OCTOBER 2026



SELECTING A LITERACY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A District Decision-Making and Gap-Analysis Tool for Comprehensive Literacy and Multilingual Learners

by Martha Hernández

CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER
CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER
CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

Selecting a Literacy Professional Development Program

A District Decision-Making and Gap-Analysis Tool for Comprehensive Literacy and Multilingual Learners

by **Martha Hernández**
Executive Director, Californians Together

October 2026

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Aracely Fox, Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, Oxnard School District

Holly Gil, Learning Innovation Specialist at Adelante Charter School, Santa Barbara Unified School District

Shelly Speigel Colemen, Strategic Advisor, Californians Together

California Department of Education

Californians Together is a coalition championing the academic success and wellbeing of California's multilingual learners. Working at the intersection of research, advocacy, practice, and policy, we dismantle historic inequities and build an education system where linguistic and cultural diversity is recognized as a strength.

COPYRIGHT

Selecting a Literacy Professional Development Program: A District Decision-Making and Gap-Analysis Tool for Comprehensive Literacy and Multilingual Learners

© 2026. This work is licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/.





CONTENTS

4	**A Short Message from Californians Together**
5	**Background and Purpose**
7	**Foundational Principles for Comprehensive Literacy and Language Development for Multilingual Learners**
9	**Understanding Cross-Linguistic Transfer, Biliteracy, and Translanguaging**
11	**CDE Guidance for LEA Selection or Development: What Districts Should Build Into the Process**
15	**District Review and Gap-Analysis Rubric**
24	**Using the Rubric for District Decisionmaking**
25	**Conclusion**
26	**Appendix**

A Short Message from Californians Together

California has made a historic investment in literacy professional development. The California Department of Education (CDE) and State Board of Education (SBE) have established criteria and guidance for local education agencies (LEAs) to select, evaluate, refine, or develop literacy professional development programs for TK-5. As LEAs make these decisions, their goal should be to select or develop professional learning that supports the implementation of a comprehensive literacy program that is aligned with California's English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework, and addresses the needs of multilingual learners and English learners.

Comprehensive literacy reflects the five interrelated themes of the ELA/ELD Framework: foundational skills, meaning making, language development, effective expression, and content knowledge. Professional learning should attend substantively to oral language development, vocabulary, background knowledge, comprehension, and writing, alongside explicit and systematic foundational skills instruction. These dimensions are interrelated and especially important for multilingual learners, and should not be treated as secondary or optional components of literacy development.

Professional development should include evidence-based approaches for teaching English learners, and prepare educators to integrate comprehensive English Language Development, including both Integrated and Designated ELD, within literacy development and across the instructional day.

The CDE guidance makes clear that LEAs are not limited to selecting a program from the SBE-approved list. An LEA may select one or more programs from the list, evaluate an off-list program against the SBE-approved criteria, refine existing in-house professional learning, develop its own program, or combine these approaches—provided the selected professional development meets the state criteria.

This resource complements the CDE's SBE-approved Criteria and Guidance, Literacy Professional Development Programs Evaluation Rubric, the CDE program-specific memos and evidence ratings for programs on the SBE-approved list. The state review process was strengthened through public input calling for greater transparency regarding how each program addresses the needs of English learners and multilingual learners. The goal of our resource is to enable LEAs to apply state requirements through a comprehensive literacy and multilingual learner lens as they determine which professional learning approach best fits their local context. Both CDE guidance and our considerations are aligned with the principles of the California English Learner Roadmap, the policy that governs education for multilingual learners.

Background and Purpose

California is entering a significant moment in literacy policy and implementation. Assembly Bill 121, Section 15, from the 2025 Education Omnibus Trailer Bill added Education Code Section 33319.6, directing the State Board of Education and the California Department of Education to approve and post criteria and guidance for the selection or development of in-service literacy professional development programs for TK-5 educators. CDE is also required to post a list of programs deemed to meet the criteria by September 30, 2026. In addition, $200 million has been appropriated for local education agencies from 2026-27 through 2029-30 to support professional development for certificated and classified staff who provide or support literacy instruction in TK-5.



