

Renewing Our Promise

Research and Recommendations to Support California's Long-Term English Learners



**CALIFORNIANS
TOGETHER**
CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS
OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER RESEARCH & POLICY REPORT

By Manuel Buenrostro & Julie Maxwell-Jolly, PhD



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ten years have passed since [*Reparable Harm*](#) called attention to California's long-term English learners (LTELs). And while it is gratifying to see that the numbers and percentage of English learners (ELs) who are LTELs have decreased slightly over the past decade—continuing this slow rate of change will leave far too many students behind. This report is a call to action to use the information and policy gains of the last decade to accelerate improvement for these students. In particular, the English Learner Roadmap offers key guidance to school districts for improving outcomes for EL students—including LTELs and those at risk of becoming LTELs.

THE STUDENTS

Of California's over six million public school students, 1.148 million are ELs, and 200,000 of these students are LTELs. They are ELs who have been in US schools for six or more years without reaching levels of English proficiency to be reclassified. Another 130,000 ELs are considered at risk of becoming LTELs.

The proportion of ELs in grades 6-12 who are LTELs ranges from 12 percent to 83 percent among districts with at least 25 LTEL students. The great majority of ELs (81 percent) speak Spanish. Almost all of the rest speak one of nine other languages. Over the last five years during which data have been available, there has been a slight decline in the percentage of ELs in grades 6-12 who are LTELs, from 52 to 46 percent—a positive trend that must be accelerated significantly to improve outcomes for these students. At the same time, there has been a two percent increase in the percentage of ELs in grades 6-12 who are at risk of becoming LTELs.

RESEARCH SUMMARY

Research on LTELs reveals that they share certain experiences that may contribute to their prolonged EL status, including:

- Variability in the quality and approach to their education in the elementary grades,
- Lack of adequate English language development (ELD) instruction,
- Teachers who have not had the preparation to address their needs (which in turn results in lack of access to appropriate grade-level content and curricula), and
- An undiagnosed or unaddressed learning disability.

Among research-supported strategies to improve outcomes for these students are infusing high-quality language instruction across the curriculum (integrated ELD), specific ELD instruction (designated ELD), dual language programs, instruction that ensures access to a rigorous curriculum, mentorship, a culturally relevant and inclusive curriculum that contributes to motivation and engagement, and clustering LTEL students in heterogeneous and rigorous grade-level content classes with English proficient students taught using strategies designed to make content accessible. Additional strategies that contribute to ongoing success for younger ELs include dual language immersion and other bilingual programs, ensuring appropriately rigorous content from the beginning (not waiting for students to gain English language proficiency before introducing complex topics), and building students' background knowledge to increase their understanding. It is important to note a tension in the field of research and practice between the potential harm of labeling students as LTELs, for example possibly leading to lower teacher expectations and student self-efficacy beliefs—and the necessity of identifying the issue of long-term EL status in order to remedy a failure of the education system and improve outcomes for these students.

POLICY OVERVIEW

The last ten years have seen several policy changes that support EL students—including long-term English learners and those at risk of becoming LTELs. The local control funding formula provides districts with funding that can be targeted to meeting the needs of these students. Districts now must identify LTELs and students at risk of becoming LTELs and must inform parents of their children's status and plans for addressing their needs. With the 2016 passage of the California Ed.G.E. (Education for a Global Economy) initiative, school districts can make decisions about the best instructional approaches for their EL students—including those that promote biliteracy and call on students' primary language for instruction. The ELA/ELD framework provides guidance on targeted ELD and how to infuse English language development across the curriculum. And the 2017 California State Board adoption of a comprehensive EL policy, the EL Roadmap, provides districts and schools the guidance and tools to implement these and other policies in ways that best support ELs, LTELs, and those at risk of becoming LTEL students.

LANDSCAPE SURVEY

The report includes results of a survey of EL leaders from 107 California school districts chosen among those with the greatest number or percentage of ELs. The results indicated that many school districts are engaging in research-supported practices for serving their LTELs and preventing EL students from becoming LTELs. These include supports for A-G course completion, mentors, and instructional aides. The survey also revealed that some research-supported strategies are being under-utilized and thus offer potential for improvement. These include primary language assistance, professional learning specific to addressing the needs of ELs and LTELs, activities that build stronger relationships with students, and instructional materials designed specifically to support the learning of LTELs.

