities. That’s what I do the most in my life and it’s just fun to know about.” Another answer exemplifies how some students were able to able to find a real-life application for their favorite topic: “[My favorite was] greetings because sometimes I use the greetings to other people at school outside of Spanish class.”

Comments about Culture

Although the interview protocol did not have any questions about culture, the topic did present itself during the interviews of several students. Whenever culture was mentioned in the interviews, the interviewer asked the student if s/he thought it was “important or not important” to learn culture. Of the 22 students who answered this question, 20 (91%) answered that is it important. As one student explained, “I think [culture is] important because, someone from one of those cultures, I would know about them and how to talk to them.” Another student agreed: “There are a few people in my class who speak Spanish and it’s fun that they know that we are enjoying their culture.”

Perceived Benefit of Language Learning

Nearly half of all students in the sample (18, 47%) shared a way that learning Spanish is useful in their daily life. A student commented, “[learning Spanish] has helped because once I went to Chick-fil-A [restaurant] and there was a little girl and she was speaking Spanish to me. I was able to talk to her and ask her a few questions.” Another 16 students (42%) stated a perceived benefit at some point during their interview, however the benefit was removed from their daily lives. One student expressed his perceived benefit by saying, “If I go to a different county, I will know how to speak [Spanish] already so I won’t need to take classes.” An additional four students (11%) did not share any perceived benefits during their interviews.
Heritage and Native Spanish Speaker Student Views

All five heritage speakers indicated that they have learned something this year in Spanish class. One student explained, “Sometimes I don’t really know everything and now I’m learning more things.” Another student reflected on her reading and writing: “I knew how to write a little bit…I didn’t know how to read in Spanish. I feel like they are better because I can read good and I can spell great in Spanish.”

Regarding their attitudes toward Spanish, all heritage speakers and native Spanish speakers reported that they liked learning Spanish in Spanish class and wanted to continue. As one student explained, “I love learning Spanish. It is coming to a different world for me.” Furthermore, a native speaker said that she wants to continue taking Spanish class because “it’s my language and I never want to forget it.” All heritage and native speakers also indicated that they enjoy helping non-heritage/native classmates. A heritage speaker shared that “sometimes [my English-speaking classmates] ask me to help them. I just give them clues and they will figure it out. I like to help the other students.” Also, all heritage and native speakers indicated that they think Spanish class is interesting, even though they already speak the language. One fourth grader said, “It was interesting even though I already speak Spanish. It’s all different. There’s new stuff.”

In summary, the results of the student interviews revealed several trends. First, all students interviewed liked learning Spanish and wanted to continue with their Spanish studies. Many students found Spanish class with their teacher to be fun and interactive; the songs, games, and movement provided evidence of this. The MIL program had several features that students found helpful in their learning, although there were some technical problems with the program. Furthermore, almost all students indicated that they had learned something over the past academic year. Most students thought learning about culture was important, and about half were able to see the perceived benefit of learning Spanish as present in their daily lives. Finally, all heritage speakers said that they liked Spanish, they had learned something this past year, and they wanted to continue with Spanish study.

e. Early Outcomes

The CAL evaluation plan (see Table 2 in Introduction) called for early outcomes to be measured as follows: program effectiveness measured via MIL usage data and statistics, program
effectiveness measured via curriculum development and school demographic studies, and student engagement measured via student interviews and MIL usage data. In addition, CAL evaluators were able to examine some preliminary assessment data even though not part of the original plan for the report of year 1 early outcomes.

1. MIL Usage Data and Statistics

MIL usage data (information on how much MIL was used by the students in the pilot classes) was available from 29 classes in the 10 pilot schools (other data received by BCPS was corrupted). The averages for activity completion for these classes ranged from 27% to 95% (percentages have been rounded). (See Table 8.) “Activity completion” refers to the percentage of MIL material that students accessed during the 2014-2015 school year. The wide range of percentage of activity completion at any one school or in different schools may be related to factors such as availability and reliability of hardware and connectivity. At the same time, the data show that at almost every school at least one grade section’s average completion rate was 80% or higher. This suggests that the level of student engagement when MIL was available was relatively high overall.

Table 8. Percentage of MIL Activities Completed by Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Number of Class Sections with Usable Data</th>
<th>% of Activities Completed by Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67/89/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnycake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63/78/84/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padonia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70/77/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Plains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettyboy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27/51/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisterstown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77/89/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71/79/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Farm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81/82/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Towson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64/67/68/87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Assessment Data

Although the CAL evaluation plan did not call for addressing assessment results until Year 2, the Office of World Languages did provide the results of a preliminary assessment they developed based on a blueprint they created jointly with Strategic Measurement & Evaluation. This assessment was conducted with a sample of students at each school in spring 2015. Students were assessed one-on-one and asked a series of five questions and prompted with a picture if they could not respond. They were also requested to ask the teacher a question. Their answers and the question they asked were rated using a 3-point scale (Exceeds/Meets/Does Not Meet Expectations). Table 9 presents the average rating for each school, the percentage of students who met or exceeded expectations, and the percentage that did not meet expectations. The percentage of students that met or exceeded expectations ranged from 62% to 87%, except for one school that had 40% in this category. In general, most students assessed at each school met or exceeded expectations. These preliminary results need to be interpreted in light of multiple factors, including program rollout, availability and reliability of MIL, assessment delivery, student sample size, and degree to which the assessment aligned with face-to-face instructional practices and MIL content.
Table 9. BCPS Pilot School Assessment Results, Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average (out of 18)</th>
<th>% Meets or Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>% Does not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnycake</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padonia</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Plains</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettyboy</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisterstown</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Farm</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Towson</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Curriculum Development and School Demographic Studies

The curriculum development process is a primary determiner of program effectiveness. In the case of the BCPS elementary school Spanish program, the process began by developing a clear, shared vision of what would be feasible for face-to-face instruction and an online learning component. The fourth grade curriculum for the teacher-based component, consisting of 10 content-enriched units, was subsequently developed by Office of World Languages staff and Spanish instructors who had demonstrated abilities needed for the task. The curriculum process was iterative and responsive to the limitations of the online program, and additional instructional materials were developed throughout the year to connect MIL to the face-to-face instruction and enhance student independent learning through MIL.

Demographic Data

BCPS did an excellent job in selecting a representative sample of elementary schools for the project. Pilot schools were not only drawn from different parts of Baltimore County, but also reflect the range of populations and special programs offered. Tables 10 and 11, below, show the range of populations in the pilot schools and percentages of students in special programs. By piloting the program in a wide range of locations and with varying populations, BCPS has
received invaluable feedback on program effectiveness which will inform revisions and the rollout of the program to additional schools in the 2015-2016 school year.

Table 10. BCPS Pilot School Enrollment by Ethnicity/Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Schools</th>
<th>Enrollment '14-'15</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnycake</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padonia</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Plains</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettyboy</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisterstown</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Farm</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Towson</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5601</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. BCPS Pilot School Enrollment in Special Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Schools</th>
<th>Enrollment 2014-15</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>Free and Reduced-Price Meals</th>
<th>English Language Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnycake</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padonia</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Plains</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettyboy</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisterstown</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Farm</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Towson</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5601</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Student Interviews

Student interviews at each of the pilot schools provided additional evidence of student engagement in the program. Thirty-eight students, of whom five were heritage Spanish speakers, two were native Spanish speakers, and eight spoke a language other than English or Spanish at home, participated in the interviews. All 38 students interviewed indicated that they liked learning Spanish and wanted to continue. They also indicated that they like Spanish class and that it was fun and interactive. Students also liked the MIL program stories, games, quizzes and the way it is organized in units. Almost all students (95%) indicated that they had learned something over the past year in Spanish class. All heritage/native speakers of Spanish said that they liked learning Spanish, had learned something this past year, and want to continue Spanish study. These comments echo feedback received by a CAL evaluator from heritage/native speakers of Spanish at “Spanish Lunch Group meeting” organized by one of the Spanish teachers during the spring site visit. Students liked the dramatic and playful nature of the class and enjoy reading the stories in MIL, recording their responses, and learning new vocabulary. The positive feedback from this group of students provides strong evidence of student engagement as well as program effectiveness across diverse populations.

