



California English Learner ROADMAP

Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies,
Programs, and Practices for English Learners



California English Learner ROADMAP

**Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies,
Programs, and Practices for English Learners**

Publishing Information

The *California English Learner Roadmap: Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Learners (CA EL Roadmap)* was written by Dr. Kenji Hakuta with input from the English Learner Roadmap Workgroup in cooperation with the California Department of Education (CDE). The cover and interior design were created and prepared by Michael Medina, graphic designer, WestEd. It was published by the Department, 1430 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-5901. It was distributed under the provisions of the Library Distribution Act and Government Code Section 11096.

©2018 by the California Department of Education. All rights reserved

ISBN: 978-0-8011-1788-6

Ordering Information

Copies of this publication are available for sale from the California Department of Education. For prices and ordering information, please visit the Web site at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/> or call the CDE Press Sales Office at 1-800-995-4099.

Notice

The guidance in the *CA EL Roadmap* is not binding on local educational agencies or other entities. Except for statutes, regulations, and court decisions that are referenced herein, the document is exemplary, and compliance with it is not mandatory. (See Education Code Section 33308.5.)

Table of Contents

California English Learner ROADMAP 1

 Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Learners 1

 Foreword.....9

 Introduction 10

 Vision..... 10

 Mission 10

 A Call to Action 12

 Policy and Research in Historical Context 14

 Lau v. Nichols: An Affirmation of Civil Rights Law 14

 The Debate Over Bilingual Education 15

 Standards-Based Reform 16

 A New Accountability Paradigm 19

 Proposition 58: California Education for a Global Economy (CA Ed.G.E.) Initiative20

 A Growing Research Consensus 20

 Four Interrelated Principles 24

 Principle One: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools 24

 Principle Two: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access 25

 Principle Three: System Conditions That Support Effectiveness..... 26

 Principle Four: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems 27

 Crosswalk of the CA EL Roadmap Principle and Elements to the LCFF and LCAP 28

 Illustrative Case Examples of CA EL Roadmap Implementation..... 31

 Characteristics of Illustrative Case Examples..... 31

 Standards for Reviewing Examples..... 32

 Highlighted Case Examples 36

 Conclusion 46

 Appendices 47

 Appendix A: EL Roadmap Policy..... 47

 California’s Vision of Success for English Learners 50

 Mission 50

 Four Principles 50

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Appendix B: Acronyms..... | 52 |
| Appendix C: Glossary | 54 |

Acknowledgements

The California English Learner Roadmap State Board of Education Policy: Educational Program and Services for English Learners was approved by the California State Board of Education (SBE) on July 12, 2017.

When this policy was approved, the following persons served on the SBE:

- Michael Kirst, Ph.D., President Ilene Straus, Ed.D., Vice President Sue Burr
- Bruce Holaday
- Feliza I. Ortiz-Licon, Ed.D. Patricia Ann Rucker Nicolasa Sandoval, Ph.D. Ting L. Sun, Ph.D.
- Karen Valdes, Ed.D. Trish Boyd Williams
- Jaden Gray, Student Member

The California English Learner Roadmap: Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Learners (CA EL Roadmap) was created with guidance and input from the English Learner (EL) Roadmap Workgroup.

The members of the EL Roadmap Workgroup included:

EL Roadmap Workgroup Co-Chairs:

- Kenji Hakuta, Ph.D., Co-Chair and author of the *CA EL Roadmap*
- Laurie Olsen, Ph.D., Co-Chair

EL Roadmap Workgroup composition includes members from local educational agencies, universities, foundations, educational organizations, the SBE, and the California Department of Education (CDE):

- Thomas Adams, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent, Teaching and Learning Support Branch
- Veronica Aguila, Ed.D., Director, English Learner Support Division
- Traci Albee, Administrator, English Language Proficiency and Spanish Assessments
- Aileen Allison-Zarea, Administrator, Literacy, History and Arts Leadership Office
- Carmen Beck, Ed.D., Chief Academic Officer, Inglewood Unified School District
- Allison Briceño, Ed.D., Assistant Professor, San Jose State University
- Nancy Chaires, California School Boards Association
- Teri Clark, Director, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Elena Fajardo, Administrator, Language Policy and Leadership Office
- Dana Feingold, English Language Development Instructional Coach, Chico Unified School District
- Cecelia Fisher-Dahms, Administrator, Quality Improvement Office, Early Education
- Irene Garcia, Special Assistant to the Superintendent, Superintendent's Initiatives Office

- Holly Hinh, Academic Coach, English Language Learner Services, Bakersfield City School District
- Tara House, Coordinator, English Language Development/Accountability, Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District
- Jonathan Isler, Ph.D., Administrator, Data Visualization and Reporting Office
- Paula Jacobs, Consultant, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- JoAnne Lauer, Director, Research and Implementation, Riverside County Office of Education
- Karin Linn-Nieves, Director, Language and Literacy, San Joaquin County Office of Education
- Hana Ma, Program Associate, S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation
- Camille Maben, Executive Director, First 5 California
- Martin Macias, Superintendent, Golden Plains Unified School District
- Hilda Maldonado, Executive Director, Multilingual Education, Los Angeles Unified School District
- Shelly Masur, CEO, Californians Dedicated to Education
- Michael Matsuda, Superintendent, Anaheim Union High School District
- Julie Maxwell-Jolly, Ph.D., Senior Director, Policy and Programs, California State Boards Association
- Aida Molina, Ph.D., Director of Education, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence
- Linda Montes, Executive Director, Educational Services, Redwood City School District
- Feliza I. Ortiz-Licon, Ed.D., Member, California SBE
- Angela Randolph, Ed.D., Director of English Learners, Alliance College-Ready Public Schools
- Sherry Skelly-Griffith, Executive Director, California Parent Teacher Association
- Kenji Treanor, Director of Strategic Grantmaking, Sobrato Family Foundation
- Chana Wynne-Swan, Child Development Consultant, First 5 California

Finally, the CDE gratefully acknowledges the following individuals for their support in the development of the CA EL Roadmap:

CDE Leadership:

- Tom Torlakson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Glen Price, Chief Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Michelle Zumot, Chief Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Tom Adams Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Teaching and Learning Support Branch
- Keric Ashley, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Performance, Planning, and Technology Branch

CDE Division Directors:

- Veronica Aguila Ed.D., English Learner Support
- Michelle Center, Assessment Development and Administration
- Stephanie Gregson Ed.D., Curriculum Framework and Instructional Resources
- Cindy Kazanis, Analysis, Measurement, and Accountability Reporting
- Barbara Murchison, Professional Learning Support
- Sarah Neville-Morgan, Early Education and Support
- Jerry Winkler, Educational Data Management Kristin Wright, Special Education
- Donna Wyatt, Career and College Transition

Representatives from the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd and from Stanford University:

- Danielle Garegnani, School Improvement Facilitator, California Comprehensive Center at WestEd
- Liz Jameyson, Senior Program Associate, California Comprehensive Center at WestEd
- Marianne Justus, Professional Development Provider, California Comprehensive Center at WestEd
- Jannelle Kubinec, Director, California Comprehensive Center, WestEd
- Robert Linquanti, Project Director, California Comprehensive Center, WestEd
- Melanie Packham, School Improvement Facilitator, California Comprehensive Center at WestEd
- Ruth Sebastian, School and District improvement, California Comprehensive Center at WestEd
- Steven Weiss, Director of Leadership Initiatives, Understanding Language, Stanford University Graduate School of Education

Consultants from the English Learner Support Division at the CDE:

- Sandra Covarrubias, Education Programs Consultant
- Suzie Dollesin, Education Programs Consultant
- Gustavo Gonzalez, Education Programs Consultant
- Geoffrey Ndirangu, Education Programs Consultant
- Marcela Rodriguez, Education Programs Consultant
- Gina Garcia-Smith, Education Programs Assistant
- Roger Guyette, Education Programs Assistant
- Lorrie Kelling, Education Programs Assistant

Support staff from the English Learner Support Division at the CDE:

- Marya Cowan, Staff Services Manager
- Jennifer Cordova, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
- Ralph Miranda, Staff Services Analyst
- Barbara Garcia, Executive Secretary
- Angela McCauley, Office Technician
- Maxwell Bass, Intern
- Eduardo Franco, Intern
- Alejandra Lamarque, Intern

Special thanks to the members of the planning committee, Veronica Aguila, Elena Fajardo, Gustavo Gonzalez, Gina Garcia-Smith, Kenji Hakuta, Robert Linqanti, Laurie Olsen, and Steven Weiss, for planning the EL Roadmap Workgroup meetings.

Special thanks to the Sobrato Family Foundation for financial support, to the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd for graphic design and facilitation support, to CDE Press for printing, and to the Californians Dedicated to Education Foundation for logistical support.

Foreword

On July 12, 2017, the California State Board of Education (SBE) unanimously approved the California English Learner Roadmap SBE: Educational Programs and Services for English Learners. The SBE policy ushers in a new era of English learner education that embraces linguistic diversity as an asset while providing the supports necessary to allow English learners meaningful access to intellectually rich and engaging curriculum. This document was developed with input from parents, teachers, administrators, county offices of education, and other agencies that assist schools to prepare California's over 1.3 million English learners for college, career, and civic participation in this, our linguistically and culturally diverse state.

This guidance document, the *California English Learner Roadmap: Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Learners (CA EL Roadmap)* supports local educational agencies (LEAs) as they incorporate English learner education into their local program designs. This guidance document elaborates on the SBE policy, providing research- and evidence-based examples from the field that illustrate the *CA EL Roadmap* principles in action. The crosswalk to the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), embedded in this document, allows LEAs to bring English learners to the forefront as they consider the state priorities and work with their communities to plan their LCAPs.

When 73 percent of California voters passed the California Education for a Global Economy (CA Ed.G.E.) Initiative in 2016, they spoke loudly and clearly that multilingualism is a priority in our state. Capitalizing on the assets that our English learners bring to our vision of a multilingual society is vital. To bring this to fruition, we need to not only cultivate English learners' language skills, but also ensure they meet the high academic expectations that we hold for all students so that they can use those biliterate/multiliterate skills to thrive and lead in a multi-lingual state.

The *CA EL Roadmap* paves the way for English learner success by providing tools and examples aligned to the State priorities so that parents, communities, schools, teachers, administrators, districts, and county offices of education can effectively implement policies, programs, and practices for our state's English learners. The *CA EL Roadmap* assists LEAs to leverage these State priorities, along with the principles within this guidance document, and tailor them to the local context.

