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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

KEY FINDINGS

The mixed method analysis revealed four major findings:

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATE RECOMMENDATIONS

Improve Alignment Between System of Support and Other State Policies

• Embed the California English Learner Roadmap policy into all levels of the System of Support process.

• Improve the System of Support by clarifying alignment and coordination between the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), Geographic Leads, Content Leads, County Offices of Education (COEs), and LEAs.

• Strengthen coordination among EL technical assistance providers and develop a robust system and processes for them to provide greater attention to and more consistent support for integrated Differentiated Assistance (DA) support for LEAs.

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

• Discontinue the use of the aggregate EL student group and instead report current ELs and Reclassified Fluent English Proficient Students (RFEPs) in the Academic Indicator and other Priority Areas.

• Incorporate disaggregated EL data (current ELs and RFEPs) to inform eligibility criteria for targeted support (Differentiated Assistance or Intensive Intervention).

• Reexamine the English Learner Performance Indicator (ELPI) status rate cut score thresholds for LEAs to establish more aspirational annual growth targets on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) results.

Support and Expand High-Quality Comprehensive English Language Development

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

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

• Revise the LCAP template to require districts to identify differentiated growth targets for student groups when setting goals to determine metrics to close gaps for student groups.

• Augment the LCAP Approval Manual to include a sharper focus on ELs and to support capacity-building within county offices of education to address the needs of ELs.

• Require that LEAs adopt a locally-designed English Learner Master Plan that complements the LCAP.
COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
RECOMMENDATIONS

Ensure LCAP Reviews Include EL Expertise

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

Strengthen LCAP Monitoring and Supports

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

Support District Implementation of
EL Roadmap Policy

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

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

Ensure LCAP Alignment with EL Roadmap Policy and EL Research

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

Set Differentiated Goals and Actions for the Different EL Profiles

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

Design and Implement Professional Development Focused on Meeting Diverse EL Needs

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

In the continued search for excellence and equity, we hope that this report sparks a renewed effort to ensure that LCFF and the accountability system deliver on its promise as envisioned by then-Governor Jerry Brown, who signed the LCFF legislation. Federal and state investments hold promise for “a restorative restart”$ for ELs and their communities, but only with a “sharpened focus” on this diverse student group.
California embraced equity as a pillar of education finance policy in 2013 through the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), where districts receive additional funding to support students identified as Foster Youth, English Learners (ELs), and Low-Income students. The LCFF mandates that district educators collaborate with educational partners (families, students, and community members) in deciding goals, strategies, and funding allocation for student programs documented in the LCAP.

California public schools serve over one million English Learners, approximately 18% of the total student population. Prior to the adoption of LCFF, funding for English Learner programs was designated by the Economic Impact Aid (EIA) program. EIA provided supplemental funds that were earmarked to support K-12 English Learner programs. In comparison, LCFF provides supplemental funds for ELs that are included in a general pool of money with no guidance or set minimums for EL program allocation at the district or school levels. The LCAP serves as the accountability tool to determine how funding is allocated to serve English Learners.

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

However, there were bright spots in the LCAPs reviewed, and we have uplifted them as examples of what is possible and what should be incorporated in technical assistance to move our districts forward. This report presents background information, details reviews and analytic processes, and shares four major findings from our mixed methods analysis. We conclude with state, county, and local level recommendations in a resolute call to action in search of equity for ELs.
THE LCAP AND COVID-19

The LCAP is a three-year plan with annual updates to goals and actions, as determined by district leaders and educational partners. The COVID-19 pandemic impacted Californians beginning in March 2020 amidst district planning for the subsequent three-year LCAP cycle. To support districts during the pandemic, Senate Bill 98^2 established that the 2020-21 LCAP would not be required, and instead, a one-year Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) would be submitted. The LCP required that districts detail funding and numerous strategies used to support student learning during the statewide social distancing mandates.^6 Figure 1 provides a timeline of the required plans used to document funding allocation, educational programs, and goals at the district level.

FIGURE 1. Timeline of Required Plans 2019 to 2022

LCAP (2019-20) Annual Update
June 30, 2020 Written Operations Report
Summer 2020 District Reopening Plans
Sept 30, 2020 Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan (2020-21)
COVID-19 Impacts CA Districts March 2020
SB 98 - Suspension of the 2020 LCAP Annual Update & School Dashboard Results
2020-21 School Year Begins via Distance Learning
LCAP (2021-22 through 2023-24)
ENGLISH LEARNERS AND LCFF/LCAP RESEARCH: A BRIEF RETROSPECTIVE

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

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

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

Subsequent advocacy and policy changes resulted in the passage of AB 1840 that addressed the need for more transparency and education partner (stakeholder) engagement with special attention to the alignment of programs and services for unduplicated student groups. Accordingly, the modified 2021-2024 LCAP Template offers LEAs the opportunity to uplift and align Dashboard indicators and metrics, assessment results, and LCAP processes to:

