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DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW
Ongoing Support to Member School Districts

English Learners Program Directors and Staff Meetings
The Council’s English Learners (EL) Team has continued regularly scheduled meetings for EL program directors and staff that began in March 2020 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. During these meetings, attendees lean on one another for shared expertise and best practices and exchange information on timely issues of concern. Typically, around 30-40 participants pose questions for collective thought, share updates, and offer suggestions. These meetings will continue as long as attendees find them to be useful. Since July 2021, the meetings have been held monthly. The kick-off meeting for SY 2023-24, featuring a welcoming of new EL directors and staff, was held on September 28, 2023. The topics and queries for discussion submitted by EL program directors include—

- programs and/or interventions to support foundational literacy for ELs;
- supports for Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE) who are over-aged/under-credited;
- foundational literacy skills instruction for English learners; and
- oral language development.

Leadership Support and Development
At the 2024 Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee Education (BIRE) Meeting, the Council invited Lauren Hodges¹ from Performance on Purpose (POP) to launch professional learning for education leaders and staff working to address the needs of multilingual learners in large complex organizations, such as the Council of the Great City Schools’ large urban school districts. Additional professional learning opportunities will be available through the first half of SY 2024-25 for interested EL program directors and staff from Council-member districts.

Assistance to Member Districts

Technical Support
Members of the EL Team assist Council-member school districts upon request. This assistance ranges from quick responses to queries that may involve issuing a brief survey to the membership or long-term engagements on specific EL programmatic concerns. Recent topics on which districts have requested assistance include—

- data collection related to newcomer enrollment;

¹ https://www.linkedin.com/in/drlaurenhodges/www.performance-on-purpose.com
• planning for English language proficiency assessment (ELPA) as a statewide assessment event;
• assessment for monitoring language development in pre-K; and
• funding formulas for staffing for EL instruction.

Professional Learning on Understanding Acculturative Stress in Newcomers
In support of the ongoing efforts to welcome newcomer families, the EL Team hosted Alex Murray, a registered psychologist from New Zealand and migration expert to explain acculturative stress and migratory grief, typical aspects of the migration experience. Separate sessions were held for (1) EL program directors, (2) elementary teachers, and (3) secondary teachers. The presentations helped attendees distinguish typical phases of the migratory experience from potential mental health needs.

2024 Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee Education (BIRE) Meeting in Minneapolis, MN

The 2024 Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee Education (BIRE) Meeting, held from May 6 to May 11, in Minneapolis, MN, was a big success. Minneapolis Public Schools and Saint Paul Public Schools opened their doors to over 90 educators for school visits.

Outcomes and Feedback. Excluding Council staff, over 230 individuals attended BIRE 2024—145 from member school districts and approximately 60 from sponsoring organizations and/or publishers. Over 33 distinct member districts were represented, with many attending as teams of two or more staff. The agenda received positive marks from the attendees. Respondents on a post-meeting feedback survey gave the highest marks (very helpful & helpful) to the following general sessions—
• *Understanding Demographic Shifts*, presented by journalist and Democracy Now co-host Juan Gonzales, provided important insights into U.S. history and its foreign policy history to highlight the origins and important contributions of Latinos and other diverse populations. About 90 percent of respondents rated this session as very helpful or helpful.

• *Student Voices to Inform Services and Instruction* provided important insights from English learners, some very new to the country, on how to improve services and foster a welcoming environment for them. Over 90 percent rated this session as very helpful or helpful.

• *Navigating Complexity and Well-being*, presented by consultant Lauren Hodges, described stress personalities and explained the power behind understanding how we handle stress. About 86 percent rated this session as very helpful or helpful.

Six of the remaining general sessions were considered very helpful or helpful by close to 80 percent of respondents. Three sessions received lower marks; between 50 and 70 percent of respondents considered these sessions to be very helpful or helpful.

**Challenge of Practice Sessions.** At BIRE 2024, a new opportunity was introduced to provide more collaborative processing time on common areas of challenge. The Council’s EL Team assembled resources to aid participants in examining the root cause of challenges and identifying possible solutions and next steps. Five key areas were identified (with the input of EL program directors and staff attending the monthly EL Program Directors meetings)—Newcomers, MTSS & ELs, Access to Rigor, Oral Language Development, and EL Service Models. Evaluation responses indicate that these sessions were considered very productive for those who attended as a *whole district team* (60%) and less for *partial district teams* (27%) or *individuals* (9%). Participants found the challenge of practice exercise to be the most beneficial for—

- exchanging ideas with colleagues (81%);
- hearing new perspectives and challenges (72%);
- time to process learning and issues (47%); and
- time to process and plan with district team members (43%).

The Council’s EL Team is further analyzing responses to identify ways to make the experience more beneficial for the wide range of attendees.
Foundational literacy skills development for ELs has been a recurring concern among district staff responsible for EL programs. The Council issued two surveys on literacy instruction to understand the challenges better. During the EL directors’ meetings, Council staff shared the findings to guide discussion on the next steps for support. From this discussion, EL directors identified two priority areas—(1) reviewing/evaluating existing programs used to teach foundational skills to ELs and (2) identifying supplemental materials that specifically address the needs of ELs in developing foundational literacy skills.

The insufficiency of existing instructional materials for teaching foundational literacy skills to English learners and the reported needs of Council-member districts called for a research-based, robust, and clear set of criteria as well as a suggested protocol for reviewing and selecting quality materials that specifically address EL needs in foundational literacy development. In the spring of 2023, these criteria and a protocol for reviewing and selecting materials were published in *A Framework for Foundational Literacy Skills Instruction for English Learners: Instructional Practice and Materials Considerations*. For its development, David Lai and Gabriela Uro led a working group comprising staff from Clark County, Dallas, Los Angeles, New York City, Omaha, San Antonio, and Tulsa, supported by language acquisition and literacy experts.

