



Does Your Local Control Accountability (LCAP) Plan Deliver on The Promise of Increased or Improved Services for English Learners?

10 RESEARCH ALIGNED RUBRICS TO HELP ANSWER THE QUESTION AND GUIDE YOUR PROGRAM

Introduction

The intent of California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) was to give districts more flexibility with their state funding but at the same time to create a new school finance system that recognizes that students with specific demographic factors need greater support to address their academic needs and improve educational outcomes: English learners, low income students and foster youth. As Governor Brown stated in January 2013, "Equal treatment for children in unequal situations is not justice". LCFF recognizes that students with additional academic needs require additional financial resources to "improve or increase services". LCFF was designed as a step towards a more equitable school finance system.

As a component of LCFF, all LEAs are required to prepare a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) which describes how they intend to meet annual goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Supplemental and concentration grant amounts are calculated based on "unduplicated pupil" counts. Given that California enrolls approximately 1.4 million English learners, 22.7% of total enrollment, the LCAP represents a significant opportunity for LEAs to plan for and fulfill the promise of improved or increased services for English learners. As such, the LCAP requires LEAs to set forth their goals, address the eight state priorities and describe the improved or increased services to close achievement gaps.

To provide guidance for LEAs in designing, funding and implementing programs for English Learners using LCFF guidelines, Californians Together, the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA), and the Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) developed a set of rubrics that address 10 focus areas with high impact on English Learners. They are:

1. English Language Development
2. Parent Engagement
3. Professional Development
4. Programs and Course Access
5. Expenditures
6. District Wide Use of Concentration and Supplemental Grant Funds
7. School Wide Use of Concentration and Supplemental Grant Funds
8. Actions and Services
9. Proportionality
10. English Learner Data to Inform Goal

The identification of these 10 focus areas and their respective indicators was informed by examining research-based principles and practices for English Learners. Additionally, the rubrics includes principles and recommendations put forth by Drs. Patricia Gándara and María Estela Zarate in their recent publication titled “Seizing the Opportunity to Narrow the Achievement Gap for English Learners: Research-based Recommendations for the Use of LCFF Funds” from the Civil Rights Project at UCLA.

In an applied use of the rubrics, the aforementioned organizations reviewed many first-year LCAPs through the lens of English Learners. Selected district LCAP reviews included districts with high numbers of English learners, high percentages of English learners, and those with a record of providing quality English learner programs. Reviewers represented a cross section of the California educational community, including legal services, educators, and EL advocates. Results from this convening assisted the development team in refining and finalizing rubrics for wider distribution and use.

These rubrics constitute a valuable resource and important tool for district administrators, teachers, parents, board and community members to analyze the strengths and limitations of their proposed programs and services for English Learners in their LCAP. It is hoped that the rubrics will help all stakeholders prioritize what needs to be improved and addressed in the annual revision of the LCAPs.

We grant permission to duplicate and distribute the rubrics for use in the districts and community but ask that they be attributed to Californians Together, California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA), and Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL).

As a community we can be responsible for assuring that the intent and goals of the this new school finance system, LCFF, delivers on the promises of “improved or increased” services and programs that lead to high levels of academic achievement for all students with an intentional target on English Learners, low income students and foster youth.

A COLLABORATION OF THE FOLLOWING SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Focus Area #1 – English Language Develop	1
Focus Area #2 – Parents	
Part A – Development of LCAP	3
Part B – Implementation of LCAP	5
Focus Area #3 - Professional Development	7
Focus Area #4 – Program and Course Access	9
Focus Area #5 – Expenditures	11
Focus Area #6 – District Wide and School Wide	
Part A – District Wide Use of Supplemental and Concentration Grant Funds	13
Part B – School Wide Use of Supplemental and Concentration Grant Funds	16
Focus Area #7 – Actions and Services	19
Focus Area #8 – Proportionality	21
Focus Area #9 – EL Data to Inform Goals	
Part A – EL Data Elements to Inform Goals	22
Part B – Teacher Recruitment and Assignment	23
Focus Area #10 – Student Outcomes	
Part A – Measures of English Language Development	24
Part B – Academic Growth Targets	26

