INTRODUCTION

The California English Learner Roadmap (ELR) was approved in 2017 with the goal of providing guidance on how best to support California’s English Learner (EL) population. The ELR is intended to address the structural deficiencies that have led to EL underachievement (Barton & Coley, 2009; Gándara, 2010; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Haycock, 2001; Lee, 2002; Pew Research Center, 2015). The core concepts in the ELR are increasingly being embraced by TK-12 Local Education Agencies (LEAs). However, institutions of higher education (IHEs) – where the majority of California's future educators are being prepared to serve our students – are considerably further behind in integrating these concepts into educator preparation programs.

The purpose of this brief is to support English Learner success by encouraging stronger alignment between teacher preparation efforts in IHEs and TK-12 policies and practices. Based on our finding that there is currently insufficient alignment between the ELR and IHE educator preparation programs, we put forth actionable policy and practice recommendations – including the use of the California English Learner Roadmap Toolkit for Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) – to ensure educational partners who play a role in educator preparation have the resources needed to encourage greater coherence across sectors in support of English Learners.
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A ROADMAP FOR IMPROVING ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION

The Urgent Need to Better Support English Learners and Their Families

English Learners are one of the most vulnerable student populations in California’s education system due to a number of opportunity gaps that negatively impact outcomes. For example, ELs are less likely to be placed into gifted programs and have limited access to programs that support college and career readiness (Johnson & Cain, 2019, p.1). Numerous studies over the years have identified education practices that have failed to address the strengths and critical needs of the EL student population, ultimately contributing to lower achievement, higher dropout rates, discipline issues, and other less favorable outcomes (Cook, Pérusse & Rojas, 2012; Lee, 2002; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Ochoa & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Schwartz, 2001; Smith, 2005; National Center for Education Statistics, 2017; Warren, 2002). With more than 11 million ELs representing one in five students in California’s TK-12 system alone (California Department of Education, 2023), improving opportunities to learn for ELs requires that all levels of our system focus on this population, beginning with defining and implementing policies to better meet the needs of this group of students and their families.
California’s English Learner Roadmap as the Vehicle for Improving Outcomes

The long-standing concerns outlined above led to the formation of the California English Learner Roadmap: Strengthening Comprehensive Educational Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Learners in 2017 to guide efforts to better support ELs and produce improved outcomes. The four principles outlined in the ELR focus on different aspects of the educational experience impacting the success of ELs, including: making school environments welcoming and being attentive to the assets ELs bring to school (principle 1); ensuring meaningful access to rigorous instruction (principle 2); creating systems to support effectiveness (principle 3); and ensuring alignment within and across systems (principle 4). The ELR acknowledges the important role educators play in meeting EL students’ linguistic, academic, and social needs (Esch et al., 2005; Hakuta, 2011; Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Karathanos, 2009; Madrid, 2011; Moll et al., 1992; Warren, 2002), leading to questions about how well university programs are preparing educators to meet those needs (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002). Indeed, educators across roles deeply impact the quality of educational experience for ELs, as depicted in Figure 1.

Towards Educational Coherence: Aligning Educator Preparation with the English Learner Roadmap

Well-designed and coherent pre-service preparation is required to ensure that beginning educators are adequately prepared to enter the profession ready to support English Learners (Barton & Coley, 2009; Gándara, 2010; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Haycock, 2001; Olsen, 2010; Lee, 2002; Pew Research Center, 2015; Johnson & Sengupta, 2009). Unfortunately, California’s professional preservice programs for teachers, school counselors, and educational administrators/leaders – the focus of this brief – have not sufficiently addressed the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are necessary for their candidates to adequately meet the needs of California’s ELs students once they enter the field (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2004; Clemente & Collison, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Orphanos, 2007; de Jong & Harper, 2005; de Jong & Harper, 2011; de Jong & Naranjo, 2019; Esch et al., 2005; Faubert & Gonzalez, 2008; Irby et al., 2012; Markos, 2012; Menken & Antuñez, 2001; Stepanek et al., 2010; Turkan & Oliveri, 2014; National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). In fact, ELs are more likely than many other student groups to have teachers lacking the preparation needed to teach them (Esch et al., 2005).

