![Guilford County Schools — Soar to Greatness logo]

English Learners
3Ls Framework Implementation Evaluation Report
2017-18

Division of Accountability and Research
Guilford County Schools
October 2018

Leigh Cox
Program Specialist-Evaluation
Research and Evaluation Department

Carolyn Gilbert, Ph.D.
Director
Research and Evaluation

English Learners
3Ls Framework Implementation
2017-18

Guilford County Schools and its English Learners (EL) Department were asked by the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) to pilot a new 3Ls Framework (Learning, Language, Literacy) during the 2017-18 school year. The literacy vocabulary framework uses extensive, descriptive grade-level vocabulary in context connecting language rather than focusing on isolated vocabulary. By emphasizing grade-level vocabulary and descriptive text, the essential questions that drive instruction are more in-depth. EL students are challenged to interact with rich grade-level text rather than text at their current English language reading levels.

Evaluation Plan

The evaluation was developed jointly by the Research and Evaluation Department and the English Learners Department through a variety of collaborative sessions utilizing conference calls, electronic communications, and face-to-face meetings. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research methods to understand the overall implementation of the 3Ls Framework. Data were collected from EL teacher and principal surveys and EL teacher focus groups on the professional development and support teachers received, as well as the impact the framework had on their students.

The EL Department held the first professional development session in August 2017 introducing the new 3Ls Framework to all district EL teachers. September sessions covered how to identify Complex and Compelling Texts and embed them within instruction. The first October session focused on Framed Motivation and developing student engagement. A second October session provided professional development on Word Play to build students' academic vocabulary. In November, EL teachers participated in a shared reflection and review process. Professional development in January covered Reading Closely and deconstructing Juicy Sentences using text dependent questions.

EL teachers also received electronic newsletters from the EL Department that shared implementation suggestions from other EL teachers and coaches. The newsletter included items such as photos of teacher-created artifacts and scoring rubrics, lists of themed bibliographies, photos of student work, and ideas for lesson plans on multiple components of the 3Ls Framework.

Evaluation Questions

The following questions guided this evaluation:

1. How effective was the professional development in guiding the framework implementation?

2. How well was the 3Ls Framework implemented in 2017-18?

Evaluation Participants

In spring 2018, surveys were administered electronically to all EL teachers and a group of principals (selected by the EL Department) to gather qualitative and quantitative data on the 3Ls Framework implementation (see Appendices A and B). Of the 125 surveys sent to the district's EL teachers, 80 teachers responded, yielding a 64% response rate. From the 35 selected principals, there were 31 responses with a response rate of 89%. Table 1 shows survey responses by school level. In addition, about 25% of the district's EL teachers were chosen by the EL Department to participate in focus groups with the Research and Evaluation Department. These teachers shared their perceptions on six open-ended questions about the framework implementation (see Appendix C).

Table 1. Survey Respondents

	Teacher Surveys			Principal Surveys		
	# of Surveys Sent	# of Surveys Returned	% of Surveys Returned	# of Surveys Sent	# of Surveys Returned	% of Surveys Returned
Total Surveys	125	80	64%	35	31	89%
Elementary	70	49	70%	25	24	96%
Middle	32	12	38%	7	5	71%
High	23	19	83%	3	2	67%

Teacher Survey Results

Professional Development and Resources

In spring 2018, EL teachers were asked to rate the helpfulness of the 3Ls Framework professional development and resources they received, using a scale from 1 to 6 ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. EL teachers rated *the overall professional development was helpful* in the Agree range (mean = 5.3), with 90% of respondents choosing Agree or Strongly Agree. Teachers also gave *the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **teacher** work* an average rating of 5.3, with 86% selecting Agree or Strongly Agree. Average ratings on the effectiveness of other professional development segments and resources were 4.9 and 5.0 in the Agree range (see Table 2).

Table 2. Overall Ratings of Professional Development and Resources

I believe…	Teacher Survey (N= 80)	
	Average Rating	**% Agree/ Strongly Agree**
the overall professional development was helpful.	5.3	90%
the monthly breakdown of the PD modules was effective.	4.9	73%
the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **teacher** work.	5.3	86%
the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **student** work.	4.9	74%
the assigned tasks provided opportunities to practice implementing each module.	5.0	79%
there was value in the collaborative groupings.	4.9	76%

Professional Development and Resources by School Level

The ratings for the professional development and resource items were also analyzed by school level. Teachers at the elementary and secondary levels rated *the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **teacher** work* highest with an average rating of 5.4 for elementary and 5.2 for secondary, both in the Agree range. Secondary teachers also gave their highest rating of 5.2 to *the overall professional development was helpful,* also in the Agree range.