1. Reduce length and redundancy
2. Increase transparency, including actions to improve services to English Learners
3. Aim for more strategic planning.
The new LCAP template was also intended to allow districts to narrate and visualize their goals and plans in a more streamlined and intentional manner (see Figure 2).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Summary (2021-22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflections: Successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflections: Identified Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LCAP Highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comprehensive Support and Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Summary of Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summary of Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of Influence of Stakeholder Feedback on LCAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measuring and Reporting Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goal Analysis [2021-22]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased or Improved Services for Foster Youth, English Learners, and Low-Income Students [2021-22]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Required Descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Tables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

Specifically, we looked for evidence of ways in which ELs are addressed as a priority, heterogeneously diverse student group for each of the five elements required by AB 1840.
In order to answer our question, we engaged in a multi-month-long process of reviewing LCAPs. This section describes our sample, review processes, methods, and findings.

**DISTRICT SAMPLE**

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

**FIGURE 3. 2021-24 LCAP Review—Districts by Location and CCEE Geographic Lead Agency (n=26)**
DISAGGREGATED ENGLISH LEARNER STUDENT GROUP DATA

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

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

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

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

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

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

**REVIEW AND RATING PROCESS**

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

**FIGURE 5: LCAP Rating Process**
We conducted calibration sessions to ensure familiarity with our English Learner Research-Aligned LCAP Rubrics (2020)\(^2\) that were used to examine evidence in the selected LCAPs. The four-point rating scale for each rubric ranged from Exemplary to No Evidence (Appendix C). To ensure consistent ratings of the LCAPs across all districts, we used a sample district LCAP and the rubrics for each LCAP reviewer to practice rating and to establish inter-rater reliability. Subsequently, the reviewers were partnered to form 23 teams who first independently read and rated their assigned LCAP and then paired up to discuss ratings and agree upon a consensus rating for each of the six Focus Area Rubrics. Table 1 provides an overview of the six rubrics and their alignments to the eight state priorities, and the 2017 California English Learner Roadmap policy (ELR).\(^2\) Reviewers also documented key evidence for the assigned rubric ratings using excerpts from the district LCAP narratives.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Focus Areas</th>
<th>STATE PRIORITIES</th>
<th>Program and Course Access (Rubric 2)</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes for English Learners (Rubric 3)</th>
<th>English Language Development (Rubric 4)</th>
<th>Professional Development (Rubric 5)</th>
<th>Family Engagement (Rubric 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUBRIC CATEGORIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2, 4, 7, 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2, 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>4, 5, 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2, 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Principle 2: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Responsiveness to EL Profiles**
- **Assessments to Inform Placement and Services**
- **Program Options**
- **Targeted Use of Supplemental and Concentration Funds**

- **Preschool**
- **Access to Rigorous Core Content**
- **LTEL Courses**
- **Enrichment and/or Extracurricular Opportunities**
- **Extended Learning**

- **L1/L2 Data Reporting**
- **GAP Reduction**
- **Transcript Evaluation**
- **Increase in Seal of Biliteracy, Pathway Awards**

- **Designated & Integrated ELD Program**
- **Knowledge of ELD Standards**
- **ELD Standards Implementation**
- **ELD Standards Professional Development**

- **PD Stakeholder Input**
- **CA English Learner Roadmap**
- **PD Content**
- **Comprehensive PD Program for Teachers of ELs**
- **PD Cultural Proficiency/Competency**

- **Stakeholder Input**
- **Communication**
- **Staffing to Support Family Engagement**
- **Decision-Making Processes**
- **Leadership Development**
- **Family Professional Learning**
A research team at Loyola Marymount University’s CEEL collected and recorded the reviewer teams’ consensus ratings and evidence for the six individual rubrics for each of the 26 district LCAPs. We conducted a mixed methods analysis using quantitative and qualitative data. Figure 6 illustrates the mixed method analysis processes.

**FIGURE 6. Mixed-Methods Data Analysis Phases**

**PHASE 1**
Quantitative Analysis
- Recorded district rater consensus scores for all LEA LCAPs.
- Calculated the distribution of ratings and percentages for individual EL Research-aligned LCAP Focus Areas.

**PHASE 2A**
Qualitative Analysis
- Compiled reviewers’ LCAP Focus Area evidence from district LCAP narratives (n=26).
- Conducted an initial theme analysis to identify bright spots for districts that scored Good or Exemplary (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

**PHASE 2B**
Qualitative Analysis
- Established confirmability and dependability of LCAP Focus Area theme analysis (Korstjens & Moser, 2018) by cross-checking Priority Focus Areas for Good and Exemplary for additional bright spots and explicitly stated evidence of equity.
- Created qualitative memos for each Focus Area.

**PHASE 3**
Triangulation
- Used memos as a basis for conducting cross-case theme analysis.
- Triangulated data (demographics, quantitative ratings and qualitative analysis of districts’ reflections).
- Finalized trends and patterns across districts.

