

RUNNING HEAD: Poverty and ELL Graduation Rate

POVERTY AND ELL GRADUATION RATE

By

ANN FRAZIER

Submitted to

The Educational Leadership Faculty

Northwest Missouri State University

Department of Educational Leadership

College of Education and Human Services

Maryville, MO 64468

Submitted in Fulfillment for the Requirements for

61-638 Research Paper

Fall, 2012

January 20, 2013

### ABSTRACT

This study was completed to find if there is a significant difference in the English Language Learning (ELL) graduation rate between poor schools and wealthy schools based on 2011 Free or Reduced Lunch percentages of eighty-nine Missouri schools. Research shows that Payne, Kieffer and Fry's theories of socio-economic status and demographics are linked to ELL graduation rate outcomes. Findings of this study show that of the eighty-nine Missouri schools that reported ELL graduation rate percentages (forty-four high-poverty and forty-five low-poverty) that ELL graduation rate is lower for students living in poverty. The reason is that poverty has definite negative effects on students' abilities to graduate high school. After compiling and reviewing the findings of this study, current research and literature, and the statistical data from the state, it is found that there is a difference in ELL graduation rates for high-poverty and low-poverty schools that needs to be addressed in the state of Missouri.

## INTRODUCTION

### *Background, Issues and Concerns*

There has been a steady decline of ELL graduation rate since 2001. Reasons are attributed to high-stakes testing requirements and low-quality teaching in districts with large ELL populations. There are substantial gaps in achievement for ELL versus non-ELL students. In 2009, “only 7% of ELL students were at or above proficiency level in math and only 5% were at proficiency level in reading versus 33% of non-ELL students nationwide. “The large percentage of ELLs performing at the below-basic level: 69 percent in mathematics and 70 percent in reading in 2007- rates that are nearly three times as high as those of non-ELLs” (Potemski, 2009, p.3). Some factors that contribute to academic underachievement and, ultimately, an ELL graduation rate decline, are the following: language used at home, family income, parent/s English language proficiency, education level of parent/s, mother’s marital status at time of birth, single versus dual-parent home (NCES, 1995). The more risk factors a student is subject to, the lower the probability a student will do well in a typical school environment. On average, the risk factors for ELLs are two-thirds more than for native English speakers. This puts ELL students at a greater risk for academic underachievement.

As educators we want English Language Learning (ELL) students to graduate, and as a value statement, we want as many ELL students to graduate as possible. Crafters of the English-only laws may have a different value statement that they want these ELL students and their parents to go away (while assuming they are in the country illegally), or perhaps they are concerned about the funding of public education and make the assumption that ELL education increases the cost, which some taxpayers don’t want to bear.

*Practice Under Investigation*

The practice under investigation is the education of English Language Learning students.

*School Policy to be Informed by Study*

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires schools to report Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for four subgroups of students, one of which is ELL students. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) requires school districts to “systematically identify and assess the educational needs of students whose native or home language is different than English.” Districts’ services show compliance through documentation. Springfield Public Schools has an ELL Mission Statement and an ELL Vision Statement.

*Conceptual Underpinning*

The puzzle of why ELL graduation rates are affected negatively by poverty is described in detail by scholars who have linked construct of meaning to empirical observation. Other scholar’s link constructs of meaning to conceptual problems that exist within theoretical frames. Dr. Ruby Payne wrote “A Framework of Understanding Poverty” in 1996, and three revised editions in 1998, 2001, and 2003. She compares and contrasts information about the “culture” of poverty, the middle class, and wealth. Payne defines poverty beyond financial resources, and focuses on the emotional, mental, spiritual, and physical aspects of poverty as well as support systems, relationships/role models, knowledge of hidden rules and the role of language and story. She also gives suggestions for instruction to improve achievement, and how to create relationships to help students of poverty succeed. With eighty-one references in this book, the United States Bureau of Census is her source to connect 2001 data regarding numbers of children living in different levels of poverty, household income ranges (1967-2001) in relationship to

educational attainment, and the race and ethnicity (1976-2001) of persons living below the poverty level and their family structure.

Dr. Michael Kieffer, Harvard University, conducted a nationally representative longitudinal study designed to include school-age language minority students. The data used was from a 2005 study conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) of the 1998-99 school year and examined the “complex roles of school, home, and individual characteristics on students’ academic and behavioral development over the school years” (Kieffer, 2008, p.853). The purpose of Kieffer’s 2008 article published in the *Journal of Educational Psychology* was to “describe the differential English reading development trajectories of three subpopulations of students as they exist on average in the national population and as they differ by children’s demographic background and schooling context from kindergarten through fifth grade” (Kieffer, 2008, p.853).