Elementary school teachers rated *the monthly breakdown of the PD modules* lowest with an average rating of 4.8, slightly below the Agree range. Two items, *the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **student** work* and *there was value in the collaborative groupings*, were rated lowest by secondary teachers at 4.9 in the Agree range (see Table 3).

Table 3. Ratings of Professional Development and Resources by School Level

I believe . . .	Elementary (N=49)		Middle/High (N=31)	
	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree
the overall professional development was helpful.	5.3	94%	5.2	84%
the monthly breakdown of the PD modules was effective.	4.8	73%	5.0	71%
the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **teacher** work.	5.4	92%	5.2	77%
the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **student** work.	4.9	73%	4.9	74%
the assigned tasks provided opportunities to practice implementing each module.	4.9	80%	5.0	77%
there was value in the collaborative groupings.	5.0	78%	4.9	74%

Teacher Support

EL teachers were asked to rank six areas of support provided by the EL Department during the implementation year. The overall ranking was determined by assigning points to each ranking. Points ranged from 1-6, with six points given for a first-place ranking and one point for a sixth-place ranking. Teachers indicated the two most important areas of support were the EL Department Newsletter and the EL coaching visits, ranked first and second respectively, with 57% of EL teachers ranking those as most important. The next two important areas of support were emails from the EL staff and feedback from EL staff observations. The least important areas of support were the CGCS Canvas course and the EL Department blog. See Table 4 for more details.

Table 4. Ranking of EL Department Areas of Support (N = 79)

Areas of Support	Overall Ranking	Ranked First		Ranked Second		Ranked Third		Ranked Fourth		Ranked Fifth		Ranked Sixth	
		# of teachers	% of teachers	# of teachers	% of teachers	# of teachers	% of teachers	# of teachers	% of teachers	# of teachers	% of teachers	# of teachers	% of teachers
EL Department Newsletter	1	23	29%	18	23%	22	28%	9	11%	6	8%	1	1%
EL Coaching Visits	2	22	28%	16	20%	19	24%	14	18%	4	5%	4	5%
Emails from EL Staff	3	13	16%	20	25%	17	22%	22	28%	6	8%	1	1%
Feedback from EL Staff Observations	4	6	8%	19	24%	14	18%	21	27%	12	15%	7	9%
CGCS Canvas Course	5	15	19%	3	4%	5	6%	10	13%	9	11%	37	47%
EL Blog	6	0	0%	3	4%	2	3%	3	4%	42	53%	29	37%

Teacher Confidence

EL teachers were asked to rate their confidence in proficiently using seven components of the 3Ls Framework (see Table 5). Six of the seven items were rated in the Agree range, with average ratings ranging from 4.8 to 5.2. The highest rated item (mean = 5.2) was for teachers believing they can proficiently *incorporate Framed Motivation*. The second highest rated item (mean = 5.1) was to *incorporate Word Play*. Eighty-six percent of respondents selected Agree or Strongly Agree in their confidence for these two components. The lowest rated item (mean = 4.4) was to *utilize differentiated tasks,* a module for which they had not yet received professional development; only 54% selected Agree or Strongly Agree. EL teachers received the differentiated task training in October 2018.

Table 5. Overall Ratings of EL Teacher Confidence Using the 3Ls Framework

I am able to proficiently…	Teacher Survey (N= 80)	
	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree
develop relevant Essential Questions.	5.0	79%
incorporate Framed Motivation.	5.2	86%
incorporate Word Play.	5.1	86%
implement Reading Closely.	5.0	81%
teach Juicy Sentences.	4.9	75%
utilize differentiated tasks.	4.4	54%
use 3Ts Planning Tool (Text, Talk, Task).	4.8	68%

Teacher Confidence by School Level

Confidence ratings were also analyzed by school level (see Table 6). Elementary school teachers rated *incorporating Framed Motivation* as their highest item (mean = 5.2), and secondary teachers rated *incorporating Word Play* as their highest (mean = 5.3), with 88% of elementary teachers and 94% of secondary teachers indicating they Agree or Strongly Agree.