RUBRIC FOR LCAP REVIEW

FOCUS AREA # 1 - English Language Development

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No mention of research-based ELD program.</u>	☐ <u>Focus on the implementation of a research-based ELD program</u> includes <u>limited</u> goals and activities for articulated ELD programs and standards-based ELD curricular materials.	☐ <u>Focus on the implementation of a research-based ELD program</u> includes <u>some</u> goals and activities for articulated ELD programs and standards-based ELD curricular materials.	☐ <u>Focus on the implementation of a research-based ELD program</u> includes <u>explicit</u> goals and activities for articulated ELD programs and standards-based ELD curricular materials.
☐ <u>No mention of ELD standards.</u>	☐ <u>Limited activities</u> for ELD standards professional development solely for teachers.	☐ <u>Focus on ELD standards</u> is identified to allow teachers, administrators and counselors to make meaning of the standards for the designated ELD.	☐ <u>Focus on ELD standards</u> is identified as an <u>explicit</u> , targeted set of activities of sufficient duration to allow teachers, administrators and counselors to make meaning of the standards and plan collaboratively for implementation in designated ELD and in content areas.
☐ <u>No mention of professional development</u> related to ELD.	☐ <u>Minimal</u> goals and activities for ELD Standards professional development.	☐ <u>Some</u> goals and activities for ELD standards professional development priorities.	☐ <u>Explicit</u> goals and activities for ELD standards professional development priorities based on needs assessment.
☐ <u>Limited professional development</u> for Common Core Standards.	☐ Presentation of Common Core Standards <u>without mention of ELD standards.</u>	☐ <u>Sequential</u> presentation of Common Core Standards and ELD standards for teachers and administrators of ELs.	☐ <u>Simultaneous</u> presentation of Common Core Standards and ELD standards for teachers and administrators of ELs.

Evidence:
(cite page #s)

FOCUS AREA # 2 - PARENTS

Part A – For development of the LCAP

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No mention of DELAC or any other EL subcommittee providing input to LCAP.	☐ General statement of <u>presenting LCAP to DELAC</u> .	☐ District met with <u>DELAC to seek input</u> prior to completing the LCAP.	☐ District met with <u>DELAC to provide training and seek input</u> prior to completing the LCAP.
☐ No mention of <u>superintendent meeting</u> and responding to DELCA recommendations.	☐ Oral response or written <u>response</u> by the superintendent <u>not specific</u> to the DELAC recommendations.	☐ Superintendent <u>met with DELAC</u> to review draft LCAP and received comments.	☐ Superintendent <u>met multiple times with DELAC</u> to review draft LCAP and received comments throughout the process.
☐ No <u>DELAC recommendations</u> included in the plan.	☐ <u>Minimal</u> recommendations included in the plan or lack of timeline.	☐ LCAP includes <u>some</u> concrete DELAC recommendations.	☐ LCAP includes <u>many</u> concrete DELAC <u>recommendations</u> .
☐ No <u>EL Focus group</u> .	☐ No <u>EL Focus groups</u> or other EL parent groups for EL recommendations.	☐ <u>Mention of other parent meetings</u> in addition to DELAC for EL recommendations.	☐ In addition to DELAC, district <u>met with EL focus groups</u> to discuss recommendations for programs and services for ELs.
☐ No <u>representation</u> of EL parents on parent advisory committee.	☐ <u>Minimal</u> representation of EL parents on parent advisory committee.	☐ <u>Some representation</u> of EL parents on parent advisory committee..	☐ <u>Proportional representation</u> of EL parents on parent advisory committee.
☐ No translations available for drafts or final version of the LCAP.	☐ <u>Translation</u> available only for the <u>summary</u> of the plan.	☐ <u>Provided translated</u> version of <u>final</u> LCAP.	☐ <u>Provided translated</u> version of <u>drafts</u> and final LCAP.

