



IN SEARCH OF EQUITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS

A Review of the 2021-2024
Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs)

AUTHORS:

Magaly Lavadenz, Ph.D., Elvira G. Armas, Ed.D.
and Sylvia Jáuregui Hodge, Ed.D.



Loyola Marymount University
Center for Equity for
English Learners

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Magaly Lavadenz, Ph.D.

Dr. Lavadenz is the Leavey Presidential Endowed Chair in Ethics and Moral Leadership and founding Executive Director of the Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) at Loyola Marymount University (LMU). Her research addresses the intersections and impact of policies and practices for culturally and linguistically diverse students, their teachers and school leaders. She has held various leadership positions as President of Californians Together, California Association for Bilingual Education, the California Association for Bilingual Teacher Education and the California Council on Teacher Education. Her work is published in numerous articles, chapters and books and her K-12 teaching career includes serving as a bilingual paraprofessional, elementary bilingual educator, and as a K-12 English as a Second Language Teacher Specialist.

Elvira G. Armas, Ed.D.

Dr. Armas is the Director of the Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) and Affiliated Faculty in the School of Education at LMU, where she leads and supports CEEL's P-21 local and national collaborative engagement initiatives. She also prepares and partners with pre-service, intern and in-service educators in the areas of leadership, curriculum, integrated standards-based instruction, assessment, and family/community engagement in culturally and linguistically diverse settings. Her TK-12 experience includes positions as a bilingual teacher and site and district-level leader. Dr. Armas is the co-author of several articles, policy briefs, and book chapters based on her research related to teacher preparation, teaching and learning in bilingual settings, parent/community engagement, and assessment.

Sylvia Jáuregui Hodge, Ed.D.

Dr. Hodge is Senior Manager of Public Policy at Subject and served as Assistant Director at CEEL at the time of this writing. She has worked as an educator in highly diverse, multilingual, Title I schools in California and Texas. In 2014, she was awarded a fellowship from the National Head Start Association (NHSA) in Washington, D.C.. She was the recipient of the CEEL Ed.D. Fellowship (2017-2021), supporting research that focused on state- and district-level accountability for English Learners. Her research interests include the intersectionality and impact of education policies on historically marginalized students and their families.

With data visualization by **Grecya López, M.S. Ed.**

Ms. Lopez is CEEL 's Research Associate and has over 20 years' of experience in conducting program evaluation and research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are indebted to the 46 reviewers who read the Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs). Their names are listed in the Appendix. Additionally, the authors express appreciation to Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, Strategic Advisor, Martha Hernandez, Executive Director, Xilonin Cruz-Gonzalez, Deputy Director, and Manuel Buenrostro, Associate Director of Policy of Californians Together, who provided invaluable support, including the development of policy questions and recommendations.

This report was made possible by the generous funding and support, in part, from the Sobrato Philanthropies, California Community, Gates, Stuart, Silver Giving, Weingart and Hewlett Foundations. Special recognition to the support from the Consortium for EL Success for their input and advocacy for improved and comprehensive LCAPs for dual language learners and multilingual learners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
Key Findings	4
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS	5
State Recommendations	5
County Office of Education Recommendations	6
District Recommendations	6
INTRODUCTION	7
CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	8
The LCAP and COVID-19	8
English Learners and LCFF/LCAP Research—A Brief Retrospective	9
A New Opportunity to Sharpen the Focus on English Learners: LCAP Policy Changes and the Current Study	9
IN SEARCH OF EQUITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS: Our Review and Analysis Process	11
District Sample	11
Disaggregated English Learner Student Group Data	12
Review and Rating Process	13
IN SEARCH OF EQUITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS: Key Findings	16
Framing Equity	16
THE FOUR FINDINGS	18
Finding One	18
Finding Two	21
Finding Three	24
Finding Four	28
RECOMMENDATIONS	30
State Recommendations	30
County Office of Education Recommendations	31
District Recommendations	31
LIKE A NEEDLE IN A HAYSTACK: The Ongoing Search for Equity for English Learners	32
APPENDICES	33
Appendix A: Sample District Characteristics (2020-21)	33
Appendix B: List of Reviewers	34
Appendix C: English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubrics	35
Appendix D: Footnotes	42



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California’s school funding policy—the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)—mandates that Local Education Agencies (LEAs) document goals, actions, services, and funding allocation to support student outcomes via the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). This report is the fourth in a series of analyses of LCAPs focused explicitly on English Learners (ELs) since the inception of LCFF in 2013. With each new review, rating and analysis, we hoped to see an improved, comprehensive focus on meeting the state funding policy mandates for English Learners as one of the focal student groups that have historically been underserved. As implied by the title of this report, the quest for equity for English Learners is still elusive.

The LCAPs we reviewed over the years are from districts with the largest number and highest percentages of English Learners. Yet results revealed that public school districts had missed the mark in detailing explicit support for English Learners (ELs). The California legislature adopted additional requirements for districts (AB 1840) to address the need for more transparency and educational partner engagement with specific attention to the alignment of programs and services for high-needs students, such as ELs. This report presents the analyses of 2021-24 LCAPs from 26 public school districts that serve either high percentages or high numbers of ELs. Our findings signal the need for targeted support for this diverse student group. LCAPs present the best evidence of how LEAs have planned services for ELs, which EL groups they have prioritized, and the type and breadth of services they intend to provide.

KEY FINDINGS

The mixed method analysis revealed four major findings:

FINDING 1: Notable mention of Long Term English Learners (LTELs) and Newcomer students; yet limited descriptions of programs, actions, and services that respond to differentiated EL needs.

FINDING 2: Conspicuous absence of differentiated growth targets to close the achievement gaps for ELs.

FINDING 3: Privileging of content standards independent of English Language Development standards resulting in multiple and disconnected professional development versus integrated and coherent professional development for educators of English Learners.

FINDING 4: Conventional approaches to family engagement that reduce opportunities for “co-powerment” to lead and monitor LCAP development and implementation.

These findings reveal that nine years into LCFF and two years after the exacerbation of systemic inequities by the devastating and continuing effects of the pandemic, the search for equity continues to resemble the search for “a needle in a haystack.” Accordingly, this report builds on many of the recurring recommendations from the previous reports. It renews a call to action for the state to revise the accountability system, dashboard indicators, the LCAP template, county review processes, and the System of Support eligibility criteria.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for the state, county offices of education, and districts are provided with the hope of achieving a path to a more equitable “multilingual California.”¹

STATE RECOMMENDATIONS

Improve Alignment Between System of Support and Other State Policies

- Embed the *California English Learner Roadmap* policy into all levels of the System of Support process.
- Improve the System of Support by clarifying alignment and coordination between the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), Geographic Leads, Content Leads, County Offices of Education (COEs), and LEAs.
- Strengthen coordination among EL technical assistance providers and develop a robust system and processes for them to provide greater attention to and more consistent support for integrated Differentiated Assistance (DA) support for LEAs.

Update the Accountability System to Improve the Equity Focus for English Learners

- Discontinue the use of the aggregate EL student group and instead report current ELs and Reclassified Fluent English Proficient Students (RFEPs) in the Academic Indicator and other Priority Areas.
- Incorporate disaggregated EL data (current ELs and RFEPs) to inform eligibility criteria for targeted support (Differentiated Assistance or Intensive Intervention).
- Reexamine the English Learner Performance Indicator (ELPI) status rate cut score thresholds for LEAs to establish more aspirational annual growth targets on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) results.

Support and Expand High-Quality Comprehensive English Language Development

- Fund and develop a statewide English Language Development (ELD) initiative to support all schools and districts in implementing high-quality designated and integrated ELD.

Strengthen LCAP Focus on Closing Gaps and Meeting the Needs of ELs

- Revise the LCAP template to require districts to identify differentiated growth targets for student groups when setting goals to determine metrics to close gaps for student groups.
- Augment the LCAP Approval Manual to include a sharper focus on ELs and to support capacity-building within county offices of education to address the needs of ELs.
- Require that LEAs adopt a locally-designed English Learner Master Plan that complements the LCAP.

COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Ensure LCAP Reviews Include EL Expertise

- Involve staff with expertise in EL programs and services to conduct the LCAP reviews and serve as members of the System of Support teams.
- Add an EL Panel to participate in LCAP Reviews of LEAs with high percentages and numbers of ELs.

Strengthen LCAP Monitoring and Supports

- Closely monitor and support the implementation of Goals and Actions in district LCAPs identified for Differentiated Assistance and Intensive Intervention (Tiers 2 and 3).
- Integrate EL supports for all LEAs in Differentiated Assistance (DA) status regardless of student eligibility group(s) across Priority Areas.

Support District Implementation of EL Roadmap Policy

- Use resources and tools aligned to the CA English Learner Roadmap and the LCFF priority areas, such as the *LCAP Toolkit—Using Research-based Tools to Promote Equity for English Learners*, and the *EL Roadmap Teacher and Administrator Toolkits* as part of technical assistance to schools and districts.
- Support districts to develop, revise, or refine the district English Learner Master Plan to align with the *CA English Learner Roadmap* policy.

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

Ensure LCAP Alignment with EL Roadmap Policy and EL Research

- Use the *LCAP Toolkit*, particularly the research-aligned English Learner rubrics, to identify strengths and weaknesses in current LCAPs for revision in the LCAP Annual Updates.
- Develop, revise, or refine the district English Learner Master Plan to align with the *CA English Learner Roadmap* policy.

Set Differentiated Goals and Actions for the Different EL Profiles

- Revise/update goals, actions, and services with a “sharpened focus” on ELs.
- Identify specific and differentiated outcomes for the different profiles of ELs with metrics sensitive to their language, academic, and social development in order to close the gaps.
- Analyze district data and other evidence disaggregated by EL typologies such as current ELs, RFEPs, LTELs, Newcomers, and Dual Language Learners (DLLs) and ensure that goals, services, and actions are delineated for them in the LCAP.
- Include preschool and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) in the LCAPs with goals, actions, and services for DLLs in preschool and ELs in TK programs.
- Make visible in the LCAP any goals, actions, and services recommended by parent, student, and/or community groups.

Design and Implement Professional Development Focused on Meeting Diverse EL Needs

- Provide professional development on the *English Learner Roadmap* for all educators to build understanding and expertise about the needs of ELs and research-based programs and practices.
- Ensure that professional development is comprehensive, coherent, and incorporates integrated and designated ELD as differentiated from generic standards-based instruction.

In the continued search for excellence and equity, we hope that this report sparks a renewed effort to ensure that LCFF and the accountability system deliver on its promise as envisioned by then-Governor Jerry Brown, who signed the LCFF legislation. Federal and state investments hold promise for “a restorative restart”² for ELs and their communities, but only with a “sharpened focus” on this diverse student group.



