



MASKING THE FOCUS ON ENGLISH LEARNERS:

The Consequences of California's Accountability System Dashboard Results on Year 4 Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs)

AUTHORS:

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

CaliforniansTogether
Championing the Success of English Learners

LMU|LA
The Center for Equity
for English Learners

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Magaly Lavadenz, Ph.D., is Distinguished Professor and founding Executive Director of the Center for Equity for English Learners in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University. Her research addresses the intersections and impact of policies and practices for culturally and linguistically diverse students, their teachers and school leaders. She currently serves as President of Californians Together and has held leadership positions in numerous associations, including as past president of the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), the California Association for Bilingual Teacher Education and the California Council on Teacher Education. Her work is published in numerous articles, chapters and books, including *Questioning our Practices: Bilingual Teacher-Researchers and Transformative Inquiry and Latino Civil Rights in Education: La Lucha Sigue*, co-edited with Anaida Colón Muñiz.

Elvira G. Armas, Ed.D., is the Director of Programs and Partnerships for the Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) and Affiliated Faculty in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University. Throughout her career, she has been actively engaged in collaborating with TK–12th grade educators to regularly explore the areas of leadership, curriculum, integrated standards-based instruction, assessment, and family/community engagement in culturally and linguistically diverse settings. She has served as a bilingual classroom teacher, mentor, district advisor, adjunct professor, staff developer, project director and curriculum materials developer. She has also co-authored several articles, policy briefs, and book chapters about issues related to teaching, learning, parent/community engagement, and assessment.

Sylvia Jáuregui Hodge, M.Ed., is completing her Doctorate in Educational Leadership for Social Justice at Loyola Marymount University, where she serves as the Doctoral Fellow at the Center for Equity for English Learners. She is a former educator having worked at highly-diverse, multilingual, Title I public schools in Texas. In 2014, she was awarded a fellowship from the National Head Start Association in Washington D.C., where she co-authored a report on successful two-generational approaches used by Head Start and Early Head Start programs. Her doctoral research focus is on school funding policies and how they affect the educational opportunities of English Learners.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was made possible by the generous funding and support from the Sobrato Family Foundation and the California Community Foundation.

The authors are indebted to the reviewers who read the 24 Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and rated them to support the findings in the report. Their names are listed in the Appendix.

Finally, Laurie Olsen, Californians Together Board Member and Special Advisor to the Sobrato Early Academic Language model, and Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, Executive Director of Californians Together, have provided invaluable support on the process for the LCAP reviews, the development of policy questions and recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
INTRODUCTION	6
California’s New English Learner Policy Context	7
The Intersect between the State Board of Education’s English Learner Academic Indicator Subgroup Definition and LCAPs	7
Table 1. <i>ELA Academic Indicator English Learner Subgroup Performance</i>	8
Figure 1. <i>EL Yellow Subgroup Disaggregated ELO and RFEP Performance</i>	8
MISSING THE MARK	9
PROCESS	10
Figure 2. <i>LCAP Year 4 Review – Districts by Location (n=24)</i>	10
Table 2. <i>LCAP English Learner Research-Aligned Rubrics – Selected Focus Areas and Alignment to State Priorities</i>	11
FINDINGS	12
Figure 3. <i>Year 4 LCAP Review – English Learner Research-Aligned Rubric Results for Selected Districts (n=24)</i>	13
QUALITATIVE RESULTS	14
Undifferentiated Professional Learning for Teachers of English Learners	14
Minimal Attention to Metrics and Analysis of English Learners.....	14
Inconsistent Services and Course Access for English Learners.....	15
PROMISING PRACTICES	16
Table 3. <i>Promising Practices for English Learners Documented in Sample LCAPs</i>	16
RECOMMENDATIONS – SHARPENING THE FOCUS ON ENGLISH LEARNERS	17
State Recommendations	17
County Office of Education Recommendations.....	18
District Recommendations	18
CONCLUSION.....	19
APPENDIX.....	20
A: Sample District Characteristics	20
B: English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubrics	21
C: List of Reviewers	26
D. Notes	27



MASKING THE FOCUS ON ENGLISH LEARNERS: The Consequences of California's Accountability System Dashboard Results on Year 4 Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs)

AUTHORS: Magaly Lavadenz, Ph.D., Elvira Armas, Ed.D. and Sylvia Jáuregui Hodge, M.Ed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines the connection between California's two current accountability policy mechanisms--the Year 4 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and the California Department of Education's (CDE) *Accountability Model* (Spring 2017 Dashboard). We found that the sample of 24 California school districts with high numbers and/or high percentages of English Learner students largely missed the mark in identifying research-based programs, actions and services for English Learners. The districts had an overall English Learner (English Learner Only – ELO + Reclassified Fluent English Proficient - RFEP), English Language Arts (ELA) Academic Performance Level of **Yellow** AND an ELO level of **Orange or Red** on the Spring 2017 Dashboard. Our focus on ELOs specifically was to examine whether the results of the state's new accountability system guided districts in identifying actions and services responsive to different types of ELs in their LCAPs. Our analyses led us to conclude the following:

KEY FINDINGS

California's current accountability system will diminish the urgency to address numerous educational needs of the ELO subgroup and thus further undermine the equity intent of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).

- 92% (22 out of 24 LCAPs) had ratings of "weak" or "no evidence" in English Learner Student Outcomes and Academic Achievement.
- Over half of the districts had overall "weak" ratings in the following three areas: 1) English Language Development (n=13); 2) Professional Development (n=13); and 3) Programs and Course Access (n=12).
- No district (0 of the 24) had ratings of "good" or "exemplary" across all five focus areas.

Furthermore, analyses of the narrative sections of the LCAPs revealed the following:

- There were few examples of promising practices.
- Few examples were found that revealed asset-based approaches to English Learner education.
- Minimal mention of metrics and/or data analysis processes focused on diverse English Learner cohort outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

Obscuring ELO results could have detrimental effects on districts' abilities to address LCAP goals, set growth targets, focus programs and services, and allocate supplemental and concentration funds for this targeted group of students. Accordingly, our past analyses have shown that the state's LCAP guidance and the LCAPs themselves have not sufficiently addressed the needs of ELs.^A

A. Olsen, L. Armas, E., & Lavadenz, M. (2016). *A review of year 2 LCAPs: A weak response to English Learners*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together. 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*. Californians Together: CA.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

AT THE STATE LEVEL

- Discontinue the use of the aggregated EL subgroup in the Academic Indicator.
- Report ELO data separately from RFEP data in a revised indicator, so as not to mask the needs and successes of the current ELs and RFEPs so that gaps and challenges can be addressed.
- Require districts to complete the Year 4 (2017-2020) LCAPs based on the revised indicators on the Dashboards' Five by Five Placement Grid for continuous improvement.
- Develop a robust system and processes for EL technical assistance providers for identified districts and schools with personnel that have EL expertise and experience with EL programs, curriculum, and instruction.
- Embed the *English Learner Roadmap* into the System of Support process.
- Build the capacity of County Offices of Education by increasing both program and personnel resources with EL expertise who read, review and support the development of LCAPs and provide technical assistance.

