



**CALIFORNIANS
TOGETHER**

CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS
OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

VOLUME 4

CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP
IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE AND TOOLKIT
FOR ADMINISTRATORS

System Conditions for Implementation



WRITTEN BY Laurie Olsen, Ph.D.

WITH GRATITUDE for valuable input from Margarita Gonzalez-Amador, Martha Hernández, Lynn Friedman, Alesha Ramirez and Victoria Weiss

A SPECIAL THANKS TO OUR SPONSORS WHO HELPED MAKE THIS PUBLICATION A REALITY:

- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- Sobrato Family Foundation
- Stuart Foundation
- Weingart Foundation
- William & Flora Hewlett Foundation



CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER

CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS
OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE AND TOOLKIT FOR ADMINISTRATORS OR FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE SERIES OF CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP TEACHER TOOLKITS, CONTACT:






















Martha Hernández, *Executive Director*

Californians Together
525 East Seventh Street, Suite 203
Long Beach, CA 90813
562-983-1333

www.californiantogether.org

Californians Together is a statewide coalition of parents, teachers, administrators, board members and civil rights organizations. Our member organizations come together united around the goal of better educating California's almost 1.2 million English learners by improving California's schools and promoting equitable educational policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
SECTION I: ABOUT PRINCIPLE #3	7
 TEXT/READING: Principle #3—System Conditions That Support Effectiveness	7
 REFLECTION AND MEANING-MAKING	8
SECTION II: LEADERSHIP GOALS AND COMMITMENTS	9
Introduction	9
Section A: Clear System Values and Commitments	10
BOX: Resolution of a Board of Trustees in Support of Proposition 58 (EdGE) and the CA English Learner Roadmap Policy	12
 CASE STUDY: Working from a Generic District Goal, EL Leaders Develop an Instructional Vision and Corresponding Principles for English Learners	15
 REFLECTION: Our Vision, Goals and Instructional Vision	16
 TOOL: Leadership Statements and Mechanisms	16
 REFLECTION: The CA EL Roadmap and our District/School Vision	18
 CASE STUDY: Los Angeles Unified School District’s Six Guiding Principles for English Learners and Standard English Learners	19
 REFLECTION: EL Roadmap Principles and the LAUSD Guiding Principles	20
 ACTIVITY: Our District Vision Juxtaposed with the EL Roadmap	21
 REFLECTION: The Value of Formal Statements	22
Section B: Plans To Implement—English Learner Master Plans	23
EL Master Plans	23
 INQUIRY: Our EL Master Plan	25
Including English Learners in the Action Plans of Districts and Schools	26
 INQUIRY: Looking for ELs in District Plans	26
Section C: Leadership Structures and Focus—District and Site	27
Basic Principles:	27
 REFLECTION	28
 TOOL: Leadership Structures to Infuse EL Expertise	28
Shifts in District Practices that Foster an Aligned EL-Supportive System	29
SCHOOL SITE: Leadership’s Role in Aligning Goals and Site Ownership/Identity	30
 READING: On Being an Advocacy Oriented Leader	31
 REFLECTION: Wisdom on being an Advocacy-Oriented Leader	32
SECTION III: DATA, ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY	33
Introduction	33
Section A: About English Learner Data	35
 READING: A Heads Up About EL Assessment and Data	35
 TOOL: Reflecting on Our EL Data Needs	37
 READING: Ways To Analyze English Learner Data Answering Different Questions	38
 READING: Monitoring Progress and Measuring Impacts Aligned to the Vision, Goals and Principles	43
 ACTIVITY	45
BOX: LAUSD Measuring Progress Toward English Proficiency	46



Action



Activity



Case Study



Inquiry



Reflection



Resource



Text/Reading



Tools



Appendix

 RESOURCE: The Data System We Need.....	47
 TOOL: Are These True of Your District Data Management System?.....	49
Section B: Using Data Well	50
Data, Assessment and Accountability: The Hallmarks of Strong Local Accountability.....	50
BOX: Oakland Unified School District’s ELL Review Process	52
Engaging The School Site in Data Practices	52
 TOOL: How Prepared is Our School to Use EL Data to Inform and Improve Practice in a Continuous Improvement Cycle?.....	53
 RESOURCE: Common Scenarios Indicating Need for Stronger Data Practices	55
 READING: Avoiding Common Data Dialogue Pitfalls and Facilitating a Culture of Inquiry and Productive Data Use.....	56
 REFLECTION	57
Assessments and Goals of Biliteracy: Appropriately Measuring What’s Important	58
 READING: Build Assessment Systems that Monitor and Honor Biliteracy	59
 CASE STUDY: San Francisco Unified School District—Monitoring The Trajectory of Progress Toward Biliteracy	61
 READING: Ten Things a School Leader can do to Build Deeper Schoolwide Understanding and Use of English Learner Data	62
DATA GLOSSARY	63
SECTION IV: BUILDING AN EDUCATOR FORCE FOR ENGLISH LEARNER SUCCESS	66
Introduction: Professional Development and Capacity Building	67
Professional Learning For Administrators	69
Professional Learning For Teachers	71
 TOOL: Professional Development and Learning	73
 CASE STUDY: Professional Development to Prevent LTELS in the Context of an Enrichment/Intervention Middle School Program	74
Recruitment And Pipeline—Finding and Building the “Right” People for the Job!	76
 CASE STUDY: Fresno’s Strategic Plan to Employ and Develop Experts in ELD and Bilingual Education	77
 READING: Where are the teachers?.....	78
The Bilingual Teacher Shortage	80
 TOOL: Retaining, Recruiting and Building a Pipeline for Teachers For EL Success	83
 CASE STUDY: A District-University Partnership to Build a Bilingual Teacher Pipeline.....	84
SECTION V: ALLOCATION AND ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES	85
The Local Control Funding Formula/ Local Control Accountability Plans	86
The English Learner Roadmap Principles Crosswalk to LCAP Priorities	87
BOX: An Essential Resource for Developing an EL-focused LCAP	88
The Site Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)	89
 REFLECTION	90
 TOOL: Resource Allocation With English Learners in Mind.....	91
Human Resources: Equity and Placement	92
SECTION VI: MOVING FORWARD WITH PRINCIPLE 3.....	93
 REFLECTION: Taking Stock—Why is Principle #3 Important?	94
 ACTION: My Learning Plan	95
 ACTIVITY: Building Awareness—Talking Points/Key Messages.....	96
 ACTION: Engaging Other—Which Activities Readings and Reflections Will I Use?	99
SECTION VII: APPENDIX—RESOURCES	101
District Master Plans, Instructional Visions, Etc.	101
Publications	101
Organizational Resources for Leaders for Equity and English Learners	102

THE CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE AND TOOLKIT FOR ADMINISTRATORS



INTRODUCTION

Similar to the other toolkits in this series (*Volume I: Leading Implementation of the EL Roadmap*, *Volume II: Creating Assets-Oriented and Needs-responsive Schools*; *Volume III, Intellectually Rich Instruction and Meaningful Access*; and *Volume V “Alignment, Articulation and Putting it all Together”*), this Volume IV, “System Conditions for Implementation of the EL Roadmap,” focuses on administrators’ roles in leading the implementation of the California English Learner Roadmap. This volume builds on the others by focusing on your role in developing a system that supports the research-based, assets-oriented, student responsive, intellectually rich practices called for by the EL Roadmap policy. Without systems, coherence, infrastructure, and aligned investment of resources, the vision and mission of the EL Roadmap cannot be enacted. The EL Roadmap policy—besides describing the effective practices needed for English learner access and success—is explicit in recognizing and calling for the development of systemic structures and approaches in LEAs and school sites that are necessary for those practices to be implemented sustainably and equitably. The task requires that adequate resources, capacity, and accountability are built into the life of schooling.

What does it look like to create the systems that lead, enable, and support the practices called for in Principles 1 and 2? How can district systems and schools foster the kind of assets-based practices that provide quality instruction and meaningful access and result in ELs with academic proficiency and multilingual skills as called for in the CA EL Roadmap mission and vision? What are the system conditions that make it possible for the vision of schooling articulated by the EL Roadmap to be enacted and sustained? This volume in the series focuses on building the local and site policy, guidance, structures, communication, data and assessment



Without systems, coherence, infrastructure, and aligned investment of resources, the vision and mission of the EL Roadmap cannot be enacted.



practices, staffing, and capacity building that adds up to a system-wide commitment to effective schooling for English learners.

The vast majority of educators—teachers, administrators, others—want to provide their English learners with the best education they can. The problem is, they don't always have the conditions to make that happen—the knowledge, the time, resources, support, or skills to make the systemic, cultural, and instructional shifts that will improve outcomes for English learners. District and school leaders make decisions every day that impact the education of English learners, from allocating resources and hiring staff to making programmatic changes and establishing placement guidelines, developing curriculum and adopting instructional materials, determining priorities, and designing professional learning opportunities. But are EL needs central when considering these options, and are leaders' decisions informed by knowing their students, drawing upon the research, and heeding policy guidance? English learner education touches every aspect of schooling and cuts across functional and organizational areas of a school system. The degree to which the system itself is structured, aligned, and mobilized to address EL needs, assets, and rights makes all the difference in EL success. Principle #3 of the CA EL Roadmap speaks to this issue.

System Conditions for Effectiveness is comprised of four related but different aspects of what it means to provide quality instruction and access:

- ***Leadership structures, policies, commitments, and practices that focus the system on English learners' needs, assets, and success***
- ***Data, assessment and accountability systems***
- ***Capacity building (professional learning, recruitment, retention) to build an educator force for EL success***
- ***Allocation and alignment of resources***

This toolkit provides readings, tools and resources for all four of these aspects.



English learner education touches every aspect of schooling and cuts across functional and organizational areas of a school system. The degree to which the system is structured, aligned, and mobilized to address EL needs, assets, and rights makes all the difference in EL success.

1

SECTION I: ABOUT PRINCIPLE #3



TEXT: Principle #3—System Conditions That Support Effectiveness

Each level of the school system (state, county, district, school, pre-school) has leaders and educators who are knowledgeable of and responsive to the strengths and needs of English learners and their communities. As such, they utilize valid assessment and other data systems that inform instruction and continuous improvement. Each level of the school system provides resources and tiered support to ensure vital programs and build the capacity of teachers and staff to leverage the strengths and meet the needs of English learners.

- 1** *Leaders establish clear goals and commitments to English Learners by providing access, growth toward English proficiency, and academic engagement and achievement. Leaders maintain a systemic focus on continuous improvement and progress toward these goals—over and above compliance via the EL Master Plan and English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) regulations.*
- 2** *The school system invests adequate resources to support the conditions required to address EL needs.*
- 3** *A culturally and linguistically valid and reliable assessments system supports instruction, continuous improvement, and accountability for the attainment of English proficiency, biliteracy, and academic achievement.*
- 4** *Capacity building occurs at all levels of the system, including leadership development to understand and address the needs of ELs. Professional learning and collaboration time are afforded to teachers. The system makes robust efforts to address the teaching shortage and build a recruitment and development pipeline of educators skilled in addressing the needs of ELs, including bilingual teachers.*



REFLECTION AND MEANING-MAKING

When you think of the essential changes needed to create effective, inclusive, equitable schools for English learners, what conditions do you think have to be present in the school district and system to support and sustain those changes? How does Principle #3 speak to those conditions?

Throughout the volumes of this Toolkit series, focusing on each Principle of the EL Roadmap one by one, we have delineated key roles of school leaders and administrators. Each of these roles has implications for systems and institutional mechanisms that need to be in place. These roles have included:

School leader roles called for in Principle #1 and Principle #2	System Implications
A voice articulating and making clear the importance and imperative of welcoming and affirming ELs, modeling and leading assets-oriented school culture. (Principle #1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications structures, mechanisms, and systems (messaging, etc.) • Local policies and formal commitments • Structured agendas and time at leadership and staff levels focusing on ELs • Structures and staffing to support Family-School partnership and engagement
A voice articulating a vision of effective instruction, meaningful access, and programmatic coherence—and building a culture of shared responsibility/ownership for delivering that vision. (Principle #2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications structures, mechanisms and systems (messaging, etc.) • Local policies and formal commitments • Collaborative structures focusing on instructional vision
Ears and eyes to look across classrooms and assess what is going on for English learners and the degree of implementation of research-based instructional approaches. (Principle #2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional learning structures for leaders • Time, protocols, routines for observations • Time, protocols, routines for dialogue focused on EL instruction
Reflective leader focusing on monitoring the progress of ELs and engaging in continuous improvement. (Principle #2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycles of inquiry • Culture of adult learning, reflection, collaboration • Valid, meaningful data on EL progress and success • Formal mechanisms for student voice
Supporter of teachers and staff engaged in the hard work of changing practice (Principle #2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledgeable leaders—professional learning for leaders • Professional learning for teachers and staff • Collaboration time and structures (time, support) • Infrastructure of coaching, mentors



REFLECTION

To be the leader you would like to be in order to build schools responsive to English learners' needs and your dreams for those students, what would you need to have in place in the system to make that possible?

Where, and in what ways, does the current system break down or fail currently in delivering the leadership and supports that would be needed to make your dreams of EL education possible?

2

SECTION 2:

LEADERSHIP GOALS AND COMMITMENTS



INTRODUCTION

“The English Learner Roadmap is intended to guide local policy and planning.”

“Leaders establish clear goals and commitments to English learners ...and maintain a systemic focus on continuous improvement and progress toward those goals.”

~ From the board-adopted EL Roadmap policy

Leadership is a daily, ongoing act of inspiring, cajoling, managing, supporting, reminding, mentoring, and doing whatever it takes to deliver on the promise of a quality education for all students. Leadership also requires systems and structures, policies and guidance, routines and practices that make it possible for coherent and vision-oriented schooling to be delivered. This section of the Toolkit focuses on those leadership systems. Principle #3 makes clear that “each level of the school system (state, county, district, school, pre-school) has knowledgeable leaders and educators responsive to the strengths and needs of English learners and their communities.” Such leadership “establishes **clear goals and commitments** to English learners’ access, growth toward English proficiency, academic, and participation, and **maintains a focus across the system** on progress toward these goals and continuous improvement.” The EL Roadmap holds all educators in the system responsible for EL students and for focusing on quality and excellence (rather than a minimum bar), and calls upon leaders to build a learning and continuously improving system aimed at realizing aspirational goals and commitments.

What begins with the process of developing and articulating values and goals—and codifying them as formal system commitments—leads then to the plans to enact those goals and then to design the structures that will facilitate an ongoing process of aligning practices to the goals. But it all starts with the formulation of the goals.

SECTION A: CLEAR SYSTEM VALUES AND COMMITMENTS

Statements of values, goals, and commitments clarify for all actors in a system what aligns their work with all others in that system and illuminate the expectations and responsibilities of being part of that system. The EL Roadmap itself articulates a goal and mission for all California schools, setting a common direction for the state's education of English learners. The expectation is that local policies will be aligned with this state vision. Locally, resolutions, vision and value statements, commitments, and goal statements at the LEA or school site level are a vital leadership tool for unifying the direction and practices across the system as it forges its own path to EL Roadmap implementation. Any of the following are tools for a system to put its intention in writing, give voice to a common direction, and propel coherence. Regardless of which mechanism is used to articulate and officially sanction the sentiment, there must be clear statements of direction, intention, and expectations for schools' and students' outcomes.

Vision or Value Statement: Vision and value statements articulate what the school/system values, what it holds important, and what it aims to realize.

Examples:

The CA EL Roadmap vision for all schools:

English learners fully and meaningfully access and participate in a 21st-century education from early childhood through grade twelve that results in attaining high levels of English proficiency, mastery of grade-level standards, and opportunities to develop proficiency in multiple languages.

Locally defined vision statements:

"In our schools, English learners fully and meaningfully access and participate in a rigorous course of study that affirms and embraces their diverse identities, develops multicultural competencies, and prepares them for college, career, and civic participation in a global, diverse, and multilingual world."

"Shared Vision": Our children are high-achieving innovative thinkers. They are multi-literate, self-reliant, and confident. They have a lifelong love of learning and are socially responsible citizens. The district takes pride in developing each child's full potential, while recognizing their uniqueness" – From Chula Vista

"We value and find strength in our diversity. Learning is meaningful and relevant, connected with each child's individual needs, ethics, culture, and experiences and is linked with the world outside the classroom."

Belief statements: Belief statements articulate a basic belief or set of beliefs about students and their learning that underlies the system's approach to English learners.

Example:

One of Oakland Unified School District's Beliefs: "English Language learners can achieve at high levels with the right supports. The language and cultural resources that students bring are tremendous assets to their learning and that of the community. All educators are responsible for the language development of ELLs."

Example: From San Francisco Unified School District

- *The achievement gap is the greatest civil rights issue facing SFUSD.*
- *It is possible to increase high-performing students' academic achievement and accelerate the achievement of those currently less academically successful.*
- * *Quality schools offer engaging and challenging programs, caring and committed staff, strong and visible leaders, and instruction differentiated to meet each child's needs.*

- *Authentic partnerships are essential to achieving our vision for student success.*
- *Equity is the work of eliminating oppression, ending biases, and ensuring equally high outcomes for all participants through the creation of multicultural, multilingual, multiethnic, and multiracial practices and conditions; as well as removing the predictability of success or failure that currently correlates with any social or cultural factor.*

Foundational Research Basis: Statements of basic foundational research that form the basis for pedagogical and instructional practices. To be credible and maximize effectiveness, leaders need to make pedagogical choices grounded in knowledge and research. Articulating major key research foundations helps educators understand the “why” behind pedagogical decisions in a district.

Example: *From the Multilingual Learner Toolkit*

Young children can acquire more than one language at once and achieve high proficiency in both languages. Young children, starting in infancy, have the capacity to learn more than one language simultaneously. Home language development plays an important role in English language development, and developing a language other than English does not impede English acquisition. Rather, a strong base in the home language can help facilitate English acquisition. The earlier that children are regularly exposed to two languages, the more likely they will develop bilingualism.

Bilingualism is a strength. Bilingualism has linguistic, academic, cognitive, and sociocultural benefits. These benefits are most likely to occur when a child achieves high levels of competence in both the home language and English. Such benefits make it clear that bilingualism should be actively fostered and celebrated.

Resolutions (usually Board level)—Resolutions are statements issued by a governing body of commitment and intent that is the impetus for action, outlining the rationale (stated as “whereas”) and (“therefore”) defining specific steps the governing board commits to in order to realize the intent.

Example:

Whereas *the District is committed to providing research-based programs preparing students with the linguistic, social, and academic competencies to lead and thrive in a diverse multilingual world, **now therefore be it resolved** that the Superintendent will establish a Dual Language Opportunities Task Force to develop a plan for starting dual language programs in each attendance area of the district within the next two years.*

Statements of Commitment and Goals—A district, department, school site, or program sometimes issue a statement articulating specific outcomes they commit to realizing, often with specific metrics and indicators.

Examples:

Every English learner will attain English proficiency within five years of enrollment in our district programs. We will increase the number of graduates attaining the Seal of Biliteracy by 20% over the next five years.

Chula Vista Strategic Goals: *All students will exit elementary school as multi-literate, life-long learners with a mastery of essential skills.*

To a large degree, formal goal statements, resolutions, belief statements, or system commitments are made at the local governing board level (Trustees, School Board) or district leadership level (Superintendent, Cabinet, etc.). They represent the voice, intentions, and direction of the district.

RESOLUTION OF A BOARD OF TRUSTEES IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 58 (EDGE) AND THE CA ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP POLICY.

Whereas, Proposition 58, also known as the California Education for a Global Economy, or CA EdGE Initiative passed by over 70% majority on November 8, 2016, reflecting California's strong support for preparing all students for college and careers in a multilingual 21st-century economy;

Whereas, the California State Board of Education adopted an English learner roadmap in July 2017 calling for school districts to ensure that English learners attain high levels of English proficiency, mastery of grade-level standards, and have opportunities to develop proficiency in multiple languages;

Whereas, close to ____% of our District students are learning English as a second language (English learners);

Whereas, the District is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and services for EL students enact the California State Board of Education's English Learner Roadmap policy and principles, including: 1) assets-oriented and needs-responsive schools; 2) intellectual quality of instruction and meaningful access; 3) system conditions to support effectiveness; and 4) alignment and articulation within and across systems; and is committed to providing all parents several high-quality language acquisition educational program options for their children;

Now therefore be it resolved that the Governing Board of the _____ School District hereby directs its Superintendent to:

- 1) Develop and strengthen multilingual language acquisition program options for the District's students including, dual immersion, bilingual, and foreign language acquisition programs; and*
- 2) Work with the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) in the development and improvement of the District's language acquisition programs and educate all parents regarding the District's language acquisition programs; and*
- 3) Evaluate current programs and services for the District's EL students to determine what changes may be needed to ensure enactment of the California State Board of Education policy; and*
- 4) Implement changes needed to ensure alignment between the District's programs and services for EL students with the CA EL Roadmap policy to be included in the District's Local Control and Accountability Plan; and*
- 5) Create differentiated growth goals for EL students within each of the LCAP priority areas, as appropriate, in order to ensure that the District's programs and services for EL students are effectively ensuring that EL students are attaining high levels of English proficiency, mastery of grade-level standards, and proficiency in their primary language, as appropriate;*
- 6) Implement and expand recognition at elementary and middle schools for attainment of proficiency in English and another language leading to the awarding of State Seals of Biliteracy upon graduation from high school.*

General “All Student” Visions and Goals—and English Learner Specific Visions and Goals

In districts where students across racial/ethnic groups consistently outperform peers in other districts, a key strategy for leaders is to set a clear vision for teaching and learning that is communicated districtwide and that centers on equity and social justice. The plan should speak unambiguously to exciting goals that have meaning for historically marginalized and excluded groups. Districts can set explicit goals for student learning in the context of new standards and accountability and also *specifically emphasize* equity for ELs in their guiding principles.

General “all student” visions relating to student outcomes, school culture, and climate distinctly include English learners along with other students. Effective districts and schools will incorporate ideas that will address aspects relating to English learner education via their visions, resolutions, commitments, and goal statements. These include:

- *Statements honoring, supporting, affirming home language and culture and the value of such diversity in the school community*
- *Commitments to attaining English proficiency (within a specific time period established by researched continuum expectations for English learners)*
- *Providing opportunities to develop skills of biliteracy or multilingual proficiency*
- *Celebrations/acknowledgments of attainment of biliteracy (Pathway or Seal of Biliteracy or other awards)*
- *Embracing, welcoming immigrants (e.g., LAUSD’s “We are one LAUSD! Standing with Immigrant Families” board resolution followed by a communications campaign.)*

There are also examples of goals and resolutions framed as “all students” statements that specifically address language issues of particular import and particular stakes for English learners—extending these commitments not just to English learners but to all students. For example:

Ysleta, TX: *All students who enroll in our schools will graduate from high school fluent in two or more languages and prepared and inspired to succeed in a four-year college or university.*

Chula Vista, CA: *Students in the Chula Vista Elementary School District experience a rigorous 21st-century learning environment rooted in effective teaching practices and high-quality instruction. Our mission is to nurture every child’s imagination, intellect, and sense of inquiry. Working collaboratively with stakeholders, we tap a collective intelligence rich with the spirit and creativity necessary for students to become difference makers in our community. By offering innovative partnerships, a technology-based curriculum, and strong visual and performing arts, we develop students’ creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration skills and have a District-wide commitment to multiliteracy.*

Instructional Visions

In addition to visions about outcomes, instructional goals focus on teaching and learning. An instructional vision describes beliefs about children’s education and the expressed goals for the school district about how to accomplish those beliefs. These visions tackle issues of meaningful



What begins with the process of developing and articulating values and goals—and codifying them as formal system commitments—leads then to the plans to enact those goals and to design the structures that will align practices to the goals. But it all starts with the formulation of the goals.

access and speak to the conditions and pedagogy of teaching and learning. Sometimes framed as “Instructional Principles,” instructional visions offer classroom inspiration to teachers, are used in the selection of curriculum, communicate the kind of professional learning that will be needed, and express the system’s commitment to students and families about the quality of teaching. Ambitious instructional visions and guiding principles appear to make a significant difference in driving for high-quality EL instruction by describing the pedagogical characteristics and vision of teaching rooted in research about dual language and second language development. The instructional vision provides a common language across the district for talking about instruction. It communicates the role of teaching practices in the actionable language of the teaching task itself.

Example:

(From the Education for Change Public Schools Instructional Principles, 2021)

Mastery of Knowledge and Skills: We believe a core task of educators is to ensure that each student builds the knowledge and skills necessary to reimagine and transform our world and succeed and thrive within it. Specifically, students must apply learning by designing, constructing, and creating new models and solutions, thinking critically to formulate and solve problems, and communicating effectively through various media across disciplines for diverse audiences and purposes.

Student Agency: We believe that to succeed in the 21st-century, students must develop agency, or the capacity to originate and direct actions for a given purpose. Empowering students with agency is complex work. Agency requires that we focus on a set of foundational habits to be internalized. Specifically, students must demonstrate a growth mindset, feel a strong sense of self-efficacy, and self-regulate as learners.

A vision speaks to our hearts, our imaginations, and our yearnings. A goal speaks to the direction we will take to try to enact that vision. A resolution or commitment puts the system on record saying it will make sure that something concrete happens. Principles guide the actions that will lead to the desired outcomes expressed in goals. While districts and school sites may have a combination of these or just use one type, they each represent the formal statement of a system. These formal statements need to be communicated clearly and often, revisited and reiterated, so people make sense of it and internalize it across the system. And its seriousness is made evident through the strength of the plans that flow and are developed through the statements to ensure implementation. They have power when progress toward those commitments is monitored, and the results of monitoring are responded to in the process of continually refining implementation. *(For discussion of the monitoring processes and data systems related to monitoring against goals, see the section in this Toolkit on Data, Assessment and Accountability, pages 33 – 65).*



A vision speaks to our hearts, our imaginations, and our yearnings. A goal speaks to the direction we will take to try to enact that vision. A resolution or commitment puts the system on record saying it will make sure that something concrete happens. Principles guide the actions that will lead to the desired outcomes expressed in goals.



CASE STUDY: Working from a Generic District Goal, EL Leaders Develop an Instructional Vision and Corresponding Principles for English Learners

District English Learner staff in Oakland Unified School District adopted the same instructional vision as the overall district principles, applying them specifically to English learners and articulating as follows:

“All OUSD English learners will find joy in their academic experience, graduating with the skills to ensure they are caring, competent, fully informed, critical thinkers who are prepared for college, career and community success.”

To move toward this vision, the EL leaders outlined guiding principles and essential instructional practices to shape their work. These principles are:

1. EL students can achieve at high levels with the right support.
2. The language and cultural resources that students bring are tremendous assets to their learning and that of the community.
3. All educators are responsible for language development.