As districts review and select programs, it is important to look beyond basic compliance or surface-level alignment. **Inclusion on the SBE-approved list only establishes that a program met the state's criteria for inclusion; it does not mean that all approved programs demonstrate the same depth or strength across every criterion, including those particularly important for English learners/multilingual learners.** A program may be included on the approved list based on evidence that individual components of the program address elements of the state criteria, standards, frameworks, or guidance. However, such evidence does not necessarily indicate the depth, coherence, or comprehensiveness with which a program

addresses a specific requirement. For example, evidence connected to a single element of the ELA/ELD Framework or the California ELD Standards does not necessarily mean that the program meaningfully prepares educators to understand and implement the full intent of the framework or standards. Programs may therefore vary significantly in how well they prepare educators to provide comprehensive literacy and language instruction for multilingual learners.

California's literacy efforts must ensure that multilingual learners, including English learners, dual language learners, newcomers, long-term English learners (LTEL) and those at-risk of becoming long-term English learners, and students in bilingual and dual language programs have full access to rich, meaningful, grade-level literacy instruction. Literacy professional development should build educators' capacity to teach foundational skills while also advancing language development, meaning making, effective expression, and content knowledge. These areas should not be treated as isolated components.

For multilingual learners, literacy development is inseparable from language development. Districts should select, adapt, or supplement professional development programs so they explicitly address Integrated ELD, Designated ELD, students' home languages and cultural knowledge as assets, differentiation across English proficiency levels, and, where applicable, biliteracy development.

Districts can use this tool to:

- → Review the extent to which a literacy professional development program addresses the needs of multilingual learners;
- → Identify strengths and gaps in a program's content, design, and implementation supports;
- → Determine what additional professional learning or district supports may be needed;
- → Support conversations among district leaders, teachers, coaches, site administrators, English learner specialists, bilingual educators, and community partners; and
- → Ensure that literacy professional development reflects the full vision of California's ELA/ELD Framework

The central question for districts is not simply: "Is this program approved?"

Rather, will this program, together with the district's existing systems and supports, prepare educators to provide comprehensive, integrated, assets-based literacy and language instruction for multilingual learners? What combination of supports are needed to best meet the state criteria and the needs of our students and educators?

Foundational Principles for Comprehensive Literacy and Language Development for Multilingual Learners



PRINCIPLE 1

Literacy and Language Develop Together

Literacy development is an integrated process in which foundational skills, oral language, comprehension, writing, and knowledge-building develop together. English learners do not need to master decoding before they are invited to engage in complex meaning making, rich discussion, grade-level content, and authentic literacy experiences.



PRINCIPLE 2

Multilingualism Is an Asset

Students' home languages and cultural backgrounds are core instructional assets. In alignment with the California English Learner Roadmap, districts should treat multilingualism as a strength, and intentionally leverage students' linguistic repertoires as bridges to English literacy, content learning, identity development, and biliteracy.



PRINCIPLE 3

Access to Complex Text Is an Equity Issue

All students, including students at emerging, expanding, and bridging levels of English proficiency, deserve equitable access to rich, high-quality, complex grade-level texts. Controlled and decodable texts may support targeted foundational skills practice, but they should not replace interactive read-alouds, shared inquiry, discussion, authentic literature, content-rich texts, and opportunities to engage with whole books.



PRINCIPLE 4

Language Is Developed Through Meaningful Communication

Language instruction should empower students to use language for real purposes across disciplines. Students need opportunities to argue, justify, explain, compare, narrate, question, analyze, and create. Instruction should develop vocabulary, syntax, grammar, discourse, and academic language in service of meaningful communication and learning.



PRINCIPLE 5

Literacy Is Interdisciplinary

Literacy should not be treated as an isolated block disconnected from content. Students build deep knowledge and understanding, and language development when literacy instruction is integrated into science, social studies, history, mathematics, the arts, and other disciplines through rich, extended thematic learning.



PRINCIPLE 6

Biliteracy Development Is Dynamic and Reciprocal

Literacy develops across languages in dynamic and reciprocal ways. Effective instruction intentionally builds connections between languages while honoring the distinct linguistic structures and features of each language.



PRINCIPLE 7

Students' Full Linguistic Repertoires are Resources

Students use their complete linguistic repertoires, including strategic translanguaging, to construct meaning, solve problems, communicate ideas, and develop literacy. Professional learning should prepare educators to leverage these resources purposefully.