AT THE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION LEVEL

- Increase and involve staff with expertise on ELs to conduct the LCAP reviews and serve as members of the System of Support teams.
- Develop a data analysis process and work with districts to dig deeper into their ELO data.
- Include the critical areas in this report as part of the technical assistance and review offered to the districts which would require enhancing *The LCAP Approval Manual* to address these issues.
- Develop and use tools aligned to the *English Learner Roadmap* and the LCFF priority areas when providing technical assistance to schools and districts.

AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL

- Revise and update Year 4 (2017-2020) LCAPs using evidence from a self-analysis based on the research-aligned English Learner rubrics in Appendix B to identify areas of improvement.
- Identify specific outcomes for the different profiles of ELs with metrics that are sensitive to their language and academic development.
- Provide professional development for all educators on the implications of implementation of the *English Learner Roadmap* to build understanding and expertise about the needs of ELs and research-based practices.
- Ensure that professional learning for teachers of ELs addresses integrated and designated ELD as well as differentiation from generic standards-based instruction.



INTRODUCTION

After several years of multi-layered planning, stakeholder engagement and design, California embarked on a historical and bold effort to implement the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)¹ — an education finance reform intended to foster equity alongside local flexibility and democratic engagement. Concomitantly, California developed a new accountability and continuous improvement system designed to provide information about how local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools are meeting the needs of California’s diverse student population². Through its equity intent, LCFF targets three subgroups — English Learners (ELs), low-income students, and homeless and foster youth. The LCFF provides each district with a base grant which is determined by the size and grade levels of the student population, as well as supplemental and concentration grants that are based on the number of ELs, low-income students, and homeless and foster youth. Districts must engage parents, teachers, students and community members in developing the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)³, a document detailing the district’s goals and strategies for using LCFF funds in a commitment to equity and continuous improvement. Linking the processes of local planning and resource allocation through the LCAP to the state’s evolving systems of technical assistance and support within a single accountability system is complex.

We focus here on ELs specifically and examine the state’s new accountability system’s results in relation to the continuous improvement needs required to trigger

actions and services responsive to different types of ELs such as newcomers and long-term English Learners. LCAPs serve as a mechanism to link continuous improvement and performance — as intended through California’s Accountability Plan and Model. The California Model Five by Five Grid Placement Report (Spring 2017 Dashboard) made its debut in Spring 2017 and included the Five by Five Placement Grid, a key function to potentially identify the needs of diverse ELs. Together, these two policy mechanisms show great promise in coupling school finance and school accountability reform centered on equity and coherence for the state and nation.

Districts used data from the state accountability system to write their Year 4 LCAPs that span the 2017-2020 academic years. It is important to note that this particular three-year LCAP period requires only annual updates, which is a departure from previous years.

This report presents:

- 1 California’s new EL policy context and an examination of the intersection between the state’s school finance reform, LCFF and two accountability mechanisms, the Dashboard and the LCAPs.
- 2 Key findings from an analysis of a purposeful sample of 24 districts’ focus on ELs in their Year 4 LCAPs, based on this context; and
- 3 State, county, and district level implications and recommendations to avoid masking the focus on English Learners.

CALIFORNIA'S NEW ENGLISH LEARNER POLICY CONTEXT

Committed to the moral and legal obligation to serve ELs effectively and emboldened by the leadership of champions for ELs at the local, state and national levels, California recently instituted two significant policy shifts to support research and evidenced-based comprehensive programs for ELs. The first was the passage of Proposition 58 (Nov. 2016) which reversed the English-only policy in educating the state's ELs to encouraging the state to offer multilingual programs leading to proficiency in English and another language for all students. The second major policy shift for ELs resulted in the adoption of the *English Learner Roadmap* (July 2017)⁴, intended to assist the California Department of Education (CDE) in guiding LEAs in "welcoming, understanding, and educating the diverse population of students who are English Learners." The *English Learner Roadmap* is based on four research-based core principles and specific elements that support high-quality programs for ELs, including bilingualism and biliteracy. LEAs have the opportunity to capitalize on these converging policies to honor their commitment to equity and to inform the development and monitoring of LCAPs to create a system that targets the specific needs of ELs.

THE INTERSECT BETWEEN THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION'S ENGLISH LEARNER ACADEMIC INDICATOR SUBGROUP DEFINITION AND LCAPS

In 2016 the State Board of Education (SBE) decided to include two years of English Learners Only (ELO) and four years of Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) student data in a composite English Learner (EL) subgroup for the Academic Indicator on the Spring 2017 Dashboard. The state's decision to not consider the diversity of ELs in the accountability system proves challenging and has long-lasting implications for state and district-level decisions in learning how to target technical assistance and interventions for all ELs. Most importantly, the aggregated results from the Dashboard could potentially mask the results for English Learner Only students, including the various EL profiles (i.e., LTEs, newcomers, etc.). Obscuring ELO results could have detrimental effects on districts' abilities to address LCAP goals, set growth targets, focus programs and services, and allocate supplemental and concentration

funds for this targeted group of students. Accordingly, our past analyses have shown that the state's LCAP guidance and the LCAPs have not sufficiently addressed the needs of ELs.⁵

The Year 4 LCAP template, which addresses a three-year time span from 2017-2018 through the 2019-2020 academic years, was revised to include descriptive sections where districts can highlight accomplishments and identify performance gaps. This revision has the potential to increase equity by explicitly asking districts to identify needs directly linked to subgroups that fall within the lowest two performance levels on the Dashboard — the Orange or Red bands of achievement. However, the 2016 EL subgroup definition (ELO + RFEP) was identified as problematic in this process, as espoused by a large contingent of organizations, schools, districts, and researchers who contended that this definition would mask the needs of ELOs by calculating the average of the data from both groups. In addition, a brief written by three researchers with EL expertise was presented to the State Board of Education describing the potential negative consequences of this proposal⁶.

