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THE LONG-TERM ENGLISH LEARNER PROJECT

The Long-Term English Learner Project is a partnership between Sanger and Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified School Districts that aims to create large-scale systems change to improve outcomes for middle and high school Long-Term English Learners (LTELs). Karen Thompson and Claudia Rodriguez-Mojica have completed the third and final year of a three-year external documentation funded by the Central Valley Foundation (CVF). The LTEL Project began in 2014-15 and was originally planned to last three years. CVF approved a one-year extension for the Project and external documentation, lasting through 2017-18.

The Long-Term English Learner Project builds on the previous District Partnership Project (DPP) between Sanger and Firebaugh that CVF funded beginning in 2011. The DPP had as its goal improving outcomes for all students in the two districts, especially English learners (ELs), through a district culture of continuous improvement. In recent years, educators and policymakers have expressed increasing concern about students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for many years but remained classified as English learners. Recognizing the large number of Long-Term English Learners in their own districts, and wanting to leverage the structures and relationships developed through their previous collaboration, Sanger and Firebaugh proposed partnering specifically to improve outcomes for LTELs in their districts.

This final report describes findings from the LTEL project since its inception in 2014-15 but highlights long term impacts and lessons learned. Findings address the following documentation questions:

1. What are the activities and infrastructure of the Sanger and Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified School Districts’ LTEL project?
2. What are the key successes and challenges of the partnership?
3. What is the academic and English language proficiency performance of English learners, specifically LTELs, at the partner districts?

How was this documentation conducted?
We include activities from all four years of the project, from 2014-15 through 2017-18, in this final report. Findings are based on site visits, interviews, staff surveys, and English learner performance trends.

Site visits and interviews
During the 2015-16 academic year, we visited Washington Academic Middle School (WAMS) in Sanger and Sanger High School. During our visit we conducted interviews with project leaders, site-level administrators and teachers. We also observed an English Language Development (ELD) Seminar at WAMS and an Academic Language Development class at Sanger High School. In addition to the Sanger campus visits, we observed a Designated ELD training and the last day of the English Learner Institute for Teacher Excellence (ELITE) training for elementary staff. We conducted Firebaugh project leader and site-level administrator interviews via videoconferencing. By the end of the 2015-16 academic year, we conducted interviews with a total of 24 individuals.

During the 2016-17 academic year, we visited Firebaugh Middle and Firebaugh High School, observing ELD instruction at both sites. We also incorporated project leader, teacher, and site-level administrator interviews into our Firebaugh visit. In addition to visiting Firebaugh school sites, we also observed an Academic Discourse training for Math teachers from both districts. We conducted Sanger project leader interviews via videoconference. By the end of the 2016-17 academic year, we had interviewed a total of nine individuals.

During the 2017-18 academic year, we observed a LTEL leadership team meeting in Sanger and visited A.E. Mills Intermediate School in Firebaugh to observe Individualized Language Plan meetings. We interviewed a total of four individuals during this final year.

**Survey**

We administered a survey to teachers and administrators from both districts in May 2016, April-May 2017, and May-June 2018. In 2016, we gathered a total of 95 responses, 69 from Sanger staff members and 26 from Firebaugh staff members. In 2017, we received a total of 162 responses, with 92 from Sanger staff members and 70 from Firebaugh staff members. In 2018, we gathered 254 responses, 183 from Sanger and 71 from Firebaugh. This represents a relatively small proportion of all district staff, particularly in the earlier years. By 2018, we received responses from approximately 25% of all Sanger staff and 66% of all Firebaugh staff. However, because the group of teachers involved in project activities varied by year and by district, calculation of response rates is complicated. For example, the survey was not administered to elementary teachers in 2016 because they had not been involved in project activities. However, by 2018, elementary teachers were the most heavily involved in project activities, and response rates among this group were generally higher than among teachers at other grades. Due to the difference in the size and composition
of the sample across the three years, we do not focus extensively on directly comparing survey results across years. However, we do briefly note patterns of results across years in some cases, noting whether a positive pattern persisted or changed, for example.

**Student data**
In addition to interviews, observations, and the survey, we also analyzed district administrative data to analyze changes in outcomes for Long-Term English Learners over time. We used a database compiled as part of Data Dialogues Network activities, which includes demographic information for all students in both districts over time, information about whether and when English learners were reclassified as English proficient, students’ English language proficiency assessment scores, and their scores and the state Smarter Balanced content-area assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and math. The analysis of student outcomes in this report is descriptive and cannot show whether LTEL project activities caused any changes observed in student outcomes. This is because many other factors could have led to changes in student outcomes, such as changes in federal and state policies and/or economic changes impacting the community. Nonetheless, analysis of student data provides information about patterns over time.

**LTEL PROJECT ACTIVITIES**
Recognizing that improving outcomes for LTELs requires system change at multiple levels, Sanger and Firebaugh intentionally designed strands of LTEL project activities targeting teachers, administrators, students, and parents. Together, these activities were designed to build administrators’ capacity to understand and act on LTELs’ needs, develop teachers’ instructional capacity for effectively educating LTELs, shift school and district structures to better support LTELs, and more effectively engage families of LTELs. Figure 1 provides an overview of these different strands of LTEL project activities, and below we provide additional detail.

**Building Teacher and Administrator Capacity**
Over the course of the LTEL project, teachers, coaches, and administrators have participated in a wide variety of professional learning opportunities. Initial ELITE training focused on building an understanding of LTELs’ needs, while subsequent trainings focused on effectively supporting students’ language
Figure 1. LTEL Project Activities
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development. These trainings include: Academic Discourse, Understanding Language Argumentation Massive Open Online Course (MOOC), Kagan, Integrated English Language Development (ELD), and Designated ELD, at the high school, middle school, and elementary levels.

The project has made a conscious effort to include teachers across content areas in LTEL trainings rather than focusing on English Language Arts and English Language Development teachers alone. In the first two years of the project, Science, Social Studies, World Language, ELA, and ELD teachers, including teachers from alternative school sites, participated in the Academic Discourse, Designated ELD and Integrated ELD trainings. In the third year of the project, Math and Special Education teachers participated in the Academic Discourse, Designated ELD, and Integrated ELD trainings. Sanger district staff has also provided customized Designated ELD for all Sanger school sites. Each school in Sanger has participated in a minimum of one customized Designated ELD training in addition to the trainings listed above. In year four of the project, Sanger TK – 5 and Firebaugh’s 3 - 5 teachers, academic coaches and administrators participated in Integrated ELD trainings. Middle school and high school teachers in both districts continued to receive Academic Discourse and Designated ELD trainings.

Over the course of the project, educators in both districts have also developed a variety of tools that teachers can use to support students’ language development. Many of these resources are designed for teachers to use during the lesson planning process, including an Academic Discourse Reflective Tool and sample ELD lesson plans. In 2015-2016, the website Sangerlearns.com was launched by Sanger Unified’s Curriculum & Instruction department. Resources from LTEL project professional development trainings were archived on the ELD page so teachers and coaches could easily access and share these materials to support student learning. Engagement with this website expanded in the subsequent years, as discussed below.

**Shifting School and District Structures**

In addition to activities focused on building educator capacity, a variety of new structures and staffing arrangements have arisen as a result of the project.

- By the end of Year 2 (2015-16), courses specifically designed for LTELs were already in place at WAMS, Sanger High School, Firebaugh Middle School, and Firebaugh High School.
In 2016-17, additional courses were added, specifically additional Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) courses at Firebaugh High School for ELs at CELDT levels 3-5 (Intermediate and above) and language support classes at Firebaugh Middle School.