While some broad efforts have been made to prepare

---

**Figure 1. Ways that Educators Impact English Learners’ Educational Experiences**

**Teachers**
- Classroom environment/climate and organization for ELs
- Rigorous and relevant EL curriculum, materials, and instruction
- Effective classroom management, social-emotional support, and positive behavioral intervention support
- Communication, collaboration, and engagement with immigrant and EL parents and families

**School Counselors and Other Pupil Services**
- Course scheduling (especially for secondary ELs)
- EL Advisement (college and career)
- Crisis management and social-emotional support
- Work with at-risk students
- Positive behavioral intervention and support

**Administrators**
- Development and functioning of school systems, structures, programs, and communication
- Scheduling, assignment and professional development of EL teachers and other personnel
- EL budgeting and resource allocation
- EL parent, advisory groups, and community relations
- Articulation with school boards, state educational agencies, businesses, and community stakeholders

**Key Areas that Impact Systems**
- Graduation rates
- Truancy and dropout rates
- School to prison pipeline
- College acceptance and entrance
- Community growth and stability
- School, district, and statewide EL student performance P-12

Source: Colón-Muñiz et al., 2022.
candidates to work with ELs through basic theory and fieldwork, the detailed elements embedded in the four ELR principles have effectively been absent from the program standard expectations that hold credentialing programs accountable for quality instruction. For new professionals to be successful with ELs, we must address the serious gaps across credentialing areas – particularly teaching, counseling, and administration/leadership – by strengthening the structure, coursework, and fieldwork of these preparation programs using the framework provided by the ELR.

California’s educator preparation programs must do their best to respond to this call for excellence. Indeed, within and across IHEs, deans, associate deans, program coordinators, faculty, and staff have an opportunity to engage in reflective processes to plan, improve, and redesign teacher preparation programs as needed.

**Identifying the Gaps Between Educator Performance Expectations and the ELR**

We followed a rigorous inquiry process to analyze the degree to which the current educator program expectations for teaching, school counseling, and administration/leadership are aligned to the ELR. Using a form of content analysis known as relational analysis (Elo et al., 2014; Holsti, 1968), we compared the California English Learner Roadmap (ELR) principles and elements to the performance expectations for the three educator areas. The relational analysis approach allowed for both qualitative and quantitative analyses.

We created a matrix (Figure 2) to designate four levels (high, moderate, low, negligible) based on the extent to which the current California performance expectations address each of the four ELR principles. **High (H)** indicates that there is high evidence of alignment (90 - 100%); **Moderate (M)** indicates that there is some evidence of alignment (60% - 89%); **Low (L)** indicates that there is little evidence of alignment (26% - 59%); and **Negligible (N)** indicates there is no or almost no evidence of alignment (25% or less).

**Analysis Process**

**Step 1: Assessing alignment between educator performance expectations and the ELR.**

1. Reviewed program standard performance expectations and their elements
2. Conducted preliminary relational content analysis to compare ELR principles and elements with educator performance expectations
3. Assigned initial ratings based on key word indicators
4. Created the matrices for the three programs

**Step 2: Engaging expert panel to calibrate and validate alignment**

1. Compared the performance expectations to the ELR principles
2. Documented and applied expert panel feedback to validate calibration process
3. Reflected on how a similar process could identify areas of improvement in California’s IHE credential preparation programs

**Alignment Analysis Results by Program**

Tables 1-3 provide the results of the relational analysis of alignment between teacher education, counseling, and administration/leadership program expectations and the ELR.

---

**Figure 2. IHE-ELR Relational Analysis Matrix Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA ENGLISH LEARNER ROADMAP PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>ELR Principle 1 (5 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 2 (7 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 3 (4 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 4 (3 elements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Standard Performance Expectation X</td>
<td>5 = high 3-4 = moderate 2 = low 0-1 = negligible</td>
<td>7 = high 5-6 = moderate 2-4 = low 0-1 = negligible</td>
<td>4 = high 3 = moderate 2 = low 0-1 = negligible</td>
<td>3 = high 2 = moderate 1 = low 0 = negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE)\(^8\) and EL Roadmap Alignment Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELR Principle 1 (5 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 2 (7 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 3 (4 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 4 (3 elements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 5: Assessing Student Learning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Educator</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Colón-Muñiz et al., 2022.
Table 2. School Counseling Performance Expectations (SCPE)⁹ and EL Roadmap Alignment Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCPE</th>
<th>ELR Principle 1 (5 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 2 (7 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 3 (4 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 4 (3 elements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPE</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPE</td>
<td>4:</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPE</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPE</td>
<td>8:</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Colón-Muñiz et al., 2022.
### Table 3. California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE) and EL Roadmap Alignment Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPE 1: Development and Implementation of a Shared Vision</th>
<th>ELR Principle 1 (5 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 2 (7 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 3 (4 elements)</th>
<th>ELR Principle 4 (3 elements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CAPE 2: Instructional Leadership                         | Negligible                    | Low                           | Negligible                    | Negligible                    |