Understanding Cross-Linguistic Transfer, Biliteracy, and Translanguaging

One of the greatest assets multilingual learners bring to school is their developing knowledge across multiple languages. Students draw upon linguistic knowledge, concepts, and literacy skills developed in one language such as phonological awareness, concepts about print, comprehension strategies, vocabulary, morphology, text structures, and metalinguistic awareness to support literacy development in another. This process, known as **cross-linguistic transfer**, should be explicitly addressed in literacy professional development so educators can recognize these connections and intentionally build instructional bridges across languages.



Viewing literacy development through a biliteracy lens shifts attention from what multilingual learners have yet to learn in English to the full range of linguistic resources they already possess. Rather than treating differences between languages as obstacles, educators can recognize them as opportunities for deeper language awareness and literacy growth.

Professional learning should enable educators to understand:

- → **how cognates can support vocabulary development;**
- → **how similarities and differences in sound-symbol relationships influence decoding;**
- → **how morphology and metalinguistic knowledge can connect across languages;**
- → **how comprehension strategies developed in one language can support reading in another; and**
- → **how students' oral language and literacy experiences in their home language can support English literacy development.**

Professional development should also support educators in distinguishing between typical biliteracy development and reading difficulties. **Without an understanding of second language acquisition and cross-linguistic transfer, educators may incorrectly interpret normal aspects of multilingual learners' development as evidence of literacy deficits or disabilities.**

Research by Dr. Kathy Escamilla and colleagues describes biliteracy development as dynamic and reciprocal: students do not develop literacy separately in each language, and knowledge developed in one language can inform learning in the other. Effective literacy instruction therefore intentionally builds connections across languages while honoring the unique linguistic features of each.

Translanguaging is one way multilingual learners draw strategically upon their full linguistic repertoires to make meaning, develop ideas, engage with complex content, and communicate. Professional learning should empower educators to understand how purposeful translanguaging can support comprehension, oral language, writing, identity, and cross-linguistic learning while also providing intentional opportunities to develop proficiency in each language of instruction.

An explicit understanding of cross-linguistic transfer and biliteracy reinforces California's English Learner Roadmap, which recognizes students' home languages as assets and promotes bilingualism, biliteracy, and multicultural competence as educational goals.



CDE Guidance for LEA Selection or Development: What Districts Should Build Into the Process

The SBE-approved guidance from the California Department of Education charges LEAs with selecting and implementing professional development programs. The guidance encourages districts to establish a collaborative process, examine local context and data, consider multiple pathways for meeting the state criteria, plan for implementation conditions, document participation, and use continuous improvement to strengthen professional learning over time.

1. Convene an LEA Literacy Team

CDE suggests convening a new or existing literacy team. To ensure representation, the team may include:

- principals and school leaders
- elementary classroom teachers and literacy coaches
- families
- county office, district, or charter school ELA/ELD specialists, and other literacy experts
- multilingual and ELD educators
- teachers on special assignment focused on literacy and ELD
- teacher librarians
- other roles based on local need

Multilingual learner equity consideration: Ensure that the team includes educators with substantive expertise in English language development, bilingual/biliteracy instruction, newcomer and long-term English learner needs, and the district's multilingual program models. Where appropriate, include family and community representatives who can bring linguistic and cultural perspectives to the selection process.

2. Review the SBE-Approved Criteria and Available CDE Program-Specific Information

The literacy team should carefully review the SBE-approved criteria. Any professional development program selected, developed, refined, or funded pursuant to EC Section 33319.6 must meet the required criteria. When considering a program from the SBE-approved list, the team should also review the CDE program memo for that provider, including the Review Committee's Strong, Moderate, or Minimal Evidence ratings for each criterion.

Ask: What does the CDE program memo tell us about this provider's demonstrated strengths and areas for further examination, particularly in criteria related to English learners/multilingual learners?

Which areas warrant additional questions of the provider or further examination by the LEA?

This Californians Together tool helps LEAs apply the criteria through a comprehensive literacy, implementation, and multilingual learner lens as they determine which professional learning approach best fits their local context.