The *CA EL Roadmap* is the road to a thriving future for California.

Tom Torlakson

State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Introduction

On July 12, 2017, the California State Board of Education (SBE) unanimously approved a new policy for English learners, the California English Learner Roadmap: Educational Programs and Services for English Learners (EL Roadmap Policy) with the following vision and mission:

Vision

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

Mission

California schools affirm, welcome, and respond to a diverse range of English learner (EL) 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.

As the SBE resolution noted, this action inaugurates a new era in state policy for English learners and lever- ages recent advances in educational research, development, policy, and practice:

The California EL Roadmap SBE Policy is necessary and timely for the following reasons: (1) the passage of the California Education for a Global Economy Initiative (CA Ed.G.E. Initiative), Proposition 58, effective July 1, 2017, amended most of Proposition 227 and resulted in changes to Education Code (EC) sections 300, 305–306, 310–311, 320 and 335; (2) the implementation of the State content standards and curriculum frameworks featuring evidence-based practices and exemplary services for English learners as described in the SBE adopted documents; (3) the implementation of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP); and (4) changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015.

The policy recognizes that many English learners rep- resent the newest members of our society (including recently arrived immigrants and children of immigrants) who bring a rich diversity of cultural back- grounds and come from families with rich social and linguistic experiences. They also bring skills in their primary languages that contribute enormously to the state's economic and social wealth of talented multilingual and multicultural population.

This policy explicitly focuses on California's English learners—whose current and former members rep- resent over 38 percent of the state's 6.2 million transitional kindergarten/kindergarten through twelfth grade students—in the context of the state's

efforts to advance the educational system, the quality of teaching and learning, and achievement outcomes for all students. It centers on standards, curriculum frameworks, assessment, accountability, school improvement, educator quality, early childhood/preschool, social and family support services, and parent/community involvement. Its purpose is to promote local capacity-building and continuous improvement in each of these areas and their interrelationships, based on evidence of effectiveness from local experience as well as the most current rigorous research evidence that speaks to the strengths and needs of the diverse population of English learners.

With this policy, the SBE directs the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop guidance to local educational agencies (LEAs) in welcoming, understanding, and educating the diverse population of students who are English learners attending California public schools. This guidance document shares the SBE policy's historical context; the research and the principles underlying the policy; and examples from California school districts that illustrate the innovative tools, evidence-gathering, and knowledge development needed to support educators' continuous improvement in serving California's substantial EL population

A Call to Action

The primary audiences for this guidance document are the state’s LEAs and technical assistance providers, including county offices of education. But every parent, professional educator, and agency involved in educating English learners—early childhood educators, institutions of higher education (IHEs), teacher and administrator credentialing bodies, and professional and advocacy organizations—are also intended audiences. Although these individuals and agencies play different roles in supporting California’s educational system, the *CA EL Roadmap* signals that serving English learners is a central responsibility of **each and every educator**. Effectively serving this diverse group of learners fosters excellence for all Californians because language is foundational to learning and development in all students.

Implementing the *CA EL Roadmap* will require:

- Parent/community leaders and district/school leaders to forge a common language and understanding of the CA EL Roadmap principles and elements to value students’ native languages and bilingualism, raise educational expectations for all students, and foster English learners’ equitable access to quality teaching and learning.
- District and school leaders to allocate resources and make purposeful decisions about program models, professional learning, curriculum and materials, and assessment practices that are consistent with CA EL Roadmap principles.
- District and school leaders to shift their planning and internal accountability practices toward continuous improvement for English learners guided by evidence of effectiveness that is timely, responsive, and meaningful for local stakeholders.
- County offices of education to support and build the capacity of local educators through well-leveraged resources for improvement and a clear focus on strengthening practices and outcomes for English learners within the context of LCFF/ LCAP.
- Early childhood educators and LEAs to design and enact services that support dual language development, early literacy and numeracy, and promote early childhood education as a crucial part of each English learner’s education.
- LEAs to strengthen career and college pathways for secondary EL students by collaborating with local industries, community colleges, and four-year universities to better guide graduates toward career preparation and degree completion.

- IHEs to prepare teachers and leaders who understand and ensure that English learners are the responsibility of all educators, to strengthen pathways for bilingual teachers, and to collaborate with accrediting agencies on these needs.
- Professional associations to leverage their conferences and professional development opportunities in support of *CA EL Roadmap* principles and components, and to foster collaboration on their implementation.

In a state whose prosperity depends on the success of immigrants and their children, all California stakeholders must own this vision and mission, respond to this call to action, and interpret and apply the content of this guidance document within their respective roles in order to improve educational opportunities for the state's English learner students.

Policy and Research in Historical Context

Every act of human learning is rooted in history, and so this document begins by offering an overview of the historical context in which California's English learners find themselves. This account sets down important markers of policy history and notes milestones in research on human learning, language development, bilingualism, and educational policies, practices, and programs that advance EL success.

Lau v. Nichols: An Affirmation of Civil Rights Law

- The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1974 to affirm the rights of English learners to have equal access to a meaningful education.¹ The justices unanimously agreed that the civil rights of the class of students represented by Kinney Lau, a student in the San Francisco Unified School District, were violated by not having available (1) English language development services, nor (2) meaningful access to the curriculum. Most importantly, equality in this case meant a program **appropriate and targeted** to the needs of English learners, and not just the same as what is provided to native English speakers.
- The Lau decision, rooted in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, lent the force of the judiciary to the nascent efforts of the United States Congress to recognize English learners (then called “Limited English Proficient” students) through its civil rights legislation embodied in the ESEA. In 1968, Congress recognized this as a separate title, the Bilingual Education Act. An effort to build local capacity has evolved, and continues as Title III, Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students, of the ESEA reauthorization of 2015, known as the Every Student Succeeds Act.
- California was one of the first to enact a state law affirming these rights. The Chacón-Moscone Assembly Bill 1329 of 1976 required all English learners enrolled in California's public schools to receive a program of English language development (ELD) and instruction in a language they understand. The bill also required all schools to provide English learners access to the regular curriculum. This bill gave rise to the ambitious effort to provide bilingual education on a broad basis.
- During this period, the rights of English learners to programs that enable access to the language of instruction as well as to the full curriculum became deeply rooted. This commitment is reflected in the Castañeda standards (after *Castañeda v. Pickard*, a 1981 U.S. Fifth Circuit Court ruling²) that identify a dual obligation to English learners to provide a program to learn English and access to the same academic achievement goals as for all other students, thus defining appropriate programming for English learners. About policies and practices adopted by a school or district, the Castañeda standards ask:

¹ *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

² *Castañeda v. Pickard*, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit. 781 F2d 456.

1. Are they based on sound educational theory?
2. Are they implemented with sufficient rigor?
3. Is there demonstrable evidence of effectiveness after a sufficient period of implementation?

An implicit fourth standard speaks to continuous improvement:

4. Based on the evidence of effectiveness, does the system make efforts to improve implementation or to modify its theory?

The Castañeda standards remain agnostic as to the method or language of instruction, and only ask for a sound theory supported by research and a commitment to an approach to implementation whose effectiveness is monitored and improved, using evidence of student learning.

The Debate Over Bilingual Education

Congressional enactment of the Bilingual Education Act, fueled by an interpretation by the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights to mandate bilingual education as a remedy to *Lau v. Nichols*, resulted in a spirited national debate about the theory and the efficacy of the bilingual approach.³

The early research on efficacy found equivocal results when comparing students in English-only versus bilingual education programs, leading to a pushback against favoring bilingual approaches.⁴ There was evidence that well-implemented bilingual programs—and evaluated in well-controlled studies—were more effective.⁵ Yet for the most part, the broad U.S. cultural attitude that bilingualism runs counter to assimilation, and is therefore un-American, ruled the day and the research received scant notice.

Within California, the bilingual education movement advanced through important publications by the CDE. The CDE published an influential series of theoretical frameworks and case studies of bilingual schools.⁶ In addition to documenting actual

³ Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Co.

⁴ Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.

⁵ Willig, A. (1985). A Meta-Analysis of Selected Studies on the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55: 269-317.; Greene, J. (1998). A Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. University of Texas at Austin and Harvard University: The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute.

⁶ California Department of Education (1984). *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. Sacramento: Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education. ERIC ED249773; California Department of Education (1986). *Beyond*

cases of effective bilingual schools to show what is possible, an important legacy of this work was the recognition of what we today call academic uses of language as distinguished from everyday oral language.⁷

Another important component of the bilingual education debate was the time frame for programs for English learners. Bilingual education models distinguish transitional approaches, where the native language is a temporary and short-term support, and maintenance approaches where the long-term goal is bilingualism and biliteracy. Congress debated not just the efficacy of the bilingual approach, but also the question of how to cap the period of time students could be served by programs utilizing the student's primary language.

This consideration of time frame also appeared in Proposition 227, which was passed by California voters in 1998 and greatly curtailed bilingual education in the state. Indeed, Proposition 227 stipulated English immersion programs be provided to EL students for a period “not normally intended to exceed one year”—a time frame unsupported by existing studies, which instead suggested a far longer time period of four to seven years.⁸

Proposition 227 also expanded on the sunset of the Chacón-Moscone bilingual education bill, which occurred in 1987. These events, coming during a period of heightened voter concerns about immigration and the shifting demographics of the state, effectively eclipsed the successes of bilingual instructional program advocacy begun by Lau.

Standards-Based Reform

The emerging paradigm of standards-based reform, beginning in the late 1980's, promised to create “a rising tide” of student achievement that would lift all students, including English learners.⁹ This paradigm shaped the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorizations in 1994 (Improving America's Schools Act), in 2001 (No

Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students. Sacramento: Bilingual Education Office. ERIC ED304241.

⁷ An early and influential conceptualization of this was introduced by researcher Jim Cummins in the California Department of Education (1984). *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework.* Cummins employs the acronyms “BICS” for Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills, and “CALP” for Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency.

⁸ Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G. & Witt, D. (2000). *How Long Does It Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?* University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. ERIC ED443275.

⁹ McLaughlin, M. W., Shepard, L.A., & O'Day, J.A. (1995). *Improving Education through Standards-Based Reform.* Report by the National Academy of Education Panel on Standards-Based Education Reform. National Academy of Education.

Child Left Behind [NCLB]), and in broad strokes it remains the framework for the current reauthorization, the ESSA of 2015.