*Publication Dissemination.* Since the document’s formal unveiling at BIRE 2023, several presentations have been made to national and state organizations and Council-member districts, by request. Several external publications have referenced the *A Framework for Foundational Literacy Skills Instruction for English Learners: Instructional Practice and Materials Considerations*.

*Instructional Materials Review.* In summer 2023, a ‘test drive’ of the framework’s selection criteria was conducted in Washington, D.C. The reviewers were practitioners and experts in literacy development with backgrounds in English learners and/or English language arts (ELA) from 13 Council-member districts. Reviewers volunteered to participate due to their experience in foundational skills development, whether generally or with ELs specifically, and their use of one or more of the instructional materials presented for review within their respective school districts.

All reviewers were asked to read *A Framework for Foundational Literacy Skills Instruction for English Learners* before convening. Additional training was provided at the July convening, to norm around the principles and criteria presented in the framework document, ensuring that the reviewers shared a common understanding and language to discuss the materials. The 28-member group reviewed four materials/products: (1) Lexia Learning, (2) Get Ready! by Vista Higher Learning, (3) Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, and (4) Lift by Cengage.

The Council’s EL Team drafted publisher-specific compilations of notes and observations based on the Framework’s criteria, which were provided to the respective publishers. The review’s
insights and findings were shared with the Council’s EL program directors during one of its monthly virtual meetings.

**Next Steps.** The EL Team is looking to develop a self-paced course, including Frequently Asked Questions and presentation slides to support Council-member districts in utilizing the framework to improve foundational literacy skills instruction for ELs.

---

**PLP: Council’s Courses on Complex Thinking and Communication**

The Council’s inaugural courses on *Complex Thinking and Communication* comprise 11 courses beginning with *Foundations*, followed by five courses in each pathway (ELA/ELD and Math). (See Figure 1.) The course content is intended to be delivered by district facilitators and amounts to more than one year’s worth of content.

**Figure 1. Complex Thinking and Communication Course Sequence**

**District Usage.** Currently, about seven districts are in the process of subscribing for SY 2023-24 to provide professional development via professional learning communities, including virtually. (See Table 2.) For some districts, course subscriptions have been delayed or paused as a result of leadership changes.
### Table 2. Subscribing Districts/Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Subscribers by Launch Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Guilford County Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NYC Department of Education – District 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kansas City Public School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tulsa Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NYC Department of Education – District 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newark Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carter G. Woodson Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Training Sessions

Around 12 training sessions have been held by the Council, mostly in conjunction with its BIRE Meeting or the Fall Conference, reaching over 127 facilitators from 28 districts (with some attending several sessions) since launching in 2017. In 2020, two general sessions (for facilitators and other interested attendees) were held virtually. In 2021, a virtual four-part series was held starting on February 3 and concluding on March 17. On May 10, 2022, a training session was conducted in San Antonio prior to the BIRE Meeting. (For sessions held from 2020 to 2022, see Table 3.)

### Table 3. Training Sessions 2020 through 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/s &amp; Focus</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Trainees</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 2020</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>ELA/ELD</td>
<td>209 from CGCS</td>
<td>33 CGCS Districts, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing 3Ls™ in a Virtual Setting (Guilford)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Districts, 228 Total</td>
<td>Nonprofit, 1 Non-CGCS School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, 2020</td>
<td>Zoom Webinar jointly sponsored by SAP &amp; CGCS</td>
<td>ELA/ELD</td>
<td>96 from CGCS Districts; 223 Total</td>
<td>32 CGCS Districts, 94 Other Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Ls™ and Foundational Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2021</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>ELA/ELD</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Ls™ Training Series: Introduction and Connecting to District Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17, 2021</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>ELA/ELD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Ls™ Training Series: Framed Motivation and Word Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2021</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>ELA/ELD</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Ls™ Training Series: Reading Closely and Juicy Sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 2021</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>ELA/ELD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Participated in original trial launch of courses in 2017.
3 Began implementing the 3Ls™ with Maryann Cucchiara prior to the development of the courses. Participated in the development of the ELA/ELD courses, and host Council-member districts.
4 Onboarding delayed due to COVID-19 pandemic.
5 These figures do not include participants of the virtual training sessions held in 2020 and afterward.
**Expert training and kick-off.** Training sessions have been held in specific districts by request. (See Table 4.) Districts have also supported one another by offering experienced educators familiar with the content of the professional development courses as presenters and inviting other districts to attend their sessions.