3. Consider all Three CDE Pathways

CDE identifies three pathways that may be used separately or in combination:

Pathway A - Select from the SBE-Approved List

Consider one or more programs from the SBE-approved list. Review the CDE program memo and criterion-level evidence ratings for each program that is under consideration, then examine how the content, design, format, and implementation supports fit the LEA's identified student and educator needs.

Pathway B - Evaluate an Off-List Program

An LEA may evaluate a program that does not appear on the SBE-approved list compared to the SBE-approved criteria. Districts may use the CDE evaluation rubric to support this review.

Pathway C - Refine or Develop In-House Professional Learning

An LEA may review its existing professional learning, determine where it meets or falls short of the criteria, and refine or supplement it. An LEA may also design professional learning that meets the criteria and the precepts of effective professional development.

The local decision is therefore not simply "Which program on the state list should we purchase?" The district should ask: **What combination of professional learning, coaching, local expertise, and supplemental support will best meet the state criteria and the needs of our students and educators?**

4. Examine Local Context Before Making the Decision

The CDE guidance encourages the literacy team to select the pathway that works best given the LEA's context, and student and educator data. For multilingual learners, the local analysis should include, at minimum:

- English learner enrollment and English proficiency profiles
- at-risk of long-term English learner and long-term English learner populations
- languages represented across schools
- English-medium, bilingual, and dual language program models
- biliteracy goals and pathways
- locally adopted instructional materials
- existing Integrated and Designated ELD structures
- student literacy and language data, considered together
- existing district expertise, coaching, and professional learning systems

5. Plan for Implementation, Not Just Program Selection

CDE directs LEAs to determine how and when educators will access professional development, and to consider:

- the total time commitment
- which components occur whole group, individually, with colleagues, or with a coach
- time available during regular work hours or designated professional development hours
- additional time and resources required
- follow-up support and coaching
- onboarding and support for district and school leaders
- connections between professional learning and locally adopted instructional materials
- alignment for TK educators with the California Preschool/Transitional Kindergarten Learning Foundations
- considerations specific to dual language settings

Under EC Section 33319.6, LEAs receiving the allocation must ensure that teachers and other certificated employees complete the training on paid time during regular work hours or designated professional development hours, unless otherwise negotiated and mutually agreed upon with the exclusive representative.

Multilingual learner equity consideration: Implementation planning should explicitly protect time and structures for Integrated and Designated ELD, ensure that professional learning is consistent with the district's English Learner Master Plan and multilingual program design, and provide coaching and support that reflects the linguistic contexts in which educators teach.

6. Build Reporting Into the Plan

LEAs receiving funds are responsible for reporting to CDE by September 1, 2029. Districts should create a process for documenting:

- → which educators completed the literacy professional development
- → the number of teachers and staff receiving professional development
- → which professional development program(s) were used at the LEA and school-site levels

Multilingual learner equity consideration: How well did the professional development support teachers to differentiate instruction based upon language of instruction and the English proficiency levels of the students?

7. Prioritize Continuous Improvement

CDE recommends that LEAs treat implementation as an ongoing improvement process rather than a one-time training event. This recommendation is in line with principle three of the California English Learner Roadmap, which addresses system conditions that support effectiveness. Suggested practices include:

- → gathering quantitative and qualitative student and educator data
- → continuing to engage the literacy team in monitoring implementation
- → working with providers, where applicable, to improve the program
- → updating LEA administration, governing boards, and the broader community as appropriate
- → planning for sustainability
- → aligning literacy professional development with other district initiatives
- → measuring local impact
- → providing structured opportunities for data analysis and educator reflection

Multilingual learner equity consideration: Continuous improvement should include evidence about both literacy and language development, and should examine whether implementation is producing equitable access to comprehensive, grade-level literacy instruction across English-medium, bilingual, dual language, newcomer, and other instructional settings.

For a one-page summary that decisionmakers can use in selecting or developing professional development, please see the Appendix. This tool also includes a decisionmaking check list to ensure leaders can best evaluate key considerations for their local contexts.

District Review and Gap-Analysis Rubric

District teams can use the following rubric to review programs, identify strengths, and determine where additional support may be needed.

For programs on the SBE-approved list, begin by reviewing the CDE program memo. The CDE ratings should inform but not replace the LEA's local review. District teams should consider the evidence identified by CDE alongside the program's actual content, local student and educator needs, existing district systems, and the additional multilingual learner considerations included in this resource.