Another key shift in school/district structures is the implementation of Individualized Language Plans (ILPs), which involve a collaborative team in identifying key needs of students, particularly LTELs, and determining how these needs will be met. The ILP team may include the principal, teachers, school psychologist, nurse, custodian, parents, and the student. Sanger initially piloted ILPs in 2013-14, prior to the LTEL project, but over the last three years, their use has been expanded and refined in Sanger and has spread to Firebaugh.

Engaging Families

Family engagement has remained a component of the LTEL project across all years. Both districts have offered the Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) program at multiple sites, and Sanger High has partnered with parents through its own Apache Pathways to Success (APS) program. During the four years of the project, 864 parents have participated in at least one parent education activity. Approximately two-thirds of parents who participated in PIQE successfully graduated from the rigorous nine-week program. In addition, parent education opportunities have expanded to a broader set of schools, with Sanger now offering the PIQE program at its alternative, continuation schools, which serve a particularly marginalized population.

The Project Leadership Team, comprised of administrators from across both districts, serves as key infrastructure for the partnership, coordinating these multi-faceted activities. As discussed in more detail below, the Leadership Team has worked to adapt project activities to each districts’ particular needs. The Leadership Team has consisted of five to eight administrators, depending on the project year.

Please see Appendix A for a comprehensive list of project activities, tools developed, and staff involved.

KEY SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES OF THE LTEL PROJECT

Successes and Challenges of Project Activities
**Direct Benefits of Project Activities: Teacher Learning**

Across all three years of survey administration, a substantial majority of respondents found the LTEL-focused professional development opportunities their districts provided to be helpful or very helpful. *Between 84% to 64% of respondents rated individual LTEL-focused professional development activities as helpful or very helpful, depending on the year and the particular activity.* Because the activities varied across years, as did the sample of survey respondents, we do not focus extensively on changes over time. Nonetheless, it is useful to note that for professional development activities that appeared across all three survey administrations, the proportion of respondents rating these activities as helpful or very helpful increased over time, as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 2 provides a snapshot of respondents’ ratings of all project activities that occurred during the final 2017-18 school year. Because of changes in project activities over time, data about all activities is not available for all years. As discussed in more detail below, over the course of the LTEL project, the two districts began to have more district-specific trainings in order to best meet the needs in their particular contexts. For example, in 2017-18 the Academic Discourse training provided by Jeff Zwiers was targeted to Sanger staff, while Firebaugh staff embarked on Academic Discourse training with Adam Ebrahim.

As noted above, staff have created a variety of resources to support teachers in meeting LTELs’ needs. *Across all three years of survey administration, a majority of survey respondents rated all of these resources as helpful or very helpful.* Because of differences in the sample of respondents who completed the survey in each year, we do not focus extensively on changes in ratings across years. However, as with professional development activities, it is still useful to note that for tools that appeared across all three survey administrations, the proportion of respondents rating these tools as helpful or very helpful increased over time (see Table 3). The shift across years is particularly striking for SangerLearns.com, which houses a wide variety of resources to support effective instruction for ELs. Spotlight 1: SangerLearns.com provides more information about this tool and its expanding impact.
Table 1. Survey responses regarding the helpfulness of LTEL project activities over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage reporting activity as helpful or very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Discourse training with Jeff Zwiers</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated ELD training</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELITE training</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer classroom observation or instructional rounds</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Survey responses regarding the helpfulness of LTEL project activities, 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage reporting activity as helpful or very helpful</th>
<th>Mean value on scale of 1-5 (1=Very helpful, 5=Not helpful at all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Discourse training with Jeff Zwiers (grades TK-12)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated ELD training</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer classroom observation or instructional rounds</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated ELD training with Lisa Clark (grades 3-5)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELITE training for administrators</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic vocabulary training (Kate Kinsella)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Discourse training with Adam Ebrahim</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Survey responses regarding the helpfulness of LTEL project resources, over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Percentage reporting resource as helpful or very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Language Plan (ILP)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language matrix</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample language targets</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SangerLearns.com</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Survey responses regarding the helpfulness of LTEL project resources, 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>% reporting resource as helpful or very helpful</th>
<th>Mean value on scale of 1-5 (1=Very helpful, 5=Not helpful at all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SangerLearns.com</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample language targets</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Language Plan (ILP)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ELD lesson plans or templates</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language matrix</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Rounds Form</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAT Tool</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 provides information about the helpfulness of all resources as reported in 2017-18. Again, because of developments in the project over time, data about all tools is not available in all years. Sanger respondents were more likely to rate these resources as helpful or very helpful than Firebaugh respondents, perhaps because several of them were originally developed by Sanger. Therefore, the resources may have more closely met the needs of educators in Sanger and/or those in Sanger may have had more extensive experience in using the resources.
Indirect Benefits of Project Activities: Influence on District Programs and Decisions

In addition to direct benefits of the LTEL project, the project and the activities the project has made possible have also influenced district programs and decisions in indirect ways.

While maintaining a focus on meeting the needs of LTELs at the secondary school level, both districts have also been thinking about how to support English learner reclassification before students become Long-Term ELs. Project leaders provided ELITE Training for administrators at district elementary schools and supported the use of Individualized Language Plans for ELs at risk of becoming LTELs in Sanger’s elementary school and Firebaugh’s intermediate school. With the grant extension, the districts were able to provide Integrated ELD training for Pre-Kindergarten through grade five teachers in Sanger and for teachers in grades three through five in Firebaugh.

The districts extended the LTEL project activities to elementary and intermediate schools in an effort to increase EL reclassification and, in turn, decrease the number of LTELs in their secondary schools. Extending the project activities beyond secondary schools also created a common language and district-wide understanding about English learners and LTELs in Pre-K – 12. The shared understanding and language gained through the LTEL project trainings, facilitated conversations and collaboration across elementary, middle and high school sites. In Firebaugh, for example, administrators from the intermediate, middle and high school convened for a meeting to discuss their work with Individualized Language Plans. During the meeting, each school site shared their ILP procedures, documents, and successes and challenges implementing ILPs at their sites. Implementing ILPs and receiving LTEL focused training across school sites created a common language and space for school administrators to collaborate with the same goal in mind: preventing and reclassifying LTELs in Firebaugh schools. Spotlight 2: Individualized Language Plans provides more information about this structure and the ways each district has developed innovations to maximize its effectiveness.

The increased awareness and knowledge about LTEL and EL needs has made it possible for administrators to analyze data in new ways and pursue alternative programs to meet the needs of ELs. In Sanger, for example, as administrators and the data specialist worked to understand factors impacting EL students’ likelihood of being reclassified, they realized that students who attended district preschool programs were less likely to become LTELs. This finding has led the
Over the course of the project, educators in both districts have developed a variety of resources to support English learner and LTEL student success. In 2015-16, Sanger launched the website Sangerlearns.com to house these resources. In addition to EL and LTEL focused resources, the website also contains resources to support instruction across content areas and grade levels. The website is publicly available and used by staff in Sanger and Firebaugh.

Engagement with this website has increased steadily over the years. In 2015-16, SangerLearns.com was the resource rated as helpful or very helpful by the lowest proportion of respondents (50%). However, in 2016-17, it jumped to being the resource rated helpful or very helpful by the highest proportion of respondents (87%). In 2017-18, this already high rating increased even further, with 92% of survey respondents reporting that SangerLearns.com was helpful or very helpful.