Some of the factors posed as potential obstacles were not significant challenges for serving LTELs in these districts. For example, few participants reported a lack of school district administration support as a significant obstacle. On the other hand, the ability to fit additional courses within the master schedule or having staff with the right expertise to serve these students were more significant obstacles.

Respondents found several supports particularly helpful. These included flexible state and federal funding that can be targeted specifically to LTELs; the LCAP engagement and planning process; learning from research, data, and best practices; and the EL Roadmap. Some participants added comments praising the EL Roadmap, the California Ed.G.E. Initiative, and the LCAP process as providing direction for serving LTEL students.

Most respondents shared policy and/or program changes implemented in their districts to address the needs of LTELs and prevent students from becoming LTELs. By far the most frequently mentioned were program and curriculum changes. Creating plans and policies for these students and monitoring their progress was the next most-frequently mentioned change.

Survey participants also offered suggestions for state policy changes. Among survey participants' suggestions for needed state policy changes were strengthening content and requirements for teacher preparation and professional learning specific to LTEL students; incorporating LTEL student outcomes into the California Data Dashboard; increasing targeted resources to meet the needs of LTELs; and making state reclassification criteria uniform and creating alternative pathways to reclassification.

DISTRICT STRATEGIES AND APPROACHES

A subset of in-depth analysis and conversations provided examples of strategies being implemented in selected school districts. These include professional learning and collaboration for special education and general education teachers for serving LTEL students with disabilities, site-based professional learning for integrating ELD across the curriculum, shadowing EL students to deepen understanding of their experience and inform data analysis, greater opportunities for EL and LTEL students to participate fully in career pathway courses, making LTEL students' needs a priority in the district Master Plan, and ongoing individualized progress monitoring of ELs to prevent their becoming LTELs or at risk of becoming LTELs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The report offers four visionary goals for California's education system and a set of 16 state policy recommendations and 16 recommended district actions to help meet these goals.

FOUR VISIONARY GOALS FOR CALIFORNIA'S EDUCATION SYSTEM

By the year 2030, California's public education system will:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 Reduce by half the percentage of ELs in grades 6-12 who are LTELs, | 2 Reduce by half the number of students at risk of becoming LTELs, |
| 3 Ensure that half of reclassified fluent English proficient students (RFEPs) earn the state seal of biliteracy, and | 4 Ensure ongoing RFEP achievement that is on par with that of fluent English proficient students. |

The third and fourth goals are critical, not in reducing the numbers of LTELs or students at risk of becoming LTELs, but in ensuring that when students are reclassified, they have the skills they need to compete on an even playing field with their English fluent peers, and do not fall behind after initially achieving the necessary threshold for reclassification.

KEY FOCUS AREAS TO MEET VISIONARY GOALS

To improve outcomes for EL and LTEL students in significant and long-term ways requires efforts that include changes across the entire education system, including in the following key focal areas:

- A. Educator Preparation and Professional Learning.** Stronger educator preparation and ongoing professional learning for all educators to understand and work effectively with EL and LTEL students across the curriculum, including time for collaboration. *This is aligned with principle three of the EL Roadmap focused on “system conditions that support effectiveness,” including capacity building for leaders and teachers.*
- B. Resources and Planning.** Focused resource allocation, goal setting, and planning that address the specific needs of ELs and LTELs. *This is aligned with principle three of the EL Roadmap focused on “system conditions that support effectiveness,” including investing adequate resources and principle four focused on “alignment and articulation within and across systems.”*
- C. Curriculum and Instruction.** Education programs that provide all ELs and LTELs the supports they need without segregating them into tracks, are based on curriculum and instruction that is accessible, engaging, culturally relevant, and rigorous, and attend to the socioemotional well-being of students along with their language and academic needs. *This is aligned with principle two of the EL Roadmap focused on “intellectual quality of instruction and meaningful access”.*
- D. Data, Assessment, and Accountability.** Data on LTELs and students at risk of becoming LTELs that are accessible, included in the accountability system, and useful for a variety of purposes. The data are used for planning effective instruction, designing professional learning, monitoring student progress, and communicating with students and their families about successes and needs. Another effect of using data and assessments is to hold the system accountable for meeting the needs of ELs and LTELs, including schools, districts, and the state. *This is aligned with principle three of the EL Roadmap focused on “system conditions that support effectiveness,” including assessment, and principle four focused on “alignment and articulation within and across systems”.*
- E. Engagement, Relationships, and Student Focus.** Frequent communication and meaningful engagement (centered on listening and learning) with students, their families, and communities to create relationships of trust. *This is aligned with principle one of the EL Roadmap focused on “assets-oriented and needs-responsive schools”.*