Suggested Rating Scale

3 - Strong Evidence: The program clearly and consistently addresses this area, provides classroom examples, and supports implementation.

2 - Some Evidence: The program addresses this area, but unevenly or without sufficient depth, examples, or implementation support.

1 - Limited Evidence: The program briefly mentions this area, but does not meaningfully prepare educators to implement it.

0 - Not Evident: The program does not appear to address this area.

District Follow-Up Needed

Use the designated space to identify what the district may need to add, clarify, supplement, or monitor.

1 Comprehensive Literacy Alignment to the ELA/ELD Framework

What to look for: The program supports implementation of comprehensive literacy aligned with the full vision of the ELA/ELD Framework, including the integration of foundational skills, meaning making, language development, effective expression, and content knowledge. It attends substantively to oral language development, vocabulary, background knowledge, comprehension, and writing.

Guiding questions

- → Does the program show what ELA/ELD Framework alignment looks like in classroom practice, not just in standards charts?
- → Does it demonstrate how the five themes are interrelated?
- → Does it treat foundational skills as one essential part of comprehensive literacy, and integrate them with oral language, vocabulary, background knowledge, comprehension, writing, meaning making, and content knowledge?
- → Does it substantively address oral language development, vocabulary, background knowledge, comprehension, and writing throughout the professional learning experience?
- → Does it connect literacy instruction to science, history, social science, mathematics, the arts, and other content areas?
- → Does it include read-alouds, student discussion, writing, whole books, and meaningful engagement with texts?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed:

2 Integrated ELD Throughout Literacy and Content Instruction

What to look for: The program helps educators understand and implement Integrated ELD as part of core literacy and content instruction throughout the day.

Guiding questions

- → Does the program clearly define Integrated ELD?
- → Does it show teachers how to use the California ELD Standards in tandem with ELA/literacy and content standards?
- → Does it provide examples of Integrated ELD during reading, writing, speaking, listening, vocabulary, comprehension, and foundational skills instruction?
- → Does it help teachers identify the language demands of lessons, texts, tasks, and discussions?
- → Does it support scaffolding by English proficiency level while maintaining access to grade-level learning?
- → Does it avoid treating English learners as a separate group who need remediation before participating in rich literacy instruction?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed

3 Designated ELD Connected to Core Instruction

What to look for: The program clearly defines Designated ELD, and helps educators understand how it builds into and from core literacy and content instruction.

Guiding questions:

- → Does the program distinguish Designated ELD from Integrated ELD?
- → Does it show how Designated ELD connects to ELA/literacy and content instruction?
- → Does it include examples at Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging proficiency levels?
- → Does it address language functions, text structures, vocabulary, syntax, discourse, and metalinguistic awareness?
- → Does it avoid reducing Designated ELD to grammar drills, vocabulary lists, worksheets, or generic intervention time?
- → Does it help administrators schedule, monitor, and support Designated ELD?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed:

4 Differentiation Across English Proficiency Levels

What to look for: The program prepares educators to differentiate instruction for multilingual learners while maintaining rigor and access to grade-level content.

Guiding questions

- → Does the program help teachers understand Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging proficiency levels?
- → Does it provide differentiated strategies for students at different English proficiency levels?
- → Does it address the needs of at-risk of becoming LTELs, dual language learners, and students with interrupted formal education?
- → Does it provide examples of scaffolds that support access without lowering expectations?
- → Does it help educators use formative assessment of both literacy and language development?
- → Does it support teachers in adjusting instruction based on language and literacy data?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed:

5 Home Languages and Cultural Knowledge as Assets

What to look for: The program positions students' home languages, cultural knowledge, family experiences, and community literacies as resources for literacy and language development.

Guiding questions

- → Does the program explicitly position multilingualism and biliteracy as assets?
- → Does it provide strategies for leveraging students' home languages to support comprehension, vocabulary, oral language, writing, and content learning?
- → Does it address cross-linguistic transfer, cognates, contrastive analysis, and multilingual language resources?
- → Does it address the role of home language literacy in English literacy development?
- → Does it include culturally and linguistically relevant texts and examples?
- → Does it help teachers avoid deficit-based assumptions about students, families, languages, or communities?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed:

6 Foundational Skills Instruction Responsive to Multilingual Learners

What to look for: The program supports explicit, systematic foundational skills instruction while also addressing the linguistic backgrounds and literacy experiences of multilingual learners.