California was first in the nation to produce ELD Standards in 2000 and implement a standards-based annual ELD assessment in 2001, signaling the importance of systematically focusing on the language development needs of EL students along with academic needs. California's efforts arguably influenced NCLB Title III, which required all states to adopt ELD standards, and mandated annual assessment and accountability for English learner progress toward, and attainment of, English language proficiency.¹⁰

During the NCLB period, the state was also focused on the “scientifically-based research” aspect of the law that guided academic programs and textbook adoptions adhering to this paradigm. This new paradigm asked educators to be more accountable for the evidence that they had to support their decision-making in practice, and had the effect of making programs focus largely on foundational literacy skills, where much of the strongest research evidence existed. This scientific paradigm was limited by its definition of rigor (through randomized control trials), which in turn limited the range of practices that could be identified, and therefore identified only those practices that could be confirmed across different contexts. In effect, the paradigm ignored approaches adapted to be effective with particular students served in local contexts.

These laws, by focusing on student attainment and progress toward attainment of the standards rather than the means by which this is done (as played out in the bilingual v. English-only debates), enabled further consideration of how to increase the capacity of schools and local districts in serving the needs of English learners.¹¹

Finally, national standards-based reform has led to the current enactment of the Common Core State Standards, which are known in California as the California State Standards, and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), and to revisions in federal law found in ESSA.

The new college- and career-readiness standards are notable in the way in which content and language are systematically related. An analysis of the key practices of the California State ELA and Math Standards and the NGSS¹² illustrates the ways in which uses of language in disciplinary learning, such as engagement in argument from evidence or supporting analysis of complex texts with evidence, comprise key ways that

¹⁰ Linquanti, R. & George, C. (2007). Establishing and utilizing an NCLB Title III accountability system: California's approach and findings to date. In J. Abedi (Ed.), *English Language Proficiency Assessment in the Nation: Current Status and future Practice* (pp. 105-118). Davis: University of California.

¹¹ August, D. & Shanahan, T. (eds.) (2006). *Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

¹² Cheuk, T. 2013. Relationships and Convergences Among the Mathematics, Science, and ELA Practices. Refined version of diagram created by the Understanding Language Initiative for ELP Standards. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

students are expected to use language during disciplinary learning. This expanded perspective on language shifted the nature of the California ELD standards, which were completely revised in 2012,¹³ to encompass collaborative and analytical practices in addition to grammatical structure related to language purpose and use, with less focus on isolated vocabulary.

The importance of language use in enacting the analytical practices found in the new academic content standards highlighted the intertwined nature of academic content and ELD standards. This in turn led to California's groundbreaking work on the nation's first integrated English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Schools (ELA/ELD Framework), developed under the state's Curriculum Framework and Evaluation Criteria Committee and adopted by the SBE in 2014.

As a result of California's ELA/ELD Framework, the concepts of **designated and integrated ELD** have been incorporated in additional state subject matter frameworks, and also gained currency nationally. Integrated and designated ELD signal that the academic uses of language are to be developed in every subject matter and classroom throughout the day, not just during the designated ELD time or stand-alone ELD class. It systemically signals that all educators, not just bilingual instructional and ELD staff, are responsible for English learners' linguistic and academic achievement.

The reauthorization of ESEA as ESSA in 2015 also brought notable changes for English learner policy through federal law. Key shifts include:

- Accountability for EL progress toward and attainment of English language proficiency is integrated into Title I accountability, signaling the importance of ELD as a key contributor to academic achievement;¹⁴
- Setting expectations for progress toward English language proficiency can take into account students' initial English proficiency status and time in U.S. schools, as called for by second language acquisition research;¹⁵
- Former EL students can be included in the EL subgroup for academic achievement for up to four years after exit in order to (a) stabilize the group and

¹³ *California English Language Development Standards: Kindergarten through Grade 12*. California Department of Education. Retrieved from the CDE website at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndpublication14.pdf>.

¹⁴ Goldschmidt, P. & Hakuta, K. (2017). *Incorporating English Learner Progress into State Accountability Systems*. Washington DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

¹⁵ Cook, H. G., Liguanti, R., Chinen, M., & Jung, H. (2012). *National Evaluation of Title III Implementation Supplemental Report: Exploring Approaches to Setting English Language Proficiency Performance Criteria and Monitoring English Learner Progress*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development.

reduce selection bias created by removing English-proficient students from the subgroup, and (b) provide a fuller accounting of long-term EL success;^{16,17}

- States, under Title III, must establish standardized, statewide entry and exit procedures and criteria for EL status, responsive to evidence of their importance from extensive research and policy analysis;^{18,19,20}
- Evidence-based interventions (not restricted to EL programs) are tiered to allow for a range of innovations and local adaptations.²¹

These changes in federal law allow for more coherent, nuanced, and responsive policies and systems of accountability that complement and support California's approach to continuous improvement and capacity building.

A New Accountability Paradigm

ESSA, as well as California's emerging accountability system for continuous improvement, represents a broad acknowledgment of the failure of NCLB-style

¹⁶ Saunders, W. M., & Marcelletti, D. J. (2013). The Gap That Can't Go Away: The Catch-22 of Reclassification in Monitoring the Progress of English Learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (35)2, 139–156.

¹⁷ Hopkins, M., Thompson, K. D., Linqunti, R., Hakuta, K., & August, D. (2013). Fully Accounting for English Learner Performance: A Key Issue in ESEA Reauthorization. *Educational Researcher*, 42(2), 101–108.

¹⁸ Umansky, I., Reardon, S., Hakuta, K., Thompson, K., Estrada, P., Hayes, K., Maldonado, H., Tandberg, S. & Goldenberg, C. (2015). Improving the Opportunities and Outcomes of California's Students Learning English: Findings from School District-University Collaborative Partnerships. PACE Policy Brief.

¹⁹ Linqunti, R., Cook, H. G., Bailey, A. L., & MacDonald, R. (2016). *Moving Toward a More Common Definition of English Learner: Collected Guidance for States and Multi-State Assessment Consortia*. Washington DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

²⁰ National Research Council. (2011). Allocating Federal Funds for State Programs for English Language Learners. Panel to Review Alternative Data Sources for the Limited-English Proficiency Allocation Formula under Title III, Part A, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Committee on National Statistics and Board on Testing and Assessment. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

²¹ This includes: Tier 1 – Strong Evidence supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized control experimental studies; Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies; Tier 3 – Promising Evidence supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias); and Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale: practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by an SEA, LEA or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness. See *Evidence-Based Interventions under the ESSA*. Retrieved from CDE Web site at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/es/evidence.asp>.

accountability to reduce achievement gaps. The state encourages the measurement and improvement of meaningful learning for students, improved resource allocation to the neediest students, and professional learning and supports for teachers and leaders. Accompanying these shifts are a continuous improvement model that builds political accountability (through LCAPs), professional accountability, and performance accountability.²² A crosswalk of the *CA EL Roadmap* to LCFF/LCAP, as elaborated later in this report, is essential to successfully implementing California’s improvement strategy.

Proposition 58: California Education for a Global Economy (CA Ed.G.E.) Initiative

Proposition 58 was approved by 73.5 percent of California voters in 2016, including by a majority of voters in every county. The CA Ed.G.E. Initiative reaffirms the requirement that public schools ensure EL students attain English language proficiency, but repeals Proposition 227’s provisions which resulted in severely restricting bilingual programs in favor of English immersion, which never demonstrated superior outcomes to bilingual approaches.²³ The CA Ed.G.E. Initiative promotes multiple pathways and opportunities, including dual language acquisition programs, for any student to become proficient in two or more languages.²⁴ The initiative also provides districts with greater flexibility in implementing instructional approaches to support English learners and native English-speaking students in obtaining the State Seal of Biliteracy, a multilingual education initiative created in California and adopted by 29 other states and the District of Columbia.²⁵

A Growing Research Consensus

A recent 2017 consensus study report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) offers important conclusions and recommendations

²² See Fullan, M. & Rincón-Gallardo, S. (2017). *California’s Golden Opportunity – Taking Stock: Leadership from the Middle*.

²³ Parrish, T., Perez, M., Merickel, A., & Linqanti, R. (2006). *Effects of the Implementation of Proposition 227 on the Education of English Learners, K–12: Findings from a Five-Year Evaluation (Final Report)*. Palo Alto, CA and San Francisco, CA: American Institutes for Research and WestEd. Retrieved from https://www.wested.org/online_pubs/227Reportb.pdf.

²⁴ See <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/caedge.asp>.

²⁵ See <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/sealofbiliteracy.asp>.

in promoting the educational success of English learners.²⁶ Many of the findings reinforce and expand on prior research syntheses, including earlier from the CDE.²⁷

Findings include the following:

- English language proficiency development: (1) is a process that takes four to seven years for those entering with emerging English, (2) benefits from coherent and aligned instruction across that time period, and (3) can take place as an integrated process simultaneous with academic content learning in addition to designated ELD and the development of bilingualism/biliteracy.
- Bilingualism provides benefits from the capacity to communicate in more than one language, may enhance cognitive skills, and may improve academic outcomes.
- Establishing proper and consistent procedures and criteria for identifying, monitoring, and exiting English learners using appropriate assessment procedures—while developing professional capacity to use assessment results—constitutes a key lever for effective system improvement.
- The diversity of the EL population (e.g., newcomers, long-term English learners, students with interrupted formal education, students with disabilities, gifted and talented students, and the expected continuous exiting of students from the EL category) necessitates pedagogy and educational support services that are differentiated and responsive.
- Brain development research reinforces the crucial period of birth through early childhood in the areas of cognitive, social, and language development. There is great need for coherent, aligned support for dual language learners across the preschool and primary grade systems to begin developing their bilingual and biliterate capacities.

The current research evidence base also supports the need to attend to the following instructional factors:

- Explicit literacy instruction, especially in the early grades and with students not literate upon entry
- Peer-assisted and small-group learning opportunities

²⁶ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017). *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. DOI: 10.17226/24677.

²⁷ CDE (1984) *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*; CDE (1986) *Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students*; and CDE (2010) *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*.