Evidence:
(cite page #s)

FOCUS AREA # 2 - PARENTS
Part B – Implementation of the LCAP

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No plan for oral or written translation.	☐ <u>Limited</u> plan for oral or written translation.	☐ <u>General</u> plan for oral or written translation.	☐ <u>Explicit</u> plans for oral and written translation.
☐ <u>No</u> hiring practices to attract and increase numbers of bilingual office staff or community/parent liaisons.	☐ <u>Limited</u> plan for hiring practices for bilingual office staff or community/parent liaisons.	☐ <u>General</u> hiring practices to ensure presence of qualified bilingual office staff <u>or</u> community/parent liaisons.	☐ <u>Detailed hiring practices</u> and professional development processes to ensure presence of qualified bilingual office staff and community/parent liaisons.
☐ <u>No plans to increase</u> , parental involvement.	☐ EL parental involvement <u>limited to DELAC</u> services.	☐ General plan for increasing EL parental involvement in decision making committees.	☐ Explicit plan for increasing EL parental involvement in district/school-wide <u>decision-making</u> committee.
☐ No plan to increase parent leadership development.	☐ <u>General plans</u> for parental involvement and development without targeted attention to EL parent population.	☐ <u>Short term plan</u> for parent leadership development programs.	☐ <u>Long-term plan</u> to build capacity for parent leadership development programs.
☐ <u>No mention</u> of DELACs meeting.	☐ <u>General plans</u> for DELACs to meet.	☐ <u>General plans</u> for DELACs to meet <u>regularly to review and monitor the implementation of the LCAP.</u>	☐ <u>Explicit plans</u> for the DELACs and ELACs to meet <u>regularly to review and monitor the implementation of the LCAP.</u>

Evidence:
(cite page #s)

FOCUS AREA # 3 - Professional Development

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No mention</u> of teacher/stakeholder input or needs assessment for EL teaching or learning.	☐ District leadership team had <u>minimal input</u> from teacher/stakeholders to identify differentiated learning needs for EL teaching and learning.	☐ District leadership team had <u>some input</u> from teacher/stakeholders to identify differentiated learning needs for EL teaching and learning.	☐ District leadership team <u>conducted needs assessments and met</u> with teachers/stakeholders <u>multiple times</u> to seek input and identify differentiated learning needs for EL teaching and learning.
☐ <u>No mention</u> of professional development for EL teachers, administrators, support staff or counselors.	☐ <u>Limited activities described</u> for professional development of EL teachers without any reference to specific topics based upon teacher needs.	☐ Professional development plan includes <u>some goals</u> for teachers of ELs and effective PD elements such as teacher collaboration, classroom-based application, OR teacher reflection or inquiry cycles.	☐ <u>Detailed</u> professional development (PD) plan includes <u>long-term goals</u> for teachers of ELs and <u>describes many</u> effective PD elements, including teacher collaboration, classroom-based application, AND teacher reflection or inquiry cycles.
☐ <u>No EL PD activities described</u> for administrators, support staff or counselors.	☐ <u>Limited EL PD activities described</u> for administrators, support staff or counselors.	☐ PD activities identify <u>some training</u> on EL issues for district/site administrators, instructional support staff, OR counselors on just one or two topics.	☐ PD activities <u>explicitly identifies training</u> on EL issues for district and site administrators, instructional support staff, AND counselors including but not limited to implementation of ELD Standards, addressing the language and academic needs of the different profiles of ELs, newcomers, Long Term English Learners, literacy and content instruction in L1 and English.
☐ <u>No mention</u> of PD training for cultural proficiency or responsiveness.	☐ <u>Minimal</u> cultural proficiency/competency training elements are identified in PD.	☐ <u>Some</u> cultural proficiency/competency training elements are identified in PD.	☐ PD activities address <u>many elements of</u> cultural proficiency/competency training, including cross-cultural interactions, cultural differences in communication patterns, role of culture and impact on EL learning and achievement, and culturally responsive instruction and curriculum.