The brief acknowledged that while including ELO and RFEP data is essential for long-term program evaluation, three-year district LCAPs rely on current Dashboard data in identifying needed programs and services for targeted subgroups. As stated previously, the Spring 2017 Dashboard Academic Indicator EL subgroup consists of two years of ELO and four years of RFEP student data. This is problematic for districts and local stakeholders when deciding student priorities in the LCAP. As well, the combined ELO + RFEP subgroup resulted in the vast majority of districts falling within the Yellow, Green, or Blue bands in the Academic Indicator for ELs. These results could potentially fail to address the needs of ELs and *exclude them* from receiving technical assistance and financial support in their LCAPs.

California embarked on a historical and bold effort to implement the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) — an education finance reform intended to foster equity alongside local flexibility and democratic engagement.


The concerns expressed to the State Board of Education were corroborated through our analysis of the Spring 2017 Dashboard Academic Indicator for English Language Arts (ELA)⁷, which includes 2015 and 2016 results from the Grades 3-8 California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP).⁷ A total of 869 non-charter public LEAs yielded results for the ELA Academic Indicator⁸. Of these, 807 had an EL subgroup, which consists of an aggregate of the ELO and RFEP student subgroups. Ultimately only 680 LEAs met two additional criteria to identify a viable EL subgroup: 1) minimum number of students to protect anonymity; and 2) a total of 2-4 years of previous data. Table 1 provides an overview of the performance levels for EL subgroups on the ELA Academic Indicator as reported in the Spring 2017 Dashboard.⁹

TABLE 1: ELA Academic Indicator English Learner Subgroup Performance

Performance Level Color	#LEAs w/EL Subgroup (n=680)	% of Total
BLUE (Highest Performance)	21	3.09%
GREEN	61	8.97%
YELLOW	462	67.94%
ORANGE	63	9.26%
RED (Lowest Performance)	73	10.74%

A majority of EL subgroups (ELO + RFEP) identified in the Yellow performance level (67.94%) on the ELA Academic Indicator. Of the 462 EL subgroups classified in the Yellow performance level, 436 had ELO subgroups, and 416 had RFEP subgroups with student populations of 11 or more.¹⁰ A comparison of the two subsets shows that ELO subgroups overwhelmingly identified in the two lowest performance levels (Orange or Red) when compared to RFEP subgroups, 65% versus 5%, respectively (see Figure 1). Furthermore, there were no districts which had ELOs at highest performance levels (Green and Blue). Because the EL subgroup is comprised of ELO and RFEP subgroups, a majority of districts — 283 of 462, or 61.3% — were identified by the accountability system in the Yellow performance level for the Academic Indicator, which is detrimental for ELOs. By receiving a Yellow performance level, 283 districts were automatically excluded from Technical Assistance or Intensive Intervention by the State Board of Education and their Academic Indicator for ELs was not triggered as a threshold to be addressed in subsequent LCAP years.

FIGURE 1: EL Yellow Subgroup* Disaggregated by ELO and RFEP Performance



*See Table 1. EL-ELA Academic Indicator English Learner Subgroup Performance



MISSING THE MARK

Through these findings, we conclude that the current California accountability system will diminish the urgency to address the educational needs of the ELO subgroup and thus further undermine the equity intent of LCFF. There is great potential for California school districts to be misled by the results of the combined English Learner subgroup Dashboard Academic Indicator performance levels. The misleading results of Dashboard outcomes and the subsequent connections to LCAP inputs usher in a school reform era that can likely leave ELs, along with reclassified ELs, behind. The decision to combine ELO and RFEP students – two student groups with distinct language and academic profiles – to calculate the Dashboard Academic Indicator Performance Levels for the EL subgroup may indeed mask access to programs and services needed by many ELs. Given that California’s new accountability system is designed as a driver for continuous improvement¹¹, the focus needed for LEAs to respond to the diverse needs of ELs in their districts is imperative.

The next phase of our work was to examine the impact of these Spring 2017 Dashboard results on Year 4 LCAPs (covering the 2017-18, 2018-19, and

2019-20 academic years). We identified and reviewed district LCAPs with an overall English Learner (ELO + RFEP) ELA Academic Performance Level of **Yellow**, AND whose ELO level was **Orange or Red**. The Yellow designation does not trigger a response on the LCAP nor signal technical assistance; neither does it preclude a district from focusing on their ELOs (especially when disaggregated results reveal a much lower ELO Academic Indicator status). Districts can and should take a more in-depth approach to shine a light on the needs of this population, often also comprised of LTELs and newcomers. Accordingly, this focus on ELs would be expected to highlight evidence in the LCAPs of *increased* comprehensive programming and services for all EL subgroups.

Two critical questions guided this review:


- 1 ***For districts whose ELA-EL academic performance level is Yellow on the Spring 2017 California School Dashboard, what evidence exists for comprehensive programs for English Learners in the districts’ LCAPs?***
- 2 ***For these same districts, what evidence exists about increased or improved services for English Learners?***

PROCESS

Beginning with the Spring 2017 Dashboard results, we used a stratified purposeful sampling strategy to select 24 districts with Yellow EL-ELA status and an ELO level of Orange or Red. These districts represent a variety of geographic locations across the state (city, suburban, and rural locations). Of the 24 districts, 11 districts have high numbers of ELs (HN), 11 districts have a high percentage of ELs (HP), and 2 have both HN and HP of ELs (see Figure 2). Altogether, these districts serve 308,226 ELs, or approximately 23 percent of ELs in California.

In January 2018, a panel of 26 reviewers representing a cross-section of the California educational community convened to review the fourth year LCAPs (See Appendix C for a list of the reviewers). The group reviewed: a) the history of LCAP plan development and its changes; b) the intent of the LCAP and its requirements; c) California’s accountability system and how it applies to ELs; and d) the identification process for sample districts. The rationale for the use of the five priority rubrics from the original ten **English Learner**

FIGURE 2: LCAP Year 4 Review - Districts by Location (n=24)



Research-Aligned LCAP Rubrics¹² was also discussed and agreed upon by the reviewers. Together these rubrics represent key facets of comprehensive programs for ELs. Each of the five priority rubrics (see Table 2) were presented, and sample indicators explained across a four-point rating scale ranging from low to high: No Evidence Included, Weak, Good, and Exemplary.