Overall, early outcomes in terms of program effectiveness and student engagement are positive and provide insight into program strengths as well as challenges that affected the Year 1 results. These early outcome results should be referenced as preparations are made for Year 2 of the pilot program.
III. Program Strengths and Challenges

a. Program Strengths

Based on classroom observations, interviews with teachers and administrators, a survey of classroom teachers, and a review of curriculum documents and the schools’ websites, the CAL evaluators noted that the pilot Spanish program has had strong support from every level of administration in the district, starting with the superintendent, in the planning and implementation of the program. The following are key strengths of the program:

- **Strong vision and mission.** The program from the outset has had a strong vision. Superintendent Dance envisioned a program that would help students become proficient in a second language, because students need 21st century skills in order to be globally competitive upon graduation.

- **Strong districtwide support.** It is evident that a strong team of district personnel are dedicated to making this program successful, including the superintendent, Office of World Languages personnel, Office of Research personnel, school principals, Spanish teachers, and fourth grade classroom teachers.

- **Well-organized 10-school pilot rollout.** The Office of World Languages, Office of Research, Department of Information Technology, and principals and teachers worked diligently to plan and rollout the pilot program that included diverse elementary schools, regular planning meetings with all stakeholders, access to instructional technology assistance, a curriculum designed jointly by teachers and Office of World Languages personnel, and Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL), a research-based self-paced learning platform.

- **Students like Spanish!** All students interviewed liked learning Spanish and wanted to continue with their Spanish studies. Many students found Spanish class with their teacher to be fun and interactive, especially the songs, games, and movement activities. When participating online on MIL, they enjoyed the stories, games, and quizzes.

- **Excellent/dedicated Spanish teachers.** The Spanish teachers demonstrated best practices in teaching languages to children, facilitating a learner-centered classroom, using the target language to provide comprehensible input for instruction, and integrating culture, content and language into instruction. The teachers use the target language at least 90% of the time in beginning classes, as recommended by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

- **Weekly collaborative meetings.** The Spanish teachers are given the opportunity to work together on a weekly basis on curriculum development, refining curriculum ideas and lesson plans, and discussing progress in meeting program goals.

- **Collaborative fourth grade teachers.** The fourth grade teachers have played a major role in the pilot, especially in the rollout of the Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL) online component, which they facilitated to the best of their abilities even though most of them do not have Spanish skills and many did not feel they had the technology skills needed.

- **Useful interactive technology.** Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL), the supplemental online Spanish program selected to complement the classroom teaching,
uses authentic cultural stories (including Mayan and Aztec) and excellent animation that
the children enjoy. The use of a variety of Spanish dialects provides the children with a
wide range of language models.

b. Program Challenges

The pilot Spanish program, as with any pilot program, faced challenges throughout its first year
of implementation. The limitations seen in the first year of the program are addressed in the
recommendations below for program expansion, and revolve around the following needs:

- Increasing the amount of face-to-face Spanish instruction to help students attain a level
  roughly commensurate with the completion of Spanish 1 by the end of fifth grade, and
  align with best practices for instruction;
- Increasing alignment of MIL activities with classroom curriculum, so that the two
  instructional components are unified in themes and subject matter;
- Improving and institutionalizing the MIL technology component of instruction (so that all
  classroom teachers are comfortable with the technology);
- Strengthening the technology services so that the technology interface is seamless during
  online instruction; and
- Revising MIL materials to incorporate best practices (minimize amount of English,
  correct introduction of isolated nouns [need to add articles to nouns], and ensure that all
  language is taught in context).

In addition, the classroom teachers in their survey identified the following specific challenges
that they would like to address in the coming year:

- Accessing the needed laptops/tablets and computer labs throughout the year (standardized
testing time was the most challenging time for the teachers to gain access to computers).
- Scheduling the MIL component – it was difficult to fit it into the school day with
  competing pressures from other academic areas, especially near the end of the year;
- Integrating MIL into the English language arts rotation for those schools selecting that
  option (sometimes students were not choosing MIL as one of their rotations);
- Increasing communication with the Spanish teachers so that classroom teachers and
  Spanish teachers work collaboratively;
- Increasing ability to assist the students with the Spanish lessons and the needed
  technology (especially at the beginning of the year).

IV. Recommendations

Overall, the BCPS pilot Spanish program should be continued and expanded. The feedback
from teachers, principals, and students has been good, results are promising, and the benefits
of an early start model are supported by research. The blended learning design provides a
foundation for a program type recommended by existing research (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2004), though more class time with the Spanish teachers is essential to achieve the desired goals.

The following recommendations for the Baltimore County Public Schools elementary school Spanish program are designed to build on the successes of the Year 1 pilot program; help set and achieve student language proficiency goals; and help increase alignment with best practices in curriculum, instruction, assessment, program design, and technology implementation:

1. **Fine-tune Spanish program goals** for grades 4 and 5 so that all stakeholders will know what the language and culture goals are. Set challenging and realistic goals that will include descriptions of what the students will be able to do with what they know by the end of the two-year sequence. This process, in turn, will help in the design of the articulation plan for continued language study in middle school and high school.

2. **In an effort to increase student proficiency by the end of grade 4 and grade 5, increase instructional time with the Spanish teacher** in both grades to align with best practices and recommendations of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). “Students should have at least 90 minutes of teacher-led instruction per week,” according to the *ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners*. (ACTFL, 2012). In an overview of lessons learned over three decades of elementary school language teaching, CAL recommends that, “sufficient instructional time needs to be allotted per week so that learners can reach the targeted goals” (Rhodes, 2014). This alignment of the program with best practices in teaching languages to children will help students continue to develop their language skills and reach higher proficiency goals.

3. **Increase coordination between the teacher-led and Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL) components**, focusing on curriculum content and proficiency-based goals. As time allows, revise overall program design to put more time and focus on face-to-face instruction and incorporate MIL program as supplemental instruction.

4. **Adapt MIL activities to reflect best practices in teaching languages** to children through technology, e.g., eliminate English usage, teach all vocabulary in context as opposed to in isolation, provide opportunities for student-student and student-teacher interaction, increase use of humor, and provide more songs and jingles as a fun way to learn language.

5. **Plan for pilot teachers to train new teachers**. Spanish teachers and fourth grade teachers who participated in the pilot should assist in the training of the new group of pilot teachers for the fall so that they can share their experiences and the program can build on what they have learned.

**Teacher Recommendations for 2015-2016**

The classroom teachers offered specific recommendations for Year 2 of the pilot, focusing on the fine-tuning of the MIL implementation:
Fourth grade classroom teachers would like to work more closely with the Spanish teachers to implement the Spanish program next year. One teacher wondered if “the ELA curriculum could work with the [Spanish] program to make the lessons easier to integrate with MIL. To integrate MIL currently into the ELA block caused a lot of curriculum rewriting.”