- Academic language support during content area instruction, balanced with structured explicit opportunities for oral and written language skills development
- Appropriate assessment in various forms (e.g., formative, benchmark, summative) to understand and support student learning
- Processes related to social-emotional development and identity formation

The NASEM report also reviews existing research on educational systems serving English learners, and notes the following characteristics (from pages 7–20, emphasis added) of effective local systems:

- **Administrative leadership at the district and school levels takes responsibility** for initiating and sustaining instructional programs and practices that support the full academic development of all students, including [English learners].
- **[English learners] are recognized as capable of learning whatever society expects all children to learn in school rather than as incapable of handling the school’s curriculum until they master English.** This is a fundamental epistemological difference between schools that educate [English learners] successfully and those that do not.
- **Socioemotional support** is provided for both teachers and students through the creation of learning communities. In the successful districts and schools described, administrators recognized that educating students with complex and diverse needs could be very challenging for teachers, emotionally and physically. They, like their students, required collegial support from fellow teachers and administrators to accomplish all they were expected to do.
- **Teachers are encouraged to work collaboratively** and support one another to improve instruction. ...[c]ross-disciplinary endeavors in planning and integrating instruction [are] critical in supporting language and literacy development across the curriculum.
- **Language-rich classroom and school environments** are promoted in which communication and self-expression are encouraged. Teachers are linguistically, culturally, and pedagogically prepared to meet the academic and sociocultural needs of [English learners]. Instruction is adapted based on frequent analysis of student performance in formative and summative assessments. School and community partnerships are encouraged to augment and enrich classroom-based learning.

The *CA EL Roadmap* principles and elements delineated below incorporate the current trajectory of policy and the most recent research consensus. The workgroup of practitioners and stakeholders which supported the CDE in developing the *CA EL Roadmap* Policy and this accompanying guidance document provided extensive input

and feedback to both, bringing to bear the diverse professional expertise and practical experiences of the workgroup's members.²⁸

²⁸ The full list of the EL Roadmap Workgroup members can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/roadmapmembers.asp>.

Four Interrelated Principles

Four principles support the vision and provide the foundation of the *CA EL Roadmap*. These principles are intended to guide all levels of the system towards a coherent and aligned set of practices, services, relationships, and approaches to teaching and learning that together create a powerful, effective, twenty-first century education for the state's English learners. Underlying this systemic application of the principles is the foundational understanding that simultaneously developing English learners' linguistic and academic capacities is a shared responsibility of all educators, and that all levels of the schooling system have a role to play in ensuring the access and achievement of the 1.3 million English learners who attend our schools. The principles address the following themes:

1. Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools
2. Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access
3. System Conditions that Support Effectiveness
4. Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems

These principles, and the elements delineated for each, are research- and values-based, and build upon California's academic content and ELD standards, the California ELA/ELD Framework, Blueprint for Great Schools 1.0 and 2.0, and other state policy and guidance documents. It is important to stress that these principles and elements are not meant to serve as a checklist. Rather, they might be thought of as the strings of an instrument from which music is created. Extending this metaphor, district and school educators are musicians who ultimately must take up these resources and strive together to attain their harmonious implementation.

Principle One: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools

Pre-schools and schools are responsive to different EL strengths, needs, and identities and support the socio-emotional health and development of English learners. 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.

Elements:

- A. The **languages and cultures** English learners bring to their education are **assets** for their own learning and are important contributions to learning communities. These assets are valued and built upon in culturally responsive curriculum and instruction and in programs that support, wherever possible, the development of proficiency in multiple languages.
- B. Recognizing that there is no universal EL profile and no one-size-fits-all approach that works for all English learners, programs, curriculum, and instruction must be responsive to different EL student characteristics and experiences. EL students entering school at the beginning levels of English proficiency have different

needs and capacities than do students entering at intermediate or advanced levels. Similarly, students entering in kindergarten have different needs than students entering in later grades. The needs of long term English learners are vastly different from recently arrived students (who in turn vary in their prior formal education). Districts vary considerably in the distribution of these EL profiles, so no single program or instructional approach works for all EL students.

- C. **School climates** and campuses are affirming, inclusive, and safe.
- D. Schools value and build strong **family and school partnerships**.
- E. Schools and districts develop a collaborative framework for identifying English learners with disabilities and use valid assessment practices. Schools and districts develop appropriate individualized education programs (IEPs) that support culturally and linguistically inclusive practices and provide appropriate training to teachers, thus leveraging expertise specific to English learners. The IEP addresses academic goals that take into account student language development, as called for in state and national policy recommendations.^{29,30,31}

Principle Two: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access

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 as well as 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.

Elements:

- A. Language development occurs in and through subject matter learning and is **integrated** across the curriculum, including integrated ELD and designated content-based ELD (per the ELA/ELD Framework pages 891–892).

²⁹ California Department of Education (2009) Inventory of Services and Supports (ISS) for Students with Disabilities. Special Education Division. Retrieved from the California Department of Education Web site.

³⁰ Park, S., Martinez, M., Chou, F. (2017). CCSSO English Learners with Disabilities Guide: A Guide for States Creating Policies on the Identification of and Service Provision for English Learners with Disabilities. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State Schools Officers. Retrieved from <http://ccsso.org/resource-library/ccsso-english-learners-disabilities-guide>.

³¹ Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) from the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division and U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, January 7, 2015. Downloaded from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-el-201501.pdf>.

- B. Students are provided a rigorous, **intellectually rich, standards-based curriculum** with instructional scaffolding that increases comprehension and participation and develops student autonomy and mastery.
- C. Teaching and learning emphasize engagement, interaction, discourse, inquiry, and critical thinking with the same **high expectations** for English learners as for all students in each of the content areas.
- D. English learners are provided **access to the full curriculum** along with the provision of appropriate EL supports and services.
- E. Students' **home language** is understood as a means to access subject matter content, as a foundation for developing English, and, where possible, is developed to high levels of literacy and proficiency along with English.
- F. Rigorous **instructional materials** support high levels of intellectual engagement. Explicit scaffolding enables meaningful participation by English learners at different levels of English language proficiency. Integrated language development, content learning, and opportunities for bilingual/biliterate development are appropriate according to the program model.
- G. English learners are provided choices of research-based language support/development programs (including options for developing skills in multiple languages) and are enrolled in programs designed to overcome language barriers and provide access to the curriculum.³²

Principle Three: 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 and who 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 strong programs and build the capacity of teachers and staff to leverage the strengths and meet the needs of English learners.

Elements:

- A. **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

³² Castañeda v. Pickard, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit. 781 F2d 456.

Master Plan and English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) regulations.³³

- B. The school system invests **adequate resources** to support the conditions required to address EL needs.
- C. A **system of culturally and linguistically valid and reliable assessment** supports instruction, continuous improvement, and accountability for attainment of English proficiency, biliteracy, and academic achievement.
- D. **Capacity building** occurs at all levels of the system, including **leadership development** to understand and address the needs of English learners. **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 English learners, including bilingual teachers.

Principle Four: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems

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 appropriate identification of strengths and needs, continuing through to reclassification, graduation, higher education, and career opportunities. These pathways foster the skills, language(s), literacy, and knowledge students need for college- and career-readiness and participation in a global, diverse, multilingual, twenty-first century world.

Elements:

- A. EL educational approaches and programs are designed for continuity, **alignment, and articulation** across grade levels and system segments beginning with a strong foundation in early childhood (preschool), and continuing through elementary and secondary levels onto graduation, postsecondary education, and career preparation.
- B. Schools plan schedules and resources to **provide extra time** in school (as needed) and build partnerships with after-school and other entities to provide additional support for English learners, to accommodate the extra challenges they face in learning English and accessing/mastering all academic subject matter.

³³ School and District English Learner Advisory Committees (ELAC/DELAC). Letter from Tom Torlakson and Michael Kirst. November, 6, 2016. Retrieved from the California Department of Education Web site at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/el/le/yr16ltr1107.asp>.

- C. EL educational approaches and programs are designed to be **coherent** across schools within districts, across initiatives, and across the state.

These principles and elements provide a set of research-, evidence-, and practice-based considerations that districts can use as they develop strategies and modify local action plans in the process of continuous improvement. As a guide, the table below shows a crosswalk of *CA EL Roadmap* principles and elements with the LCFF priorities. As these principles and elements are integrated into the communication of district and school systems, educators can shape conversations about priorities both with each other and with parents and community members, and better serve EL students.

Crosswalk of the CA EL Roadmap Principle and Elements to the LCFF and LCAP

The *CA EL Roadmap* sets a common direction for the state and provides guidance for LEAs in local planning and improvement of programs and services for English learners. It was designed to speak to the eight state priorities embedded in the LCFF and 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 *CA EL Roadmap* and to use the principles as a lens for assessing strengths and needed improvements in services, programs and approaches to EL education. The following crosswalk between the *CA EL Roadmap* principles and the eight state priority areas can facilitate this process.

The Crosswalk can be used in various ways. An LEA might, for example, focus on a priority around implementing state standards. To ensure they are incorporating the needs of English learners in that effort, those working on the LCAP could examine the row of the Crosswalk for Priority Two (State Standards [Conditions of Learning]) and note the way in which each principle (in columns 2–5) has elements that together comprise a comprehensive EL approach for standards implementation. They would find that under Principle One (Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools) Element A and B, it would be important to turn to the sections of the California ELA/ ELD Framework that address the different profiles, strengths, and need within the English learner population (e.g., long term English learners, newcomers, etc.), and might decide to incorporate aspects of the History-Social Studies Framework that speak directly to culturally responsive curriculum and instruction. Continuing across the row of the Crosswalk for that Priority, they would be reminded to consider various research- and evidence-based language acquisition program options. This process would continue across all of the principles for that Priority row.

Another way to utilize the Crosswalk involves an LEA focusing on a particular principle of the *CA EL Roadmap*. For example, an LEA might elect to work on Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems (Principal Four) in order to build coherence. Looking through the lens of the *CA EL Roadmap*, that LEA would find that there are actions to be considered in each of the LCAP priority areas in order to comprehensively

address this challenge. They would find that under Priority One, they need to consider their teacher workforce for early childhood programs and that materials are available and are articulated across grade levels and appropriate to the various language acquisition program pathways the district offers (e.g., dual language immersion, heritage language, etc.). Under Priority Two, the academic content and performance standards already articulate across grade levels, but the LEA might decide that implementation is uneven across schools and so investing in grade level collaboration across sites around ELD standards implementation would be helpful. This process would continue down each of the priority areas.