Elementary and secondary teachers rated being able to proficiently *utilize differentiated tasks* as their lowest item (mean = 4.1 and 4.7, respectively), with only 45% of elementary teachers and 68% of secondary teachers choosing Agree or Strongly Agree.

Table 6. Ratings of EL Teacher Confidence Using the 3Ls Framework by School Level

I am able to proficiently…	Elementary (N=49)		Middle/High (N=31)	
	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree
develop relevant Essential Questions.	4.8	76%	5.2	84%
incorporate Framed Motivation.	5.2	88%	5.2	84%
incorporate Word Play.	5.0	82%	5.3	94%
implement Reading Closely.	4.9	76%	5.2	90%
teach Juicy Sentences.	4.9	76%	4.8	74%
utilize differentiated tasks.	4.1	45%	4.7	68%
use 3Ts Planning Tool (Text, Talk, Task).	4.7	63%	4.9	74%

Student Learning

Teachers considered six potential effects that the 3Ls Framework implementation might have on EL student learning. Increasing students' *oral language output, use of academic language in speaking,* and *ability to interact with complex text* were rated the highest (mean = 4.9) in the Agree range (see Table 7). Nearly 80% of teachers chose Agree or Strongly Agree for each of these three items. The lowest rated item was increasing students' *written language output* (mean = 4.5), with only 63% of teachers choosing Agree or Strongly Agree.

Table 7. Overall EL Teacher Perceptions of the 3Ls Framework on Student Learning

I think the 3Ls implementation is increasing students'…	Teacher Survey (N= 80)	
	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree
oral language output.	4.9	79%
use of academic language in speaking.	4.9	79%
written language output.	4.5	63%
use of academic language in writing.	4.6	68%
ability to interact with complex text.	4.9	76%
motivation to learn using 4Cs texts (complex, compelling, concise, connected).	4.6	64%

Student Learning by School Level

The framework's effect on student learning was also analyzed by school level. Elementary teachers rated increasing students' *oral language output* the highest (mean = 5.0), while secondary teachers rated increasing students' *ability to interact with complex text* the highest (mean = 5.0). These average ratings were all in the Agree range (see Table 8).

Elementary teachers rated increasing students' *written language output* the lowest with a mean of 4.3, while secondary teachers rated increasing students' *motivation to learn using 4Cs texts* the lowest (mean = 4.5). These average ratings were between the Slightly Agree and the Agree range.

Table 8. EL Teacher Perceptions of the 3Ls Framework on Student Learning by School Level

I think the 3Ls implementation is increasing students'…	Elementary (N=49)		Middle/High (N=31)	
	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree
oral language output.	5.0	80%	4.7	77%
use of academic language in speaking.	4.9	80%	4.8	77%
written language output.	4.3	51%	4.8	81%
use of academic language in writing.	4.5	61%	4.7	77%
ability to interact with complex text.	4.8	71%	5.0	84%
motivation to learn using 4Cs texts (complex, compelling, concise, connected).	4.7	65%	4.5	61%

Teacher Survey Comments

EL teachers were asked how the implementation of the 3Ls Framework has changed the way their classroom looks to the observer. They were also given the opportunity to share additional comments about the 3Ls Framework implementation. There were 149 comments from the 80 teachers completing the survey. About 52% of the comments stated lessons were more rigorous and engaging for students, and that the framework helped teachers plan and organize more efficiently. Ten percent of the comments came from teachers who felt they were still mastering the framework and needed more practice. Nine percent of the comments noted that teachers still needed the differentiation module to address all students' needs and provide a better overview of the framework. About six percent of the comments addressed the difficulty of using a higher-level English text with novice students who had yet to develop language skills.

Teacher Focus Group Responses

Thirty-four elementary, middle, and high school teachers were asked by the EL Department to participate in focus groups regarding the 3Ls implementation, and 32 agreed to do so. Their responses to six questions are summarized below.

Professional Development

Focus group participants were asked about the effectiveness of the yearlong professional development they received. Some participants stated the slow delivery of each module was confusing and they would have preferred an overview first, while others were more comfortable with the slower rollout. Many teachers stated they would have preferred training on all modules before their instructional planning began in August. Some commented that another year of practice and training would be helpful as it had been overwhelming to implement all parts the first year, and they would also like more guidance on the time allotted for each component. A few indicated the videos of California classrooms seemed aimed at whole class instruction rather than the pullout model used by GCS. Some middle and high school teachers felt the training was geared more toward elementary and would like to see more secondary examples.