A senior research associate at the Pew Hispanic Center since 2001, and a former senior economist at the Educational Testing Service, Dr. Richard Fry has more than thirty-five published articles on the characteristics of the United States racial, ethnic and immigrant populations. He has been recognized for his expertise in the analysis of U.S. education and demographic sets of data. His report addresses the ELL achievement gap, and “examines the contribution of low-achieving public schools to the relatively poor academic achievement of ELL students” (Fry, 2008, p.2). He also examines some of the other characteristics of these public schools. The assessment data analyzed was from the National Longitudinal School-Level State Assessment Score Database (NLSLSASD) in 2004-05. This organization collected state testing results from nearly 90,000 public schools.

The specific terms are in reference to the field of English Language Learning (ELL). Whether it is the student's second, third, or fourth language being learned, the term ELL is now used over English as a Second Language (ESL) to emphasize the learning of English in a positive light rather than stating that someone learning English is deficient in some way because it is their second language. ELL students benefit from various styles of English language support systems. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is used in many references to students who do not meet the U.S. Department of Education State Standards through English language testing. English Language Proficiency (ELP) refers to students who meet the U.S. Department of Education's State Standards. The demographic factor of poverty can negatively affect many aspects of a student's life at school.

#### *Statement of the Problem*

If the null hypothesis is rejected then there is a difference in ELL graduation rate between poor schools and wealthy schools, and teachers and administrators need to know how to improve instruction for ELL students addressing the issues of poverty which would in turn improve the graduation rate of these students.

#### *Purpose of the Study*

The study's purpose is to determine if there is a significant difference in ELL Graduation Rate in high-poverty schools versus low-poverty schools. The independent variable is Free or Reduced Lunch percentages, and the dependent variable is ELL Graduation rates.

#### *Research question*

Is there a difference in Graduation Rate of ELL students between schools with higher poverty levels and schools with lower poverty levels?

*Null Hypothesis*

There is no difference in Graduation Rate of ELL students between schools with higher poverty levels and schools with lower poverty levels.

*Anticipated benefits of study*

If a significant difference is found, then improving the graduation rate of high-poverty schools would need to be addressed through interventions, professional development and other strategies. The equitable outcome of more ELL graduates would be an improved workforce and improved graduation rate which would even out across schools in line with the United States NCLB mandate. Also, further research to determine why there is a difference between high and low poverty schools would be appropriate and may signal other strategies for districts to develop a plan of action.

*Definition of Terms*

**“ELL** (English language Learner): an active learner of the English language who may benefit from various types of language support programs.” (National Council of the Teachers of English, 2008, page 2)

**ESL** (English as a Second Language): term assigned to programs, classrooms, and students of ELL before the term ELL was used.

**LEP** (Limited English Proficiency): term referring to ELLs who do not meet U.S. Department of Education state standards in an English language classroom.

**iLEP** (initial Limited English Proficiency): referring to ELLs entering kindergarten who do not meet oral proficiency in the U.S. Department of Education state standards in an English language classroom.

**FEP** (Fluent English Proficiency): term referring to ELLs who meet the U.S. Department of Education State standards in an English Language classroom.

**iFEP** (initial Fluent English Proficiency): referring to ELLs entering kindergarten who do not meet oral proficiency in the U.S. Department of Education state standards in an English language classroom.

*Summary*

This study will determine if there is a difference in ELL graduation rate for high poverty and low poverty schools for students in the state of Missouri.

Ruby Payne's theories of socio-economic status play an integral part within the framework of this topic. Authors Michael Kieffer and Richard Fry provide data to explain the cause and effect relationship as well.



## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

English Language Learning is one of the fastest growing public school student populations in the United States today. “The projected number of school-age children of immigrants will increase from 12.3 million in 2005 to 17.9 million in 2020” (Fry, 2008, p.3). In 2001, George W. Bush put into place the No Child Left Behind Act to hold school districts nation-wide accountable to report student achievement through state testing as a whole and also noting whether certain subgroups (ELL) are making adequate yearly progress as well. Authors DeCohen and Clewell emphasize “the fact that NCLB has improved education for ELLs because schools have become more accountable for ELL student performance” (DeCohen, 2009, p.1). NCLB has helped improve ELL services and also helped teachers to learn effective ELL educational strategies, although the ELL graduation rate declines. There are state and federal policies related to ELLs such as Title III, enacted October 2, 2008, which provides federal funding to support ELL instructional services. “The ELL graduation rate has been dropping since 2001 which is linked to high-stakes testing requirements under Title III, and lack of high-quality teachers (HQT) in districts with large ELL populations” (Potemski, 2009, p.3). Across the United States 75% of ELLs speak Spanish and 25% speak more than 100 languages and dialects. In terms of demographics, the largest ELL versus non-ELL student difference was between ethnic composition and free or reduced lunch status.

Both voter initiatives, Proposition 227 of California established in 1998 and Proposition 203 of Arizona established in 2000, eliminated primary language instruction. “The idea that students do not have language acquisition from their first language to their second language is completely false and these propositions do not recognize this. The elimination of the students’

home language has had profound and negative consequences and has been very upsetting to students and teachers” (Gutierrez et al., 2002, p.329). On top of this occurring, teachers have the pressures of “teaching to the test” in high-stakes testing as mandated by NCLB to qualify and receive federal assistance. “In multiple sources, poverty is the demographic factor that ultimately influences reading achievement levels” (Kieffer, 2008, p.865).

The negative effects of poverty are many. Generational poverty (at least two generations) “has its own culture, hidden rules, and belief systems” (Payne, 2003, p.64). One of the indicators of generational poverty is an attitude that society owes them a living, versus someone of situational poverty who refuses charity because of their pride. The mother is at the heart of everything in a family of poverty. Often there are multiple relationships and different fathers of the children, and legal “marriage and divorce don’t occur unless there is property to distribute or custody of children” (Payne, 2003, p.73). Ruby Payne (2003) says, “Schools are virtually the only places where students can learn the choices and rules of the middle class” (p.80). If a child is forced into an adult role before childhood and adolescence, it puts their emotional development on hold while they are functioning in an adult role. Then once they enter adulthood, “they most likely will not have the emotional resources and stamina necessary to function as an interdependent adult” (Payne, 2003, p.83). Parental neglect can affect their child’s hygiene, as well as their emotional and mental stability. I see the results of parental neglect in my job as an elementary paraprofessional in a school with 94% Free or Reduced Lunch. I have also seen the positive change in a student’s life at school when they have adequate sleep, clean bodies, and emotional support. Sometimes school is the only place where students experience boundaries, care, and being told what they do and say matters. To become a functioning adult, children must move from dependence to independence and then to interdependence. Payne (2003) states that

“emotional responses dictate behavior, and eventually determine achievement” (p. 83).

Characteristics of poverty in the family affect the child’s school life. The “current alliances and relationships at the moment” dictates who stays with them after school, the arrangement of family and friends in the household, and who helps the child deal with school issues (Payne, 2003, p.74). A school counselor said, “Giving the family money can improve the standard of living, but it won’t give the children the tools they will need for success. I think it is the parenting values--the parenting style--that matters more than the money” (Payne, 2003, p.184). Payne (2003) says that “Education is the key to getting out and staying out of generational poverty” (p.79). Teachers and administrators can often be a part of the support system for families of poverty as they do not have friends and family that are dependable for support. How students are able to escape poverty often occurs from them having “a sponsor or mentor, they have a special talent or ability, or they have a goal or vision and determination to escape a situation that is so painful” (Payne, 2003, p.79). Mentors can help them develop coping strategies such as self-talk, connection to other people and resources, and help provide options during problem-solving. Many people of generational poverty live only in the present, and do not have the mindset to think or plan for their future.

Diane Barone, an article in the *Early Childhood Education Journal*, describes a parent-literacy project implemented in kindergarten classrooms of a linguistically rich K-6 high-poverty school. The program facilitator’s priority was to build trust with the parents, which took an entire school year. After trust had been established, the facilitator introduced the year-long Title 1 funded program called “Partners in Print, A Parent Involved Program for Beginning Readers” (Barone, 2011, p.380). The program was implemented because arriving kindergarten students spoke only Spanish and little or no English, had little or no alphabet recognition in either

language, and were unaware of how to read top to bottom or turn pages. Parents were invited to the kindergarten classroom twice a week. Speaking Spanish and English, the facilitator modeled how to interact with their child by having the children read to her first and then to the parents. For success at home, the facilitator modeled what parents should say and ask their child during the reading process and then had them write and draw about the book. The parents took each book home and kept it for their child to start a personal library. This program is an example of education being the key to breaking out of poverty. It was so successful in this school that the program was started for the first grade parents as well. In building trust with the parents, they take ownership in becoming instruction leaders in a family-friendly school.