In identifying the single most helpful training or resource focused on supporting LTELs, a Sanger classroom teacher said, “SangerLearns because it is easy to access when I’m planning my lessons.” As the teacher points out, some resources are intended for use by teachers during the lesson planning process. For example, the website contains an ELD standards checklist, ELD lesson planning templates, resources on how to write language targets in Designated ELD and Integrated ELD, sample lesson plans and classroom videos.

The website also includes ELD placement and monitoring resources, best practices and engagement strategies, discourse analysis tools and links to recommended websites for Designated ELD support. Individualized Language Plans (ILPs) are another key resource used by Sanger and Firebaugh that are housed in Sangerlearns.com. The website holds ILP templates, instructions and resources to engage in the ILP process, sample ILPs and video and photos illustrating the process. In addition, Sanger has uploaded Google Slides of the ELD trainings developed by Sanger’s Theresa Blanchard and Stanford University’s Jeff Zwiers. With these online resources, grade level or content-area teams can review the material together when they need the support and school leaders can use the material to train new teachers.

It is important to highlight that the resources developed through the LTEL project and housed in Sangerlearns.com are freely available online to anyone searching for ways to support ELs and LTELs. The resources in SangerLearns.com have been used in teacher education programs, and some of the future teachers have shared the website and resources with teacher colleagues. In this way, the resources developed to support Sanger and Firebaugh’s English learner and LTEL students are reaching English learners and LTELs beyond the partner districts.
district to expand its outreach efforts to increase of the number of ELs enrolling in preschool. Sanger now has four state-funded and five district preschool sites with a total of 13 preschool classrooms.

Sanger also launched dual language programs at two elementary schools. A Sanger administrator views the LTEL activities as instrumental in setting the groundwork to establish this program.

I think a lot of that stems [from] all the work we’ve been doing and learning and making people aware of what’s best for our English learners. And I think a lot of that came through our ELITE training through the grant. … I can really see, because I’ve been here the whole time and before that, I can really see how the effects of the grant are permeating and percolating throughout the district in different ways. And I really believe that [the] dual language classroom is a result of that percolation, because it really made people more aware and brought language to the surface, what’s best for our kids. – Sanger administrator

As the administrator above states, the LTEL activities raised awareness and knowledge about English learner needs and prepared the district to accept dual language as an appropriate way to meet the needs of English learners.

**Staffing Challenges and Their Impact on Project Continuity**

While the LTEL project has provided direct and indirect benefits, both districts have faced staffing challenges that have tested the districts’ abilities to think creatively in order to ensure project continuity. According to data from the California Department of Education, in 2017-18, 23% of Firebaugh teachers and 16% of Sanger teachers were in their first or second year as educators. Therefore, it is an ongoing challenge to ensure that new teachers have the opportunity to learn the crucial information about supporting LTELs – and other core practices and areas of focus within the districts – that other teachers have already been exposed to in the past.

Firebaugh’s geographically remote location in the Central Valley has led to challenges in teacher recruitment and retention. According to Firebaugh administrators, some teachers accept positions in Firebaugh while they’re working on their teaching credential but leave soon after receiving their credential for a position closer to home. Firebaugh has struggled to remain competitive at traditional teacher recruitment fairs because they have been
Alongside their efforts to better support long-term English learners by shifting instructional practices, improving data systems, and increasing family engagement, Sanger and Firebaugh are implementing an innovative tool to identify and address individual long-term English learner students’ needs. As every parent and teacher knows, each student has different strengths and needs. In recognition of this key idea, Sanger and Firebaugh now convene collaborative teams to develop *Individualized Language Plans* (ILPs) for LTEls and other English learners in particular need of support.

Once a team has identified a student who could benefit from an ILP, the collaborative team—potentially including multiple teachers, the principal, parents, the student, and other stakeholders—come together for a conversation about the students’ strengths and needs, with a particular focus on the students’ language needs. The team then identifies and documents next steps to build on strengths and address needs.

*While the practice of collaboratively developing individualized learning plans is required by federal law for students with disabilities, the practice has not typically been part of supporting English learners.* Sanger initially piloted ILPs in 2013-14, prior to the LTEL project, but over the last three years, their use has been expanded and refined in Sanger and has spread to Firebaugh.

Over the years, each district has developed particular innovations in the ILP process. In Firebaugh, the middle school now convenes all of a student’s teachers across content areas for the ILP meeting, sometimes including the student as well. The teachers each bring student writing samples and compare the student’s writing across content areas, leading to deep conversations among teachers about the specific strategies the teachers are using in each of their classes. In some cases, when the student is present, the teacher may ask the student for input, as well, about supports they find particularly useful. In addition, Firebaugh has used the ILP process as an opportunity to foster cross-grade teacher conversations, with middle school teachers participating in ILP meetings for students in the upper elementary grades.

In Sanger, a district data specialist has worked closely with district leaders to develop data systems that streamline the ILP process, making it more user-friendly and less time-consuming. In addition to supporting school teams in identifying students who might benefit from an ILP, these system improvements also support the plans’ implementation. As the data specialist explains, “If a 5th grader is on an ILP, and then they go to 6th grade at the middle school next year, all that data gets moved over. There’s no more shuffling of paperwork or anything like that. … [Also] teachers are able to add notes and those get automatically shared between all of the student’s teachers.” The districts are working to ensure that ILPs meet their goal of fostering collaboration and supporting student success.
unable to make attractive offers that will counteract the long commute for prospective teachers living in the Fresno area. A Firebaugh administrator shared how challenges with teacher recruitment and retention has made it difficult to maintain momentum and build on district progress.

... [W]e still struggle with continuity of personnel in the classroom at the site level. This often requires a restart and unfortunately prevents us from really building on the success that we had established in the current year into the next. So the systems to sustain any of our initiatives are a little bit of a, well, they’re a greater challenge for us as opposed to a district where the staff have that commitment to stay there. – Firebaugh Administrator

Traditional teacher recruitment efforts are not yielding teachers who are committed to teach at Firebaugh for the long-term, and high teacher turnover is causing challenges to district progress and LTEL activity continuity. In response, administration has organized a “grow your own” effort to recruit school staff from the Firebaugh community. A Firebaugh administrator describes district efforts to recruit committed members of the community into the education profession:

So now, we try to grow our own staff and we reach out to our classified people, parents in our community, employees in the district and ask them to invite family members, relatives, people they know with ties to the community that may or may not be thinking about teaching or working in the district. – Firebaugh administrator

While it is a promising solution to Firebaugh’s staffing challenges, the “grow your own” effort requires significant resources, support and mentoring for individuals new to the teaching profession. Because the “grown your own” teacher recruitment effort targets community members who may have not been thinking about teaching as a profession, they begin Firebaugh teaching positions with little formal preparation.