Teachers said they were looking forward to the last two modules (differentiated tasks and closure) to provide a complete understanding of the framework. A few teachers stated they liked practicing with students between trainings and found that practicing with texts during the PD was "powerful." Teachers noted that learning the framework during the school year was difficult, but that working in groups and collaborating helped with the learning process. Most teachers found the professional development and resources, such as the EL Newsletter, very useful.

Many teachers enjoyed professional development on the complex and compelling texts and considered it "a great learning experience." Teachers stated that watching videos on how to implement was very helpful and many would like to see more. A few teachers shared they were pleased when they tried components of the framework and saw how well the components worked with students. Teachers shared that the lead teachers did a great job with sharing new ideas through PowerPoint presentations and videos, facilitating lessons in the classroom, and imparting a "jump in and try it mentality." Focus group participants said trainers were supportive and stated, "We're learning with you," which kept the teachers from feeling intimidated.

Changes in Instructional Planning

Teachers were asked how their approach to instructional planning had changed. Many teachers indicated their planning for the 3Ls Framework was much more in-depth than in previous years and it was time-consuming to develop units. Time had to be set aside for typing up text examples and copying them for students to annotate, creating new PowerPoints and flash cards, finding complex texts with Juicy Sentences, and developing rigorous essential questions tied to a text to generate deeper student thinking. Some teachers felt overwhelmed at first while others found planning different, but fun, and enjoyed looking for texts. A few teachers stated materials were not an issue. Several teachers said the emphasis was on continually pushing students, but a few teachers found that the new text levels could be compelling on their own.

Some teachers found their planning was more intentional and their expectations for students were higher. Many teachers said they eliminated decoding due to lack of time, but a few others stated many students still needed decoding. Some teachers believed that the framework was flexible enough they could embed other reading strategies and were glad the framework did not have the high number of vocabulary drills used in the past. Most teachers noted that time spent planning next year should be less since they will use materials created this past year. Some teachers stated that while planning, they now spend more time ensuring both academic and language content goals are addressed. A few teachers indicated they have collaborated more with other teachers on the same grade level, while others said EL planning was a lonely process without a PLC.

Many teachers, who stated that one text does not fit all students, purchased their own books to help students make connections to what they were reading. Teachers felt the EL Department helped them in their selection process by sending out lists of recommended texts. Teachers also indicated they used more technology in teaching, had more planning tools, and that the framework had "rejuvenated [their] love of teaching." Some teachers believed the framework represented the methodology of creating good lessons using background knowledge, vocabulary, close reading, and closure, with advanced teacher preparation. Others stated they were still learning to plan using the new lesson plan format and to understand all the components. Some teachers stated they looked at old lesson formats and tried to match previous practices with the new framework. One teacher created a new framework format to help with planning. Another teacher stated, "This framework brought them [students] up to their grade level, not watered down like I would have done before."

One instructional planning frustration mentioned was a lack of time in the classroom. Sometimes this meant it took two months to finish a unit because EL teachers might only be in a school one or two days a week, or only see students for 20 minutes versus 60 minutes. For teachers without a permanent classroom, it was difficult to have resources readily available. In addition, teachers who served large grade spans, such as K-5, found planning difficult for multiple grade levels.

EL Coaching

Participants were asked what impact EL Department coaching visits had on their implementation. Many teachers said their EL coaches were helpful in getting them started with the implementation and reviewing lesson plans. Some teachers said they had more support in the beginning of the year, while others said they did not receive many coaching visits at all. Teachers who were visited appreciated the confidence-building positive reinforcement and specific feedback they received. Some teachers stated their coaches helped them with resources, offered options, and one went to the public library to get books. Teachers noted that coaches did a great job with the newsletter by sharing ideas, photos, and articles. Many teachers appreciated the model lessons from teacher leaders, the EL database created for shared lessons, and the establishment of an EL professional development community.