Guiding questions

- → Does the program address foundational skills for multilingual learners specifically, in English and, where applicable, the home or partner language?
- → Does it help teachers understand how students' home languages may influence English decoding, spelling, pronunciation, morphology, and fluency?
- → Does it help teachers understand that students who are literate in one language may only need foundational skills instruction on letter sound correspondence that is different from their home language?
- → Does it include cross-linguistic examples, especially for students whose home language is Spanish or another alphabetic language?
- → Does it address students who are literate in another language as well as students developing initial literacy?
- → Does it integrate foundational skills with oral language, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, meaning making, and content knowledge?
- → Does it help educators avoid over-identifying multilingual learners as struggling readers when the issue may be English language development or limited opportunity to learn?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed:

7 Implementation of Comprehensive Literacy and ELD

What to look for: The program goes beyond awareness, and helps educators implement comprehensive literacy and language instruction in classrooms over time, including the five ELA/ELD Framework themes and comprehensive ELD for multilingual learners.

Guiding questions

- → Does the program include coaching, lesson study, professional learning communities, or other implementation supports?
- → Does it provide tools for observing and strengthening Integrated and Designated ELD?
- → Does it help administrators understand what high-quality literacy and ELD instruction should look like?
- → Does it include classroom-based assignments or cycles of practice?
- → Does it help educators examine student work and language samples in English, the home language, or both?
- → Does it provide guidance for implementation across English-medium, dual language, bilingual, heritage language, and newcomer settings?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed:

8 Multilingual and Biliteracy Program Models

What to look for: The program addresses literacy development across languages, and supports multilingual and biliteracy program models.

Guiding questions

- → Does the program address dual language, bilingual, heritage language, and newcomer settings?
- → Does it help educators understand how literacy develops across languages, not only in English?
- → Does it include strategies for biliteracy instruction, cross-linguistic transfer, contrastive analysis, and metalinguistic awareness?
- → Does it address how foundational skills instruction differs across languages, including the structure of the language being taught?
- → Does it support intentional bridges between English and the partner language?
- → Does it distinguish between English literacy instruction, partner-language literacy instruction, Integrated ELD, and Designated ELD?
- → Does it support the goals of dual language education, including bilingualism, biliteracy, academic achievement, and sociocultural competence?
- → Does it avoid treating bilingual education as simply English literacy instruction translated into another language?

Rating: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3

District follow-up needed:

Using the Rubric for District Decisionmaking

After reviewing a program, district teams should discuss the following questions:

1. How do our findings compare with the strengths and areas for further examination identified in the CDE program memo?
2. Where is there strong evidence?
3. Where is the evidence limited or missing?
4. Which gaps can be addressed through district systems, coaching, supplemental professional learning, materials, or existing expertise?
5. Which gaps are significant enough to affect whether the program should be selected?
6. What additional supports will teachers, coaches, site leaders, and district leaders need?
7. How will the district monitor whether the professional development improves instruction for multilingual learners?

Districts should not assume that one professional development program will meet every need. Instead, the selection process should help leaders determine how a program fits into the district's larger literacy, ELD, biliteracy, curriculum, and instructional improvement systems.



Conclusion

California's investment in literacy professional development creates an important opportunity to strengthen instruction for all students. For multilingual learners, program selection requires careful consideration of both literacy and language development. The selection process also presents an opportunity for districts to ensure they are on the right track in implementing the California English Learner Roadmap.

Inclusion on an approved list should be a starting point for local review, not the end of the decisionmaking process. Districts should examine whether a program, together with existing district resources and supplemental supports, prepares educators to provide comprehensive, integrated, assets-based literacy and language instruction.

Strong professional learning should prepare educators to teach foundational skills explicitly and systematically while simultaneously developing oral language, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, meaning making, and content knowledge. It should build educators' capacity to provide Integrated and Designated ELD, differentiate across English proficiency levels, leverage students' home languages and cultural knowledge, and support biliteracy and cross-linguistic development where applicable.