When using MIL during ELA rotation, teachers suggest requiring Spanish as a regular rotation. One teacher provided details: “I used MIL as a rotation based on the book, ‘The Daily Five,’ where they suggest giving the students choice as to which activity they do first. We did the ‘Daily Three’ (Spanish, Independent Reading, and Writer's Workshop), and some kids were inconsistently accessing MIL until I directed the rotations. I will do this from the beginning of the year next year.”

Other teachers found that asking the students to report back what they learned in MIL worked well: “When I began to have students tell me the Unit/Lesson they were on after each whole class setting, they began to make more progress.”

Lastly, classroom teachers would like to share tips and strategies with other teachers: “It would be helpful to see how other teachers in different schools implemented the program.”

Developing a plan to address the overall recommendations as well as the teacher recommendations before the expansion of the pilot in the fall will be a good step in helping the team build on its successes and adjust goals and procedures as needed before the next rollout.

V. Summary

In line with its mission of creating a culture of deliberate excellence for every student, every school, and every community, Baltimore County Public Schools’ new pilot Spanish program is a great step towards introducing languages to all students in the district beginning in fourth grade. The district’s vision to ensure that every student becomes proficient in a second language in order to be globally competitive upon graduation is a far-reaching plan that can serve as a model for the nation. The first year has gotten off to a strong start, and with this foundation, the program can be expected to expand and show marked progress in developing a rich blended learning (teacher-based and technology-focused) model, showing measurable success in increased student proficiency levels and district-wide collaboration.
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APPENDIX A:
SURVEY AND INTERVIEW RESULTS
Appendix A1. Student Interviews at Pilot Schools

Methodology

The original pool of students consisted of 40 fourth-graders at ten elementary schools in Baltimore County that piloted the Passport Schools Blended Learning Spanish program during the 2014-2015 academic year. Each school was asked to select four students: a student who was doing well in the program; a student who was doing satisfactorily in the program; a student who was struggling in the program; and, if possible, a non-native English speaker. All students selected for the interviews received permission forms that required parent signatures in order to participate in the interviews. Due to absences on the days of the interviews, the final student sample was 38. In order to avoid any interviewer bias, the interviewer did not ask into which requested category each student belonged, so the background of the students was not known (except when students were obviously non-native English speakers).

The interviews took place in quiet rooms in each of the ten schools. In addition to the interviewer and the individual student, a Baltimore County Public School employee was present at all times. The interviewer began the interviews by introducing herself and asking general questions about summer break to put the student at ease. After that, the interviewer stated the purpose of the interview, explained that nobody at the student’s school will know what s/he said, and asked if she could audio-record the conversation. All students consented to the audio-recording.

The language of delivery of the interviews was English; the only Spanish interviews were conducted with two native Spanish speakers who had limited English. The interviews took approximately ten minutes each.

The interviewer presented the questions from the protocol (see Materials section) to the student and asked clarification questions when necessary. She also asked a few impromptu questions to each student with the goal of extending the information that the student had already chosen to share. If the demographic questions showed that a student was a heritage speaker, the interviewer included additional questions (see below).

After each interview concluded, the interviewer thanked the student for participation.
**Interview Questions**

The basic interview protocol consisted of 14 questions divided into five categories:

**Table 1. Protocol Questions**

| Demographic Questions | What language or languages do you speak with your family at home?  
Do your parents or other adults in your home speak any languages other than English? (If “yes,” ask “which languages?”)  
Have you ever studied a language at school or in an afterschool or weekend program before this one? (If “yes,” ask “which language?”) |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Affective Questions    | Do you like learning Spanish? Why?  
Is learning Spanish easy or hard? Why?  
Do you want to keep learning Spanish? Why?  
Do you want to learn other languages? Which one(s)? |
| Questions about Middlebury Interactive Language Program | What do you like best about the Middlebury Interactive Language program (computer)?  
Is there anything that you don’t like about the Middlebury Interactive Language program? What is that? |
| Questions about Spanish Class with Teacher | What do you like best about class with your Spanish teacher?  
Is there anything you don’t like about class with your Spanish teacher? What is that? |
| Questions about Learning and Topics | What have you learned in Spanish this year?  
What was your favorite topic?  
What was your favorite activity?\(^1\) |

---

\(^1\) The answers to this question were not presented as results specific to this question in the following section due to the nature of the question; student answers instead provided support for other questions/topic in the interview.
In addition to these protocol questions, the interviewer asked impromptu questions such as “What did your Spanish teacher do to teach you about how people in Spanish-speaking countries live (culture)?” “Do you think learning about culture is important or not important? Why?” The interviewer also asked additional questions to students identified from the demographic questions as heritage speakers: “Have you learned anything new in Spanish class that you did not already know? Do you think Spanish class is interesting or boring? Do you think Spanish class is helping you learn more Spanish or is it not helping?” All closed-ended questions were followed by requests for explanations, such as “Why is that?”

Scoring

All interviews were transcribed and then answers were coded in response to the questions. In addition to coding for the questions, the interviewer noticed several reoccurring topics volunteered by students and therefore also coded for those.

Discussion

The discussion of the student interview results are presented in terms of the positive learning experience of the Passport Schools Blended Learning Spanish program, outcomes of learning, the Middlebury Interactive Language Program, topics as extensions of personal interests, perceived benefits, and the validation of heritage and native Spanish speakers.

Considering that every student interviewed not only likes Spanish but also wants to continue learning it, it appears that the Passport Schools Blending Learning Spanish program has been effective in providing a positive learning experience. This is supported by student responses to what they like about Spanish class with their teacher: the consistent references to Spanish class as being “fun” and “interactive” through songs, movement, pictures, and games suggests that students are greatly enjoying learning Spanish in the format used. One fourth grader effectively summarized this sentiment when saying, “We learn Spanish and sometimes I’m happy because I was tired and didn’t want to do work, but [our Spanish teacher] comes in, and I’m all happy, I’d rather do Spanish than work.”

The types of learning occurring in the Spanish classrooms also appeared to have an effect on students. The numerous mentions of ancillary materials such as passports and computers (as a way to look up information) suggest that students are becoming proficient in manipulating tools
in their classroom environment to independently answer their own questions. This type of independent learning and problem-solving is arguably much more effective than simply asking the teacher as soon as a student has a question. Furthermore, the fact that several students shared the learning techniques they use in the classroom seems to indicate that the specific processes and skill sets necessary to learn another language are making them more aware of their own learning. These students appear to know their strengths and weaknesses and yet are still able to find techniques to boost their learning.

The overwhelming number of references to the voice-recording feature of the Middlebury Interactive Language Program suggests that this is a useful tool for students. It seems to fulfill both practical and affective needs: many students indicated that being able to record and then hear themselves is helpful in learning Spanish, while a few others mentioned that they like this feature because they do not feel the same pressure as when speaking to an actual person.

Since technical problems were the only consistent dislike of the Middlebury Interactive Language Program, it appears that additional computer support and Middlebury site maintenance is necessary. Many students mentioned problems of delayed log-ins and other time-sensitive problems; these issues ultimately take away significant amounts of hands-on classroom time. Regarding the non-technical dislikes of the Middlebury Interactive Language Program, the varied nature of the dislikes makes it difficult to pinpoint anything that could be improved. For example, while one student said that he never had enough time to complete the entire lesson on the computer, another expressed frustration that she always finished her computer lesson much before her classmates and then had nothing to do.

The topics discussed in class appeared to be very popular with students. Overall, students had no difficulty in quickly recalling many topics they had learned during the year. It appears that the teachers organized and presented the topics in ways that piqued student interest and enabled them to view learning these topics in Spanish as simply an extension of learning more about their favorite topics, regardless of language.