Guided by these principles, the EL leaders articulated a theory of change grounded in California’s then newly-adopted ELA, math, and science content standards, and the new ELD standards, and the ELA/ELD Framework—which emphasize using sophisticated language to engage in subject-specific practices. The theory of change is summarized in five essential practices that ensure all multilingual learners are on track to graduate college and become career- and community-ready. Through this statement of the five essential practices, the district is committed to holding all educators accountable for English learners’ academic, linguistic, and social-emotional needs. The Five Essential Practices are:

- **Access and Rigor:** Ensure all EL students have full access to and engagement with the academic demands of current content and ELD standards.
- **Integrated and Designated ELD:** Ensure EL students receive designated ELD and integrated ELD in every content area.
- **Data-Driven Decisions:** Make programmatic, placement, and instructional decisions for EL students that are grounded in a regular analysis of evidence.
- **Asset-Based Approach:** Leverage the linguistic and cultural assets of students and ensure that they are active contributors to their own learning and that of their community.
- **Whole Child:** Leverage family and community supports. Activate resources to address the unmet, nonacademic needs that hinder EL students’ ability to thrive in school.





REFLECTION: Our Vision, Goals and Instructional Vision

Write out your district’s vision, goals, and overall Instructional Principles. Wherever there is mention of “students,” replace it with “English learners.” Now, reading the statements with “English learners” substituted for “students,” do you feel the goals and vision are sufficient to guide the district’s implementation of English learner schooling?


Do you have a formal Instructional Vision? What is your district’s Instructional Vision, and how might it be adapted and revised to address English learners?



TOOL: Leadership Statements and Mechanisms

Which mechanisms are used in your district to articulate the leadership direction, beliefs, commitments? To what degree do they feel sufficient to address the kind of formal articulation of commitment to English learners you believe would strengthen EL schooling in your district?

Statement/Mechanism	Have this?	Reflections on sufficiency for English learner education
Vision		
Mission		
Belief Statements		
Instructional Vision or Principles		
Articulated research foundations		
Formal resolutions/Commitments specific to English learners		
Other:		



Alignment Up and Down the System: The Role of the Vision, Mission, and Principles of the California English Learner Roadmap

The CA EL Roadmap policy lays out a vision, mission, and principles governing English learner education for all schools in California. Developed by a diverse working group of educators from all over the state and formally and unanimously adopted by the State Board of Education as the English learner policy for California in 2017, it is state policy in a local control context. It expects that the clear values and non-negotiables articulated in the policy would be considered, made sense of, and be rewritten for each locale’s language and context—but that the major elements would find their way into district and site vision statements, policies, and goals. Local efforts might add principles—or make some more prominent than others—but in the end, a strong core of coherence will exist across the state.

The implementation of the EL Roadmap vision, mission, and principles begins with meaning-making and making sense of what the vision, mission, and principles are saying. It then moves to questions like: What does this have to do with us? How consonant are these principles with who we are and what we believe in our district? What does this add for us to consider? How does this reframe or help us more clearly align our beliefs and practices to the research and new directions in the field? How is this state adopted EL Roadmap a tool and resource to guide us in being clearer, more specific, and more focused on building schools that embrace and serve our English learners?

The task of engaging a district and community in making sense of the EL Roadmap and making connections to local policy and practice is squarely on the shoulders of leadership. This involves creating the time and facilitation and structures for dialogue, using the EL Roadmap as a lens to look at current practices and using the opportunity to involve stakeholders in their own articulation of what matters and what they want for English learners. Out of this process comes alignment that embraces the vision, mission, and principles of the EL Roadmap in the language that makes sense locally and with additional aspects that have particular local importance. In the end, it is not about, “The state says we have to....”, but rather, “Who we are as a district embraces the EL Roadmap as a key part of our vision and principles—aligning us with schools and districts across the state in a research-based and assets-oriented direction as we pursue what matters to us and our students and community.”



The task of engaging a district and community in making sense of the EL Roadmap and making connections to local policy and practice is squarely on the shoulders of leadership. This involves creating the time and facilitation and structures for dialogue, using the EL Roadmap as a lens to look at current practices and using the opportunity to involve stakeholders in their own articulation of what matters and what they want for English learners.



REFLECTION: The CA EL Roadmap and our District/School Vision

Values, elements, and language of the EL Roadmap	How do these, or how should these, show up in your school, district, and community's goals, principles, and vision statements?
Assets-based and student-responsive instruction that values and builds on the cultural and linguistic assets students bring.	
Intellectually rich instruction.	
Relevant and standards-based curriculum.	
Meaningful access to the full standard-based curriculum for ELs.	
Affirm diversity.	
Commitment to provide opportunity and develop proficiency in multiple languages—value of biliteracy. Expanded DL opportunities.	
Preparation for a global, diverse, and multilingual world.	
Safe, welcoming, and affirming school climates	
Emphasis on engagement, interaction, inquiry, and critical thinking.	
Linguistic, academic, and social competencies are all built.	

Are there aspects of your goals, visions, commitment statements that you feel centralize and respond to the needs of English learners that aren't included in the column derived from the EL Roadmap? What are these?



CASE STUDY: Los Angeles Unified School District's Six Guiding Principles for English Learners and Standard English Learners

Over a period of four years, beginning in 2013, LAUSD leaders engaged in building a set of policies that emphasized a commitment to bilingualism for all students. In 2013, a board resolution stated a commitment to preparing students for a multilingual global economy. In 2015, the board passed a resolution directing the district to expand dual language instructional pathways from TK through the secondary grades. Then, in 2017—shortly after the passage of Proposition 58 (CA Ed.G.E. Initiative) and the adoption of the CA EL Roadmap—district leaders began work on a new Master Plan for English Learners and Standard English Learners (SELs) that operationalized their commitment to bilingualism for all. *(For more information about the LAUSD EL Master Plan, see pages 24 – 25).* The Roadmap policy became a necessary and important input into developing their local EL Master Plan. After gathering stakeholder input over months, the Master Plan was formally adopted in 2018 and unanimously approved by the board. The Master Plan begins by laying out LAUSD's vision. The powerful statement that opens the Master Plan articulates a vision and sets forth guiding principles:

“Join us in envisioning and imagining that every single student feels as though their language matters, their culture matters, that they matter. Picture a future where L.A. students are prepared for 21st-century jobs, where our students lead the way because they have an impressive suite of skills and knowledge, excellent academic achievement across the spectrum of coursework, and full bilingualism and biliteracy ... In the current context, we can't afford to envision any other future.”

The plan then outlines six guiding principles that highlight the values underlying the district's commitments:

- **Asset-Based Education:** *Educators foster an assets-oriented mindset by knowing, valuing, and affirming their own, students', and families' cultures and languages, empowering students' voices and cultivating a joy of learning.*
- **Bilingualism and Biliteracy:** *Students have opportunities to learn language skills in two or more languages, including speaking, writing, reading, and listening. Educators promote students' metacognitive skills, allowing them to make the appropriate language choices based on situational awareness. These skills support future language development, content learning, and postsecondary success to benefit their community and society.*
- **Sociocultural Competence:** *There is an affirming classroom and school culture where staff, students, and families foster positive attitudes among students regarding both their own and others' diverse and complex cultural and linguistic identities.*
- **Rigorous Academics for All:** *Language learners engage in intellectually rigorous and developmentally appropriate learning experiences that promote high levels of proficiency in English and another language, including academic language, and academic achievement across the curriculum.*
- **Alignment and Articulation:** *Language learners experience a coherent, articulated, and aligned set of practices and pathways across contexts, starting in early childhood through reclassification and graduation, in preparation for college and careers in the twenty-first century.*
- **Systemic Support:** *Leaders and educators across all levels of the school system are provided integrated professional development. They share responsibility for educating and monitoring the progress of language learners, are accountable and responsive to the needs of diverse learners, and ensure fiscal investments are equity-oriented and evidence-based.*



REFLECTION: EL Roadmap Principles and the LAUSD Guiding Principles

What CA EL Roadmap Principles and vision do you recognize in the LAUSD vision guiding principles? How are LAUSD’s guiding principles aligned to the ELR? What are some local reframings and additions?

CA EL Roadmap	LAUSD Master Plan Principles
<p>Asset Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools</p> <p>Principle #1: ASSETS-ORIENTED AND NEEDS-RESPONSIVE SCHOOLS</p> <p>Pre-schools and schools are responsive to different EL strengths, needs, and identities, and support English learners’ socio-emotional health and development. Programs value and build upon the cultural and linguistic assets students bring to their education in safe and affirming school climates. Educators value and build strong family, community, and school partnerships.</p> <p>Principle #2: INTELLECTUAL QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION AND MEANINGFUL ACCESS</p> <p>English learners engage in intellectually rich, developmentally appropriate learning experiences that foster high levels of English proficiency. These experiences integrate language development, literacy, and content learning and provide access for comprehension and participation through native language instruction and scaffolding. English learners have meaningful access to a full standards-based and relevant curriculum and the opportunity to develop proficiency in English and other languages.</p> <p>Principle #3: SYSTEM CONDITIONS THAT SUPPORT EFFECTIVENESS</p> <p>Each level of the school system (state, county, district, school, pre-school) has leaders and educators who are knowledgeable of and responsive to the strengths and needs of English learners and their communities and utilize valid assessment and other data systems that inform instruction and continuous improvement; resources and tiered support are provided to ensure strong programs and build the capacity of teachers and staff to build on the strengths and meet the needs of English learners.</p> <p>Principle #4: ALIGNMENT AND ARTICULATION WITHIN AND ACROSS SYSTEMS</p> <p>English learners experience a coherent, articulated and aligned set of practices and pathways across grade levels and educational segments, beginning with a strong foundation in early childhood and continuing through to reclassification, graduation, and higher education. These pathways foster the skills, language(s), literacy, and knowledge students need for college—and career— readiness and participation in a global, diverse, multilingual 21st-century world.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asset-Based Education: Educators foster an assets-oriented mindset by knowing, valuing, and affirming their own, students,’ and families’ cultures and languages, empowering students’ voices and cultivating a joy of learning. 2. Bilingualism and Biliteracy: Students have opportunities to learn language skills in two or more languages, including speaking, writing, reading, and listening. Educators promote students’ metacognitive skills, allowing them to make the appropriate language choices based on situational awareness. These skills support future language development, content learning, and postsecondary success to benefit their community and society. 3. Sociocultural Competence: There is an affirming classroom and school culture where staff, students, and families foster positive attitudes among students regarding both their own and others’ diverse and complex cultural and linguistic identities. 4. Rigorous Academics for All: Language learners engage in intellectually rigorous and developmentally appropriate learning experiences that promote high levels of proficiency in English and another language, including academic language, as well as academic achievement across the curriculum. 5. Alignment and Articulation: Language learners experience a coherent, articulated, and aligned set of practices and pathways across contexts, starting in early childhood through reclassification and graduation, in preparation for college and careers in the twenty-first century. 6. Systemic Support: Leaders and educators across all levels of the school system are provided integrated, professional development. They share responsibility for educating and monitoring the progress of language learners, are accountable and responsive to the needs of diverse learners, and ensure fiscal investments are equity- oriented and evidence-based.



ACTIVITY: Our District Vision Juxtaposed with the EL Roadmap

Post your district and/or school “vision” next to the Mission/Vision and Principles of the EL Roadmap. To what degree are they aligned and consonant? What appears articulated in the EL Roadmap that is NOT reflected in your school or district vision/goals that you feel it would make a difference to have explicitly articulated in your vision/goals?

Your School and/or District Vision/Goals/Mission	The CA English Learner Roadmap
	<p>Vision: English learners fully and meaningfully access and participate in a 21st-century education from early childhood through grade twelve that results in attaining high levels of English proficiency, mastery of grade-level standards, and opportunities to develop proficiency in multiple languages.</p> <p>Mission: California schools affirm, welcome, and respond to a diverse range of English learner strengths, needs, and identities. California schools prepare graduates with the linguistic, academic and social skills and competencies they require for college, career, and civic participation in a global, diverse, and multilingual world, thus ensuring a thriving future for California.</p> <p>From the Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Value and build upon the cultural and linguistic assets students bring to their education.• English learners have meaningful access to a full standard-based and relevant curriculum and the opportunity to develop proficiency in English and other languages.



REFLECTION: The Value of Formal Statements

Consider the value of creating a school or district goal, vision or statement of intent regarding the education and success of English learners and/or the implementation of an EL Roadmap aligned vision. Why might this be important? Useful? Used? How would it support your efforts as a school leader to implement the EL Roadmap? What shared values, goals, declarations might be essential to be made explicit? Why and how would it make a difference if your school or district had a policy and messaging providing clear values, goals, and asset-based commitments to English learners? What would those be?



Leadership requires systems and structures, policies and guidance, routines and practices that make it possible for coherent and vision-oriented schooling to be delivered.

SECTION B: Plans To Implement—English Learner Master Plans



EL Master Plans

Often the statements of values, goals, and commitments regarding English learners are contained in a district English Learner Master Plan. The primary purpose of the English Learner Master Plan is:

- *To provide the district and the schools with a clear statement of policies related to the developing, implementing, and evaluating of English learner programs and services.*
- *To articulate key principles and research-based understandings that are the foundation of the pedagogical approach to English learners in the district.*
- *To describe the district's English learner programs and services—providing both description and guidance for implementation—by outlining the student population served by each of these: exit criteria, student population served, staffing requirements, and program components.*
- *To provide specific procedural guidelines for the identification, assessment, and placement of students; reclassification of students; notification and involvement of parents; the formation and functioning of the District English Learner Advisory Committee and site English Learner Advisory Committees; the annual evaluation of English learner programs; and the use of state and federal funds for EL programs and services.*
- *To align policies and procedures with current state and federal mandates.*

There are districts where an EL Master Plan written by some person(s) at the district office years ago sits on a shelf and gathers dust, seldom referred to by anyone, and where each school site follows its own lead and traditions in serving English learners. These are rarely the districts with a robust, comprehensive, research-based, coherent system of programs and services for English learners. As with the articulation of visions, goals, and principles, the development of specific district guidance regarding programs and procedures is a mechanism for leadership to step up and guide their schools to effective programs.

California districts making significant progress in improving educational programs and outcomes for English learners have strategically engaged diverse and critical stakeholders in developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating their EL master plans. Their master plans are driven by an ambitious instructional vision for ML education and include guiding principles for high-quality EL instruction.

For example, Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) has articulated a set of five Essential Practices for English learners and placed them in their new EL Master Plan. These five practices were designed to both guide and hold accountable all OUSD educators in collective responsibility for the academic, linguistic, and socio-emotional needs of English learners.

- 1. ACCESS & RIGOR:** *Ensure all English Language Learners have full access to and engagement in the academic demands of Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, and California's 2012 English Language Development Standards.*
- 2. INTEGRATED and DESIGNATED ELD:** *Ensure ELLs receive daily Designated ELD and Integrated ELD in every content area.*
- 3. DATA-DRIVEN DECISIONS:** *Make programmatic, placement, and instructional decisions for English Language Learners that are grounded in regular analysis of evidence.*
- 4. ASSET-BASED APPROACH:** *Leverage the linguistic and cultural assets of our students and ensure that students are active contributors to their own learning and that of their community.*
- 5. WHOLE CHILD:** *Leverage family and community supports. Activate resources to address the unmet, non-academic needs that hinder ELLs' ability to thrive in school.*

Strong EL Master Plans are based upon an understanding of the research on effective evidence-based definitions of high-quality English learner pedagogy and practices, a thorough understanding of the policies and laws governing English learner education, a good knowledge of the English learner students and community being served, a close connection to the educators and sites serving those students that can inform the kind of information that would be most helpful, and, finally, embracing local priorities and values. This requires, then, not only EL expertise, but also a process of facilitating and collaborating with district and community stakeholders in the development of the plan. And that means sufficient investment of resources and time and staff to the process.

Los Angeles Unified School District undertook the job of rewriting their EL Master Plan in 2017. Their prior EL Master Plan, just 5 years old was written before the passage of the EdGE Initiative which opened the door for bilingual education programs, prior to the ELA/ELD Framework, which articulated a new vision of language development integrated with content, and prior to the adoption of the CA EL Roadmap. The district decided from the start that it would be a Master Plan for English Learners and the large number of Standard English Learners in the district. The purpose was not only to articulate the vision and outline programs and procedures, but to lay out the district's vision for educating culturally and linguistically diverse students and would respond to and incorporate not just the changes in state EL policy but also the adoption of several board resolutions in LAUSD that supported goals of bilingualism and biliteracy. The content of the Master Plan would reflect and serve to fulfill the district's overall mission for all students: "Embracing our diversity to educate L.A.'s youth, ensure academic achievement, and empower tomorrow's leaders."

The first step was forming a Project Management Group consisting of the district office staff and some external partners. The Information gathering phase drew upon legal, financial, and policy advisors, stakeholder groups,



California districts making significant progress in improving educational programs and outcomes for English learners have strategically engaged diverse and critical stakeholders in developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating their EL master plans. Their master plans are driven by an ambitious instructional vision and include guiding principles for high-quality EL instruction.

and external partners to identify the priority topics for inclusion in the Master Plan. They conducted 35 in-person outreach sessions with 740 LAUSD stakeholders and 150 surveys from LAUSD high school EL students. Feedback sessions included parents, the UTLA (teachers union), and the administrators' union. By 2018—In an iterative process of writing, feedback, and revision—the Project Management Group completed the EL Master Plan. The “new” 2018 Master Plan compared to the 2012 version has these features:

- *Focuses on assets-based education.*
- *Incorporates goals of bilingualism and biliteracy for all.*
- *Expands dual-language education programs.*
- *Updates research, practice, monitoring, and resources on instructional delivery models for comprehensive ELD, including designated and integrated ELD.*
- *Shifts from a “Structured English Immersion” program to a Language and Literacy in English Acceleration Program.*
- *Updates research, practices, monitoring, and resources for identifying and educating SELs in a comprehensive Mainstream English language Development program.*
- *Incorporates the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California to determine English language proficiency and to monitor progress.*
- *Aligns goals to the CA EL Roadmap.*

For all new plans that involve English learners, it is essential that the district processes engage school site leadership not only for their input, but also in preparation for them to be able to play their crucial role of building a sense of connection and ownership to that vision and in preparation for leading implementation at their sites. Their involvement ensures the plan will speak to the challenges and realities at the site level. Moreover, their participation provides site leadership with the background and context to be able to lead. And, both by law and the integrity of the process, the DELAC must always be engaged—for their input, their role in reaching out to and representing the EL parent community, and their ability to be ambassadors for the plan.


Finally, keeping the plan in the public eye “spotlight” is key to implementation. Regular mechanisms of communication help systems create the necessary sense of urgency. Newsletters, regular reports on progress, efforts to showcase practices that align with your vision and goals, and regularly agendized updates on implementation are all excellent ways to spread the ideas while keeping the vision and goals exciting. Every year, for example, Oakland Unified School District produces a districtwide Roadmap to ELL Achievement report that summarizes the impact of their efforts in implementing the EL Master Plan and Five Essential Practices. The report identifies subsequent priorities and actions that keep them accountable to the community, and strengthens their commitment to implementation.



INQUIRY: Our EL Master Plan

- How recently was your EL Master Plan developed? _____ / _____ / _____
- Does it respond to the changes in state policy and guidance (e.g., EdGE Initiative, the ELA/ELD Framework’s call for Integrated and Designated ELD, the CA EL Roadmap)? **Explain:**
- Does it speak to current needs, challenges, visions and priorities of your community?

Check one: YES! UM, NO. I’M NOT SURE.



Including English Learners in the Action Plans of Districts and Schools

Districts and school sites have a myriad of plans—technology plans, equity plans, safety plans, and plans specific to various content areas (such as VAPA Plans, Literacy Plans). These plans speak generally to all students, including English learners. Because English learners have specific challenges, needs and assets that can impact their access and participation in all school programs and services, it is always essential to look at those general plans through a lens of the degree to which they address the access and participation needs of ELs. An EL impact analysis can be helpful as part of ensuring meaningful access and the inclusion of English learners in the life and programs of the school. It also can make apparent where professional learning might be helpful for staff and faculty on English learner needs, and where collaboration and partnerships with the EL Department are warranted. Key questions and lenses to use in an EL impact analysis include:

- *Is language accessibility addressed for English learners?*
- *Do the programs and plans incorporate and build upon evidence based high-quality practices for English learners?*
- *Are there opportunities within the plan for students to incorporate, leverage, and utilize their cultural and linguistic assets?*



INQUIRY: Looking for ELs in District Plans

Look at a few examples of general plans and substitute EL for “students.” When you do, does the plan adequately speak to ELs? What additions or modifications would be needed to make it a good plan for EL students?)

SECTION C: Leadership Structures and Focus—District and Site

To provide coherent, high-quality programs and services for English learners, there must be structured roles, staffing, and leadership mechanisms at both the district and site levels. Given that ELs are the responsibility of all educators across the system, there must be expertise on the needs of ELs and a focus on them in all the systems' functions. In addition, there must be clearly designated responsibilities for coordinating the focus on ELs. Balancing the need to keep a specific focus (a narrower, vertical energy) on ELs while empowering and spreading EL expertise across the system (from a wider, horizontal perspective) is the challenge within the system. For too long, English learners were a marginalized population and a siloed responsibility in schools—the province for the EL Coordinator and ELD teachers to handle alone. And too often, without someone designated to take that responsibility, focus on English learners was lost altogether. The new system has to be structured to end silos, fragmentation, and marginalization of ELs, AND it must ensure that EL expertise is infused throughout. This includes inviting EL expertise to the table, creating agendas where ELs are the focus, equalizing the status of EL work within the district and site, and building connective structures and tissue across the system for shared vision and responsibility for English learners.

Basic Principles:

The following guidelines are intended to support structuring roles and leadership related to English learners that will ensure:

- **EL expertise is at the table:** *Top leadership structures incorporate at least one person with designated EL responsibility to ensure EL expertise is at the table. This includes, for example, the district's Superintendent Cabinet, the district's Curriculum Council, and the Leadership Team at a site.*
- **EL focus is institutionalized** and routinized at the table of leadership. *Top leadership bodies include standing agenda items related to monitoring progress, raising issues, reporting on implementation of the EL Master Plan, and other EL initiatives. This includes the Superintendent's Cabinet, Curriculum Council, Leadership Team and Staff meetings at the site.*
- **Cross function, cross-department structures** focus on English learners. *At the district level, establish structures, routines, and time for collaboration across departments, including EL Departments and EL expertise. At the site level, these structures are cross-discipline/department and also cross-grade—including the EL Department.*
- **Collaborative structures for site principals** are created to enable site administrators to be thought partners and work together on EL programs, services, and communities. *This might include, for example, year-long PLCs or networks of Principals by similar school/populations served (e.g., the high concentration of EL schools.)*
- Ensure that **designated EL staff positions/roles/departments** will provide targeted attention to EL programs and services, coordinate EL instruction and programs across sites, etc. *That role/person must not be overly burdened with many other responsibilities—they need adequate time for the role. An EL Coordinator or ELD Department Chair is an essential linchpin for coherent implementation of EL programs and services at the site level.*
- Support **networks** of EL Coordinators and ELD Department leads, etc. across sites in the district.
- Ensure **equitable status** of EL roles and functions with other departments and functions in the district and site. *This includes equal rank of titles and salaries, budgets, presence at the table, etc.*
- Form **stakeholder EL Task Forces** for focus, inquiry, and recommendations to the district about the EL program, progress on implementing improved programs and services, etc.



REFLECTION

What changes to district office structures and routines could increase collaboration and shared expertise? What changes to district office structures and routines could increase the visibility and focus on ELs? What changes at the site level might strengthen the visibility and reach of EL expertise?



TOOL: Leadership Structures to Infuse EL Expertise

Indicator	Check "yes"	Notes/Reflections
Our district has articulated an evidence-based instructional vision and guiding principles to support high quality instruction for English Learners.		
We have an equity oriented and assets-based district vision and goals for EL education that incorporates both closing the gap and raising the bar.		
The Superintendent's Cabinet regularly focuses on EL education as a standing agenda item.		
Our Master Plan for ELs is updated and aligned to the CA EL Roadmap vision, mission, and principles. It encompasses local priorities and responds to local conditions.		
Our district EL Master Plan provides clear research-based definitions and guidance for EL programs, pathways, and placement.		
There is alignment between our district's vision and mission with state EL policies and priorities—and the alignment continues with school site plans.		
Our district has built a culture of shared responsibility for EL success—with an explicit focus on equal access.		
The district office structure facilitates the presence of EL expertise across all functions.		
There are clear roles for coordinating EL programs/services in the district office and leading the EL focus within the district. These roles are designated and staffed with people with deep EL expertise, and are accorded equal status with other content areas.		
The site leadership team includes our EL Coordinator and/or Chair of the ELD Department as a means of infusing EL expertise into leadership dialogue and decisions, ensuring a continuing focus on EL students.		
Our school site has a culture of shared responsibility for EL success.		
At our site (secondary), we have an ELD Department with equal status (budget, time, etc.) to other content departments.		
At our site (elementary), we have a designated EL Coordinator with responsibility for keeping an overall focus on ELs across our program and coordinating services for ELs.		

Shifts in District Practices that Foster an Aligned EL-Supportive System

This chart describes the shifts in district practices needed to foster an aligned continuous improvement model that is accountable for and responsible for English learners and other students. It is excerpted from: Santos, M. & Hopkins, J. (2019) *“Creating Schools and Systems that Support Asset-Based, High-Quality instruction for Multilingual Learners,”* Chapter 7, *Improving Education for Multilingual and English Learner Students: From Research to Practice*, California Department of Education: Sacramento.

From traditional practices that...	To systemic practices that...
Hold the EL Department responsible for English learner students.	Hold all educators and adults in the system responsible for English learners <i>and all other students</i> .
Have a focus on compliance as the high bar.	Have a focus on quality, excellence, and “doing the right thing” (with <i>compliance as the minimum bar</i>).
Are driven by an external accountability process.	Are driven by processes that build first individual internal accountability, then collective internal accountability, and finally move to external accountability.
Support beliefs that English learner students have problems, deficits, and require simplified education.	Assert that all English learner students <i>have strong assets</i> and can and must learn at grade level and beyond.
Use information as a hammer.	Use information as a <i>flashlight</i> .
Focus on getting English learners to English proficiency only.	Focus on getting English learners <i>college- and career-ready</i> .
Rely on English-only instructional programs.	Cultivate all <i>students’ multilingualism</i> through diverse language program pathways.
Have content, ELD, and bilingual teachers working in isolation from each other.	Ensure there are structures and processes in place to encourage and allow for content, ELD, and bilingual teachers to work together to plan and deliver high-quality instruction.
Offer subject matter professional development and ELD professional development separately.	Approach professional learning as a mutually beneficial community composed of content, ELD and bilingual teachers—recognizing that <i>language develops in and through content</i> .
Have a smorgasbord of initiatives approach to change.	Have adopted <i>coherent, powerful, aligned</i> models for change.