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No systems</u> in place to evaluate effectiveness of PD plan.	☐ <u>Minimal</u> systems in place to evaluate effectiveness of PD plan.	☐ <u>Some</u> systems in place to evaluate effectiveness of PD plan.	☐ <u>Explicitly</u> details systems to evaluate effectiveness of PD plan based on degree of implementation, participant feedback, and student outcome data.
Evidence: (cite page #s)			

FOCUS AREA # 4 – PROGRAM AND COURSE ACCESS

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No mention</u> of increased availability of early learning opportunities for ELs.	☐ <u>Limited program and activities</u> to promote early learning opportunities (e.g. pre-school) for ELs with no mention of home language.	☐ <u>General program and activities</u> provide/promote early learning opportunities (e.g. pre-school) for ELs with reference to support in the home language and English.	☐ <u>Detailed program and activities</u> to increase the availability of early learning opportunities (e.g. pre-school) for ELs that includes the development of both primary language and English.
☐ <u>No evidence of program and activities</u> to increase EL access to rigorous academic content in all core content areas, including college prep courses for MS/HS.	☐ <u>Limited program and activities</u> to increase EL access to rigorous academic content in core content areas with no designation to grade levels.	☐ <u>General program and activities</u> increase EL access to rigorous academic content in core content areas TK, K-12 th grade, including college prep courses for MS/HS.	☐ <u>Detailed program and activities</u> to increase EL access to rigorous academic content TK, Kinder – 12 th grade in all core content areas, including college prep courses for MS/HS.
☐ <u>No mention</u> of Long Term English Learners (grades 6-12)	☐ <u>Mention of Long Term English Learners but no description</u> of what is to be provided. (gr. 6-12).	☐ <u>Described specialized ELD courses</u> for Long Term English Learners. (grades 6-12)	☐ <u>Detailed program and activities</u> to have specialized ELD courses for Long Term English Learners and access to all core curriculum (grades 6-12).
☐ <u>No evidence of program and activities</u> for increased EL participation in enrichment courses (e.g. GATE, AP, IB, music).	☐ <u>Limited program and activities</u> to promote EL participation in enrichment courses (e.g. GATE, AP, IB, music).	☐ <u>General program and activities</u> provide/promote EL participation in enrichment courses (e.g. GATE, AP, IB, music).	☐ <u>Detailed program and activities</u> to increase EL participation in enrichment courses (e.g. GATE, AP, IB, music).
☐ <u>No evidence of program and activities</u> for extended learning time or differentiated intervention programs for ELs.	☐ <u>Limited program and activities</u> to provide extended learning time and differentiated intervention programs for ELs.	☐ <u>General program and activities</u> to provide extended learning time and differentiated intervention programs for ELs.	☐ <u>Detailed program and activities</u> to provide extended learning time and differentiated intervention programs for ELs.

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No plan</u> to provide Biliteracy programs for ELs.	☐ <u>Limited plan</u> to provide Biliteracy programs for ELs.	☐ <u>General plan for Biliteracy</u> programs for ELs, such as bilingual or two-way dual language programs.	☐ <u>Long-term plans</u> to provide Biliteracy programs for ELs, such as bilingual or two-way dual language programs.
☐ <u>No program and activities</u> to provide EL access to extra-curricular activities.	☐ <u>Limited program and activities</u> to promote EL access to extra-curricular activities.	☐ <u>General program and activities</u> to provide/promote EL access to extra-curricular activities.	☐ <u>Detailed program and activities</u> to provide increased EL access to extra-curricular activities.
Evidence: (cite page #s)			

FOCUS AREA # 5 - Expenditures

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No actions and services are specific to ELs and are linked to specific expenditures.	☐ Minimal actions and services are <u>specific to ELs</u> and are not linked to specific expenditures.	☐ Some actions and services are specific to ELs and linked to specific expenditures.	☐ All actions and services <u>specific to ELs</u> are linked to specific expenditures.
☐ Uses <u>exclusively</u> Federal Title III and/or Title I money to pay for EL programs and services.	☐ <u>Comingles funding</u> from all sources and does not provide how much money will be used from each source.	☐ Identifies <u>some</u> funding sources for programs and services for ELs.	☐ Identifies non-LCFF, state and federal funding sources for programs and services for ELs.
☐ <u>Does not provide</u> any <u>Funding source</u> for EL programs and services.	☐ Uses <u>mostly</u> Federal Title III money to pay for EL programs and services	☐ Provides for EL expenditures with LCFF funds <u>without distinguishing supplemental, concentration and base funds</u> .	☐ Identifies <u>base, supplemental or concentration grant funding</u> for <u>each EL program and service</u> provided (LCFF funds).
☐ No Title I or Title III funds are designated for EL programs and services.	☐ <u>Limited funding</u> from Title I and III for EL programs and services.	☐ Designates EL programs and services funded by Title III and Title I but it is <u>not clear if these services are supplemental</u> .	☐ Designates EL programs and services funded by Title III and Title I <u>which supplement</u> programs and services provided by LCFF.
☐ <u>No indication</u> of increased EL spending from prior years.	☐ Demonstrates <u>minimal increase</u> in EL spending from subsequent years.	☐ Demonstrates <u>some increase in EL spending</u> for subsequent years.	☐ Demonstrates an <u>increase</u> in EL spending from prior years.