INTRODUCTION

California embraced equity as a pillar of education finance policy in 2013 through the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)³, where districts receive additional funding to support students identified as Foster Youth, English Learners (ELs), and Low-Income students. The LCFF mandates that district educators collaborate with educational partners (families, students, and community members) in deciding goals, strategies, and funding allocation for student programs documented in the LCAP.⁴ California public schools serve over one million English Learners, approximately 18% of the total student population.⁵ Prior to the adoption of LCFF, funding for English Learner programs was designated by the Economic Impact Aid (EIA) program⁶. EIA provided supplemental funds that were earmarked to support K-12 English Learner programs. In comparison, LCFF provides supplemental funds for ELs that are included in a general pool of money with no guidance or set minimums for EL program allocation at the district or school levels. The LCAP serves as the accountability tool to determine how funding is allocated to serve English Learners.

This report is the fourth in a series of analyses of Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) focused explicitly on English Learners that began with the inception of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) in 2013. With each new reading, rating, and set of analyses, we hoped to see an improved, comprehensive focus on the programs, actions, and services for English Learners. As implied by the title of this report, the quest for equity for English Learners is still elusive.

However, there were bright spots in the LCAPs reviewed, and we have uplifted them as examples of what is possible and what should be incorporated in technical assistance to move our districts forward. This report presents background information, details reviews and analytic processes, and shares four major findings from our mixed methods analysis. We conclude with state, county, and local level recommendations in a resolute call to action in *search of equity* for ELs.




CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

THE LCAP AND COVID-19

The LCAP is a three-year plan with annual updates to goals and actions, as determined by district leaders and educational partners. The COVID-19 pandemic impacted Californians beginning in March 2020 amid district planning for the subsequent three-year LCAP cycle. To support districts during the pandemic, Senate Bill 98⁷ established that the 2020-21 LCAP would not be required, and instead, a one-year Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) would be submitted. The LCP required that districts detail funding and numerous strategies used to support student learning during the statewide social distancing mandates.⁸ Figure 1 provides a timeline of the required plans used to document funding allocation, educational programs, and goals at the district level.

FIGURE 1. Timeline of Required Plans 2019 to 2022



ENGLISH LEARNERS AND LCFF/LCAP RESEARCH: A BRIEF RETROSPECTIVE

Inequitable educational opportunities have contributed to disappointing academic outcomes for English Learners.⁹ As an equity-based school finance policy, the LCFF provides supplemental funding to districts to support English Learners as one of the three targeted student groups. However, LCFF policy research has shown that its impact on improving educational outcomes is still unclear.¹⁰ As a key mechanism in public educational accountability, LCAPs are intended to be *sufficiently transparent* for Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to make data-informed funding allocations and to set academic goals. Districts are mandated to engage educational partners (families, students, teachers, etc.) in the decision-making process; however, recent ethnographic research on educational partner engagement has shown that English Learner families face many barriers to participating in authentic democratic decision-making in the LCAP process.¹¹

This series of reports by the Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) and Californians Together has focused on how districts address the strengths and needs of English Learners in LCAPs. All of the reports engaged diverse educational partners in the process of analyzing the LCAPs of a representative sample of statewide districts that served a high number and/or percentage of English Learners.¹² The first two reports focused on an exploratory analysis of LCAPs and found that LEAs were *Falling Short (2015) with Weak Responses (2016)* for EL-focused LCAP goals, actions, and services. Subsequently, the third report examined the connection between the California School Dashboard (Dashboard),¹³ the public database that provides student performance data, and the LCAP. Our sample of LCAPs points to the fact that the state's accountability system contributes to *Masking the Focus on ELs (2018)*, particularly given the aggregate EL Academic Indicator combines current ELs with former EL students. We concluded that "masking the focus on ELs" is a result of the aggregate EL indicator for academic achievement on the Dashboard and that the LCAP requires policy changes to "sharpen the focus on ELs" to ensure equity in state and local accountability.¹⁴

A NEW OPPORTUNITY TO SHARPEN THE FOCUS ON ENGLISH LEARNERS: LCAP POLICY CHANGES AND THE CURRENT STUDY

Subsequent advocacy and policy changes resulted in the passage of AB 1840¹⁵ that addressed the need for more transparency and education partner (stakeholder) engagement with special attention to the alignment of programs and services for unduplicated student groups.¹⁶ Accordingly, the modified 2021-2024 LCAP Template¹⁷ offers LEAs the opportunity to uplift and align Dashboard indicators and metrics, assessment results, and LCAP processes to:

- 1 Reduce length and redundancy
- 2 Increase transparency, including actions to improve services to English Learners
- 3 Aim for more strategic planning.



The new LCAP template was also intended to allow districts to narrate and visualize their goals and plans in a more streamlined and intentional manner (see Figure 2).

FIGURE 2. 2021-24 LCAP Template Overview: New Opportunities to Address the Needs and Assets of English Learners

Plan Summary (2021-22)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Information • Reflections: Successes • Reflections: Identified Need • LCAP Highlights • Comprehensive Support and Improvement
Stakeholder Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Process • Summary of Feedback • Description of Influence of Stakeholder Feedback on LCAP
Goals and Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal • Measuring and Reporting Results • Actions • Goal Analysis [2021-22]
Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students [2021-22]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required Descriptions
Expenditure Tables

Along with this guidance, LEAs are directed to (1) provide a **narrative description of the analysis and reflection** on student outcomes in the 2019-20 LCAP and 2020-21 Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan that informed the development of the 21-22 through 23-24 LCAP; (2) describe **language acquisition programs for ELs**; (3) describe **professional development for educators of ELs**; (4) **respond to stakeholder feedback**; and encouraged to (5) **include specific EL metrics to measure closing of gaps**. The new LCAP template and the 2021-2024 LCAP plans thus invite a new opportunity to prioritize equity for ELs. We sought evidence of these five directives by asking the following question:

To what degree did districts with high percentages and high numbers of ELs address the needs of diverse English Learners in their LCAPs?

Specifically, we looked for evidence of ways in which ELs are addressed as a priority, heterogeneously diverse student group for each of the five elements required by AB 1840.



IN SEARCH OF EQUITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS: OUR REVIEW AND ANALYSIS PROCESS

In order to answer our question, we engaged in a multi-month-long process of reviewing LCAPs. This section describes our sample, review processes, methods, and findings.

DISTRICT SAMPLE

We identified 26 districts with a high number (HN; greater than 999) or high percentage (HP; greater than 40%) of English Learners based on a review of the 2019-20 English Learner data (Appendix A). These districts were consistent with the distribution of ELs statewide and were representative of all regions, including Geographic Lead Agencies¹⁸ (Geo Leads) and California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) Regions. Of the 26 districts selected, 23 were included in the previous three LCAP studies (2015, 2016, 2018).


FIGURE 3. 2021-24 LCAP Review—Districts by Location and CCEE Geographic Lead Agency (n=26)



DISAGGREGATED ENGLISH LEARNER STUDENT GROUP DATA

Figure 4 presents the **disaggregation** of the 2019-20 California School Dashboard data¹⁹ for the English Language Arts Academic Indicator for the 26 selected districts. An analysis reveals that the current English Learners (or English Learner Only) student group for all districts in our sample were identified in the two lowest performance levels (Figure 4).²⁰ Coupled with research that shows how the pandemic has intensified existing inequalities for English Learners,²¹ the 2019 **disaggregated** Dashboard data signal urgency for these 26 districts to address the needs of ELs in their 2021-24 LCAPs.

FIGURE 4: 2019 ELA Academic Indicator Dashboard Disaggregated Results for Current ELs and RFEP Student Groups (N=26)



These findings reveal that nine years into LCFF and two years after the exacerbation of systemic inequities by the devastating and continuing effects of the pandemic, the search for equity continues to resemble the search for a needle in a haystack.

Districts are required to use these results to inform the 2021-2024 LCAPs; however, the Dashboard currently provides level designations for the **aggregate** EL student group, (e.g., Figure 4, “Dashboard EL Aggregate Student Group” bar graphs). Culling **disaggregated data** for current ELs (EL Only) and former ELs (Reclassified Fluent English Proficient, RFEP) remains a local responsibility. Disappointingly, in our analysis of the 26 selected LCAPs, we found that although all districts included some references to ELs in the Plan Summary Section (General Information, Reflections: Successes, Reflections: Identified Need), this was limited to: (1) stating the percentage of ELs, (2) signaling language proficiency progress, and/or (3) reporting **aggregate** EL student group Dashboard data to describe successes or needs for ELs. Only ONE district (District X, City: Midsize, 49% ELs) discussed **disaggregated** Dashboard data for Current ELs and RFEP students:

When the results of the 2019 Dashboard and more recent data from 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 are reviewed as a whole, some clear trends emerge... Additionally, when the academic performance of the current English Learner student group is disaggregated, the performance of Current English Learner Only students shows a very significant gap from that of Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students.


Given that the selected districts are consistent with the distribution of ELs statewide and representative of all regions—including Geo Leads established by Assembly Bill 1808 as part of the System of Support and overseen by the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE)—this has significant implications for building the capacity of County Offices of Education (COEs) to provide support to districts, a point we will return to in the recommendations section.

The next sections address our approach to reviewer selection and calibration for the LCAP rating process.

REVIEW AND RATING PROCESS

A panel of 46 reviewers (Appendix B) representing California educators, researchers, and advocates convened to review the 2021-24 LCAPs in October 2021. They represented advocacy groups, district leaders, and non-profit organizations and engaged in a series of calibration and rating processes (Figure 5).

FIGURE 5: LCAP Rating Process




We conducted calibration sessions to ensure familiarity with our *English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubrics (2020)*²² that were used to examine evidence in the selected LCAPs. The four-point rating scale for each rubric ranged from Exemplary to No Evidence (Appendix C). To ensure consistent ratings of the LCAPs across all districts, we used a sample district LCAP and the rubrics for each LCAP reviewer to practice rating and to establish inter-rater reliability. Subsequently, the reviewers were partnered to form 23 teams who first independently read and rated their assigned LCAP and then paired up to discuss ratings and agree upon a consensus rating for each of the six Focus Area Rubrics. Table 1 provides an overview of the six rubrics and their alignments to the eight state priorities, and the 2017 *California English Learner Roadmap* policy (ELR).²³ Reviewers also documented key evidence for the assigned rubric ratings using excerpts from the district LCAP narratives.