The new system has to be structured to end silos, fragmentation, and marginalization of ELs, AND it must ensure that EL expertise is infused throughout. This includes inviting EL expertise to the table, creating agendas where ELs are the focus, equalizing the status of EL work within the district and site, and building connective structures and tissue across the system for shared vision and responsibility for English learners.

SCHOOL SITE: Leadership's Role in Aligning Goals and Site Ownership/Identity

In effective schools, the sites craft their own goals, beliefs, and statements of identity that while aligned with district goals become important rallying cries, sources of identity, and have meaning that drives practice.

School leadership makes it explicit and clear that addressing the needs of ELs is a responsibility of the whole school and is key to the school's mission and vision. The alignment of direction/goals from "above" in the system with school site ownership is not always easy to accomplish. Bringing a state policy and a district vision, commitment, goal to the site level where it must be given life requires thoughtful leadership. It cannot be what "the district said," or "the state requires." Alignment is about agreement, alliance, and a "match." It implies an affinity of purpose and action. It is decidedly not about "we have to do this because they are making us."

Site leadership, then, needs to create a process through which a school site can build connection and meaning to those policies and goals "from above" even though the teachers and staff who are expected to give it life at the site weren't part of developing it. This can be a major task—but an essential one. It helps if the site leaders, site EL Coordinators, and the DELAC were invited into the district process of developing and adopting the goals and plans. But even where that may not be the case, the work at the school site begins with site leadership crafting a process where teachers, parents, and staff can be engaged in building meaning about the policy and goals (what they are, what they mean, where they came from, and why). Spending time considering what school needs, priorities, and visions for students would be and then connecting those to the district and state policies and goals is next. What seems right to us about the vision and policy? What do these state/district policies and goals mean for our students? What do we want for our students, and how is that reflected in the state/district vision? What else feels important for us to articulate about our own vision? In our school and for our students, what makes sense to us as a way to enact the district and state policy?

Though there are many approaches to supporting those dialogues, the Site Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is a vehicle that site leaders have found effective to articulate a site's goals and purposes; and work toward alignment with district and state goals. One elementary Principal described their process:

"Our SPSA was the place where we articulated how our school fit with the district's three goals, where we made our own meaning and tailored those goals to who we are, to our own "why." So we began in November, even though the SPSA wasn't due to be submitted until April. We took the time, and it was whole site engagement. We talked about the district goals. The goals were vague enough to give us room to operationalize them for ourselves. "Closing the achievement and opportunity gap," and the first thing we realized is that for us, at our school, we wanted to reverse that statement to "Closing the opportunity and achievement gaps" because we felt it was important to lead with addressing our own actions that shape students' opportunities to learn. And then we looked at our own data to define what those opportunity and achievement gaps were at our site. We took the district goal of "21st-century teaching and learning" and articulated our best understanding of what that meant to us for our students in relation to dual-language programs and cross-cultural competencies. The combination of the two goals ended up with our site priorities centering around our English learners and keeping the focus on equity, professional learning around best practices in dual language education, and committing to working collectively to continue examining our data and keeping the focus on closing opportunity gaps and implementing best instructional practices.

"Our SPSA enabled us to fund coach/facilitator positions, professional learning, collaboration time. So it made possible the concrete conditions enabling us to live our commitment to equity and centering our English learners. But the whole process created something else for us also. It began to build a culture at the school, a sense of pride and identity that who we are is a community of educators dedicated to social justice and to doing the work to keep focused on equity for our English learners. For too long, we had been seen in the district as the poor underachieving school with all of the English learners. We rewrote that narrative. We built our identity about our commitment to assets-oriented education, to best practices in dual language development, to closing opportunity gaps, to equity."



READING: On Being an Advocacy Oriented Leader

Ensuring meaningful access and high-quality instruction to English learners is an equity issue. As with all equity issues, with long histories of schooling in which students have been underserved or excluded, bringing about changes in beliefs, expectations, practices, and commitments requires advocacy-oriented leadership. This means setting expectations, speaking up and speaking out, focusing all stakeholders on English learners' diverse needs, assets, and rights, and leading changes to respond systemically to English learners.

In many districts and schools, English learners still are

considered the responsibility of the ELD teacher or the dual language program. To create districts and schools that embrace and support English learners well, the entire school community has to feel and enact ownership of the English learner students and proactively work toward eliminating the opportunity and achievement gap. The CA English Learner Roadmap clearly states that ELs are the responsibility of all educators. The CA ELD/ELA Framework clearly positions language development in and across all content areas. But realizing and enacting these policies requires strong advocacy-oriented leadership from district superintendents to site-based principals and teacher-leaders that make it clear that English learners are important and that all aspects of the school must be made accessible and inclusive to them.

Advocacy-oriented leadership at the district and site levels ensures that the school's structure works for English learners as well as other students—shaping the day, calendar, and schedule to meet the needs of the community. Advocacy-oriented leaders make certain they have the data to know whether and in which ways their program is effective for English Learners, and be prepared to defend that program. Advocacy-oriented school and district administrative systems effectively address issues of data, communication, accountability, and equity around aspirational goals and EL programs, and services so resources can be leveraged most powerfully.

Advocacy-oriented leadership realizes that to achieve the vision of EL student success requires the ongoing expansion of a community of supporters for that vision. A common unity must be developed among colleagues, friends, and allies. This involves providing leadership that models, inspires and facilitates relationship building, trust and mutual support. Finally, advocacy-oriented leadership involves both successes and struggles. It is important to engage in public ceremonies that acknowledge those successes, and focuses on who the students are, what they contribute, and what they have the potential to become. Through the celebratory process, new visions and possibilities are created that move schools from a deficit, behavioristic way of thinking, doing, and being, to a more asset-based and humanistic approach, which is what students and families need, want, and deserve.



Advocacy-oriented leadership is not easy. Effective leaders build around them the supports, connections, and allies to stand with them, to be thought-partners to think through the challenges of standing up to exclusionary forces, and to collectively serve as a voice for equity. Site principals speak of the need for support from their district to know that the district will have their back on positions that face resistance. For districts seeking to have the backs of advocacy-oriented leaders, these supports may look like:

- *Creating a network (or cohort group or PLC) of site leaders working in similar situations with dedicated collaboration time*
- *Provision of equity-oriented leadership coaches (not a “you’re in trouble” coach)*

Advocacy-oriented leaders also intentionally and strategically build allies within their school site, looking for and cultivating those within their school community who share the commitment to equity, social justice, and assets-based schooling. They seek out and invite those allies to be engaged on school committees, in school planning, and in roles in which those voices need to be heard. These leaders hire people who share the commitment to inclusion and who embrace diversity, and whose own life experiences bring understanding of the equity imperative to the table.

Advocacy-oriented leaders seek to articulate with purpose and urgency why they are making the choices they are making, and why they are focusing on equity and social justice. And to reach such clarity, they dedicate themselves to their own learning, to listening, to stretching their understanding of how exclusion, racism, linguisticism, and xenophobia are part of the structures and practices of schooling—and what it will take to undo those patterns.



REFLECTION: Wisdom on being an Advocacy-Oriented Leader

What would you add to the above description of advocacy-oriented leadership? What does it involve? What does it take? What have you learned about how to be an advocacy force for your English learners and their success?



To create districts and schools that embrace and support English learners well, the entire school community has to feel and enact ownership of the English learner students and proactively work toward eliminating the opportunity and achievement gap. Realizing and enacting these policies requires strong advocacy-oriented leadership that make it clear that English learners are important and that all aspects of the school must be made accessible and inclusive to them.

3

SECTION 3:

DATA, ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY



INTRODUCTION

Data can be a powerful tool to keep the needs of English learners visible and to help identify what works and what doesn't in supporting their achievement. It is essential to a process of effective and thoughtful continuous improvement. If we don't know how students are doing, we can't assess the efficacy of our programs, services, and approaches. If we don't know which students are thriving and which are falling behind, we can't know how to create a more equitable system or where and how to target our efforts. The capacity of educators to know how students are progressing is core to good instruction. And, good data can prompt the very dialogues that schools need to be having about goals, beliefs, and expectations for our students. In short, without data (good, reliable, valid, and timely) we are driving blind in our efforts to forge a schooling system that embraces and serves all students, preparing them for college and career and participation in a global, diverse world.

Living in this era where schools are expected to be engaged in continuous improvement processes and to produce data showing the impact of their work, it is imperative that school leaders be familiar with and proficient in defining what constitutes meaningful evidence of achievement and equity. They must become savvy at collecting the right data and using it well to drive and focus efforts to strengthen the education of all students.

For data to do all of that, however, it has to be good, valid, and meaningful. In our world of such diversity, it also has to be based upon culturally and linguistically appropriate assessments. Yet much of the data collected and placed in front of educators today are not sufficient to support analysis and interpretations about what English learners know and can do. Nor are the assessments adequate to the goals and visions of schooling in California as articulated by the English Learner Roadmap. The challenge facing school leaders, then, is to understand the various measures and assessments (what they do and don't measure) and how to make sense of them in terms of English learner achievement. And then leaders need to be able to build a climate, set routines, and facilitate

the engagement of staff in inquiry and planning—using data as a means for deepening understanding and as a spark for the essential dialogues that build common understanding, direction, and coherence. Having a system of valid and comprehensive assessment is not just about the processes of measuring and using data about student programs and achievement. We want a system that also creates an adult culture of professional responsibility and curiosity, and one that builds a set of practices within a school that engage educators in collaborative data-collection and reflection about their practices and their program.

Data and inquiry must become part of the life of a district and each school. Leaders need the skills and mechanisms infusing data into planning and refining approaches and have strategies for how to use data to improve practice, engage with others in examining school and program effectiveness, build consensus, and measure progress.

Leaders are only able to do so, however, if the assessments being used are valid and reliable. For English learners, this requires assessments in which lack of English proficiency is not a barrier to demonstrating what the student knows and can do. Assessment plays a powerful role in the education process in the United States and has a disproportionately negative impact on students who do not come from English-speaking, mainstream, middle-class backgrounds. Given the significance of testing in education today, linguistic and cultural validity in assessment is an urgent issue. The search for and use of appropriate and reliable assessments to support instruction for English learners require involvement at multiple levels of the system.

This section of the Toolkit will hopefully help you clear the path to these benefits—to develop the data that can answer your questions about how English learners are doing, facilitating multiple forms of data use for inquiry and action planning.



SECTION A: About English Learner Data

The notion of assessing how students are doing, analyzing that data to inform planning and improvement, and then monitoring whether those improvements are indeed making a difference seems pretty straightforward. But scratch below the surface even a little, and the complexities arise, particularly when considering English learner assessment and data. How can we assess what ELs know and can do? Are the assessments valid and reliable to tell us what we want to know? What are the questions to ask of the data, and what kind of analysis will yield the clearest picture of what is going well and what needs improvement? These can be complex issues for all students, but even more so when it comes to English learners.



READING: A Heads Up About EL Assessment and Data

The standard data used in state accountability and by most districts and schools in determining how their English learners are doing are:

- **The Smarter Balanced Summative assessments** of English Language Arts and Math are required for all students grades 3-8 and grade 11 (exception is for an English Language Arts assessment for English learners who are in their first 12 months attending school in the United States), with interim assessments that are optional. The test is administered in English. A series of testing supports and accommodations can be made available to English learners to address the challenges of being assessed in a language a student doesn't know - such as translated test directions and glossaries for select words in math test items. Accommodations available for individual students that can be arranged for by the school on the Math assessment include a "stacked" version with test questions and instructions presented in English first with Spanish translation below.
- The **California Science Test** (CAST) aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards, for all students in grades 5 and 8 and once in either grade 10, 11, or 12—administered in English. A stacked version is available for Spanish-speaking English learners (see description under the Math assessment above).
- The **ELPAC** (English Language Proficiency Assessment for California) that is administered initially upon enrollment for students whose primary language is not in English (per the Home Language Survey) to determine whether they are "English learners" and in need of services. The K-12 Summative assessment is administered annually for all identified English learners until they are redesignated as fluent English proficient. It measures and tracks progress toward proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing domains.
- The **California Spanish Assessment** (CSA) is an elective assessment test measuring Spanish reading and language arts skills in grades 3-8 and high school. The CSA is an optional assessment offered to students who have learned Spanish formally or informally, including, but not limited to, students who are receiving instruction in Spanish in California and in which the LEA/school is seeking a measure that recognizes their Spanish. The CSA provides a measure of a student's competency in Spanish Language Arts and student-level data in Spanish competency, and can be used to evaluate the implementation of SLA programs at the local level. The CSA also provides a high school measure suitable to be used, in part, for the State Seal of Biliteracy. For Spanish-speaking students in Grades 2–11 whose primary language is Spanish and who are receiving instruction in Spanish or who are recently arrived EL students whose primary language is Spanish, the CSA is an additional measure of language arts literacy but does not take the place of the Smarter Balanced English language arts (ELA)/literacy assessment. English learners may be exempted from the Smarter Balanced ELA test if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than 12 months. LEAs also may opt to allow their schools to use the CSA to test students who are enrolled in dual-language immersion programs that include Spanish regardless of their English fluency—whether they speak little or no English or English only—and regardless of the length of time they have been in school in the United States. The CSA

is not considered comparable to the English Language Arts assessment because it has not constructed a response-writing task, and only measures three levels of proficiency.

There are alternative assessments available for students with active IEPs that designate the need for an alternate assessment. In addition, a variety of reading and writing assessments and curriculum embedded assessments are typically used in districts, along with district-developed benchmark assessments.

The commitment to assess and monitor progress, equity, achievement, and participation of English learners is written into law. The requirement of valid and reliable assessments is also part of both federal and state policy. And certainly, school leaders committed to continuous improvement and to providing the strongest possible educational experiences for their English learner students know they need to have and be able to use data to guide their decision-making. So what are the complications?

The first challenge of using the major assessments to determine how well students are doing is the issue of the validity and reliability of the assessments when given to English learners—commonly referred to as the extent to which a test measures what it claims to measure. For ELs, it is critical to consider the degree to which interpretations of their test scores are valid reflections of the actual skill or proficiency that the assessment is intended to measure. Knowledge and mastery of content are NOT adequately measured for ELs by tests administered in English—the language they have not yet mastered. Because almost all assessments measure language proficiency to some degree, ELs often receive lower scores on content area assessments administered in English than they would if they took the same tests in a language in which they were proficient. For example, an EL who has the mathematical skills needed to solve a word problem may fail to understand the task because of limited English proficiency even though they might fully understand the mathematical thinking and processes involved. In this case, the assessment is testing not only mathematical ability but also English proficiency. If the construct of interest is mathematical skill exclusive of language skills, then it is inaccurate to base inferences about the academic content knowledge or skills of this student and other ELs on the scores of tests administered in English. Accommodations (such as the staked version of tests available for Spanish-speaking English learners) mediate this problem somewhat. But because they are voluntary—and decisions are made at the school site for individual students if the site is aware of and chooses to use accommodations—the reality is that the vast majority of English learners are assessed only in English. Analyzing EL data by English proficiency levels and by the number of years in the U.S. school system provides essential context for understanding the validity of EL data. Additional forms of assessment such as performance task assessments and use of assessments in the primary language, etc., are among the tools that can provide a more accurate look at what English learners know and can do.

Cultural validity is also an issue. Due to their limited English proficiency and diverse cultural experiences, EL students' performance should be evaluated cautiously when using traditional assessments created for their English-speaking and U.S.-born peers. Assessment and other evaluation materials should, of course, not be racially or culturally discriminatory. And they need to be written in ways that don't rely upon or privilege students who are culturally familiar with references that immigrant and English learner students from other parts of the globe and from diverse experiences won't recognize. These are issues in the writing of assessments, and also the screening of those assessments for applicability to specific populations of students. The creation of the assessment is not a task for school leaders per se, but looking for and asking about whether the assessments you are considering have been normed for English learners is essential before adopting its use.



The notion of assessing how students are doing, analyzing that data to inform planning and improvement, and then monitoring whether those improvements are indeed making a difference seems pretty straightforward. But scratch below the surface even a little, and the complexities arise, particularly when considering English learner assessment and data. Knowledge and mastery of content are NOT adequately measured for ELs by tests administered in English—the language they have not yet mastered.



TOOL: Reflecting on Our EL Data Needs

On your own or with a team, reflect on the questions below. They are designed to spark reflection and dialogue about the kind of data you want and need and help to define your “data agenda.”

Needed Data

- 1. Can you answer to your satisfaction how your English learners are doing, and whether they are achieving to high standards? If not, what information and data would you need in order to tell you how they are doing?*
- 2. When you look at English learner data, are you able to (and do you) disaggregate that data to look at specific typologies/subgroups of English learners? (e.g., LTELs, newcomers, by language group, by English proficiency level). If not, which subgroups of English learners would you like to be able to look at separately from a general overall “English learner” category?*
- 3. Do you “know” or believe that your program and supports for English learners are effective but don’t have the data that could defend it adequately? If so, think about the kind of impacts you are having and what kind of data might be useful to collect that would provide evidence of the impact.*

Data Practices That Might Need Improvement

- 1. Does your school (or district) collect data about English learner achievement, access, and participation and then no one uses it? If so, where does “data use” break down? (Is it because the data are not in a form that people can understand? Or perhaps people don’t know how to interpret it. Or maybe they don’t think the information is valid, etc.)*
- 2. In your district or school, is EL student achievement and participation data being used in a way that finger points or blames, and doesn’t support an inquiry or change process? If so, what behaviors and approaches need to change in order for data to be a more positive force?*
- 3. In your school or district, is data used in ways that support individual teachers’ improvement and the change process of the school as a whole? If so, how is it supportive? How might it be more so? If not, what would need to be in place to make it happen?*

Key Questions to Investigate

- 1. Can you answer to your satisfaction whether your programs for ELs are effective or whether some groups of students are not being served as well as others in those programs? If not, what are the questions you have that you seek data to help you answer?*
- 2. Are you in situations where the data used to evaluate you and your school isn’t data that you trust or feel is valid and reliable? If so, what data do you question? Why?*
- 3. Based on this reflection, identify and list those important areas you want to work on to improve the schools’ capacity to use data productively to serve English learners better.*




READING: Ways To Analyze English Learner Data Answering Different Questions

There are many ways to look at achievement and participation data to answer how English learners are doing and whether changes may be needed in programs and services. The first step is getting clear on the question you are really asking. The questions will imply different kinds of analysis. Explanations of some of the major questions and types of analyses are offered in this reading. For a complete EL “audit” or a comprehensive look at your school, you might want to do all of these types of analyses annually.


Proportionality/Representation: Are English Learners achieving in the proportion expected?

This perspective assumes that equity is achieved when any subgroup is reflected in any achievement or participation category in proportion to their representation in the overall enrollment. For example, if English learners are 36% of the student population in a school, they should be 36% of the students who are suspended, 36% of students in honors classes, etc. If in that same school, English learners are only 10% of the students in honors classes, they would be “under-represented.” If there were 80% of those who are suspended, they would be “overrepresented” in that category. This kind of equity analysis helps determine if there are biases in the system or specific barriers that exist related to that subgroup.



“Progress over time.” Are things getting better?

Another common measure is progress over time. Is a group doing better now than in the past? Does its progress mirror that of other groups? If we look at the progress of Spanish-speaking English learners over time in a certain school we might conclude that they are doing better now than ten years ago. One could say, “We are doing well. We are performing at more equitable levels because there has been a 118% increase in the college-prepared rate of our Spanish-speaking English learners over the past decade.”




Student Growth over time: Are ELs progressing normatively toward English proficiency?

For English learners, it normatively can take 5—7 years to gain academic proficiency in English and to be reclassified. It is important to know whether students are progressing normatively through the levels of English toward proficiency as a function of how long they have been learning English. Over the past year, have they progressed one level? Have they plateaued at a level? Have they fallen behind a level? A school can look at their English learner population and do an analysis that would show how many students have progressed a level since the prior year’s assessment. Overall, two-thirds of their English learners have progressed a level since the prior year—fewer in the fourth grade, which might trigger a deeper inquiry.

	#/% Grew 1 or more levels	#/% Stayed same level	#/% Fell 1 or more levels
First grade (EL n = 32)	(26) 81%	(6) 19%	
Second grade (EL n = 34)	(18) 53%	(12) 35%	(4) 12%
Third grade (EL n = 26)	(20) 77%	(5) 19%	(1) 4%
Fourth grade (EL n = 18)	(8) 44%	(8) 44%	(2) 12%
Fifth grade (EL n = 14)	(10) 71%	(2) 14%	(2) 14%
Overall (EL n = 124)	(82) 68%	(33) 27%	(9) 7%

Size of Gaps: Are ELs catching up to native English speakers in English proficiency?


Yet another measure of progress in serving English learners is whether or not they are catching up with their English-speaking peers. Are we closing the gap? The “goal” for English learners is to achieve English proficiency at a level close to the “norm” for English native speakers at their grade and age level. However, active English speakers develop more and more sophisticated and complex levels of English each year. They are, in other words, moving targets. For English learner students to catch up, they must make more than one year’s progress in school in one year’s time because their English only peers are also progressing in their English development, as the following chart illustrates. It may be that all students are progressing (Yay!) and that English learners are progressing at the same rates as their English fluent peers (which from a strictly “equity” perspective could be viewed as good news), *but the gap is still not closing*. Attention to the size of the gap over time is crucial, as is attention to the need for accelerated learning for EL students who have to make greater progress to close the gap.



Comparison to other locales: How is our school doing compared to others?

Comparing two schools within a district; or one county's schools to state or national averages yields yet another view of equity. For example, 33.8% of one county's high school students complete the college A-G requirements, compared to a state average of 32.3%. This county could take pride in exceeding the state average. However, the comparison approach does not tell whether that state average is acceptable—merely how one locale compares to an overall average. Further these kinds of comparisons tell nothing about

comparability of context. The enrollment in one school or district may include a large influx of newly arrived immigrants with little or no English. So it would make sense that their EL population would appear to be doing less well than a school or district across the state where the EL population is mostly students that started with some English proficiency and have been in the schools since Kindergarten. "Similar school rankings" help to some extent—and investigating comparability of populations is useful if those rankings are not available.



Meeting high standards: Are English Learners mastering standards?

Much of the data analysis (especially for accountability purposes) relies on the number and percentage of English learners who met or exceeded standards in Math and English Language Arts on the annual state assessment (Smarter Balanced Test Results). It is an important metric because one purpose of state academic standards is to ensure that students throughout the state are receiving the same basic education. The annual assessment is designed to measure mastery of those standards. However, the tests are given in English—a language that (by definition) English learners have not yet mastered. Therefore, the average achievement of current ELs will typically be lower than for English fluent students and other EL groupings such as RFEPs and Ever ELs because it includes only students who have not yet internalized English. Even on a well-designed assessment with linguistic supports, some of these students (particularly those who are true beginners) may, at times, struggle to understand test content and show what they know and can do in English. (Translated test forms typically do not solve this problem unless the students also have been instructed and had the opportunity to learn academic language and content in their home language).


Current EL students' performance also may reflect these students' opportunities to learn in English: they may have a harder time accessing instruction delivered in English or may even receive less rigorous coursework based on the mistaken belief that they cannot handle grade-level content until after they have learned English. Some newly arrived EL students also may have experienced interruptions to their education before entering U.S. schools. As a result of these types of factors, it is not atypical for current ELs to exhibit lower achievement than their English-only peers. Therefore, conclusions about efficacy of programs or meaningful progress and success of English learners cannot be answered sufficiently based upon these assessments.

Some stakeholders look at the performance trends of scores on the CAASP/Smarter Balanced assessments for ELs. However, this performance trend report is not appropriate for judging whether the achievement of the EL

subgroup is changing over time. Each year, new students enter the EL subgroup who are just beginning to learn English. Also, each year, students with very high levels of English proficiency are reclassified out of the group. Because of this constant cycling, the average achievement of the EL subgroup tends to stay the same over time. In fact, the more students are reclassified (a potentially positive outcome), the lower the average achievement score will be for the students who remain. As a result, these graphics should not be used to draw conclusions about trends in EL achievement over time. This performance trend report may be useful for determining whether ELs are being prepared to meet grade-level achievement standards. However, it is important to keep in mind that gaps between current ELs and EOs reflect both the composition of the current EL population—which changes from year to year—and the rigor and quality of the instruction that EL and EO students receive. It can be difficult to disentangle these factors to interpret achievement, particularly when looking across time. For this reason, it is strongly recommended that this performance trend not be used as the sole basis for drawing conclusions about EL achievement within the state. At the site level, performance tasks and curriculum embedded assessments that have been differentiated by English proficiency level are the better measures of standards mastery.

Reaching and maintaining achievement on a par with English-proficient students—Are our impacts holding over time?

Whether English learners have in fact overcome the language barrier to educational access is based on whether they reach and *maintain* achievement on a par with English-proficient students. For example, reclassifying standards at a third grade would only mean that English learners have sufficient English to function on a par with English fluent students at that grade. It would not be sufficient enough to know whether the students' literacy base in English is strong enough to maintain the same level as English fluent students as the academic requirements become more complex over time. Long-term data on English learners have demonstrated that many students (particularly those who do not develop a strong primary language literacy and were reclassified early—in first or second grade) progress to a certain level academically and then fall behind as they reach upper elementary school years and secondary school. This is why schools are required to continue to monitor English learners for four years after reclassification. The graph to the right illustrates this point.




Furthermore, this long view “over time” provides important perspective across the system. It is important for elementary school educators to see what happens to their English learner students as they move on to the upper grades and for secondary school educators to see the patterns of their students from elementary school. A concern with “maintaining” gains would require data that tracks students across grade levels and continues after they become reclassified as RFEP. For LEAs, this means constructing a database that stores historical information and continuously tracks students across the full PK-12 spectrum.

**Impact of Improvements over time—
Are our improvement efforts actually
improving outcomes?**

In many schools and districts, investments have been made in professional development, new curriculum, new technologies and interventions as part of efforts to strengthen schooling for English learners. In order to get a picture of whether these improvements are making a difference, it's important to look at a program's impact over time. For example, to tell whether the break-down of a large comprehensive high school into "houses" or "academies" makes a difference in helping 9th grade English learners, we might look at grades (rates of Ds and Fs) of English learners

for the year prior to the change, and continue to look at 9th grade results for the next several years after the change. If the program is indeed becoming stronger, we would see improvements in 9th grade results over time.



Biliteracy Trajectory— How are students faring in each language and on a trajectory toward biliteracy?