**Table 4. District-requested Training Sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Jun. 2018</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Training for 25 teachers who taught in summer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford County</td>
<td>Aug. 2019</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Approximately 30 facilitators and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro-Nashville</td>
<td>Sep. 23-25, 2019</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Held virtual session with coaches and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 12-13, 2019</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Held in-person session for over 50 teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Jun. 13, 2019</td>
<td>Lily Wong Fillmore</td>
<td>Overview for about 30 teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>Nov. 26-27, 2018</td>
<td>Harold Asturias</td>
<td>Launch math pathway with teachers, coaches, and facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 11, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Sep. 22, 2020</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Held virtual session with coaches and PD leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(virtual)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Held virtual session for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep. 29, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(virtual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Jun. 9, 2021</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Held virtual session with EL team, Literacy team, principals, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(virtual)</td>
<td></td>
<td>district academic leaders, introducing them to the 3Ls™ approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Aug. 3, 2021</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Introductory training session for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(virtual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>Rachel Rosenbaum</td>
<td>Developed lesson plans and units of study for newcomer summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(virtual)</td>
<td>Mandell</td>
<td>program and supported the instructional delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>virtually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>February 8, 2022</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Introduction and planning meeting with EL office leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(virtual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>April 8, 2022 (virtual)</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Introductory overview and hands-on activity with senior academic leadership team—deputy superintendent and assistant superintendents of school leadership, curriculum, instruction, equity, and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford County</td>
<td>Aug. 2022</td>
<td>Allison Velez (NYC)</td>
<td>Introductory training session for teachers, which included a participant from East Baton Rouge Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Sep. 15, 2022 (virtual)</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Introductory training session for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro-Nashville</td>
<td>Feb. 2, 2023 (virtual)</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Walk through sample 3Ls™ lesson flow using district-adopted texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford County</td>
<td>April 2023</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>3Ls Lesson Review in preparation for the BIRE 2023 school visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro-Nashville</td>
<td>October 19, 2023 (virtual)</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Presentation on the connection between 3Ls™ and WIDA ELD standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Pending - November 2023 (virtual)</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Pending topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>January 23, 2024 (virtual)</td>
<td>Maryann Cucchiara</td>
<td>Lesson feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Spring 2024, February 16, 2024, April 5, 2024</td>
<td>Guilford County Schools Staff</td>
<td>In-person supportsip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2018, the Pathway to Academic Success Project at the University of California, Irvine (UCI), was awarded a five-year, $14.7 million grant, based on its strong record of improving outcomes for English learners and a robust dissemination component thanks to the partnership with the Council of the Great City Schools. Dr. Carol Booth Olson, Principal Investigator (PI) on the Pathway to Academic Success Project at the University of California, Irvine (UCI), invited the Council to collaborate on the project, specifically to bolster the dissemination part of the application for Education Innovation and Research (EIR) expansion grant application administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

**Course development.** Specifically, as a partner with the University of California Irvine Writing Project, the Council received over $600,000 to create a set of courses for a professional learning program to be disseminated using the CGCS Professional Learning Platform, following the Council’s design for hybrid professional learning. The courses include videos and training materials to provide a much-needed focus on writing instruction offered by the Pathway professional development. Specifically, the Pathway-content professional learning experience builds educators’ capacity to teach text-based analytical writing to English learners across all content areas.

**Pilot courses.** Three courses were completed by April 2023 for piloting in: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Dallas Independent School District, Guilford County Schools, Oakland Unified School District, and Pinellas County Public Schools. The pilot was successfully completed, providing insightful feedback for the final development of the courses. Participating districts were granted gratis access to the courses throughout SY 2023-24.

**Facilitator Training.** The Council’s EL Team successfully secured an additional $40,000 to host an in-person training session for course facilitators for all seven courses. This training will take place on August 8 and 9 in Washington D.C. with the participation of six Council-member districts: Baltimore City (to be confirmed), St. Paul, Anchorage, Denver, Minneapolis, and Guilford County.

**Status.** The EL Team is working with UCI-NWP colleagues in finalizing the seven courses. Council staff expect completion of all related materials by November 2024.

---

Welcoming Newcomer Students

A. Survey: Meeting the Needs of Newcomers in Great City Schools

In 2022, the Council conducted a comprehensive survey, of Council-member districts at that time, to understand how member districts define a subset of English learners—newcomers and SLIFE—and what types of support, instruction, and services are provided to meet the needs of these students. The results from the survey were presented at BIRE 2023 and during several of the EL Program Directors monthly virtual meetings. Survey results have been used to identify topics for which experts have been invited to present at monthly meetings or during BIRE.

B. Guidance for Identification and Placement

The Council’s EL Team assembled a working group comprising EL program directors and staff to inform the development of a guidance document for identifying newcomers/SLIFE and placing them appropriately for learning and support. This was in response to a request for the Council to create a guidance document to assist Council-member districts in identifying newcomers and responding to their unique needs following the joint discussion of the survey’s preliminary findings at the EL Task Force meeting convened during the 2022 Fall Conference.

The Council has partnered with a research group from the City University of New York (CUNY) to develop a model Educational Background Questionnaire (EBQ) to help educators ascertain students’ educational background for purposes of making programming and instructional decisions using an asset-based approach that accounts for the diverse range of skills, abilities, and educational experiences students bring with them to the United States.

- **Pilot opportunity.** In addition to the EBQ, CUNY is developing a literacy assessment tool modeled after the existing Multilingual Literacy Screener (MLS) developed for NY State that would be available to districts beyond New York. The Council is supporting five districts interested in piloting the Spanish literacy assessment: Austin, Clark County, Chicago, and Metro-Nashville.

- **Document review.** The Council surveyed districts for information and documents throughout summer 2023 related to district processes, protocols, and guides that impact the instruction and services that newcomers/SLIFE receive. The information and documents will guide and inform the work of the working group.

**Status.** The EL Team, CUNY, and the working group will further refine the draft document through fall 2024. The projected completion of a draft to be presented at the March EL Task Force is expected by February 2025.
Recent Publications

The Council’s EL Team publishes a number of briefs, reports, and resources on a regular basis. Below are examples of the most recent publications. These documents are accessible through the Council’s website at: https://www.cgcs.org/Page/631. Most documents are produced with Creative Commons licenses to encourage free distribution throughout the membership and with external audiences.

**A Framework for Foundational Literacy Skills Instruction for English Learners: Instructional Practice and Materials Considerations** *(Spring 2023)*

English learners (ELs) need a comprehensive and connected approach to foundational literacy skills development that involves grade-level instruction by teachers who build on the linguistic repertoire of ELs, teaching how the English language system works to convey meaning. This document rethinks English foundational skills instruction—explicating the research, explaining what teachers should know, and providing considerations for designing and selecting instructional materials.