Given that 47% of students interviewed were able to share a way that learning Spanish is useful in their daily life, it appears that the Passport Schools Blended Learning Spanish program somehow encourages learners to personalize the perceived benefit and find a direct benefit in their everyday lives. It is uncertain which aspect of the class assists learners in making these
connections; some possibilities may be teacher attitude, class discussions, self-reflection, or reflection on learning. Regardless, it is remarkable that such a large amount of fourth grade students are already able to find such direct applications of their perceived benefit of learning Spanish.

Although it is not especially surprising that all heritage and native Spanish speakers like Spanish class and want to continue learning Spanish, it is interesting that they seem to get a sense of validation from Spanish class. This validation or celebration of being a linguistic and cultural minority may come from many aspects of Spanish class. First, non-Spanish-speaking students often ask the heritage and native Spanish speakers for help, thus arguably making them feel that their language skills are valued. Also, the teacher discusses the heritage and native Spanish speakers’ cultures as part of the class lesson, therefore placing value on the concept of diverse cultures. An English-only student explained some of the reverence and respect that he feels toward the heritage and native Spanish speakers due to his own experience learning Spanish: “[Learning Spanish is] teaching us how other people learn the language and how hard it is.”

In summary, this discussion highlights many positive aspects of the Passport Schools Blended Language Spanish program: learning experiences were overwhelmingly positive, students demonstrated independent problem-solving and appropriate use of learning strategies, the Middlebury audio recording feature appealed to both practical and affective needs, topics were presented as extensions of personal interest, student were able to view perceived benefits as pertinent to daily life, and heritage and native Spanish speakers experienced a strong sense of validation. Overall, the Passport Schools Blended Language Spanish program appears to have been a very effective introduction to the Spanish language and culture, as expressed by the students.
Appendix A2

Teachers’ Comments on Training and Technology (Question 11)

1. We were trained but not sufficiently. We had a leader who got the sufficient training and he did the troubleshooting for us.
2. We do not have the time or resources to deal with the lack of technology within our building, let alone the fact that a huge bulk of time was taken for a ridiculous amount of testing!
3. We received one training the first week of school. There was no specific "start" time to this meeting so when people randomly showed up they missed a majority of what was being taught. Multiple meetings should have been offered at different times to accommodate everyone.
4. Our training was very unclear. We watched videos, but were not really sure of what was expected of us. We were encouraged to take the class as well, but it was impossible when the technology often did not work for several students. It was not appropriate for teachers.
5. Too many different issues to address, and primarily due to poor technology. No formal required training.
6. We were not given any training on troubleshooting issues with the headsets, as far as recording their assignments or hearing them played back.
7. I felt like our training session was a sales pitch. There were neat things about it, but we went into a presentation that was already started and had to merge in with what had already been discussed. Also, I felt like we didn't have teachers to ask questions to. I felt the sales rep had a nice understanding, but no idea how it would be implemented in the "real" classroom.
8. There was not much MIL training received before the school year.
9. The troubleshooting technology was sort of "on the fly" as needed and I could not troubleshoot for the kids when I was working with small groups. I also felt like whenever I asked about problems with MIL technology, I was told that it would be fixed soon without any clear information. When I voiced concerns about other aspects of MIL implementation, I was similarly told that I should figure it out and MIL was the bottom line. However, I also think that ELA and Math are "bottom lines" and it is really hard to pick one over the other.
10. I was unable to troubleshoot the MIL software. Many times no student was able to access MIL, and that caused a lack of instructional time in MIL.
11. I'm not sure where we would have been able to express concerns. It would have been nice to have a survey in the middle of the year to discuss the issues.
12. It was frustrating having to go through channels to determine if the issues were with Chrome, Middlebury, the setup of the lab, etc. Issues that I'm sure will be resolved for next year were how the way to access the program needed to change midstream.
13. The first 2 months the students had many issues which I was unable to address. However, these issues occurred for some students, not all.
14. I was not really familiar with what was required by a student to complete MIL. If I would have had an opportunity to sit down and actually do the program myself it would have been more helpful. Students were unsure themselves at first and I was not confident in
my knowledge. Some students got frustrated that they didn't understand the program. Even with some discussion about the how tos, they did not remember or truly understand what they said. I often asked other students to show me what they did to try and help those students. They thoroughly enjoyed and looked forward to visits from Mrs. Brown. I allowed them to ask her questions and they went on and on. She worked with students too. They wanted to please her and show what they did since her last visit. She made additional posters for troubleshooting and set up a simple reward box that students still use.

15. I did not receive any training on how to work the program or troubleshoot any problems. I had to learn this through trial and error and with the help of the OWL. I learned the content of MIL through watching the students use the program.

16. This problem has been addressed for next year, but we were unprepared to have students access the program from the first week of school. We needed usernames and passwords that are not traditionally given out that early in the school year. With specific directions and timelines, this will not be a problem next year. In addition, we were not told that the program could not be accessed through Internet Explorer, and we lost student time on computers waiting for Google Chrome to be loaded on the computers so that the kids could access MIL.
Appendix A3. Additional MIL Training Teachers’ Request
(Question 12)

What additional training would you have liked to receive regarding the use of MIL?

Troubleshooting technology issues
1. Troubleshooting technology
2. Troubleshooting or a tech support person on site
3. Written procedural narratives would help to be able to troubleshoot student difficulties with the program as we are in the labs.
4. Training on the associated booklets that were meant to accompany MIL

Hands-on MIL training for teachers before the program is implemented
5. I felt like the training given at the beginning of the year didn't explain everything that would be occurring. I wasn't given time to explore the site with an instructor or shown ways to help students on the site.
6. Teachers should be taking into the lab or given computers to actually use the program instead of watching someone else tell us what should happen. The training was VERY ineffective!
7. Training at the beginning of the year on how to navigate MIL.
8. I would have liked to work through a unit as the kids have to. I also was not happy that I couldn't log in myself once my Spanish class was deleted from BCPS one.
9. I would like professional development or a "book study" to go through the program. Maybe an after school program that dives into the technology, what students are learning and the language they have to master. I just felt very lost and unhelpful to the students.
10. Teacher Spanish language training.
11. How the program works and how I can support students in using the program.
12. I would have liked to try the program myself in a room with the MIL people so they could help me troubleshoot. I would have also liked to receive training on how to help my students with IEPs access MIL. I ended up basically not having them use MIL because they couldn't do it alone and I only have 1 aide for the 4 of them, so they couldn't receive the one-on-one help they desperately needed to complete MIL. I did voice these concerns to a few members of the Office of World Languages so I am hopeful that something else or some modifications will be put in place next year for students with IEPs.

Streamlining logon procedures
13. An easier, more streamlined way to log onto MIL would be better for students. I also became confused about the multiple steps required to access the MIL software.
14. I would like to be trained on how to teach my students the easiest way to get to the MIL program. I would also like training on how to troubleshoot problems when students cannot log on.

Helping students when they can't record
15. Troubleshooting when students can't record.
16. We had lots of problem with the students’ dictation and being able to hear what they recorded. We need more training with troubleshooting on this one!
17. I would have liked to have a way to monitor student progress from the very beginning. I didn't know their true progress and students began to fall very far behind.
18. None [The teachers should not be responsible for the MIL component]. It should be presented as a course that would be self-regulated without additional responsibilities put on the classroom teacher. Students should be trained by the Spanish teacher before using the program.