A shortage in staff and lack of funding to pay staff, makes having a dedicated coach for LTEL support at Firebaugh school sites initially seemed like an unattainable goal. In 2016-17, when asked what they need at the school site to better support their LTELs, an administrator said:
I could tell you right now as far as the first thing that comes to my
mind is personnel, and maybe when I go over to Sanger, … they
have a dedicated person to focus in on these things. Here at a
smaller school, we’re a little bit Johnny-do-it-all. And so, when I
say [a] specific person, I’ll tell you almost exactly what I’d love to
see is that person that is dedicated to ILPs, that is dedicated to
coaching our teachers, observing our teachers, and helping them
improve. – Firebaugh administrator

Supporting very new teachers in learning how to teach is a concern that requires
immediate attention and personnel from an already limited pool of resources.
Staffing challenges and the pressing need to support new teachers across the
district makes it difficult for Firebaugh to allocate resources to retrain and train
new staff on LTEL project activities. By the end of the project, however,
Firebaugh had several encouraging developments in staffing. As an
administrator explained in spring 2018:

With the high school, we have a new shot in the arm or a boost if you will.
We hired a EL academic coach to work hand in hand with the core
teachers. … [And] for 2018-19, we have the least number of turnovers in
classroom teachers in our last four years. – Firebaugh administrator

Sanger has also experienced staffing challenges that have led them to rethink
delivery of LTEL training content and tools. The LTEL training schedule
designates trainings for one subject area at a time and allows for a partnership-
wide “make-up” day of training for anyone in the district who was unable to
attend the original training. Although the challenges are different than with
Firebaugh, Sanger also has new teachers every year that may have missed their
subject area’s training day the year before. A Sanger administrator describes the
challenge to maintain LTEL Project continuity with the story of painting the
Golden Gate Bridge:

So when they paint the Golden Gate Bridge, they start at one end
and they paint all the way across this bridge. And when they’re
done and they’re on the other side, they have to come back and
start over again because it’s been that long, and the bridge becomes
weathered so quickly. It’s a continuous process.

And so we try to keep that in mind with what we’ve done with
professional learning. We need to make sure that we’re going back
and retraining and newly training people who haven’t had that. That’s a struggle because you want to be sure that you get your new teachers, your new administrators. How do you give them the same training? Well, a lot of it has to be through their PLCs. You have to keep a focus on your PLCs to make sure that they’re bringing that person into the fold, so to speak, and that that training gets conveyed. – Sanger administrator

Sanger uses a Trainer of Trainers model and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to continue the LTEL trainings for new teachers and administrators. The district-created website, Sangerlearns.com, has also become a significant source of support for continued professional learning to meet English learners needs, as survey responses indicated. District staff have developed and uploaded professional learning slides on specific English learner strategies and activities for school site coaches to use in leading presentations and professional learning, among other resources. The material is easily accessible on the Sangerlearns.com website.

**Challenges in Identifying Long-Term English Learners**

Sanger and Firebaugh have worked to identify LTEL students in a timely, efficient manner, but this has required a substantial investment of time. As described in more detail in Spotlight 3: Developing Data Systems, the LTEL definition is complex and requires combining demographic and assessment information. To address this challenge, both districts have invested in a variety of data systems.

While these systems have proved crucial, data specialists who understand administrators’ and teachers’ needs—and who can therefore design data reports and tools to provide key information about LTELs—have also proved crucial. Appendix B shows an example of one type of report that a data specialist designed, succinctly showing characteristics of students on Individualized Language Plans across the district. Describing their data specialist, a district leader explains the qualities that make him so effective:

> [He] is interested in learning kind of the why behind it or the story behind all of the different data sets that he’s collecting. So it’s been amazing to have him. … He already anticipates and knows what data we would need.

Given the effort that districts have made to identify LTEL students, it is not surprising that across all years, survey respondents described a systematic
process through which they received information about which students in their classes were LTELs. One survey respondent described how ELITE training had helped staff better understand how to identify LTELs. Many survey respondents described receiving a list of students who met LTEL criteria or having these students flagged within their data systems. Some survey respondents described how these lists served as the basis for conversations about which students to target for interventions.

> We have an EL site coordinator that gives very detailed binders to each teacher, which she updates on a regular basis. Each teacher should know exactly at which level each EL student is, and whether or not they are considered long-term ELs or classified otherwise. We have a team that is extremely particular on which students to choose to be put on an ILP for ELs (usually 1-2 students per class). We meet with the teacher and team every 6 weeks or so to gather new data to see if we can reclassify or change individual ILP goals for our long-term ELs in order to help make them successful. – Sanger elementary literacy coach

While most respondents reported knowing which of their students were LTELs, 22% of survey respondents working at the secondary level in 2017-18 did not know this information.¹ As discussed above, both districts face staffing challenges. Given the substantial proportions of new teachers in both districts, even the best-designed system for providing information to teachers about which students are LTELs may face challenges. Brand-new teachers may be so focused on the nuts and bolts of teaching that they may not yet be ready to absorb or act on this information.

**Successes and Challenges of the Partnership Itself**

*Project Flexibility as Key*
While the first two years of the LTEL project progressed smoothly, by the third year of the partnership, the two districts’ distinct needs posed challenges to implementation of project plans as originally conceived.

¹ Because LTELs are defined as students in grades 6 and above, teachers in grades K-5 cannot have LTELs in their classes.
As in many sectors of society, ever-increasing amounts of data are available to school districts. However, effectively using this data to generate insights and inform systems poses a significant challenge. Sanger and Firebaugh have dedicated substantial effort to improving data systems to provide timely, useful information about Long-Term English Learners.

An important precursor to improving outcomes for Long-Term English Learners is identifying which students are LTELs. The definition established by the California legislature defines LTELs as students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for more than six years; whose English language proficiency level has stayed the same or dropped over two or more consecutive years; and who do not meet standards on the state’s English language arts content-area assessment. This definition is complex because it includes both demographic information (grade level, years in U.S. schools) and assessment results. This information typically resides in separate databases for school districts.

Over the past four years, Sanger has invested in three different data tools: iDashboard, ELLevation, and Tableau, which taken together, provide crucial information about individual students and about system-wide outcomes for LTELs as well as for other students. In 2015-16, Sanger’s data specialist used iDashboard to create user-friendly lists of students meeting LTEL criteria. This report also has a “Student Detail” element, which allows users to click on names of individual students meeting LTEL criteria and view specific information, such as grades and test scores over time. Any administrator or teacher can access these reports from any computer, with site-level educators able to view information for their particular site and district administrators able to view information district-wide. Meanwhile, beginning in 2016-17, Sanger’s data specialist worked closely with district administrators and ELLevation technicians to customize features of that platform to meet district needs. For example, administrators can use simple checkboxes to identify students who are only missing one or two criteria for reclassification and then potentially select some of these students for the Individualized Language Plan process. In 2017-18, Sanger also provided teachers with ELLevation accounts, improving data access and enhancing collaboration. Firebaugh has also invested in ELLevation and is just beginning the implementation process.

District administrators now more fully recognize the value of closely collaborating with their data specialists, and have shifted to involving them in leadership team meetings so that they have a richer understanding of district needs and can anticipate the types of data and systems that will best support district priorities, including improving LTEL outcomes. A Sanger data specialist described how the data team has become core to the district’s functioning, explaining, “The insights that they’ve gained from having this data team I think have really shown its value.”
After multiple meetings and conversations about individual district needs, the districts were able to create a plan for continuing project activities and their work through a grant extension from CVF. A Sanger administrator shares how the districts created a new vision of what their partnership would mean, allowing for joint activities when appropriate but also allowing for separate activities when necessary to meet each district’s distinct needs:

We were able to modify and change the grant to meet the needs of both districts, because I think now that we’ve been together this long, we see different needs in our districts. And I think we kind of got that ironed out. There are some things we can do together, but there are also some things we need to do separately because we’re at different places with our teams. So that was a great realization for everyone. – Sanger administrator

Sanger and Firebaugh focused even more effort on “LTEL prevention” by continuing their expansion of professional development opportunities at the elementary level while also continuing professional development at the secondary level. The combination of joint goals but separate paths towards those goals was evident in the partnership’s plans for professional development. While both districts focused on Integrated ELD, Designated ELD, and Academic Discourse, each district used different professional development providers that aligned with the needs of their own teachers.