**Great City Schools Step Up to Meet the Needs of Refugee Children** *(May 2023)*

In May of 2022, the Council of the Great City Schools brought together bilingual directors, educators, and staff from big-city member districts and invited them to share the work they had done and continue to do on behalf of newcomers and refugee students and their families. In addition to providing newcomer aid, instruction, and social services to the new arrivals, attendees reported helping families find housing and coordinating community services.

**District Considerations for Universal Dyslexia Screening: Ensuring Appropriate Implementation and Instruction for English Learners** *(October 2022)*

The purpose of this brief is to (1) share potential challenges regarding the implementation of universal dyslexia screening for English learners (ELs) and (2) highlight considerations that ensure English learners are appropriately screened given their language development trajectory and the foundational literacy instruction ELs have received. Furthermore, the brief offers considerations for the appropriate interpretation and use of screener results when districts are required to universally screen for
dyslexia, including for students who have limited oral language development and little to no knowledge of English phonemes (e.g., when sound/letter correspondence differs between languages with different writing systems).

**Connecting 3Ls™ to English Language Development Standards & Frameworks** (September 2021)

School districts that have adopted the 3Ls™ approach to provide rigorous instruction for English learners (ELs) have, invariably, had to make a case for what this approach offers, how it reflects best practices in English language development (ELD) instruction, and how it meets the needs of English learners. They have also had to make explicit connections to their own district standards, frameworks, and practices that guide their instruction to English learners.

This companion document to 3Ls™ *Learning, Language, and Literacy* (2018) was developed by a team of educators and Maryann Cucchiara to highlight key connections between the 3Ls™ approach and specific English language development frameworks, standards, or approaches, including the Council’s ELD framework, WIDA, ELPA21, and the California ELA/ELD Framework.
VIRTUAL MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS
Council of the Great City Schools Meetings with English Learners Program Directors

March 2024 – June 2024

**Understanding Stress & Grief in Newcomers**
03-01-2024 | 02:00 PM - 03:30 PM ET
Virtual

**Special Presentation: Oral Language Development with Jeff Zwiers**
03-28-2024 | 02:00 PM - 03:00 PM ET
Virtual

**EL Program Directors Meeting**
04-25-2024 | 02:00 PM - 03:00 PM ET
Virtual

**Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee Education Directors Meeting**
05-06-2024 07:00 AM - 05-11-2024 11:00 AM CT
The Royal Sonesta Minneapolis Downtown, 35 S 7th St, Minneapolis, MN 55402

**Elementary Teachers: Understanding Stress & Grief in Newcomers**
05-31-2024 | 01:00 PM - 03:00 PM ET
Virtual

**Secondary Teachers: Understanding Stress & Grief in Newcomers**
05-31-2024 | 04:00 PM - 06:00 PM ET
Virtual

**EL Program Directors Meeting**
06-27-2024 | 02:00 PM - 03:00 PM ET
Virtual
EL FORUM FOR TEACHERS: UNDERSTANDING STRESS & GRIEF IN NEWCOMERS

When: Friday, May 31 at
• 1 PM EDT (Elementary Teachers)
• 4 PM EDT (Secondary Teachers)

Who: Alejandra ‘Alex’ Murray, Registered Psychologist and Expert in Migration

Alex is the founder and coordinator of Therapy for Migrants, a company based in New Zealand that provides mental health support for Spanish-speaking migrants around the world.

Alex’s presentation will address key concepts and factors related to the mental health needs of immigrant-origin students, such as acculturative stress and migratory grief. She will discuss how teachers can recognize and address these mental health needs in the classroom. The interactive two-hour session will include time for Q&A.

Click Below to Register or Use QR Code Above:
Elementary at 1 PM EDT - https://shorturl.at/MU7kZ
Secondary at 4 PM EDT - https://shorturl.at/GPqEq
Jeff Zwiers' Presentation Uploaded to CGCS Communities

1. Jeff Zwiers' Presentation Uploaded to CGCS Communities

Posted 04-03-2024 02:57 PM

Great City Schools ELL Directors and Program Staff-

The slides and recording from last week's special session with Jeff Zwiers are now in our CGCS Communities library. (CGCS Communities has replaced EdWires.) To access the files, please click the "Library" tab on our community page after logging in at https://connect.cgcs.org/. Alternatively, you may locate the files by searching "Integrating Oral Language and Content Development in Every Discipline (Jeff Zwiers)" using the search bar located in the upper right corner of CGCS Communities.

Thanks to all who attended the session. We hope that it was beneficial.

---
Professional Learning Cohort

June 2024 through March 2025

Virtual Sessions on Personal Leadership Development & Small Group Coaching Sessions
At the 2024 Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee Education (BIRE) Meeting, Lauren Hodges from Performance on Purpose (POP) kicked off professional learning for education leaders and staff working to address the needs of multilingual learners in large complex organizations such as the Council of the Great City Schools' large urban school districts.

For more information on Lauren's approach and work, see the following:

**Lauren Hodges, Ed.D.**

- LinkedIn (https://www.linkedin.com/in/drlaurenhodges/)
- www.performance-on-purpose.com
- LinkedIn Learning Course (https://www.linkedin.com/learning/discover-your-stress-personality/get-to-know-your-other-personality)

To support the growth of leaders in member districts, the Council is partnering with Performance on Purpose to provide several additional opportunities to learn, grow, ask questions, and receive group coaching. These opportunities are intended to support deeper self-awareness and resilience. Participants will engage in three virtual sessions and two small group coaching sessions interspersed between the virtual sessions.