TABLE 2: LCAP English Learner Research-Aligned Rubrics – Selected Focus Areas and Alignment to State Priorities

State Priorities*	Focus Area	Focus Area Categories
2	RUBRIC #1: English Language Development (ELD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated & Integrated Program • ELD Standards • ELD Standards Implementation • ELD Standards PD
2, 6	RUBRIC #3 Professional Development (PD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD Stakeholder Input • Comprehensive PD Program for Teachers of ELs • PD Content • PD Cultural Proficiency/Competency
2, 7	RUBRIC #4: Program & Course Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool • Access to Rigorous Core Content • LTEL Courses • Enrichment and/or Extracurricular Opportunities • Extended Learning
2, 4, 7, 8	RUBRIC #7 Actions & Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsiveness to EL Profiles • Assessment-Based Placement and Services • Program Options • Targeted Use of Supplemental and Concentration Funds
4, 5, 8	RUBRIC #10B Student Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L1/L2 Data Reporting • GAP Reporting • Transcript Evaluation (high school only) • Increase in Seal of Biliteracy, Pathway Awards

*State priorities for Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)

1 - Basic (Conditions of Learning); 2 - State Standards (Conditions of Learning); 3- Parental Involvement (Engagement); 4- Pupil Achievement (Pupil Outcomes); 5- Pupil Engagement (Engagement); 6 – School Climate (Engagement); 7 – Course Access (Conditions of Learning); 8 – Other Pupil Outcomes (Pupil Outcomes)

Note. L1 = Native language, home language; L2 = non-native language; GAP = Achievement gap; LTEL = Long-Term English Learner.

A sample district LCAP provided the basis for group rating and was used to establish inter-rater reliability ensuring consistent application of the rubric indicators. Two reviewers read the same LCAP in its entirety, and then the pair of reviewers agreed upon a consensus rating for each indicator on all rubrics. Review panel members recorded sample evidence statements to support rubric ratings. A research team at Loyola Marymount University’s Center for Equity for English Learners compiled all rubric scores to identify patterns, trends, and identifiable evidence of increased or improved services for ELs based on each of the five rubrics.




FINDINGS

The Year 4 LCAP review reflected a slight decrease in the number and percentage of districts that received overall *No Evidence Included* and *Weak* ratings and a slight overall increase in *Good* ratings when compared to the previous LCAPs review reports.⁵ Across all 24 LCAPs, we found only three LCAPs that were rated *Exemplary* in the English Language Development (Rubric 1) and Professional Development (Rubric 3) focus areas, and only one that was rated *No Evidence Included* in Programs and Course Access (Rubric 4)

An overwhelming majority, 22 out of 24 LCAPs (92%), had ratings of *Weak* or *No Evidence Included* in the English Learner Student Outcomes focus area, underscoring the lack of equity goals/outcomes for English Learners.

focus area. An overwhelming majority, 22 out of 24 LCAPs (92%), had ratings of *Weak* or *No Evidence Included* in the English Learner Student Outcomes (Rubric 10B) focus area, underscoring the lack of equity goals/outcomes for ELs. Over half of the districts had overall weak ratings in the following three areas: 1) English Language Development (n=13); 2) Professional Development (n=13); and 3) Programs and Course Access (n=12). In fact, there was no single district from the 24 reviewed that had evidence of *Exemplary* or *Good* ratings across all five focus areas. These results imply a lack of district systemic approaches to articulating local policies and practices based on research for improving English Learner achievement and the consequences of how California's current accountability system masks the needs for ELs, particularly in the sample of districts that were purposefully selected on the criteria of high numbers and/or high percentages of English Learners. [See Figure 3 for the *English Learner Research-Aligned Rubric Results for Selected Districts.*]

FIGURE 3: Year 4 LCAP Review – English Learner Research-Aligned Rubric Results for Selected Districts (N=24)





QUALITATIVE RESULTS

The Year 4 LCAP template afforded LEAs the opportunity to orient readers to their overall plans in several introductory sections: 1) LCAP Highlights; 2) Areas of Greatest Progress; 3) Greatest Needs; and 4) Performance Gaps. We conducted a content review of these three sections to determine: a) Did district LCAPs address the needs of ELO students?; and b) Were Dashboard results mentioned explicitly in Year 4 LCAPs for ELs with regard to ELA academic achievement? If so, were these data also examined for ELO students in order to identify specific action steps for increased or improved services?

The analysis of the aforementioned introductory sections revealed the following:

- **Half (n=12) of the reviewed LCAPs discussed only the English Learner Progress Indicator – not ELA Achievement – as an area of concern for ELs.**¹³
- **Only one-fourth (n=6) of the reviewed LCAPs mentioned a concern for the ELA achievement of ELs.**
- **Only 1 of 24 districts specified a concern for the academic achievement of ELO students.**

There is clear evidence that the Dashboard EL Academic Indicator masks the needs of ELOs and the accountability system appears to fail in focusing attention, awareness, and generating responsiveness to the needs of this diverse group. This is further corroborated by results from the analysis of evidence produced by the reviewers' rating of the full LCAPs, which revealed several trends and patterns for each of the five rubrics.

The following themes emerged from these analyses:

UNDIFFERENTIATED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR TEACHERS OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

There was minimal evidence of districts' approaches to differentiating professional learning for teachers of English Learners concerning content and language development standards, instruction, or cultural proficiency training. In many LCAPs, general descriptions of professional development services for teachers of ELs prevailed with only some mention of specific plans for sustained learning opportunities (e.g. collaboration, coaching, teacher reflection, inquiry cycles) for implementing evidence-based strategies for designated and integrated ELD. The same was true for setting priorities for ELD standards implementation based on student language proficiency and academic data. These findings echoed those from previous LCAP analyses. There were few promising practices identified and, in few instances, some districts identified utilizing cultural competency training. When considering the dire need for highly qualified teachers that are trained to meet the needs of ELs, the lack of differentiated professional learning is alarming.

MINIMAL ATTENTION TO METRICS AND ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH LEARNER OUTCOMES


Very few districts identified EL specific metrics beyond the required reclassification, CELDT or SBAC metrics. Additionally, growth measures overwhelmingly mentioned ELs as an aggregate subgroup rather than identifying growth targets for various EL typologies such



as students at-risk of becoming LTELs, or newcomers. In the few cases where additional EL-specific metrics were identified, these included the Seal of Biliteracy, district or site-adopted assessments such as the ADEPT (A Developmental English Proficiency Test), or assessments included in state-adopted materials. Very few LCAPs identified primary language assessments for ELs.

INCONSISTENT SERVICES AND COURSE ACCESS FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS

Although many LCAPs mentioned LTELs and newcomers, the description of specialized ELD or programs for these groups of students lacked clarity in many plans, and there was minimal mention of the role of primary language for instruction or assessment. Few LCAPs described how access to enrichment and/or extracurricular opportunities are promoted and monitored. Often descriptions of improved or increased services provided through supplemental and concentration funding focused on the continuation of staff, or additional staff to serve ELs, including EL Coordinators, bilingual TOSAs (Teachers on Special Assignment), or bilingual paraprofessionals. In many cases, the rationale for this staffing was to provide intervention or extended services, rather than to develop asset-based approaches to curriculum and instruction.