Student Engagement

When asked about the framework's effect on student engagement, most teachers reported they could see a difference because students' confidence rose. Students also increased their use of academic language, which some teachers attributed to the fact that teachers themselves were increasing their use of academic language. In addition, students became more comfortable seeing large amounts of text once they understood the text would be broken down into parts. Many teachers said that the Framed Motivation component with its opportunity for student talk was a student favorite because they enjoyed using the complex vocabulary. Teachers felt the framework components were more purposeful and content-oriented than a traditional anticipatory set, and teachers could apply the resulting student motivation to the next task. Students were better at dissecting words based on Word Play strategies. One teacher mentioned that students loved Word Play "game day" and writing Juicy Sentences on the board. Students appeared more confident and smiled when using the tier 2 and 3 words from Juicy Sentences, even when they still struggled with sight words. Students seemed more aware of expectations. Teachers said the use of thematic units helped with awareness and understanding, and that they were pleased when students began choosing library books based on EL themes.

Some teachers were less positive about the implementation of the framework. They stated the framework included more teacher talk than in the past, which they viewed as resulting in less student engagement. They noted the videos used were also weighted toward more teacher talk, so they worked to find activities for their students. Teachers stated that upcoming training on the differentiation piece might help them develop activities addressing individual student needs. Some teachers said it was hard to read an entire novel using the techniques, but that students still needed to know how to read a novel and not just "snippets of text." A few teachers noted that breaking instruction down to the students' level was more challenging with the framework's higher-level texts, even though they appreciated the district's goal to raise rigor. EC-ESL students struggled with the text level, as did novice and Level I readers. Teachers had difficulty finding compelling chunks of text at those levels, which they felt resulted in those students being less engaged.

Other teachers stated that the linguistic frames were helpful for novice readers to acquire the language and incorporate it into their everyday speaking and writing. Many students were able to apply some of the strategies into their regular education classes, prompting those teachers to ask questions about the new framework and to incorporate some of the framework strategies themselves. One EL teacher said she videotaped her students using the framework and then shared the session with the principal and regular classroom teachers, all of whom were surprised by the level of student engagement and acknowledged their expectations for students were not high enough.

Changes in Perception of the Framework

Participants were asked how their perception of the framework had changed since the beginning of the year. Some teachers said that they were excited but also stressed at the beginning of the year as they struggled with the complex texts, particularly with K-1 students. However, as the modules were rolled out, they gained confidence and observed students' ability to do the work. Teachers realized they did not need to add all components at once, but could incorporate a piece at a time. Learning how to analyze one sentence or one section at a time made implementation manageable. One teacher was uncertain what the EL Department expected; however, the teacher received feedback that helped provide direction. Another teacher who liked the framework said the mandatory training created stress, "but it was like a journey and I've grown. It was a learning process."

Many teachers stated they felt more comfortable after a year of implementation experience, while some felt they needed more practice and were still a little overwhelmed. Many were excited and looking forward to year two now that they had developed many of the resources they needed. Some teachers noted that students enjoyed the framework and were more engaged than they expected. Many shared the opinion that if principals and teachers knew about the framework and supported it, particularly in the students' regular classroom, the overall impact on all EL students would be greater. Teachers said that students showed improvement in some areas more than others, and teachers needed to reflect on how to help grow all areas.

Some teachers noted the need to teach differently to implement framework strategies. A few teachers stated they were able to see the bigger picture after receiving feedback from coaches. A few teachers were less enthusiastic at the end of the year and felt there needed to be more clarification on component timing, less time spent writing lesson plans, and more time to prepare students for district and state assessments. Some teachers became frustrated with the framework due to the shortage of materials, particularly as they shifted into each new unit. Many teachers felt the need to spend their own money on books or borrow books from one school to use in another.

Other Comments

Many EL teachers stated that the framework should be tied more closely to the standards that students were learning in the regular classroom and to CKLA and ARC unit topics. Some teachers would like to see texts less complex than the current ones, although more rigorous than those of past years. One teacher who previously taught ELA using a district planning guide appreciated the framework establishing consistent EL classroom content across the district. However, some teachers stated that principals were affecting the consistency of the framework implementation by asking EL teachers to teach regular classroom content.

Teachers had mixed views about implementation for 2018-19. They were glad to have already developed many resources, yet were concerned about the overall pacing and the assessment

piece. They would like tools to help determine students' strengths and challenges. Teachers were also hoping the differentiation component training would help address the needs of low-level students and novice readers. Many elementary teachers would have preferred a partial rollout, such as implementing the framework with upper elementary students first.