Evidence:
(cite page #s)

FOCUS AREA # 6 - Part A: DISTRICT WIDE USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND CONCENTRATION GRANT FUNDS - IF ENROLLMENT OF UNDUPLICATED PUPILS IS MORE THAN 55% OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT:

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No indication</u> of total unduplicated pupils in the district/ percentage of total district enrollment.	☐ <u>Some indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 55% of total district enrollment, but exact percentage of total enrollment not provided.	☐ <u>Specific indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 55% of total district enrollment and exact percentage provided.	☐ <u>Specific indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 55% of total district enrollment and exact percentage provided along with total number of unduplicated pupils.
☐ <u>No mention</u> of extent to which concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis.	☐ <u>Some mention</u> that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis but: (1) no identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a district wide basis and/or (2) no description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.	☐ <u>Mentions</u> that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a district wide basis and (2) general description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.	☐ <u>Mention</u> that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a district wide basis; - and (2) specific description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.
			☐ LCAP <u>addresses</u> how district wide use of concentration or supplemental grant funds will benefit ELs, specifically, in meeting the district's goals in the state priority areas.

FOCUS AREA # 6 - Part A: DISTRICT WIDE USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND CONCENTRATION GRANT FUNDS - IF ENROLLMENT OF UNDUPLICATED PUPILS IS LESS THAN 55% OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT:

☐ <u>No mention</u> of total unduplicated pupils in the district/ percentage of total district enrollment.	☐ <u>Some indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils is less than 55% of total district enrollment, but exact percentage of total enrollment not provided.	☐ <u>Specific indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils is less than 55% of total district enrollment and exact percentage provided.	☐ <u>Specific indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils is less than 55% of total district enrollment and exact percentage provided along with total number of unduplicated pupils.
☐ <u>No mention</u> of extent to which supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis.	☐ <u>Some mention</u> that supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis but: (1) no identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a district wide basis; (2) no description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas; (3) no description of how the services are the <i>most effective</i> use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.	☐ <u>Mention</u> that supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a district wide basis; (2) general description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas; (3) general description of how the services are the <i>most effective</i> use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.	☐ <u>Mention</u> that supplemental grant funds will be provided on a district wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a district wide basis; (2) specific description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas; and (3) specific description of how the services are the <i>most effective</i> use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.
			☐ LCAP <u>addresses</u> how district wide use of supplemental grant funds will benefit ELs, specifically, in meeting the district's goals in the state priority areas.

Evidence:
(cite page #)

FOCUS AREA # 6 Part B: SCHOOL WIDE USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND CONCENTRATION GRANT FUNDS - IF ENROLLMENT OF UNDUPLICATED PUPILS IS MORE THAN 40% OF TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No indication of total unduplicated pupils in the school/ percentage of total school enrollment.	☐ Some indication that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 40% of total school enrollment, but exact percentage of total enrollment not provided.	☐ Specific indication that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 40% of total school enrollment and exact percentage provided.	☐ Specific indication that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 40% of total district enrollment and exact percentage provided along with total number of unduplicated pupils.
☐ No mention of extent to which concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a school wide basis.	☐ Some mention that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a school wide basis but: (1) no identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a school wide basis; (2) no description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas;	☐ Mentions that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a school wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a school wide basis; (2) general description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.	☐ Mentions that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a school wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a school wide basis; (2) specific description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas;
			☐ LCAP <u>addresses</u> how school wide use of concentration or supplemental grant funds will benefit ELs specifically in meeting the district's goals in the state priority areas.