**Commitment of Time and Energy**

- **Virtual sessions (3):** Webinar-like 90-minute sessions for a deeper dive into the topics of self-awareness and resilience introduced at BIRE 2024.
- **Group coaching sessions (2):** Up to 60 minutes to work with a coach in a small group setting (no more than 5 colleagues). This will be a time to ask questions, troubleshoot setbacks, learn, and grow with fellow peers while building a community of support and accountability.

**Who Can Attend**

- **Virtual sessions (3):** Open to anyone. Registration will likely be limited to 100 on a first-come, first-served basis.
- **Group coaching sessions (2):** We will also host two group coaching sessions for a smaller group of recipients. Participants in the group coaching sessions must commit to (1) attending all three virtual sessions and (2) attending both group coaching sessions.
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PATHWAY WRITING COURSES
Reconceptualizing the Development of Educator Expertise for a Multilingual, Intercultural Future

*Engaging English Learners in Content Learning and Language Development Simultaneously*

June 17–18, 2024 • Portland, Oregon • OSU Portland Center

**About the Conference**

This conference will be an opportunity to:

- Learn about studies being conducted by Center researchers on actionable teacher education, curriculum, instruction, and policy practices that can dramatically improve the education of secondary English Learners.
Be inspired by national and international panels exploring progress and challenges in reconceptualizing learning and language development.

Network, share, discuss, question assumptions, build new understandings, and offer solutions.

Engage in working sessions to develop actionable plans to implement.

Make a difference for adolescents who need support to simultaneously learn subject matter content and practices, and the English necessary to communicate them.

Confirmed Speakers

- Alexandra Estrella, Superintendent, Norwalk Public Schools, CT
- Nelson Flores, University of Pennsylvania
- Montserrat Garibay, Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of the Office of English Language Acquisition at the U.S. Department of Education
- Mari Haneda, The Pennsylvania State University
- Pauline Jones, Wollongong University, Australia
- Tatyana Kleyn, City University of New York
- Amanda Kibler, Oregon State University
- Luis Enrique López, *Instituto Iberoamericano de Lenguas Indígenas*
- Mary Martínez-Wenzl, Oregon Department of Education
- Diego Román, University of Wisconsin, Madison
- Alice Stott, The Oracy Project, Great Britain
- Karen Thompson, Oregon State University
- Ilana Umansky, University of Oregon
- **Gaby Uro, Council of Great City Schools**
- Aída Walqui, WestEd
- Susan Gardner, Dean, College of Education, Oregon State University
- Víctor Zúñiga, *Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Mexico*

Dates and Times

June 17 and 18, 2024
Breakfast: 8:30 AM
9:00 AM - 3:30 PM daily
Hybrid Courses on Cognitive Strategies Approach to Teach Writing

Pathway and CGCS Project Overview

Partnered with Council of the Great City Schools to meet the dissemination requirement of the grant, making valuable research accessible to schools across the nation

WHY the Council?

- Coalition of 78 of the nation’s largest urban public-school systems
- Member districts enroll 7.84 million students
- Member districts in the aggregate enroll 1.33 million English learners - 27% of the nation’s English learners
Partnership with The Council

- Co-developed based on Council’s course design on Canvas
- Conducted pilot with five (5) Council member districts
- Incorporated feedback from pilot experience
- Amplified the language features content of the course to explicitly address English learner needs
- Expanded the use of videos to present content by experts and practitioners
- Co-branded materials and videos

Council’s Course Design Goal

**GOAL: Transfer of knowledge** to teachers to improve their practice in teaching writing:

- **Practice with UCIWP-developed tutorials** for teaching writing build understanding of the using the cognitive strategies approach.
- **Learning from the tutorials**: Transfer of knowledge occurs as teachers apply their understanding of tutorial/model lesson design using the Cognitive Strategies approach in developing their own instructional lessons and activities to develop student writing.
Key Learning:
The CS Approach & Language Features

- **Cognitive Strategies Approach.** Teachers learn this approach to reading and writing instruction, using a rich variety of relevant texts and writing tasks, that equips students to apply cognitive strategies independently and strategically in their own writing.

- **Key Language Features.** Teachers learn how to recognize and address key language features that persistently present challenges for ELs as they engage with a rich variety of relevant texts and writing tasks.

Key Learning:
Contextualized for Each District

- **Context.** The *hybrid nature* of the professional learning on the Council's Professional Learning Platform enables teachers to incorporate the Cognitive Strategies approach to their district's context (e.g., adopted texts, curriculum, instructional settings, staffing configurations, and district initiatives and constraints).

- **Facilitators.** The hybrid courses are designed to be *facilitated by district staff* who have the best understanding of the district context and its curriculum, initiatives, and organization to create the necessary coherence of the professional learning.
Incorporating LBUSD Teacher Feedback

- How does the professional learning support teachers to use the Cognitive Strategies (CS) and model lessons for different texts?
  - Courses include guidance and examples of how teachers have adapted CS to use with other texts.

- What scaffolding is provided for ELs at all levels, including newcomers and long-term ELs, to support academic language development?
  - New content addresses EL language development needs (e.g., language features guidebook).
  - Resources include guides and rubrics to help teachers evaluate both the cognitive and language dimensions of student writing.