The *CA EL Roadmap* will only be valuable if it is integrated in processes of local reflection, planning, resource allocation, and accountability. By working across the LCAP Priorities and the EL Roadmap principles, districts can move more efficiently and coherently towards developing, implementing, and improving the programs and services English learners need in order to participate, achieve and thrive in California schools.

| Crosswalk | Principle One Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools | Principle Two Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access | Principle Three System Conditions that Support Effectiveness | Principle Four Alignment And Articulation Within and Across Systems |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| LCAP One Basic (Conditions of Learning) Teachers, Materials, Facilities | Elements A, C & E | Elements A, B, & D | Elements B & D | Elements A, B, & C |
| LCAP Two State Standards (Conditions of Learning) | Elements A, B & E | Elements A, B, F, & G | Elements B & D | Elements B & C |
| LCAP Three Parental Involvement (Engagement) | Elements B, D & E | Element D | Element D | Element C |
| LCAP Four Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes) | Element C | Elements A, B, & C | Elements A & B | Elements B & C |
| LCAP Five Pupil Engagement (Engagement) | Elements B, C, & D | Elements E & F | Element D | Element C |
| LCAP Six School Climate (Engagement) | Elements A & D | Elements A & D | Element D | Element C |
| LCAP Seven Course Access (Conditions of Learning) | Elements B & D | Elements D, E, & G | Element C & D | Elements B & C |
| LCAP Eight Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes) | | | Elements A, C, & D | Elements A & C |

Illustrative Case Examples of CA EL Roadmap Implementation

The online resources to this guidance document contain examples of system approaches and strategies that illustrate the principles and elements of the *CA EL Roadmap*. Sharing such examples will model and inspire practitioners throughout California to plan, act, document, and iterate their own cycles of learning, considering the examples of others. The CDE will facilitate and curate examples submitted from the field to establish a dynamic, online community of educators focused on effective systems and practices for English learners.³⁴

The principles and elements of the *CA EL Roadmap* are sufficiently general, and the diversity of California districts and their community characteristics are so vast, that there will likely be a great diversity of implementation scenarios. The examples, accumulated over a period of time, will become a record of system improvement efforts and outcomes, with an increasing number of time-tested and innovative metrics that can be used to gauge implementation and student outcomes, and that are recognized and adopted by educators.

Characteristics of Illustrative Case Examples

The examples are chosen to be generative and inspiring. The practices, in agreement with the Castañeda standards,³⁵ will exhibit the following characteristics:

1. They have a research basis that holds promise to have local impact.
2. They are monitored using local metrics of system implementation and adult learning outcomes.
3. They pay attention to evidence of student learning outcomes and make adjustments as needed.

They should lead the reader of the example to recognize connections to their own district's challenges and either inspire an adaptation or spur evidence gathering and sharing of their own approaches to the challenges.

"Evidence" in this case refers to objective information that is broadly interpreted, in contrast to the "scientifically-based research" grounded in randomized control experiments that were a hallmark of NCLB. Furthermore, as in the Castañeda

³⁴ This cycle of continuous improvement is varyingly called "PDSA" (Plan, Do, Study, Act) or "Improvement Science". See Bryk, A., Gomez, L., Grunow, A. & LeMahieu, P. (2015). *Learning to Improve: How America's Schools Can Get Better at Getting Better*. Harvard Education Publishing.

³⁵ Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) from the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division and U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, January 7, 2015.

standards, evidence should be applied to the theoretical or conceptual model, the implementation, and the locally observed outcomes for the district.³⁶

Examples should reflect the variability of local contexts found in districts around California, but should include evidence that can be gathered and monitored to inform the continuous improvement of the system. The use of evidence in continuous improvement cycles is fully consonant with the local capacity-building approach of the Blueprint 2.0 as well as the LCFF/ LCAP priorities and the SBE's approach to district accountability.³⁷

Standards for Reviewing Examples

The following standards are proposed for reviewing examples submitted for inclusion in the online appendix. These standards inform the guidelines for online submission.

Standard 1: Research basis that holds promise to have local impact.

In 1997, the National Research Council released a report on English learners that summarized the research to date. During the intervening years, considerable progress has been made in identifying and documenting promising practices, and developing a nuanced way of judging evidence (including the changes between NCLB in 2001 and ESSA in 2015 referenced above). Any effort at district reform to address the needs of English learners should to begin with a clear specification of the theory (Standard One of Castañeda), and a clear sense of what research base might support the theory. The following are some milestone publications:

³⁶ While the “gold standard” of evidence is valuable in identifying practices whose effectiveness is likely to be causally related to outcomes, and therefore should be given priority as a starting point, examples are not limited to those practices. First, equating “scientific” with a specific research design and methodology aimed to establish causality does not reflect the dynamic nature of scientific inquiry in education, whose essence is the iteration of theory, observation, and explanation (see Shavelson and Towne, *Scientific Research in Education* (<https://www.nap.edu/catalog/10236/scientific-research-in-education>)). Second, there are technical limitations to thinking about validity of inferences that can be made from randomized control studies with a single-minded focus on the randomization aspect of the research enterprise (the internal validity of an experiment) poses threats to other forms of validity, including what can be applied to a range of educational contexts (see Darling-Hammond, L. & Plank, D. (2015). *Supporting Continuous Improvement in California's Education System*. PACE. Downloaded at <http://www.edpolicyinca.org/publications/supporting-continuous-improvement-californias-education-system>).

³⁷ Darling-Hammond, L. & Plank, D. (2015). *Supporting Continuous Improvement in California's Education System*. PACE. Downloaded at <http://www.edpolicyinca.org/publications/supporting-continuous-improvement-californias-education-system>.

- “Promising Futures“ report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (discussed above)³⁸
- Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides on literacy³⁹ and academic content/language⁴⁰
- National Literacy Panel on English learners⁴¹
- The CDE’s publication of research-based practices⁴²
- Other published syntheses of research on English learners⁴³

Such publications should provide an initial impetus to districts looking for an evidentiary foothold into their reform efforts. That said, the conclusions from research by no means guarantee applicability and effectiveness in a given local context — with local variations in capacity for implementation or the appropriateness of an approach for the particular composition of the EL student characteristics in the district.

Thus, regardless of the strength of the evidence in the research literature, a district contemplating research-based strategies needs to assess the “goodness of fit“ of an approach to their own capacity and population, and if deemed worthy of implementation, gather their own evidence around implementation, and judge its efficacy to promote the desired learning outcomes.

³⁸ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from the NASEM Web site at <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/24677/promoting-the-educational-success-of-children-and-youth-learning-english>.

³⁹ Gersten, R., Baker, S.K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., & Scarcella, R. (2007). Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide (NCEE 2007-4011). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

⁴⁰ Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

⁴¹ August, D. & Shanahan, T. (eds.) (2006). *Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

⁴² California Department of Education (2010). *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-based Approaches*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

⁴³ Goldenberg, C. (2013). Unlocking the Research on English Learners: What We Know – and Don’t Yet Know – About Effective Instruction. *American Educator*, 4-11.

Standard 2: Monitoring use of local metrics of system implementation and adult learning outcomes.

Research on effective systems serving English learners speaks to the important role of coherent leadership. In a process of continuous improvement, it would therefore be important to develop meaningful indicators of system implementation, such as:

1. Leadership roles and responsibilities for EL students are distributed and shared.
2. Leadership creates different plans for EL students based on individual educational and learning histories (e.g., differentiating between programs for newcomers, long-term English learners, and reclassified English-proficient students).
3. Professional learning is focused on content pedagogy, active learning, and coherent, sustained, collective participation.
4. Leadership engages in networks and collaborations with other districts in continuous improvement planning and activities.
5. District resource allocation processes are driven by strategic priorities for English learners.

Standard 2a: Monitoring use of local metrics of student learning supports and processes.

Student learning outcomes are ultimately products of classroom instruction and student engagement in learning. The capacity of schools and districts to deliver a high intellectual quality of instruction and meaningful access through rigorous instruction depends on the availability of materials, the professional learning opportunities available to teachers, and how the educators in the system are formatively assessing their practice. The following are examples of indicators that might help educators understand the quality of the classroom learning environment.

Student tasks are intellectually meaningful:

1. Materials are accessed with sufficient scaffolding and opportunities for English learners at all levels of proficiency to engage in intellectually rich learning.
2. Professional learning opportunities are available for teachers on how to use materials to engage English learners of all levels of language proficiency in intellectually rich learning.
3. Implementation of materials is accompanied by an examination of ongoing evidence of student engagement and learning.

From the perspective of California State Standards-aligned instructional and learning practices, it is especially valuable to gather evidence of students' oral and written language across disciplinary practices at the classroom and school level, as well as the distribution of the uses of language across English learners with varying levels of proficiency and backgrounds. Examples may include:

1. Students use language and materials purposefully to describe, explain, persuade, inform, justify, negotiate, entertain, and retell.

2. Students contribute actively to class and group discussions, such as by asking questions, responding appropriately, clarifying or seeking clarification, building on what others say, or providing useful feedback verbally and in writing.
3. Students demonstrate metalinguistic behaviors (making explicit references to language and communication) while engaged with structured cohesive texts, expanding and enriching ideas, or combining and condensing ideas.
4. Teachers monitor student participation in learning activities and provide support to build on the strengths and meet the needs of individual students.
5. The socio-emotional climate is culturally and linguistically respectful and appropriate, and could be monitored in a variety of methods, including student climate and Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) surveys.

Standard 3: Evidence of student learning outcomes.

English learners come from a range of educational and learning histories; districts and schools can vary considerably in the composition of their English learners. The state data system has made available a differentiated view of English learners with varying number of years in EL programs or services (“EL 0–3 years,” “At-Risk 4–5 years,” and [Long-Term English Learner] “LTEL 6+ years,” “EL 4+ years not at risk of LTEL,” [Reclassified Fluent English Proficient] “RFEP,” and “Ever-EL” [current plus former English learners]), as well as various state-specified statuses. Dually identified students (EL students with disabilities) are also a significant portion of the population, especially concentrated in the long-term English learner population at the secondary level.

It is important to examine local data on student learning, to the extent possible, considering the composition of the students. For example, looking at student progress in the area of English language proficiency (California English Language Development Test [CELDT] or English Language Proficiency Assessments for California [ELPAC] scores) will show more rapid progress for newcomer populations with low initial proficiency scores than in students who are at higher levels of English proficiency, as has been observed by researchers. At the same time, students who begin with higher levels of English proficiency attain reclassification earlier than those who start at lower levels of initial English proficiency.