A district's goal is to make an informed decision. Understand what a program does well, identify what is missing, and ensure that the district has a plan for providing the comprehensive professional learning educators need to implement the ELA/ELD Framework and serve multilingual learners well.



Appendix

Summary for District Decisionmakers

As districts select or develop literacy professional development, they should examine whether the approach supports implementation of a comprehensive literacy program aligned with the full vision of California's ELA/ELD Framework, and prepares educators to meet the needs of multilingual learners and English learners.

Implement comprehensive literacy aligned with the ELA/ELD Framework. Address and integrate the five interrelated themes of Foundational Skills, Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge.

Integrate literacy and language development. Prepare educators to implement comprehensive ELD, including Integrated ELD throughout the instructional day and Designated ELD during protected instructional time.

Respond to different levels and profiles of multilingual learners. Prepare educators to differentiate instruction while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level learning for students at Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging levels, including newcomers and at-risk of long-term English learners and long-term English learners.

Build upon linguistic and cultural assets. Prepare educators to leverage home languages, cultural knowledge, family experiences, and students' full linguistic repertoires as resources for learning.

Address biliteracy and cross-linguistic transfer. Help educators understand how literacy knowledge develops across languages and how to intentionally build bridges between them.

Attend to the full range of literacy development. Support explicit and systematic foundational skills instruction together with oral language development, vocabulary, background knowledge, comprehension, and writing, while helping educators understand how students' linguistic backgrounds and prior literacy experiences influence literacy development.

Address multiple instructional settings. Include meaningful preparation for English-medium, bilingual, dual language, heritage language, and newcomer settings.

Support implementation. Provide opportunities for classroom application, coaching, collaborative learning, analysis of student work and language, and leadership support.

Quick Decision-Making Checklist

☐ **CDE program memo and criterion-level evidence ratings reviewed**

Consideration	Strong	Some	Limited/ None
Comprehensive literacy aligned with all five ELA/ELD Framework themes	☐	☐	☐
Oral language development	☐	☐	☐
Vocabulary development	☐	☐	☐
Background and content knowledge	☐	☐	☐
Comprehension and meaning making	☐	☐	☐
Writing and effective expression	☐	☐	☐
Explicit and systematic foundational skills within comprehensive literacy	☐	☐	☐
Evidence-based instruction for multilingual learners/English learners	☐	☐	☐
Integrated ELD	☐	☐	☐
Designated ELD	☐	☐	☐
Differentiation by English proficiency	☐	☐	☐
Newcomer students, at-risk of LTEL and LTELs	☐	☐	☐
Home languages and cultural knowledge as assets	☐	☐	☐
Cross-linguistic transfer and biliteracy	☐	☐	☐
Dual language/bilingual settings	☐	☐	☐
Coaching, classroom application, and implementation support	☐	☐	☐
Leadership support and continuous improvement	☐	☐	☐
Evidence of effectiveness with multilingual learners	☐	☐	☐

The purpose is not necessarily to find one program that does everything. The purpose is to understand what a program provides, identify what may be missing, and determine how the district will address significant gaps.

References

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., & Slavick, J. (2021). *Teaching (Bi)Multilingual Learners: Connecting Languages*. The Reading Teacher, 75(3), 363-371.

Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., & Escamilla, K. (2016). *Complementing the Common Core with Holistic Biliteracy*. Journal of Education, 196(2), 89-98.

Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2014). *Struggling Reader or Emerging Biliterate Student? Reevaluating the Criteria for Labeling Emerging Bilingual Students as Low Achieving*. Journal of Literacy Research, 46(1), 68-89.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*.

Cummins, J. (1979, 1981, 2000). *Work on linguistic interdependence and common underlying proficiency*.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*.

Primary source: California Department of Education, *Literacy Professional Development Programs and the SBE-approved Criteria and Guidance for the Selection or Development of Literacy Professional Development Programs*.

Californians Together is a coalition championing the academic success and wellbeing of California's multilingual learners. Working at the intersection of research, advocacy, practice, and policy, we dismantle historic inequities and build an education system where linguistic and cultural diversity is recognized as a strength.



CALIFORNIANS
TOGETHER
CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS
OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

caltog.org