Other (General) Comments about MIL Technology (Question 15)

- There aren't enough activities for students who actually take it seriously and do the work. I had several students who worked on it and completed the program in March and then had a few weeks with nothing to do until the passport books were given. Even then Mrs. Brown had to make up activities for my students for about a month.
- It isn't as student friendly as I would like, and does not lend itself well to students with IEPs (as noted above).
- A troubleshooting guide (in paper form) would be helpful.
- We need more technology in our building in grades 4/5 to be able to implement this program! Many days we were scrambling to find computers to be able to implement the program. At times, students had questions I couldn't answer. I told them to wait until the Spanish teacher comes in to teach to ask the question.
- Difficult for students when the buttons they were to click at the top of the page at times were not readily visible. Screen resolution also became a problem since the side bars were unavailable limiting the use of the program.
- There are too many steps the students have to take just to get into the MIL program. We had many students struggle each time they were asked to log onto the program because of the multiple steps required. New students that came in during the middle of the year were also having issues logging on right away and often times had to wait to receive their log in information.
- Most students have shown growth in their knowledge of Spanish. I enjoy listening to them record their Spanish vocabulary on the program when we are in the lab. They are also showing the ability to respond in conversation to Señorita Reier. Some even respond to basic answers in class sí/no in Spanish. Their knowledge of Spanish has grown!
- Please make sure the log-in process is explained to teachers and students thoroughly. Last year the program was very sensitive to the way students logged in and it could affect whether their work was saved or not.
Appendix A4. Teachers’ Comments on Overall Spanish Program
(Questions 17 and 18)

17. If you selected “disagree” or strongly disagree” with any of the items in question 16 [about the overall Spanish program], please explain why you disagree with the statement(s).

18. Do you have any other comments about your experience with the Passport Schools blended learning program?

Passport books
- The Passport books were an important piece. As my "rushers" completed the program, the books slowed them down in order to focus on the lessons/videos.
- I do believe there needs to be more directions for the teachers when the students are completing the Passport booklets. At times the directions were unclear to the students and I couldn't help them because I wasn't given any information about the Passports.
- I only have 4 students who completed the online program and are working on the Passport books. I don't know how to monitor their progress for accuracy.
- The students struggled with using the Passports. Since they struggled with it, they didn't like using them. They couldn't understand a lot of the directions or sentences within the passports.
- My students lost interest in MIL after a while and it has been a struggle to try to encourage and motivate them to complete it. Similarly, they aren't too excited about the Passports and it's hard to find the time to have them complete them.
- The students, although they finished the MIL program, had difficulties completing the Passport independently. They would not read directions and try to figure out words. At times, words weren't in the program for translation.

MIL technology
- I liked certain aspects of the program and I am eager to see it next year now that some kinks have been worked out. I am afraid that I will sound so negative on this survey due to some of my comments but it's only because I am trying to be honest and help the program succeed after its pilot year. I enjoyed the in-class lessons and they improved a lot as the year went on. I think the biggest problem was with MIL – I was told that students weren't going on it, but I wasn't sure when to find extra time and a lot of times they weren't going on it but doing something wrong. I didn't know enough about the program to help them or see what they were doing wrong, so they kept falling further behind.
- I would like to see more tech support with MIL as well as more engagement with the instructor. I'd like to see her more visible in the school as well.

Students with special needs
- The students in my class with more severe special needs struggled with MIL.
- Students with learning needs struggles a great deal with the program. They don't have an interest and they cannot read well enough to navigate through the program on their own. I have a student who is struggling and only in unit 2 or 3 at this point in the year.
- Students with an IEP or 504 should be allowed (sometimes) to be pulled from MIL in order to complete those hours. When students are just being pulled from ELA and never Spanish it leaves gaps sometimes. Suggestion: I would also really like to recommend that
any school using the computer lab have someone come in the beginning of the year and periodically to check technical issues such as working headphones, volume/speaker, the correct browser, etc. When these problems are not addressed it makes the entire experience a difficult one.

- My IEP students struggled significantly using the computers and not many reached the end of the program to work on passports.
- Most of our students with special needs had an extremely difficult time logging onto the program. The program itself was very beneficial to our students but the log in process made some students frustrated with the process.
- The students with special needs did not seem to be able to understand the program. Many have severe reading issues and could not understand the directions on their own. Some have severe attentional/behavior concerns and require daily assistance in their regular classes to persevere and make progress. Some students require an assistant for daily progress.
- My ELL students had no idea how to log on and the instructions were difficult to follow. Special education students struggled with the log in process.
- Struggling students need more practice and reinforcement with MIL.
- Students with learning disabilities had difficulty at times. We helped them as best as we could with the knowledge that we had about MIL.
- I was really impressed at how the needs of the kids were addressed. For example, the program started out completely auditory, but when we realized our visual learners were struggling, visuals were added to help them succeed.
- MIL was very ineffective for my students with special needs because they were unable to complete a lesson without 1-on-1 adult assistance, which was not available to them.

Native Spanish speaking/heritage students
- The Spanish speaking students seemed to be very fluent in their ability to speak the language. From the beginning, they carried on conversations with the Spanish teacher while the other students watched in amazement. These students often are the translators for their Spanish speaking parents at conferences or with the office.
- The Spanish speaker that I have in my classroom does not need Spanish instruction. She is fluent in English and Spanish and was done the program very quickly.
- My Spanish speakers often got bored on MIL because they already knew most of the words.

Overall program benefits
- I truly see the benefit for our students and their futures. I was glad we were selected to be a part of the pilot program. It was very positive to be able to meet with Brian and feel that we could express our concerns about part of the implementation. The students enjoyed being able to meet Dr. Dance who they knew was instrumental in making the Spanish program possible.
Appendix A5. Teachers’ Comments on MIL Scheduling (Question 8)

- More time is needed for MIL.
- I would like to try another way of scheduling because sometimes the transition took away from time in the lab. I would also like to see extra time allotted to those students with disabilities. Several of my students have IEPs and were not able to complete the work because of their reading and comprehension deficits.
- The computer lab is not always accessible due to testing. When we were able to get into the lab it was easier to schedule a longer block of time a few times a week as they logged in, passed out headphones, rather than 10 minutes each time. In our classroom, we had 4 computers/laptops typically for 20 students to share.
- Computer lab schedule due to testing was an issue. I think next year will work better because 3 grades will have devices and other computers will be available for use.
- The log in process takes time and, if we are only in the lab for 15 minutes, there's never enough time to get going (between log in/log off, equipment cleanup, transition, etc.)
- We are always so pressed for instructional time that it was very hard to sacrifice the time for MIL. Also, there are so many interruptions that come up during the school week, especially as the end of the year is coming up, and it was hard to prioritize MIL over other crucial subjects. Scheduling MIL was definitely the most frustrating part of the Passport Program, and I don't really have a clear solution on how to make it better.
- We don't have enough technology to implement successfully. When testing occurred, we couldn't use MIL for about two weeks at a time. This happened three times this year.
- We should not allow students to make their own choice about time spent on MIL as we did in the beginning of the year. Many lost motivation and began not making the effort to choose MIL. We should have scheduled time for a whole class MIL session once a week in the computer lab. We can allow student choice during ELA as well, but not have it as the sole time for the program.