FOCUS AREA # 6 Part B: SCHOOL WIDE USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND CONCENTRATION GRANT FUNDS - IF ENROLLMENT OF UNDUPLICATED PUPILS IS LESS THAN 40% OF TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No indication</u> of total unduplicated pupils in the school/ percentage of total school enrollment.	☐ <u>Some indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 40% of total school enrollment, but exact percentage of total enrollment not provided.	☐ <u>Specific indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 40% of total school enrollment and exact percentage provided.	☐ <u>Specific indication</u> that enrollment of unduplicated pupils exceeds 40% of total district enrollment and exact percentage provided along with total number of unduplicated pupils.
☐ <u>No mention</u> of extent to which concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a schoolwide basis.	☐ <u>Some mention</u> that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a school wide basis but: (1) no identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a school wide basis; (2) no description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas; (3) no description of how the services are the <i>most effective</i> use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.	☐ <u>Mentions</u> that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a school wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a school wide basis; (2) general description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas; (3) general description of how the services are the <i>most effective</i> use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.	☐ <u>Mentions</u> that concentration or supplemental grant funds will be provided on a school wide basis and: (1) identification in LCAP of specific services that are provided on a school wide basis; (2) specific description in LCAP of how such services are directed towards meeting the district's goals for unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas; - and (3) specific description of how the services are the <i>most effective</i> use of the funds to meet the district's goals for its unduplicated pupils in the state priority areas.
☐			☐ LCAP <u>addresses</u> how schoolwide use of concentration or supplemental grant funds will benefit ELs specifically in meeting the district's goals in the state priority areas.

Evidence:
(cite page #)

FOCUS AREA # 7 - *Actions and Services*

Services address and meet the specific needs of English Learners

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No distinction by proficiency level or EL profile is made for services for English Learners.	☐ General services and programs do not differentiate for EL proficiency levels nor are specific to the various profiles of English Learners.	☐ Services and programs recognize the needs of some different profiles of students: newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool - 12th grade.	☐ Specific services, programs and actions address the language and academic needs of the different profiles of students: newcomers, L1/L2 proficient students, LTELs, students at risk of becoming LTELs, preschool - 12th grade.
☐ EL Students are not annually assessed on language development.	☐ ELs are assessed annually on language development but results play no role in program placement or development.	☐ Services for ELs are based on ELs being assessed on an annual basis (summative) on language development and placed by their ELD level.	☐ Services for ELs are based on all ELs being assessed appropriately (L1 when appropriate) on an annual (summative) and on going basis (formative) on language development and being placed in appropriate programs options.
☐ Students are placed in programs and provided services without considering their EL level and profile.	☐ Program options for ELs are difficult to distinguish from English only students.	☐ Program options for ELs take into consideration the needs of the ELs and district resources to determine placement and options.	☐ The program options for English learners are based upon the needs of the ELs, the resources in the district and the preferences of the parents and community.
☐ Supplemental and concentration funds are used in the same way that base funds are.	☐ No description is included on EL services provided through supplemental and concentration funding.	☐ Services provided through supplemental and concentration funding are aligned to EL needs.	☐ Improved and increased services through supplemental and concentration funding add additional support, opportunities, personnel, resources etc. for enhancing the base program for all English learners.

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ Staff and students <u>language use is limited to English.</u>	☐ Staff are <u>monolingual English speakers</u> and not encouraged to use or learn another language.	☐ Some <u>bilingual personnel are available</u> and assigned to instruct and support students.	☐ Services to students are provided by <u>bilingual personnel who are trained and available to provide appropriate services and instruction.</u>
Evidence: cite page #)			

FOCUS AREA # 8 - *Proportionality (LCAP Section 3C & 3D)*

Actions taken by the LEA will demonstrate proportionate funding in supplemental and concentration funding for English learners