TABLE 1: Alignment Among English Learner Research Aligned Rubrics, State Priorities, and the California English Learner Roadmap

Rubric Focus Areas	Actions and Services (Rubric 1)	Program and Course Access (Rubric 2)	Desired Outcomes for English Learners (Rubric 3)	English Language Development (Rubric 4)	Professional Development (Rubric 5)	Family Engagement (Rubric 6)
STATE PRIORITIES	2, 4, 7, 8	2, 7	4, 5, 8	2	2, 6	8
CA EL ROADMAP ALIGNMENT	<p>Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools</p> <p>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</p> <p>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</p>	<p>Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools</p> <p>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</p>	<p>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</p> <p>Principle 4: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems</p>	<p>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</p> <p>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</p>	<p>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</p> <p>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</p>	<p>Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools</p> <p>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</p>
RUBRIC CATEGORIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsiveness to EL Profiles • Assessments Inform Placement and Services • Program Options • Targeted Use of Supplemental and Concentration Funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool • Access to Rigorous Core Content • LTEL Courses • Enrichment and/or Extracurricular Opportunities • Extended Learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L1/L2 Data Reporting • GAP Reduction • Transcript Evaluation • Increase in Seal of Biliteracy, Pathway Awards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated & Integrated ELD Program • Knowledge of ELD Standards • ELD Standards Implementation • ELD Standards Professional Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD Stakeholder Input • CA English Learner Roadmap • PD Content • Comprehensive PD Program for Teachers of ELs • PD Cultural Proficiency/Competency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder Input • Communication • Staffing to Support Family Engagement • Decision-Making Processes • Leadership Development • Family Professional Learning

A research team at Loyola Marymount University's CEEL collected and recorded the reviewer teams' consensus ratings and evidence for the six individual rubrics for each of the 26 district LCAPs. We conducted a mixed methods analysis using quantitative and qualitative data. Figure 6 illustrates the mixed method analysis processes.

FIGURE 6. Mixed-Methods Data Analysis Phases




We now return to the central question for this review:

To what degree did districts with high percentages and high numbers of ELs address the needs of diverse English Learners in their LCAPs?

Each of the findings represents the integration of the quantitative and qualitative results—both the numeric ratings as well as the narratives for each of the LCAPs reviewed. Figure 7 illustrates the intersections of the five directives to LEAs and the six Focus Area Rubrics described in Table 1.

FIGURE 7. Intersections of AB 1840 Requirements and EL Research-Aligned LCAP Rubric Focus Areas





IN SEARCH OF EQUITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS: KEY FINDINGS

Educational equity is when each and every student is provided the academic, social, emotional, cultural, linguistic, and other opportunities, resources, and supports that they specifically need, when they need them, to experience belonging in school, achieve academic success, and attain self-actualization. California's commitment to equity and social justice is illustrated in its policies, standards, frameworks, and resources...

– California Department of Education, 2020²⁴

FRAMING EQUITY


As one of the three pillars of the state accountability system,²⁵ we searched for how the sample districts defined or addressed **equity** for ELs. Figure 8 illustrates that 62% (n=16) of districts included a stated focus on equity in the introductory or general information section of the LCAP. However, the majority of districts (85%, n=22) did not include goals with an explicit focus on ELs or English Language Development. Instead, they were primarily guided by LCAP development instructions that stipulate, “A goal can be focused on the performance of all students, a specific student group(s), narrowing performance gaps, or the implementation of programs and strategies to improve student outcomes.”²⁶ This resulted in the inclusion of broad LCAP goals framed around *Academic Achievement, Student Performance, Core Curriculum, and Instruction, or Engagement*, wherein ELs are listed as one of the student groups.

In contrast, 15% (n=4) of districts included goals with explicit goal statements for English Learners or English Language Development, such as these exemplars:

GOAL: All English Learners will be provided integrated and designated English Learner support, guaranteeing access to the core curriculum, and ensuring successful reclassification by the end of the elementary school experience and/or five years of U.S. instruction, thereby decreasing the number of Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) as measured by state and district level assessments. – *District I (Town: Remote, 58% ELs)*

GOAL: By May 2023, refine Designated and Integrated ELD as defined in the ELA/ELD Framework pages 891-892 to support English Learners’ development and use of academic vocabulary in speaking and writing in order to engage with complex language and text. We measure success through classroom observations utilizing a district developed classroom observation tool for Designated English Language Development and the Thoughtful Classroom Framework Episodes 5 and 7 for Integrated English Language Development.
 - District B (Town: Fringe, 66.7% ELs)

FIGURE 8. EL-specific Goals and Equity Statements



We also searched for an explicit mention of the *English Learner Roadmap* (ELR), given that these districts serve high numbers and/or high percentages of ELs; only one-third of (35%, n=9) referenced the ELR policy. We uncovered that some districts reference their English Learner Master Plan local policy to elaborate on planned actions and services for ELs. To further explore the potentiality of this practice, we conducted an internet search to quantify how many of the 26 districts have English Learner Master Plans. We discovered that although 18 of 26 districts have EL Master Plans available on their websites, only 35% (n=9) of these have been approved and/or updated within the last five years, and an even smaller percentage –25% (n=7)—include reference or alignment to the ELR. These overall findings that examine the stated commitment to equity and alignment to EL policy and initiatives point to a continued need to build collective capacity and resources to center EL-focused LCAP development.

In the following sections, we present four key findings from our triangulated, mixed- methods analysis of the LCAP ratings and reflection narratives. For each of the findings, we include the results of the reviewers’ ratings corroborated by qualitative evidence. We uplift selections from LCAP narratives’ “bright spots,” which are identified as examples of stronger evidence.



SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS

SAMPLE EQUITY STATEMENTS

- Equity and access for all students—coupled with the mindset that the ethnic and linguistic diversity in [District N] are an asset to be celebrated, encouraged and reinforced is another highlight of this LCAP.
 - District N (City: Midsize, 49.8% ELs)
- A key feature of this year’s LCAP is its grounding in the district’s core value and overarching Equity, Access, and Social Justice Guiding Principle. The recognition of the fundamental inequities in our system and the need to confront and interrupt inequities to level the playing field are key elements of multiple LCAP goals. The vision that all students will graduate with multiple postsecondary choices from a wide array of options is a key driver across the new LCAP goals. - District O (City: Large, 19% ELs)



THE FOUR FINDINGS

1 FINDING ONE


Notable mention of LTELs and Newcomer students; yet limited descriptions of programs, actions, and services that respond to differentiated EL needs.

Research indicates that the recognition of the specialized needs of the multifaceted group of English Learner students is critical in designing, implementing, supporting, and monitoring language acquisition programs and instructional experiences.²⁷

Evidence of Language Acquisition Programs for ELs

This finding was informed by an analysis of the *EL Research-aligned LCAP rubric ratings* for *Focus Area 1: Actions and Services* (Figure 9) and *Focus Area 2: Programs and Course Access* (Figure 10) to examine specifically how district LCAPs addressed the heterogeneity of the EL student group to design and deliver language acquisition programs.


FIGURE 9: EL Actions and Services Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)



Half of the districts in our sample (n=13) described general approaches to designing differentiated *Actions and Services*, often not going beyond basic access to materials and curriculum, as noted in this example, “EL Programs will be implemented in both integrated and designated learning models using Benchmark curriculum, which includes EL curricular materials,” (District F, Rural: Fringe, 42.5% ELs).

Similarly, findings from *Focus Area 2: Programs and Course Access* rubric analyses point to a weak (77%, N=20) representation of research-based, articulated approaches to **language acquisition** programs that provide access to rigorous core content, specialized LTEL courses and enrichment opportunities, and extended learning (Figure 10).

FIGURE 10: EL Programs and Course Access Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)



A deeper analysis of responsiveness to the LTEL profile revealed that although 77% (n=20) of districts mentioned LTEs, only 61% (n=16) delineated specific actions for this population and these LTEL-specific actions were broad.

Bright Spots

Overall, it appeared that districts were focused on recognizing the diversity of English Learners, primarily Long Term English Learners (LTEs) and Newcomer students. Examples include specific statements acknowledging this student population, such as in District L (Rural: Fringe, 58.7% ELs), “A continued challenge for the district is the arrival of newcomers to our secondary sites.” In another case, a district described how their district-adopted data dashboard is designed to ensure a focus on meeting the unique needs of different types of ELs to inform programmatic and instructional decisions effectively.

- [Interactive district] dashboard data can be disaggregated by school, grade, race/ethnicity, gender, foster status, English fluency, and fluency subgroup (e.g., newcomers, long-term English Learners, reclassified as fluent), special education status, home language, etc., to address gaps and monitor progress, and authorized users can drill down to the student level. - District M (City: Large, 31.2% ELs)

These and other promising examples can inform continuous improvement efforts as districts strive to systemize equitable practices for English Learners while simultaneously accelerating learning to address inequities amplified by the effects of the pandemic.

SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS

LANGUAGE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

- English Learners in [district] scoring at Level 4 in the ELPAC but not reclassified and reclassified students, will have increased access to specialized programs to support their continued need for rigor of instruction. - *District C (City: Large, 27.8% ELs)*
- The district will provide assessments to Newcomers to assess their proficiency in their native language. These assessments will help determine a newcomer's placement for the appropriately designated ELD class, provide insight into the student's language proficiency in the four language domains (reading, writing, listening, and speaking), and help develop appropriate supports for learning. - *District X (City: Midsize, 49% ELs)*
- Centering and strengthening relationships to increase academic performance... [District Z will provide] stipends for bilingual teachers and teachers in combo classes in dual language programs, teacher extra time for training... - *District Z (Suburb: Large, 31.6% ELs)*

In actuality, the ratings for the EL Actions and Services Rubric (Figure 9) were the highest across all rubrics, with half (50% or N=13) of districts scoring *Good or Exemplary* ratings related to EL program options, academic needs, and assessments to inform services. Bright spots included specific mention of language and literacy attainment for designated groups of English Learners (e.g. ELs scoring at ELPAC Level 4 but not reclassified) with specific action steps and resources responding to their needs, such as specialized programs staffed by specialists with expertise in curriculum design and delivery to accelerate learning (see side bar). A few districts pointed to descriptions of EL programs in their English Learner Master Plan for more details, and many districts (81% or N=21) described dual language program options and resources.