In a longitudinal study conducted by Michael Kieffer of a nationally represented sample, he compared native English speakers with Language Minority (LM) students of two subgroups. Language Minority means they have been exposed to language other than English at home. One of the kindergarten groups had initial Limited English Proficiency (iLEP) upon entering kindergarten. The other kindergarten group had initial Fluent English Proficiency (iFEP) upon entering kindergarten. His study examined the students' growth trajectories from kindergarten through fifth grade, both as they exist on average in the national population and as they differ by children's demographic background and schooling context. The results showed that LM iFEP students, when compared with native English speakers, have the same reading achievement from kindergarten through fifth grade. However, the LM iLEP students start out behind the native English speakers and remain behind through fifth grade, which demonstrates divergence. Basically, LM learners in the U.S. who are orally proficient in English entering kindergarten reach the same achievement levels as native English speakers. It was found that LM iFEP students who are in a low-poverty school and non-poverty SES (socio-economic status) converge

with native English speakers by fifth grade and remain close and narrow the gap through secondary school. However, it was found that LMiLEP students in high-poverty schools and low SES have low-reading achievement levels that are slightly above their native English speaking classmates with low SES. Thus, poverty is the demographic factor that ultimately influences reading achievement levels regardless of LEP in kindergarten. Kieffer's findings also suggest that the "negative effects of concentrated poverty are actually less severe for LM learners than for native English speakers" (Kieffer, 2008, p.866).

Richard Fry, Senior Research associate, of the Pew Hispanic Center reported about data reflective of the U.S. Department of Education databases and utilized the National Longitudinal School-Level State Assessment Score Databases. The NLSLSASD measures at a state level the degree of concentration of ELL students in particular schools, and analyzes "the potential role of school isolation in student test performance" (Fry, 2008, p.2) This report examined ELL concentration in low-achieving public schools associated with the "large achievement gap in mathematics between ELL students and other major student groups." Richard Fry looked at the 2003-04 school year data for Arizona, California, Florida, New York and Texas, whose states have 70% of the nation's ELL students. ELL students were less likely than white students to score above the state's proficiency level than white students. However, when the public school had a minimum threshold number of white students, the math scores (at or above the proficiency level) were narrowed considerably. The difference in math scores between ELLs and other students is attributed in part to the characteristics of the public schools, such as higher enrollment, central city location, higher student-to-teacher ratios, greater free or reduced-price school lunches, and designated Title One schools with a larger portion of economically disadvantaged students. His report also showed that when there was a high concentration of ELL

students, the white and black students in that school were doing worse than their peers in a public school with few ELL students.

The findings from the studies show that the demographic factor of poverty (Free or Reduced Lunch percent) significantly affects ELL Graduation rate between low-poverty and high-poverty schools. The t-test results from the 2011 testing year indicated that the p-value was 0.06 which was lower than the alpha level set at 0.25; therefore, the null hypothesis tested is indefinitely rejected with confidence. There is a difference between low-poverty and high-poverty schools in ELL graduation rate.

The conceptual underpinning of theorists Ruby Payne, Michael Kieffer, and Richard Fry are strongly supported by these research findings. The characteristics of poverty in the home influence the life of students at school and explain the reasons why ELL graduation rates are significantly affected by poverty. Teachers should be made aware of the characteristics of poverty and how it plays into their students' behavior, attitudes, and self-esteem. Teachers should also be given professional development opportunities to explore teaching strategies to help improve their working relationship and teaching styles for themselves and learning styles for their students. After concluding this study there are some further studies that could be conducted to confirm the accuracy of these results throughout several school years.

## RESEARCH METHODS

### *Research Design*

A quantitative study was conducted using the DESE website to gather data on Free or Reduced Lunch percentages (Independent Variable) of eighty-nine high-poverty and low-poverty schools and ELL graduation rates (Dependent Variable) in those schools.

### *Study Group Description*

Free or Reduced Lunch percentages of eighty-nine schools in 2011 were divided into two groups of forty-four high-poverty and forty-five low-poverty schools indicating socio-economic level.