Course 1-3 Pilot
Spring 2023
Pilot of Hybrid Courses

- **Districts**
  - Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
  - Dallas Independent School District
  - Guilford County Schools
  - Oakland Unified School District
  - Pinellas County Public Schools

- **Participants**
  - 21 professional learning participants (i.e., teachers)
  - 7 facilitators

Instructional Field (n=21)

- **ESL/Bilingual/EL Education**: 10
- **General Education**: 10
- **Other (ELA Teacher with ESOL Experience)**: 1
Years of Experience in Working with Second Language Acquisition and/or Literacy (n=21)

- 8, 38% (5 Years - 10 Years)
- 6, 29% (<1 Year to 3 Years)
- 5, 24% (3 Years - 5 Years)
- 2, 9% (10+ Years)

Course Structure and Relevance (n=21)

- Videos effectively conveyed content within an appropriate length of time: 2, Strongly Disagree; 8, Disagree; 11, Agree; 1, Strongly Agree
- Resources on Canvas supported and enriched learning experience: 1, Strongly Disagree; 8, Disagree; 12, Agree; 1, Strongly Agree
- Information, videos, and strategies were presented in a helpful sequence: 3, Strongly Disagree; 8, Disagree; 10, Agree; 1, Strongly Agree
- Transitions between course elements and corresponding activities were smooth: 1, Strongly Disagree; 10, Disagree; 10, Agree; 1, Strongly Agree
- Course provided an appropriate balance between content and practice: 1, Strongly Disagree; 11, Disagree; 9, Agree; 1, Strongly Agree
- Strategies and knowledge were useful: 0, Strongly Disagree; 6, Disagree; 15, Agree; 0, Strongly Agree
- Course provided a clear description of strategies and knowledge: 0, Strongly Disagree; 11, Disagree; 10, Agree; 0, Strongly Agree
Course Structure and Relevance (n=21)

Positive Feedback About:
- Useful strategies and knowledge
- Courses’ clear description of strategies and knowledge
- Content and length of videos

Facilitator-dependent Features:
- Sequence of information, videos, and strategies
- Balance between content and practice
- Transitions between course elements and activities

Connections Made by Facilitators (n=21)

- Curriculum: 19, 90.5%
- District Initiatives: 11, 52.4%
- School Initiatives: 9, 42.9%
- Teacher Evaluation Framework: 4, 19.0%
PATHWAY 1: Using a Cognitive Strategies Approach to Teaching Academic Writing to English Learners

PATHWAY 2: The Reading, Writing, and Language Connection in the Cognitive Strategies Approach

PATHWAY 3: Writing an Analytical Essay About Theme in a Literary Work

Table of Contents
1. Introduction
2. Learn Argumentative/Analytical Writing
3. Learn Writing Effective Argumentative/Analytical Essay About “The Horned Toad”
4. Plan and Annot
5. Reflect
CITATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS ON FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS DOCUMENT
Early one summer, my parents moved our family into a 900-square-foot house in the central part of town that would become home for my siblings and me for the next 25 years. We didn't have much, so it only took a few truckloads to get us from the old apartment building, only a few blocks from one of the area's busiest US/Mexico
education. This led to great anticipation as the first day of school was approaching. Later that summer, a neighbor accompanied my parents and me to school. Since my parents only spoke Spanish, she provided the language support they needed as I was registered for school. The following week, I walked into my first-grade classroom as an English learner, and my journey along this educational pathway began.

It continues today. I can list myriad missteps early in my educational experience, but I chalk it up to the system simply not knowing any better.

Now, we know better. We know the importance of identifying and supporting a student’s cultural, social, emotional, experiential, and linguistic assets. However, are we effectively getting this vital information to teachers and administrators? Better yet, how are we ensuring that future teachers enrolled in teacher preparation programs across the country understand how best to work with English learners when they enter their classrooms?

Before I continue, I also realize that myriad terms are used in districts nationwide to describe students who speak another language at home and are still not proficient in English.

These terms include English learners, multilingual learners, emergent bilinguals, dual language learners, and several others I have probably missed. However, to maintain a level of consistency, I will be using the term English learner to better reflect the definition that appears in the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. The act defines an English learner as any student whose primary language is not English, whose English skills are not sufficient to be successful in the classroom, and who has not yet tested proficient in English. No disrespect is meant to any local educational agency using any term other than English learner.

The Number of English Learners Continues to Grow

According to the latest IES Report on the Condition of Education, in the fall of 2020, approximately five million English learners were attending schools nationwide. This accounted for 10.3% of the total student population. Compared to the number of ELs when I began as a bilingual early childhood teacher, the number has more than
compared to 37% of their peers. These numbers only get worse if one looks back at previous years. In 2002, only 5% reached a proficient level, and two years before that, only 3%. It wasn’t until 2019 that the field reached double-digit numbers, but it remained stagnant at 10% through 2022, as was reported previously. The bottom line is that despite the changes to reading laws promoting scientifically based reading instruction and the added attention to the psychology of reading, our ELs are nowhere near reaching reading proficiency.

**Teacher Preparation Is Key**

As a former school district administrator, I know the challenges, the expenses, and the amount of time it takes to provide teachers with the knowledge base needed to deliver effective reading instruction they may have missed from their initial teacher preparation experience. I was part of two large state reading initiatives that impacted reading-proficiency scores as teachers were trained in reading science. Several years after their initial rollout, teachers still receive professional development to ensure sustainability. The greatest challenge is that until recently, these states were moving forward with little support from teacher preparation programs. The point here is not to direct blame at one entity or another but to say, let’s continue moving forward.

More and more institutions of higher education have realized that adjustments or a complete retooling of their programs must be made. And for that, I applaud them. A reminder to all is that much work remains to be done to ensure ALL students are successful readers. Compared to where we were several years ago, the future looks much brighter, especially when it comes to the instruction being provided to English learners. A reflective and yet effective two-pronged approach must be taken. Let’s tackle this challenge through continued quality professional development provided by local education agencies, AND, most importantly, institutions of higher learning must continue evolving and ensuring what they are teaching and putting into field practice is reflective of the most current research findings and moves away from misconceived ideology. Let’s look at a couple of points.