There is clear evidence that the Dashboard EL Academic Indicator masks the needs of ELOs and the accountability system appears to fail in focusing attention, awareness, and generating responsiveness to the needs of this diverse group.




PROMISING PRACTICES

District LCAPs were also analyzed for examples of research-based, promising practices in serving ELs (see Table 3)¹⁴. These practices signal districts' slow progress towards seizing the opportunity to provide equitable educational programs to ELs. The methods highlighted reflect inclusive practices, which are primarily proactive rather than reactive. In other words, while it is best practice to provide research-based interventions to ELs, interventions should not be the only educational opportunities available and documented in the LCAP. Instead, asset-based approaches, such as those that expand the knowledge and skills of linguistically diverse students, should be the foundation of the educational programs available to this historically underserved group.

TABLE 3: Promising Practices for English Learners Documented in Sample LCAPs

Focus Area Rubrics	Focus Area Categories	Promising Practices
RUBRIC #1: English Language Development (ELD)	Designated and Integrated Program	<p>Rubric created for schools to use as guidance on daily lesson expectations for implementing a Designated and Integrated ELD program.</p> <p>Implementation and expansion of the Sobrato Early Academic Language Program, an intensive professional development for teachers of ELs; Formation of EL Taskforce to address EL needs.</p> <p>Staff Development coaches provided teachers with support in providing ELs with Designated and Integrated ELD using Sobrato Early Academic Learning Program units and strategies.</p>
	ELD Standards	Kagan cooperative learning strategies training in the area of ELD for all teachers and training instructional aides on how to best provide support to EL students.
RUBRIC #3: Professional Development (PD)	PD Stakeholder Input	ELD Director conducted needs assessment for PD with administration, teachers & staff to identify learning needs.
	PD Content	<p>All new teachers received special training in teaching ELs, unit/lesson planning using academic vocabulary an EL instructional strategies.</p> <p>Bilingual classified staff received PD on reteaching in small groups, intervention strategies, and translating and interpreting for non-bilingual certificated staff.</p>
RUBRIC #4: Programs and Course Access	Access to Rigorous Core Content	<p>Middle School program was redesigned as a response to ELs lack of access to a broad course of study due to participating in intervention classes. With the redesign, ELs have access to electives and still receive the interventions needed.</p> <p>Ensure that all schools have effective and equitable bilingual aide support for ELs.</p> <p>A number of districts documented their efforts in establishing bilingual and dual language programs. Some LCAPs detailed strategic partnerships and steps to ensure the success of the new programs, with plans to expand in the following school years.</p>



RECOMMENDATIONS SHARPENING THE FOCUS ON ENGLISH LEARNERS

To adequately address the needs of ELs, our state accountability system and each level of the educational system must sharpen the focus on current English Learners' diverse needs. Simultaneously, our system should recognize, acknowledge and reward districts who make strides with their RFEP students and ensure their continued success. As it is currently constructed, the Academic Indicator aggregate EL subgroup (ELO+RFEP) masks the needs and weakens the focus on ELO students. A series of recommendations for the state, county office of education, and district levels follow.

STATE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Discontinue the use of the aggregated EL subgroup in the Academic Indicator. Report ELO data separately from RFEP data so as not to mask the needs of the current ELs and instead highlight the gaps and challenges that should be addressed.
- Redesign the EL Academic Indicator.
- Require districts to complete the LCAP (2017-2020) annual updates based on the revised indicator on the Dashboards' *Five by Five Placement Grid* for continuous improvement. This will allow districts to address the changing needs of the diverse EL subgroups.
- Establish guidelines for the implementation of the *English Learner Roadmap* as a key policy mechanism to create research-based reforms for EL education in the state to inform the LCAPs through the:
 - Development of district and school site knowledge base of the principles and elements of the *English Learner Roadmap* to serve as guidance needed for reforms and increased or improved EL services.
 - System of Support providers, the CDE, California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) and California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) should also be knowledgeable and confident to use the *English Learner Roadmap* when providing technical assistance to districts and schools.

- Coordinate the continuous improvement work of the CDE, CCEE, CCSESA and other agencies to ensure that accelerated achievement expectations for EL outcomes result in closing achievement gaps.
- Develop a robust system and processes for EL technical assistance providers for identified districts and schools with personnel that have EL expertise and experience with EL programs, curriculum, and instruction.
- Require that EL support providers work with districts and schools to dig deeper into the EL data focused on various EL profiles including students-at-risk of becoming LTEL, and newcomers.
- Build the capacity of County Offices of Education by increasing both program and personnel resources with EL expertise who read and support the development of LCAPs and provide technical assistance.
- Provide support for development of multilingual programs to promote high levels of proficiency in English and another language.

COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Increase and involve staff with expertise on ELs to conduct the LCAP reviews and serve as members of the System of Support teams.
- Develop a data analysis process (e.g. the San Diego County Office of Education English Learner Dashboard) and work with districts to dig deeper into their ELO data to identify programs and services to support language development and close opportunity and achievement gaps.



- Include the critical areas (5 priority *English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubrics*) in this report as part of the technical assistance and review offered to the districts which would require enhancing *The LCAP Approval Manual* to address these issues.
- Embed the *English Learner Roadmap* into the System of Support process.
- When assisting districts to identify areas of concern, programs and instruction for ELs, a comprehensive approach should include alignment with the *English Learner Roadmap* principles and elements focused on assets-based approaches.
- Develop and use tools aligned to the *English Learner Roadmap* into the System of Support process.

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

- Identify and include English Learner cohorts on the LCAP Introductory sections (Areas of Greatest Progress, Greatest Needs, Performance Gaps).
- Allocate resources that respond to the needs of ELOs, RFEPs and other EL cohorts to close opportunity and achievement gaps and respond to identified challenges.
- Identify specific outcomes for the different profiles of ELs with metrics that are sensitive to their language and academic development.
- Complete the LCAP (2017-2020) annual updates based on the revised indicator on the Dashboards' *Five by Five Placement Grid* for continuous improvement. Use evidence from a self-analysis based on the *English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubrics* (see Appendix B) to identify areas for improvement.
- Provide professional development for all educators on the implementation of the *English Learner Roadmap* to build understanding and expertise about the needs of ELs and research-based practices.
- Ensure that professional learning for teachers of ELs addresses integrated and designated ELD as well as differentiation of standards-based instruction.
- Work with district and other bilingual specialists to support the implementation of the new and expanding dual immersion and developmental bilingual programs identified in the LCAPs.