We now return to the central question for this review:

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

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

**FIGURE 7. Intersections of AB 1840 Requirements and EL Research-Aligned LCAP Rubric Focus Areas**
Educational equity is when each and every student is provided the academic, social, emotional, cultural, linguistic, and other opportunities, resources, and supports that they specifically need, when they need them, to experience belonging in school, achieve academic success, and attain self-actualization. California’s commitment to equity and social justice is illustrated in its policies, standards, frameworks, and resources…

— California Department of Education, 2020

FRAMING EQUITY

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

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

GOAL: All English Learners will be provided integrated and designated English Learner support, guaranteeing access to the core curriculum, and ensuring successful reclassification by the end of the elementary school experience and/or five years of U.S. instruction, thereby decreasing the number of Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) as measured by state and district level assessments. - District I (Town: Remote, 58% ELs)
GOAL: By May 2023, refine Designated and Integrated ELD as defined in the ELA/ELD Framework pages 891-892 to support English Learners’ development and use of academic vocabulary in speaking and writing in order to engage with complex language and text. We measure success through classroom observations utilizing a district developed classroom observation tool for Designated English Language Development and the Thoughtful Classroom Framework Episodes 5 and 7 for Integrated English Language Development.
- District B (Town: Fringe, 66.7% ELs)

FIGURE 8. EL-specific Goals and Equity Statements

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

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

1 FINDING ONE

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

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

Evidence of Language Acquisition Programs for ELs

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

FIGURE 9: EL Actions and Services Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)
Half of the districts in our sample (n=13) described general approaches to designing differentiated Actions and Services, often not going beyond basic access to materials and curriculum, as noted in this example, “EL Programs will be implemented in both integrated and designated learning models using Benchmark curriculum, which includes EL curricular materials,” (District F, Rural: Fringe, 42.5% ELs).

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

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

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

**Bright Spots**

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

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

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

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

- Develop focused, targeted supports for probable Long-Term ELs (PLTELs) to reduce the number and percentage of Long-Term ELs (LTEls) in secondary schools. Because PLTELs struggle in reading, writing, academic vocabulary— and are at-risk of not meeting the reclassification criteria within 5 years of formal English instruction— their supports will consist of the following: Provide targeted language development, literacy development, and instructional programs and services that address their specific academic linguistic and academic needs...
  - District K (City: Large, 20.3% ELs)

- [Training will be provided to]... counselors and/or site reps that [enables] them to inform ELs of UC/CSU requirements in order for the students to take such courses. Establish Long Term ELs goal settings into counselor’s check-in protocol with EL students. Report on how many ELs graduate UC/CSU eligible or not.
  - District Z (Suburb: Large, 31.6% ELs)

- Examine areas of academic underperformance, benchmarks assessments, and options for interventions and academic support to ensure Multilingual learners, including LTEls and students at risk of becoming LTEls make progress.
  - District S (City: Large, 21.1% ELs)

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

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

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

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

Evidence of EL Gap Reduction

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

FIGURE 11: Desired Outcomes for ELs Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)
A deeper analysis of the districts’ approaches revealed that while most districts readily identified EL performance gaps, the majority (69% or N=18) signaled the same growth targets for academic and other performance measures, such as high school graduation rate, local priority measures (e.g., Lexile levels, social-emotional learning survey), or pupil engagement (e.g., school attendance, chronic absenteeism). For example, to measure outcomes for a goal related to safe schools and involvement opportunities for “all students, including the district student groups and parents,” District L (Rural: Fringe, 58.7% ELs) stipulated:

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

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

Overall patterns also indicate that there were limited plans for primary language assessment and reporting for ELs not in dual language programs. Plus, few districts identified metrics for Biliteracy Pathway awards or the State Seal of Biliteracy for ELs.
A few other bright spots were culled from districts (31% or N=8) that identified differentiated growth targets. These provided examples of how to address gap reduction for ELs and identify EL-specific outcomes (see chart below).

**SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS**

**GAP REDUCTION AND DIFFERENTIATED OUTCOMES FOR ELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Desired Outcome for 2023-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATION RATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students who received a high school diploma within four or five years of entering 9th grade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: California School Dashboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Results do not include charter schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Desired Outcome for 2023-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2K GATE Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students in grades 2-12 identified for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program relative to overall grade 2-12 student population by student group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Advanced Learning Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evidence of Integrated Professional Learning and Comprehensive English Language Development

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

FIGURE 12: English Language Development Rubric Ratings Distribution (N=26)
Indeed, many of the districts in our study provide broad, generalized descriptions of the **WHAT** (implementation of the ELD standards or content standards), with limited or no information on the **HOW** (programmatic, curricular, or staffing supports). For example:

- District E (Rural:Fringe, with 41.1% ELs enrolled) indicated, “[we]… will continue to provide support to English Learners to improve the implementation of ELD standards,” and

- District P (City: Midsize, 51.7% ELs) indicated, “Our program is designed to ensure English acquisition as rapidly and as effectively as possible, and provides instruction to students on the state-adopted academic content standards, including the English language development standards.”