Other teachers had opinions on MIL scheduling as well (Question 9)

- I think it will be easier once we get one-to-one devices.
- Testing needs to be considered. We need to not disrupt the Spanish.
- The only problem with offering MIL as a rotation/choice during small group instruction occurred when students encountered a technical issue and needed assistance. Either they would have to stop or I would have to interrupt a small group to troubleshoot.
- The only issue I had was that with the program taking up time of reading I could only go at a certain time [to the lab] due to resourcing staff. I also felt that my students who were significantly below grade level and on IEP had difficulties with MIL and would have benefited more from intervention in English
- MIL worked well during ELA.
• I feel embarrassed that I couldn't always figure out MIL scheduling, especially in group meetings when it seemed so easy for everyone else. I want to share that I truly did try and I apologize if I wasn't the best pilot participant based on my data. Also, I was wondering if the ELA curriculum could work with the Passport program to make the lessons easier to integrate with MIL. To integrate MIL currently into the ELA block caused a lot of curriculum rewriting.

• I would like to have more interactions with the Spanish teacher. I wish we could have worked more as a team to implement the Spanish program this year.

• Will be very happy to have more available time to use the lab next year. It will truly be needed with the addition of the fifth grade teachers also needing lab time.

• Between the instructor coming in for 30 minutes and the 20 minutes that it was scheduled in ELA, it took too much time away from instruction. However, it doesn't seem like there is any way to avoid this.

• When I began to have students tell me the Unit/Lesson they were on after each whole class setting, they began to make more progress.

• It would be helpful to see how other teachers in different schools implemented the program.

• I used MIL as a rotation based on the book, "The Daily Five," where they suggest giving students choice as to which activity they do first. We did the "Daily Three" (Spanish, Independent Reading, and Writer's Workshop), and some kids were inconsistently accessing MIL until I directed the rotations. I will do this from the beginning of the year next year.
APPENDIX B:
DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS
Appendix B1. Observations of Middlebury Interactive Learning Sessions April 2015
Baltimore County Public Schools Blended Learning Evaluation, Center for Applied Linguistics

Observer: __________________________  School: ________________________________

Date: __________________  Time start ______________  Time end _______________________

Overarching questions to keep in mind:
• How is time used within the 30 minute period?
• What are students and teachers doing?

Prior to students entering the room

Where is the lesson taking place? ___ Computer lab  ___ Classroom  ___ Other

How many computers are in the room for students? __________

Is there a projector for demonstrations?  Yes  No

What kind of computers are there?  ___ Laptops  ___ Desktops  ___ iPads  ___ Android tablets
If laptop/desktop:  ___ Macs  ___ PCs

What kind of headsets are available?  ___ Earphones only  ___ Earphones with microphone  ___ Both
Are there enough headsets for everyone?  Yes  No

Are any instructions written on the board specifically for MIL use (not general computer rules)?
Please copy here.

Other notes:

Segment 1: 10 minutes

What is the “opening” of the class? Does the teacher give any instructions? Does the teacher demonstrate anything using a projected computer?

How many of the following type of adults are in the room?  ___ Classroom teacher  ___ Technology teacher  ___ Technology aide  ___ Classroom aide  ___ Other: ________________________________

How are students sitting?  ___ One per computer  ___ Two per computer  ___ Some ones and some twos
___ Other: ________________________________
How long does it take most students to get settled? _____ minute(s)

Are there any students that take longer to get settled? How many? What happened to delay them? (e.g., technological issue, behavior issue)

Are there any students who require accommodations due to physical or learning disability?

**In the first ten minutes, focus on the teacher(s).** What questions are they asking? Who are they working with? Are they monitoring what students are doing? When do they intervene with what students are doing? Do they miss opportunities to intervene when they should?
**Segment 2: 10 minutes**

Pick two students (one boy and one girl) to observe for five minutes each. Ask the teacher ahead of time which kids not to observe because they will get freaked out and pick randomly from the others.

*Child 1*

- What skills are they working on? (l/s/r/w, grammar/vocab, content theme)
- What kinds of activities are they doing? (cloze, writing, reading, conversation, role play)
- Are they successfully completing the activities?
- Are activities receptive (listening/reading) or productive (speaking/writing)?
- If oral/written instructions are in Spanish, do students seem to understand them and know what to do?
- What do they do when they get stuck or have a problem?
- How does the program assess their learning and give them feedback?
- Do students have an opportunity to correct errors or go back and practice something they got wrong? If they have opportunities, do they do it?

*Child 2*

- What skills are they working on? (l/s/r/w, grammar/vocab, content theme)
- What kinds of activities are they doing? (cloze, writing, reading, conversation, role play)
- Are they successfully completing the activities?
- Are activities receptive (listening/reading) or productive (speaking/writing)?
- If oral/written instructions are in Spanish, do students seem to understand them and know what to do?
- What do they do when they get stuck or have a problem?
- How does the program assess their learning and give them feedback?
- Do students have an opportunity to correct errors or go back and practice something they got wrong? If they have opportunities, do they do it?

**Segment 3: 10 minutes** In the last ten minutes, observe the whole class. What questions do students ask of each other and of the teacher? Do students ever work together and if so, what do they do in pairs or groups? What off-task behaviors do you observe, if any (e.g., mindlessly clicking or playing with the program in an off-task way, chatting, surfing the internet)? Do students access any resources not on their computer (dictionary, word wall, book)?

In the last ten minutes, what percent (0-100%) of students seem to be working ON TASK? __________

In the last ten minutes, how many students seem to be working on the same task?

- __ Everyone or nearly everyone is working on the same task or lesson
- __ Most students are working on the same task or lesson but some are doing other things
- __ Some combinations of students are working on the same task or lesson but most are working on different things
- __ All or almost all students are working on different things

**Closing** Other than computer logoff/shutdown procedures or behavioral instructions, does the teacher give any MIL-specific instructions or wrap-up comments.
Appendix B2. Face-to-Face Component Observation

Class Observation Form (Elementary School Foreign Language)
Indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with each statement.
Adapted from STARTALK “Site Visit and Team Learner Guide” 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class period or time of class</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the classroom setting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Describe the student population (number of students, ethnicities, etc., and language backgrounds) |       |

| Topic or topics: |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No opportunity to assess/Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The observed class matches the written descriptions of the F2F component.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The teacher has created a lesson plan that clearly communicates the learning goals and activities for each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Students clearly understand the goals of the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The environment is conducive to language learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The staff to student ratio is appropriate to ensure the success of the F2F component.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The target language is used at least 90% of the time for communication and instruction. English is used only when necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) The input is comprehensible. Students demonstrate comprehension of the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) The teacher checks frequently for student understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Instruction is designed to facilitate learner-centered learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Instruction allows for meaningful interaction in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(11) Instruction integrates language and culture.

(12) Students use technology when available in the classroom.

(13) Authentic resources are used effectively to support program goals.

(14) Learning experiences address the interpretive mode of communication.

(15) Learning experiences address the interpersonal mode of communication.

(16) Learning experiences address the presentational mode of communication.

(17) Instructional experiences build toward opportunities in each lesson for meaningful, unrehearsed communication. A balance exists between meaningful guided and independent practice.

(18) Evidence of student learning is collected in a variety of ways throughout the program.