Dual language/bilingual programs have goals of developing proficiency in two languages (biliteracy), and of accruing to students the benefits of being bilingual. Students in these programs are engaged in academic study in and through both languages. Knowing whether students are mastering academic content and whether they are developing biliteracy requires assessing in both languages and looking at "achievement" as a product of what students can do across the two languages. Obviously, this means assessing in two languages, but it also means defining expectations for growth in each one and having a way to look at the development of the two languages side by side to examine measurable progressions over time toward the goal of biliteracy using comparable assessments in both languages.

Type of analysis/Question being asked	Do we analyze and look at data to answer these questions?	If not currently a practice, is this a priority to begin asking?
Proportionality/Representation: Are English Learners achieving in the proportion expected?		
Progress over time: Are student outcomes improving?		
Growth over time: Are ELs progressing normatively?		
Size of gaps: Are we shrinking the opportunity and achievement gap?		
Comparison to other locales: how are we doing compared to others?		
Meeting high standards: Are ELs mastering the standards?		
Reaching and maintaining progress: Are the improvement holding?		
Impact of Improvements/Reforms: Are the things we are implementing to strengthen programs/services actually resulting in better outcomes?		
Dual language: Are English learners becoming biliterate? What are outcomes in each and in both languages?		



READING: Monitoring Progress and Measuring Impacts Aligned to the Vision, Goals and Principles

Systems should measure what they value—to know whether the investments and efforts are paying off in delivering on their goals and vision. This requires assessments aligned to the goals and vision for student outcomes (state, local, site), and defining measurable indicators of impact. This alignment is key to creating a coherent and effective system of continuous improvement. At each juncture (moving from a goal to selecting the appropriate assessment, from the assessment to defining the metrics and indicators), care has to be paid to building coherence and to addressing both validity and appropriateness for English learners. Using the **SMARTIE goals framework** with some adaptation, goals and their indicators should be:

SPECIFIC. This includes being specific about which students and which aspects of their education is being addressed—as well as who in the system is expected to act, and in which realm of schooling. For example, is it all English learners? Is it specific to Long-Term English Learners? Is it specific to students in the dual language program? Is it particularly focusing on math outcomes? Is it specific to feeling welcome and safe on campus? Is this classroom teachers or counselors or front office staff whose actions are being addressed? Who and what is this indicator speaking to? And whose actions are expected in order to achieve the goal?

MEASURABLE. Some skills and competencies have standardized assessments that directly measure attainment and mastery. In those cases, attention to the validity for English learners is important (see discussion on page 36). Other aspirational goals may not be easily operationalized or have standard assessments directly link to measuring them, such as “preparation for civic engagement in a diverse global world.” In these cases, dialogue and planning for how to determine whether students are attaining those competencies is important. Performance tasks, qualitative measures can be developed. Does each goal refer to a measurable outcome? Does it set a standard that will allow the team to know whether or not the goal has been met?

ATTAINABLE AND AMBITIOUS, RIGOROUS AND REALISTIC, TIMEBOUND BUT MEANINGFUL.

The goal being measured has to be realistic and doable, with a meaningful and appropriate time frame. However, it has to be sufficiently aspirational as to push and move the system with some sense of urgency. For example, a goal related to closing the opportunity gap cannot define the time period and increment of change expected at such a minimal level that it would take fifty years to close a gap. Does the goal seem reachable given where things are now? At the same time, is it challenging enough that success would mean significant progress for the school? Has a timeframe been established for achieving the goal? Have shorter term benchmarks been set so progress can be monitored along the way?

RELEVANT. Effective goals focus on things that really matter, and that are relevant to actualizing the vision and goals for education and students. Will attaining this goal make a difference in the quality of students’ lives? Is the goal aligned with other school improvement goals?

INCLUSIVE AND EQUITY-BASED. Some goals don’t—at face value—specifically promote equity and inclusion, so it is important to specify how this goal addresses issues of gaps, mitigating disparate impact or advancing equity and inclusion. Similarly, an assets-oriented lens can help articulate goals and measures through the specific focus on leveraging, protecting and celebrating the cultural and linguistic assets students bring. The goal and its measures should be designed to prepare for equity-oriented analyses (e.g., does it enable comparison of groups, does it allow for longitudinal historical analysis that would get at improvements over time?)

A tight connection between broad outcome goals, EL specific objectives, and specific meaningful and measurable indicators is key to an accountability system. An example of these connections is borrowed from Oakland Unified School District's LCAP goals:

GOAL 1: GRADUATES ARE COLLEGE AND CAREER READY

- Increase the percent of ELs who graduate in four years from 57% to 70%.
- Double the number of Seals of Biliteracy earned from 81 to 160.
- Strengthen newcomer persistence; year-to-year return rate for newcomers in secondary newcomer programs will increase from 84% to 90%.
- Increase percent of ELs who complete A-G requirements at the time of graduation from 28% to 50%

GOAL 2: STUDENTS ARE PROFICIENT IN STATE ACADEMIC STANDARDS

- Move from Red to Yellow on California Dashboard in ELA for ELL subgroup.
- Move from Orange to Green on California Dashboard in Math for ELL subgroup.

GOAL 3: STUDENTS ARE READING AT OR ABOVE GRADE LEVEL

- Increase percent of ELs showing one or more years of SRI growth from 45% to 65%.
- Decrease percent of Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students reading multiple years below grade level from 31% to 20%.

GOAL 4: ELLS ARE REACHING LANGUAGE FLUENCY

- Increase overall EL reclassification rates from 15% to 16% and LTEL reclassification rates from 14% to 20%.
- Increase percent of ELLs making at least one level of growth in ELPAC proficiency levels to 50%.

GOAL 5: STUDENTS ARE ENGAGED IN SCHOOL EVERY DAY

- Increase percent of positive responses on the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) indicating school connectedness by students with a home language other than English from 58% to 65%.
- Decrease average chronic absence rate of newcomer students in secondary newcomer programs from 16% to 10%.

GOAL 6: PARENTS & FAMILIES ARE ENGAGED IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

- Increase percent of parents who strongly agree or agree that school is welcoming, inclusive, and empowering on CHKS survey from 88% to 95%. Statements:
 - This school encourages me to be an active partner with the school in educating my child.
 - This school encourages me to participate in organized parent groups (councils, committees, parent organizations, etc.).
 - My child's background (race, ethnicity, religion, economic status) is valued at this school.



ACTIVITY

Consider a goal you have for your English learner students. Working with a partner, write a goal statement with indicators that meet the criteria and guidelines of the SMARTIE approach outlined above.

OR

Look at the most recent LCAP for your district or SPSA for your site. Select one of the goals and indicators, and examine it through the lens of the SMARTIE guidelines. How could it be strengthened as a goal for English learners?



Living in this era where schools are expected to be engaged in continuous improvement processes and to produce data showing the impact of their work, it is imperative that school leaders be familiar with and proficient in defining what constitutes meaningful evidence of achievement and equity.

LAUSD MEASURING PROGRESS TOWARD ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

Los Angeles Unified School District monitors English learners progress toward English proficiency using two indicators:

- Number of ELs who make progress from year to year on standardized tests of English proficiency (ELPAC)
- Number of ELs who make progress from year to year on tests of English academic achievement

The district has created a chart of minimum progress that lays out by the number of years an EL has been in the program the expected results on various assessments—making it possible to monitor whether progress from year to year is normative and to look across assessments. The chart is below.

MINIMUM PROGRESS EXPECTATIONS FOR ELS						
Years in program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (ALL ELS)						
ELPAC Overall level	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Min./Max.	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.	Min/Max
ELD Standard-based assessment	Enter Emerging	Exit Emerging	Enter Expanding	Exit Expanding	Enter Bridging	Exit Bridging
ENGLISH ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (ALL ELS)						
Dibels composite K-5	WBB— Well below benchmark	BB— Below benchmark	BB— Below benchmark	B – Benchmark	B – Benchmark	Benchmark / Above Benchmark
Reading Inventory 6-12	BB Below Basic	BB Below Basic	BB Below Basic	B Basic	B Basic/ P Proficient	P Proficient
Smarter Balanced	Standard not met	Standard not met	Standard not met	Standard nearly met	Standard met	Standard met/ Exceeded
Assessments—ELA						

By articulating a minimum progress expectation and aligning these with the number of years an English learner has been in the program, educators are able to see whether students are progressing as needed. This is essential to avoid, for example, misinterpreting an assessment result of “standard not met” or “Below Benchmark” as an academic problem of underachievement for English learners who have only been in the program for a few years or less. In a school with many newcomers, the assessment report that 70% have not met standards in ELA should not be interpreted as a major achievement problem—as long as they are progressing each year in levels on the ELPAC. In a school where most of the English learners have been in the program for five or more years, that same data (70% not meeting standards in ELA) would clearly be an indication of an achievement problem.



RESOURCE: The Data System We Need

The processes of collecting data, organizing and housing the data, creating reports and analyses of data, and feeding data-based inquiry and planning are all components of the data SYSTEM in any district. The most effective data systems are designed to support meaningful inquiry and continuous improvement as well as progress monitoring and are able to facilitate the kind of analyses needed to gain a strong picture of English learner experience and achievement.

First, such a system is *adequately staffed* to administer assessments in a timely and linguistically accessible way. It is staffed with people who understand the assessments and what they measure and are experienced in creating data analyses and reports that respond to the questions and priorities of the district and sites.

Second, the system incorporates *multiple data sources* and uses *valid and reliable assessments* for the populations and purposes needed. The data collected and stored (and available for analysis) is a mix of demographic data, enrollment and participation information, and achievement data that enables assembling the strongest profiles of English learner experience and achievement in school. A *regular calendar of data reports* and communications are established to inform key decision-making for sites and the district office in a timely manner. Data reports are communicated in clear accessible language to educators and community. Training and support are made available to enable educators to understand the data.

In addition, these data systems have clean and up-to-date data, support issuing routine reports in a timely manner, respond to inquiries for deeper analysis (also in a timely manner), and maintain historical data allowing for longitudinal analyses and comparisons over time.



Data to be collected and available for analyses

Demographic/Background Data

- *Language(s) spoken*
- *Free and reduced lunch participation*
- *Age*
- *Entry date to US schools*
- *DLL/EL student subgroup category/typology (newcomer, SLIFE, LTEL)*
- *Disability classification (if applicable)*

Enrollment and Participation Data

- *Preschool and Pre-k enrollment*
- *Attendance rate, by grade*
- *Initial ELPAC*
- *Participation in Designated and Integrated ELD*
- *Participation in special education*
- *Participation in gifted and talented programs*
- *Enrollment in Bilingual, dual language, heritage language programs*
- *A-G enrollment and attainment rates*
- *Career and technical education enrollment*
- *AP course enrollment and completion*
- *Participation in extended learning opportunities for ELs (e.g., Summer ELD Institutes)*
- *Participation in specialized EL programs (e.g., newcomer program, LTEL courses)*
- *Disciplinary referrals, suspensions, expulsions*
- *Referrals to reading and math interventions*

Additional Input Data

- *Educator qualifications and training to serve ELs*

Outcome Data

- *ELPAC scores and growth year to year*
- *English language proficiency progress monitoring*
- *ELA and math assessment results*
- *Academic achievement assessments in languages other than English*
- *Proficiency levels and growth in languages other than English*
- *Grades (Ds and F rates)*
- *Credits accumulated toward graduation*
- *Graduation rates*
- *A-G completion*
- *Local district benchmark data*
- *Seal of Biliteracy awards and pathways awards*



There are many ways to look at achievement and participation data to answer how English learners are doing and whether changes may be needed in programs and services. The first step is getting clear on the question you are really asking.



TOOL: Are These True of Your District Data Management System?

Characteristics of an effective EL Data Management SYSTEM	Check "yes"	What's missing
Collects and stores a comprehensive set of demographic and background data on EL students (see list above, including typologies).		
Collects and stores a comprehensive set of enrollment and participation data on EL students (see list above).		
Assesses and stores comprehensive outcome data on EL students (see list above).		
Data across demographic characteristics, enrollment and participation, and outcome can be cross-analyzed.		
Data in the system are "clean."		
Data in the system are up to date.		
Data are available, retrievable, and analyzable in a timely fashion.		
Historical data is maintained in the system to support longitudinal analyses and comparisons over time.		
System allows for inquiries and is responsive to inquiries.		
A regular calendar of relevant data reports is provided to decision-makers at the district and site levels focusing on ELs.		
A regular calendar of relevant data reports aligned to community/school/district/state goals for ELs is prepared in a clear, non-technical accessible format for parents and community and other non-educator stakeholders.		
The data management system is adequately staffed to support accuracy, timeliness, responsiveness.		
Training, support, and technical assistance is made available to enable educators to understand EL data, to build capacity in making inquiries and interpreting results of the system.		

SECTION B: Using Data Well

Understanding English learner data, and having the right data are necessary components of effective continuous improvement efforts – but knowing how to use the data is the key. The role of school leaders is to create a culture, routines and habits and authentic purposes for engaging a school community collectively in looking at and talking about data linked to strengthening student experiences and outcomes. This means linking data to goals, investing in time for data dialogue, and developing skills for data analysis.

Data, Assessment and Accountability: The Hallmarks of Strong Local Accountability

The CA EL Roadmap is a state policy meant to guide and ensure that English learners are provided the education they need—and have a right to—under equal educational opportunity protections. Schools have an obligation to provide that education and to hold themselves accountable for doing so. Under California’s local control approach, the responsibility for setting goals, monitoring progress toward goals, and allocating resources in alignment with attaining those goals is squarely on the school district (LEA). The following chart lists key hallmarks of a strong, equity-focused accountability system for English learners, with description and room for your own reflections about whether and the degree to which your local system exhibits those hallmarks.

Hallmark	Reflection
We have set high expectations and aspirational goals for EL progress.	
We focus on closing opportunity and academic gaps between ELs and no ELs. <i>This includes comparative analyses between ELs and EOs, and setting accelerated differentiated growth expectations for ELs in the LCAPs and SPSA’s that commit all educators to catching ELs up to their English-fluent peers.</i>	
We articulate and set clear goals for the development of English proficiency, and define benchmarks along the pathway toward proficiency. <i>This includes defining normative expectations of progress by years, and incorporating EL elements in the data such as tracking the length of time ELs have been in the system. It also requires assessing and monitoring progress against those expectations.</i>	
We articulate and set clear goals for the development of biliteracy for students in DL programs, and define benchmarks along a biliteracy trajectory. <i>This includes defining normative expectations of progress along a biliteracy trajectory by years in the program AND by primary language, and using comparable assessments in both the target language and English.</i>	
Our EL goals and what we measure aligns to the assets-based vision and 21st-century education goals for EL achievement as articulated in the CA EL Roadmap—including its priority on developing students’ dual language proficiency. <i>We focus on ensuring implementation of the EL Roadmap.</i>	
Our goals, data entry and analyses identify and focus on subcategories of ELs. <i>This includes transparency about which ELs are included in definitions for calculating and analyzing specific indicators (e.g., newcomers, LTEL, SLIFE, ELs with disabilities), and articulating specific goals for these subcategories.</i>	

Hallmark	Reflection
<p>We utilize meaningful and reliable assessments that reflect what ELs know and can do.</p> <p><i>This means assessments that are valid and reliable and normed for English learners, are culturally and linguistically accessible, are free of bias, are administered using appropriate accommodations for ELs, and match the language of instruction.</i></p>	
<p>We monitor access and opportunity by tracking the inputs in the education of ELs.</p> <p><i>This includes placement in specific language acquisition program options, instructional minutes, access to digital and other materials, access to the full curriculum, provision of D and IELD, and appropriate staffing of programs.</i></p>	
<p>We focus on EL growth, with clear tracking of starting points, and articulation of growth expectations by year</p>	
<p>Our system addresses goals of biliteracy by incorporating assessments that track biliteracy progress.</p>	
<p>We look for and shine a spotlight on successes and promising practices within our schools that result in progress toward our goals for ELs.</p> <p><i>This includes disaggregating EL data by program and interventions to identify successful models. High levels of progress, participation and achievement of ELs trigger identification of successful practices.</i></p>	
<p>We look for and highlight areas needing improvement, and support learning and inquiry enabling schools to form hypotheses about why they have obtained certain results, and to inform further actions such as program planning and resource allocation.</p> <p><i>This fosters continuous improvement and encourages open conversations about the need for improvement, acknowledging low achievement instead of hiding it. It keeps urgency when goals for ELs are not met and identifies schools not meeting ambitious goals so support can be targeted.</i></p>	
<p>We build the capacity of educators to understand and use assessments and data meaningfully for inquiry, planning and to inform instruction, by providing training, time and support</p>	
<p>The thrust of our data collection and analysis is to build understanding, inform planning, drive continuous improvement, and trigger action (including allocation of funds and resources)</p>	
<p>Decision making includes a process of asking questions about the specific impacts of programs and services and policies on ELs.</p>	
<p>We engage in reviews and equity audits with input from diverse stakeholders—and where possible with the support of an external partner—in order to step back, look, and reflect on our overall system and practices for EL education.</p>	
<p>Educators across the system effectively analyze EL data (multiple measures, quantitative and qualitative) to make informed programmatic and instructional decisions.</p>	

(This set of indicators is derived from the Californians Together Accountability Framework, 2020)

OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT'S ELL REVIEW PROCESS

Oakland Unified School District engages in an ELL Review process to gather evidence of practice in order to inform sites of their progress toward providing English learners the academic skills and tools to meet the academic demands of the:

- *Common Core State Standards (CCSS)*
- *Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)*
- *California ELD Standards*
- *California ELA/ELD Framework*

The ELL Review is grounded in the district's Five Essential Practices summarizing their theory of change to ensure English Language Learners are on track to graduate college, career, and community ready. (*see the Five Essential Practices on page 15 of this Toolkit*). These essential practices are designed to both guide and hold accountable all OUSD educators to take collective responsibility for the academic, linguistic, and socio-emotional needs of our ELLs.

The reviews are conducted at the beginning and end of the school year, and focus on the use of complex, academic language to articulate thinking and reasoning in speaking and writing in subject-specific ways. Data from the initial ELL Review provides sites the opportunity to begin to collaboratively design a plan addressing site-selected focal indicators for the year. For example, it might be "ELLs will meaningful engage in grade-level texts and tasks with the support of language scaffolds and support", or "Teachers will make grade-level and complex content comprehensible by amplifying rather than simplifying texts and tasks," or "Academic language related to the task and objective will be explicitly named, taught, rehearsed, and reinforced." Or "The site will have clear structures, expectations and support for daily Designated ELD." The review then seeks evidence of these focal indicators through a combination of data collection mechanisms, including self-assessment tools, classroom observation tools linked to the Focal indicators, a teacher survey, student survey, parent focus groups, and principal interviews.

Engaging the School Site in Data Practices

Annual assessments and district benchmarks are essential markers of student outcomes, but the opportunity and need to engage educators at the school site in data about current students and current practices requires efforts at the school site to focus collectively on assessments of learning. Engaging school faculty in focusing on and becoming practiced at using data can powerfully illuminate what's working and what needs work, can spark productive dialogues and sharing about practice, and help shape a sense of schoolwide direction. An example from one elementary school demonstrates how this can work.

At McNeil Elementary school, before the start of the year, the faculty meet together to select three anchor standards (one in reading, one in writing, one in math). Grade-level teams focus on determining or designing specific assessments, performance tasks or rubrics they will use to assess student progress on those standards, and decide upon a timeline for when and how they will be administered. Using examples from the prior year, the team works to calibrate their scoring. This gives them a shared system of assessing learning on a few key anchor standards that they have decided are key. The results are shared on report cards. The district office provides a data person who pulls data from the report cards and sorts and analyzes the data into accessible formats displaying both grade-level and school level trends. Work sessions (in grade-levels, and cross-grades) look for patterns in the data, explore hypotheses about what explains those patterns, and sets up inquiries that are followed up in collaboration time sessions over the next few months in which student work is examined together, and teachers share strategies. This creates a shared focus in instruction, ownership of the data process, and a culture of collective inquiry and learning.



TOOL: How Prepared is Our School to Use EL Data to Inform and Improve Practice in a Continuous Improvement Cycle?

	Check "yes"	To some degree	Rarely or not happening	Comments
As a school leader, I feel confident in my understanding of EL data.				
Our district provides data to the site in accessible formats, in a timely manner, and in formats that enable various forms of inquiry and data-based planning at the site.				
It is easy for teachers and staff to obtain ELPAC levels for individual EL students (e.g., appears on class rosters, etc.)				
Teachers understand the meaning of ELPAC levels and the implications of those levels for planning instruction and providing supports.				
Pertinent EL typology designations appear on class rosters.				
Teachers and counselors understand the meaning of and implications of EL typologies for placement, instruction, and services.				
Teachers consistently plan instruction and support for ELs based on English proficiency level and formative assessments of language needs.				
Grade-levels, department groups and the whole school look at growth and progress toward English proficiency as part of a regular planning cycle.				
All student achievement data can be disaggregated and analyzed by EL typology, English proficiency level, and program placement.				
Regular, formal mechanisms and forums exist through which staff collaboratively reflect on student work and EL data.				
The general culture of the school welcomes data as a tool for increased understanding, inquiry, and planning—as an adult learning community committed to improving the education of ELs.				
Grade-level teams and/or departments work together on developing common performance tasks and formative assessments linked to the curriculum and differentiated for EL students at different English proficiency levels.				
Teachers, counselors, and administrators are aware of allowable and appropriate accommodations for testing English learners — and the school provides for those accommodations.				

	Check "yes"	To some degree	Rarely or not happening	Comments
We engage in multiple kinds of data analyses, asking multiple types of questions about EL progress, participation, and achievement to get a comprehensive picture of our effectiveness.				
Placement decisions and high-stakes decisions are based upon multiple measures and methods and triangulated data. ELs are placed in courses based on multiple factors—including ELPAC, SRI, years in US schools, and ELL subgroup (newcomer, at-risk, progressing, long-term ELL).				
We communicate regularly with the ELAC and the EL parent community in linguistically accessible formats, sharing data about EL access, progress, and achievement.				
We have established clear entrance and exit criteria for ELD, newcomer or intervention courses and use data to make ongoing, flexible placement decisions.				
We engage in regular monitoring routines (like learning walks, EL shadowing, instructional rounds) that use common and aligned protocols and processes to reflect on our EL programs and practices.				
We partner with Resource Specialists and psychologists with bilingual and bicultural skills to ensure timely and accurate identification of students with disabilities.				
We monitor the progress of ELs and recently reclassified students (within the last four years) to ensure they are on-track for graduation, college, and career readiness—and to trigger targeted support and intervention as appropriate.				

NOTES:



RESOURCE: Common Scenarios Indicating Need for Stronger Data Practices

Situation	Things to Consider
<p>Your teachers can't identify for you which of their students are English learners.</p>	<p>If teachers cannot identify their EL students, it is likely they are not addressing the language needs or providing the instructional supports needed. Provide teachers with rosters of the EL students with EL proficiency levels, and provide support in reviewing the ELD standards through the lens of differentiating instructional supports by level.</p>
<p>Data about English learner achievement are being discussed and used as a basis for analysis and planning. The data being shared aren't disaggregated by English proficiency level or typology (e.g., LTEL, newcomers). It is reported as a single English learner category.</p>	<p>When concerns about achievement are being discussed, ask probing questions about subgroups of English learners. Make it a habit to ask: "WHICH ELs do you mean? Students at WHICH level of English proficiency? Are these LTELs? Newcomers?" etc.</p> <p>Request that your EL achievement, progress, and participation data be disaggregated by typology and English proficiency levels.</p>
<p>Dashboard data about the English learner category is taken as an indication that programs and services for English learners are in good enough shape and don't require further attention or improvement.</p>	<p>The definition of English learner used for the Dashboard combines EL + RFEP into a single "Ever EL" category. Without drilling down further and looking at your current EL students as a group, or drilling even further to see LTELs as a subgroup of current ELs, you risk that the combined average of EL data can lead to erroneous conclusions about the success of your program. This is because the achievement of RFEPs masks what could be problems with ELs stuck at low levels of English proficiency.</p>

NOTES:



The opportunity and need to engage educators at the school site in data about current students and current practices requires efforts at the school site to focus collectively on assessments of learning. Engaging school faculty in focusing on and becoming practiced at using data can powerfully illuminate what's working and what needs work, can spark productive dialogues and sharing about practice, and help shape a sense of schoolwide direction.



READING: Avoiding Common Data Dialogue Pitfalls and Facilitating a Culture of Inquiry and Productive Data Use

Educators, as a whole, care about students and care about doing a good job of educating all students. Most spend long hours planning lessons and refining their plans to improve instruction to better engage students and support learning. Looking at data collectively can be enlightening, inspiring, create a sense of urgency, offer clarity about direction, and be the springboard to meaningful improvements. But it can also sometimes be just plain hard to spend time reflecting on evidence that things may not be working as well as we want for our students. It's often made harder because most educators don't have a reservoir of positive experiences with honest critiques and reflections about their instruction and programs with each other, nor the time set aside to do so.

In inviting people to a data dialogue and to the table of data-based planning, leaders need to make it very clear that the purpose of examining student data is to help the school support English learners' achievement and success. You are gathering together to identify areas that need further inquiry, to figure out priorities, to structure the support and programs students need, and to articulate the needed resources to make that doable. Appeal to participants as responsible educators who are entrusted with understanding a challenge and crafting solutions. Remind them that the purpose of looking at data is to figure out what kind of changes they want and need to make on behalf of their students—and to identify and affirm what is going well. Assume that everyone at the table is there because each wants to make schools a better place for English learners—and to be more efficacious themselves in their own practice.

While examining data about student achievement and access can be illuminating and powerful for planning, the reality is that many data dialogues fizzle, fall flat or explode—in short, they fail to be productive.

Consider the following common patterns that occur in many schools when data is presented for discussion. What might the leader and facilitator do to avoid these responses or respond in ways that might result in more productive dialogue?

Common Patterns	Leadership Moves
The group feels depressed by the patterns of EL achievement and participation data that emerge in the data	Examples: Begin by looking for evidence and dialogue about what is going well; Set the tone that you are looking together for how to strengthen the program and student outcomes – and link it to planning for use of resources to support actions to improve.....
The group is hesitant to listen to data or say things that might be heard as “blame” of teachers and the school. This is preventing honest dialogue and examination of the data.	Examples: Focus first on vision and engaging people in talking about what they hope and want for their students; use language and messaging that talks about teachers as caring about students and as professionals working together to find ways the school can enact that vision for students....
The data are not disaggregated so it is hard to see how specific groups of students are achieving.	Examples: Set the stage that you are looking to understand WHICH students are benefiting and which may not be; Prepare data that is disaggregated in various ways by EL typologies.....
The discussion keeps coming back to the data we need instead of the data you are looking at together.	Examples: Acknowledge from the start that as an inquiring team, there is also additional questions and data needed – and start a chart listing those questions and data needs – and then refocus the group on what can be learned or surmised from the data you have....
Statements are made that blame young people or their families and are based on an assumption that there is nothing the school can do (e.g., “those kids just don’t try,” or “their parents don’t care.”).	Examples: Redirect the dialogue back to what schools and educators can do; share examples of classrooms/schools that serve similar communities with more positive outcomes and pose questions about what they are doing.....
The group jumps quickly from looking at a display of some data into designing and planning interventions.	Example: Applaud the desire to take action, but slow down the planning and ask probing questions about the data that might illuminate which kinds of plans and interventions might be most appropriate; Ask what data might help the group make most efficacious and wise decisions about the choice of actions and use of resources....
Some prominent voices keep deflecting from a focus on EL data to wanting to look at all students or another group of students.	Example: Acknowledge that other groups of students also merit attention, but affirm that THIS discussion needs to be about the specific needs of ELs and that a focus on other groups can occur at another time.....