Within these areas of focus, both state policy and local school actions can be undertaken to meet the needs of ELs, including LTELs. The following two sections lay out those policies and the action agenda.

STATE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Educator Preparation and Professional Learning** *(aligned with principle three of the EL roadmap focused on “system conditions that support effectiveness,” including capacity building for leaders and teachers).* Improving outcomes for LTEL and EL students requires teachers to develop the mindset, cultural understanding, language skills, and pedagogical expertise to promote their success and well-being. This does not happen in a single year of teacher preparation or a few additional professional learning sessions. Rather, building these skills and understanding is part of an ongoing professional trajectory and requires the investment of time and funding to support teachers through this journey. This requires an infrastructure that includes time for planning and collaboration time, teachers on special assignment, instructional coaches, and other supports built into the system.
- 1. Invest in District and Regional Efforts to Recruit and Retain Highly Qualified Educators.** The state must continue to support efforts to recruit teachers from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds who have the skillsets to support ELs and LTELs. Recruitment efforts can include additional investments in teacher residency programs (see page 36), loan and tuition forgiveness, and financial support for classified staff to obtain a teaching credential. All state investments to increase the teacher pipeline should prioritize the recruitment and retention of bilingual educators and include a component related to promoting the success of EL and LTEL students. Given that all LTELs are in grades 6-12, it is essential to focus a significant effort on building the pool of educators with such specialized skills in these grades. And, because students who do not progress in the elementary years are those who become or are at risk of becoming LTELs, it is equally urgent to make similar investments in building the capacity of elementary school teachers. These efforts would help restore the pool of teachers with the expertise necessary for fostering the success and well-being of EL and LTEL students that was decimated during the almost 20 years under Proposition 227.
 - 2. Invest in Professional Learning, Support, and Collaboration for Current Educators.** School districts need resources and guidance to ensure that they can provide all teachers with effective, professional learning opportunities focused on meeting the learning needs of ELs and LTELs. This should include ongoing professional learning for bilingual teachers who provide instruction in dual language programs and linguistic support in all program models, and professional learning for special education teachers, focused on meeting the needs of EL and LTEL students to support ELs dually identified for special education services. To ensure that ongoing professional learning is sustained, these investments must also focus on the infrastructure of teacher learning and support, includes time for planning and collaboration, teachers on special assignment, instructional coaches, and other supports built into the system.
 - 3. Invest in an EL and LTEL Initiative Focused on Building District and School Leadership Capacity.** The Initiative could provide grants to districts and county offices to build capacity and provide ongoing professional development for teacher leaders and administrators to meet the needs of LTELs and prevent those at risk from becoming LTELs. This would help expand the pool of current and future leaders prepared to plan and implement effective and equitable programs for these students. Research supports the importance of leadership at all levels of the education system in providing guidance, oversight, allocating resources, and setting organizational priorities—among other roles that facilitate all the factors discussed in these recommendations. The importance of state, school district, and site leadership was highlighted by participants in the LTEL survey, for example, noting the positive influence of leaders’ attention to supporting LTEL outcomes. This LTEL Initiative could be modeled on the 21 California School Leadership Academies.