CONCLUSION

This is an exceptional time of opportunity to significantly improve the education of ELs and engagement of their families in California. We have new state policy, new research, and strong public support. Never before have these three elements been aligned. In November 2016, 73.5% of the electorate voted to support multilingual programs and at the same time to repeal the requirement for all ELs to be enrolled in English-only programs. In February 2017 the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine released their report, *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. The report supports the development of bilingualism saying, “Those who become proficient in both a primary language and English are likely to reap benefits in cognitive, social and emotional development and may also be protected from brain decline in older ages. In addition, their varied cultures, languages and experiences are assets for their development, as well as for the nation.”¹⁵

On July 12, 2017, the California State Board of Education unanimously adopted new English Learner policy in the form of an *English Learner Roadmap*, further acknowledging the value of English Learners’ primary languages and replacing the English-only policies. Lastly, on May 31, 2018 State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Torlakson, released a new initiative, *Global California 2030*¹⁶ setting a target of 50% of all K-12 students participating in programs leading to proficiency in two or more languages.

As LCAP implementation enters its fifth year and LCFF its sixth, California’s promise of equity for its students has yet to be achieved. Our students come to school with diverse backgrounds, abilities, talents, and challenges. Schools ensure equity by recognizing, respecting, and acting on this diversity. In fact, high-quality schools have the capacity to differentiate instruction, services, and resource distribution to respond effectively to the diverse needs of their students, with the aim of ensuring that all students benefit equally. This report on Year 4 LCAPs underscores the urgency to make visible and not mask the needs of California’s English Learners. Failure to do so will deny the promise of quality education to English Learners and deter California from making steady progress towards equity and implementation of continuous improvement practices for all of California’s students.

Those who become proficient in both a primary language and English are likely to reap benefits in cognitive, social and emotional development and may also be protected from brain decline in older ages. In addition, their varied cultures, languages and experiences are assets for their development, as well as for the nation (NASEM Report, 2017).¹⁵

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

District Characteristics and Spring 2017 Dashboard English Language Arts (ELA) Academic Indicator English Learners Only (ELO) Results for Sample Districts with an English Learner (EL), ELA Academic Indicator Performance Level Equal to Yellow.

District Characteristics						ELA Academic Indicator for ELO Subgroup		
DISTRICT*	GRADE SPAN	LOCATION	# OF ELS+	% OF ELS+	DEMO GRAPHICS	PERFORMANCE LEVEL (COLOR)	STATUS	CHANGE
A*	K-6	City, Large	11,353	60.2	HN, HP	Orange	Very Low	Increased
B	P-8	City, Large	9,524	31.5	HN	Red	Very Low	Maintained
C	K-8	Rural, Distant	89	74.2	HP	Red	Very Low	Declined
D*	K-Adult	Suburb, Large	12,692	32.8	HN	Red	Very Low	Maintained
E*	P-12	City, Large	16,439	22.4	HN	Red	Very Low	Declined
F	K-8	Suburb, Midsize	651	53.4	HP	Red	Very Low	Declined
G	K-8	City, Midsize	4,159	49.2	HP	Red	Very Low	Declined
H	P-8	Town, Remote	1,627	61.8	HP	Red	Very Low	Declined
I*	P-Adult	City, Large	165,453	25.9	HN	Red	Very Low	Maintained
J*	P-Adult	City, Large	7,694	25.3	HP	Red	Very Low	Maintained
K*	K-Adult	City, Large	17,928	23	HN	Red	Very Low	Declined
L	K-Adult	Suburb, Large	9,114	32.2	HN	Orange	Very Low	Increased
M*	K-8	City, Large	3,092	29.1	HP	Red	Very Low	Maintained
N	P-8	Suburb, Large	3,043	51.7	HP	Red	Very Low	Declined
O	P-Adult	Suburb, Large	8,583	34.7	HN	Red	Very Low	Declined
P*	K-8	City, Small	3,883	42.7	HP	Red	Very Low	Maintained
Q	K-Adult	City, Large	8,600	18.4	HN	Orange	Very Low	Increased
R*	K-Adult	City, Midsize	14,449	27.1	HN	Orange	Very Low	Increased
S*	P-12	City, Large	16,051	27.3	HN	Red	Very Low	Maintained
T	P-8	City, Small	2,174	45.8	HP	Orange	Very Low	Increased
U*	P-8	City, Large	3,255	67.7	HP	Red	Very Low	Declined
V	K-8	City, Small	10,178	61.4	HP, HN	Red	Very Low	Maintained
W*	P-Adult	Suburb, Large	10,652	34.4	HN	Red	Very Low	Maintained
X	K-12	Town, Distant	737	54.8	HP	Red	Very Low	Declined Sig

KEY:

HN = Districts with an EL population greater than 999

HP = Districts with an EL percentage greater than 49%.

**Districts were also part of the sampling for the LCAP Year 1 and Year 2 reviews focused on examining increased or improved services for English Learners.*

+English Learner Numbers and Percentages for the Spring 2017 Dashboard results were based on 2015-16 reports.

English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubric
Focus Area #1 – English Language Development

Overall Rubric Rating:

FOCUS AREA # 1 --- English Language Development

	Exemplary	Good	Weak	No Evidence Included
Designated & Integrated ELD Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes explicit goals, evidence-based strategies/practices for an articulated ELD program, and standards-based ELD curricular materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes several goals and evidence-based strategies for an articulated ELD program, and standards-based ELD curricular materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on the implementation of designated or integrated ELD includes minimal goals or evidence-based strategies and standards-based ELD curricular materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.
ELD Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on ELD standards is identified as an explicit, targeted set of on-going activities to allow teachers, administrators, and counselors to understand the standards, and to plan collaboratively for implementation in designated ELD and integrated ELD in content areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on ELD standards is identified with several activities to allow teachers and administrators to understand the standards for implementation in designated ELD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on ELD standards is identified with minimal activities that focus only on teachers' understanding of the standards for implementation in designated ELD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of ELD standards.
ELD Standards Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities are set with explicit goals and activities for ELD standards implementation based on needs assessment and student language proficiency and academic data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities are set with several goals and activities for ELD standards implementation based on student language proficiency and academic data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal goals and activities are set for ELD Standards implementation and do not consider student language proficiency or academic data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No student language proficiency or academic data is considered to set goals or specific activities for implementation related to ELD standards.
ELD Standards Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned, simultaneous professional development of California Core Standards and ELD standards for teachers and administrators of ELs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sequential professional development of California Core Standards and ELD standards for teachers and administrators of ELs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development of California Core Standards for teachers only without inclusion of ELD standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited professional development of California Core Standards.