REFLECTION

What monitoring systems are in place in your district to assess EL program and EL instructional improvement? What other examples of leadership moves can you add for each of the scenarios on the chart?

Assessments and Goals of Biliteracy: Appropriately Measuring What's Important

What gets measured is a statement of values. Through the California EL Roadmap, the EdGE initiative, Global California 2030, and other policy and guidance, California schools are committed to biliteracy as a goal, and to the development of 21st-century multicultural competencies. The English Learner Roadmap specifically calls for “assessments to support instruction and continuous improvement and accountability for attainment of English proficiency, biliteracy and academic achievement.” Supporting such a goal means we need to assess the development of those skills, to monitor progress toward those goals, and to incorporate assessments of biliteracy into the accountability system making clear that the goal of biliteracy matters. And as districts create new dual language programs and expand existing ones, the challenge is to create an assessment system that measures and monitors in alignment with the goal of biliteracy. The questions every school and district with a dual-language/bilingual program (or planning to start one) needs to be able to answer affirmatively include:

- *Do you have academic assessments in the target languages of your dual-language programs so you can assess achievement in the language in which students are learning?*
- *Do you have language assessments in each of the languages of instruction?*
- *Do you have articulated expectations of what normative progress toward bilingual language proficiency should be in both languages?*
- *Do you have a way to assess whether students are developing the skills of bilingualism?*
- *Have you adjusted your expectations of achievement tests in English for students engaged in dual-language programs?*
- *Does your school have agreed upon criteria for biliteracy pathway awards, and a systemic approach to supporting all students the opportunity to be eligible for the State Seal of Biliteracy?*



Looking at just one language doesn't tell the whole story. If dual-language programs are to thrive, then multiple measures, including measures of language development in both languages and bilingual measures of content understanding are needed.



READING: Build Assessment Systems that Monitor and Honor Biliteracy

This reading is excerpted from: Olsen, L., Martinez, M. et.al. (2020) *“Multilingual Programs & Pedagogy: What Teachers and Administrators Need to Know and Do”* Chapter 3, *Improving Multilingual and English Learner Education: from Research to Practice*. California Department of Education: Sacramento.

Educators and the community need to know whether students are progressing adequately toward biliteracy and mastering grade-level standards as they engage in dual-language education. This requires valid and appropriate assessments in both languages and a means of analyzing progress in a biliteracy trajectory. Developing proficiency in a language takes time—and attainment of academic proficiency in two languages is a process that normally takes five to seven years and can continue to build to higher levels of academic biliteracy throughout schooling. Again and again, research has demonstrated that well-implemented dual-language programs indeed result in equal or stronger outcomes in English with the addition of proficiency in a second language. Yet, parents, teachers, and administrators often focus on whether or not students in dual language programs are on target to meet academic benchmarks in English and worry that time spent in a Language Other Than English (LOTE) will detract from English mastery.

Districts need clarity on expectations for normative progress toward biliteracy, which is different from the trajectory of a student in an English monolingual program. Over time, the biliteracy models produce equal or superior outcomes in English as well as provide the benefit of literacy in a second language. But students in a monolingual English program will normatively assess differently in the first six years than students receiving instructional time in both languages. Without awareness of the biliteracy trajectory in a dual language program, erroneous conclusions about lack of adequate progress can lead parents, administrators and district leaders to pressure for more English earlier or to eliminate the dual language program altogether (Lindholm-Leary, 2014). For this reason, a key role of administrators is to ensure teachers have appropriate assessments for monitoring student progress in both languages, a system for monitoring progress along a biliteracy trajectory, and are able to communicate articulately with families and the district about the impacts of the program on student progress.

Across studies, 5th grade appears to be the year in which most students in multilingual programs reach parity and begin to move beyond their English only instructed peers in terms of English language proficiency. Thus, parents and educators should not be concerned about dual language students' initial slower development of English. It will, in most cases, catch up and even accelerate. Every DL program, school, and district needs an accountability system that can track whether students are moving toward and eventually attaining bilingual proficiency. Regular testing in both languages need not be “high stakes” to meet specific standards but should allow parents and educators to track students' progress and acknowledge their accomplishments. Yet, few districts currently have assessment and accountability systems appropriate to dual language education. In those situations, administrators need to resist judging programs based only on bilingual students' achievement on tests designed for and normed for monolingual instruction. These assessments won't adequately measure students' learning and skills, and they can therefore powerfully undermine programs. (Valdés & Figueroa, 1994).

“When a bilingual individual confronts a monolingual test... both the test taker and the test are asked to do something they cannot. The bilingual test taker cannot perform like a monolingual. The monolingual test cannot measure in the other language.”

Students' bilingualism is not well measured using tools in either language (Escamilla, Butvilofsky, & Hopewell, 2017). A bilingual assessment perspective recognizes that what students can do in one language isn't yet the same as what they can do in the other and that looking at just one language doesn't tell the whole story. Assessment only in English undermines the value of teaching and learning of the LOTE. To support biliteracy programs, districts need to perform parallel assessments in the languages of the biliteracy programs. Districts

should build their local accountability and continuous improvement system to incorporate indicators and benchmarks toward biliteracy as part of what is being monitored and responded to as a core part in local planning. There is mounting evidence that without this switch in district valued assessments incorporated into local accountability—due to their tendency to score lower in accountability measures in English in the first five or six years of a dual language program—bilingual children are particularly vulnerable to the narrowing of curriculum that can accompany testing (Palmer & Snodgrass-Rangel, 2011).

Given the variation of students' bilingual abilities, districts should develop their own expectations around biliteracy trajectories based on an examination of their own data from bilingual assessments that are aligned with their instructional goals and grade-level standards. If dual-language programs are to thrive, then multiple measures, including measures of language development in both languages and bilingual measures of content understanding are needed. Districts should define a normative biliteracy trajectory for monitoring progress toward biliteracy as a mechanism for communicating with students, parents, and teachers about individual progress, and as a means of monitoring program effectiveness toward continuous improvement.

To offset fears that lower levels of proficiency in English in the first years of study in a dual-language program are indications that students are failing to make adequate progress, leaders will be aware of why the following actions are crucial:

- *Knowing the research about normative progress and expectations.*
- *Setting explicit scope and sequencing of skills and year-end targets in both languages.*
- *Using biliteracy trajectories to determine adequate progress.*
- *Regularly communicating this to students, parents, and school boards.*

Finally, district monitoring should disaggregate impacts of dual language programs by student type. Research has increasingly demonstrated that not all students in two-way programs reap the same benefits (Palmer & Henderson, 2016). Aggregating data on all students in two-way programs into one measure doesn't reveal whether English learners in the program are gaining equality to English proficient students.

Citations:

Escamilla, K., Butvilofsky, S., & Hopewell, S. (2017) What Gets Lost When English Only Writing Assessment Is Used to Assess Writing Proficiency in Spanish-English Emerging Bilingual Learners? *International Multilingual Research Journal*.

Lindholm-Leary, K. & Genesee, F. (2014) Student outcomes in one-way and two-way immersion and indigenous language education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(2), 165-180.

Palmer, D., & Henderson, K. (2016) Dual language tracking and teacher discourses on emergent bilingual students. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(1), 17-30.

Palmer, D. & Snodgrass-Rangel, V. (2011) High stakes accountability and policy implementation: Teacher decision making in bilingual classrooms in Texas. *Educational Policy*, 25(4), 614-647.

Valdes, G. and Figueroa, R (1994). *Bilingualism and Testing: a special case of bias*. Ablex Publishing. New York: New York.



CASE STUDY: San Francisco Unified School District— Monitoring The Trajectory of Progress Toward Biliteracy

Bilingual education is not new to San Francisco.

As one of the few districts that maintained bilingual programs through the Proposition 227 era, SFUSD now can boast a plethora of dual language and bilingual pathways from preschool through graduation with opportunities for students to develop proficiency in Italian, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, Spanish, Arabic, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Hebrew in addition to English. Parents can choose to enroll their children in preschool dual language programs in Spanish and Cantonese, in K-5 Elementary dual-language immersion programs in nine languages, in heritage language programs in four languages, in newcomer EL programs (elementary, middle, and high school), and secondary school dual language and World Language programs. Each program addresses a different typology of student but all share a commitment to high levels of academic proficiency in two or more languages. Working in partnership with Stanford University, SFUSD engaged in an EL Pathway Study to determine outcomes from their programs and define a biliteracy trajectory for monitoring progress toward proficiency. The study found that in elementary school, more students in English Plus (English medium with ELD) classrooms were being reclassified as English proficient than in dual language pathways. However, they also found that students in the dual language pathways catch up by the 7th grade and have the added benefit of bilingualism. In a Communications Guide for parents, the district explains clearly:



Each program addresses a different typology of student but all share a commitment to high levels of academic proficiency in two or more languages. Working in partnership with Stanford University, SFUSD engaged in an EL Pathway Study to determine outcomes from their programs and define a biliteracy trajectory for monitoring progress toward proficiency. The study found that in elementary school, more students in English Plus (English medium with ELD) classrooms were being reclassified as English proficient than in dual language pathways. However, they also found that students in the dual language pathways catch up by the 7th grade and have the added benefit of bilingualism. In a Communications Guide for parents, the district explains clearly:

- *As your child develops English and academic skills, they will reach a point when they will be reclassified as a Fluent English Proficient student.*
- *In 5th grade, three out of four students in English Plus pathway have reclassified, which is somewhat higher than reclassification rates in the other pathways.*
- *By the 7th grade, reclassification rates are virtually the same—above 85%—in all three EL Pathways. The students in the dual language pathways have caught up.*
- *Furthermore, the average ELA test scores of ELs enrolled in the Dual Immersion Pathway increase faster from 2nd through 7th grade than those of students enrolled in the English Plus or Bilingual Maintenance Pathways.*
- *Although those in Dual Immersion score below their peers in the Bilingual Maintenance and English Plus Pathways in 2nd grade, by 5th grade, they catch up such that their scores do not differ across pathways.*
- *By 7th grade, ELs in Dual Immersion score higher on the ELA test than the average student in California and higher than ELs enrolled in the other pathways.*

The district uses these trajectories to monitor “normative” progress for the various pathways and to reassure parents that students in the dual-language models are not suffering in English proficiency because they are working toward proficiency in two languages. The district also relies on this expected trajectory as a mechanism for their own monitoring of program effectiveness to inform continuous improvement.



READING: Ten Things a School Leader Can Do to Build Deeper Schoolwide Understanding and Use of English Learner Data

- 1** Create and support a variety of formats for teachers to form collaborative inquiry groups, conduct action research and engage in examining student work and data together.

- 2** Build an infrastructure for data use to be woven into the life of the school. Routinely use EL data as a topic of discussion, at whole staff meetings, during professional development meetings, and as part of leadership meetings.

- 3** Create an annual school calendar of data and inquiry related activities.

- 4** Provide collaborative planning time for grade-level teams (elementary schools) or department teams (secondary) to develop a bank of performance tasks and formative assessments linked to the curriculum that are differentiated by English proficiency level.

- 5** Familiarize yourself and your staff with allowable test accommodations for English learners. Check on whether your English learners are, in fact, being provided with appropriate testing accommodations and if the school/district requested those on the appropriate CAASP form for each individual child. Find out whether your district has developed or identified a translation glossary for English learner to use.

- 6** Provide data to teachers about the ELPAC levels of their students, and work with them to prepare ELPAC profiles of their classrooms.

- 7** Discuss implications for instruction, using the ELD Standards as guidance.

- 8** At the end of each semester, review English Learners' grades by course and department. Look for patterns in terms of where more supportive instructional strategies may be needed.

- 9** Ask counselors to provide a list of English learners who have stayed at the same ELPAC level (or dropped a level) since the prior year and the course grades for those students.

- 10** Pull together a specialty team of ELD teachers and classroom teachers who have taught those students to look for patterns that might inform program improvement and instructional modifications.



DATA GLOSSARY

Accommodations

Standardized tests are given in standard conditions. There are specific time limits for completing the tests. There are regulations regarding whether or not students are allowed to have reference materials with them, etc. A testing accommodation is a change in those standard conditions that is permitted for a specific group of students who would be disadvantaged unfairly under standard conditions but who can (with some modifications) be able to demonstrate what they know on the test. English learners are one of those groups for whom testing accommodations are allowed. Accommodations may include, for example, more time to answer questions or translation glossaries.

Designated Supports

Designated supports are available to all students when determined for use by an educator or team of educators (with parent/guardian and student input, as appropriate) or specified in the student's individualized education (IEP) or Section 504 plan. This is distinguished from Universal tools that are available to all students on the basis of student preference and selection.

English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)

ELPACs are assessments that measure an English learner's proficiency in relation to the 2012 English Language Development Standards. Three purposes for the ELPAC are specified in state law: (1) Initially identifying students as English learners; (2) Determining the level of ELP for students who are English learners; and (3) Assessing the progress of limited English learners in acquiring the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English. The legal basis for the ELPAC is that all students have the right to an equal and appropriate education, and any English language limitations left unidentified and/or unaddressed could preclude a student from accessing that right. LEAs have a legal obligation to ensure that EL students can participate—language acquisition services to become proficient in English and participate equally in the standard instructional program within a reasonable period of time. But first, they must be identified—and then provided services until they reach proficiency. For this reason, state and federal laws require that all students with a language other than English be assessed for ELP.

State and federal laws (Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) require that local educational agencies (LEAs) administer a state test of English language proficiency to (1) newly enrolled students

whose primary language is not English, as an initial assessment, and (2) students who are English learners (ELs), as an annual summative assessment of progress toward English proficiency, and until they are identified as RFEP. For California’s public school students, this test is the ELPAC. EL students continue to take the Summative ELPAC annually until they meet their LEA’s reclassification criteria. Districts use ELPAC data to monitor progress toward English proficiency, to help inform proper educational placements, and to help determine if a student is ready to be reclassified. The ELPAC assesses students in the following four domains in English: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. It is aligned with the English language development standards adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE).

The Summative ELPAC, given annually, shows the overall English performance level attained by students, as well as performance for each composite. The performance levels are reported in four levels (1, 2, 3, and 4).

TABLE: Summative ELPAC Performance Level Descriptors

Level	Description
<p style="text-align: center;">4 Well Developed</p>	<p>English learners at this level have well-developed oral (Listening and Speaking) and written (Reading and Writing) skills. They can use English to learn and communicate in meaningful ways that are appropriate to different tasks, purposes, and audiences in a variety of social and academic contexts. They may need occasional linguistic support to engage in familiar social and academic contexts; they may need light support to communicate on less familiar tasks and topics. This test performance level corresponds to the upper range of the “Bridging” proficiency level as described in the 2012 ELD Standards.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3 Moderately Developed</p>	<p>English learners at this level have moderately developed oral (Listening and Speaking) and written (Reading and Writing) skills. They can sometimes use English to learn and communicate in meaningful ways in a range of topics and content areas. They need light to minimal linguistic support to engage in familiar social and academic contexts; they need moderate support to communicate on less familiar tasks and topics. This test performance level corresponds to the upper range of the “Expanding” proficiency level through the lower range of the “Bridging” proficiency level as described in the 2012 ELD Standards.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">2 Somewhat Developed</p>	<p>EL students at this level have somewhat developed oral (Listening and Speaking) and written (Reading and Writing) skills. They can use English to meet immediate communication needs but often are not able to use English to learn and communicate on topics and content areas. They need moderate to light linguistic support to engage in familiar social and academic contexts; they need substantial to moderate support to communicate on less familiar tasks and topics. This test performance level corresponds to the low to middle range of the “Expanding” proficiency level as described in the 2012 ELD Standards.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">1 Beginning to Develop</p>	<p>EL students at this level have minimally developed oral (Listening and Speaking) and written (Reading and Writing) English skills. They tend to rely on learned words and phrases to communicate meaning at a basic level. They need substantial to moderate linguistic support to communicate in familiar social and academic contexts; they need substantial linguistic support to communicate on less familiar tasks and topics. This test performance level corresponds to the “Emerging” proficiency level as described in the 2012 ELD Standards.</p>

The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) of the California School Dashboard uses the Summative ELPAC results for LEA accountability and reporting EL student progress toward English language proficiency.

English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)

The ELPI is one of the state indicators on the California School Dashboard. The ELPI measures EL progress toward ELP based upon results from the ELPAC. LEAs and schools use this data in the ongoing process of program monitoring and evaluation. (Note: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the US Department of Education (ED) removed the requirement to report the ELPI on the California School Dashboard for the 2020–21 school year.)

English proficiency level: There is a continuum from knowing absolutely no English to being fully English proficient. As students learn English, they progress along this continuum through stages of language development. Language assessments measure where an individual student falls along the continuum and then track progress along the continuum toward full proficiency. The continuum can be divided into levels. In California, the ELPAC assessment delineates four levels of English proficiency: Emerging, Developing, Bridging. The levels help teachers plan differentiated instruction and scaffolds for students targeting their needs. The levels also facilitate tracking of progress across the five to seven years it can take for English learners to reach full English proficiency and be reclassified.

Reclassification

Reclassification is the local process used by LEAs to determine whether a student has acquired sufficient ELP to perform successfully in academic subjects without EL support. EC Section 313(f) specifies the four criteria that must be used when making reclassification decisions locally.

Reclassified fluent English proficient (RFEP)

Students with a primary language other than English who were initially classified as English learners but who have subsequently met the LEA criteria for ELP are RFEPs. EC Section 313(f) specifies four criteria that LEAs must use in reclassifying students from EL students to RFEP:

1. *Assessment of ELP, using an objective assessment instrument, including, but not limited to, the state test of ELD. The state criteria for reclassification is ELPAC Level 4.*
2. *Teacher evaluation, including, but not limited to, a review of the student's curriculum mastery.*
3. *Parent opinion and consultation.*
4. *Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the performance of English-proficient students of the same age. Locally determined.*



Looking at data collectively can be enlightening, inspiring, create a sense of urgency, offer clarity about direction, and be the springboard to meaningful improvements. But it can also sometimes be just plain hard to spend time reflecting on evidence that things may not be working as well as we want for our students. Assume that everyone at the table is there because each wants to make schools a better place for English learners—and to be more efficacious themselves in their own practice.

4

SECTION 4:

BUILDING AN EDUCATOR FORCE FOR
ENGLISH LEARNER SUCCESS

“Each level of the school system has leaders and educators who are knowledgeable of and responsive to the strengths and needs of English learners and their communities..... Capacity building occurs at all levels of the system, including leadership development to understand and address the needs of ELs, professional development and collaboration time for teachers, and robust efforts to address the teaching shortage and build a pipeline (recruit and develop) of educators skilled in addressing the needs of ELs, including bilingual teachers.”

– From the CA English Learner Roadmap Principle #3

INTRODUCTION: Professional Development and Capacity Building

Good teaching always involves learning—continual learning—in response to new cadres of students appearing in the classroom presenting new challenges and in response to new research that appears on effective practices. For teachers, every lesson, every unit, and every new school year poses the opportunity to try things a little differently and explore ways to strengthen and deepen students' learning. Being a learner engaged in refining the art and craft of teaching is part and parcel of being a good teacher. School leaders also, dedicated to navigating a site or a district in a coherent direction and toward continuous improvement during always-changing contexts and conditions, also have to be learners. What we know is that good schools, high-performing schools, and effective school systems intentionally support adult learning, investing in creating the time and space and culture where adults learn together as a community in the act of continuous improvement in pursuit of sturdier student outcomes.

Providing meaningful access and high-quality instruction for English learners depends upon having educators who understand the strengths and needs of English learners and have the capacity to deliver standard-based, assets-oriented, affirming, and responsive education. Since the adoption of the Common Core State Standards for Math and ELA and the Next Generation Science Standards, the content, performance, and language demands have increased the challenges for English language learners. As teachers have grappled with the implications of more rigorous standards and engagement with academic language, the need for professional development has increased to support the deeper content, performance, and language demands expected of students. The content, quality, and delivery of professional learning opportunities need to support teachers' deeper understanding of content and mastery of instructional strategies that assist all students' attainment of more rigorous standards.

Furthermore, the implementation of the research-based practices and of the vision of EL schooling described in the CA English Learner Roadmap and in the CA ELA/ELD Framework requires a more nuanced understanding of second language and dual-language development and a toolkit of instructional strategies that go beyond the practices and approaches prevalent just a decade ago. Many California educators do not feel adequately prepared to deliver rigorous standards-aligned instruction that engages EL students in asset-oriented and culturally and linguistically responsive and accessible ways. While educational policy stipulates that ELs are to be educated by high-quality teachers, initial pre-service preparation and credentialing are insufficient, and a systemic approach to teacher and administrator professional learning is necessary to ensure enactment of the vision and principles of effective instruction for ELs. And so, school and district leaders have the task of guiding continuous instructional improvement through data-driven priority setting, drawing upon research, and fostering the learning that can give life to the commitment of meaningful access for English learners.

Far too often, professional development sessions are one-shot workshops—perhaps full of information and strategies—that are seldom in sufficient depth or duration to actually impact practice. Changing practice takes exposure to new ideas and strategies and the time and support to try them out and refine them. It takes attention to the purpose, theory, rationale, *and* research behind an approach, and practical application in real classrooms with real students. It requires the support of coaches, mentors and colleagues. National and state professional development standards articulate the importance of high-quality professional learning as part of the daily work of educators and call upon schools to provide the resources to support ongoing adult learning and collaboration. The California Superintendent of Public Instruction identified seven learning standards to promote quality professional learning and development. Although they focus on teacher professional learning, these standards are also applicable to district and school leaders and other school-based personnel. They provide the framework within which effective programs and instruction for English learner professional trainings can be shaped.

CA Quality Professional Learning Standards	Specific Application to Professional Learning for EL Success
<p>Data: Quality professional learning uses varied sources and kinds of information to guide priorities, design, and assessments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educators are engaged with understanding culturally and linguistically valid and appropriate assessment, and issues and approaches to assessment of English proficiency for second language learners and dual-language assessment. • Educators are acquainted with equity-oriented analyses of data pertinent to English learners, such as gap analysis, proportionality analysis, etc. • Educators are taught and engage with qualitative methods to elicit EL student and family perspectives, experiences and input.
<p>Content and Pedagogy: Quality professional learning enhances educators' expertise to increase students' capacity to learn and thrive.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilingual teachers are provided professional learning in dual language pedagogies. • All teachers are provided professional learning related to evidence-based strategies to support language. Development in and through content. • Professional learning addresses creating assets-oriented, student responsive, and affirming learning environments.
<p>Equity: Quality professional learning focuses on equitable access, opportunities, and outcomes for all students, with an emphasis on addressing achievement and opportunity disparities between student groups.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional learning focuses on issues of equalizing language status, understanding and combating dynamics of linguisticism and xenophobia, and racism. • Professional learning includes regular engagement in collective review of data regarding achievement and opportunities disparities between language groups, between English learners and English fluent students.
<p>Design and Structure: Quality professional learning reflects evidence-based approaches, recognizing that focused, sustained learning enables educators to acquire, implement, and assess improved practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaches, mentor teachers, and staff with EL expertise provide ongoing support for teachers in learning, implementing and refining evidence based instructional approaches for EL success.
<p>Collaboration and Shared Accountability: Quality professional learning facilitates the development of a shared purpose for student learning and collective responsibility for achieving it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular structured time is built into the school day/calendar enabling grade-level teams, cross-grade teams, cross-discipline teams, and program-specific teams to engage in ongoing cycles of examining student work and data, reflecting on practice, inquiry, goal setting, and monitoring improvements in instructional practice. • Collective engagement in setting school-wide goals and vision of EL schooling is followed with monitoring progress toward those goals. • A culture and climate of adult learning is linked to shared commitment to EL success.
<p>Resources: Quality professional learning dedicates resources that are adequate, accessible, and allocated appropriately toward established priorities and outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs of EL Coach positions, collaboration and planning time related to a focus on ELs, and costs of professional learning opportunities are included in site plans and district LCAPs, and linked to the instructional and equity goals set by the site and district.
<p>Alignment and Coherence: Quality professional learning contributes to a coherent system of educator learning and support that connects district and school priorities and needs with state and federal requirements and resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title I, Title III, and Immigrant federal funds are braided with state LCFF funds to cover professional learning expenditures aligned with federal EL law, the CA EL Roadmap principles, district and site instructional vision for English learners.

More information on California's Quality Professional Learning Standards is available on the California Department of Education website at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/ch7.asp#link21>.

Professional learning efforts in a district or school should be tightly aligned with the instructional vision and goals for English learners. While the overall theoretical framework, instructional vision, goals, and pedagogical stance for educating English learners should be consistent in professional learning across all roles within the system, the design, delivery, and content of professional learning should be geared toward the specific jobs and roles. Professional learning is job-specific and job-embedded.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR ADMINISTRATORS

As instructional leaders, administrators have to be grounded in the research and theoretical frameworks for effective EL instruction and biliteracy development. They need to know what effective EL instruction looks like and sounds like, to be able to recognize effective and less effective practices, be able to engage in dialogue with teachers about those practices, and mobilize resources for supporting teachers to strengthen instruction. Administrators need to understand research-based language acquisition program design and the essential characteristics of the various program models that lead to effectiveness. And administrators need strategies for leading a school community to a shared vision about commitments for English learners, managing the change process, and dismantling entrenched practices and attitudes that can relegate English learners to watered-down and inappropriate schooling.

Not all districts clearly specify expectations and competencies required for EL leadership. However, some define for themselves competencies for leaders as they feel it is required for English learners' success. An example is Fresno Unified School District's "Competencies for Leaders," aligned to the district's general leadership standards and the CA ELA/ELD Framework.