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No <u>mention</u> of proportionality percentage.	☐ The determined proportionality percentage is stated <u>without any explanation on how it was calculated.</u>	☐ The <u>steps</u> used to determine proportionality percentage are <u>explained without reference to the detailed steps of the formula.</u>	☐ The <u>steps</u> used to determine proportionality percentage are <u>clearly explained and displayed.</u>
☐ No <u>quantitative and qualitative</u> description of services being increased and improved for ELs in comparison to all pupils.	☐ <u>Minimal quantitative and qualitative</u> description of services being increased and improved for ELs in comparison to all pupils.	☐ <u>General quantitative and qualitative</u> description of services being increased and improved for ELs in comparison to all pupils.	☐ <u>Detailed quantitative and qualitative</u> description of services being increased and improved for ELs in comparison to all pupils.
☐ No <u>description of increased programs and services in proportion</u> to the increased funding is specific to ELs.	☐ <u>Minimal description of increased programs and services in proportion</u> to the increased funding is specific to ELs.	☐ <u>General description of increased programs and services in proportion</u> to the increased funding is specific to ELs.	☐ <u>Detailed description of increased programs and services in proportion</u> to the increased funding is specific to ELs.
☐ The LCAP <u>does not indicate an increased in funding over the last EIA allocation.</u>	☐ The LEA <u>does demonstrate increased funding without mentioning supplemental and concentration grant funding over last EIA allocation.</u>	☐ The LCAP <u>demonstrates an increase in funds without differentiating concentration and supplemental funding sources over the last year of EIA funding.</u>	☐ The LCAP <u>clearly demonstrates that the funds allocated for supplemental and concentration grant are an increase over the last year of EIA funding.</u>
Evidence: (cite page #)			

FOCUS AREA # 9 - EL Data to Inform Goals
Part A. Data Elements to Inform Goals

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No EL data elements were used to inform district goals, programs and services to address the language and academic needs of ELs.	☐ Few EL data elements including, but are not limited to, length of time in US schools, EL proficiency level, L1 proficiency and literacy and program type (e.g. dual-language, structured-English immersion, etc.) informed the development of the district goals, programs and services to address the language and academic needs of ELs.	☐ Some EL data elements including, but are not limited to, length of time in US schools, EL proficiency level, L1 proficiency and literacy and program type (e.g. dual-language, structured-English immersion, etc.) informed the development of the district goals, programs and services to address the language and academic needs of ELs.	☐ Many EL data elements including, but not limited to, length of time in US schools, EL proficiency level, L1 proficiency and literacy and program type (e.g. dual-language, structured-English immersion, etc.) informed the development of the district goals, programs and services to address the language and academic needs of ELs.
☐ Only general data elements were presented to stakeholders to inform the goals.	☐ Few EL data elements were presented to some stakeholders resulting in minimal impact on the development of the district goals.	☐ Some EL data elements were presented to all stakeholders to help inform the development of the district goals.	☐ Many EL data elements were presented to all stakeholders to help inform the development of the district goals.
Evidence: (cite page #)			

FOCUS AREA # 9 - EL Data to Inform Goals
Part B. Teacher Recruitment and Assignment

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ <u>No plan</u> for the recruitment, hiring and retention of credentialed <u>bilingual teachers</u> . In the <u>district</u> .	☐ <u>Limited plan</u> for the recruitment, retention and hiring of credentialed <u>bilingual teachers</u> in the <u>district</u> .	☐ <u>General plan</u> for the hiring and recruitment of <u>bilingual teachers</u> in the <u>district</u> .	☐ <u>Detailed 3 year plan</u> for the recruitment, and hiring of a credentialed <u>bilingual teacher</u> workforce with appropriate funding.
☐ <u>No plan</u> detailing the hiring of new teachers with bilingual credential.	☐ <u>Minimal plan</u> detailing expected Increases in the number of new teacher hires with bilingual credential.	☐ <u>General 3 year plan</u> for the retention and development of a credentialed <u>bilingual teacher workforce</u> .	☐ <u>Detailed 3 year plan</u> for the retention and development of a credentialed <u>bilingual teacher workforce</u> .
☐ <u>No data</u> on the number of tenured credentialed <u>bilingual teachers</u> in the <u>district</u> .	☐ <u>Identify number</u> of tenured teachers with bilingual credentials.	☐ <u>General plan to increase</u> in the number of new teacher hires with bilingual credential annually.	☐ <u>Detailed plan to increase</u> the number of new teacher hires with bilingual credential annually.
Evidence: (cite page #)			