Notably, some districts provided detailed examples of specialized services and monitoring for identified English Learner student groups:

- Develop focused, targeted supports for probable Long-Term ELs (PLTEs) to reduce the number and percentage of Long-Term ELs (LTEs) in secondary schools. Because PLTEs struggle in reading, writing, academic vocabulary— and are at-risk of not meeting the reclassification criteria within 5 years of formal English instruction— their supports will consist of the following: Provide targeted language development, literacy development, and instructional programs and services that address their specific academic linguistic and academic needs... - *District K (City: Large, 20.3% ELs)*
- [Training will be provided to]... counselors and/or site reps that [enables] them to inform ELs of UC/CSU requirements in order for the students to take such courses. Establish Long Term ELs goal settings into counselor's check-in protocol with EL students. Report on how many ELs graduate UC/CSU eligible or not. - *District Z (Suburb: Large, 31.6% ELs)*
- Examine areas of academic underperformance, benchmarks assessments, and options for interventions and academic support to ensure Multilingual learners, including LTEs and students at risk of becoming LTEs make progress. - *District S (City: Large, 21.1% ELs)*

These and other promising examples can inform continuous improvement efforts as districts strive to systemize equitable practices for English Learners while simultaneously accelerating learning to address inequities amplified by the effects of the pandemic.

2 FINDING TWO

Conspicuous absence of differentiated growth targets to close the achievement gaps for ELs.


Equity is **actualized** by educators' agency and systemic prioritization of differentiated distribution of resources based on an **awareness** of the lack of access, resources, opportunities, and **academic and linguistic outcomes** and a commitment to the needs of the population to address issues of disproportionality.²⁸ The alignment between LCAP goals, actions, expenditures, and metrics to measure corresponding outcomes that narrow—or close—performance and achievement gaps is critical when addressing the needs of ELs, especially given the changing pandemic landscape. This sense of urgency and focus is emphasized by District K (City: Large, 20.3% ELs): "As regular instruction and assessment administration resumes in the 2021-24 LCAP period, the District plans to implement... assessments... to determine how best to accelerate student performance and reduce equity gaps..."

Undeniably, districts faced challenging circumstances when writing their 2021-24 LCAPs. This included gaps in standardized state and district-level assessment measures to anchor baseline data for metrics. Nonetheless, districts were expected to, "For each LCAP year, identify the metric(s) that the LEA will use to track progress toward the expected outcomes. LEAs are **encouraged** to identify metrics for specific student groups, as appropriate, including expected outcomes that would reflect **narrowing of any existing performance gaps.**"²⁹

Evidence of EL Gap Reduction

We applied the use of *Rubric 3: Desired Outcomes for ELs* to identify the extent to which districts in our sample identified EL-focused assessments/metrics and differentiated growth targets to address gap reduction while also measuring progress toward multilingualism (Seal of Biliteracy). Alarming, this area was rated the lowest (Figure 11); the percentage of districts that were rated *Weak* or *No Evidence Included* was 81% (N=21).

FIGURE 11: Desired Outcomes for ELs Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)



A deeper analysis of the districts' approaches revealed that while most districts readily identified EL performance gaps, the majority (69% or N=18) signaled the same growth targets for academic and other performance measures, such as high school graduation rate, local priority measures (e.g., Lexile levels, social-emotional learning survey), or pupil engagement (e.g., school attendance, chronic absenteeism). For example, to measure outcomes for a goal related to safe schools and involvement opportunities for "all students, including the district student groups and parents," District L (Rural: Fringe, 58.7% ELs) stipulated:

These actions/services will contribute to improvement in the average daily attendance rate, CTE participation, and completer rates, and result in overall gains academically in addition to the contribution of closing any existing achievement gaps. The metrics will illustrate the year-to-year growth of both all-student and student subgroups with performance gaps.

They identified the High School Dropout Rate as one of their metrics with a targeted decrease of 3% for all students, and they projected the same percent decrease for ELs—essentially not reducing or closing the gap given the dropout rate for ELs at baseline (2019-20) was almost double the documented rate for all students (All = 11.5%; ELs = 21.4%).

Overall patterns also indicate that there were limited plans for primary language assessment and reporting for ELs not in dual language programs. Plus, few districts identified metrics for Biliteracy Pathway awards or the State Seal of Biliteracy for ELs.



BRIGHT SPOTS

A few other bright spots were culled from districts (31% or N=8) that identified differentiated growth targets. These provided examples of how to address gap reduction for ELs and identify EL-specific outcomes (see chart below).

SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS

GAP REDUCTION AND DIFFERENTIATED OUTCOMES FOR ELS

Metric	Baseline		Desired Outcome for 2023-24		
	18-19	19-20			23-24
1A					
GRADUATION RATE Percentage of students who received a high school diploma within four or five years of entering 9th grade. <i>Source:</i> California School Dashboard <i>Note:</i> Results do not include charter schools.	ALL	85.7	87.3	ALL	91
	EL	81.2	75.8	EL	82
	FY	66.7	81.3	FY	86
	HY	75.3	72.9	HY	80
	SED	84.7	86.1	SED	90
	SWD	66	70.4	SWD	78
	AA	77.1	82.4	AA	87
	AI/AN	81.8	73.3	AI/AN	81
	A	93.7	93.5	A	95
	F	100	95.2	F	97
	H/L	84.2	84.6	H/L	89
	PI	87	71.9	PI	80
	W	84.6	92.5	W	95
TOM	88.1	87.8	TOM	91	

Metric	Baseline		Desired Outcome for 2023-24	
	GRADES 2-12	18-19		
2K				
GATE Demographics Percentage of students in grades 2-12 identified for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program relative to overall grade 2-12 student population by student group. <i>Source:</i> Advanced Learning Department	ALL	N/A	ALL	15.0
	EL	18.0	EL	4.0
	SED	60.3	SED	8.0
	SWD	15.6	SWD	5.0
	AA	13.2	AA	4.7
	AI	0.5	AI	7.6
	A	19.2	A	18.4
	HL	40.7	HL	9.4
	PI	2.2	PI	5.6
	W	16.7	W	29.9
TOM	7.4	TOM	23.7	

Percentage of students within each student group who are identified as (GATE) will be comparable to each group's proportion of the overall student population (grades 2-12).

- District Q (City: Large, 19% ELS)

- The District will monitor the effectiveness of dual language education programs using the following progress monitoring measures to track outcomes for English Learners: increased number of 5th-, 6th-, and 8th-grade students who receive the [District K] Pathway to Biliteracy Award, and increased number of 12th-grade students who graduate receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy. - District K (City: Large, 20.3% ELS)

For the Newcomer English Learner student group, assessment of academic progress outcomes via transcript evaluation is critical as a differentiated step to place, support, and monitor this student group accurately. As such, we highlight one promising example from District H (City: Large, 18.5% ELS):

Monitor newcomer ELs to acquire EL proficiency at the rate of one level per year and make timely academic progress [through] support for counselors to ensure proper placement, secure transcripts, determine 5-year plans when needed, determine AB 2121 eligibility (Coursework and Graduation Requirements for Migratory Children and Newly Arrived Immigrant Pupils which reduces the number of graduation credits required for high school newcomer ELs who meet certain criteria), and seamless transitions to post-secondary settings upon graduation.

Deeply related to how LEAs build equity and coherence in policies and practices for ELs and other student groups in their LCAPs,³⁰ the next set of findings shows how districts addressed the challenge. These data suggested an approach to implementing gap reduction goals for diverse typologies of ELs described in the first two findings through robust professional development systems based on students' needs.

3 FINDING THREE


Privileging of content standards independent of English Language Development standards resulting in multiple and disconnected professional development versus integrated and coherent professional development for educators of English Learners.

Decades of research on educator learning affirm the effectiveness and impact of well-designed, high-quality, coherent, and sustained systems of professional learning informed by local student information and data. Accordingly, designing coherent professional learning for EL educators requires a systematic approach to support leadership, teaching practices, and capabilities to dismantle educational inequities.³¹

Evidence of Integrated Professional Learning and Comprehensive English Language Development

This finding is informed by two of the six Focus Areas described in this report: English Language Development (ELD, Rubric 4) and Professional Development (Rubric 5). The results are illustrated in Figures 12 and 13, respectively. Together with the qualitative thematic analysis, these findings represent an opportunity to search for evidence of a comprehensive approach to addressing professional learning for designated and integrated ELD across the districts whose LCAPs we analyzed for this report. As stated previously, we also looked specifically for how our sample districts addressed the *ELR* policy, given the alignment of these two rubrics to Principles 2-4 (see Table 1). Of those who had publicly available EL Master Plans approved within the last 5 years (n=9), only seven indicated alignment to the *ELR*. How districts define comprehensive ELD programming and instruction for their students is central to districts developing comprehensive professional learning for EL educators. Figure 12 shows that 17 of 26 districts had weak or no evidence of comprehensive ELD programming and instruction.

FIGURE 12: English Language Development Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)






Indeed, many of the districts in our study provide broad, generalized descriptions of the **WHAT** (implementation of the ELD standards or content standards), with limited or no information on the **HOW** (programmatic, curricular, or staffing supports). For example:

- District E (Rural:Fringe, with 41.1% ELs enrolled) indicated, “[we]... will continue to provide support to English Learners to improve the implementation of ELD standards,” and
- District P (City: Midsize, 51.7% ELs) indicated, “Our program is designed to ensure English acquisition as rapidly and as effectively as possible, and provides instruction to students on the state-adopted academic content standards, including the English language development standards.”

Evidence of Professional Development for Educators of English Learners

Complementary to these findings are those from Professional Development (Focus Area 5), as shown in Figure 13. Reviewers found no evidence of exemplary professional development practices in this focus area, with 69% of reviewers finding weak or no evidence.

FIGURE 13: Professional Development Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)



Additionally, reviewers found some evidence of practices related to cultural and linguistic diversity; in particular, 10 of the 26 districts (38%) noted a focus on Ethnic Studies. Similarly, we found that half (N=13) of the districts identified support/use/focus on English Learners' primary language, five of which were in reference to dual language/bilingual programs.

Generalized and unspecified goals and actions for professional learning are exemplified in this LCAP excerpt:

District and site leadership training was refined to focus on the heart and science of thinking, planning, and measuring the effect of four actions to achieve goals identified [in the] Reflection on local district survey results, including California Healthy Kids Surveys (CHKS), X County Survey, as well as academic data has led the group to collectively identify engagement, student achievement, and professional development as critical factors to promote a commonly owned plan for success (District B, Town: Fringe, 66.7% ELs).

BRIGHT SPOTS

Our examination of promising practices for clearly defined and comprehensive professional learning for EL educators is included below. These examples illustrate clear, concise, and observable approaches that simultaneously address content, language, and professional learning to support EL outcomes. These excerpts are from districts that were rated good or exemplary.

SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS

INTEGRATED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING WITH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS OF ELS

- Explicit systems and resources to reinforce the principles of the **California English Learner Roadmap**, designated and integrated English language development (ELD), ELD standards, and the variety of **English Learner profiles**. – *District K (City, Large, 20.3% ELs)*
- Sustained efforts of personnel to lead critical and collaborative effort with the work of Integrated and Designated ELD as well as differentiated instruction for ...**Integrated and Designated ELD**. – *District T (City, Large, 28.1% ELs)*
- Subject-expert staff leaders assist with professional learning, understanding new curriculum, and support teachers in the classroom adopted math curriculum and training on the implementation of ELD and state standards through the curriculum will effectively meet the needs of unduplicated students... – *District P (City, Midsize, 51.7% ELs)*
- 100% of the professional development provided by the Education Services Division will provide strategies to support [educators] in:
 - *Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiation*
 - *Social Emotional Learning (SEL)*
 - *Language Development/Emergent Bilingual Support*
 - *Parent Engagement - District A (City, Large; 53.4% ELs)*



These examples have the potential to shift professional development programs and practices. Research has found that ELs do not have equitable access to rigorous core content as schools have struggled to identify and support diverse EL students.³² Even before the pandemic, schools did not have the capacity to support ELs who experienced trauma—and teachers, leaders, and policymakers have called out for more support.³³ This finding underscores the significance of locally defined and developed comprehensive professional learning for EL educators.

SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Universal Design for Learning and differentiation, including Language Development/ Emergent Bilingual Support... the district will continue to provide targeted professional learning opportunities on research-based instructional strategies for teachers to deepen their understanding of levels of proficiency of students, different needs and capacities of each EL student, differentiation by student typology, and student language development supports needed across all content areas.
- *District M (City: Large, 31.2% ELs)*
- Professional development on ELD provided by [the] Coach for each site. This position will support the development of the school's designated and integrated ELD. - *District N (City: Midsize, 49.8% ELs)*
- Dedicated Professional Development for teachers of ELs to implement ELD.
- *District P (City, Midsize, 51.7% ELs)*

4 FINDING FOUR


Conventional approaches to family engagement that reduce opportunities for “co-powerment” to lead and monitor LCAP development and implementation.

Family engagement as a core requirement of LCFF and the LCAPs is informed by the research literature on the importance of family engagement relative to student success³⁴.

Evidence of Stakeholder-Family Engagement

We found referents to family engagement across all LCAPs. However, as Figure 14 indicates, there were generally weak (N=15: 58%) responses to quality family engagement in LCAP development, with 10 (38%) districts demonstrating Good or Strong evidence across all of the categories in Focus Area 6 (Family Engagement, Rubric 6).

FIGURE 14: EL Family Engagement Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)



To further explore these findings, we conducted an examination of the 26 districts’ narrative responses to the three prompts in the stakeholder engagement section: summary of process, summary of feedback, and description of LCAP aspects influenced by stakeholder input. All districts noted various stakeholder groups (e.g., teachers, community, families/parents). However, concerning EL-specific family/community input, the majority only noted this was occurring through engaging the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC); yet, the number of documented DELAC meetings varied, with most districts having only two to three meetings. A few districts described the formation of subcommittee groups within larger stakeholder groups to focus on EL-specific issues.

Furthermore, we found limited descriptions of (1) orientation to LCAP requirements and processes prioritizing the role of families, (2) formation of dedicated EL parent panels focused on addressing parent concerns, (3) parent-led LCAP workshops, and (4) parent workshops connected to LCAP EL goals and how they support teaching and learning for ELs. For instance, we found almost unanimous and multiple mentions of bilingual auxiliary staff to provide translation/interpretations, such as in this statement from District V (City: Large, 62% ELs), “Interpreters to provide translation/interpretation services throughout the district.” In another example from a small city district, a specific action statement was to, “...maintain current staffing levels for bilingual secretaries to continue to support communication to students and families in the targeted student groups.” (District U, City: Small, 46.4% ELs). Communication in the languages of EL families is both a legal³⁵ and foundational requirement for the full EL family engagement and is one of the categories of the Family Engagement (Focus Area 6) Rubric reflected in this finding.

BRIGHT SPOTS

In addition to the reciprocal nature of communicating with families in languages they understand, educators are “co-powered”³⁶ to not only address information sharing, input/feedback on LCAPs and student progress, but also to partner to support EL family leadership development that envisions families in a diversity of roles in schools and their children’s education (as co-creators, supporters, encouragers, monitors, advocates and models).

The box below illustrates bright spots highlighting parent leadership development training, parent-led training, and potential.

Mapp and Bergman’s dual capacity framework also calls on educators to “have the mindsets, be trained, and cultivate the relationships with families as co-creators of a learning journey for students” and to fully partner with their parents to support their children’s academic, linguistic, and social-emotional growth and development.³⁷



SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS

CO-POWERMENT OF FAMILIES TO LEAD AND MONITOR LCAP DEVELOPMENT

- The [district] Parent Leadership team was formed in the 2017-2018 school year as a part of the effort to engage parents as partners and expand leadership development among parents in our district. This group of parent leaders from a variety of school sites have participated in expanded training, stakeholder and advisory committees, volunteering, facilitated training for other parents, and contributed to the development of new parent engagement efforts, including surveys and expanded outreach. – *District X (City: Midsize, 49% ELs)*
- In addition to regular participation in committees and councils, the district has also spent a great deal of effort in providing parents with training such as Project 2-Inspire. This opportunity has empowered parents and created strong leaders who now work collaboratively with district and school staff. This has also created a great space for open and honest communication between families and the school district. – *District N (City: Midsize, 49.8% ELs)*
- Parent Engagement Action includes Empowered Parents & Families Academies, a series of three courses to educate family ambassadors about parent rights and responsibilities, leadership, and advocacy, to be hosted through the Communities of Schools:

*Student Empowerment team...the District’s LCAP team also convened a series of **student focus groups** to elevate the voices, perspectives, and needs of students in our future planning: **English Learner Student Focus Group** (January 26, 2021; March 2, 2021; April 27, 2021)– *District K (City: Large, 20.3% ELs)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

California’s accountability system has the components needed to achieve its promise to English Learners. To ensure equity for English Learners, however, the entire system must function in concert. Each level of the educational system must sharpen the focus on the diverse needs of English Learners. A series of recommendations for the state, county office of education, and district levels follow.

STATE RECOMMENDATIONS

Improve Alignment Between System of Support and Other State Policies

- Embed the *California English Learner Roadmap* policy into all levels of the System of Support process.
- Improve the System of Support by clarifying alignment and coordination among the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), Geographic Leads, Content Leads, County Offices of Education (COEs), and LEAs.
- Strengthen coordination among EL technical assistance providers and develop a robust system and processes for them to provide greater attention to and more consistent support for integrated Differentiated Assistance (DA) support for LEAs.

Update the Accountability System to Improve the Equity Focus for English Learners

- Discontinue the use of the aggregate EL student group and instead report current ELs and RFEPs in the Academic Indicator and other Priority Areas.
- Incorporate disaggregated EL data (current ELs and RFEPs) to inform eligibility criteria for targeted support (Differentiated Assistance or Intensive Intervention).
- Reexamine the English Learner Performance Indicator (ELPI) status rate cut score thresholds for LEAs to establish more aspirational annual growth targets on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) results.

Support and Expand High-Quality Comprehensive English Language Development

- Fund and develop a statewide English Language Development (ELD) initiative to support all schools and districts in implementing high-quality designated and integrated ELD.

Strengthen LCAP Focus on Closing Gaps and Meeting the Needs of ELs

- Revise the LCAP template to require districts to identify differentiated growth targets for student groups when setting goals and determining metrics to close gaps for student groups.
- Augment the LCAP Approval Manual to include a sharper focus on ELs and to support capacity-building within county offices of education to address the needs of ELs.
- Require that LEAs adopt a locally-designed English Learner Master Plan that complements the LCAP.

COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Ensure LCAP Reviews Include EL Expertise

- Involve staff with expertise in EL programs and services to conduct the LCAP reviews and serve as members of the System of Support teams.
- Add an EL Panel to participate in LCAP Reviews of LEAs with high percentages and numbers of ELs.

Strengthen LCAP Monitoring and Supports

- Closely monitor and support the implementation of Goals and Actions in district LCAPs identified for Differentiated Assistance and Intensive Intervention (Tiers 2 and 3).
- Integrate EL supports for all LEAs in Differentiated Assistance (DA) status regardless of student eligibility group(s) across Priority Areas.

Support District Implementation of EL Roadmap Policy

- Use resources and tools aligned to the *CA English Learner Roadmap* and the LCFF priority areas, such as the *LCAP Toolkit - Using Research-based Tools to Promote Equity for English Learners*, and the *EL Roadmap Teacher and Administrator Toolkits* as part of the technical assistance to schools and districts.
- Support districts to develop, revise, or refine the district English Learner Master Plan to align with the *CA English Learner Roadmap* policy.

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

Ensure LCAP Alignment with EL Roadmap Policy and EL Research

- Use the *LCAP Toolkit*, and in particular, the *Research-aligned English Learner Rubrics* to identify strengths and weaknesses in current LCAPs for revision in the LCAP Annual Updates.
- Develop, revise, or refine the district English Learner Master Plan to align with the *CA English Learner Roadmap* policy.

Set Differentiated Goals and Actions for the Different EL Profiles

- Revise/update goals, actions, and services with a “sharpened focus” on ELs.
- Identify specific and differentiated outcomes for the different profiles of ELs with metrics sensitive to their language, academic and social development in order to close the gaps.
- Analyze district data and other evidence, disaggregated by EL typology, such as current ELs, RFEPS, LTELs, Newcomers, and DLLs and ensure that goals, services, and actions are delineated for them in the LCAP.
- Include preschool and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) in the LCAPs with goals, actions, and services for Dual Language Learners in preschool and ELs in TK programs.
- Make visible in the LCAP any goals, actions, and services recommended by parent, student, and/or community groups.

Design and Implement Professional Development Focused on Meeting Diverse EL Needs

- Provide professional development on the *English Learner Roadmap* for all educators to build understanding and expertise about the needs of ELs and research-based programs and practices.
- Ensure that professional development is comprehensive, coherent, and incorporates integrated and designated ELD as differentiated from generic standards-based instruction.



LIKE A NEEDLE IN A HAYSTACK: The Ongoing Search for Equity for English Learners

This report includes most of the recurring recommendations we have made in the previous LCAP analyses of 2015, 2017, and 2018. Nine years into LCFF and seven years of LCAP implementation continue to represent the most significant school finance, accountability, and instructional reform in our state's history that seeks to redress decades of systemic injustices and foster local decision-making and autonomy. While on this path, existing inequities were further exacerbated by the devastating and continuing effects of the pandemic. The pivot to distance learning challenged the education system in ways unimagined, and while so many of our families, students, and educators demonstrated resiliency, innovation, and resolve during this time, recovery is still underway. Additional federal and state investments should be leveraged to support recovery, reimagine education, and fully realize "a restorative restart"³⁸ for ELs and their communities. AB 1840 provided a new opportunity to improve the LCAP process and product through a redesigned

template that encourages LEAs to be more concise, direct, and transparent in describing their successes and ongoing improvement efforts. Yet our review and analysis process that sought to locate evidence regarding LEAs descriptions of language acquisition programs, professional development for educators of ELs, response to stakeholder feedback, and specific EL metrics to measure closing of gaps was akin to searching for "a needle in a haystack." Multiple and iterative examinations of the 26 district LCAPs lead us to conclude that the promise of improved or increased services and programs—suggesting higher levels of academic achievement and success for English Learners, low-income students, and foster youth— continues to be a promise that is yet to be fully realized. As we enter the 10th year of California's landmark education funding formula and local accountability reform, we have yet another opportunity to implement the longstanding recommendations included in this report.