- 1. School leaders carry out the district's vision for English learner students, and have clear and high expectations for all English learner students.*
- 2. School leaders collect data (i.e., nativity, proficiency levels, years of services, home language, prior schooling) to inform culturally relevant curriculum and instructional practices.*
- 3. School leaders use research to inform service delivery models for English learner students that yield high quality instruction.*
- 4. School leaders facilitate professional learning communities that examine English learner students' work and tasks for evidence of alignment to grade-level cognitive and academic language demands.*
- 5. School leaders ensure that teachers of English learner students receive professional learning on discipline-specific language and literacies development and have time to assess content knowledge.*
- 6. School leaders seek observable evidence of the discipline in practice, and are able to articulate means for improving implementation.*
- 7. School leaders provide professional learning on ways to differentiate instruction for subgroups of English learner students (newcomers, Long-term English learner students, English learner students with IEPs, etc.).*
- 8. School leaders facilitate the creation of detailed EL case studies enabling the school community to have a common understanding of English learner students' academic and socio-emotional needs.*
- 9. School leaders provide time for ELD/bilingual teachers and content area teachers to collaborate on understanding the cognitive demands and discipline-specific language challenges of curriculum, instruction, and assessments.*
- 10. School leaders create opportunities that strengthen the capacity of parents of English learner students to support learning, language, and literacy in all disciplines.*

These competencies are useful for clarifying the specific expectations of leadership and for guiding professional learning for school leaders. For example, based on these competencies, Fresno has created a Leaders Academy which consists of a professional learning module for existing district administrators on how to best establish an effective EL Instructional Program that includes strategies for language development, and attaining projected outcomes as outlined in the Master Plan. This module leads to attainment of the Fresno Unified Certificate of Expertise in English Learner Leadership. Other districts may not formalize a list of competencies but do arrange for professional learning specifically for school leaders. Regardless of whether it is done through a district created module or other mechanisms to support learning and growth, it is important for districts to invest significantly in leaders' professional learning. The goal is to deepen their understanding of effective instruction, programs and services for English learner students. There are many resources that can be drawn upon related to the content of this learning (see Section 7: Appendix – Resources and Links, page 101), and multiple approaches to engaging in professional learning for administrators including:

- *The creation of professional learning networks within a district or region focuses on reading, sharing, and learning together as leaders for English learner success.*
- *Instructional rounds in which school leaders participate together in a community of practice are grounded in onsite classroom observation focused on deepening the understanding of effective EL practices and leading to a shared focus on instructional improvement. These inquiry-based instructions shatter norms of isolation through a collective meaning-making and learning process. The emphasis is on the leaders' learning—not on evaluating, supervising, or giving feedback to the teachers and sites.*
- *Learning sessions or modules designed for school administrators that engage them together in focusing on leading for English learner success.*
- *Collaboration time for school leaders focuses on key problems of practice related to English learner education.*
- *Opportunities to attend professional development trainings are offered for leaders to accompany their teachers to understand what their teachers are learning. This is done so leaders can support teachers in making instructional changes—followed by debriefing sessions with other school leaders about their roles in creating the conditions to support implementation.*
- *A professional library of readings, resources, and references is made available to administrators.*
- *“EL Book Club for Leaders” provides key literature (books, articles) from the field of English learner education. Administrators read and discuss through the lens of implications for leading their schools toward EL success.*



Good schools, high-performing schools, and effective school systems intentionally support adult learning, investing in creating the time and space and culture where adults learn together as a community in the act of continuous improvement in pursuit of stronger student outcomes.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR TEACHERS

The main purpose of teacher professional development related to English learners is to help teachers better meet the needs of their students. High quality professional learning guides educators in supporting ELs not just by teaching instructional strategies (although a toolkit of effective instructional strategies is definitely needed) but also by increasing their awareness of how the dual-language brain works and why ELs perform the way they do. As educators learn more about the complex processes of second and dual-language development, their understanding of student learning transforms and they are able to better assess what their students need. As they learn more about who their students—the life experiences, cultures, and language experiences they bring to the classroom—they are better able to shape teaching and learning to leverage those assets, more fully invite their students to the table, and engage ELs in learning. As teachers become more sophisticated observers, listeners, and assessors of their students' learning process and products, teachers are more able to determine which instructional strategies and scaffolding will be appropriate and which content/skills should be focused upon to accelerate student progress. The instructional strategies are the tools and means of responding to student needs—but the driver is the teacher's understanding of EL students.

The competencies teachers of English learners need in this era of Common Core and Next Generation Science standards, the ELA/ELD Framework, and as implied in the CA EL Roadmap Principles include:

- 1. Teachers have to be able to integrate the ELD standards in order to provide the strategies, language, analytical practices, and content instruction that provide access to challenging grade-level content to English learner students.*
- 2. Teachers need to design units of study using high-quality literature and academic texts, which explicitly and deliberately integrate language and content objectives.*
- 3. Teachers need to know how to plan differentiated lessons with English learner students in mind, and design appropriate and purposeful scaffolds required for ELs at various levels of English proficiency to master grade-level standards.*
- 4. Teachers need to be able to design and use a variety of approaches to formative assessment to inform the kinds of additional time and support ELs need to access and master grade-level content—and to gather evidence to guide productive next steps to support the simultaneous learning of conceptual understandings, analytical practices, and academic language development in disciplinary areas.*
- 5. Teachers need to be able to adapt and use grade-level, research-based curriculum, and materials to integrate cultural/linguistic knowledge that builds student understanding of the world and values student background, experiences, and cultural diversity.*
- 6. Teachers have to know how to use student data (i.e., nativity, proficiency levels, years of services, home language, prior schooling, prior performance, social emotional experiences) to inform curriculum design and instructional practices—including understanding the various typologies of English learners.*

And to do the above, teachers need available to them professional learning to equip them to better serve their English learners, including:

- Attention to beliefs, attitudes, expectations for EL learning and progress— including issues of language status, biases related to culture and ethnicity, equity—exploring one's own positionality and practices, and creating learning environments that are anti-bias and inclusive.*

- *Understanding the processes of second language development (how it differs from first language development), and understanding the role of home language and processes of the dual-language brain with implications for cross-language connections and the development of biliteracy.*
- *Understanding the structural aspects of language development (e.g., syntax, phonology, language forms, etc.)*
- *Understanding the English Language Development standards—the trajectory toward proficiency and aspects of language development that are represented in the standards, how those standards and ELD competencies relate to engagement in academic tasks, the implications of the standards for planning differentiated instruction, and how to use them.*
- *Understanding academic language and how students develop discipline-specific academic language.*
- *An emphasis on the knowledge students bring to school rather than the knowledge they lack—and what it means to teach with an assets-based orientation.*
- *Understanding the role of culture and its relationship to language development, how to create affirming and culturally sustaining learning environments, and support the development of healthy bilingual, bicultural identities.*
- *Acquiring knowledge and developing skills with respect to effective instructional practices for promoting language development and learning in EL students through differentiated scaffolds.*
- *Understanding the role of assessment and how to implement appropriate formative assessment strategies with EL students.*
- *Understanding how to engage respectfully and inclusively with culturally and linguistically diverse families.*
- *And, of course, high level pedagogical practices and instructional strategies that give life to all of the above in the daily life of classrooms—including how to scaffold for different levels of English proficiency, and how to create language-rich and language supportive learning environments.*

Putting these understandings about language and learning to work requires hands-on opportunities to practice and master teaching strategies that respond to all of the above—with support, coaching, and time for reflection and planning. High quality professional development for teachers is designed to support implementation. It is collaborative—offering engagement and reflection and sharing with other teachers—and provides opportunities to observe and practice research-based strategies and receive feedback and coaching. In addition to the Standards of Quality Professional Development (on the chart above), the following are hallmarks of an effective staff development system:

- *Time is created, allocated, devoted, and protected for adult learning—including paid time within the regular calendar and day when teachers are not responsible for students.*
- *Staff roles are designated and conditions/resources are created that support the endeavor of professional learning (e.g., coaches, mentor relationships, professional libraries and materials, protocols to focus attention on key essential aspects of teaching and learning, calendared routines for cycles of inquiry and cycles of implementation, walkthroughs and “look for’s” inform responsive professional learning).*
- *A culture of inquiry and commitment to seeking out the most current research and evidence-based practices in the service of providing the strongest and most effective schooling for English learners.*
- *Messaging, practices, and modeling underscore that the work of professional learning is everyone’s responsibility and is never done, and that collectively all adults in the system feel it is incumbent on them to engage together to make education more equitable, fully accessible, inclusive, relevant, joyful, and effective for English learners.*



TOOL: Professional Development and Learning

How strong is our approach to professional learning for teachers related to strengthening instruction for English learners? Do we have the infrastructure, culture, and commitments for professional development that will move our classrooms in a coherent pursuit of an aspirational instructional vision for English learners?

Indicator	Present?	Reflection
Support for Teachers		
An infrastructure of mentor teachers, coaches, and resource teachers with expertise in EL are available to teachers, high quality professional learning (including coaching, demonstration lessons, co-planning, co-teaching workshops, etc.) is available to teachers regarding meeting the needs of ELs and delivering research-based approaches and models.		
Collaborative planning time is built into the schedule for grade-level teams to discuss EL student work, align curriculum and instruction, and plan together for Designated ELD.		
All teachers understand the ELD standards and are provided support to use them in planning instructional scaffolds with a language focus for Integrated ELD.		
A professional library and reference resources are available to teachers to understand the language systems of their students, to appreciate the national and immigration backgrounds of the community served, and to augment professional learning related to high quality EL instruction. Teachers have ready access to research.		
Bilingual teachers are provided professional development in the primary/target language focused on delivery of content in the target language.		
Teacher inquiry and action research is encouraged and supported as part of strengthening instruction and responsiveness to ELs.		
The school supports quality teaching through use of mentor teachers, coaches, and resource people with deep expertise on EL issues.		
Teachers and administrators are tapped into networks, informed about, and are encouraged and supported to participate in local and state professional development trainings related to meeting the needs of EL.		
Teachers are co-participants in decision making about professional development—providing input about their needs and the types of professional learning support that would be helpful.		
Funding for high quality professional development addressing issues of ELs is built into the school site plans.		
Professional development efforts are sustained over time, include job-embedded learning, and are ongoing.		
Collaborative planning time is structured for ELD teachers together with content area teachers for purposes of informing and aligning Integrated ELD and Designated ELD responsive to the linguistic demands of the content.		
Effective PL also affords opportunities for educators to share ideas and exchange relevant resources, offers coaching and expert support, and provides time for feedback and reflection.		



CASE STUDY: Professional Development to Prevent LTELs in the Context of an Enrichment/Intervention Middle School Program

The Journalism for English Learners Program, developed by the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University, is an example of high-quality professional development for teachers embedded in a project-based, student-centered program focusing on oral and written language development for middle school EL students at risk of becoming LTELs. The need for upper elementary and middle school teachers to develop skills to support their English learners' communication and informational text writing skills is a key element in addressing the needs of students in grades 4 to 8 at risk of becoming Long Term English Learners. While some professional development approaches immerse teachers in workshops where they learn instructional strategies, the Journalism for English Learners Program creates the opportunity for teachers to develop their skills in the context of delivering a curriculum and program of project-based journalism.

The student impact goals of the program are to increase English Learners' achievement and engagement in 1) English language arts in the area of informational reading and writing, particularly in the journalistic genre; and 2) Oral academic language skills in order to reach English language proficiency and prevent Long-Term English Learner status. The goal is also to build teacher capacity to address these critical areas of EL instruction—all to prevent the long-term trajectory of prolonged EL status for this group of students.

While the Journalism for EL Students curriculum and professional development institute has now been implemented in districts throughout California, it was first piloted as an innovative, eleven-week afterschool program between 2008-2011 in Lennox School District. Recognizing the need to address their LTEL challenges, the district had researched existing Intervention programs. Their queries found that other programs appeared to be extensions of the regular school day curriculum (offering more of the same) and reflected the emerging research on LTEL intervention programs indicating that many programs are based on deficit perspectives rather than promoting the assets-based, differentiated LTEL curriculum that was needed. Traditional intervention programs did not provide sufficient support for meeting the needs of ELs. Nor did they promote the kind of pedagogy called for by the ELA/ELD standards and research. Students need active participation, social integration with strong language models through integrated language learning in affirming environments. These include authentic opportunities to connect learning with students' communities and social realities.

The district was looking for interventions for students—but also for professional development for their teachers who needed support in learning how to approach instruction in ways that would address LTEL students' needs—particularly strategies and methods that could integrate English language instruction with content area learning (as called for by the ELA/ELD Framework).



High quality professional learning guides educators in supporting ELs not just by teaching instructional strategies but also by increasing their awareness of how the dual-language brain works and why ELs perform the way they do. As educators learn more about second and dual-language development, their understanding of student learning transforms and they are able to better assess what their students need. As they learn more about who their students are—the life experiences, cultures, and language experiences they bring - instructional strategies are the tools and means of responding to student needs. But the driver is the teacher's understanding of EL students.

The Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University's Journalism for EL Students provided the combination of a research-based intervention for EL students and quality professional learning for teachers. Dedicated professional development and planning time for program teachers was delivered by the ELD Intervention Specialist and occurred weekly during the eleven-week program cycle. Teachers prepared for the ELD Intervention Program by attending a training session at the beginning of each cycle where they were informed of the assessment and instruction protocols and procedures as well as the lesson objectives for each week. Immersion in understanding second language development and the critical role of oral language as a foundation for writing, as well as engaging students in purposeful relevant curriculum framed the focus on strategies. Program goals and pedagogy were introduced; however, program teachers provided input on lesson delivery. The curriculum for this afterschool intervention incorporated strategies from district professional development trainings (such as a vocabulary lesson planner and think-alouds) in order to maintain consistency and familiarity with strategies presented during the regular school day.

Students were about to become journalists on community issues, charged with creating a newspaper of articles. Thus the community partnership aspect of the model was essential. Teachers selected community business/locations for student fieldwork and prepared students to conduct computer-based research and prepare interview questions for the community experts on their focus topic. Background information about the experts and locations was given to students prior to beginning their research. Armed with their interview questions (and having practiced the oral skills involved in interviewing), students became the reporters/journalists once they arrived by bus at the selected locations. After conducting their interviews, students paraphrased, analyzed, and synthesized information through a writing process approach to producing articles for their Lennox Voices newspaper. The district newspaper was distributed to participating schools, throughout the community, and to the locations visited.

The articles were evidence of the ELD program's impact in bolstering LTEL's oral and written language output—verified by the evaluation assessment of students' skills. The evaluation also focused on impacts on teachers, revealing that the ELD Journalism program heightened teachers' awareness of effective practices for LTELs—to use in integrated and Designated ELD settings. A majority of program teachers reported incorporating strategies and practices from the afterschool intervention program into their regular daily classroom practice. Teachers identified the specific strategies used to ensure that students received rigorous and relevant curriculum through meaningful teaching and learning in an engaging environment. These included:

- *Scaffolding for oral and written language input and output.*
- *Selecting expository reading materials at students' instructional level to support research and inquiry for field research.*
- *Use and modeling of genre-specific academic language (journalism) with the expectation that students use and appropriate the language orally and in writing.*
- *Use of ELD reading/writing levels to differentiate instruction through IPT assessments.*
- *Highlighting community connections through field experiences.*
- *Use of varied grouping strategies and one-on-one support during on-going instruction.*

Since the pilot, the Journalism for EL curriculum has been used in various contexts. The program is research-based, focuses on journalistic writing, includes a minimum of 40 hours of instruction, and can be delivered either after school or within the school day as standards-aligned after school or summer enrichment and for designated or specialized English Language Development or interventions. Teachers engaged in the professional development institute learn how a standards-aligned curriculum can support and develop English Learners' abilities to write investigative journalistic articles in a real-world context and experience critical instructional strategies and routines to develop oral and written language, and foster EL students' engagement and interaction.

For more information: <https://soe.lmu.edu/centers/ceel/professionallearning/journalism/>



Recruitment and Pipeline—Finding and Building the “Right” People for the Job!

Strengthening the knowledge base, capacity, and competency of the current educator workforce is an essential commitment of effective school systems. So, too, is finding and hiring the personnel with the skills, aptitudes, and heart needed to build an effective, assets-oriented and EL student responsive school system. Good schools—with strong supportive leadership, a collaborative teacher culture, commitments to professional learning, and with a strong assets-oriented and equity-oriented instructional vision—attract good teachers and staff. But given the teacher shortage, active recruitment of teachers is also needed. Being clear about what you are looking for, and being able to articulate to candidates a clear picture of the schools’ vision and commitments and culture, are key to recruitment. And, getting the word out through channels that will reach the people you are trying to reach is essential. Professional associations of educators with a focus on English learners are one avenue. Activating the enthusiastic staff in your school, able to speak about the schools’ instructional vision and support for quality teaching, and commitments to English learners and equity helps. Recruitment might be a standard Human Resource function, but there is a shortage of teachers overall in California—and even among the teachers available and seeking positions, an inadequate preparation for delivering the evidence-based, assets-oriented, high-quality instruction for English learners called for by the CA EL Roadmap and the ELA/ELD Framework is common. And so, attention to building a pipeline of teachers to enter the field, and encouraging and incentivizing the current workforce to engage in additional professional learning becomes the task of effective systems for EL education.



CASE STUDY: Fresno's Strategic Plan to Employ and Develop Experts in ELD and Bilingual Education

Fresno Unified School District has identified a set of strategic drivers for their continuous improvement plan. The first Strategic Driver is to “Get the right people in the right work.” In applying this to the education of English learners, a subsidiary EL Focus for that strategic driver was set: To employ and develop experts in English language development and bilingual education. Their plan? The district set a goal to employ certificated teachers with expertise in ELD, bilingual education, academic content areas, and languages other than English—and to engage in various efforts to address teacher recruitment, placement, retention, and professional learning. Their commitment was that school leaders, teachers, and support staff would have opportunities to improve their practice and ensure that all of their English learner students would have access to grade-level materials and instruction through professional learning and collaboration as springboards to prepare all teachers to provide for the needs of English learners.



To achieve this commitment, the district set out the following strategies:

- To continue the implementation of a diverse pipeline of talent with clear pathways for advancement to recruit, prepare, and support teachers qualified to teach ELs by partnering with high schools and institutions of higher education
- To develop and implement a districtwide EL leadership academy focused on developing expertise in leading schools with high numbers of English Learners
- To develop a districtwide teacher cohort focused on high-quality, effective instruction for English learner students
- To enhance the teacher and administrator onboarding programs to emphasize the EL Master Plan's components.
- To analyze district data on teacher recruitment, retention, and movement in and out of the district to identify unsuccessful and successful patterns associated with district- and site-level programs.
- To collect recruitment and retention data on district and site-level newly hired teachers, to review teacher retention statistics, and to review teacher mobility statistics
- To review district policies and intra-district teacher transfers for opportunities to enhance successful recruitment of teachers qualified to teach English learner students in alternative programs.
- And, to collaborate with stakeholders of existing education pathway programs at the high school level to strengthen the district's early career pipeline into teaching and expand to additional sites.



READING: Where are the teachers?

This reading is excerpted from: Olsen, L. (2019). *Where are the Teachers? A Half Century of Effort to Address the Teacher Shortage for English Learners*, *A Legacy of Courage and Activism: Stories from the Movement for educational access and equity for English Learners in California*. Californians Together: Long Beach.

As is true for all students, access to education for ELs is profoundly impacted by whether or not they have teachers prepared to understand and address their needs. Ever since the landmark federal Civil Rights Act was passed in 1965, establishing that discrimination would not be tolerated on the basis of race, ethnicity, and national origin, efforts to ensure an adequate supply of prepared and qualified teachers have been central in building a system that ensures equal educational opportunity for English Learners.... More than 50 years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act, we are still confronted with the need to mount a vigorous effort to address the fundamental issue of the shortage of teachers prepared to meet the needs of English learners.

In January 2015, a renewed focus on English Learners within the Office of Civil Rights and the Department of Justice led to issuing a "Dear Colleague" letter, reminding schools of their legal obligations under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to ensure that students with limited English proficiency can meaningfully participate in the educational programs and services. One section of that memorandum discusses staffing, and reiterates the obligation to provide personnel necessary to effectively implement the chosen English Learner (EL) program, including having highly qualified teachers, trained administrators to evaluate those teachers, and materials appropriate for EL programs. The letter states that every school district is responsible for ensuring that teachers have mastered the skills necessary to effectively teach in the program. The memorandum goes on to cite the State Education Agency's responsibility to ensure that districts have adequately trained teachers through guidance and monitoring: "SEAs (State Education Agencies) and school districts that provide EL teacher training are also responsible for evaluating whether their training adequately prepares teachers to implement the program effectively.

Because of the CLAD authorization in California, all credentialed teachers are now officially deemed adequately prepared to address the needs of English Learners. Thus, formally there is no shortage of teachers for English Learners. However, whether or not teachers are actually prepared to teach ELs is still an open question. Since the adoption of the 2014 California English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework, the state faces a major challenge in preparing teachers to teach the new standards and the Integrated and Designated ELD that is encompassed in the vision of integrated curriculum. While there has been a rollout of the ELD standards and the ELA/ELD Framework, those efforts have been minimal compared to the heavy lift of retooling the teaching force to serve English Learners. Integrating content instruction and ELD, designing and delivering ELD in response to content demands in the rest of the curriculum all require a level of expertise, and mastery of strategies, and planning time that is not addressed through professional development or pre-service preparation. Whether the state will respond with funding beyond the LCFF or will see this as a continuing issue of equal educational opportunity requiring a focus on teacher capacity to meet the needs of English Learners, we do not yet know. But there are steps that should be considered:

- *Building a robust discussion of the skills and knowledge required to address English Learners' participation, language development, and access within integrated/designated ELD into the existing statewide mechanisms focusing on the ELA/ELD Framework implementation*
- *Reassessing the CLAD as the foundational certification for preparing all teachers to work with English Learners, and seeking to strengthen and update its provisions*
- *In the development of LCAPs, focusing attention on the crucial need for professional development related to meeting the needs of English Learners*
- *Strengthening faculty capacity in teacher preparation and administrative leadership programs to more fully address the needs of English Learners*

As of 2017, due to the overwhelming passage of ballot initiative Proposition 58 that called for increased bilingual programs, there is a new opportunity to build bilingual program options. Restrictions on bilingual education programs are lifted, allowing California school districts to more easily create or expand bilingual and immersion programs. Schools and families now have greater latitude to seek bilingual programs, and this will likely lead to increased demand for teachers with bilingual authorizations in a variety of languages. Indeed, bilingual education cannot occur without those teachers. However, as we have learned from the past, the expansion of bilingual programs requires serious attention to the supply of qualified bilingual teachers. Expanded programs and quality opportunities for bilingual development can only occur if there are teachers prepared to deliver them as well as administrators ready to support them. If such investments are not made, the likelihood of repeating the old mistakes of poorly implemented programs and severe limitations on building consistent quality pathways to biliteracy will undermine a movement for biliteracy.

Proposition 58, the English Learner Roadmap, the Seal of Biliteracy, and other statewide calls for expanded bilingual opportunities alone are not enough. There must be:

- *Mechanisms to attract, recruit, and bring people with bilingual skills into teaching*
- *Incentives and professional supports to retool the skills of people with BCLADs who once taught bilingually but have been teaching in English-instructed programs for the last decade or so in order to re-enter bilingual classrooms with the preparation needed for success*
- *Updated guidance for the field about what current research suggests constitutes a prepared teacher for the various bilingual language program options available under Proposition 58*
- *Incentives, models, and supports to expand BCLAD programs in teacher preparation institutions—including building faculty capacity to deliver such programs*

The effort to focus policy and practice on building an effective teaching force to meet the needs of English Learners has been an essential part of the advocacy movement to build bilingual programs and appropriate schools for English Learners for decades. It begins with convincing educators, policymakers, and the public that English Learners matter, and then helping them understand the competencies and knowledge teachers need in order to ensure English Learners receive the educational opportunities to which they have a right. We need vigorous campaigns to reject the English-Only belief system that permeated California education for so long. From there, we need the resources and infrastructure to invest in building a teaching force that can effectively and equitably educate the more than one million English Learners in California’s schools. Finally, we need policy and leadership at the local and state levels to monitor and ensure that it be done.”



THE BILINGUAL TEACHER SHORTAGE

There is no full implementation of the CA English Learner Roadmap without the implementation of dual language/biliteracy programs. And yet, the shortage of bilingual teachers in California is acute. The majority of school districts are facing a shortage even to fill positions for their current bilingual/dual-language programs and cite the shortage as a major barrier influencing their ability to expand and create new dual language opportunities. Without concerted effort to address the teacher shortage and to build a pipeline, the result is and will continue to be postponing the development and expansion of bilingual programs. While some of the solutions to this critical shortage lie in the state policy realm (e.g., investments in building a pipeline of bilingual teachers and expanding bilingual authorization pre-service programs), districts seeking to address this shortage need their own strategies to fill the need and realize their visions of dual language opportunities. These strategies should include efforts on multiple levels: to retain existing bilingual teachers, entice existing bilingual teachers who aren't teaching in DL programs to re-enter bilingual teaching, supporting teachers with bilingual skills but who have never taught bilingually, providing career ladders for bilingual paraprofessionals to become teachers, and "growing our own" through career pathways for high school bilingual students.

Approaches to retaining existing bilingual teachers in DL programs.

Teaching in dual language/bilingual programs (especially more newly established programs) carries extra responsibilities. Planning for instruction in and across two languages requires time and also requires aligned curriculum that addresses content standards in two languages which often means teachers time creating and adapting materials. The degree of administrative support for the dual language program, including addressing the planning time challenge and the need for materials, makes an enormous difference in retaining teachers. Pay differentials for bilingual teachers are offered by some districts—although this is an issue for bargaining units. But stipends or extra pay for additional work can be incorporated into site budgets related to strengthening the dual language program—and is decidedly helpful in retaining teachers in those positions. Other steps that districts can take to retain teachers in dual language programs is to alleviate the teacher load either through fewer class periods, lower class size, translation support, more preparation time and planning days, and/or



by providing bilingual teacher aides. Ensuring sufficient bilingual resources such as literature and classroom libraries with books and materials in the target languages they teach is also a helpful incentive. A district's or site's commitment to support ongoing professional learning in dual language pedagogies through opportunities to attend conferences for their own continuing education is important to augment the coaching, collaboration time with colleagues, and other built-in mechanisms of professional learning support.

Approaches to engaging existing bilingual teachers in teaching in a DL program.

There are bilingual teachers from the era before Proposition 227 and the English Only era vastly reduced the number of bilingual programs in California who are still teaching in schools, but in English-instructed classrooms. And there are some educators who entered the teaching position and earned their bilingual authorization but ended up in schools that didn't have a bilingual program. These are an important source of teachers for expanding or new DL programs. A recent survey of these teachers found some reluctance about moving to a bilingual setting now, feeling they need support to get caught up on current research and pedagogy and best practices for effective instruction in bilingual programs. Types of supports they named that would recruit them to dual language program positions include: professional development in updated research-based biliteracy pedagogy and methods, opportunities to brush up and strengthen their own academic language skills in the target language, and the assurance of bilingual materials and curriculum for their classrooms. The lure of stipends or extra pay for bilingual positions is also helpful.