B. Resources and Planning *(aligned with principle three of the EL Roadmap focused on “system conditions that support effectiveness,” including investing adequate resources and principle four focused on “alignment and articulation within and across systems”).* The importance of LTEL-specific plans and goals with dedicated resources was a common sentiment of survey participants. They mentioned that the plans they developed kept them focused on these students and held them accountable to work toward the goals for improvement set in their LCAPs and other plans.

- 1. Ensure Equitable Allocation and Investment of Funds.** Ensure that all state and federal funds, including resources designated for COVID rescue efforts, are equitably allocated and that school districts intentionally target some of these funds for ELs and LTELs. This includes ensuring that adequate proportions of the investments in the 2021-22 California Budget⁵⁴ for specific programs, such as expanded learning, community schools, early education, and dual enrollment, among others, reach EL and LTEL students. These investments can be coupled with stronger accountability and guidance for funding currently targeted to these students, such as LCFF concentration and supplemental funds.
- 2. Require identification of LTELs and Students at Risk of Becoming LTELs in District Plans.** Amend the state LCAP Template to specifically identify LTELs and students at risk of becoming LTELs as a cohort of ELs that should be addressed when defining actions and services for ELs. In addition, require districts to set specific differentiated growth targets in their LCAPs for ELs and LTELs.
- 3. Invest in and Ensure that CDE and County Offices of Education Deliver Support Focused on Meeting the Needs of LTELs and Students at Risk.** Provide additional investment for the California Department of Education and County Offices of Education (COEs) to promote and facilitate school districts to implement the program and policy guidance provided in the English Learner Roadmap. Within their differentiated assistance, COEs should include strategies for LTEL success at all three levels of differentiated assistance, plans for assisting districts with these strategies over time (rather than “one and done” efforts), and personnel with the expertise to provide this assistance. Within the COE’s Multi-Tiered System of Support, ensure that strategies for supporting these students are provided at all levels of intervention.

C. Curriculum and Instruction *(aligned with principle two of the EL Roadmap focused on “intellectual quality of instruction and meaningful access”).* State policy support and encouragement are necessary to ensure the development and implementation of curriculum and instructional practices that improve outcomes for ELs and LTELs. We learned from our survey and interviews that while many school districts were engaging in research and practice-supported strategies and approaches, many were not, for various reasons, including a lack of available appropriate materials.

- 1. Invest in the Expansion and Support for Implementation of Research-Based Instructional Programs that Prevent Students from Becoming LTELs.** This includes investments in the expansion of dual-language programs that promote EL’s language and content progress in both English and their primary language. It also includes investing in language-rich and intentional high-quality integrated and designated ELD so that language development is provided across the curriculum. These investments will facilitate the ability of ELs to meet the threshold necessary for reclassification and success beyond reclassification.
- 2. Prioritize Expansion of Programs and Services for Dual Language Learners in the Expansion of the California State Preschool Program and Transitional Kindergarten.** Ensure the expansion of programs and services for dual language learners as part of the state’s investment in early childhood education. This includes California’s recent commitment to provide access to universal

transitional kindergarten for all four-year-old children by 2025 and expand the California State Preschool Program (CSPP). By some estimates, 60 percent of children under age six come from homes where English is not the primary language. By supporting these students early on in their home language and English, California can reduce the number of those who become LTELs or at risk of becoming LTELs.

3. **Ensure LTELs Can Participate in the Full Curriculum, Including all Courses to Meet High School Graduation and Post-Secondary Requirements.** To support expanded access to the full curriculum, the state must invest in expanding opportunities for ELs and LTELs to engage in work- and project-based learning as ways of deepening their understanding and demonstrating what they've learned. Programs such as those supported by the Career Pathways Trust⁵⁵ and Linked Learning among others can facilitate and support the meaningful and equitable participation of EL and LTEL students. Within middle school and high school, expanding the AVID LTEL program can be helpful.
4. **Expand the Variety and Availability of Instructional Materials that Support English Language Development.** Clarify that within all curriculum frameworks, alignment to standards includes both content and ELD standards, as exemplified by the ELA/ELD Framework. This will support the state and district material adoptions to ensure that all approved materials are designed to meet the needs of ELs. The state should also continue to support the submission of much-needed instructional materials that promote ELD designed specifically for LTELs as well as materials to support instruction in dual language programs. These materials would support our vision of an integrated curriculum designed to meet the academic language needs of students that unlocks access to the content. Several survey participants indicated the need for interesting, rigorous, and grade-level-appropriate curricular materials to support LTELs in classrooms with their English-fluent peers where they should spend the great majority of their learning time, and in well-designed rigorous courses providing the targeted academic language skills these students need. Note: In no circumstances should LTELs be relegated to an LTEL "track."