### *Data Collection and Instrumentation*

Originally seventy school districts were randomly selected through Quantum Origin. Data was collected from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) website. Only eight school buildings were found to have reported (LEP) ELL Graduation Rate percentages. After moving up one number (another school district) on the randomly selected school districts and still finding no reported ELL graduation percentages, the entire Missouri DESE data was read to find as many reported ELL Graduation Rate percentages as possible. Eighty-nine Missouri school buildings that measured and reported ELL Graduation Rate percentages for 2011 were found. The Free or Reduced Lunch percentage for each of the eighty-nine schools which determined the level of poverty for each school building was recorded.

Districts and schools have federal and state accountability and are required to report a Final Adequate Yearly Progress Summary for each district and each school building including raw data. The difference in Graduation Rate of ELL students between high-poverty and low-

poverty schools were compared based on Payne, Kieffer and Fry's theories of socio-economic status and demographics.

*Statistical Analysis Methods*

A t-test was conducted with two categorical groups, high-poverty and low-poverty schools, for the independent variable. The dependent variable was a continuous variable of ELL Graduation Rate. The mean, mean D, t-test, df, and p-value were concluded from this test. The Alpha level was set at 0.25 to test the null hypothesis: There is no difference in Graduation Rate of ELL students between schools with higher poverty levels and schools with lower poverty levels.



## FINDINGS

A t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference in ELL Graduation Rate in 2011 for higher poverty and lower poverty schools. The following table will depict the organized findings based on the statistical raw data found on the Missouri DESE website in 2012.

Figure 1

### **t-Test analysis Results of Free or Reduced Lunch with 2011 ELL Graduation Rate**

Source	Mean	Mean D	t-test	Df	p-value
Lower 50% (n= 44)	86.96				
Upper 50% (n= 45)	78.13	8.83	1.92	87.00	0.06
Note: Significant when $p < 0.25$					

Eighty-nine school buildings in the state of Missouri were selected (those who reported LEP graduation percentage) to observe differences between socio-economic status and ELL graduation rate in 2011. The free or reduced lunch percentage of each school building was evaluated to produce two groups. The lower 50% (bottom 44) were placed in one group and the upper 50% (top 45) were placed in another. The mean of the more affluent schools was 86.96 and the mean of the higher poverty schools was 78.13. The Mean D, or difference between the two groups was 8.82. The t-test result was 1.92 and the df was 87. The null hypothesis states there is no difference in Graduation Rate of ELL students between schools with higher poverty levels and schools with lower poverty levels. Since the p-value of 0.06 was less than the Alpha level of 0.25, the null hypothesis must be rejected. Therefore, there is a difference in Graduation Rate of ELL students between schools with higher poverty levels and schools with lower poverty levels. The mean Graduation Rate for the low-poverty group was higher than the mean

Graduation Rate of the high-poverty group. This finding that ELL graduation rate is lower for students living in poverty is consistent with the theories of Payne, Kieffer and Fry.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations from Payne for schools to use as support systems for students of poverty are the following: school-wide homework support, supplemental school-wide reading programs, keeping students with the same teacher(s) for two or more years or having a school within a school, teaching coping strategies, school-wide scheduling, parent training and contact through video, direct-teaching of classroom survival skills, requiring daily goal-setting and procedural self-talk, team interventions.

The debate continues on “which approach to use whether it be bilingual, English-only, or dual-language” (Christie, 2008, p.470). Kenji Hakuta of Stanford University proposes that policy makers and others “concentrate on program quality, regardless of the approach used” (Christie, 2008, p.470). Hakuta was involved in research published by EdSource in 2007. It looked at why some schools do better with ELL students than other schools. These influential school-wide practices included: using assessment data to improve student achievement and instruction; ensuring availability of instructional resources; implementing a coherent, standards-based curriculum and instructional program; and prioritizing student achievement. Some schools found that providing teachers with instruction in English language development was beneficial. The study also found that “simply adding to the number of daily instructional minutes devoted to explicit English-language development was not significant” (Christie, 2008, p.470). Meaningful quality of instruction was more beneficial than quantity.