Administrators from both districts appreciated and admired CVF’s ability to keep them accountable for their Project goals while being flexible and understanding of their evolving needs. An administrator shared that receiving CVF’s permission to modify their plans instead of trying to merge their efforts in ways that were not working lifted a “huge weight” off their shoulders. After receiving CVF permission to modify their plans to meet their individual district needs while maintaining true to their project goals, both districts felt a sense of relief.

**STUDENT PERFORMANCE TRENDS AMONG LTELS**

Changes implemented in 2017-18 to California’s English language proficiency assessment and graduation rate calculation complicate analysis of LTEL performance trends across the life of the project. We focus on analysis of LTEL performance trends for the first three years of the project when these elements were stable, while noting developments in 2017-18.
**Number of Long-Term English Learners Over Time**

One way to understand the impact of the Long-Term English Learner Project is to compare the number of Long-Term English Learners in both districts over time. As Figure 2 shows, the number of LTEls has dropped substantially over time. At the end of the 2013-14 school year (labeled 2014 in Figure 2), just before the LTEL project began, there were a total of 500 LTEls in both districts. By the end of the 2016-17 school year (labeled 2017 in Figure 2), there were a total of 385 LTEls in both districts. Therefore, during the first three years of the project, the number of LTEls in both districts dropped 23%. This reduction in the number of LTEls was not driven by a drop in enrollment because data show that overall enrollment in both districts has remained stable over time.

Further analysis shows that during this time period, when using the state definition for students considered LTEls, the number of LTEls in Sanger decreased while the number of LTEls in Firebaugh stayed relatively similar over time, as illustrated below (see Figure 3). This may be due to a variety of factors. First, as noted above, Sanger’s data analysis capacity—including early investment in software designed to facilitate analysis of EL outcomes and the support of a strong data specialist who worked closely with administrators—seems to have facilitated identification of students who met key aspects of the state LTEL definition, to whom services could be targeted. Second, as also noted above, staffing challenges in Firebaugh, including large proportions of new teachers and challenges in finding well-qualified people to serve as EL coordinators, may have made targeted LTEL services more challenging to develop and implement.

In 2017-18, California implemented a new English language proficiency assessment. Unlike its predecessor the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), which was administered in the fall, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) is administered in winter/spring. Districts did not receive final 2017-18 ELPAC scores until after...
September 2018 and also needed to determine new reclassification criteria. Therefore, districts were unable to use ELPAC scores to make EL reclassification decisions in 2017-18. Because fewer students had the opportunity to be reclassified, more students met LTEL criteria at the end of 2017-18 than at the end of 2016-17. This is very likely a reflection not of less effective services for ELs but simply the result of the shift in the assessment and its timeline. Thus, it is not advisable to compare the number of LTELs in 2017-18 to the number of LTELs in the prior year.

**Later Outcomes for LTELs**

While a drop in the number of students meeting LTEL criteria is an important indicator for districts, graduation is a much more powerful metric, with tangible consequences for students. Figure 4 shows EL four-year graduation rates for each district and California overall from 2011-12 (the year the initial partnership between the two districts began) through 2015-16 (the latest year for which the information for all students ever classified as ELs at any time during high school, so it captures information about students who remain LTELs as well as students who were LTELs in high school but were reclassified.³

California Department of Education’s graduate rate calculation formula is comparable to past years. The state-reported EL graduation rate includes As Figure 4 shows, in 2015-16, 97% of students ever classified as ELs in high school graduated within four years in both Firebaugh and Sanger, compared to 72% of their peers statewide, a difference of 25%. This very high EL graduation rate in both LTEL project districts is striking. According to CDE data, 76 out of 78 students in the EL cohort in Firebaugh graduated, as did 180 out of 185 students in Sanger. Furthermore, in both Firebaugh and Sanger, EL graduation rates increased from their already high levels in 2014-15 to even higher levels in 2015-16.

Firebaugh has seen a substantial increase in its EL graduation rate over these four years, rising from 76% in 2011-12 to 97% in 2015-16. Sanger saw a brief dip in its EL graduation rate in 2013-14, which district administrators attribute to an unusually high number of students in special education, who earned a Certificate

³ Data indicate that among Firebaugh and Sanger students in 12th grade in 2015-16 who were ever classified as ELs in high school (and so are included in the EL graduation rate), 76% would have been considered LTELs in at least one year. Therefore, the EL graduation rate primarily, though not exclusively, captures the graduation rate for current and former LTELs.
Figure 2. Number of LTELs by year for Sanger and Firebaugh combined.

Figure 3. Number of LTELs by year and district.
of Completion but do not count as graduates in the state calculation. Sanger’s graduation rate rebounded the following year and has continued to increase annually since then.

The California Department of Education substantially modified its graduation rate calculation for 2016-17 (the most recent year for which graduation data is available). One key shift in the new metric is that students who transfer to adult school are no longer considered graduates. Under this formula shift, the 2016-17 EL graduation rate is 87% in Firebaugh, 72% in Sanger, and 67% in the state overall. Thus, Sanger and Firebaugh continue to have EL graduation rates that

---

4 Under the new graduate rate metric, the CDE explains, “[H]igh school students who transfer to an adult education program or to community college during the four-year cohort outcome period without earning a regular high school diploma will no longer be removed from the cohort.” Of the 89 students in the 2016-17 EL cohort in Sanger, 18 were considered “Other Transfers,” meaning that they transferred to adult education or community college without earning a regular high school diploma. Previously, students in this category would have been removed from the EL cohort. Under the new formula, they remain in the cohort and are not considered graduates. This is a main reason that Sanger’s EL graduation rate dropped substantially. Firebaugh had 0 students in the “Other Transfers” category in 2016-17, which is a main reason why their graduation rate was less impacted by the formula shift.
are higher than the state as a whole. However, the two districts no longer outpace the state by as wide a margin.

LASTING IMPACTS OF THE LTE PROJECT

As the LTEL project draws to a close, both Sanger and Firebaugh see lasting impacts that the project will have on their districts’ systems and practices in the years to come.

District leaders describe a strong underlying moral imperative to ensure that systems and practices meet the needs of English learners, from pre-K through high school. Initial trainings in the first years of the project not only fostered an increased understanding of LTELs’ needs, they also created a conviction that leaders had a “moral imperative” to improve outcomes for LTEL students. Both districts now have clear districtwide commitment to language development.

Describing Firebaugh’s four district-wide areas of instructional focus, an administrator explains:

> Language proficiency is number one. … Everything we talk about, including my district-wide teacher committee is on language proficiency. When we go into the classrooms we’re looking at language proficiency—Integrated [ELD] and Designated [ELD]—as a district. … I don’t think there’s a teacher on staff that doesn’t understand what we’re looking for when we’re in the classrooms now. – Firebaugh administrator

Both districts are very clear that this focus will remain in the coming years. Towards this end, Sanger has developed a one-page list of Designated and Integrated ELD expectations for 2018-19, with a concise set of links to resources, such as language targets and planning templates, along with information about language assessment tools and ways access data about ELs through the district data system (see Appendix C).

While the project began with a focus on addressing the needs of Long-Term English Learners through changes at the middle and high school level, over time both districts recognized more fully the need to prevent students from becoming Long-Term English Learners and therefore have devoted considerable attention to developing supportive structures to foster students’ language and content learning in the early years, such as through expanded pre-school options, dual
language programs, and Individualized Language Plans for students in need of additional support in elementary school.