First, I believe the field has turned the corner on embracing research and how best to teach our students to read. Educational pedagogy is changing, and the field is...
English learners, educators must know that language acquisition and literacy development are different constructs that do not develop or evolve simultaneously. Still, they must be addressed explicitly, as they contribute directly to reading proficiency (see Council of the Great City Schools report 3).

Second, and most importantly, educator preparation programs (EPPs) across the country are being called upon to step up their game. These programs face a formidable challenge, including retooling syllabi and instructional content. They must become the transformative tool that converts research into practice. Our EPPs must ensure that preservice teachers graduate from their programs knowing how to teach reading and writing and, as stated by the 2006 National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth, learn how to make the necessary “adjustments” that some English learners might need. Rather than calling them necessary adjustments, I see them as necessary scaffolds. In addition, as previously stated, preservice candidates must leave their learning experience knowing there is a difference between language acquisition and literacy development.

Unfortunately, the current situation regarding preparing future teachers of ELs looks dismal. The good news is there’s no other way to go than up. The most current NCTQ analysis states that 69% of the 702 elementary teacher preparation programs provided less than two instructional hours on teaching ELs to read. In addition, 88% of programs did not require any reading instruction practice or fieldwork prior to graduation.4

This lack of knowledge can result in teachers simply not knowing how to address the needs of our ELs or applying teaching methodologies that are ineffective or damaging to these students. However, it is also essential to call out states like Tennessee, Colorado, Alabama, Mississippi, New Mexico, and others that are significantly ahead of the game or are beginning the process.

I may have suffered from educational naivete when the National Literacy Panel published its report more than 20 years ago. About a year after the almost 500-page report was made available, the US Department of Education partnered with the National Institute for Literacy and the National Institute of Child Health and...
I was a product of an EPP that leaned heavily toward the implicit teaching of reading. In fact, during the field experience phase of the preservice training, my field service professor warned us against teaching any foundational reading skill lesson. Doing so meant a failing grade for her class.

Because I had witnessed the teaching of foundational reading skills (including the teaching of explicit phonemic awareness skills) to federal prison inmates, I knew teaching reading was about more than just osmosis. It had to do with the explicit teaching of certain skills. Since I had not learned those skills through my EPP, the information published by the National Literacy Panel made sense. When I coupled it with the publication Teaching Reading IS Rocket Science, written by my mentor and teacher Dr. Louisa Moats, everything made sense. It’s been over 20 years that I have been on my journey of teaching literacy skills.

Because of my lack of teaching reading know-how, I clung to everything that had to do with teaching foundational reading skills through the support of oral language development. Unfortunately, the disputes began, and clearly, two opposing points of view emerged: those who did not feel that the psychology of reading applied to English learners and those who did. Regrettably, these polar opposites kept the attention away from teacher-training programs. All is not gloom and doom. I feel the field has also had an epiphany like the one I had 20 years ago. There has been a positive shift in our field of education, acknowledging and incorporating scientific insights into the teaching and learning of reading. This shift has included English learners, as was evident with the release of The Reading League's Joint Statement.

I was part of this historic convening of experts that occurred in early 2023 and once and for all brought all camps and viewpoints together to acknowledge that a comprehensive body of reading knowledge exists, and it is a body of knowledge that is also relevant to the instruction provided to our nation's English learners. According to the Joint Statement, “this knowledge should be embraced and applied to inform instruction, complemented by understanding and addressing the social, linguistic, and cultural factors that impact students.”

Taking Action
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1. Coursework that includes:
   • The principles specific to the psychology of reading.
   • High-quality textbooks that cover phonics instruction, phonemic awareness, fluency, oral language development, comprehension strategies, and the cognitive processes involved in reading that can also drive lesson scaffolding and differentiation.
   • All elements that are specific to the teaching of ELs, including oral or spoken language acquisition and development (form, use, and content), and how, because of high variability factors among ELs, oral language must be the common fabric across all subject matter being learned.
   • The targeted teaching of all language systems (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, oral and written discourse, and orthography) and how they, too, should be incorporated across all content and subject matter.
   • How to align assessments with the specific goals and needs of English learners, considering factors such as age, language proficiency levels, and cultural background.
   • Processes needed to either enhance or include parent and community engagement.

2. Field practice that includes working with English learners and skilled teachers delivering effective and scaffolded instruction.

3. An introductory course dedicated only to the teaching of English learners that covers key concepts, strategies, and methods that educators can use to support the language development and academic success of students who are learning to read and write in English and the considerable variability among all English learners.

Bureaucracies can never be eliminated, but the processes universities and colleges must undertake when making changes to course requirements to better reflect current research findings must be significantly expedited. The procedures needed for change should never be the reason not to pursue it.

We have a way to go, but the future does indeed look bright. The field, overall, has embraced a shift not based on the latest trend but one supported and driven by science. Do we have all the answers? Of course not, but the path to getting those answers continues to be paved by evidence of what works and the scaffolds that
with the skills they need to ensure success for every child in every classroom, regardless of “the language they are loved in” (to quote my mentor, Dr. Moats).

Notes


Antonio Fierro, EdD, is the VP of professional learning and academics at 95 Percent Group (www.95percentgroup.com).
Dear Esteemed Colleagues,

As we navigate the ever-evolving landscape of education, it's imperative that we continue to innovate and expand opportunities for all students. Dual Language Immersion (DLI) programs stand as a beacon of inclusivity and academic excellence, offering a pathway to success for English Language Learners (ELLs) and students whose home language is English, alike. These programs foster linguistic proficiency, and they cultivate cultural competence and global awareness, preparing students to thrive in an interconnected world.