**Evidence of Professional Development for Educators of English Learners**

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

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

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

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

---

**BRIGHT SPOTS**

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

**SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS**

**INTEGRATED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING WITH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS OF ELS**

- Explicit systems and resources to reinforce the principles of the California English Learner Roadmap, designated and integrated English language development (ELD), ELD standards, and the variety of English Learner profiles. – District K (City, Large, 20.3% ELs)

- Sustained efforts of personnel to lead critical and collaborative effort with the work of Integrated and Designated ELD as well as differentiated instruction for ...Integrated and Designated ELD. – District T (City, Large, 28.1% ELs)

- Subject-expert staff leaders assist with professional learning, understanding new curriculum, and support teachers in the classroom adopted math curriculum and training on the implementation of ELD and state standards through the curriculum will effectively meet the needs of unduplicated students… – District P (City, Midsize, 51.7% ELs)

- 100% of the professional development provided by the Education Services Division will provide strategies to support [educators] in:
  - Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiation
  - Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
  - Language Development/Emergent Bilingual Support
  - Parent Engagement – District A (City, Large; 53.4% ELs)
These examples have the potential to shift professional development programs and practices. Research has found that ELs do not have equitable access to rigorous core content as schools have struggled to identify and support diverse EL students. Even before the pandemic, schools did not have the capacity to support ELs who experienced trauma—and teachers, leaders, and policymakers have called out for more support. This finding underscores the significance of locally defined and developed comprehensive professional learning for EL educators.
Conventional approaches to family engagement that reduce opportunities for “co-powerment” to lead and monitor LCAP development and implementation.

Family engagement as a core requirement of LCFF and the LCAPs is informed by the research literature on the importance of family engagement relative to student success.34

Evidence of Stakeholder-Family Engagement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

SAMPLE BRIGHT SPOTS FOR GOOD OR EXEMPLARY RATINGS

**CO-POWERMNT OF FAMIILES TO LEAD AND MONITOR LCAP DEVELOPMENT**

- The [district] Parent Leadership team was formed in the 2017-2018 school year as a part of the effort to engage parents as partners and expand leadership development among parents in our district. This group of parent leaders from a variety of school sites have participated in expanded training, stakeholder and advisory committees, volunteering, facilitated training for other parents, and contributed to the development of new parent engagement efforts, including surveys and expanded outreach. - District X (City: Midsize, 49% ELs)

- In addition to regular participation in committees and councils, the district has also spent a great deal of effort in providing parents with training such as Project 2-Inspire. This opportunity has empowered parents and created strong leaders who now work collaboratively with district and school staff. This has also created a great space for open and honest communication between families and the school district. - District N (City: Midsize, 49.8% ELs)

- Parent Engagement Action includes Empowered Parents & Families Academies, a series of three courses to educate family ambassadors about parent rights and responsibilities, leadership, and advocacy, to be hosted through the Communities of Schools:

  Student Empowerment team…the District’s LCAP team also convened a series of student focus groups to elevate the voices, perspectives, and needs of students in our future planning: English Learner Student Focus Group (January 26, 2021; March 2, 2021; April 27, 2021) - District K (City: Large, 20.3%) ELs)
California’s accountability system has the components needed to achieve its promise to English Learners. To ensure equity for English Learners, however, the entire system must function in concert. Each level of the educational system must sharpen the focus on the diverse needs of English Learners. A series of recommendations for the state, county office of education, and district levels follow.

**STATE RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

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

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

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

Ensure LCAP Reviews Include EL Expertise

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

Strengthen LCAP Monitoring and Supports

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

Support District Implementation of EL Roadmap Policy

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

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

Ensure LCAP Alignment with EL Roadmap Policy and EL Research

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

Set Differentiated Goals and Actions for the Different EL Profiles

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

Design and Implement Professional Development Focused on Meeting Diverse EL Needs

- Provide professional development on the English Learner Roadmap for all educators to build understanding and expertise about the needs of ELs and research-based programs and practices.
- Ensure that professional development is comprehensive, coherent, and incorporates integrated and designated ELD as differentiated from generic standards-based instruction.
LIKE A NEEDLE IN A HAYSTACK: The Ongoing Search for Equity for English Learners