Permission is granted to duplicate and distribute this document freely when credit is given to the sponsoring organizations.



English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubric Focus Area #3 – Professional Development

Overall Rubric Rating: _____

FOCUS AREA #3: Professional Development (PD)

	Exemplary	Good	Weak	No Evidence
PD Stakeholder Input	<p><input type="checkbox"/> District gathered <u>input</u> by conducting <u>needs assessments/meetings</u> with teachers, other educators (e.g. administrators, specialists, etc.) and stakeholders <u>multiple times</u> to identify differentiated learning needs for EL teaching and learning.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> District has <u>some input</u> from teachers and other stakeholders to identify differentiated learning needs for EL teaching and learning.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> District gathered <u>minimal input</u> from teachers OR stakeholders to identify differentiated learning needs for EL teaching and learning.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>No mention</u> of teacher/stakeholder input or needs assessment for EL teaching or learning.</p>
Comprehensive PD Program for Teachers of ELs	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Detailed</u> professional development (PD) plan includes short and <u>long-term goals</u> for teachers of ELs and describes many effective PD elements, such as ongoing teacher collaboration, classroom---based application, AND teacher reflection or inquiry cycles.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Professional development plan includes <u>some goals</u> for teachers of ELs and <u>effective PD elements</u>, such as teacher collaboration, classroom---based application, OR teacher reflection or inquiry cycles.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Limited activities</u> described for professional development of EL teachers without any reference to specific professional development goals based upon teacher needs.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>No mention</u> of professional development goals or plan for teachers of ELs.</p>
PD Content	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PD activities <u>explicitly</u> identifies training on <u>EL issues</u> for district and site administrators, teachers, instructional support staff, AND counselors including but not limited to implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and socio-emotional needs of the different EL profiles (e.g. newcomers, Long Term English Learners) literacy and content instruction in L1 and English.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PD activities identify <u>some training on EL issues</u> for district/site administrators, teachers, instructional support staff, OR counselors such as the implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and socio-emotional needs of the different EL profiles (e.g. newcomers, Long Term English Learners) literacy or content instruction in L1 and English.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Limited</u> EL PD activities described for administrators, teachers, support staff or counselors such as the implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and socio-emotional needs of the different EL profiles (e.g. newcomers, Long Term English Learners) literacy or content instruction in L1 and</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>No EL PD activities</u> described for administrators, teachers, support staff or counselors.</p>
PD Cultural Proficiency/Competency	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Explicit</u> PD activities for certificated and classified staff to address <u>key elements of cultural proficiency/competency training</u>, 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some cultural proficiency/competency training elements</u> are identified in PD for 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Minimal cultural proficiency/competency training elements</u> are identified in PD for 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>No mention</u> of PD training for cultural proficiency or responsiveness.</p>

1

Permission is granted to duplicate and distribute this document freely when credit is given to the sponsoring organizations.

Revised 1-17-18



English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubric Focus Area #4 – Program and Course Access

Overall Rubric Rating:

FOCUS AREA # 4 - Program and Course Access

	Exemplary	Good	Weak	No Evidence Included
Preschool*	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Explicit</u> description of preschool program(s) and activities for ELs including the development of both primary language and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>General</u> description of preschool program(s) and some activities for ELs including support in both primary language and English.	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Limited</u> description of preschool program(s) and activities for ELs with no mention of primary language support.	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>No mention</u> of availability of preschool program(s) for ELs and no mention of primary language support.
Access to Rigorous Core Content	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Explicit description</u> of 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"/> <u>General description</u> of 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"/> <u>Minimal description</u> of 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"/> <u>No evidence</u> of program and activities to increase EL access to rigorous academic content and no mention of primary language support.
LTEL Courses*	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Detailed program and activities</u> describe specialized ELD courses for Long Term English Learners and access to core curriculum (grades 6-12).	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Some description</u> of specialized ELD courses for Long Term English Learners and access to core curriculum (grades 6-12).	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mention of Long Term English Learners but no description</u> of ELD courses or access to core curriculum (grades 6-12).	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>No mention</u> of Long Term English Learners (grades 6-12).
Enrichment and/or Extracurricular Opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Detailed description</u> of program and activities to increase EL participation in enrichment and/or extracurricular opportunities (e.g. sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>General description</u> of program 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"/> <u>Limited description</u> of program and activities to promote EL participation in enrichment and/or extracurricular opportunities (e.g. sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>No evidence</u> of program 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"/> <u>Detailed description</u> of program(s) and activities to provide extended learning time specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>General description</u> of program(s) and activities to provide extended learning time specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Minimal description</u> of program(s) and activities to provide extended learning time not specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>No evidence</u> of program and activities for extended learning for ELs.

*If rubric area does not apply to the district context, do not score and omit rubric area in calculation of overall score.

Permission is granted to duplicate and distribute this document freely when credit is given to the sponsoring organizations.

English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubric Focus Area #7 – Actions and Services

Overall Rubric Rating:

FOCUS AREA # 7 - Actions and Services

	Exemplary	Good	Weak	No Evidence Included
Responsiveness to EL Profiles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Specific services, programs and actions, including interventions, address the <u>differentiated language and academic needs of the various profiles of English Learners:</u> newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool -12th grade. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Services, programs, and actions, including interventions, <u>recognize the needs of some profiles of English Learners:</u> newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool --12th grade. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No mention of services, programs, and actions, including interventions, by EL proficiency level or profiles.
Based Placement and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Program placement and services for ELs are informed by annual (summative) academic and language development results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> ELs are assessed annually on language development but results play no role in program placement or services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No mention of language development assessments for placement in program or services.
Program Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Program options (e.g. Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, etc.) for English learners are <u>based upon the needs of ELs, preferences of the parents and community;</u> district resources are <u>aligned.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Some program options (e.g. Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, etc.) for ELs are offered based upon the needs of ELs and district resources to determine program design and placement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Some program options (e.g. Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, etc.) for ELs are limited and are not based upon the needs of ELs or district resources to determine program design and placement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No mention of how students are placed in programs (e.g. Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, etc.) and provided services; difficult to distinguish EL programs from those for English only students.
Targeted Use of Supplemental and Concentration Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General description of services provided through supplemental and concentration funding with some mention of how they are aligned to EL needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental and concentration funds are identified for ELs but the targeted use of funds are not described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental and concentration funds are not used to improve or increase services for English Learners.

1

Permission is granted to duplicate and distribute this document freely when credit is given to the sponsoring organizations.