A few teachers were concerned because the framework was presented in videos as whole class instruction with a certified trainer, but GCS was instead implementing the framework in small pullout blocks of time. The difficulty of implementation seemed to depend on the grade level or content of the class being taught: K-2 was more difficult than 3-5, English I and II were more difficult than sheltered English, with all three high school English courses requiring a balance between the framework and core requirements.

Teachers offered several suggestions for the continued implementation process:

- Allow EL teachers to observe in other EL classrooms.
- Incorporate a poetry component.
- Create a blog for teachers to directly communicate with each other, separate from the EL Department blog.
- Continue to assist in finding complex texts.
- Develop a grade-level text list so students do not read the same texts in multiple years.
- Add time for basic reading, phonics, and writing.
- Share the 3Ls Framework with regular classroom teachers so all students can benefit.
- Shift secondary teacher training to a full day instead of half-day. (The logistics for teachers needing to leave campus at 11:15 for training, with afternoon substitutes starting at 12:15, were problematic. In addition, teachers found it difficult to get substitutes for a half day in the afternoon; so many teachers took off a full day to secure a substitute.)

Some teachers still had questions: what is the deadline for total implementation, what are the time expectations for each component, and could the trainers add time for secondary teachers to share and reflect since they teach different courses?

Principal Survey Results

Select principals were asked to rate specific 3Ls Framework teacher tasks they observed during their visits to EL classrooms using a scale from 1 to 6 ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree (see Table 9). Principals rated all items in the Agree range, ranging from 4.9 to 5.2. The highest rated items (means = 5.2 and 5.1) were for observing *positive changes in the EL classroom compared to last year* and *the EL teacher using instructional supports for students during lessons (graphic organizers, sentence frames, word walls, etc.)*.

The two lowest rated tasks were still in the Agree range (mean = 4.9), for observing more *EL student collaboration in the classroom* and *the EL teacher scaffolding content during instruction*.

Table 9. Principal Observations in 3Ls Classrooms

This school year, I have observed…	Principal Survey (N= 31)	
	Average Rating	% Agree/ Strongly Agree
positive changes in the EL classroom compared to last year.	5.2	87%
more EL student collaboration in the classroom.	4.9	74%
more rigor in EL instruction.	5.0	84%
evidence of the 3Ls framework in EL teacher lesson plans (*framed motivation, word play, reading closely, differentiated tasks, closure*).	5.0	87%
the use of complex and compelling texts in the EL classroom.	5.0	81%
the EL teacher scaffolding content during instruction.	4.9	81%
the EL teacher using instructional supports for students during lessons (*graphic organizers, sentence frames, word walls, etc*.).	5.1	90%

Principal Survey Comments

Four principals chose to share additional comments. One principal expressed concern that the school's EL teacher only implemented the Juicy Words component of the 3Ls framework. Another principal stated that the vocabulary component was exceptional, but had concerns about the previously taught phonics not being a part of the 3Ls Framework to support students with decoding. The remaining two principals had only positive comments. One stated the framework is a "perfect example of acceleration versus remediation. Great program." Another principal said, "It gives students an opportunity for more academic talk and access to more rigorous, grade level content."

Summary

Overall, the majority of EL teacher survey respondents believed that the professional development they received was effective in helping them implement the 3Ls Framework. Ninety percent of respondents rated the helpfulness of the PD in the Agree or Strongly Agree range. When teachers rated their ability to proficiently teach each component separately, they

rated their confidence in the Agree range for all of the components for which they had received professional development.

In EL teacher focus groups, while some teachers liked the slow rollout of the modules and others would have preferred the framework overview first, most teachers agreed that the training and support they received gave them the confidence to try the components with students. Moreover, when they had questions about implementation, teachers stated that the continual training and support from the EL Department staff helped them navigate the 3Ls Framework implementation process.

During the focus groups, teachers reported that they had worked diligently to implement the 3Ls Framework. The majority of teachers said their instructional planning had become much more in-depth, and their expectations for students had increased. Teacher perceptions were that student engagement had risen in the classroom by using more rigorous texts. Teachers saw positive results when using the framework components with their students. The most noted impediment for implementation came from teachers with only 20-minute classes, as it was difficult to fit in all of the framework components.

Principals also indicated they observed positive changes in the EL classroom with more rigor in the instruction and collaboration among students. Over 80% of responding principals agreed or strongly agreed that they saw components of the 3Ls Framework in teacher lesson plans and during instruction. One principal commented that the framework is a "perfect example of acceleration versus remediation."