This report includes most of the recurring recommendations we have made in the previous LCAP analyses of 2015, 2017, and 2018. Nine years into LCFF and seven years of LCAP implementation continue to represent the most significant school finance, accountability, and instructional reform in our state’s history that seeks to redress decades of systemic injustices and foster local decision-making and autonomy. While on this path, existing inequities were further exacerbated by the devastating and continuing effects of the pandemic. The pivot to distance learning challenged the education system in ways unimagined, and while so many of our families, students, and educators demonstrated resiliency, innovation, and resolve during this time, recovery is still underway. Additional federal and state investments should be leveraged to support recovery, reimagine education, and fully realize “a restorative restart” for ELs and their communities. AB 1840 provided a new opportunity to improve the LCAP process and product through a redesigned template that encourages LEAs to be more concise, direct, and transparent in describing their successes and ongoing improvement efforts. Yet our review and analysis process that sought to locate evidence regarding LEAs descriptions of language acquisition programs, professional development for educators of ELs, response to stakeholder feedback, and specific EL metrics to measure closing of gaps was akin to searching for “a needle in a haystack.” Multiple and iterative examinations of the 26 district LCAPs lead us to conclude that the promise of improved or increased services and programs—suggesting higher levels of academic achievement and success for English Learners, low-income students, and foster youth—continues to be a promise that is yet to be fully realized. As we enter the 10th year of California’s landmark education funding formula and local accountability reform, we have yet another opportunity to implement the longstanding recommendations included in this report.
### APPENDIX A: SAMPLE DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS (2020-21)

#### DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

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

**KEY:**

HN = (High Number) Districts with an EL population greater than 999  
HP = (High Percentage) Districts with an EL population greater than 40%  

---
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Kings County Office of Education
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Veronica Torres McLane  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Katie Riggs  
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Elvira G. Armas  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Charice Guerra  
SEAL (Sobrato Early Academic Language)

Catalina Rupert  
English Learner Leadership & Legacy Initiative Advocate

Marine Avagyan  
Glendale Unified School District

Carla Gutierrez  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Araceli Sandoval  
ASG Strategy Consulting Inc.

Renae Bryant  
Anaheim Union High School District

Holly Harding  
Butte County Office of Education

Corina Sapien  
SEAL (Sobrato Early Academic Language)

Manuel Buenrostro  
Californians Together

Martha Hernandez  
Californians Together

Day Son  
Advancement Project

Alma Castro  
California Association for Bilingual Education

Sylvia J. Hodge  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Shelly Spiegel-Coleman  
Californians Together

Lucero Chavez  
Parent Institute for Quality Education

Izela Jacobo  
San Diego County Office of Education

Lilia Torres-Cooper  
English Learner Leadership & Legacy Initiative

Patricia Chavez  
Parent Institute for Quality Education

Linda Kaminski  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Marcia Turner  
Retired Educator

Kenneth Cole  
Advancement Project

Claudia Lara  
Promesa Boyle Heights

Nati Rozsa  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Karen Costa  
Kings County Office of Education

Magaly Lavadenz  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Shilpa Ram  
Public Advocates

Xilonin Cruz-Gonzalez  
Californians Together

Claudia Lockwood  
California Association for Bilingual Education

Angela Randolph  
Desert Sands Unified School District

Laura Diaz  
California Association for Bilingual Education

Martha Martinez  
SEAL (Sobrato Early Academic Language)

Veronica Rauschenberger  
Rio School District

Rafael Escamilla  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Eduardo Muñoz-Muñoz  
San José State University

José Posada  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Rafael Escamilla  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Veronica Torres McLane  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Sandy Mendoza  
Families In Schools

Laura N. DuPre  
Fallbrook Union Elementary School District

Eduardo Muñoz-Muñoz  
San José State University

Gisela O’Brien  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Berenice Onofre  
Nacional Latino-PEMA

Sylvia J. Hodge  
Center for Equity for English Learners

Elizabeth Orozco  
California Association for Bilingual Education

Izela Jacobo  
San Diego County Office of Education

Stacy Percell  
Fresno County Office of Education

Claudia Lockwood  
California Association for Bilingual Education

José Posada  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Shilpa Ram  
Public Advocates

Laura Diaz  
California Association for Bilingual Education

Martha Martinez  
SEAL (Sobrato Early Academic Language)
## Focus Area #1 - Actions and Services

### FOCUS AREA RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXEMPLARY</strong></td>
<td>Services, programs, and actions, including interventions, addressing the differentiated language and academic needs of the various profiles of ELs: Newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool - 12th grade.</td>
<td>Services, programs, and actions, including interventions, addressing the linguistic and academic needs of some profiles of ELs: Newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool -12th grade.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOOD</strong></td>
<td>Program placement, and services for ELs are informed by formative (ongoing) and summative (annual) academic and language development results, including L1 assessments when appropriate.</td>
<td>Program placement and services for ELs are informed by annual (summative) academic and language development results.</td>
<td>No mention of language development assessments for placement in program or services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEAK</strong></td>
<td>EL program options (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) for ELs are based upon the needs of ELs, preferences of the parents and community; district resources are aligned.</td>
<td>EL program options (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) for ELs are offered based upon the needs of ELs and district resources to determine program design and placement.</td>
<td>No mention of how EL students are placed in programs (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) and provided services; difficult to distinguish EL programs from those for English-only students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED</strong></td>
<td>Supplemental and concentration funds are identified for ELs, but the targeted use of funds is not described.</td>
<td>Supplemental and concentration funds are not used to improve or increase services for English Learners.</td>
<td>Supplemental and concentration funds are not used to improve or increase services for English Learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools**

**Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access**

**Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness**

---

**Responsive to EL Profiles**

- **Assessments inform Placement & Services**
  - EL program options (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) for ELs are based upon the needs of ELs, preferences of the parents and community; district resources are aligned.