D. **Data, Accountability, and Assessments** (*aligned with principle three of the EL Roadmap focused on "system conditions that support effectiveness," including assessment, and principle four focused on "alignment and articulation within and across systems"*). Data collection on LTELs and students at risk of becoming LTELs is essential for understanding the strengths and needs of these students. Data should be accessible to inform the development of intentional, targeted courses, instruction, curriculum, materials, and professional learning across the disciplines. This information should also be used to monitor student progress for state and local accountability and communicate with families and students about successes and areas for improvement.

1. **Set Statewide Goals for EL, RFEP, and LTEL Student Achievement.** The state must set clear visionary goals for districts to meet when it comes to the achievement of these students. Specifically, a goal must be set to reduce the number and percentage of LTEL students and students at risk of becoming LTELs by half by 2030. To determine that RFEPs are continuing to succeed after reclassification, set a clear goal for their achievement to remain on par or above that of English only students across all measures monitored at the state and local level (e.g., ELA, Math, A-G completion rates, graduation rates).
2. **Disaggregate Achievement and Progress Data for Different Typologies of ELs.** Within the California Schools Dashboard, DataQuest, and all state-level reporting on student outcomes—EL, RFEP, LTEL, and newcomer student achievement outcomes should be reported separately. Within the current accountability system, which combines RFEP and EL students into a single EL indicator, the need to support ELs, LTELs, and RFEPs is masked. This is most problematic in grades 6-12 since there

are many more RFEPs than ELs in these grades, making LTELs invisible. This change will also help RFEPs continue to achieve after they are reclassified by tracking their ongoing achievement on all measures monitored at the state and local level. Further, this will help districts and the state determine progress toward meeting previously mentioned goals.

3. **Report Data on ELs and LTELs Dually Identified for Special Education Services.** The numbers and outcomes of students dually identified for special education services must be reported in the state data system, including Data Quest. Further, the state should strengthen guidance and resources to ensure these students are correctly identified and provided with targeted interventions that best meet their needs.

E. Engagement, Relationships, and Student Focus *(aligned with principle one of the EL Roadmap focused on “assets-oriented and needs responsive schools”).* There is extensive research on the positive impact of strong family-school relationships as well as a body of work on the importance of students' connection and relationship with school and the adults and youth they encounter there. This was reinforced both by survey responses about the importance of relationships for EL and LTEL student learning and well-being, and by what we learned in the deeper-dive interviews with districts that are successfully supporting the success of these students.

1. **Support Efforts to Develop District Capacity to Meaningfully Engage with Families and Communities.** The state can strengthen its efforts and support for LEAs to foster the meaningful engagement of EL stakeholders and families. Moreover, all state guidance must continue to emphasize that effective engagement must be ongoing and continue to adapt based on feedback. One example of how the state can support such engagement is by continuing to support the CCEE Community Engagement Initiative and including information for parents about LTELs and students at risk of becoming LTELs.
2. **Support the Expansion of School-Based Mentors Focused on Engaging LTEL students.** Create a program of community and/or school-based mentors for LTEL students both to increase students' knowledge and understanding and reinforce their connectedness and relationships with trusted adults.
3. **Expand Student Voice Across the System.** The state should invest in an initiative to expand youth voice. This can include grants to districts seeking to pilot innovative ways to engage students in the LCAP development process, including students who are ELs and LTELs. It can also include the dissemination of district best practices with implementation support coming from COEs, such as the expansion of student shadowing and other strategies that focus on the student experience.