Approaches to supporting teachers with bilingual skills who don't have bilingual authorizations.

Increasingly, there are people who have entered the teaching profession who are themselves bilingual. Many were previously English learners who have a lived experience that connects them to their English learner students, and many have a cultural heritage that is shared as well. These are a wonderful potential source to teach in bilingual programs, but they do not have the training in bilingual pedagogy, nor do they have the authorization. They need the invitation and support to enroll in programs leading to bilingual authorization. Incentive programs—including stipends and financial assistance, tuition reimbursement, and priority placement in the district's dual language programs—can make it possible for them to become fully authorized. In some cases, it can help if the district offers to pay for tests required to complete requirements for a bilingual authorization. In addition, the promise of extra pay for bilingual positions is helpful. Districts should identify the existing bilingual teacher workforce who, with support, might be willing to transition to bilingual classrooms, and engage them in discussion about what would support that move.

Approaches to supporting paraprofessionals to obtain a bilingual teaching authorization.

Bilingual paraprofessionals (e.g., teacher assistants, school-based staff, community members, tutors, translators) are an important resource in searching for bilingual talent to staff dual language programs. Often from the communities of the students, the cultural assets and community knowledge positions them to be effective additions to a teaching faculty. They need, however, support in obtaining their teacher training and credentials. Financial assistance, tuition reimbursement and stipends can make it possible for these paraprofessionals to enter a program, along with pipeline partnerships with nearby teacher education programs. Existing policies on alternative routes for teacher preparation can be leveraged to support the development of partnership programs geared toward developing local teacher candidates to work in local schools. It is important to remove barriers for these non-traditional teacher candidates who often face multiple academic, linguistic and financial barriers to entering the teacher profession and require targeted supports and services. Multiple forms of mentorship and the opportunity to take all of their courses locally help. The district's program coordinator can serve as a "barrier buster" — charged with ensuring that the candidates have access to necessary resources and information to navigate the program.

Approaches to recruiting new teachers entering the teaching profession.

There are many people enrolled in teacher preparation programs in California who have bilingual skills but do not consider the extra work and cost of pursuing a bilingual authorization because they are unsure there is actually a viable job market for bilingual teachers at the end of their training—or because of the extra costs and time incurred in going for the bilingual credential. Establishing Intern programs in partnership with local Bilingual Authorization teacher preparation programs, and offering tuition reimbursement and stipends for teachers who agree to teach in the district after graduating is a way to build a pipeline of bilingual teachers. Similarly, district alternative credentialing programs can create a pipeline. Teacher residencies (one-year intensive apprenticeships modeled on medical residencies) allow districts to immediately fill vacancies while the teacher-in-training apprentices alongside a bilingual mentor teacher for a full academic year while completing coursework for a Master’s degree. Some districts have found “signing bonuses” a helpful recruitment tool for this hard-to-fill teaching need.

Approaches to recruiting young bilingual people into the teaching profession.

California schools are rich in young people with bilingual skills. The heartbreak is that far too many end up never developing biliteracy or even lose proficiency and connection to their home language as they become English speakers. But for those who enter our high schools with bilingual skills and with commitments to their communities, it is important to present them with the idea, the invitation, the pathway, and the opportunity to enter a bilingual teaching career—especially those who are pursuing the Seal of Biliteracy and who have invested themselves in their biliteracy skills, teaching may be a wonderful career option. Career Academies in bilingual teaching, programs that acquaint students with the joys of teaching through career education placements working in classrooms with younger children, and “Teaching Clubs” can recruit and prepare high school students to enter teaching as a field. District partnerships with colleges that enable bilingual students to pursue a five-year combined B.A./teacher education program leading to bilingual authorization can be combined with scholarships for future bilingual teachers. Financial assistance, stipends, or loans for local bilingual students who pursue a bilingual teaching credential can be linked to agreements to teach in the district for a set number of years. These are ways to “grow your own.”



There is no full implementation of the CA English Learner Roadmap without the implementation of dual language/biliteracy programs. And yet, the shortage of bilingual teachers in California is acute, and serves as a major barrier influencing districts’ ability to expand and create new dual language opportunities. Without concerted effort to address the teacher shortage and to build a pipeline, the result is and will continue to be postponing the development and expansion of bilingual programs so crucial to the EL Roadmap vision.



TOOL: Retaining, Recruiting and Building a Pipeline for Teachers for EL Success

Strategy	Have	Plan to Achieve
Retaining Teachers		
Strong professional development supports.		
Supportive conditions (materials, leadership).		
Collaborative Culture (collaboration time, networks of teachers).		
Clear assets and equity-oriented commitment.		
Analyzed data on teacher retention and movement in and out of the district to identify unsuccessful and successful patterns associate with district/site EL programs.		
Pay differentials, extra pay for extra work, stipends for teachers in bilingual/dual language programs		
Mediated teacher load for newcomer classes, SIFE classes, bilingual classes with lower class size, translation support, adequate materials, additional prep time and planning days, or bilingual aides.		
Recruiting		
Clear articulation of competencies needed for EL success—with additional competencies articulated for DL programs		
Outreach through EL/bilingual association networks.		
Existing teachers' outreach.		
Analyze district data on recruitment and retention of newly hired teachers.		
Based on goals for expanding bilingual/DL pathways and programs, project needed bilingual authorized staff—and place hiring emphasis accordingly.		
Determine number of bilingual teachers in district teaching in English-instructed settings—and offer incentives (additional training in updated bilingual pedagogy, etc.).		
Determine the number of teachers with bilingual skills who don't have bilingual authorization. Provide invitation and support to enroll in programs leading to authorization—including stipends, financial assistance, tuition reimbursement.		
Building a Pipeline		
Education career pathway program at HS level—including bilingual teaching career pathways		
Create pathways for bilingual paraprofessionals to obtain a bilingual teaching authorization—including financial assistance, tuition reimbursement, pipeline partnership with local teacher preparation programs, residency programs, etc.		



CASE STUDY: A District-University Partnership to Build a Bilingual Teacher Pipeline

At the start of the 2015–16 school year, the dual language immersion and world language programs at Portland Public Schools (PPS) were in a precarious situation. The district, which had offered dual language immersion programs for several decades, was undertaking an ambitious expansion of these offerings as part of a larger effort to increase equity and close, long-standing achievement gaps.

However, with expanding dual language immersion programs in neighboring districts and small numbers of bilingual candidates graduating from Oregon’s teacher preparation programs, there was a dearth of educators to support the model. The district had been unable to fill 14 teacher vacancies and scrambled to adjust program models in some schools to cover the staffing gaps. It was clear that district administrators needed to take action to ensure that their dual language immersion programs had the staff they needed. So, the district decided to grow their own teachers.

In summer 2016, the district, in partnership with Portland State University (PSU), launched two cohorts of the PPS & PSU Dual Language Teacher Partnership—an alternative route program. The partnership provides 28 dual language teacher fellows with the opportunity to earn a master’s degree in elementary education with a bilingual/English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) endorsement or in secondary education with a world language endorsement (e.g., Spanish). During this time, they simultaneously work as classroom teachers, full-time substitutes, or paraprofessionals. Each bilingual fellow underwent a multi-step process to join the program, including gaining admission into PSU and the teacher preparation program (either Bilingual Teacher Pathway or Graduate Teacher Education Program) and getting hired by the school district. These candidates were drawn from both existing staff (e.g., paraprofessionals) and the local community. “The whole premise of this [program] was the belief that we already had tomorrow’s teachers...in our community. We just had to identify them and equip them,” explained Debbie Armendariz, senior director of Dual Language Immersion at PPS.

PPS has put a variety of support services in place to help break down barriers for the dual language teacher fellows (nine of whom are former paraprofessionals in the district). For example, PPS’s program coordinator provides assistance with the entire application process to both the district and Portland State and ongoing guidance to fellows once they are in the program. The district also pays the upfront costs of exams, application fees, and transcript translation for those educated outside of the U.S. And PSU worked with the district to modify their program’s course sequences to ensure that they were maximally relevant to the fellows’ work as classroom teachers.

This program is the first in Oregon to leverage a school district/university partnership to build an alternative certification bilingual educator pathway that allows participants to work as classroom teachers (and earn a teacher’s salary) while pursuing an education degree and licensure. The PPS/PSU program is one example of how states and districts are addressing the need for qualified bilingual educators through alternative pathways designed to help them grow their own talent.

For more information: Garcia, A. “*Building a Bilingual Teacher Pipeline*” and “*The Portland Public Schools and Portland State University Dual Language Teacher Partnership*” policy briefs, New America: Washington D.C. 2017.

[Building a Bilingual Teacher Pipeline: The Portland Public Schools and Portland State University Dual Language Teacher Partnership](#)

5

SECTION 5:

ALLOCATION AND ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES



There is much that a school leader can do without financial resources to create an affirming and inclusive culture of responsiveness to English Learners and build a shared collective sense of responsibility for EL education across a school and district. The words and actions of a school leader can inject urgency and vision into planning and delivery of EL instruction, and bring people together in a collective endeavor to leverage the assets and address the challenges facing EL students. But unless the system invests resources in alignment with that vision, urgency, and understanding of what EL students need, the task of providing meaningful access and intellectually rich education that will prepare those students for college, careers, and participation in a global 21st-century world cannot be accomplished.

The English Learner Roadmap has ushered in a new emphasis in California education on meaningful access, assets-based and student-responsive approaches, a high intellectual quality of instruction, and a commitment to system support for the conditions required to enact effective schooling for English learners. As with any major change in direction, implementation takes both time and resources—to build capacity to deliver, and to create the will and systems to support the change. For this reason, the section on allocation and alignment of resources comes after having built meaning around what the EL Roadmap Principles 1 and 2 call for, and after having considered what a system of supports must provide. Resources have to be aligned to the vision and goals of a district and school, and they need to follow understanding and knowing who the students are—their assets and needs. Resources have to support the kind of instruction and curriculum that provide meaningful access and intellectually-rich learning for ELs. And resources are needed for the staffing infrastructure that makes meaningful family engagement/partnerships possible—and that support professional learning needed for effective instruction and covers the costs of support programs and materials.

The Local Control Funding Formula/ Local Control Accountability Plans

In California, the process of aligning goals, student needs, and actions for improving programs and services with the allocation of resources is centrally the task of the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). The enactment of the LCFF turned over to local control the responsibility and accountability for allocating resources equitably and appropriately—to close existing gaps of opportunity and access, and provide the programs and services to better meet student needs. Built into the Local Control Funding Formula are supplementary and targeted resources needed to address equity and response to English learner’s need for meaningful access and equal educational opportunity. The Local Control Funding Formula includes base funding for all students, with additional Supplemental and Concentration Funds for English learners (among three targeted student subgroups that also includes low income, foster and homeless youth). Instructions and guidance related to the development of an LCAP calls for specific attention in the plan to English learners (among other subgroups) and attention in the process of developing the plan to the engagement of EL stakeholders (including EL parents and the DELAC).

The CA English Learner Roadmap, as the state policy guiding EL programs and services, is intended to be used in tandem with Local Control Accountability Plans to ensure adequate resources to back up the commitment to assets-based education and meaningful access. This combination is intended to counter the decades-long history of differential access, achievement, and opportunities for English learners in the state—and unequal resources for the education of English learners. LCFF as the state’s school finance policy represents the “mechanism to ensure equity by providing more opportunities for underserved students” (California Education Code. § 52064, 2018)³. Yet, since its inception in 2013, LCFF’s equity goal for English learners has been elusive and requires a sharper focus for this still underserved student population.

It is not the purpose or place of this discussion to serve as a guide to understanding and writing an EL-focused LCAP. However, the experiences over the past five years in California with the challenge of ensuring that English learners are adequately addressed in the LCAP process point to some guidance that school leaders can utilize to ensure that resources are allocated equitably and sufficiently to build a system responsive to English learners. This guidance applies both to the development of the LCAP and the allocation of other resources.

- 1. EL responsive districts and schools should proactively seek and garner needed resources to support the EL program and their EL priorities.*
- 2. The development of the LCAP (and other resource allocation plans) must engage and draw upon both those with professional EL expertise and the input, representation and oversight of the EL community. This might include, for example, EL expert teams and EL focus groups integrated into the LCAP (or other fiscal planning) committees and subcommittees.*
- 3 Funding decisions should be aligned to goals. The development of district visions for English Learners (student outcomes and instructional visions) should be supported by analysis of the budget and resources needed to support implementation—and these should be represented in the LCAP.*



The words and actions of a school leader can inject urgency and vision into planning and delivery of EL instruction, and bring people together in a collective endeavor to address the challenges facing EL students. But unless the system invests resources in alignment with that vision, urgency, and understanding of what EL students need, the task of providing meaningful access and intellectually rich education that will prepare those students for college, careers, and participation in a global 21st-century world cannot be accomplished.

4. Following the “supplement, not supplant” guidance, care must be taken that the targeted dollars meant to address the additional needs of EL students beyond what all students require are not in fact used to alleviate the use of basic funding to meet EL needs.
5. Specificity about English learner needs, programs, and services should be apparent in LCAP goals and plans—naming the targeted actions and services that specifically address and will serve English learner needs. Similarly, metrics must be specific to English learners. To sharpen the focus on ELs, stakeholders involved in planning the allocation of resources must know and understand who their diverse English Learners are to allocate resources and articulate programs, actions, and services equitably. The programs should address Diverse English Learner typologies or profiles including those in early childhood/preschool ages—known as Dual Language Learners (DLLs). Consideration should also be given for those with special learning needs, including but not limited to Long Term English Learners, students with limited or interrupted schooling, and pupils with disabilities.
6. EL, supplemental and targeted funds to schools should be equitably distributed based on English Learner population size and/or EL need.

THE ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP PRINCIPLES CROSSWALK TO LCAP PRIORITIES

The California English Learner Roadmap is intended to set a common direction for the state and to provide guidance for LEAs in local planning and improvement of programs and services for English learners. For these purposes, it was designed to speak to the eight state priorities embedded in the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). Local leadership and governing boards will find it useful to consider alignment of local goals and policies with the mission, vision, and principles of the EL Roadmap, and to use the Principles as a lens for assessing strengths and needed improvements to be included in services, programs, and approaches to English Learner education.

	LCAP 1 Teachers	LCAP 2 Standards	LCAP 3 Parents	LCAP 4 Achievement	LCAP 5 Engagement	LCAP 6 Climate	LCAP 7 Access	LCAP 8 Outcomes
Principle #1: Assets-Oriented and Needs- Responsive Schools	Elements A & C	Elements A & B	Elements B & D	Element C	Elements B, C, & D	Elements A & D	Elements B & D	
Principle #2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access	Elements A, B, & D	Elements A, B, G, & F	Element D	Elements A, B, & C	Elements E & F	Elements C & E	Elements D, E, & G	
Principle #3: System Conditions That Support Effectiveness	Elements B & D	Elements B & D	Element D	Elements A & B	Element D	Element D	Element C & D	Elements A, C, & D
Principle #4: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems	Elements A, B, & C	Elements B & C	Element C	Elements B & C	Element C	Element C	Element B & C	Elements A & C

AN ESSENTIAL RESOURCE FOR DEVELOPING AN EL-FOCUSED LCAP

A new resource is available for LEA's engaged in developing their LCAPs with intentionality to address English Learners. This resource is:

Lavadenz, M., O'Brien, G. and Armas, E.G. (2021) *The LCAP Toolkit: Using research-based tools to promote equity for English Learners*. Center for Equity for English Learners and Californians Together. Long Beach, CA.

The LCAP Toolkit provides guidance based on the EL Roadmap that responds to the Focus Areas of the LCAP with an EL lens, as follows:

- 1. Actions and Services:** English Learner Program options should be responsive to the different language and academic needs of various EL profiles. Assessment should be used to inform EL placement and services with targeted use of supplemental and concentration funds.
- 2. Program and Course Access:** English learner programs should be research-based and represent an aligned and articulated approach to provide maximum opportunities for college and career access pathways inclusive of opportunities to develop proficiency in English and other languages. English learners should receive access to a full curriculum, rigorous coursework, and quality standards-based instruction that is interdisciplinary and leverages primary language instruction and scaffolding.
- 3. Desired Outcomes for English Learner Achievement:** Regardless of the assigned instructional program, English learners' academic growth should be documented in all languages in which they are instructed. Program outcomes should be diagnosed with assessments designed specifically for ELs. Districts should implement a clear plan to analyze and monitor progress toward "gap" reduction.
- 4. English Language Development:** English learners should receive a comprehensive English Language Development (ELD) program delivered by prepared teachers during a designated ELD period and an integrated period for content area instruction. ELD teaching and learning should be guided by the ELD standards and ongoing educator development planned and provided to support effective implementation.
- 5. Professional Development:** A comprehensive learning plan for educators of English learners should utilize research-based approaches to engage in professional development guided by short and long-term goals, CCSS and ELD standards, the CA EL Roadmap, and cultural proficiency. Learning should be collaborative with opportunities to plan units and lessons, observe and practice research-based strategies and receive feedback and coaching in supportive networks.
- 6. Family Engagement:** District, schools, and classrooms should provide affirming environments and opportunities for families to support maximum opportunities for college and career access pathways for English learners. Clear strategies are to be developed and implemented to engage families in accessing information, understanding program options available to their children, and making decisions.
- 7. Expenditures:** Districts should develop an explicit and coherent LCAP plan that includes equitable and coherent resource allocation. The plan should include a detailed budget description, expenditures aligned to actions and services for ELs, intentional use of LCFF and non LCFF (Title III and other funding sources), and transparency of usage across LCAP years.



The Site Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)

The Site Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) was described earlier as a vehicle for developing site vision, goals, and improvement plans. It is also the vehicle for determining a site budget which rolls up into the LEA's LCAP. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires all schools receiving Title I funds to develop a school plan. In California, this is the SPSA—which consolidates all school-level planning efforts into one plan for programs funded through the consolidated application (ConApp), and for federal school improvement programs, including schoolwide programs, Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), pursuant to California Education Code (EC) Section 64001 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by ESSA. The development of the School Plan is required to include the following:

- *A comprehensive needs assessment*
- *Analysis of verifiable state data consistent with state priorities, including state-determined long-term goals—and also may include local data*
- *An identification of the process for evaluating and monitoring the implementation of the School Plan and progress toward accomplishing the goals*

The School Plan is also required to include the following:

- *Stakeholder involvement*
- *Goals to improve student outcomes, including addressing the needs of student groups*
- *Evidence-based strategies, actions, and services*
- *Proposed expenditures*

Given that the needs of students and families differ from school to school and community to community, the set of services and partnerships at each school must differ. The School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is created by a school team including the principal, teachers, parents, community partners, and, where applicable, secondary school students. The School Site Council (SSC) is involved in developing the SPSA, and also is required to annually review the SPSA, establish an annual budget, and make modifications to the plan that reflect changing needs and priorities. It is best the tool for sites to use in prioritizing the particular programs and strategies that will best serve their students, families, and the community. And, it is, therefore, the way to allocate resources.

School leaders use the SPSA process as a major means of building school community, vision, and ownership, and building transparency into the relationship between those goals/visions and the allocation of resources. Mirroring the guidance offered for LCAPs, the following is suggested for the process of resource allocation through the SPSA.

- 1. EL responsive schools proactively seek and garner needed resources to support the EL program and their EL priorities.*
- 2. The development of the SPSA engages and draws upon both those with professional EL expertise and the input, representation and oversight of the EL community. This might include, for example, EL expert teams and EL focus groups integrated into the SPSA (or other fiscal planning) committee and subcommittees.*
- 3. Funding decisions are aligned to goals. The development of site visions for English Learners (student outcomes and instructional visions) gives rise to an analysis of the budget and resources needed to support implementation—and these are then represented in the SPSA.*
- 4. Specificity about English learner needs, programs, and services are made apparent in SPSA goals and plans—naming the targeted actions and services that specifically address and will serve English learner needs. Similarly, metrics are specific for English learners. To sharpen the focus on ELs, those involved in planning the allocation of resources know and understand who their diverse English Learners are so they can allocate resources and articulate programs, actions, and services equitably. The programs address diverse English Learner typologies or profiles. Consideration is given for those with special learning needs, including but not limited to Long Term English Learners, students with limited or interrupted schooling, and pupils with disabilities.*



REFLECTION: Costs Associated with My Priorities

What's something that has arisen as a priority for you re: EL education as you have delved into the English Learner Roadmap's principles? What are the cost factors related to action and implementation for that priority? Where and how can it be funded?



TOOL: Resource Allocation With English Learners in Mind

Indicators	True	Reflection
Our funding decisions are aligned to our instructional vision and analysis of EL strengths and needs.		
Our resource allocation is sufficient to meaningful progress in meeting our EL goals.		
LCAP includes support for EL programs and teacher professional development.		
We proactively seek and garner needed resources to support the EL program and their priorities.		
The development of our LCAP (or SPSA) engages and draws upon those with EL expertise.		
The development of our LCAP (or SPSA) meaningfully seeks and supports the input and representation of the EL community.		
Funds that are targeted and are meant to address the specific needs of EL students beyond what all students require are not in fact used to alleviate the use of basic funding to meet EL needs.		
Specificity about English learners' needs, programs, and services is apparent in LCAP/SPSA goals and plans—naming the targeted actions and services that precisely address and will serve English learner needs.		
EL, supplemental and targeted funds to schools are equitably distributed based on English learner population size and/or EL need.		
Site leaders use the SPSA process as a vehicle for building school community, vision, and ownership, and building transparency into the relationship between those goals/visions and the allocation of resources.		

NOTES:

Human Resources: Equity and Placement

Funding is not the only valuable resource. The human resources in the school system also must be deployed and allocated in alignment with the vision and goals and commitments of a district and school. If the commitment is to equity, to prioritizing students with the greatest needs, then staffing decisions should match those commitments. Sometimes this involves the fiscal decisions (e.g., decisions to fund coach or TOSA positions to support effective EL instruction, or funding a bilingual Family Engagement Coordinator), but it is also a matter of how humans are deployed. Common equity challenges, for example, include disproportionate placement of the least experienced teachers in high-need schools, or the choice to utilize a scarce supply of bilingual teachers in programs where they are serving primarily as enrichment in a FLES program for English proficient students seeking the benefits of bilingualism rather than providing bilingual classes for English learners. For example, schools with large concentrations of English learners may have front office staff who are only English speaking, while there are front office personnel with bilingual skills in other schools in the district.

Ideally all students have teachers with the skills and appropriate authorizations and training to meet their needs. Assuring that there is an adequate supply of teachers with the skills to deliver quality instruction to English learners is a matter of intentional hiring, investments in professional learning, and prioritizing the placement of those most skilled and prepared with students with the greatest needs. Districts seeking equity for their English learners should regularly monitor the following to inform whether a rebalancing and redeployment of teachers might be necessary:

- *Comparison of high EL concentration schools with low EL concentration schools in a district: Number of teachers without proper authorization for their subject.*
- *Comparison of high EL concentration schools with low EL concentration schools in a district: Analysis of teacher absenteeism, use of long-term subs, teacher turnover.*

Beyond deployment, close attention to the human resources in a school or district should inform recruitment and hiring (see pages 76-83).



The human resources in the school system must be deployed and allocated in alignment with the vision and goals and commitments of a district and school. If the commitment is to equity, to prioritizing students with the greatest needs, then staffing decisions should match those commitments.

6

SECTION 6:

MOVING FORWARD WITH PRINCIPLE 3



Principle #3, “Ensuring System Conditions to Support Effectiveness” is the great enabler for the vision and the rest of the principles of the EL Roadmap. Recognizing that the most aspirational visions and all of the knowledge about research-based practices that lead to those visions are nothing but paper and talk without systems and supports designed to give them life, the EL Roadmap explicitly built into the policy the call to create system conditions—leadership structures and local policies, assessment and data systems, professional learning and recruitment to build the educator workforce, and the alignment of resources to the vision and goals. It is through Principle # 3 that we get held to walking the talk. This Toolkit closes with a section of reflection and planning.



REFLECTION: Taking Stock—Why is Principle #3 Important?

Reflecting back on the sections of Principle #3 (leadership goals and commitments, leadership structures, data and assessment systems, professional learning and capacity building, resource allocation), and what it means to create the system conditions to support the implementation of assets-oriented, needs responsive, intellectually rich schools with meaningful access for ELs—try to articulate your response to the following:

What seems most essential to you personally about this Principle? What matters the most?

Are there any key areas of need, improvement, or urgency for your school that stood out to you as the most important or highest priority?

Are there any aspects of your school that you feel particularly proud about in terms of enacting the vision of Principle #3?



ACTION: My Learning Plan

This Toolkit was designed to support you as a school leader and administrator in deepening your understanding and learning about the system conditions you need to create in order to support effective schools for English learners. The prior toolkits, with their focus on Principles #1 and #2, engaged you in exploring the kind of education English learners need. This one calls upon you to actually create the systems to make that happen. Reflect on what you read, encountered, and thought about as you worked through this Toolkit focusing on Principle #3.

Digging deeper — What aspects, if any, did you identify as a high priority to learn more about, to read about, to discuss with colleagues, or to deepen your understanding?

Looking further — Some of the activities in the Toolkit led to observing what was going on in how your school and district function, how they are structured as a system. Which aspects, if any, seem important to you now to go back and spend more time observing or inquiring about to get a clearer sense of the status of current practices, policies, and structures?



ACTIVITY: Building Awareness—Talking Points/Key Messages

To acquaint your school community or district colleagues with Principle #3 of the English Learner Roadmap, you as a school leader need to be able to articulate what it is and why it's important. First review the set of Key Messages listed below, checking or highlighting those that seem most important for you to communicate to others. Then, gather your notes about why you believe building a system with the conditions to support the EL Roadmap implementation are important for you, your students, and your school. Gather your notes on key points from the readings and learnings. Then add your personal notes to the Talking Points (below). This becomes your communications agenda.