Revised 1-17-18



**English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubric
Focus Area #10B – Desired Outcomes for English Learner Activities**

Overall Rubric Rating: _____

FOCUS AREA #10B --- Desired Outcomes for English Learner Activities

	Exemplary	Good	Weak	No Evidence Included
L1/L2 Data Reporting	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes on assessments in the LCAP are in English and the primary language of the students who are literate in their home language or are being instructed in the home language.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes on assessments are reported in the LCAP in English and the primary language of the students who are being instructed in the home language.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes for ELs are reported for English. No assessment results are included in the primary language.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No assessment results for ELs in English or the primary language are included in the LCAP.</p>
GAP Reduction	<p><input type="checkbox"/> EL academic growth exceeds the expected growth of English only students to demonstrate the closing of the achievement gap. 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.</p>	<p><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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Specific Academic growth measures for ELs are not included.</p>
Transcript Evaluation (high school only)	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non---U.S. schools are evaluated so that students can be accurately placed and receive credit for courses taken and passed outside the U.S.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non---U.S. schools are evaluated so that students can be accurately placed in grade level and appropriate courses.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non---U.S. schools are evaluated but no credit is given for courses from non--- US schools.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Transcripts from non---U.S. schools are not evaluated.</p>
Increase in Seal of Biliiteracy, Pathway Awards	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliiteracy and Biliiteracy Pathway Awards (if appropriate) increase every year. The number of former ELs and EOs are disaggregated in Seal and Pathway award reports.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliiteracy and Biliiteracy Pathway Awards (if appropriate) increase every year.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliiteracy or other students receiving Biliiteracy Pathway awards (if appropriate) remain the same.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> District does not mention the State Seal of Biliiteracy or Biliiteracy Pathway Awards.</p>

Permission is granted to duplicate and distribute this document freely when credit is given to the sponsoring organizations.

Revised 1-17-18



APPENDIX C: LIST OF REVIEWERS

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

Lynne Aoki

Californians Together

Elvira Armas

*Center for Equity for English Learners,
Loyola Marymount University*

Cassandra Bautista

Santa Barbara County Education Office

Pye Roberta Cornejo

Alvord Unified School District

Xilonin Cruz-Gonzalez

Californians Together

Laura Díaz

California Association for Bilingual Education

JunHee Doh

Advancement Project California

Laure Dupre

Fallbrook Union Elementary School District

Zoila Gallegos

Paramount Unified School District

Martha Hernández

Californians Together

Sylvia Jáuregui Hodge

*Center for Equity for English Learners, Loyola
Marymount University*

Nancy Hofrock

Fontana Unified School District

Sherry Kully

Glendale Unified School District

Magaly Lavadenz

*Center for Equity for English Learners,
Loyola Marymount University*

Claudia Lockwood

California Association for Bilingual Education

Erika Menjivar

Californians Together

Baldwin Moy

California Rural Legal Assistance

Allyson Osorio

UnidosUS

Griselda Palma

San Diego State University

Catherine Retana

California Rural Legal Assistance

Maxine Sagapolutele

English Learner Leadership and Legacy Initiative

Shelly Spiegel-Coleman

Californians Together

Lilia Torres-Cooper

Whittier Union High School District

Maria Valencia

California Association for Bilingual Education

Emma Watson

Advancement Project California

Leni Wolf

The Education Trust-West

Mary Helen Ybarra

California Latino School Board Association

APPENDIX D: NOTES

- 1 Local Control Funding Formula, 2013 (AB 97, SB 91, and SB 97).
- 2 California Department of Education. (2018). *Accountability: California accountability model and school dashboard*. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/>
- 3 California Department of Education. (2017). *Local Control and Accountability Plan and annual update template instructions*. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lc/templateinstructions.asp>
- 4 California Department of Education. (2018). *English learner roadmap*. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/>
- 5 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.

Olsen, L., Armas, E., & Lavadenz, M. (2016). A review of year 2 LCAPs: A weak response to English Learners. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.
- 6 Cadiero-Kaplan, K., Lavadenz, M., & Olsen, L. (2017). *Fostering equity and meaningful accountability for California's English Learners (ELs): Utilizing the EL academic indicator as a mechanism to drive continuous improvement and resource allocation*. Testimony submitted to the California State Board of Education in March 2017.
- 7 Fall 2017 Dashboard data was released towards the end of the data analysis process.
- 8 California Alternate Assessment results are not included in these calculations. Also, to protect the anonymity of students, data is not provided for districts with student groups of less than 11 pupils.
- 9 California Department of Education. (2018). *Spring 2017 dashboard data files and guide*. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/spring2017dashboarddocs.asp>
- 10 Not all LEAs will have an ELO and/or RFEP subgroup with at least 11 students. Therefore, the number of ELO and RFEP subgroups will not match the total number of EL subgroups in the analysis.
- 11 California Department of Education. (2016). *Preparing All Students for College, Career, Life, and leadership in The 21st Century*. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/documents/account-report-2016.pdf>
- 12 Californians Together, California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA), and the Center for Equity for English Learners. (2015). *Does your local control accountability plan (LCAP) deliver on the promise of increased or improved services to English Learners?: 10 research-aligned rubrics to help answer the question and guide your program*. Retrieved from <https://www.californianstogether.org/product/does-your-local-controlaccountability-plan-lcap-deliver-on-the-promise-of-increased-or-improvedservices-to-english-learners-10-research-aligned-rubrics-to-help-answer-thequestion-and-guide-you/>
- 13 English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) is a separate Dashboard Indicator that monitors progress towards English Proficiency, answering only part of the challenge facing English Learners – whether they are moving towards academic proficiency in English while gaining mastery of the language.
- 14 California Department of Education. (2015). *English language arts/English language development framework for California public schools, grades kindergarten through 12*. Retrieved from: <https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/cognoti/content/file/resources/documents/ac/ac1376ba/ac1376ba78a91e80241cb0e458caaa57310d0763/elaelfmwfefeb17.pdf>
- 15 National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/24677>
- 16 California Department of Education. (2018). *Global California 2030. Speak. Learn. Lead*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/globalca2030report.pdf>



CaliforniansTogether

Championing the Success of English Learners

Californians Together is a statewide coalition of parents, teachers, administrators, board members and civil rights non-profit organizations. Our member organizations come together united around the goals of better educating California's 1.3 million English Learners by improving California's schools and promoting equitable educational policy.

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:

Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, *Executive Director*
shelly@californianstogether.org

Californians Together

525 East Seventh Street, Suite 215
Long Beach, CA 90813 562-983-1333