Mary Ann Zehr said, “Nearly eight years after its passage (NCLB), thirteen states and numerous districts still don’t report that information (high school graduation rates) to the public or the U.S. Department of Education. And some of those that do are offering numbers that may not be entirely accurate” (Zehr, 2009, p.19). Some of those thirteen states still do not have the

capacity to do so. Even more interesting is the difference in how Arizona, California, and Texas Public Schools tabulate their graduation rates versus the International Network of Public Schools in New York City, a special school for ELL students who have been in the U.S. for four years. The state public schools ELL graduation rate data does not include those students who become proficient and exit their ELL program during their four years. The ELL graduation rate for the International Network School does include students who become proficient in English, therefore the state public schools have a much lower ELL graduation rate versus 73 percent for the International Network School. This is just one example of different categorization towards an ELL graduation rate percentage. “Other educators want policy makers to pay attention to the rate ELLs are reclassified as ‘English fluent,’ and how well they do once they exit special programs to learn English, than to examine the graduation rate” (Zehr, 2009, p.20).

The New York City Public Schools ELL graduation rate increased from 25.1 percent in 2006 to 35.8 percent for 2007, and to 56.4 percent in 2008. Maria Santos, ELL programs director, contributes the improvement to providing “professional development to mainstream teachers on how to work with English-learners” (Zehr, 2009, p.20). Besides having “small schools in the city that have a mission to serve English-learners,” (Zehr, 2009, p.20) a funding formula was put in place to target money to spend on ELL students in particular. The International Network for Public Schools has a “twenty-two year history of success in New York City” (p. 544, Christie). As a high school that exclusively serves immigrant students who have been in the U.S. four years or less, the organization developed the following eight principles for their success: creating educational programs emphasizing high expectations and effective support systems; view students’ native languages and cultures as resources to the student, classroom, community and society; support further development of the students’ native

languages inside and outside the classroom; design a professional development program for all faculty members that specifically addresses needs of ELL students; integrate professional development into the school week to enable teachers to reflect and plan collaboratively on how to include ELLs; involve families as educational partners; provide meaningful exposure to the real world through experiential learning; incorporate language development into all content areas (Christie, 2008, p.544). “David Francis of the University of Houston presented data showing that by 2015, ELL students are expected to be 30% of our school-age population” (Christie, 2008, p.469).

ELL is one of the four subgroups of students that NCLB requires schools to report Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). This study focuses on the effects of poverty in relationship to ELL Graduation Rates using school reported data collection by DESE.

## REFERENCES

- Barone, D. (2011). Welcoming Families: A parent literacy project in a linguistically rich, high-poverty school. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38(5), 377-384. doi: 10.1007/s10643-010-0424-y. Retrieved from EBSCO host on June 7, 2012.
- Christie, K. (2008), Dat's Story: Things have got to change. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(7), 469-544. Retrieved from EBSCO host June 10, 2012.
- De Cohen, C., Clewell, B., & Urban Inst., W.C. (2007), Putting English language learners on the educational map: The no child left behind act implemented. Education in Focus: Urban Institute Policy Brief. Urban Institute Policy Brief. *Urban Institute*. Retrieved from EBSCO host June 10, 2012.
- Fry, R., & Pew Hispanic, C. (2008). The role of schools in the English language learner achievement gap, *Pew Hispanic Center*. Retrieved from EBSCO host on June 20, 2012.
- Gutierrez, K.D., Asato, J., Pacheco, M., Moll, L.C., Olson, K., Horng, E., & ... McCarty, T.L. (2002). 'Sounding American': The consequences of new reforms on English language learners. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(30), 328-343. Retrieved from EBSCO host on June 20, 2012.
- Kieffer, M.J. (2008). Catching up or falling behind? Initial English proficiency, concentrated poverty, and the reading growth of language minority learners in the United States. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 851-868. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.100.4.851. Retrieved from EBSCO host on June 7, 2012.

- Kim, J. (2011). Relationships among and between ELL status, demographic characteristics, enrollment history, and school persistence (CRESST Report 810). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).
- Payne, R.K. (2003). *A framework for understanding poverty* (third revised edition). Highlands, TX: **aha!** Process, Inc.
- Potemski, A., & National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, (2009). Teaching English language learners: A complex system, policy-to-practice brief. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from EBSCO host on June 10, 2012.
- Watnick, B., & Sacks, A. (2006). A snapshot of teacher perceptions on full inclusion in an international urban community: Miami-Dade County, FL. *Journal of the International Association of Special Education*, 7(1), 67-74.
- Zehr, M. (2009). Graduation rates on ELLs a mystery. *Education Week*, 29(3), 1. Retrieved From EBSCO host on June 20, 2012.