For example, through a planning grant from CVF, Firebaugh is now working to enhance preschool services in the community, ensuring that students, particularly ELs, enter kindergarten with strong school readiness skills:

> We’ve created a certificated teacher who’s bilingual/biliterate to be full-time, working with our preschool staff and backwards mapping, identifying this is what our pre-K kiddos need to know, this is what our kinder kids need to know. So let’s talk about the rigor. And let’s talk first about language. – Firebaugh administrator

These efforts to expand and enhance preschool services (in both districts) and develop and expand a dual language program (in Sanger) will continue in coming years.

The project also increased administrative and teacher capacity for meeting LTELs’ needs. Through the wide variety of trainings and tools described above, a broad swath of teachers across grade levels and content areas had the opportunity to learn key strategies for supporting language development for ELs across the school day.

Importantly, key staff within each district were able to ensure that teachers had ongoing support to implement ideas from trainings in their day-to-day classroom practices:

> Our site contact person is very involved in the process of Designated and Integrated ELD. She ensures teachers get support and help with creating lessons. She checks in during these times and throughout the day to make sure students are receiving the services they need. Training from the district this year has been helpful to keep the focus on EL students and supporting them (and it benefits our English-only students, too) through intentional teaching of language. – Sanger literacy specialist

Both districts describe a variety of ways in which they are working to maintain a focus on LTELs in the coming years. For example, Firebaugh plans to continue cross-site ILP meetings. Sanger is continuing to work with the Ventura County Office of Education on LTEL-related trainings, and a district instructional
specialist will continue to work with school sites on EL and LTEL needs they have identified at the site level.

**Educators across both districts describe increased collaboration across departments and grade levels, focused on supporting language development.**

Another lasting impact of the project seems to be greater communication and collaboration, both between ELD and content-area teachers and between teachers at different grade levels. The ongoing emphasis on Integrated ELD, along with resources to support teachers’ Integrated ELD planning has helped build the understanding that students’ language development is all teachers’ responsibility.

One of the big, big eye openers was just introducing the entire staff to Integrated ELD ... and how English Language Development should be happening in every class across the board... that started to lend itself to many conversations. The biggest conversation was centered on the concept that it is not just the English department’s job to help support our students. If students in Science don’t understand the language, then they can’t understand the subject of Science. ...That shift in thinking was one of the big accomplishments, and there was no single activity that led to the shift, but the focus on all teachers being responsible was really critical to the entire project. - Firebaugh Administrator

In both districts, administrators emphasize that teachers are eager to continue conversations about cross-grade collaboration to effectively educate ELs. As noted above, Firebaugh plans to continue cross-site Individualized Language Plan meetings. Meanwhile, in Sanger Curriculum Support Providers had a recent conversation about ways to increased alignment across sites, including with their alternative education school, in ways that provide better information about ELs’ strengths and needs.

**Districts are developing more robust, user-friendly data systems, tailored to provide actionable information to improve outcomes for ELs, including LTELs.** As described in more detail in Spotlight 3: Data Systems, districts have invested in powerful platforms to gain deeper insight into ELs’ needs. With the guidance of a dedicated, responsive data specialist, and leadership that values and includes the data team as partners, Sanger has been able to draw on iDashboards, ELLevation, and now Tableau to develop a suite of user-friendly
tools for teachers that are now integrated into district practices. These tools facilitate the identification of students for Individualized Language Plans, enable information sharing among students’ teachers, and streamline reporting and analysis for administrators. Firebaugh has now invested in ELLevation as well and is now beginning implementation.

LESSONS LEARNED

As we have described above, the LTEL project has supported a concerted focus on LTEls across the districts and the development of LTEL resources. Reflecting on the successes and challenges of the LTEL project over the years, the districts share lessons learned.

Improving outcomes for LTEls requires a comprehensive, pre-K-12 approach with extensive collaboration. At the beginning of the project, Sanger and Firebaugh focused entirely on supporting LTEls in secondary schools. They did this by providing LTEL specific professional development training for secondary teachers, ELITE training that provided secondary administrators, coaches, lead teachers and counselors a foundational understanding of LTEL’s distinct academic needs and the addition of new courses for LTEls at their secondary sites (e.g., Academic Language Development in Sanger and LTEL Support in Firebaugh). The ELITE training was instrumental in shifting the awareness of secondary leadership and school staff about how to best meet LTEL needs. Hearing positive feedback about the ELITE training in the secondary schools, Sanger elementary leaders requested the ELITE training for their own sites. They received ELITE training in year two of the project.

Seeing the need to prevent English learners in their elementary and intermediate schools from becoming LTEls, both districts began expanding their efforts from LTEL support in secondary schools to LTEL prevention in elementary schools. While maintaining a focus on meeting the needs of LTEls at the secondary school level, Sanger and Firebaugh offered the ELITE training to elementary and intermediate school leadership and later provided the LTEL specific professional development to elementary and intermediate school teachers. Sanger also began inviting pre-K teachers to attend their LTEL-specific trainings. The LTEL project activities required whole-district commitment and involvement.

An effective partnership requires balancing alignment and differentiation. The cross-district collaboration between Sanger and Firebaugh has brought both
rewards and challenges, with both districts working to maintain common goals while also tailoring project activities to the needs of their individual contexts.

Towards the end of the project, an unanticipated challenge emerged. As the districts found themselves needing to pursue different project activities to meet their shared goal, they found it challenging to compare data and discuss progress because they used different district progress assessments and different assessments to gauge the success of professional development sessions and resources. Not having the new English language proficiency scores available for comparison made the lack of common data points more salient. Without comparable data points, the districts found themselves discussing what they each had learned separately instead of what they had learned together, as district partners. Reflecting on this challenge, a district administrator shared:

So that’s more of a logistical challenge because we wish we had more commonalities in our assessments or even in our trainings because it was a joint project. But our elementary [schools] were doing different things ... than theirs were and [we each] wanted to contract with different outside people. And that’s totally fine. And we’ve made adjustments. But we still learned a lot and we’re still open to sharing and collaborating. - District administrator

As the district administrator notes, each district began with their own set of prior commitments and had different professional development facilitators that worked well with their district staff. Maintaining more shared data points to compare progress could have facilitated more conversations about joint progress, particularly in the project’s final year. Similarly, since the districts held differentiated trainings towards the end of the project, another administrator noted that it would have been helpful for leadership to have attended each other’s trainings.

**CONCLUSION**

Over the past four years, the LTEL project has shown evidence of positive impact on teachers, parents, and students. Staff have generally found professional development opportunities and resources emerging from the project to be helpful and are eager for more exposure to classroom practices that are beneficial to LTELs’ language and content learning, as well as more opportunities to see these practices in action.
While changes to assessments and graduation rate calculations at the state level hamper analysis of student performance trends, data from 2014-15 through 2016-17 indicate that the number of Long-Term English Learners has decreased and graduation rates for ELs have increased.

Sanger and Firebaugh have navigated a variety of challenges over the course of the project, particularly staffing challenges. In addition, the districts have worked to balance cohesion and differentiation in their partnership, maintaining common goals but allowing activities and tools to be tailored to the needs of each district’s context.