RECOMMENDED DISTRICT ACTIONS

The above changes in state policy would provide districts with additional support and guidance in their efforts to improve outcomes for ELs, LTELs, and students at risk of becoming LTELs. Nonetheless, there is much that districts can do within the existing state policy context. The following are potential actions that school districts can take to address the needs of these students. Districts can also use this list as a tool for reflecting on strengths and need for improvement in how they are currently serving EL and LTEL students.

A. Educator Preparation and Professional Learning. To support educator preparation and professional learning, does the district:

1. Have a comprehensive professional learning plan that includes teachers, school leaders, and district leaders, focused on meeting the needs of LTELs, including:
 - a. Adequate human and financial resources dedicated to carrying out the plan?
 - b. The professional learning and collaboration of 6th-12th grade counselors and teachers across subject areas?
 - c. Regular time and space for teachers across curricula and courses to collaborate on programs, strategies, courses, and to identify materials and best practices for serving LTELs and monitoring their progress?
 - d. Professional development focused on implementing specific components of the EL Roadmap for all staff?
2. Ensure professional learning and time for collaboration between classroom and special education teachers to understand the needs of LTELs, including:
 - a. Differentiating language issues from special education issues?
 - b. Reviewing students' cumulative records to determine the specific learning disability and how best to target the language and learning needs of the dually identified students?
 - c. Providing effective services to ELs and LTELs who have been appropriately identified for special education services?
3. Invest in the development of school and district leaders with the skills and understanding to promote the success of all EL and LTEL students?
4. Partner with local universities, community colleges, and other entities to establish and grow your programs, teacher residencies, intern programs, and other programs that support the recruitment and preparation of teachers with the appropriate credentials?

B. Resources and Planning. To support resource and planning, does the district:

1. Have an EL Master Plan (or similar plan) that includes a clear plan for placement and program for LTELs that:
 - a. Is developed through the engagement of educators across all curricula and courses?
 - b. Is developed with the engagement of counselors to ensure appropriate placement and counseling for LTELs?
 - c. Includes clear goals and expectations for language development, achievement, and reclassification?
 - d. Allocates adequate resources to meet these goals?
 - e. Has goals and resources written into the LCAP to ensure alignment?
 - f. Ensures that all necessary elements are drafted in a way that is understandable, available, and frequently communicated to all stakeholders, including students, families, and educators?

2. Make planning and resource-use decisions prioritizing the needs of the most vulnerable students, including LTELs. (For example, by ensuring that classes for LTELs are the first rather than the last consideration in crafting the master schedule, again to avoid the development of an LTEL track of classes)?
3. Allocate resources to monitor and support RFEP student achievement in grades 6-12 to ensure their achievement remains on par with that of English-only peers?

C. Curriculum and Instruction. To support curriculum and instruction, does the district:

1. Include investments in instructional materials for meeting the needs of LTELs in the district master plan, LCAP, and other planning documents?
2. Ensure that LTELs are provided with a well-rounded education that meets high school graduation and college entrance requirements and does not separate them from their non-EL peers (except for designated or specialized ELD/LTEL classes), by:
 - a. Providing supports for these students to enroll and be successful in the variety of content and language courses (along with their non-EL and non-LTEL peers) necessary to meet graduation and college admission requirements?
 - b. Ensuring that specialized LTEL courses are designed to address their specific needs, and are engaging, rigorous, and meet A-G and graduation requirements?
 - c. Reviewing student schedules to ensure that LTELs have access to the arts, physical education, and other electives encompassed in a well-rounded education?
 - d. Implementing work-based learning opportunities and programs (such as Linked Learning) that provide students with highly motivating learning experiences, practical interpersonal and job skills, and a window into possibilities for ongoing education and future work?
 - e. Establishing partnerships with community colleges and adult schools to ensure participation in dual enrollment courses?
 - f. Expanding learning time during the school day to ensure opportunities for electives (such as through a zero period or an afterschool program)?
3. Deliver programs that are supported by research indicating their efficacy in promoting EL achievement in elementary schools as a way to reduce the number of students who might become LTELs or at risk of becoming LTELs, by:
 - a. Expanding multilingual and dual-language programs?
 - b. Aligning these programs with early childhood education to ensure that the needs of dual language learners are met in English and their home language?