The range of evidence around student learning might include:

1. Statistically tallied information from formative assessment practices
2. Periodic EL-focused classroom observational or shadowing to monitor level of student engagement and opportunities for academic language use
3. Local interim/benchmark assessment results
4. Summative assessments in content from California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) (the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium [SBAC] in ELA and math, the forthcoming California Spanish Assessment [CSA] for Spanish language arts, and the California Science Test)

5. Summative assessments in English language proficiency (CELDT/ELPAC)
6. Local (including classroom-level) assessment evidence
7. Student progress toward meeting the reclassification criteria
8. Reclassification percentages
9. Post reclassification progress in academic assessments

A Meta-Standard: Data for Articulation Across Systems

Despite broad recognition of the importance of cross-segmental articulation of programs valuable opportunities are regularly missed (e.g. transition from an early childhood educational program to a transitional kindergarten through twelfth grade system, within the kindergarten through twelfth grade school segments, and from a kindergarten through twelfth grade system to higher education). The *CA EL Roadmap* envisions identifying system efforts at promoting better articulation, such as capturing developmental information on children in early childhood programs to inform EL classification in the kindergarten through twelfth grade system, or creating better opportunities for high school credit to be recognized by the higher education system. Such articulation efforts can be documented by examining how students flow across systems and reporting how effectiveness and improvement changes over the course of implementation.⁴⁴

- Data articulation with early childhood programs
- Data articulation across school segments (elementary, middle, and high school)
- Data articulation with higher education/career technical education

Highlighted Case Examples

Example 1: Sobrato Early Academic Language (SEAL)⁴⁵

Principles and elements highlighted by this model:

Principle One: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools

Element 1A – Language and Culture as Assets

Element 1B – English Learner Profiles

Element 1C – School Climate

Element 1D – Family and School Partnerships

⁴⁴ Aguilar, J., Nayfack, M., & Bush-Mecenas, S. (2017). Exploring Improvement Science in Education: Promoting College Access in Fresno Unified School District. PACE. Downloaded at <http://www.edpolicyinca.org/publications/exploring-improvement-science-education-promoting-college-access-fresno-unified-school-district>.

⁴⁵ Sobrato Early Academic Language PreK-3 Model: Powerful, Joyous, Rigorous Language and Literacy Learning. The Sobrato Family Foundation.

Principle Two: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access

Element 2A – Integrated and Designated ELD

Element 2B – Intellectually Rich, Standards-based Curriculum

Element 2C – High Expectations

Element 2D – Access to Full Curriculum

Element 2E – Use of Students’ Home Languages

Element 2G – Programmatic Choice

Principle Four: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems

Element 4A – Alignment and Articulation

SEAL is a research- and evidence-based, language-rich, early education through third grade model designed to build the capacity of educators to powerfully develop the language and literacy skills of young EL children. This approach strengthens instruction and curriculum across the school for all students while centralizing the needs of English learners. Working through standards-based, teacher-created integrated thematic units, SEAL locates language development within and in connection to science and social studies content — thus ensuring access to the full curriculum for all children, and providing motivating instruction to engage students. Teachers become deeply immersed in state ELA, ELD, NGSS, and social studies standards, explore the Frameworks within the context of research about the development of dual language students in order to design curriculum and prepare high-leverage instructional strategies. They are supported in this work through a series of professional development workshops, job-embedded coaching, and collaborative and reflective professional learning in grade level teams over a three-year period. SEAL further supports students and teachers by providing school and district administrators professional learning opportunities as they lead systemic change.

The SEAL model rests on four pillars: A focus on the development of powerful, precise, academic language; the creation of content- and language-rich and affirming environments; articulation across grades and alignment of the preschool and kindergarten through third grade systems; and strong partnerships between families and schools. All of these pillars are built on the bedrock for instructional improvement and the implementation of the SEAL model: teacher intentionality and responsiveness. Through an extensive series of professional development modules, teachers come to understand how language develops, the needs of English learners and dual language learners, and the optimal schooling conditions that foster learning. SEAL teachers learn strategies in the context of the broader research on literacy development, discussing why particular strategies are effective and when and for whom they might be used. The SEAL model of professional development follows the components of high quality staff development (per the National Standards for Staff Development), including sustained

professional development supported by job-embedded coaching and facilitation, coupled with leadership development and the building of a collaborative culture. SEAL provides a toolkit of research-based instructional strategies that fit in the larger pedagogical context of integrated language and content instruction and cross-content thematic units.

Further, SEAL recognizes that mastering a complex set of new instructional strategies and curricular approaches takes time, resources, and support for teachers. Teachers also need opportunities to see the practices being modeled in their own classrooms, encouragement to try new strategies, and constructive feedback from a knowledgeable and supportive coach and from colleagues.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with each participating school district outlines all the components of implementation, including job-embedded coaching.

SEAL is currently being implemented at 101 sites across 20 California districts. These districts range from rural (Williams, Coalinga-Huron, Golden Plains, Mendota, and Fillmore Unified School Districts) to urban (Los Angeles Unified School District), to suburban (Oak Grove and Milpitas Unified School Districts). SEAL implementation also entails leadership development and technical assistance for site and district administrators.

Evidentiary Basis

Standard 1 (supported by an existing research basis): The program explicitly states three foundations that draw from research syntheses on effective instruction and the importance of attending to student language development.⁴⁶

Standard 2 (local metrics of system implementation and adult learning outcomes): Teachers who participated in professional learning supports showed evidence of SEAL instructional approaches; SEAL parents who were involved in training on the importance of engaging in literacy activities with their children showed greater engagement compared with national comparison statistics.

Standard 2a (local metrics of student learning supports and processes): There was an increase in the number of preschool parents who requested enrollment in the kindergarten classrooms on campus and an evaluation showed that school and district leaders cited increased involvement of preschool personnel and preschool families in the life of the school.

⁴⁶ The foundational document can be retrieved from the Sobrato Family Foundation Web site references August, D. & Shanahan (2006). *Developing Literacy in Second Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Minority Language Children and Youth*. (Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ), Goldenberg, C., Hicks, J., Lit, L. (2013). *Dual Language Learners: Effective Instruction in Early Childhood and* Goldenberg, C. (2013). *Unlocking the Research on English Learners: What We Know – and Don't Yet Know – about Effective Instruction*, both published in Summer 2013.

Standard 3 (student learning outcomes): In a five year pilot evaluation study, SEAL students made statistically significant growth on measures of language and literacy in Spanish and English, as well as in assessments of cognitive and social skills, and on the CELDT. SEAL students also consistently outperformed demographically similar comparison groups in growth and achievement, especially in areas related to language and literacy. Building on these promising results, a major external evaluation of SEAL is currently under way, using controlled comparison groups and an expanded set of outcome measures.

Example 2: Sanger and Firebaugh- Las Deltas Partnership

Principles and elements highlighted by this model:

Principle Two: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access

Element 2A – Integrated and Designated ELD

Principle Three: System Conditions That Support Effectiveness

Element 3A – Leadership

Element 3B – Adequate Resources

Element 3C – Assessments

Element 3D – Capacity Building

Sanger Unified School District, beyond the southeast edge of Fresno, is a rural district that has been noted for its school turnaround efforts beginning in the late 1990's.⁴⁷ With a relatively large population of English learners and students from low-income families, the district has gained recognition for developing a culture emphasizing collaboration and systemic change, and this culture is evident throughout the district's leadership structure. In 2011, building on its successful turnaround approach, Sanger established a collaboration with Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified School District, located about 45 minutes west of Fresno. The Central Valley Foundation provided funding for this cross-district partnership, which emphasized fostering a culture of continuous improvement in order to improve outcomes for all students, particularly English learners. Beginning in 2014, the two districts sharpened the focus of the partnership to specifically address the needs of the districts' long-term English learners. Although the districts are different in many ways geographically and demographically, they have found benefits from collaborating to develop and share tools for reform.

⁴⁷ David, J. & Talbert, J. (2013). *Turning Around a High-Poverty District: Learning from Sanger*. The S. H. Cowell Foundation. Retrieved from the S. H. Cowell Web site at <http://shcowell.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Learning-From-Sanger.pdf>.

While the LTEL label was created to focus attention on an overlooked and underserved population, the label has been critiqued as perpetuating a deficit perspective.⁴⁸ However, Sanger and Firebaugh have taken a systemic approach to implementing classroom, school, and district practices that better support students' language and content learning. Through the initiative, the districts have thought deeply about how to build on students' assets. For example, informed by research showing that English learners in dual-language programs have better long-term language and content outcomes, Sanger has developed and launched a new dual-language program. In addition, based on internal data analysis showing that English learners who participated in the district's preschool program were attaining English proficiency earlier, Sanger has committed to expanding its outreach to families to encourage more parents of English learners to enroll their children in preschool.

Evidentiary Basis

Standard 1 (supported by an existing research basis): There is little systematic research that speaks to the efficacy of cross-district collaboration,⁴⁹ although there is a growing knowledge base on teacher professional collaboration and on research practice-partnerships.⁵⁰ Sanger's approach to reform that supports its teacher professional learning culture and a focus on student learning has been well-documented.⁵¹

Standard 2 (local metrics of system implementation and adult learning outcomes): In the context of Sanger's collaborative district culture, school leaders formed professional learning communities (PLCs) that observed and examined ELD practices, leading to the conclusion that "teachers needed to ask questions that would provoke thoughtful conversation. They observed that ELD was disconnected from core classroom instruction, so their work included ways of linking the two, including the use of ELD time to introduce vocabulary and skills in upcoming core lessons."⁵² The district regularly collects and analyzes data from such PLCs.

⁴⁸ Thompson, K. (2016). Questioning the Long-term English Learner Label: How Categorization Can Blind Us to Students' Abilities. *Teachers College Record* (117), 120305

⁴⁹ See Vescio, V., Ross, D. & Adams, A. (2008). A Review of Research on the Impact of Professional Learning Communities on Teaching Practice and Student Learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24: 80-91.

⁵⁰ See Coburn, C. & Penuel, W. (2016). Research-Practice Partnerships in Education: Outcomes, Dynamics, and Open Questions. *Educational Researcher*, 45: 48-54.

⁵¹ David, J. & Talbert, J. (2013). Turning around a High-Poverty District: Learning from Sanger. The S. H. Cowell Foundation. See also National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (2017). *Promoting the Education Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

⁵² David, J. & Talbert, J. (2013). *Turning around a High-Poverty District: Learning from Sanger*. The S. H. Cowell Foundation. See also National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (2017). *Promoting the Education Success of Children and*

Standard 2a (local metrics of student learning supports and processes): Student work has always guided much of the work of teacher PLCs. More recently, through the partnership, Sanger and Firebaugh teachers have gathered samples of student collaborative conversations as an indicator of student engagement and learning, using the free online Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) from Stanford's *Understanding Language* (UL) that focuses on collaborative conversations and argumentation.