**Program Options**

- Some EL program options (e.g., Dual Immersion, Structured English Immersion, Bilingual, Native-speaker courses, etc.) for ELs are offered based upon the needs of ELs and district resources to determine program design and placement.

**Targeted Use of Supplemental and Concentration Funds**

- 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.

- General description of improved or increased services provided through supplemental and concentration funding AND mention of how they add additional support, opportunities, personnel, resources, etc., to enhance the base program for all ELs.

- Supplemental and concentration funds are identified for ELs, but the targeted use of funds is not described.

- Supplemental and concentration funds are not used to improve or increase services for English Learners.
## Focus Area #2 - Program and Course Access

### FOCUS AREA RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment</th>
<th>Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools</th>
<th>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXEMPLARY</strong></td>
<td>General description of preschool program(s) and some activities for DLLs, including support in both primary language and English.</td>
<td>Limited description of preschool program(s) and activities for DLLs OR no mention of primary language support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOOD</strong></td>
<td>General description of preschool program(s) and activities for DLLs, including the development of both primary language and English.</td>
<td>No mention of the availability of preschool program(s) for DLLs OR no mention of primary language support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEAK</strong></td>
<td>General description of the approach to provide ELs full access to rigorous academic content in all core content areas, TK–12th grade, with no mention of primary language support.</td>
<td>No evidence of programs and activities to increase EL access to rigorous academic content and no mention of primary language support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED</strong></td>
<td>Limited description of the approach to provide ELs full access to rigorous academic content in all core content areas, TK–12th grade, including support in both primary language and English.</td>
<td>No evidence of programs and activities for increased EL participation in enrichment and/or extracurricular opportunities (e.g., sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preschool</strong></td>
<td>Minimal description of programs and activities to promote EL participation in enrichment and/or extracurricular opportunities (e.g., sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).</td>
<td>No evidence of programs and activities for extended learning for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Rigorous Core Content</strong></td>
<td>Minimal description of the approach to provide ELs full access to rigorous academic content in all core content areas, TK–12th grade, including support in both primary language and English.</td>
<td>No evidence of programs and activities for extended learning for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LTEL Courses</strong></td>
<td>Limited description of programs and activities to provide extended learning time not specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.</td>
<td>No evidence of programs and activities for extended learning for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrichment and/or Extracurricular Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Limited description of programs and activities to promote EL participation in enrichment and/or extracurricular opportunities (e.g., sports, clubs, GATE, Visual and Performing Arts).</td>
<td>No evidence of programs and activities for extended learning for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended Learning</strong></td>
<td>General description of programs and activities to provide extended learning time specific to the language and academic needs of ELs.</td>
<td>No evidence of programs and activities for extended learning for ELs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If rubric area does not apply to the district context, do not score.*
Focus Area #3 - Desired Outcomes for English Learner Activities

**FOCUS AREA RATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1/L2 Data Reporting</th>
<th>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</th>
<th>Principle 4: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXEMPLARY</td>
<td>Assessment results in English and the primary language are reported in the LCAP whether or not ELs receive instruction in their home language (L1).</td>
<td>Only assessment results in English are reported in the LCAP for ELs, even though some ELs receive instruction in their home language (L1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>EL Academic growth measures for ELs are included, but have not been compared to EO growth. Few specific academic growth measures (e.g., SBAC, A-G, graduation rate, AP, and EAP passing scores) are disaggregated by ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>Specific Academic growth measures for ELs are not included.</td>
<td>No assessment results for ELs in English or primary language are reported in the LCAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GAP Reduction**

| EXEMPLARY             | transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated so students can be accurately placed in grade level and appropriate courses. | transcripts from non-U.S. schools are not evaluated. |
| GOOD                  | transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated so students can be accurately placed in grade level and appropriate courses. | transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated but are not considered for placement, OR no credit is given for courses from non-U.S. schools. |
| WEAK                  | transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated but are not considered for placement, OR no credit is given for courses from non-U.S. schools. | transcripts from non-U.S. schools are not evaluated. |
| NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED  |                                                          |                                                             |