Key Messages from Principle #3:

- The EL Roadmap policy is explicit in recognizing and calling for the development of systemic structures and approaches in LEAs and school sites that are necessary for assets-based, student responsive, intellectually rich practices leading to meaningful access to be implemented sustainably and equitably—with adequate resources, capacity and accountability built into the life of schooling. Without systems, coherence, infrastructure and aligned investment of resources, the vision and mission of the EL Roadmap cannot be enacted.
- The degree to which the school and district system itself is structured, aligned, and mobilized to address EL needs, assets and rights makes all the difference in EL success.
- Each level of the school system (state, county, district, school, pre-school) needs leaders and educators who are knowledgeable of and responsive to the strengths and needs of English learners and their communities.
- Formal statements of values, goals, and commitments clarify for all actors in a system what aligns their work with all others in that system, and the expectations and responsibilities of being part of that system.
- In districts where students across racial/ethnic groups consistently outperform peers in other districts, a key strategy employed by leaders is to set a clear vision for teaching and learning that is communicated districtwide and that centers on equity and social justice, and speaks explicitly to specific goals that have meaning for historically marginalized and excluded groups. They set explicit goals for student learning in the context of new standards and accountability, and also specifically emphasize equity for ELs in their guiding principles.
- Ambitious instructional visions and guiding principles appear to make a significant difference in driving for high-quality EL instruction by describing the pedagogical characteristics and vision of teaching rooted in research about dual language and second language development. The instructional vision provides a common language across the district for talking about EL instruction. And it can communicate in the actionable language of the task of teaching and the role of teaching practices.
- Strong EL Master Plans are based upon an understanding of the research on effective evidence-based definitions of high-quality English learner pedagogy and practices, a thorough understanding of the policies and laws governing English learner education, a good knowledge of the English learner students and community being served, a close connection to the educators and sites serving those students that can inform the kind of information that would be most helpful, and the embracing of local priorities and values. This requires, then, not just EL expertise, but a process of facilitating and collaborating with district and community stakeholders in developing the plan. And that means sufficient investment of resources—desire, funding, time, and staff—to the process.

- In order to provide coherent, high-quality programs and services for English learners, there must be structured roles, staffing and leadership mechanisms at both the district and site levels. Given that ELs are the responsibility of all educators across the system, there must be expertise and a focus in all functions of the system on the needs of ELs. In addition, there must be clear designated responsibility (a position or person) who coordinates the focus on ELs. Balancing this need to keep a specific focus on ELs and to empower and spread EL expertise across the system is a challenge.
- School leadership makes it explicit and clear that addressing the needs of ELs is a responsibility of the whole school and is key to the school's mission and vision.
- As with all equity issues, with long histories of schooling in which students have been underserved or excluded, bringing about changes in beliefs, expectations, practices, and commitments requires advocacy-oriented leadership. This means leaders need to be setting expectations, speaking up and speaking out, focusing all stakeholders on the diverse needs and assets and rights of English learners, and leading changes to respond systemically to English learners.
- Much of the data collected and placed in front of educators today are not sufficient to support analysis and interpretations about what English learners know and can do. Nor are the assessments adequate to the goals and visions of schooling in California as articulated by the English Learner Roadmap.
- Knowledge and mastery of content is NOT adequately measured for ELs by tests administered in English—the language they have not yet mastered. Because almost all assessments measure language proficiency to some degree, ELs often receive lower scores on content area assessments administered in English than they would if they took the same tests in a language in which they were proficient. Due to their limited English proficiency and diverse cultural experiences, EL students should be cautiously assessed when using traditional assessments created for their English speaking and U.S.-born peers.
- The most effective data systems are designed to support meaningful inquiry and continuous improvement as well as progress monitoring, and are able to facilitate the kind of analyses needed to gain a strong picture of English learner experience and achievement. First, such a system is **adequately staffed** to administer assessments in a **timely and linguistically accessible** way. It is staffed with people who understand the assessments and what they measure and are experienced in creating data analyses and reports that respond to the questions and priorities of the district and sites. Second, the system incorporates **multiple sources of data** and uses **valid and reliable assessments** for the populations and purposes needed. The data collected and stored (and available for analysis) is a mix of demographic data, enrollment and participation information, and achievement data that enables assembling the strongest profiles of English learner experience and achievement in school. A regular **calendar** of data reports and communications is established to inform key decision-making for sites and the district office in a **timely** manner. Data reports are communicated in clear **accessible language** to educators and community. **Training and support** are made available to enable educators to understand the data.
- What we know is that good schools, high-performing schools, and effective school systems *intentionally* support adult learning, investing in creating the time and space and culture where adults learn together as a community in the act of continuous improvement in pursuit of stronger student outcomes.
- Changing practice takes exposure to new ideas and strategies, *and* the time and support to try them out and refine them. It takes attention to the purpose, theory, rationale, and research behind an approach, *and* practical application in real classrooms with real students. It requires the support of coaches, mentors, and colleagues.

- Professional learning efforts in a district or school should be tightly aligned with the instructional vision and goals for English learners. While the overall theoretical framework, instructional vision, goals, and pedagogical stance for educating English learners should be consistent in professional learning across all roles within the system, the design, delivery, and content of professional learning should be geared toward the specific jobs and roles. Professional learning is job-specific and job-embedded.
- Good schools—with strong supportive leadership, a collaborative teacher culture, commitments to professional learning, and with a strong assets-oriented and equity oriented instructional vision—attract good teachers and staff. But given the teacher shortage, active recruitment of teachers is also needed. Being clear about what you are looking for, and being able to articulate to candidates a clear picture of the schools' vision and commitments and culture for ELs, are key to recruitment.
- Without concerted effort to address the teacher shortage and to build a pipeline, the result is and will continue to be postponing the development and expansion of bilingual programs. While some of the solutions to this critical shortage lie in the state policy realm (e.g., investments in building a pipeline of bilingual teachers and expanding bilingual authorization pre-service programs), districts seeking to address this shortage need their own strategies to fill the need and realize their visions of dual language opportunities. These strategies should include efforts on multiple levels: to retain existing bilingual teachers, entice existing bilingual teachers who aren't teaching in DL programs to re-enter bilingual teaching, supporting teachers with bilingual skills but who have never taught bilingually, providing career ladders for bilingual paraprofessionals to become teachers, and "growing our own" through career pathways for high school bilingual students.
- Unless the system invests resources in alignment with their vision and understanding of what EL students need, the task of providing meaningful access and intellectually rich education that will prepare those students for college, a career, and participation in a global 21st-century world cannot be accomplished. Resources have to be aligned to the vision and goals of a district and school, and they need to follow understanding and knowing who the students are—their assets and needs. Resources have to support the kind of instruction and curriculum that provide meaningful access and intellectually rich learning for ELs. And resources are needed for the staffing infrastructure that makes meaningful family engagement/partnerships possible, that support professional learning needed for effective instruction, that covers the costs of support programs and materials.
- The CA English Learner Roadmap, as the state policy guiding EL programs and services, is intended to be used in tandem with Local Control Accountability Plans to ensure adequate resources to back up the commitment to assets-based education and meaningful access. Yet, since its inception in 2013, LCFF's equity goal for English Learners has been elusive and requires a *sharper focus* for this still underserved student population.
- Assuring that there is an adequate supply of teachers with the skills to deliver quality instruction to English learners is a matter of intentional hiring, investments in professional learning, and prioritizing the placement of those most skilled and prepared with students with the greatest needs.

Other key messages:



ACTION: Engaging Other—Which Activities, Readings, and Reflections Will I Use?

Work with your ELR Implementation Team to determine who you are going to engage and in which formats and ways you will make meaning of Principle #3, generate dialogue about Principle #3, and build your shared understanding of the status of Principle #3 implementation at your site and within your district. Review the activities, readings, and tools in this Toolkit to determine which (if any) might be used with which groups.

PLANNING CHART: Which Activities Will I Use with My ELR Implementation Team and Others?

Purpose	Activity/Readings	ELR Team	Faculty & Staff	Others?
Build awareness and meaning of Principle #3	Readings: The Text of Principle #3			
Strengthen our formal goals, values, commitment statements	Readings: Clear systems values and commitments, alignment up and down			
	Case studies: LAUSD six guiding principles (with reflection) Resolution of Board of Trustees			
	Reflections: Key elements of EL Roadmap, the value of formal statements			
	Activity: Our district vision juxtaposed with ELR			
	Activities: Replace students with ELs			
	Tool: Leadership Statement and Mechanisms			
Strengthen our EL Master Plan	Readings: EL Master plans, and Including ELs in the Action Plans of District and Schools			
	Inquiry/Find out: Our EL Master Plan			
	Inquiry: Looking for ELs in General Plans			
Strengthen our structures for EL focus	Readings: Basic Principles, Shifts in District Practices			
	Reflection: Changes in structures			
	Tool: Leadership Structures to Infuse EL Expertise			
Strengthening skills of being an advocacy-oriented leader	Reading: On being an Advocacy oriented Leader			
	Reflection: Your wisdom			
Strengthening our assessment and data systems	Readings: Heads Up about EL assessments and data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways to analyze EL Data • The Data system we need • Data assessment and accountability • Assessments and goals of biliteracy • Build assessment systems that monitor and honor biliteracy 			
	Reading: Avoiding common data dialogue pitfalls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ten Things a leader can do 			
	Case examples: OUSD ELL Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SFUSD monitoring trajectory of progress toward biliteracy 			
	Tool: Reflecting on our EL Data needs			
	Tool: Are these true of our data system?			
	Tool: How prepared is our school to use EL data?			
	Activity: Common scenarios indicating need for stronger data			

Purpose	Activity/Readings	ELR Team	Faculty & Staff	Others?
Build an educator force for EL success	Readings: Professional Development and Capacity Building (for teachers, for administrators) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment and the Pipeline • Where are the teachers? • The Bilingual Teacher Shortage 			
	Case Study: PD in context of an EL Intervention Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fresno’s strategy to employ and develop experts in ELD and bilingual education • Portland Build Their Own 			
	Tool: Professional development and learning			
Engage people in reflecting on our LCAP	Readings: The Local Control Funding Formula Tool: Resource Allocation with ELs in Mind			
Engage people in reflecting on the SPSA	Reading: The Site Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) Tool: Resource Allocation with ELs in Mind			
Reflecting on Deployment of Human Resources	Read: Human Resources: Equity and Placement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in data analysis 			



Recognizing that the most aspirational visions and all of the knowledge about research-based practices that lead to those visions are nothing but paper and talk without systems and supports designed to give them life, the EL Roadmap explicitly built into the policy the call to create system conditions—leadership structures and local policies, assessment and data systems, professional learning and recruitment to build the educator workforce, and the alignment of resources to the vision and goals. It is through Principle # 3 that we get held to walking the talk.

7

SECTION 7:

APPENDIX – RESOURCES AND LINKS

DISTRICT MASTER PLANS, INSTRUCTIONAL VISIONS, ETC.

Oakland Unified School District

www.ousd.org

The OUSD website includes a set of resources on the English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA) section. These include: The English Language Learner Master Plan, the Roadmap to ELL Achievement, the ELL Snapshot and Progress Monitoring materials, the ELL Instructional Vision, the Five Essential Practices, information on the districts ELL programs and program guidance, as well as resources for teachers and families.

Los Angeles Unified School District

www.achieve.lausd.net

The 2018 Master Plan for English Learners and Standard English Learners is available on the district website in both English and Spanish versions. An implementation Toolkit for the Master Plan is also available.

Fresno Unified School District

www.fresnou.org

The FUSD website offers sections on their vision and programs for English learners. The direct link to the Master Plan for English Learner Success is below:

<https://www.fresnou.org/news/stories/Documents/Master%20Plan%20for%20EL%20Success.Final.pdf>

Chula Vista Elementary School District

www.cvesd.org

Chula Vista Elementary School District's vision, values, and goals are available on the CVESD Vision and Values web page on the CVESD website.

PUBLICATIONS

Armas, E., Lavadenz, M., Rozsa, N. & O'Brien, G. (2021) *The English Master Plan Playbook: Developing Equitable Local Policies for Multilingual and English Learner Students*, Loyola Marymount University Center for Equity for English Learners. CEEL@lmu.edu

Armas, E., M. Lavadenz, and L. Olsen. 2015. *Falling Short on the Promise to English Learners: A Report on Year One LCAPs*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together

Alejandre, R. H., and R. S. Massaro. 2016. *Keeping the Promise of LCFF in Districts Serving Less than 55% High-Need Students*. San Francisco, CA: Public Advocates

Burns, D., L. Darling-Hammond, and C. Scott (with T. Allbright, D. Carver-Thomas, E. J. Daramola, J. L. David, L. E. Hernández, K. E. Kennedy, J. A. Marsh, C. A. Moore, A. Podolsky, P. M. Shields, and J. E. Talbert). 2019. *Closing the Opportunity Gap: How Positive Outlier Districts in California Are Pursuing Equitable Access to Deeper Learning*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Californians Together, (February 2021), *The Accountability System English Learners Deserve: Framework for an Effective and Coherent Accountability System for ELs*, Californians Together: Long Beach, CA. www.californianstogether.org

Elmore, R. F. 2004. *School Reform from the Inside Out: Policy, Practice, and Performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press

Isola, R. and J. Cummins. (2019) *Transforming Sanchez School: Shared Leadership, Equity and Evidence*. Caslon Publishing.

Santos, M. & Hopkins, M. (2020) "Creating Schools and Systems that Support Asset-Based, High -Quality Instruction for Multilingual Learners," Chapter 7, *Improving Education for Multilingual and English Learner Students: Research to Practice*. California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA.

Lavadenz, M., E. Armas, and S. J. Hodge. 2017. Masking the Focus on English Learners: The Consequences of California's Accountability System Dashboard Results on Year 4 Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs). Long Beach, CA: The Center for Equity for English Learners and Los Angeles, CA: Californians Together.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAEM). 2017. *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAEM). 2018. *English Learners in STEM Subjects: Transforming Classrooms, Schools, and Lives*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press

Santibañez, L. and Gandara, P. (2018) *Teachers of English Language Learners in Secondary Schools: Gaps in Preparation and Support*. Los Angeles, A: UCLA The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles.

Santos, M., L. Darling-Hammond, and T. Cheuk. (2012) *Teacher Development to Support English Language Learners in the Context of Common Core State Standards*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University/Understanding Language.

Skrla, L., J.J. Scheurich, J and Garcia, J. and G. Nolly (2004) "Equity Audits: a Practice Leadership Tool for Developing Equitable and Excellent Schools." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 4.0 (1): 133-161

Zarate, M.E. and P. Gandara (2019) "Can the LCFF Improve Teaching and Learning for EL Students? A Review of the emerging Research in California and Directions for Future Implementation." *Peabody Journal of Education* 94 (2): 157-175.

ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES FOR LEADERS FOR EQUITY AND ENGLISH LEARNERS

AVID—Advancement Via Individual Determination

<https://www.avid.org/>

AVID equips teachers and schools with what they need to help students who often will be the first in their families to attend college and are from groups traditionally underrepresented in higher education succeed on a path to college and career success. AVID offers a variety of classroom activities, lesson plans, professional learning videos, and articles that are relevant to students. AVID's professional learning focuses on Culturally Relevant Teaching, Academic Language and Literacy, and Digital Teaching and Learning. A major component of the program is a one period elective class where students receive the additional academic, social, and emotional support they need to succeed in rigorous courses. AVID Excel is specifically for middle schools to address the needs of Long Term English learners by accelerating language acquisition, developing academic literacy, and placing them on a path to high school AVID and college-preparatory coursework. The elective provides explicit instruction in English language development and academic language through reading, writing, oral language, academic vocabulary, and college readiness skills. AVID Excel can also be implemented to ensure that heritage language courses support full biliteracy, increase academic rigor, and provide a path to Advanced Placement language classes for EL students.

Be GLAD®

<https://begladtraining.com/about>

Be GLAD®, is a national organization providing professional development on the Guided Language Acquisition Design instructional model to states, districts, and schools promoting language acquisition, high academic achievement, and 21st-century skills. Teachers are trained to modify the delivery of student instruction to promote academic language and literacy. The professional development offered focuses on improved pedagogy with consistent instructional routines while creating a school environment responsive to diversity with an inclusive learning environment. Be GLAD® helps to establish a project-based, student-centered curriculum process that is inquiry driven. This is a strong support for Integrated ELD.

Blueprints for Effective Leadership and Instruction for our English learners' Future (B.E.L.I.E.F.)

https://rcoe.learning.powerschool.com/mmccabe/b.e.l.i.e.f/cms_page/view

The seven B.E.L.I.E.F. modules are designed to support district and site administrators with implementation of both integrated and designated ELD. The modules include current ELD research; opportunities to deepen understanding of integrated and designated ELD; activities to analyze, reflect upon, and refine programs for English learners; and follow-up activities to use with staff to support implementation. B.E.L.I.E.F. is a comprehensive professional learning tool designed to increase efficacy, confidence, and capacity of leadership personnel in regard to meeting the needs of the English learner populations in schools, grounded in data, research, and the messages of the CA ELA/ELD Framework. Blueprints for Effective Leadership and Instruction for our English learners' Future (B.E.L.I.E.F.)

The **California Association of Bilingual Education** was incorporated in 1976 to promote bilingual education and quality educational experiences for all students in California. CABE has chapters, members, and affiliates, along with partnerships with other state and national advocacy organizations working to promote equity and student achievement for students with diverse cultural, racial, and linguistic backgrounds. CABE recognizes and honors the fact that we live in a multicultural, global society and that respect for diversity makes us a stronger state and nation. CABE offers multiple professional learning opportunities for administrators and other educators. www.gocabe.org

Californians Together is a statewide advocacy coalition of 24 organizations from all segments of the education community including teachers, administrators, board members, parents and civil rights non-profit groups. of better educating 1.1 million English Learners by improving California's schools and promoting equitable educational policy. Member organizations come together united around the goal of better educating our English learners by improving California's schools and promoting equitable education policy. Californians Together provides research briefs, policy briefs, and professional learning opportunities for educators and advocates on major issues impacting English learners. www.californianstogether.org

The **Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL)** is a non-profit organization in Washington DC whose mission is to promote language learning and cultural understanding by serving as a trusted source for research, resources, and policy analysis. CAL has earned an international reputation for its contributions to the fields of bilingual and dual language education, English as a second language, world languages education, language policy, assessment, immigrant and refugee integration, literacy, dialect studies, and the education of linguistically and culturally diverse adults and children. CAL is led by a team of highly qualified and talented researchers, language scholars, and experienced practitioners, many of whom are recognized leaders in their fields. www.cal.org

The **Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL)** at Loyola Marymount University was established with the explicit purpose of improving educational outcomes for English learners (ELs). The Center's research, policy and professional development agendas inform leadership and instructional practices for California's 1.2 million ELs and the nation's 5 million English learners. The Center for Equity for English Learners enriches and supports the work of schools, school systems, educational/community partners, and policy makers through an assets-based approach. CEEL's staff provides consistent, research-based high quality professional development that promote equity and excellence for ELs and advance multilingualism.

CSU Expository Reading and Writing Course

<https://www2.calstate.edu/CAR/Pages/erwc.aspx>

The ERWC (Expository Reading and Writing Course) is a college preparatory, rhetoric-based English language arts course for grade 12 designed to develop academic literacy (advanced proficiency in rhetorical and analytical reading, writing, and thinking.)

Education Trust-West Advocacy Tools: Implementing the EL Roadmap and Affirming the rights of English Learners. These resources, available in English and Spanish, clarify English learners' basic rights and outline ways to ensure the EL Roadmap Policy is being implemented in your community. These resources include flyers titled, "What is California's English Learner Roadmap?," "10 Questions to Ask Your School and District about California's English Learner Roadmap," and "English Learners Have Rights: An Advocacy Guide for Parents and Other Stakeholders."

EL Achieve

www.elachieve.org

EL Achieve supports districts to implement system-wide approach to addressing the needs of English learners. The approach is rooted in multiple areas of educational theory, research, and practice, including effective literacy and content instruction, second language pedagogy and policy, trusting and caring school environments, academic optimism, and the science of implementation. Student-centered pedagogy and robust language learning are the focus of their "Constructing Meaning" Integrated ELD approach, and their Systematic ELD which is designated ELD.

Enhancing Learning with Authentic Communication, Jeff Zwiers

<https://jeffzwiers.org/>

Website includes resources that focus on the development of classroom instruction that fosters rich communication and productive academic conversations across disciplines and grade-levels.

Project GLAD®

<http://www.ocde.us/NTCProjectGLAD/Pages/default.aspx>

As a model of professional learning, the Orange County Department of Education National Training Center (NTC) for the Project GLAD® (Guided Language Acquisition Design) model, is dedicated to building academic language and literacy for all students, especially English learner/emergent bilingual students. The model enhances teachers' design and delivery of standards-based instruction through an integrated approach with the intent of building language proficiency and academic comprehension. Project GLAD® classrooms promote an environment that respects and honors each child's voice, personal life experience, beliefs and values their culture. GLAD strategies are supports for Integrated ELD across the curriculum.

Leading for Learning is a systemic approach for school districts focused on improving teaching and learning for English learners. That approach includes intensive blended professional learning for teachers, instructional coaches, and principals, and systems work with district leadership teams. Leading with Learning's ultimate goal is raising student achievement and ensuring that all English learners and other culturally and linguistically diverse students graduate from high school ready for college, careers, and meaningful interaction with civic life. WestEd Teachers and Leaders Resources web page

www.wested.org

Multilingual Learning Toolkit: Resources for Supporting PreK-3rd Multilingual Children.

<http://www.multilingualelearningtoolkit.org/>

This new website of resources focuses specifically on the early years, preschool to 3rd grade, providing an introduction to supporting young Multilingual Learner (ML) students, and intended for educators of children from preschool to 3rd grade, particularly those who may have limited access to or opportunities to participate in training on how to support ML students. It describes the foundational principles and evidence-based strategies for instruction that are critical for teachers to know. It can be used by teachers to learn about evidence-based strategies, as well as by school or district administrators to understand how to support their teachers and inform decisions about training and resources to provide.

The **National Equity Project** is a leadership and systems change organization committed to increasing the capacity of people to achieve thriving, self-determining, educated, and just communities. Their mission is to transform the experiences, outcomes, and life options for children and families who have been historically underserved by our institutions and systems. Their Center for Equity Leadership provides a range of professional development opportunities for leaders at every level of school district—as well as nonprofits, foundations, governments, and communities. <https://www.nationalequityproject.org/>

Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL) works to provide both elementary and secondary educators with the tools they need to accelerate language development, academic literacy, and disciplinary knowledge of all students, particularly English learners. A project of WestEd, information can be found at: www.qtel.wested.org

Sobrato Early Academic Language Model

<https://www.seal.org/>

SEAL (Sobrato Early Academic Language) is a professional development and instructional model that builds the capacity of preschools and elementary schools to powerfully develop the language and literacy skills of English learner children within the context of integrated, standards-based, and joyful learning. They have created and made available a variety of resources for administrators and teachers on implementing Integrated ELD, Designated ELD, and dual-language instruction preschool through sixth grade, including a library of videos of research-based practices and instructional strategies. Support for school leaders and district administrators is provided.

Teachers College Reading and Writing Project

<https://readingandwritingproject.org>

The Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP) was founded and is directed by Lucy Calkins. The organization has developed state-of-the-art tools and methods as well as professional development for teaching reading and writing, for using performance assessments and learning progressions to accelerate progress, and for literacy-rich content-area instruction. Lucy Calkins' 5-part reading and writing workshop framework offers a combination of whole-class, small-group, one-on-one instruction, and independent practice. The TCRWP has many free resources for teachers, coaches and administrators. They offer videos that provide an orientation to the Units of Study series for reading and writing as well as videos that show students and teachers at work in classrooms. There are documents to support the assessment of student growth, resources for implementation of reading and writing workshops and links to professional texts written by TCRWP staff. They have an FAQ available on their website.

TCRWP Supports for English Language Learners

<https://readingandwritingproject.org/resources/supports-for-multilingual-learners>

Developed in partnership with voices from California educators, these resources offer connections between TCRWP Reading and Writing unit minilessons to support English learner students during workshops. This resource can be used by leaders to support whole school workshop implementation with the needs of EL students including practices to support linguistically diverse learners and suggestions for CA ELD Standards alignment.

Thinking Maps

<https://www.thinkingmaps.com/>

Thinking Maps are consistent visual patterns linked directly to eight specific thought processes. Through visualization, concrete images of abstract thought are created. Students use visual patterns to work collaboratively for deeper comprehension in all content areas. They use the maps to analyze complex texts and think mathematically for conceptual understanding and problem solving. Thinking maps allow teachers to see the evidence of their students thinking and learning. In a school-wide implementation, Thinking Maps help establish a common language for learning and are particularly powerful for English learners for whom the visual scaffolding makes content more comprehensible and can be used consistently across language settings in bilingual and dual-language programs.

Understanding Language, Stanford Graduate School of Education

<https://ell.stanford.edu/>

Understanding Language aims to heighten educator awareness of the critical role that language plays in the new Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards. The long-term goal of the initiative is to increase recognition that learning the language of each academic discipline is essential to learning content. Obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information; articulating and building on ideas; constructing explanations; engaging in argument from evidence—such language-rich performance expectations permeate the new Standards. This site offers educator resources, research papers, and access to online courses.

University Council for Education Administration (UCEA), Preparing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners Modules. This set of modules includes: Advocacy and Leadership; Learning Environments; English Language Learning; Families and Community; Trust and Racial Awareness; Resources per Data and Student Need; Culturally Relevant Teaching. <http://www.ucea.org/>

The **University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership (CEL)** was founded in 2001 as a nonprofit service arm of the University of Washington College of Education. CEL “partners with courageous leaders in classrooms, schools and the systems that support them to eliminate educational inequities by creating cultures of rigorous teaching, learning and leading.” With the goal of transforming schools to empower all students, regardless of background, to create limitless futures for themselves, their families, their communities and the world, their four dimensions of school leadership Framework describes key actions and dispositions for equity-driven school leaders. It illustrates what school leaders need to know and be able to do to ensure that each student, particularly those furthest from justice, has a school experience that prepares them for a limitless future. <https://www.k-12leadership.org/>

West-Ed

https://www.wested.org/area_of_work/english-language-learners/

West-Ed is a non-profit technical assistance organization with expertise related to practice and policy to accelerate achievement among English learners. They conduct research and evaluation studies, and provide professional development and technical assistance that address the needs of students who must master academic content and English language simultaneously.

The WRITE Institute

<https://writeinstitute.sdcoe.net/>

The Writing Redesigned for Innovative Teaching and Equity (WRITE) Institute, a national Academic Excellence model for professional learning supports schools and districts with systemic, K-12 literacy implementation in English and Spanish. WRITE provides research-based professional learning and curriculum, including a focus on the specific needs of English learners and dual-language learners. Through partnerships with schools, districts, and county offices, WRITE develops a network of leaders with a shared understanding around quality academic literacy instruction.



The vast majority of educators want to provide their English learners with the best education they can. The problem is, they don't always have the conditions to make that happen—the knowledge, the time, resources, support, or skills to make the systemic, cultural, and instructional shifts that will improve outcomes for English learners. District and school leaders make decisions every day, from allocating resources and hiring staff to making programmatic changes and establishing placement guidelines, developing curriculum and adopting instructional materials, determining priorities, and designing professional learning opportunities. Those decisions must be made with English Learners at the heart.



CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER

CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS
OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

**FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE
CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP
IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE AND TOOLKIT
FOR ADMINISTRATORS CONTACT:**

Californians Together
525 East Seventh Street, Suite 203
Long Beach, CA 90813
562-983-1333

info@californianstogether.org

www.californianstogether.org