(19) Instructional time is used effectively in each lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Classroom Activities (introduce new topics, review lessons, etc.)</th>
<th>Interpersonal communication</th>
<th>Presentational Speaking/Writing</th>
<th>Interpretive listening/reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 1:</strong> Duration and Primary Mode of Communication</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2:</strong> Duration and Primary Mode of Communication</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3:</strong> Duration and Primary Mode of Communication</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 4:</strong> Duration and Primary Mode of Communication</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STARTALK endorsed Principles for Effective Teaching and Learning**

- Implementing a standards-based and thematically organized curriculum
- Facilitating a learner-centered classroom
- Using target language and providing comprehensible input for instruction
- Integrating culture, content, and language in a world language classroom
- Adapting and using age-appropriate authentic materials
- Conducting performance-based assessment
Appendix B3. BCPS Spanish Teacher Interview Questions

Part A: Background Information

1. What is your name? ________________________________

2. Where are you a Spanish teacher?
   - Bear Creek
   - Hampton
   - Johnnycake
   - Padonia
   - Pleasant Plains
   - Prettyboy
   - Reisterstown
   - Sussex
   - Vincent Farm
   - West Towson

3. What grade levels do you teach? 4 5 6

4. Are you certified? Y N

5. If yes, what kind of certification do you have? ________________________________

6. How long have you been teaching?
   - 1-2 years
   - 4-10 years
   - More than 10 years

7. What is your native language?
   - Spanish
   - English
   - Both Spanish and English (both spoken at home from age 3 or earlier)
   - Other ________________________________

8. What languages do you currently teach in?
   - Spanish
   - English
   - Both
   - Other

9. Is there anything else that you would like to share about your background?

Part B: Questions about the BCPS Program

Face to Face Instruction

1. How many classes do you teach each day?
2. How many students do you teach each day?
3. Are there differences between the sites (number and background of students, instructional setting, resources)
4. If there are differences between sites, what are they and how do you accommodate them?
5. Do the students enjoy the face-to-face class?
6. What do the students enjoy the most?
7. What types of activities go well?
8. What types of activities need adjusting?
9. What is the focus of the Face to Face component?
10. What are the goals of the Face to Face component?
11. What resources do you have for teaching (textbooks, visuals, props, etc)?
12. How much support do you get from the staff at the different program sites?
13. What are the Face to Face component’s greatest strengths?
14. What modifications to the Face to Face component would you like to see?
15. Do the classroom teachers reinforce your teaching?

**Face to Face development and planning, materials development**
1. Is there a set curriculum for the Face to Face component?
2. How involved were you in the development/planning of the Face to Face component?
3. What materials were developed for the program?
4. How much planning time do you have? What is the planning process? Do you meet with the other Spanish teacher? MIL facilitators?
5. How much say do you have in the direction of this component?
6. What is the relationship between F2F and the MIL Component?

**MIL Component**
1. How much do you know about the content/focus of MIL?
2. Based on what you know, are there any modifications you would recommend?
3. How much time do you spend reinforcing what is taught in MIL?
4. Do you know if the classroom teachers are supporting MIL in any way?
5. Do the students ever ask you to help with what they have learned in MIL?

**Program in General**
1. What do you think are the strengths of the hybrid program model (face to face + MIL)
2. What would you change? Why?
3. Would you recommend this model to others?
4. How involved were you in the design of the hybrid program? How is it working in reality?
5. Do the schools try to make the language program (F2F+MIL) an integral part of the school? Explain.
6. Has there been any discussion/planning about how it will articulate with middle school?
7. Is there anything else that you would like to share concerning the components or the program in general?
Appendix B4. Baltimore County Passport Schools Teacher Survey

Baltimore County Passport Schools Teacher Survey

1. Welcome

The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is working with Baltimore County Public Schools to conduct an external evaluation of the Second Language Acquisition Initiative of the Passport Schools. This survey will help us understand how Middlebury Interactive Languages was implemented at your school and what your successes and challenges were this year.

This survey is for fourth grade classroom teachers whose students participated in the Spanish program. We are asking you to identify which school you teach at so that we can look at trends within and across schools, but comments will remain confidential and we will not report any comments in a way that could identify individual respondents.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Lynn Thompson at 202-355-1519 or lthompson@cal.org. Thank you very much for your participation.

1. In which school do you teach?

[Blank]
Baltimore County Passport Schools Teacher Survey

2. Program Scheduling

1. In the space below, please indicate how Middlebury Interactive Languages (MIL) was implemented at your school (e.g., 10 minutes every day, 20 minutes twice a week). If the way that the program was implemented changed over the course of the year, please indicate how so (e.g., “September through December, 10 minutes every day; January through May, 20 minutes twice a week”).

2. In which of the following ways did students use MIL during the course of the 2014-15 school year? Select all that apply.

- In the computer lab with the whole class during scheduled MIL time
- In the computer lab at any other time (not during a scheduled MIL period)
- In the classroom in a whole-class setting (e.g., using laptops or tablets)
- In the classroom during ELA rotations
- In the classroom during recess or free choice time
- Other (please specify)

3. Using the choices from question 2, please indicate what percent of the time students accessed MIL in each way. If that changed over the course of the year, please indicate how so (e.g., “100% in the computer lab all year,” “100% in the computer lab Sept/Oct, then 50% computer lab and 50% during ELA rotations”).

4. If you changed how MIL was implemented over the course of the year, why were those changes made?
5. BCPS suggested that students use MIL for 40 minutes per week. Between October and May, roughly how consistently did your students have at least 40 minutes a week dedicated to MIL? (For example, if you think you hit that weekly target about three quarters of the time, enter “75%.”)

6. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding program scheduling. If you select “disagree” or “strongly disagree,” please explain why in question 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The way MIL was scheduled at our school worked well.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I could voice concerns about the scheduling of MIL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think we should schedule MIL the same way next year that we did this year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If you selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with any of the items in question 6, please explain why you disagree with the statement(s).

8. Do you have any other comments about MIL scheduling?
### 3. Technology and Training

1. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding MIL. If you select “disagree” or “strongly disagree,” please explain why in question 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received sufficient training on how to use the MIL technology/software.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received sufficient training on how to troubleshoot technology issues.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received sufficient training on how to help students use the Middlebury content (outside of technology issues).</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I could voice concerns about MIL technology implementation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I could voice concerns about other aspects of MIL implementation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Office of World Languages responded to my questions and concerns in a way that was timely, clear, and helpful.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Office of Technology responded to my questions and concerns in a way that was timely, clear, and helpful.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If you selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with any of the items in question 1, please explain why you disagree with the statement(s).

3. What additional training would you have liked to receive regarding the use of MIL?

4. Which of the following technical issues caused problems for your class throughout the year? Please select one answer per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>This was a major or frequent problem throughout the year</th>
<th>This was a minor or occasional problem throughout the year</th>
<th>This was not a problem</th>
<th>I don’t know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet connectivity</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students unable to log in</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students forget login information</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer crashes/freezes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headsets do not work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify problem[s] and indicate “major” or “minor”)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. At what point did you feel confident facilitating the use of MIL?

- [ ] Immediately after roll-out
- [ ] After a few weeks of working with it
- [ ] After a few months of working with it
- [ ] After at least six months of working with it
- [ ] I still don’t feel confident facilitating MIL

6. Do you have any other comments about the MIL technology?
Appendix B5. BCPS Letter to Classroom Teacher with Link to Survey

Dear fourth grade teacher,

The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is working with Baltimore County Public Schools to conduct an external evaluation of the Passport Schools blended learning program. This survey will help us understand how Middlebury Interactive Languages was implemented at your school and what your successes and challenges were this year.

This survey is for fourth grade classroom teachers whose students participated in the Spanish program. We are asking you to identify which school you teach at so that we can look at trends within and across schools, but comments will remain confidential and we will not report any comments in a way that could identify individual respondents.

Please click on this link to begin the survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/NYD939N.

This survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. You will have until midnight, June 7th to complete the survey. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Lynn Thompson at 202-355-1519 or lthompson@cal.org. Thank you very much for your participation.