**Transcript Evaluation** *(high school only)*

| EXEMPLARY             | the numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy and Biliteracy Pathway Awards (if appropriate) increase every year. The numbers of former ELs and EOs are disaggregated in Seal and Pathway award reports. | the numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy or other students receiving Biliteracy Pathway awards (if appropriate) remain the same. |
| GOOD                  | the numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy and Biliteracy Pathway Awards (if appropriate) increase every year. | the numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy or other students receiving Biliteracy Pathway awards (if appropriate) remain the same. |
| WEAK                  | the numbers of students receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy or other students receiving Biliteracy Pathway awards (if appropriate) remain the same. | District does not mention the State Seal of Biliteracy or Biliteracy Pathway Awards. |
| NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED  |                                                          |                                                             |

**Increase in Seal of Biliteracy, Pathway Awards**

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

*If rubric area does not apply to the district context, do not score.*
## Focus Area #4 - English Language Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS AREA RATING</th>
<th>CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment</th>
<th>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</th>
<th>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</th>
<th>NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXEMPLARY</strong></td>
<td>□ Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes explicit goals, evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies/practices for an articulated ELD program and standards-based ELD curricular materials.</td>
<td>□ Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes several goals and evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies for an articulated ELD program and standards-based ELD curricular materials.</td>
<td>□ Focus on implementation of designated or integrated ELD includes minimal goals or minimal evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies and standards-based ELD curricular materials.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOOD</strong></td>
<td>□ Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes explicit goals, evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies/practices for an articulated ELD program and standards-based ELD curricular materials.</td>
<td>□ Focus on the implementation of designated and integrated ELD includes several goals and evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies for an articulated ELD program and standards-based ELD curricular materials.</td>
<td>□ Focus on implementation of designated or integrated ELD includes minimal goals or minimal evidence-based (research, assessment tools, and data results) strategies and standards-based ELD curricular materials.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEAK</strong></td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED</strong></td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
<td>□ No mention of an ELD program or designated ELD instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Designated &amp; Integrated ELD Program</strong></th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE OF ELD STANDARDS</th>
<th>ELD STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>ELD STANDARDS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Priorities are set with explicit goals and activities for ELD standards implementation based on needs assessment and student language proficiency and academic data (assessment tools and data results).</td>
<td>□ ELD Standards are identified with several activities to allow teachers and administrators to understand the standards for implementation in designated ELD.</td>
<td>□ Minimal goals and activities are set for ELD Standards implementation and do not consider student language proficiency or academic data (assessment tools and data results).</td>
<td>□ No professional development of California Core Standards and ELD standards were strategically designed for teachers and administrators of ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Designated &amp; Integrated ELD Program</td>
<td>□ ELD Standards are identified with several activities to allow teachers and administrators to understand the standards for implementation in designated ELD.</td>
<td>□ Minimal goals and activities are set for ELD Standards implementation and do not consider student language proficiency or academic data (assessment tools and data results).</td>
<td>□ Professional development of California Core Standards for teachers with minimal inclusion of ELD standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Designated &amp; Integrated ELD Program</td>
<td>□ ELD Standards are identified with several activities to allow teachers and administrators to understand the standards for implementation in designated ELD.</td>
<td>□ Minimal goals and activities are set for ELD Standards implementation and do not consider student language proficiency or academic data (assessment tools and data results).</td>
<td>□ Professional development of California Core Standards for teachers without inclusion of ELD standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If rubric area does not apply to the district context, do not score.*
## Focus Area #5 – Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS AREA RATING</th>
<th>CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment</th>
<th>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</th>
<th>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXEMPLARY</strong></td>
<td>District gathered input by conducting data-driven needs assessments/meetings with teachers, other educators (e.g., administrators, specialists, etc.), and stakeholders <em>multiple times</em> to identify differentiated teaching and learning needs for EL/DLLs.</td>
<td><em>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</em></td>
<td><em>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOOD</strong></td>
<td>District gathered <em>some input</em> by conducting needs assessments/meetings with teachers and other stakeholders to identify differentiated teaching and learning needs for EL/DLLs.</td>
<td><em>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</em></td>
<td><em>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEAK</strong></td>
<td>District gathered <em>minimal input</em> from teachers or stakeholders to identify differentiated teaching and learning needs for EL/DLLs.</td>
<td><em>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</em></td>
<td><em>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO EVIDENCE INCLUDED</strong></td>
<td>No mention of teacher/stakeholder input or needs assessment for EL/DLL teaching or learning.</td>
<td><em>Principle 2: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access</em></td>
<td><em>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PD Stakeholder Input

- **CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment**
  - District gathered input by conducting data-driven needs assessments/meetings with teachers, other educators (e.g., administrators, specialists, etc.), and stakeholders *multiple times* to identify differentiated teaching and learning needs for EL/DLLs.

### PD Content

- **EL PD activities explicitly identify training for district and site administrators, teachers, instructional support staff, AND counselors, including but not limited to** the implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and social-emotional assets and needs of different EL profiles (e.g., newcomers, Long Term English Learners), literacy and content instruction in L1 and English.