Standard 3 (student learning outcomes): Reclassification rates for long-term English learners have increased during the course of the partnership. Both districts also have maintained or improved their district graduation rates for the "Ever-EL" category of students to 93 percent in 2015, compared to a statewide average of 70 percent; the combined graduation rate for "Ever-EL" students for 2016 was 97 percent, compared to 72 percent statewide. During a recent five-year period, both districts also improved the rate at which students entering kindergarten attain English proficient status on the CELDT. For example, during the interval between 2010 to 2014, the time it took for 50 percent of the cohort of students to attain English proficiency was reduced from four and a half years to three years.

Example 3: Garden Grove Unified School District

Principles and elements highlighted by this model:

Principle Two: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access

Element 2A – Integrated and Designated ELD

Principle Three: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness

Element 3A – Leadership

Element 3C – Assessments

Element 3D – Capacity Building

In 2014, the Garden Grove Unified School District, as part of its work in the *Math in Common* Community of Practice Network, embarked on a multi-year project to increase the quantity, quality, and equitable distribution of student-to-student collaborative conversations taking place during math in their kindergarten through eighth grade classrooms. They believed that if the quality and quantity of these conversations improved for English learners, then increased student learning of math would result. Their journey began with participation in an online course, Constructive Classroom Conversations, offered by Stanford's UL initiative, in which Garden Grove's Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) learned how to gather and analyze samples of student discourse using UL's Conversation Analysis Tool (CAT). Emma Druitt, Director of Garden Grove's kindergarten through eighth grade math department, and her team of

Youth Learning English: Promising Futures. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

TOSAs created their own version of the CAT and began to collect baseline data in classrooms to measure the quality of student mathematical discourse. Over time, they refined the discourse tool to meet their specific needs. Responding to the initial data collection, her team created a Summer Math Institute, in which 40 math teachers co-taught for two hours a day (one kindergarten through sixth grade teacher paired with one seventh through twelfth grade teacher), and received two hours of professional development (PD). During the PD time, teachers learned about the district's conversation tool (the Academic Discourse Tool for Mathematics), engagement strategies, and how to train their students to collaborate with each other.

Excited by the results of the summer program, Druitt and her team lead a team of teachers throughout the academic year in ongoing PD as part of their Discourse Collaborative and continue to collect data to monitor the effectiveness of the professional development. The district has documented changes over time in the quality and in the distribution of student-to-student mathematical conversations that are collaborative and focused on the lesson content. The district is monitoring change in the math CAASPP for student subgroups. They have shared their process with other math educators through presentations at the California Mathematics Council conferences as well as through the *Math in Common* district collaboration. They continue to use the observation tool to develop cohorts of math teacher leaders to enhance this work.

Evidentiary Basis

Standard 1 (supported by an existing research basis): The work is motivated by engaging students in the mathematical practices in the California State Standards around discourse. They rely on the work of Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey from San Diego State University, who have published on the importance of collaborative conversations. In the area of mathematics for English learners, they rely on a foundational paper by Judit Moschkovich.⁵³

Standard 2 (local metrics of system implementation and adult learning outcomes): The district math leaders created a Discourse Collaborative and a Summer Math Institute, and recruitment and participation is registered. Observers are trained in the use of the Academic Discourse Tool for Mathematics that record the level of mathematical discourse in classrooms.

Standard 2a (local metrics of student learning supports and processes): Observations using the Academic Discourse Tool for Mathematics enable analyses of the level of quality of the discourse and mathematical understanding observed in classrooms. The results from the first two years indicate a large shift in the quality of mathematical language used by students.

⁵³ Moschkovich, J. (2011). *Mathematics, the Common Core, and Language: Recommendations for Mathematics Instruction for ELs Aligned with the Common Core*. Retrieved from the Stanford University Understanding Language Web site.

Standard 3 (student learning outcomes): Consistently strong student math scores on the CAASPP that exceeded expectations for Garden Grove were noted in a report that analyzed data for districts participating in *Math in Common*, a collaborative learning network. While the report is a comprehensive look at the district culture that may have supported the outcome, the role of this initiative is how “a focus on student math discourse now deeply permeates the thinking of staff throughout the district”.⁵⁴

Example 4: Fresno Unified School District⁵⁵

Principles and elements highlighted by this model:

Principle Three: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness

Element 3A – Leadership

Element 3D – Capacity Building

Principle Four: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems

Element 4A – Alignment and Articulation

The Fresno Unified School District has approximately 73,000 students, with English learners comprising 21 percent of the population. In 2009, then-Superintendent Mike Hanson formed the Equity and Access Partnership with University of California (UC), Merced to address areas of inequity in the system and to improve the post-secondary opportunities of Fresno students. In the words of the Superintendent, the purpose of the partnership was “to provide all students with an equal opportunity to graduate with the greatest number of postsecondary choices from the widest array of options.”

Within the district, the Office of Equity and Access, led by Jorge Aguilar (now Superintendent of Sacramento City Unified School District), began by developing a data dashboard to identify students who were not applying to California State Universities (CSUs) and UCs although they were qualified to attend. Upon further investigation, Equity and Access team members identified the root cause of this mismatch—Fresno Unified School District seniors were not always aware of all the college options that were available to them based on their academic profile.

In response, the district developed I am Ready college packets that provided individualized information to students and their families about the colleges and universities for which students were eligible. High school counselors participated in two

⁵⁴ Perry, R., Reade, F., Heredia, A. & Finkelstein, N. (2017). *Three Structures in the Garden Grove Unified School District that Support Implementation of the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics*. WestEd. Retrieved from the WestEd Web site at <https://www.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/resource-garden-grove-ccss-math-mic8.pdf>.

⁵⁵ Haxton, C. & O’Day, J. (2015). *Improving Equity and Access in Fresno: Lessons from a K12-Higher Education Partnership*. American Institutes for Research.

days of training to learn about student eligibility to CSU and UC campuses so that they could better inform students about their post-secondary options.

The combination of the *I am Ready* packets and follow-up conversations by high school counselors with Fresno Unified School District seniors led to an increase in student applications to UC/CSU campuses outside of Fresno. Applications increased from 382 to 578. Encouraged by these results, the Office of Equity and Access continued to use data to drive school improvement. As a result, the district has seen the four-year cohort graduation rate increase from 69 percent in 2009–10 to 79 percent in 2013–14 and twelfth grade students' A–G completion rates rise from 32 percent to 48 percent.

Evidentiary Basis

Standard 1 (supported by an existing research basis): The central theoretical motivation for this work is in the continuous improvement model most recently synthesized in the improvement science work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.⁵⁶

Standard 2a (local metrics of system implementation and adult learning outcomes): Jorge Aguilar and his team note a careful, deliberative process undertaken by the team in understanding the root cause of their problem: “Before developing and testing specific solutions to this problem, the Fresno team sought to understand the problem as it was experienced by the user, in this case the District’s college-eligible students. The Equity and Access team worked closely with school counselors to understand the experiences of their students. They interviewed students to document (a) why certain students applied to more colleges than others and (b) what interventions had already been tried by counselors. This allowed district leaders to understand the variation in performance across schools, as well as challenges and opportunities for improvement.”⁵⁷

Standard 2b (local metrics of student learning supports and processes): Specific to English learners, the Fresno team noted that in the course of analyzing A–G completion by student subgroups, that these students were disproportionately lacking foreign language credits, and that for a large number of students, this was the only deficiency for the students to complete their A–G requirements. This led the district to create UC-approved Spanish for native speakers as an avenue to meet the A–G foreign language requirement.

⁵⁶ Bryk, A., Gomez, L., Grunow, A. & LeMahieu, P. (2015). *Learning to Improve: How America’s Schools Can Get Better at Getting Better*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing. The Fresno work is directly framed in this way in Aguilar, J., Nayfack, M., & Bush-Mecenas, S. (2017). Exploring Improvement Science in Education: Promoting College Access in Fresno Unified School District. *PACE Policy Brief*.

⁵⁷ Aguilar, J., Nayfack, M., & Bush-Mecenas, S. (2017). Exploring Improvement Science in Education: Promoting College Access in Fresno Unified School District. *PACE Policy Brief*.

Standard 3 (student learning outcomes): The district has looked at the four-year cohort graduation rate (increasing from 69 percent in 2009–10 to 79 percent in 2013–14) and twelfth grade students' A–G completion rates (rising from 32 percent to 48 percent during this same time period). In addition, the district has recently created partnerships with the local community college and Fresno State University to share data with the aim of improving student progress from the primary through secondary grades and toward higher education degree completion.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ Appleton, R. (2016, June 2). Fresno Unified, Higher-Ed Partners Get Grant for College Focus. *Fresno Bee*.

Conclusion

The work envisioned in the implementation of the *CA EL Roadmap* evokes what district leaders at the Sanger Unified School District refer to as the “Golden Gate Bridge” metaphor — a continual repainting of the structure to constantly reinforce district values and provide educators with repeated learning opportunities to refresh their understanding and skills for the core initiatives, using data as their guide.⁵⁹ With evidence as a guide for schools and districts to engage in a community of practice, it is our hope that all California educators will participate in this statewide learning endeavor to share their practices.

We envision a focus on a safe, affirming, welcoming school climate and culture that values and builds upon the linguistic and cultural assets that each individual student brings, supported by a culturally responsive curriculum and instruction. We envision leadership committed to this challenge. We envision explicit recognition of early childhood education as a crucial part of the system. We envision a focus on English proficiency plus proficiency in multiple languages and recognition of the role of home language in supporting English and overall literacy. We envision English language development in and through rigorous academic content rooted in the California State Standards and NGSS, leading to access to the full curriculum along with supports for participation and success in that curriculum. We envision all teachers actively engaged in instruction that elicits academic discourse and lively argumentation across the content areas. All of the hard work will lead our EL students to college- and career-readiness and preparation for civic participation in a global, diverse, multilingual, twenty-first century world.

⁵⁹ Smith, R., Johnson, M. & Thompson, K. (2012). Data, our GPS. *Educational Leadership*, 69(5): 56-59. Also see David, J. & Talbert, J. (2013). *Turning around a high-poverty district: Learning from Sanger*. S. H. Cowell Foundation.

Appendices

Appendix A: EL Roadmap Policy

California English Learner Roadmap State Board of Education Policy:

Educational Programs and Services for English Learners

This policy is intended to assist the California Department of Education in providing guidance to local educational agencies (LEAs) in welcoming, understanding, and educating the diverse population of students who are English learners attending California public schools. Many English learners represent the newest members of our society (including recently arrived immigrants and children of immigrants) who bring a rich diversity of cultural backgrounds and come from families with rich social and linguistic experiences. They also bring skills in their primary languages that contribute enormously to the state's economic and social strengths as a talented multilingual and multicultural population.