Sincerely,

Christine W. Koth, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Research
Baltimore County Public Schools
9611 Pulaski Park Drive, Suite 305
Baltimore, Maryland 21220
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Baltimore County Public Schools – Passport Schools Blended Learning Evaluation

Student name: ___________________________________________________________________

School: ______________________ Date: ________________________________

Read this to the student:
I’m visiting your school today to help your teachers figure out what things are working well with your
Spanish program and what things could be better. So I’m talking to some students like you about what
you think about the program and some of the things you’ve learned.

I want you to know that I’m not going to tell anybody here at the school what you tell me. When I write
down a few things that I talk about with you and your friends, I’m not going to use your name.

While we talk, I’m going to write down some of the things you say. Also, I’m going to record this so that I
can go back and listen to us on tape so that I can be sure that I got everything you said. Is that ok? (If no,
do not record.)

This should only take about ten minutes, but tell me if you need to stop or take a break. Do you have
any questions?

First let me ask you a few things about yourself:

1. What language or languages do you speak with your family at home?

2. Do your parents or other adults in your home speak any languages other than English? (If “yes,”
ask “which languages?”)

3. Have you ever studied a language at school or in an afterschool or weekend program before this
one? (If “yes”, ask “which language?”)
I am now going to ask you a few questions about the Spanish program.

1. Do you like learning Spanish?

2. Is learning Spanish easy or hard? Why?

3. Do you want to keep learning Spanish? Why?

4. Do you want to learn other languages? Which one(s)?

5. What do you like best about the Middlebury Interactive Language program?

6. Is there anything that you don’t like about the Middlebury Interactive Language program?

7. What do you like best about class with your Spanish teacher?

8. Is there anything you don’t like about class with your Spanish teacher?

9. What have you learned in Spanish this year?

10. What was your favorite topic?

11. What was your favorite activity?

Thank you so much.
APPENDIX C:
TEACHER DEVELOPED MATERIALS
### Appendix C1

#### Mi vocabulario y expresiones importantes en la clase de español

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partes del cuerpo</th>
<th>¿Qué actividad te gusta?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ojos</td>
<td>Correr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orejas</td>
<td>Caminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca</td>
<td>Saltar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazos</td>
<td>Nadar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nariz</td>
<td>Cantar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piernas</td>
<td>Bailar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Cuál es tu deporte favorito?</th>
<th>¿Cómo te sientes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi deporte favorito es...</td>
<td>Me siento...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baloncesto</td>
<td>Tranquilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basquetbol</td>
<td>Enojado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fútbol americano</td>
<td>Emocionado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béisbol</td>
<td>Nervioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baile</td>
<td>Aburrido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porra</td>
<td>Contento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natación</td>
<td>Triste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>Cansado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Cuál es tu juguete favorito?</th>
<th>¿De dónde eres?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi juguete favorito es...</td>
<td>Yo soy de...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>una pelota</td>
<td>Aburrido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>una muñeca</td>
<td>Contento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unos videojuegos</td>
<td>Triste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>una bicicleta</td>
<td>Cansado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unos bloques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>los carros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿A dónde vas?</th>
<th>¿Qué quieres ser de grande?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yo voy ...</td>
<td>Yo quiero ser...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al mercado</td>
<td>actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al parque</td>
<td>enfermera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a la escuela</td>
<td>maestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a la biblioteca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al parque de diversiones</td>
<td>constructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al hospital</td>
<td>policía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a la playa</td>
<td>escritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al cine</td>
<td>el cajero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>salvavidas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mi vocabulario y expresiones importantes en la clase de español

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Cómo estás?</th>
<th>¿Cómo te llamas?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estoy bien</td>
<td>Me llamo Pink Panther.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy más o menos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy mal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Cuántos años tienes?</th>
<th>¿Cuál es tu color favorito?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uno dos tres cuatro cinco seis siete ocho nueve diez</td>
<td>Mi color favorito es...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yo tengo ___ años.</td>
<td>Azul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rojo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Qué ropa llevas?</th>
<th>¿Cómo eres?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yo llevo...</td>
<td>Yo soy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Cómo eres? (personalidades)</th>
<th>¿Qué tiempo hace?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yo soy...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inteligente</th>
<th>Impaciente</th>
<th>Paciente</th>
<th>Serio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tímido</td>
<td>Hablador</td>
<td>Simpático</td>
<td>Atlético</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work on this choice board after you complete ALL UNITS ON MIDDLEBURY and ALL OF YOUR PASSPORT. Read all instructions carefully for each column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Choose TWO activities to complete in this column. Complete one activity on the top half of the inside front cover of your Pasaporte. Complete one activity on the bottom half.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go back to Middlebury units 2 and 7 and review the vocabulary and expressions.</td>
<td>Go back to Middlebury units 4 and 9 and review the vocabulary and expressions. (Choice Board – Column D – Activity #2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw a picture of el gigante (Unit 2) OR el armadillo (Unit 7) wearing crazy colorful clothes. Label parts of the body and clothing along with colors.</td>
<td>Complete the Animal Maze: Help each animal find its way home. Complete the maze. Give each animal a Spanish name. Write a sentence describing each animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Check when completed</td>
<td>□ Check when completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go back to Middlebury unit 10 and review the colors.</td>
<td>Go back to Middlebury units 14 and 15. Review the vocabulary and expressions. (Choice Board – Column D – Activity #3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw a rainbow and label each color in Spanish. Write a word beginning with the same letter as the color in Spanish.</td>
<td>Read and follow the directions for the Activity Pyramid. You will be asked to keep track of the activities that you do during a typical week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Check when completed</td>
<td>□ Check when completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go back to Middlebury unit 7 and review the vocabulary and expressions.</td>
<td>Go back to Middlebury units 5 and 11 and review the vocabulary and expressions. You may also use other vocabulary. (Choice Board – Column D – Activity #4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw an animal and give it 6 body parts of other Middlebury animals. Label the body parts and the animals they come from. Watch the stories again to help you.</td>
<td>Read and follow the directions for the Cinco Monedas. You will be asked to use your imagination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Check when completed</td>
<td>□ Check when completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go back to Middlebury units 1 and 9 and review the vocabulary and expressions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the animals in Middlebury are now in your family. Write the name of the animal in Spanish and its relationship to you in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Check when completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C2. Choice Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mi nombre es:</td>
<td><strong>Work on this choice board after you complete ALL UNITS ON MIDDLEBURY and ALL OF YOUR PASSPORT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Read all instructions carefully for each column.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Choose TWO activities to complete in this column.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complete these activities by writing messages to your teacher and watching videos.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Go back to Middlebury Units 2, 4, and 6 and review the vocabulary and expressions. Watch the videos again.</td>
<td>Go back to Middlebury Units 2, 4, and 6 and review the vocabulary and expressions. Watch the videos again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Send a message to your teacher. Introduce yourself and tell her 5 of your favorite things.</td>
<td>Write 10 details about yourself in complete Spanish sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check when completed.</td>
<td>Check when completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>You are interviewing your teacher for BCPS TV. Send her a message and ask her 5 questions in Spanish.</td>
<td>Go back to Middlebury Units 5, 11, and 13 and review the vocabulary and expressions. Watch the videos again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check when completed.</td>
<td>Check when completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Send a message to your teacher in Spanish telling her 2 things you like and 1 thing that you do not like.</td>
<td>Send a message to your teacher telling her in Spanish two activities that you like and in which season you like to do them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check when completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pick any character from any unit to be the friend of the flower in your community. Write 1 sentence about his or her job and 1 sentence about where he or she works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check when completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check when completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The flower speaks 4 times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>