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS (2020-21)

DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS					
DISTRICT	GRADE SPAN	LOCATION (NCES DATA) ¹	# OF ELs	% OF ELs	DEMOGRAPHICS
A	K-8	City: Large	9,267	53.4	HP, HN
B	P-8	Town: Fringe	2,058	66.7	HP
C	P-8	City: Large	8,543	27.8	HN
D	P-12	City: Large	9,918	32.9	HN
E	P-Adult	Rural: Fringe	7,401	41.1	HP
F	K-8	Rural: Fringe	870	42.5	HP
G	K-Adult	Suburb: Large	8,992	14.1	HN
H	P-Adult	City: Large	13,554	18.5	HN
I	P-8	Town: Remote	1,568	58.0	HP
J	K-Adult	City: Large	12,381	16.9	HN
K	P-Adult	City: Large	123,579	20.3	HN
L	K-12	Rural: Fringe	2,078	58.7	HP
M	P-Adult	City: Large	15,671	31.2	HN
N	P-8	City: Midsize	8,036	49.8	HP, HN
O	K-8	Suburb: Large	1,853	53.9	HP, HN
P	K-12	City: Midsize	1,505	51.7	HP, HN
Q	K-Adult	City: Large	8,924	19.0	HN
R	K-Adult	City: Midsize	12,352	23.4	HN
S	P-Adult	City: Large	26,233	21.1	HN
T	P-12	City: Large	16,960	28.1	HN
U	P-8	City: Small	2,139	46.4	HP, HN
V	P-8	City: Large	2,840	62.0	HP, HN
W	P-Adult	City: Large	17,438	33.9	HN
X	P-8	City: Midsize	8,309	49.0	HP, HN
Y	P-12	City: Large	9,484	22.8	HN
Z	P-Adult	Suburb: Large	10,037	31.6	HN

KEY:

HN = (High Number) Districts with an EL population greater than 999

HP = (High Percentage) Districts with an EL population greater than 40%

¹ Geverdt, D. E. (2015). Education Demographic and Geographic Estimates Program (EDGE): Locale Boundaries User's Manual. NCES 2016-012. National Center for Education Statistics.

APPENDIX B: LIST OF REVIEWERS

Thank you to the educators, researchers, and the advocates who participated in the review of the LCAPs.

Genevieve Almanzar

*Kings County Office
of Education*

Elvira G. Armas

*Center for Equity for
English Learners*

Marine Avagyan

*Glendale Unified
School District*

Renaë Bryant

*Anaheim Union
High School District*

Manuel Buenrostro

Californians Together

Alma Castro

*California Association
for Bilingual Education*

Lucero Chavez

*Parent Institute for
Quality Education*

Patricia Chavez

*Parent Institute for
Quality Education*

Kenneth Cole

Advancement Project

Karen Costa

*Kings County Office
of Education*

Xilonin Cruz-Gonzalez

Californians Together

Laura Diaz

*California Association
for Bilingual Education*

Rafael Escamilla

*Los Angeles Unified
School District*

Carlos Flores

*Corona-Norco Unified
School District*

Charice Guerra

*SEAL (Sobrato Early
Academic Language)*

Carla Gutierrez

*Los Angeles Unified
School District*

Holly Harding

*Butte County Office
of Education*

Martha Hernandez

Californians Together

Sylvia J. Hodge

*Center for Equity for
English Learners*

Izela Jacobo

*San Diego County Office
of Education*

Linda Kaminski

*Center for Equity for
English Learners*

Claudia Lara

Promesa Boyle Heights

Magaly Lavadenz

*Center for Equity for
English Learners*

Claudia Lockwood

*California Association
for Bilingual Education*

Martha Martinez

*SEAL (Sobrato Early
Academic Language)*

Veronica Torres McLane

*Center for Equity for
English Learners*

Sandy Mendoza

Families In Schools

Eduardo Muñoz-Muñoz

San José State University

Laura N. DuPre

*Fallbrook Union
Elementary School District*

Gisela O'Brien

*Center for Equity for
English Learners*

Berenice Onofre

Nacional Latino-PEMA

Elizabeth Orozco

*California Association for
Bilingual Education*

Stacy Percell

*Fresno County Office
of Education*

José Posada

*Los Angeles Unified
School District*

Nati Rozsa

*Center for Equity for
English Learners*

Shilpa Ram

Public Advocates

Angela Randolph

*Desert Sands
Unified School District*

Veronica Rauschenberger

Rio School District

Katie Riggs

Retired Attorney

Catalina Rupert

*English Learner
Leadership & Legacy
Initiative Advocate*

Araceli Sandoval

*ASG Strategy
Consulting Inc.*

Corina Sapien

*SEAL (Sobrato Early
Academic Language)*

Day Son

Advancement Project

Shelly Spiegel-Coleman

Californians Together

Lilia Torres-Cooper

*English Learner
Leadership &
Legacy Initiative*

Marcia Turner

Retired Educator

APPENDIX C: ENGLISH LEARNER RESEARCH-ALIGNED LCAP RUBRICS

Focus Area #1 – Actions and Services

FOCUS AREA RATING				
	CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment	Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness		
	EXEMPLARY	GOOD	WEAK	NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED
Responsive to EL Profiles	<input type="checkbox"/> Services, programs, and actions, including interventions, addressing the differentiated language and academic needs of the various profiles of ELs: Newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool - 12th grade.	<input type="checkbox"/> Services, programs, and actions, including interventions, addressing the linguistic and academic needs of some profiles of ELs: Newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool -12th grade.	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal services, programs, and actions, including interventions, are described and do not differentiate for EL proficiency levels or are not specific to the various profiles of English Learners.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of services, programs, and actions, including interventions, by EL proficiency level or profiles.
Assessments inform Placement & Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Program placement, and services for ELs are informed by formative (ongoing) and summative (annual) academic and language development results, including L1 assessments when appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program placement and services for ELs are informed by annual (summative) academic and language development results.	<input type="checkbox"/> ELs are assessed annually on language development but results play no role in program placement or services.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of language development assessments for placement in program or services.
Program Options	<input type="checkbox"/> EL program options (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) for ELs are based upon the needs of ELs, preferences of the parents and community; district resources are aligned.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some EL program options (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) for ELs are offered based upon the needs of ELs and district resources to determine program design and placement.	<input type="checkbox"/> EL program options (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) are limited and are not based upon the needs of ELs or district resources to determine program design and placement.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of how EL students are placed in programs (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) and provided services; difficult to distinguish EL programs from those for English-only students.
Targeted Use of Supplemental and Concentration Funds	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit description of improved or increased services provided through supplemental and concentration funding AND mention of how they add additional support, opportunities, personnel, resources, etc., to enhance the base program for all ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> General description of improved or increased services provided through supplemental and concentration funding AND mention of how they add additional support, opportunities, personnel, resources, etc., to enhance the base program for all ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental and concentration funds are identified for ELs, but the targeted use of funds is not described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental and concentration funds are not used to improve or increase services for English Learners.

APPENDIX C: ENGLISH LEARNER RESEARCH-ALIGNED LCAP RUBRICS

Focus Area #2 - Program and Course Access

FOCUS AREA RATING				
	CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment	Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access		
	EXEMPLARY	GOOD	WEAK	NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED
Preschool*	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit description of preschool program(s) and activities for DLLs, including the development of both primary language and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> General description of preschool program(s) and some activities for DLLs, including support in both primary language and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited description of preschool program(s) and activities for DLLs OR no mention of primary language support.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of the availability of preschool program(s) for DLLs OR no mention of primary language support.
Access to Rigorous Core Content	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit description of the approach to provide ELs full access to rigorous academic content in all core content areas, TK-12th grade, including the development of both primary language and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> General description of the approach to provide ELs full access to rigorous academic content in all core content areas, TK-12th grade, including support in both primary language and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal description of the approach to provide ELs full access to rigorous academic content in all core content areas, TK-12th grade, with no mention of primary language support.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of programs and activities to increase EL access to rigorous academic content and no mention of primary language support.
LTEL Courses*	<input type="checkbox"/> Detailed program and activities describe specialized ELD courses for Long Term English Learners and access to all core curricula (grades 6-12).	<input type="checkbox"/> Some description of specialized ELD courses for Long Term English Learners and access to core curricula (grades 6-12).	<input type="checkbox"/> Mention of Long Term English Learners but no description of ELD courses or access to core curricula (grades 6-12).	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of Long Term English Learners (grades 6-12).
Enrichment and/ or Extracurricular Opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> Detailed description of programs and activities to increase EL participation in enrichment and/ or extracurricular opportunities (e.g., sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).	<input type="checkbox"/> General description of programs and activities to provide/promote EL participation in enrichment and/ or extracurricular opportunities (e.g., sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited description of programs and activities to promote EL participation in enrichment and/ or extracurricular opportunities (e.g., sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of programs or activities for increased EL participation in enrichment and/ or extracurricular opportunities (e.g., sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).
Extended Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Detailed description of programs and activities to provide extended learning time specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> General description of programs and activities to provide extended learning time specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal description of programs and activities to provide extended learning time not specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of programs and activities for extended learning for ELs.

*If rubric area does not apply to the district context, do not score.