This policy explicitly focuses on English learners in the context of the state's efforts to improve the educational system, the quality of teaching and learning, and educational outcomes. It centers on standards, curriculum frameworks, assessment, accountability/ school improvement, educator quality, early childhood/ preschool, social and family support services, parent/ community involvement, and higher education. Its purpose is to promote local capacity-building and continuous improvement in each of these areas and their interrelationship, based on evidence of effectiveness from local experience as well as the most current rigorous research evidence that speaks to the strengths and needs of the diverse population of English learners.

The impetus for this policy comes from a number of important related developments in California as well as nationally. If properly coordinated and articulated as part of a coherent California English Learner Roadmap, these developments can better serve the state's large population of English learners to attain college- and career-ready standards and to further promote the rich linguistic diversity of the state as it thrives in a global economy and culture of learning, innovation, and advanced technology.

The adopted academic State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards, and corresponding English Language Development (ELD) standards, signal an important shift toward emphasizing academic uses of language for all students, and student engagement with college- and career-ready curriculum using English and other languages. Taken together, these standards highlight the tightly interconnected nature of developing disciplinary content understandings, analytical practices, and academic uses of language for all students. This shift enables the educational system to move beyond remediating students' English language skills to simultaneously developing their language and literacy skills while engaging in the full range of academic content learning.

The State Seal of Biliteracy encourages districts to recognize students' biliterate proficiency. Developing assessments in languages other than English that are aligned to state academic standards (e.g., the California Spanish Assessment) are key to recognizing biliteracy and academic achievement in more than one language. The passage of the California Education for a Global Economy Initiative, known as Proposition 58 (amending Proposition 227), moves us beyond improvement efforts focused solely on language of instruction to programs and pathways that effectively develop academic content knowledge, discipline-specific practices and academic language uses, and bilingual-biliterate proficiency.

California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is premised on local districts providing equitable learning conditions, pupil outcomes, and effective engagement of English learners. Districts are expected to set, with their parent and community partners, meaningful goals and outcomes that require full access to the curriculum, assure English learners' meaningful progress toward attaining academic English proficiency, and closing gaps in academic achievement for students entering as English learners. LCFF provides districts additional resources to build local capacity to implement and support evidence-based practices. State-produced documents provide coherent guidance for districts on implementing more and better comprehensive, research evidence-based services for diverse groups of English learners via the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process, and provides support for continuous improvement.

Our accountability system is state-determined, and is consistent with federal guidance provided for states to implement the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which supports our aligning federal and state policies to better integrate and leverage resources, services, assessment and accountability. Consonant with LCFF, ESSA elevates English language proficiency to a central indicator for Title I accountability. It values English language development, which California has identified as both, designated ELD equally with integrated ELD—as presaged in California's English Language Arts (ELA)/ELD Curriculum Framework.

Given ESSA's Title III provisions, California will re-examine standardized, statewide EL entrance and exit procedures and criteria, and report academic performance of key subcategories of English learners, such as long-term English learners and students with disabilities. The broader federal stance on multiple indicators of performance also complements our system's use of multiple state and locally-collected indicators on academic achievement, EL progress, high school graduation, chronic absenteeism and student suspension, school climate and parent engagement to advance a more complete picture of district program effectiveness.

This policy also reflects the current national research consensus on second language learning, bilingualism, program effectiveness, and policy research⁶⁰, much of which is consistent with earlier syntheses from the California Department of Education⁶¹.

Findings include the following:

- English language proficiency development is a process that takes five to seven years for those entering with emerging English, benefits from coherent and aligned instruction across that time period, and can take place as an integrated process simultaneous with academic content learning in addition to designated ELD and the development of bilingualism/biliteracy.
- Bilingualism provides benefits from the capacity to communicate in more than one language and may enhance cognitive skills, as well as improve academic outcomes.
- Establishing proper and consistent procedures and criteria for identifying, monitoring, and exiting English learners using appropriate assessment procedures—while developing professional capacity to use assessment results—constitutes a key lever for effective system improvement.
- The diversity of the EL population (e.g., newcomers, long-term English learners, students with interrupted formal education, students with disabilities, gifted and talented students, and the expected continuous exiting of students from the EL category) necessitates pedagogy and educational support services that are differentiated and responsive.

Brain development research reinforces the crucial period of birth through early childhood in the areas of cognitive, social, and language development. There is great need for coherent, aligned support for dual language learners across the preschool and primary grade systems to begin developing their bilingual and biliterate capacities.

The current research evidence base also supports the need to attend to the following instructional factors:

- Explicit literacy instruction especially in the early grades
- Peer-assisted and small-group learning opportunities
- Providing academic language support during content area instruction, balanced with structured explicit opportunities for oral and written language skills development

⁶⁰ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017). *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. DOI: 10.17226/24677

⁶¹ CDE (1984) Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework; CDE (1986) Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students; and CDE (2010) Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches.

- Appropriate assessment in various forms (e.g., formative, benchmark, summative) to understand and support student learning
- Processes related to social emotional development and identity formation

California is a state that welcomes newcomers and their families, and that addresses their linguistic diversity with a positive, additive orientation. Our schools need to reflect this orientation by affirming, welcoming and responding to a diverse range of student strengths, needs, and identities, and prepare graduates with the linguistic, academic and social skills and competencies needed for college, career and civic participation in a global, diverse and multilingual world.

California’s Vision of Success for English Learners

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

Mission

California schools affirm, welcome and respond to a diverse range of EL 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.

Four Principles

Four principles support our vision and provide the foundation of California’s English Learner Roadmap. These principles are intended to guide all levels of the system towards a coherent and aligned set of practices, services, relationships, and approaches to teaching and learning that together create a powerful, effective, 21st century education for our English learners. Underlying this systemic application of the Principles is the foundational understanding that simultaneously developing English learners’ linguistic and academic capacities is a shared responsibility of all educators, and that all levels of the schooling system have a role to play in ensuring the access and achievement of the 1.3 million English learners who attend our schools.

Principle #1: ASSETS-ORIENTED AND NEEDS-RESPONSIVE SCHOOLS

Pre-schools and schools are responsive to different EL strengths, needs and identities, and support the socio-emotional health and development of English learners. 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.

Principle #2: INTELLECTUAL QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION AND MEANINGFUL ACCESS

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 as well as 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.

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, and utilize valid assessment and other data systems that inform instruction and continuous improvement; resources and tiered support is 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.

Principle #4: ALIGNMENT AND ARTICULATION WITHIN AND ACROSS SYSTEMS

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.

The California State Board of Education will direct the California Department of Education to provide guidance to districts and intermediary support organizations (e.g., county offices of education, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence) on how districts and schools can implement and strengthen comprehensive, research-based programs and services for all profiles of English learners via the LCAP, and provide support for establishing continuous improvement strategies and expectations that enable access to college- and career-ready learning as well as opportunities to attain the State Seal of Biliteracy.

The guidance will invest in and build educators' professional capacity; emphasize collaborative efforts; support effective pedagogy; and develop systemic solutions to create a coherent and positive education system. The guidance will encourage innovative district and school implementation of evidence-based practices for curricula, materials adoption and development, instruction, professional development and leadership that are responsive to the differentiated strengths and needs of English learners, and strengthening appropriate assessment tools and practices. The guidance will be consistent with the requirements set forth in state and federal laws addressing English learners.

Approved by the California State Board of Education (SBE) on July 12, 2017.

Appendix B: Acronyms

- CAASPP: California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress
- CA Ed.G.E. Initiative: The California Education for a Global Economy Initiative
- *CA EL Roadmap*: The California English Learner Roadmap: Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Learners
- CAT: Conversation Analysis Tool
- CDE: California Department of Education
- CELDT: California English Language Development Test
- CSA: California Spanish Assessment
- CSU: California State University
- EC: Education Code
- EL: English learner (abbreviation used for adjectives only, not when used as a noun)
- ELA: English language arts
- ELAC: English Learner Advisory Committee
- ELD: English language development
- EL Roadmap Policy: California English Learner Roadmap State Board of Education Policy: Educational Programs and Services for English Learners
- DELAC: District English Learner Advisory Committee
- ELPAC: English Language Proficiency Assessments for California
- ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act
- ESSA: Every Student Succeeds Act
- IEP: Individualized education program
- IHE: Institution of higher education
- LCAP: Local Control and Accountability Plan
- LCFF: Local Control Funding Formula
- LEA: Local Educational Agency
- LTEL: Long term English learner
- MOOC: Massive Open Online Course
- MOU: Memorandum of Understanding
- NASEM: National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine
- NCLB: No Child Left Behind
- NGSS: Next Generation Science Standards
- PD: Professional development
- PLC: Professional learning community
- RFEP: Reclassified fluent English proficient
- SBAC: Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium
- SBE: State Board of Education
- SEAL: Sobrato Early Academic Language

- SEL: Social and emotional learning
- TOSA: Teacher on Special Assignment
- UC: University of California
- UL: Understanding Language

Appendix C: Glossary

Local educational agency (LEA): As defined in ESEA, an LEA is a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or for a combination of school districts or counties that is recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary schools or secondary schools.

Biliteracy: Biliteracy is high level proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in two languages.

Designated English language development (ELD): Designated ELD is a protected time during the regular school day when teachers use the CA ELD Standards as the focal standards in ways that build into and from content instruction in order to develop critical English language skills, knowledge and abilities needed for content learning in English.

Integrated ELD: Integrated ELD is made up of effective instructional experiences for English learners throughout the day and across disciplines that: Are interactive and engaging, meaningful and relevant, and intellectually rich and challenging; are appropriately scaffolded in order to provide strategic support that moves English learners toward independence; build both content knowledge and academic English; value and build on primary language and culture and other forms of prior knowledge.

Dual language program: A dual language program is a program in which students are taught literacy and content in two languages. When a program is called “dual language immersion” it is usually the same as two-way immersion or two-way bilingual. When a program is called “dual language” it may refer to students from one language group developing full literacy skills in two languages.

Heritage language program: A heritage language program is a program with the goal of literacy in two languages. Content is taught in both languages, with teachers fluent in both languages. Heritage language programs typically target students who are non-English speakers or who have weak literacy skills in their first language.

Dual language learner: A dual language learner is a child learning two (or more) languages at the same time as well as a child learning a second language while continuing to develop their first (or home) language.

Long term English learner: A long term English learner is a student who has been enrolled in U.S. schools for more than six years, who is not progressing toward English proficiency, and who is struggling academically because of their limited English skills.