| CAPE 3: Management and Learning Environment              | Low                           | Negligible                    | Moderate                      | Low                           |

| CAPE 4: Family and Community Engagement                 | Low                           | Negligible                    | Negligible                    | Negligible                    |

| CAPE 5: Ethics and Integrity                            | Moderate                      | Negligible                    | Negligible                    | Negligible                    |

| CAPE 6: External Context and Policy                     | Negligible                    | Negligible                    | Negligible                    | Negligible                    |

Source: Colón-Muñiz et al., 2022.

While we do not fully describe each of the areas of analysis due to space limitations, we found many more gaps than areas of alignment between the ELR and the performance expectations across the three programs (Colón-Muñiz, et al., 2022). These findings suggest that educator preparation programs have a long way to go in aligning their programs with the ELR – a critical priority if we are to ensure the next generation of educators are prepared to serve California’s English Learners well.
Increasing alignment between educator preparation and TK-12 systems is imperative. *The English Learner Roadmap Toolkit for Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)*, developed by the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University, provides a tailored resource to support these efforts. With decades of experience in higher education and expertise in credentialing programs, coordination, certification, and program development, experts on EL education have thoughtfully created this resource to support IHE preparation programs in their efforts to increase alignment.

**Toolkit Overview**

The toolkit offers a comprehensive set of tools and resources to support program redesign. Figure 3 offers a high-level overview of the sections of the toolkit.

![Figure 3. Organization of the English Learner Roadmap Toolkit for Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)](image)

Source: Colón-Muñiz et al., 2022.

Because the toolkit is lengthy and easy to reference, we highlight key toolkit sections and resources here along with a brief description of the section and page references.
### Table 4. Highlights from the English Learner Roadmap Toolkit for Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toolkit Highlights</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Starting Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 2, Tool 1: English Learner Roadmap Alignment Review Tool</td>
<td>Engage interdisciplinary program teams to assess alignment of performance expectations to ELR principles</td>
<td>P. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3: Preparing for (Re) Design with the ELR</td>
<td>Explore how to increase alignment between credential programs and the ELR, from formation of a redesign team, to considering necessary revisions, to program/course design</td>
<td>P. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4, Tool 4A: Quality of an ELR-Aligned Program</td>
<td>Assess whether key program elements are ELR aligned</td>
<td>P. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4, Tool 4B: Program Revision Assessment and Recommendations</td>
<td>Identify program elements ripe for redesign or refinement</td>
<td>P. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4, Tool 4C: Aligning Our Philosophy Statement</td>
<td>Consider faculty beliefs about how best to serve EL students and commitments to redesign processes</td>
<td>P. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4, Tool 4E: Program Design Logic Model and Reflection</td>
<td>Engage interdisciplinary teams in iterative processes for designing ELR-focused program elements</td>
<td>P. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4: Coursework and Fieldwork: ELR-Focused Syllabus Augmentation</td>
<td>Augment program expectations and course content to better prepare candidates to work with ELs</td>
<td>P. 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the lead of county offices of education (COEs) and our elementary and secondary-level districts and schools, the field of educator preparation now needs state policies and practices to guide IHEs to better align to the ELR in their program design, implementation, and evaluation. And, IHEs must actually begin the work of aligning their educator preparation programs with the ELR using resources like the toolkit highlighted in this brief. Here, we include detailed recommendations for state entities, professional organizations, and IHEs.
RECOMMENDATIONS (Continued)

State-Level Recommendations

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)

• Engage the field in a review process to update and align the current State of California Standard Expectations and its accreditation procedures with the ELR. Prioritize teacher education, school counseling, and administration/leadership credentialing programs initially before ensuring all credential areas are ultimately upgraded to align with the ELR principles, including programs for special education teachers, school psychologists, and other teaching and support staff.

• Improve program accreditation processes in alignment with the ELR. Ensure review team members become familiar with the California English Learner Roadmap policy through knowledge-building sessions prior to accreditation visits, and equip them with updated resources (particularly the English Learner Roadmap Toolkit for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and other resources developed by the CDE) to ensure intake and observation documents/tools support the team during the review and reporting process. Share these resources with IHE leaders well in advance of accreditation reviews to help them understand the ELR-aligned program elements they will be assessing.