Recommendations

Professional Development

- ♦ Suggest options and acceptable ways for teachers to modify the framework with students who are novice English speakers (any grade level), K-1 students, or for students who have limited time with their EL teacher, e.g. 20 minutes each day.

- ♦ For training new teachers, consider first providing an overall "big picture" and briefly discuss each framework component, then start the in-depth training for the first module. Many teachers shared they wanted to see how everything fit together, instead of waiting to see what was next.

- ♦ Provide PD examples, including videos that are more applicable to middle and high school instructional practices.

- ♦ Offer full-length training videos of an entire lesson at each of the three school levels, so teachers can view all of the components in "real-time."

♦ Consider scheduling the high school PD to three full days instead of six half-days. Teachers had difficulty getting substitutes to come in for a half-day. In addition, substitutes arrive at 12:15 but teachers needed to leave earlier to attend the PD on time.

General Implementation

♦ Generate a discussion with EL teachers about creating a district-wide list of text resources by grade level so students are not reading the same texts in multiple years.

♦ Continue providing implementation guidance through the EL Department Newsletter.

♦ Create a blog for teachers to directly communicate and share with each other, rather than going through the EL Department blog.

♦ Where feasible, work to establish equitable EL student class lengths across the district.

♦ Provide more opportunities for EL teachers to visit other EL teachers' classrooms to observe teaching and lesson organization.

Appendices
Appendix A

Teacher Survey – End of Year 3Ls Framework Implementation

Spring 2018

1. **What is your school level?** *(Mark all that apply.)*
     Elementary   Middle   High

Please select the response that best reflects your level of agreement for statements 2a-2f.

2. I believe …	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. the overall professional development was helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. the monthly breakdown of the PD modules was effective.	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **teacher** work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. the EL Newsletter is helpful in sharing exemplary **student** work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. the assigned tasks provided opportunities to practice implementing each module.	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. there was value in the collaborative groupings.	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. **Rank the helpfulness of the following types of support from 1 to 6, with 1 being the most helpful.**
     _____EL Department Newsletter
     _____Emails from EL staff
     _____EL coaching visits
     _____Feedback from EL staff observations
     _____EL blog
     _____CGCS Canvas course

Please select the response that best reflects your level of agreement for statements 4a-5f.

4. I am able to proficiently …	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. develop relevant Essential Questions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. incorporate Framed Motivation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. incorporate Word Play.	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. implement Reading Closely.	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. teach Juicy Sentences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. utilize differentiated tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. use 3Ts Planning Tool (Text, Talk, Task)	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. I think the 3Ls implementation is increasing students'…	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. oral language output.	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. use of academic language in speaking.	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. written language output.	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. use of academic language in writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. ability to interact with complex text.	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. motivation to learn using 4Cs texts (complex, compelling, concise, connected)	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. How has the 3Ls implementation changed the way your classroom looks to the observer?

7. Is there anything else you would like to share about the 3Ls Framework implementation?

Thank you for your time to complete this survey.

Principal Survey – End of Year 3Ls Framework Implementation

1. **What is your school level?** *(Mark all that apply.)*
    Elementary   Middle   High

Please select the response that best reflects your level of agreement for statements 2a-2g.

2. This school year, I have observed …	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. positive changes in the EL classroom compared to last year.	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. more EL student collaboration in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. more rigor in EL instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. evidence of the 3Ls framework in EL teacher lesson plans (*framed motivation, word play, reading closely, differentiated tasks, closure*).	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. the use of complex and compelling texts in the EL classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. the EL teacher scaffolding content during instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. the EL teacher using instructional supports for students during lessons (*graphic organizers, sentence frames, word walls, etc.*).	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. **Please share any additional comments about the 3Ls framework implementation.**

    Thank you for your time to complete this survey.

Appendix C

Teacher Focus Group Questions – End of Year 3Ls Framework Implementation

1. Describe how the 3Ls professional development experience prepared you for teaching the new framework.

2. How has your approach to instructional planning changed with this framework?

3. What impact did the EL department coaching visits have on your implementation of the framework?

4. How has the new EL framework affected students' engagement in the classroom this year?

5. How has your perception of the 3Ls framework changed since the beginning of the year?

6. What else would you like to share about the implementation at your school?