D. Data, Accountability, and Assessment. To support data, accountability, and assessment, does the district:

1. Monitor and support the achievement of students at risk of becoming LTELs and LTELs by:
 - a. Designing and supporting local assessment structures that provide information to identify and improve outcomes for these students?
 - b. Providing time and support for teachers to understand, share, and use these data to develop interventions?
 - c. Establishing a plan for how teachers will share these data with students and their families?

2. Monitor and support RFEP student achievement to ensure it is on par with that of English-only peers, by:
 - a. Tracking their progress across all grades and all statewide and local measures?
 - b. Establishing a plan for supporting these students when necessary?
3. Disaggregate EL achievement data by LTEL and students at risk of becoming LTELs and use that information to inform planning?

E. Engagement, Relationships, and Student Focus. To support engagement, relationships, and student focus, does the district:

1. Authentically engage LTEL students and students at risk of becoming LTELs by:
 - a. Working with students, educators, and communities to develop a plan for engaging and listening to these students about their experiences and needs?
 - b. Convening a group of these students or conducting individual student interviews to discuss what support they need to develop proficiency in language and literacy and inform planning?
 - c. Incorporating student shadowing to further inform data and monitoring structures?
 - d. Engaging individual students to help them better understand their LTEL status, set goals, and monitor their own progress?
2. Expand student engagement and access to mentors, by:
 - a. Developing and supporting partnerships with local businesses and organizations that can provide meaningful work-based learning opportunities, exposure to bilingual professionals, and mentors?
 - b. Providing guidance on appropriate conditions and actions both for businesses and students who participate in these programs?
 - c. Linking coursework to these real-world engaging experiences?
3. Develop a plan for communicating and engaging with families in ongoing, varied, and meaningful ways, by:
 - a. Ensuring that parents informed of their child's status as "at risk" or LTEL, are provided with a description of the intentional instructions and program services that will be provided, along with goals for developing language and literacy proficiency?
 - b. Allocating resources for ensuring that non-English fluent families can participate fully within all school and district activities?
 - c. Ensuring regular communication with families in their home language that includes updates about student progress, requirements for graduation and college entrance, student successes, and opportunities available for students and families to participate?
 - d. Developing partnerships with organizations that can help plan and facilitate family engagement in ways that are meaningful and culturally relevant?



The state policy recommendations and recommended district actions are focused around five key areas:

- A. Educator Preparation and Professional Learning:** Stronger preparation and ongoing professional learning to help all educators to understand and work effectively with EL and LTEL students across the curriculum.
- B. Resources and Planning:** Focused resource allocation, goal setting, and planning to address the specific needs of ELs and LTELs.
- C. Curriculum and Instruction:** Support for research-supported education programs that provide ELs and LTELs the supports they need without segregating them into tracks. These programs are based on curriculum and instruction that is accessible, engaging, culturally relevant, rigorous, and addresses the socioemotional well-being and language needs of students.
- D. Data, Assessment, and Accountability:** Data on LTELs and students at risk of becoming LTELs that are accessible and useful for planning effective instruction, designing professional learning, monitoring student progress, and communicating with students and their families about successes and needs. The data and assessment hold schools, districts, and the state accountable for meeting the needs of EL and LTEL students.
- E. Engagement, Relationships, and Student Focus.** Frequent communication and meaningful engagement centered on listening and learning with students, their families, and communities to create relationships of trust.

CONCLUSION AND CALL TO ACTION

The policy changes that support EL students enacted over the last several years are essential and necessary but not sufficient. They require our investment of time, resources, and ongoing attention to achieve the vision proposed for California's education system in the EL Roadmap.

It is time to be bold and recommit to improving outcomes for ELs and LTELs. The pandemic has shed a glaring light on the gaps in student opportunity that have existed for years—and the influx of state and federal funds creates an opening for us to address these gaps. Now is not the time for complacency but for using these policy gains and new resources to redouble our efforts and accelerate progress so that the seeds of progress sown over the past decade bear fruit in the next.



FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Californians Together

525 East Seventh Street, Suite 203

Long Beach, CA 90813

562-983-1333

info@californianstogether.org

www.californianstogether.org