### Comprehensive PD Program for Teachers of ELs

- **Detailed professional development (PD) plan includes short- and long-term goals for ELs teachers and describes many effective PD elements, such as ongoing teacher collaboration, classroom-based application, AND teacher reflection or inquiry cycles.**

### PD Cultural Proficiency/Competency

- **Explicit PD activities for all certificated and classified staff to address key elements of cultural proficiency/competency training, including cross-cultural interactions, cultural differences in communication patterns, role of culture and impact on EL learning and achievement, and culturally responsive instruction and curriculum.**

### Example

- EL PD activities identify some training for district/site administrators, teachers, instructional support staff, OR counselors, such as the implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and social-emotional assets and needs of different EL profiles (e.g., newcomers, Long Term English Learners) literacy or content instruction in L1 and English.

- **Limited activities described for professional development of ELs teachers without any reference to specific professional development goals.**

- **Minimal cultural proficiency/competency training elements are identified in PD for all certificated or classified staff, such as cross-cultural interactions, cultural differences in communication patterns, role of culture and impact on EL learning and achievement, and culturally responsive instruction and curriculum.**

- **No mention of professional development goals or plan for teachers of ELS.**

- **No mention of PD for cultural proficiency or responsiveness.**
Focus Area #6 - Family Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS AREA RATING</th>
<th>Principle 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools</th>
<th>Principle 3: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA English Learner Roadmap Alignment</strong></td>
<td><strong>EXEMPLARY</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOOD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Explicit plans to provide families with LCAP Orientations are focused on the legal requirements of the policy and the role of families.</td>
<td>□ General plans to provide families with an LCAP Orientation are focused on the legal requirements of the policy and the role of families.</td>
<td>□ Limited plans to provide families with an LCAP Orientation are focused on the legal requirements of the policy and the role of families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ General plans for the DELACs and other parent committees to meet regularly to review and monitor the development and implementation of the LCAP.</td>
<td>□ Limited plans for the DELACs or other parent committees to meet regularly to review and monitor the development and implementation of the LCAP.</td>
<td>□ No mention of plans for the DELACs or other parent committees to meet regularly to review and monitor the development and implementation of the LCAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Explicit plans for conducting parent surveys AND focus groups with school leaders to provide input on the development and implementation of the LCAP.</td>
<td>□ Limited plans for conducting parent surveys OR focus groups with school leaders to provide input on the development and implementation of the LCAP.</td>
<td>□ No evidence of plans for conducting parent surveys OR focus groups with school leaders to provide input on the development and implementation of the LCAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Input</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explicit plan</strong> for oral and written translation of official district policies, plans, student progress, and other data (e.g., school climate survey) in <strong>multiple languages</strong>, beyond <strong>minimum legal requirement of 15% of the EL population</strong>, as required by law.</td>
<td>□ General plan for oral and written translation of official district policies, plans, student progress, and other data (e.g., school climate survey) in target languages spoken by at least 15% of the EL population, as required by law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>□ General plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of <strong>qualified bilingual staff</strong> (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).</td>
<td>□ Limited plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of qualified bilingual staff (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing to Support Family Engagement</strong></td>
<td>□ General plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of <strong>qualified bilingual staff</strong> (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).</td>
<td>□ Limited plan for hiring practices to ensure the presence of qualified bilingual staff (e.g., office staff, community representatives, parent liaisons, and other classified or certificated personnel).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Focus Area #6 - Family Engagement (continued)

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


3. Local Control Funding Formula, 2013 (AB 97, SB 91, and SB 97).


16. The revised LCAP template for the 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24 school years reflects statutory changes made through Assembly Bill 1840 (Committee on Budget), Chapter 243, Statutes of 2018. These statutory changes enhance transparency regarding expenditures on actions included in the LCAP, including actions that contribute to meeting the requirement to increase or improve services for foster youth, English Learners, and low-income students, and to streamline the information presented within the LCAP to make adopted LCAPs more accessible for stakeholders and the public. California Education Code [EC]§2064(e)(4).


19. 2019 Dashboard statistics are the most recent state data available for districts to use in the development of their LCAPs. Local district measures vary by district.

20. For the Dashboard Academic Indicator, the English Learner (EL) student group is comprised of two groups: students identified as RFEP in the last four years AND students currently identified as English Learners (ELO in the Dashboard data files).


LCAP 2021-22 template instructions. A well-developed goal can be focused on the performance relative to a metric or metrics for all students, a specific student group(s), narrowing performance gaps, or implementing programs or strategies expected to impact outcomes. LEAs should assess the performance of their student groups when developing goals and the related actions to achieve such goals. See The LCAP and Annual Update Templates and Instructions for the 2021-22 School Year (PPTX, Slide 48) and https://www.cde.ca.gov/fq/aa/lc/tues2archive.asp


LCAP Template Instructions, 2021-22, Goals & actions—measuring and reporting results section. https://www.cde.ca.gov › lcaptemplate2022


https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-lep-parents-201501.pdf


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

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