The multi-faceted nature of the LTEL project—with its joint focus on building educator capacity, redesigning systems and structures, and engaging families—seems to enhance the likelihood that the project’s impact will be felt for many years to come.
## Appendix A

### LTEL Project Activities by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 (2014-15)</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who is involved?</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.                | *English Learner Institute for Teaching Excellence (ELITE)* Training that provided a foundational understanding of LTEL’s distinct academic needs. The training included time for secondary teams to develop plans to meet LTEL needs at individual sites. Teams set priorities that led to the expansion and creation of LTEL courses. | Sanger & Firebaugh (70 total)  
  - 16 Teachers  
  - 13 Coaches  
  - 30 Administrators  
  - 9 Counselors  
  - 2 Data Specialists | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)  
Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 3, Activities) |
| 2.                | *New course* Academic Language Development I (9th grade LTELs) | Course for Sanger High LTELs | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)  
Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 4, Goals) |
<p>| 3.                | <em>New course</em> LTEL support class (6th grade) | Firebaugh | Interview with Firebaugh administrators |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Discourse Training (Zwiers)</th>
<th>Sanger &amp; Firebaugh (95 total)</th>
<th>Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Focused on ELA teachers</td>
<td>• 58 Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 14 Coaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 22 Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 3, Activities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic Discourse for Trainers of Trainers (Zwiers)</td>
<td>Sanger &amp; Firebaugh (54 total)</td>
<td>Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 3, Activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainer of trainer modules that “inspired instructional change at the teacher level to support the linguistic needs of LTEL students”</td>
<td>• 25 Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 12 Coaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 15 Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Discourse Reflective Tool</td>
<td>Sanger EL Services created</td>
<td>Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed in Year 1 and ready for full implementation in Year 2.</td>
<td>Firebaugh integrated components of the tool into their electronic walkthrough forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Party(s)</td>
<td>Report/Doc Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7.  | Developed Language Matrices  
Matrices replace SOLOM Matrix and are intended to monitor language fluency                                                                 | Developed by Sanger EL Services  | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)       |
| 8.  | Individualized Language Plan (ILP)  
Sanger increased and improved ILPs. Now a digital document accessed via Illuminate. Through this process a PLC is created that includes administrators, counselors, teachers, nurses, resource specialists, speech teachers, school psychologists, EL site contacts, intervention teachers, district personnel, parents and the focus student. | Sanger                           | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)       |
| 9.  | Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE)  
A way to form partnerships between parents and educators to advance students' academic success                                                                 | Sanger & Firebaugh (171 parents) | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 3, Activities) |
| 10. | Developed Site EL Leadership Teams  
The EL Leadership teams include curriculum support providers (CSPs) from Sanger and Learning Directors from Firebaugh, principals, EL site contacts, guidance instructional advisors, and Trainer of Trainers. The teams provide guidance and plan to expand membership to | Sanger & Firebaugh               | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 2, Lessons Learned) |
parents, teachers across content areas and grade levels and possibly students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2 (2015-16)</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. English Learner Institute for Teaching Excellence (ELITE)</td>
<td>Sanger Elementary leadership requested ELITE training given the success of the training with Secondary administrators.</td>
<td>Sanger</td>
<td>Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 2, Lessons Learned)</td>
<td>Note: LCAP funding paid for Y2 ELITE, not LTEL CVF funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. One Day Academic Discourse Training (Zwiers)</td>
<td>Academic Discourse professional development for Social Studies &amp; Science Teachers</td>
<td>Social Studies &amp; Science Teachers grades 6-12 (95 teachers)</td>
<td>Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
<td>70 Teachers, 13 Coaches, 12 Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Two Days of in-depth Training of Trainers (Zwiers)</td>
<td>Training for teachers who serve as academic discourse coaches for other teachers.</td>
<td>(83 Total)</td>
<td>Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 3, Activities)</td>
<td>51 Teachers, 21 Coaches, 11 Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Integrated ELD Training</strong>&lt;br&gt;Integrated ELD training for ELA, Social Studies &amp; Science Teachers</td>
<td><strong>Sanger &amp; Firebaugh</strong>&lt;br&gt;(182 total)&lt;br&gt;• 137 Teachers&lt;br&gt;• 20 Coaches&lt;br&gt;• 25 Administrators</td>
<td><strong>Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 3, Activities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Kagan Training</strong>&lt;br&gt;Training for English Language Arts (ELA) secondary teachers that focused on ways to increase student opportunities for collaborative conversations and academic discourse.</td>
<td><strong>Secondary ELA Teachers</strong>&lt;br&gt;(81 total)&lt;br&gt;• 58 Teachers&lt;br&gt;• 9 Coaches/DIS&lt;br&gt;• 14 Administrators</td>
<td><strong>Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Individualized Language Plan (ILP)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Firebaugh implemented ILPs for 6th graders and plans to expand to 7th through 12th grade in Year 3. Sanger continued with ILPs.</td>
<td><strong>Sanger &amp; Firebaugh</strong>&lt;br&gt;Interviews with Firebaugh and Sanger administrators</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>New course</strong>&lt;br&gt;Academic Language Development II (10th grade LTELs)</td>
<td><strong>Sanger High</strong>&lt;br&gt;Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|7. | *New course*  
Course designed to provide lessons and units aligned to LTELs’ content classes and in tandem with the ELD standards. | Sanger WAMS | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 4, Goals) |
|8. | *New staff position*  
WAMS created a new position for a Designated ELD teacher/coach | Sanger WAMS | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 4, Goals) |
|9. | *Refined Academic Seminar course*  
WAMS refined Academic Seminar courses to include Designated ELD | Sanger WAMS | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)  
Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 1) |
|10. | *Added 8th grade LTEL cohort class*  
Firebaugh Middle School added an 8th grade LTEL cohort class | Firebaugh Middle School | Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1) |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong></td>
<td>New course</td>
<td>Firebaugh High School added new course for EL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firebaugh High School</td>
<td>Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firebaugh High School</td>
<td>Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong></td>
<td>Launching of Sangerlearns.com</td>
<td>A website available to both districts that has expanded to provide resources, sample lessons, templates, videos, and strategies aimed at supporting ELs in both Integrated ELD and Designated ELD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanger created, used by Sanger and Firebaugh</td>
<td>Y1 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanger created, used by Sanger and Firebaugh</td>
<td>Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong></td>
<td>Stanford’s “Learning as Evidence: Improving ELLs’ Argumentation Skills through Formative Assessment Practices” MOOC</td>
<td>28 Sanger and Firebaugh Trainer of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Sanger and Firebaugh Trainer of Trainers</td>
<td>Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Year 3 (2016-17) | 1. | English Learner Institute for Teaching Excellence  
ELITE training and Instructional Rounds for Sanger principals, Curriculum Support Providers and English Learner Site Contacts (ELSCs) | Sanger and Firebaugh  
- Elementary leadership  
- Secondary leadership | Interviews |
| Sanger & Firebaugh  
(254 Total)  
- 187 SHS Participants  
- 5/7 KRHS Graduate  
- 10/27 FHS Graduate  
- 20/21 WAMS Graduate,  
- 32/43 FMS Graduate  
- 67 PIQE graduates | Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 3, Activities) |
| This MOOC increased knowledge base, formative assessment practices on supporting English Learners, especially LTEls. | PIQE parent training  
*Note: The SHS participant number reflects APS participants, not PIQE.* | Y2 Annual Report (CVF Form 2, Lessons & Changes) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>2.</strong> One Day Academic Discourse Training (Zwiers)**</th>
<th><strong>Secondary Math Teachers from Sanger and Firebaugh</strong></th>
<th><strong>Training observation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Academic Discourse professional development for Math Teachers | • 51 Teachers  
• 9 Coaches  
• 11 Administrators  
• 3 Other Districts | Y3 Annual Report (CVF Form 3) |
<p>|   | <strong>3.</strong> One Day Integrated ELD Training            | <strong>Secondary Math Teachers from Sanger and Firebaugh</strong> |                          |
|   | Integrated ELD professional development for Math Teachers |                          |                          |
|   | <strong>4.</strong> Trainer of Trainers Designated ELD Training for teachers who serve as Designated ELD coaches for other teachers. | <strong>Sanger and Firebaugh</strong> |                          |
|   | <strong>5.</strong> Trainer of Trainers Integrated ELD Training for teachers who serve as Integrated ELD coaches for other teachers. | <strong>Sanger and Firebaugh</strong> |                          |
|   | <strong>6.</strong> Courses for LTELs                          | <strong>Firebaugh</strong>                                               | <strong>Y3 Annual Report (CVF Form 1)</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 4 (2017-18)</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>English Learner Institute for Teaching Excellence 3.0 ELITE training and Instructional Rounds for Sanger with Academic Discourse focus.</th>
<th>All administrators in Sanger</th>
<th>Y4 Annual Report (Form 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Individualized Language Plans (ILPs) Firebaugh implemented ILPs at the middle school and piloted the ILPs at the high school. They plan to further expand the ILP process in 2017-18. Sanger continued with ILPs at the Secondary level and is now also using them at the elementary schools.</td>
<td>Sanger and Firebaugh</td>
<td>Interviews Y3 Annual Report (CVF Form 1 and Form 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>PIQE parent training Sanger and Firebaugh continued implementation of the PIQE program. Sanger offered PIQE to middle school and continuation school parents, while Firebaugh continued offering PIQE to parents and the middle and high school. Sanger High continued implementation of the Apache APS parent education program. <em>Note: The SHS participant number reflects APS participants, not PIQE.</em></td>
<td>Sanger and Firebaugh</td>
<td>Y3 Annual Report (CVF Form 1 and Form 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firebaugh High School added new SDAIE courses for EL students with CELDT levels 3-5, and Firebaugh Middle School added a language support class.
| 2. | **Integrated ELD Training (Jeff Zwiers)**  
Six days of Integrated ELD training with Academic Discourse focus for prevention of LTEIs. | All Sanger TK – 5 teachers, coaches and administrators | Y4 Annual Report (Form 3) |
| 3. | **Integrated ELD Training (Lisa Clark)**  
Six days of Integrated ELD training and onsite coaching. | All Firebaugh teachers grades 3 – 5, academic coaches and administrators | Y4 Annual Report (Form 3) |
| 4. | **Academic Vocabulary Toolkit training**  
Training and utilization of Kate Kinsella’s Academic Vocabulary Toolkit. | All Firebaugh teachers grades 3 – 5 | Y4 Annual Report (Form 3) |
| 5. | **Designated ELD Training (Jeff Zwiers)**  
One day of Designated ELD training for TK – 12 coaches and lead teachers. | Sanger coaches and lead teachers in grades TK – 12. | Y4 Annual Report (Form 3) |
| 6. | **Academic Discourse Training Refresher**  
One day of Academic Discourse training as a refresher for teachers teaching grades 6-12. | Sanger teachers in grades 6 – 12. | Y4 Annual Report (Form 3) |
| 7. | **Designated ELD/Academic Discourse Training (Adam Ebrahim)**  
Six days of Designated ELD/Academic Discourse training for new English and History Social Science teachers in grades 6 – 8 and academic coach. | Firebaugh English and History Social Science teachers in grades 6 – 8 and academic coach. | Y4 Annual Report (Form 3) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observation tools</th>
<th>Sanger and Firebaugh administrators and coaches</th>
<th>Y4 Annual Report (Form 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>Observation tools</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sanger continued refining and using the Instructional Rounds form and COAT tool. Firebaugh refined their observation tool to focus on the four domains of language proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>Individualized Language Plans (ILPs)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Firebaugh implemented ILPs at the intermediate, middle and high school. Sanger continued with ILPs at elementary school and secondary school sites. Sanger added ILPs at elementary sites for ELs “at risk” of becoming LTELS and Firebaugh added ILPs for at risk students at the intermediate school site. In Firebaugh, teachers from all four content areas participated in the ILP process.</td>
<td>Sanger and Firebaugh</td>
<td>Y4 Annual Report (Form 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>PIQE parent training</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sanger and Firebaugh continued implementation of the PIQE program. Firebaugh offered the training to parents at the intermediate, middle and high school. Sanger encouraged parents from all 6 – 12 sites to participate in PIQE and Sanger High continued implementation of the Apache APS parent education program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A total of 54 graduating parents in Firebaugh.&lt;br&gt;A total of 26 graduating parents from Sanger.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Analysis of Students on Individualized Language Plans in Sanger, 2016-17