Focus Area #3 - Desired Outcomes for English Learner Activities

FOCUS AREA RATING				
	CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment	Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness Principle 4: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems		
	EXEMPLARY	GOOD	WEAK	NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED
L1/L2 Data Reporting	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment results in English and the primary language are reported in the LCAP whether or not ELs receive instruction in their home language (L1).	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment results in English and the primary language are reported in the LCAP for ELs receiving instruction in their home language (L1).	<input type="checkbox"/> Only assessment results in English are reported in the LCAP for ELs, even though some ELs receive instruction in their home language (L1).	<input type="checkbox"/> No assessment results for ELs in English or primary language are reported in the LCAP.
GAP Reduction	<input type="checkbox"/> EL academic growth exceeds the expected growth of English-only students to demonstrate the achievement gap closing. Specific academic growth measures (e.g., A-G, graduation rate, AP, IB, and EAP passing scores) are disaggregated by ELs and reported by grade level and levels of English proficiency.	<input type="checkbox"/> EL academic growth equals the expected growth of English- only students. Some specific academic growth measures (e.g., SBAC, A-G, graduation rate, AP, IB, and EAP passing scores) are disaggregated by ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> EL Academic growth measures for ELs are included, but have not been compared to EO growth. Few specific academic growth measures (e.g., SBAC, A-G, graduation rate, AP, and EAP passing scores) are disaggregated by ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific Academic growth measures for ELs are not included.
Transcript Evaluation * (high school only)	<input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated so students can be accurately placed and receive credit for courses taken and passed outside the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated so students can be accurately placed in grade level and appropriate courses.	<input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated but are not considered for placement, OR no credit is given for courses from non-U.S. schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are not evaluated .
Increase in Seal of Biliteracy, Pathway Awards	<input type="checkbox"/> The numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy and Biliteracy Pathway Awards (if appropriate) increase every year . The numbers of former ELs and EOs are disaggregated in Seal and Pathway award reports.	<input type="checkbox"/> The numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy and Biliteracy Pathway Awards (if appropriate) increase every year .	<input type="checkbox"/> The numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy or other students receiving Biliteracy Pathway awards (if appropriate) remain the same .	<input type="checkbox"/> District does not mention the State Seal of Biliteracy or Biliteracy Pathway Awards.

Did the district set differentiated growth targets to close the achievement gaps for ELS? Yes No

*If rubric area does not apply to the district context, do not score.

APPENDIX C: ENGLISH LEARNER RESEARCH-ALIGNED LCAP RUBRICS

Focus Area #4 - English Language Development

FOCUS AREA RATING				
	CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment	Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness		
	EXEMPLARY	GOOD	WEAK	NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED
Designated & Integrated ELD Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes explicit goals, evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies/practices for an articulated ELD program and standards-based ELD curricular materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes several goals and evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies for an articulated ELD program and standards-based ELD curricular materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on implementation of designated or integrated ELD includes minimal goals or minimal evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies and standards-based ELD curricular materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.
Knowledge of ELD Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on ELD standards is identified as an explicit , targeted set of ongoing activities to allow teachers, administrators, and counselors to understand the standards for implementation of designated ELD and integrated ELD in content areas.	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on ELD standards is identified with several activities to allow teachers and administrators to understand the standards for implementation in designated ELD.	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on ELD standards is identified with minimal activities that focus only on teachers' understanding of the standards for implementation in designated ELD.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of ELD standards.
ELD Standards Implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Priorities are set with explicit goals and activities for ELD standards implementation based on needs assessment and student language proficiency and academic data (assessment tools and data results).	<input type="checkbox"/> Priorities are set with several goals and activities for ELD standards implementation based on student language proficiency and academic data (assessment tools and data results).	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal goals and activities are set for ELD Standards implementation and do not consider student language proficiency or academic data (assessment tools and data results).	<input type="checkbox"/> No student language proficiency or academic data (assessment tools and data results) is considered to set goals or specific activities for implementation related to ELD standards.
ELD Standards Professional Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Aligned , simultaneous professional development of California Core Standards and ELD standards were strategically designed for teachers and administrators of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sequential professional development of California Core Standards and ELD standards were strategically designed for teachers and administrators of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional development of California Core Standards for teachers with minimal inclusion of ELD standards .	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional development of California Core Standards for teachers without inclusion of ELD standards .

**If rubric area does not apply to the district context, do not score.*

Focus Area #5 - Professional Development

FOCUS AREA RATING				
	CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment	Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness		
	EXEMPLARY	GOOD	WEAK	NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED
PD Stakeholder Input	<input type="checkbox"/> District gathered input by conducting data-driven needs assessments/meetings with teachers, other educators (e.g., administrators, specialists, etc.), and stakeholders multiple times to identify differentiated teaching and learning needs for EL/DLLs.	<input type="checkbox"/> District gathered some input by conducting needs assessments/meetings with teachers and other stakeholders to identify differentiated teaching and learning needs for EL/DLLs.	<input type="checkbox"/> District gathered minimal input from teachers OR stakeholders to identify differentiated teaching and learning needs for EL/DLLs.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of teacher/ stakeholder input or needs assessment for EL/DLL teaching or learning.
CA English Learner Roadmap	<input type="checkbox"/> District PD plan includes all elements of the EL Roadmap, including site/classroom level implementation and a plan for articulated implementation (e.g., coherence in site-level plans and policy documents).	<input type="checkbox"/> District PD plan includes some elements of the EL Roadmap, including awareness and site/classroom level implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/> District PD plan includes minimal evidence of the EL Roadmap focused only on awareness.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of EL Roadmap elements.
PD Content	<input type="checkbox"/> EL PD activities explicitly identify training for district and site administrators, teachers, instructional support staff, AND counselors, including but not limited to implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and social-emotional assets and needs of different EL profiles (e.g., newcomers, Long Term English Learners), literacy and content instruction in L1 and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> EL PD activities identify some training for district/site administrators, teachers, instructional support staff, OR counselors, such as the implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and social-emotional assets and needs of different EL profiles (e.g., newcomers, Long Term English Learners) literacy or content instruction in L1 and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> EL PD activities identify limited training for administrators, teachers, support staff OR counselors, such as the implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and social-emotional assets and needs of different EL profiles (e.g., newcomers, Long Term English Learners) literacy or content instruction in L1 and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> No EL PD activities described for administrators, teachers, support staff or counselors.
Comprehensive PD Program for Teachers of ELs	<input type="checkbox"/> Detailed professional development (PD) plan includes short- and long-term goals for ELs teachers and describes many effective PD elements, such ongoing teacher collaboration, classroom-based application, AND teacher reflection or inquiry cycles.	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional development plan includes some goals for ELs teachers and effective PD elements such as teacher collaboration, classroom-based application, OR teacher reflection or inquiry cycles.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited activities described for professional development of ELs teachers without any reference to specific professional development goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of professional development goals or plan for teachers of ELs.
PD Cultural Proficiency/ Competency	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit PD activities for all certificated and classified staff to address key elements of cultural proficiency/ competency training, including cross-cultural interactions, cultural differences in communication patterns, role of culture and impact on EL learning and achievement, and culturally responsive instruction and curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some cultural proficiency/ competency training elements are identified in PD for all certificated and classified staff, such as cross-cultural interactions, cultural differences in communication patterns, role of culture and impact on EL learning and achievement, and culturally responsive instruction and curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal cultural proficiency/ competency training elements are identified in PD for all certificated or classified staff, such as cross-cultural interactions, cultural differences in communication patterns, role of culture and impact on EL learning and achievement, and culturally responsive instruction and curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of PD for cultural proficiency or responsiveness.

APPENDIX C: ENGLISH LEARNER RESEARCH-ALIGNED LCAP RUBRICS

Focus Area #6 - Family Engagement

FOCUS AREA RATING					
CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment		Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness			
		EXEMPLARY	GOOD	WEAK	NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED
Stakeholder Input	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit plans to provide families with LCAP Orientations are focused on the legal requirements of the policy and the role of families. Includes training and strategies for parents to provide meaningful stakeholder input.	<input type="checkbox"/> General plans to provide families with an LCAP Orientation are focused on the legal requirements of the policy and the role of families.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited plans to provide families with an LCAP Orientation are focused on the legal requirements of the policy and the role of families.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of plans to provide families with an LCAP Orientation focused on the legal requirements of the policy and the role of families.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit plans for the DELACs and other parent committees to meet regularly to review and monitor the development and implementation of the LCAP.	<input type="checkbox"/> General plans for the DELACs and other parent committees to meet regularly to review and monitor the development and implementation of the LCAP.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited plans for the DELACs or other parent committees to meet regularly to review and monitor the development and implementation of the LCAP.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of plans for the DELACs or other parent committees to meet regularly to review and monitor the development and implementation of the LCAP.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit plans for conducting parent surveys AND focus groups with school leaders to provide input on the development and implementation of the LCAP.	<input type="checkbox"/> General plans for conducting parent surveys OR focus groups with school leaders to provide input on the development and implementation of the LCAP.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited plans for conducting parent surveys OR focus groups with school leaders to provide input on the development and implementation of the LCAP.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of plans for conducting parent surveys OR focus groups with school leaders to provide input on the development and implementation of the LCAP.	
Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit plan for oral and written translation of official district policies, plans, student progress, and other data (e.g., school climate survey) in multiple languages, beyond minimum legal requirement of 15% of the EL population, as required by law.	<input type="checkbox"/> General plan for oral and written translation of official district policies, plans, student progress, and other data (e.g., school climate survey) in target languages spoken by at least 15% of the EL population, as required by law.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited plan for oral and written translation of official district policies, plans, student progress, and other data (e.g., school climate survey) in target languages spoken by at least 15% of the EL population, as required by law.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of a plan for oral and written translation of official district policies, plans, student progress, and other data (e.g., school climate survey) in target languages spoken by at least 15% of the EL population, as required by law.	
Staffing to Support Family Engagement	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of qualified bilingual staff (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).	<input type="checkbox"/> General plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of qualified bilingual staff (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of qualified bilingual staff (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of a plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of qualified bilingual staff (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).	

Focus Area #6 - Family Engagement (continued)

FOCUS AREA RATING				
	CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment	Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness		
	EXEMPLARY	GOOD	WEAK	NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED
Staff Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit plan for professional learning for teachers, administrators, AND other staff on family engagement, welcoming environments, and cultural sensitivity.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some description of professional learning for teachers OR administrators and other staff on family engagement, welcoming environments, and cultural sensitivity.	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited description of professional learning for teachers or administrators and other staff on family engagement, welcoming environments, and cultural sensitivity.	<input type="checkbox"/> No mention of professional learning for teachers or administrators and other staff on family engagement, welcoming environments, and cultural sensitivity.
Decision-Making Processes	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit plan to provide EL parental involvement in committees beyond DELAC for input on LCAP development and other district/school-wide decision-making (e.g., hiring practices, EL programs, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> General plan to provide EL parental involvement in committees beyond DELAC for input on LCAP development and other district/school-wide decision-making (e.g., hiring practices, EL programs, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> EL parental involvement is limited to DELAC committee(s) input on LCAP development or other district/school-wide decision-making (e.g., hiring practices, EL programs, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of a plan for EL parental involvement for input on LCAP development or other district/school-wide decision making (e.g., hiring practices, EL programs, etc.).
Leadership Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit, long-term plan to build capacity for parent leadership development, specifically targeting EL parental population, such as bilingual parent workshops on leadership strategies, creating an EL parent panel to address concerns, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> General, short-term plan for parent leadership development programs specifically targeting EL parental population (e.g., bilingual parent workshops on leadership strategies).	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited plan for parent leadership development programs specifically targeting EL parental population (e.g., bilingual parent workshops on leadership strategies).	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of a plan for parent leadership development programs specifically targeting EL parental population (e.g., bilingual parent workshops on leadership strategies).
Family Professional Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit, long-term plan to provide families with professional learning opportunities including but not limited to Parent-led workshops and trainings connected to LCAP EL goals and how they support their students learning (e.g., Student Data workshops, How to assist English Learners at home, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> General, short-term plan (current year only) for providing families with professional learning opportunities including but not limited to workshops and trainings connected to LCAP EL goals and how they support their students learning (e.g., Student Data workshops, How to assist English Learners at home, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited plan for providing families professional learning opportunities includes only minimally required trainings for EL parents/guardians such as initial identification and reclassification requirements and processes.	<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of a plan for providing families with professional learning opportunities.