• Serve as a convenor in the IHE space to support ELR alignment efforts. For example, convene California’s three public higher education segments (University of California, California State University, and California Community College) along with the more than 150 private IHE institutions in California to support intersegmental collaboration.

California Department of Education (CDE)

• Disseminate existing ELR resources more broadly to IHEs and all educator preparation programs. The CDE awarded two sets of implementation and dissemination grants using funds earmarked by the state legislature to support ELR implementation. The resources developed by grantees can support and inform the efforts of IHEs to align their preparation programs with the ELR and should be intentionally disseminated in IHE contexts by CDE. CDE staff can collaborate with CTC and the professional organizations named below in these dissemination efforts.

California Legislature

• Commit sustained funding for ELR implementation. More funding is needed, beyond the initial investments made via the two sets of implementation grants, to continue the important work of implementing the ELR in every California classroom. Funding should be sustained into the future, with IHE-specific allocations to support educator preparation alignment efforts.

State-Level Professional Organizations

• Train faculty to be knowledgeable about the ELR. Mainstream professional organizations such as the California Council on Teacher Education, the California Association of School Counselors, the California Association of Professors of Education Administration, and the Association of California School Administrators should play a role in these training efforts by leveraging faculty experts in those organizations to lead these efforts and through their collaboration with CTC in the development of training materials.

Educator Preparation Program Recommendations

• Align programs with the English Learner Roadmap by utilizing the English Learner Roadmap Toolkit for Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs). In particular, IHEs that have teacher education, school counseling, and administration/leadership preparation programs should immediately begin the work of aligning with the ELR using the toolkit, focusing on Sections 1-4 and the tools embedded within them. Tap into faculty with expertise in EL and bilingual education to support these efforts.

• Strengthen TK-12 and IHE alignment by collaborating with COEs and school districts in service of the ELR’s goals. Collaboration with and across these TK-12 agencies will strengthen the quality of partnerships between educator preparation and create better articulation and alignment for TK-12 ELR implementation based on lessons learned on the ground that can help inform IHE program design.

• Engage in collaborative opportunities that support stronger ELR program alignment. Consider opportunities to foster intersegmental collaboration with other IHEs as well as opportunities to foster new relationships with local LEAs. Lean on the resources and supports available through CTC and other state agencies.
CONCLUSION

With the California English Learner Roadmap, California’s TK-12 system is poised to turn the tide for California’s 1.1 million ELs. However, IHEs must also respond to the urgent call to better support ELs by aligning their educator preparation programs with the principles of the ELR. Doing so will require efforts on the part of IHEs to engage in redesign efforts with the support of the English Learner Roadmap Toolkit for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and other resources. It will also require action on the part of state agencies, policymakers, and professional organizations to ensure policies and practices that are all working in service of the same goal: Preparing educators to provide the educational supports and services our ELs deserve.
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ENDNOTES

1. English Learners are increasingly referred to as “emergent bilingual” students or “multilingual learners” in recognition of both languages they are learning, rather than just their progress towards English proficiency. We use the term English Learner given the alignment to the CA English Learner Roadmap. (See also “Improving Education for Multilingual and English Learner Students,” California Department of Education, https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/mleleducation.pdf.)

2. For the purposes of this brief, we limit the term “educators” to teachers, counselors, and administrators. We recognize that there are many types of educators that serve students and schools.

3. The full toolkit can be found at https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ceelreports/9/.

4. For more information about the California English Learner Roadmap, see https://www.cde.ca.gov/SP/el/er/index.asp.

5. For more information about the four ELR principles, see https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/erm/.

6. Relational content analysis utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methods to: (1) examine the level of presence of concepts in a text or across texts (e.g. the ELR policy document and Educator Program Standards Expectations) by identifying key words, sets of words, or concepts; and (2) explore the relationship between concepts.

7. “Elements” are sub-topics within each ELR principle, as reflected in the ELR policy document. For example, one element under Principle 1, Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools, is “School Climate.”


10. The California Administrator Content Expectations (CACE) describe what preliminary candidates need to know and understand in order to meet the performance expectations established in the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE) and measured by the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). See https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/defaultsource/educator-prep/asc/2017-cape-and-cace.pdf?sfvrsn=f66757b1_2 for more information.

11. For more information about these grants, see https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/erwigelrm/policy.asp.
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