Overview:
- Total ILP Students: 227
- 16-17 Total RFEPs: 353
- 16-17 RFEPs on ILP: 51
- 16-17 RFEPs on ILP with a Primary Disability: 9

ILP Data
May 11, 2017
ILP counts are from Elevate. Any student with a finalized ILP meeting within Elevate between August 18th, 2016 and May 11th, 2017 is counted as an ILP student.
Updated May 11th, 2017 5:00 PM

ILP Students by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>ILP Students</th>
<th>EL &amp; 16-17 RFEP</th>
<th>Percent on ILP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanger High School</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>26.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Day School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Elementary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>15.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Academic Middle School</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>14.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan Elementary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star Elementary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Elementary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,077</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.52%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years EL and ILP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years EL</th>
<th>ILP Student</th>
<th>EL &amp; 16-17 RFEP</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 to 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 to 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 to 4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>8.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 to 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 to 6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 to 7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 to 8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>19.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ILP vs Non-ILP Students

Dual Identified Students with ILP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Disability</th>
<th>ILP Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: SANGER’S ELD EXPECTATIONS FOR 2018-19

Sanger Unified School District
Designated & Integrated ELD Expectations
2018 - 2019
Grades TK - 12

The purpose of the Sanger Unified School District ELD Expectations is for Designated & Integrated ELD instructors, support providers, & administrators to have clear expectations on best practices, protocols, & resources to ensure high-quality ELD instruction. These expectations are based on the most up-to-date research, professional development, & information available.

2018 - 2019 District Expectations:

- **Instruction**
  - Designated & Integrated ELD instruction should include overlapping best practices
    - [SUSD Effective Instruction Elements & 10 Essential Features](#)
  - Tailored to push students to the next English language proficiency level using a UDL lens
    - Students grouped by Emerging, Expanding, or Bridging levels in Designated ELD

- **Content**
  - Language targets & lessons must be aligned to ELD standards
    - Consider pacing & track progress with checklist or planning templates
    - Address language skills needed to access content (ELA, math, science, H-SS, etc.)
      - Reinforce content vocabulary & academic language
      - Consider upcoming units, topics, presentations, or assignments
  - Prompts need to be designed to build oral & written English skills
  - ELD lessons or units should build to a culminating speaking or writing project

- **Language Development Strategies**
  - Top 10 ELD Strategies
  - Academic Language Crowdsourcing & Cheat Sheets

- **Assessment & Data**
  - Log-in to Elevation to review English learners’ progress & update goals (ILP or RFEP)
  - Adjust instruction accordingly based on assessment results & classroom observations
    - Initial & Summative ELPAC
    - COAT → Conversation Observation & Analysis Tool
    - Language Matrix
    - Other language samples or scores (speaking, listening, reading, & writing)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create Your Own ELD Adventure Map</th>
<th>ELPAC Overview &amp; Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TK-12 Digital ELD Toolkit</td>
<td>B.E.L.I.E.F. Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting English Learners with IEPs</td>
<td>Supporting Newcomers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>