FOCUS AREA # 10 - Student Outcomes

Part A – Measures of English Language Development

No Evidence Included	Weak	Good	Exemplary
☐ No English language proficiency benchmarks to measure language growth in English.	☐ Minimal outcomes on English language proficiency are identified and <u>are measured only by CELDT.</u>	☐ Desired outcomes on English language proficiency <u>are measured only by CELDT.</u>	☐ Desired outcomes on English language proficiency are included and <u>are measured by CELDT, language development benchmarks, or other indicators.</u>
☐ The <u>AMAO 2 data is not included.</u>	☐ English proficiency as reported by AMAO 2 <u>without expected growth</u> is included.	☐ English proficiency as <u>reported by AMAO 2 increases yearly.</u>	☐ English proficiency as reported by <u>AMAO 2 increases yearly</u> and is <u>reported by grade level and years</u> in US schools.
☐ No mention of Long Term English Learners and students at risk of becoming Long Term English Learners.	☐ Numbers of Long Term English Learners are reported.	☐ Numbers of Long Term English Learners are reported and their numbers or % of LTELs is expected to decrease yearly.	☐ Numbers of Long Term English Learners <u>and</u> students at risk of becoming Long Term English learners are reported and a <u>decrease in numbers or % of these EL students is expected yearly.</u>
☐ No expected growth or outcome for students meeting district reclassification criteria.	☐ The % of EL students who meet the district reclassification criteria is expected to increase.	☐ The % of EL students reported by grade level who meet the district reclassification criteria is expected to increase.	☐ The number of EL students and the % of EL students reported by grade level and years in US Schools who meet the district reclassification criteria are expected to increase.

Evidence:
(cite page #)

FOCUS AREA # 10 - Student Outcomes

Part B – Academic Growth Targets

☐ Desired <u>outcomes for ELs are only reported in English</u> and no assessment data is reported in the student's primary language.	☐ Desired <u>outcomes on assessments are reported in English and the primary language of the students who are being instructed in the home language but limited to one or two grade levels.</u>	☐ Desired outcomes on <u>assessments are reported in English and the primary language of the students who are being instructed in the home language.</u>	☐ Desired outcomes on <u>assessments are reported in English and the primary language of the students who are literate in their home language or are being instructed in the home language.</u>
☐ Specific Academic growth <u>measures for ELs are not included.</u>	☐ Few specific academic growth <u>measures (including A-G, Graduation rate, AP, and EAP passing scores) are disaggregated by ELs .</u>	☐ Some specific academic growth <u>measures (including A-G, Graduation rate, AP, and EAP passing scores)are disaggregated by ELs . Academic growth equals the expected growth of English only students.</u>	☐ All specific academic growth <u>measures (including A-G, Graduation rate, AP, and EAP passing scores) are disaggregated by ELs and reported by grade level and levels of English proficiency. EL academic growth exceeds the expected growth of English only students to demonstrate the closing of the achievement gap.</u>
☐ <u>Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are not evaluated.</u>	☐ <u>Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated but no credit is given for courses from non-US schools.</u>	☐ <u>Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated so that students can be accurately placed in grade level and appropriate courses.</u>	☐ <u>Transcripts from non-U.S. schools are evaluated so that students can be accurately placed and receive credit for courses taken and passed outside the U.S.</u>
☐ District <u>does not mention the State Seal of Biliteracy.</u>	☐ The numbers of seniors receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy <u>remains the same.</u>	☐ The numbers of seniors receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy <u>increases every year.</u>	☐ The numbers of seniors receiving the State Seal of Biliteracy and <u>schools offering the State Seal of Biliteracy are expected to increase every year.</u>

☐ District <u>does not mention</u> <u>Biliteracy Pathway Awards</u> .	☐ The numbers of ELs receiving the Biliteracy Pathway Awards <u>remains the same</u> .	☐ The <u>numbers of ELs</u> receiving the Biliteracy Pathway Awards <u>increases every year</u> .	☐ The <u>number or % of ELs</u> receiving <u>Biliteracy Pathway Awards</u> are expected to <u>increase each year</u> .
Evidence: (cite page #)			

Additional Comments:

Focus Area: _____

Focus Area: _____

Focus Area: _____