APPENDIX D: NOTES

- 1 California Department of Education. (2019c). *Global California 2030. Speak. Learn. Lead. An initiative of the state superintendent of public instruction*. Tom Torlakson. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/globalca2030report.pdf>
- 2 Myung, J., Kimner, H., Cottingham, B., Diaz Luna, S., Shiels, S., & Hough, H. (2021). *Restorative restart: The path towards reimagining and rebuilding schools* [Report]. Policy analysis for California education. <https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/restorative-restart>
- 3 Local Control Funding Formula, 2013 (AB 97, SB 91, and SB 97).
- 4 California Department of Education. (2022). Local control and accountability plan and annual update template instructions. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/>
- 5 California Department of Education. (2021). Facts about English Learners in California. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/cefelfacts.asp>
- 6 California Department of Education. (2020). Economic impact aid. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pr/eia.asp>
- 7 Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan. Senate Bill 98. (2020). <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/EO-N-56-20.pdf>
- 8 Williams, C. & Buenrostro, M. (2021). *Teaching and learning during uncertain times. A review of learning continuity and attendance plans*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together. <https://californiantogether.org/lcpreport/>
- 9 Gándara, P., & Mordechay, K. (2017). Demographic change and the new (and not so new) challenges for Latino education. *Educational forum*, 81(2), 148-159. [10.1080/00131725.2017.1280755](https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2017.1280755)

Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English Learners*. Californians Together.

Perez Huber, L., Malagón, M. C., Ramirez, B. R., Gonzalez, L. C., Jimenez, A., & Vélez, V. N. (2015). *Still falling through the cracks: Revisiting the Latina/o education pipeline*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED574691). <https://www.chicano.ucla.edu/files/RR19.pdf>
- 10 Jiménez-Castellanos, O., López, P. D., & Rivera, M. (2019). The politics of K-12 local control funding and accountability for Latinx and ELL students: Lessons Learned from California. *Peabody journal of education*, 94(2), 115-121.

Lafortune, J. & Mehlotra, R. (2021). *Targeted K-12 funding and student outcomes: Evaluating the local control funding formula*. Public Policy Institute of California. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1598099>
- 11 Carruba-Rogel, Z., Durán, R. P., & Solis, B. (2019). Latina parents' literacy practices and concientización in petitioning their local school board regarding funding priorities. *Peabody journal of education*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1598131>
- Hodge, S.J. (2021). *Muchos somos mas fuertes: Testimonios of Latina parent leaders in the local control and accountability plan process* (Publication No. 28721321) [Doctoral dissertation, Loyola Marymount University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Porras, D. A. (2019). Latina mothers of emergent bilinguals as policymakers? Barriers and opportunities toward critical participation in LCAP. *Peabody journal of education*, 94(2), 226-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1598130>
- 12 Armas, E., Lavadenz, M., & Olsen, L. (2015). *Falling short on the promise of increased or improved services for English Learners: A report on year one LCAPs*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.

Lavadenz, M; Armas, E.; & Hodge, S.J. (2017). *Masking the focus on English Learners: The consequences of California's accountability system dashboard results on year four local control and accountability plans (LCAPs)*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.
- Olsen, L., Armas, E., & Lavadenz, M. (2016). *A review of year two LCAPs: A weak response to English Learners*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.
- 13 California Department of Education. (2022). California School Dashboard. Retrieved from <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>
- 14 Lavadenz, M., Armas, E., Murillo, M., & Hodge, S. J. (2019). Equity for English Learners: Evidence from four years of California's local control funding formula. *Peabody journal of education* 94, no. 2, pp176-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1598113>
- 15 A.B. 1840, 2018 Annum, 2018 Sess. (Calif. 2018) <https://openstates.org/ca/bills/20172018/AB1840/>
- 16 The revised LCAP template for the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 school years reflects statutory changes made through Assembly Bill 1840 (Committee on Budget), Chapter 243, Statutes of 2018. These statutory changes enhance transparency regarding expenditures on actions included in the LCAP, including actions that contribute to meeting the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English Learners, and low-income students, and to streamline the information presented within the LCAP to make adopted LCAPs more accessible for stakeholders and the public. California Education Code [EC]52064(e)(4).
- 17 California Department of Education. (2022). Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/>
- 18 California Department of Education. (2021). Geographic lead agencies. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/crss.asp>
- 19 2019 Dashboard statistics are the most recent state data available for districts to use in the development of their LCAPs. Local district measures vary by district.
- 20 For the Dashboard Academic Indicator, the English Learner (EL) student group is comprised of two groups: students identified as RFEP in the last four years AND students currently identified as English Learners (ELO in the Dashboard data files).

- 21 Great Public Schools Now. (2021). *Educational recovery now: LA's children and schools need a comprehensive plan*. https://greatpublicschoolsnow.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/EdRecoveryNow_Final_3-29-21.pdf
- Migration Policy Institute. (2021). *Effects of the pandemic on high school English Learners and ways to help them recover*. Webinar. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/events/effects-pandemic-high-school-english-learners>
- Pier, L., Christian, M., Tymeson, H., & Meyer, R.H. (2021). *COVID-19 impacts on student learning: evidence from interim assessments in California*. Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE.
- 22 Lavadenz, M. O'Brien, G., & Armas, E. (2020). *The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Toolkit: Using research-based tools to promote equity for English Learners*. Californians Together.
- 23 California Department of Education. (2022). English Learner road map. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/>
- 24 California Department of Education. (2020). *Improving education for multilingual and English Learner students: Research to practice*. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/mleeducation.pdf>
- 25 California Department of Education. (2016). *Preparing all students for college, career, life, and leadership in the 21st century*. <http://www.edsynergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Preparing-All-Students-for-College-Career-Life-and-Leadership-in-the-21st-Century.pdf>
- 26 LCAP 2021-22 template instructions. A well-developed goal can be focused on the performance relative to a metric or metrics for all students, a specific student group(s), narrowing performance gaps, or implementing programs or strategies expected to impact outcomes. LEAs should assess the performance of their student groups when developing goals and the related actions to achieve such goals. See The LCAP and Annual Update Templates and Instructions for the 2021-22 School Year(PPTX, Slide 48) and <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/tues2archive.asp>
- 27 California Department of Education (2020). *Improving education for multilingual and English Learner students: Research to practice*. Sacramento, CA.
- 28 Lavadenz, M., Kaminski, L. R. G., Armas, E. G., & López, G. V. (2021). Equity leadership for English Learners during COVID-19: Early lessons. *Frontiers in education*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.636281/full>
- 29 LCAP Template Instructions, 2021-22, Goals & actions—measuring and reporting results section. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/lcap/template2022>
- 30 Humphrey, D., Koppich, J., Lavadenz, M., Marsh, M., O'Day, J., Plank, D., Stokes L., Hall, M., Allbright, T., Blum, J., Dhaliwal, T., Fahimuddin, L., Stokes, K., & Laura Tobben. (2017). *Paving the way to equity and coherence? the local control funding formula in year 3*. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE): Stanford. http://edpolicyinca.org/sites/default/files/LCFERC_04_2017.pdf
- 31 Edley, C. Jr. & Kimmer, H. (2018). Education equity in California: A review of getting down to facts ii findings. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE): Stanford. https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/GDTFII_Equity%20Review.pdf
- 32 Umansky, I., Hopkins, M., Dabach, D. B., Porter, L., Thompson, K., & Pompa, D. (2018). *Understanding and supporting the educational needs of recently arrived immigrant English Learner students: Lessons for state and local education agencies*. Council of Chief State School Officers.
- 33 Edley, C. Jr. & Kimmer, H. (2018). *Education equity in California: A review of getting down to facts II findings*. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE): Stanford. https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/GDTFII_Equity%20Review.pdf
- 34 Mapp, K.L. & Bergman, E., (2019). Dual capacity-building framework for family-school partnerships (version 2). www.dualcapacity.org.
- 35 <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-lep-parents-201501.pdf>
- 36 Vargas, R. (2008). *Family activism: Empowering your community, beginning with family and friends*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- 37 Estrada-Miller, J., Wolf, L., Armas, E. G., & Lavadenz, M. (2022). *Uplifting the perspectives and preferences of the families of English Learners in Los Angeles Unified School District and charter Schools: Findings from a representative poll*. [Educational Policy Brief No. 10]. Loyola Marymount University Center for Equity for English Learners. <http://doi.org/10.15365/ceel.policy.11>
- 38 Myung, J., Kimner, H., Cottingham, B., Diaz Luna, S., Shiels, S., & Hough, H. (2021). *Restorative restart: The path towards reimagining and rebuilding schools* [Report]. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE): Stanford. <https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/restorative-restart>



CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER

CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS
OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

Californians Together, a coalition of education, civil rights, parent/caregiver, community, and advocacy organizations, champions the educational success of California's more than 1.1 million English learners. Californians Together serves as a trusted voice, source of expertise, and steadfast advocate standing for the educational rights of access for California's English learners, immigrants, and linguistically and culturally diverse students. Seeking to overcome and transform the harms of systemic racial, language, and cultural inequality in education and to close opportunity gaps from early childhood through post-secondary education, the coalition exposes timely issues, advocates for cutting-edge policy and practice solutions grounded in research, and mobilizes to provide capacity-building support to multiple levels of the educational system.

This report can be downloaded in pdf format from
www.californianstogether.org

For additional paper copies of this report or other information about Californians Together's initiatives contact:

Martha Hernandez, *Executive Director*
Martha@caltog.org

Californians Together
525 East Seventh Street, Suite C203
Long Beach, CA 90813
562-983-1333