For ELLs, DLI programs offer unparalleled benefits. Research consistently demonstrates that bilingualism enhances cognitive skills, including problem-solving and multitasking abilities. By engaging in rigorous academic content delivered in both their home language and English, ELLs develop a strong academic foundation while preserving their cultural identity. This linguistic and cultural dexterity not only boosts their confidence but also empowers them to excel academically and socially.

One of the most compelling outcomes of DLI programs is the attainment of the NYS Seal of Biliteracy, a prestigious recognition of linguistic proficiency. This achievement opens doors to higher education and career opportunities, and it instills a sense of pride and accomplishment in students. By actively promoting and nurturing DLI programs, we pave the way for more students, particularly ELLs, to reach this milestone and unlock their full potential.

In cultivating a new generation where language is not a barrier, but a bridge, we foster a society that celebrates diversity and embraces cultural richness. By investing in DLI programs, we not only enrich the educational experience for all students, but we also lay the foundation for a more inclusive and interconnected world. Let us seize this opportunity to initiate, sustain, and grow these transformative programs, empowering our students to become global citizens equipped with the linguistic and cultural competence to thrive in the 21st century and beyond.

Yours in Unity,

Elisa Alvarez
Leading The Instructional Shift in Linguistically Diverse Schools

In the Science of Reading (SOR) movement, there is national concern that teaching children to rely on context clues in texts to figure out the meaning of words and sentences alone does not work to improve children’s reading. In it’s Framework for Foundational Literacy Skills Instruction for English Learners, the Council of the Great City Schools stated that English Language Learners (ELLs) need “a comprehensive and connected approach [to foundational literacy skills, which] recognizes the need for [ELLs] to develop both broad language-based skills with related content knowledge to support meaning-making and learning the English language system and code-based skills that build phonemic awareness and decoding skills.” While it is crucial to develop basic literacy skills, it equally is important that ELLs develop language through accessing the content-rich grade-level texts and have a good command of spoken and written academic language. Content-rich texts include informational texts with complex and sophisticated academic language.

To lead the shift from supporting diverse learners through intervention to focusing on strengthening the instructional core, we must first look at how we lead our daily practice in teaching ELLs and whether teaching language-based and code-based skills is part of our day-to-day instruction for our students. One of the five hallmarks (Lesaux 2016) in the instructional shift is how we use texts to communicate the purpose for reading. Content-rich texts of various varieties in thematic units help build up students’ understanding of unit topics and allow for alternative interpretations of the topics. Research has found that providing ELLs with opportunities to access grade-level texts with different levels of readability and perspectives affects student success. ELLs who are immersed in learning from rich texts with purposeful and appropriate instructional support in their language development can build their knowledge and language simultaneously.

The second hallmark of a strong instructional core is the instructional focus on developing ELLs’ academic vocabulary and providing opportunities for ELLs to experiment with language. Peer interaction and discussion is part of the classroom routine. We recognize that learning is a social process, and that ELLs develop their language through participating in conceptual and analytical practices when they learn collaboratively with peers, and teachers, in deliberately structured learning activities. ELLs should be given the opportunity to engage in grade-level content with targeted and structured instructional support in a collaborative learning environment.

The third hallmark of the instructional shift is using writing as a method for consolidating learned knowledge and recognizing that reading and writing are complementary aspects of SoR. Instructional designs should build in writing routines and make writing an integral part of the curriculum. Writing assignments should be content-based, which helps ELLs develop their academic language when they consolidate what they have learned and use the vocabulary and examples from texts to write in their own language to express their thoughts and opinions. ELLs talk with their peers to share their thoughts, they read with a focus, and they write to experiment with academic language usage and structure.

The fourth hallmark is the focus on teaching high-utility vocabulary words. Teachers select target words from texts, and design and provide learning opportunities for students to explore deep conceptual understanding of the vocabulary words. Students use high-utility content-based vocabulary words in their peer-to-peer discussions, notetaking, and written summaries to consolidate their learning.

The fifth hallmark calls for school-wide protocols to ensure the successful implementation of the instructional shift that supports ELLs’ literacy and language development, meets the needs of ELLs, and recognizes their assets. The protocols are research- and evidence-based instructional procedures and routines in the everyday teaching of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. These protocols are not only implemented in literacy and language learning classes, but are practiced across classrooms and content areas.

A successful instructional shift to focus on strengthening the instructional core should result in a reduction in the number of students who need intervention.

To summarize, here is a quote from the opening remarks by a representative from the Council of the Great City Schools (2023): “[ELLs] need a comprehensive and connected approach to foundational literacy skills development that involves grade-level instruction by knowledgeable teachers who build on the linguistic repertoire of ELLs and can teach ELLs how the English language system works to convey meaning.”

References:


Resources:

- NYSED: Topic Briefs (1-8): Advanced Literacies Topic Briefs - Linguistically Diverse Learners and the NYS Next Generation P-12 Learning Standards
- The Reading League Summit: Joint Statement on Understanding and Implementing SoR for ELLs
- WestEd: Quality Education for ELLs/MLLs: Why We Need It and How We Can Achieve It
Purpose
The Maryland State Department of Education Office of Teaching and Learning seeks approval from the State Board of Education (SBOE) to adopt the newly developed MSDE High Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) Selection Frameworks.

Background
The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) is committed to providing best in class curricular guidance and materials through a collaborative and transparent process that emphasizes students and teachers.

The Blueprint for Maryland’s Future requires that MSDE develop a system to identify and promote High Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) that support students in achieving the College and Career Readiness standard. MSDE has created a foundational HQIM framework document that outlines the definitional underpinnings of this signaling system. This document was developed in consultation with national experts and Maryland educators. MSDE has been advised by an additional panel of national experts on each of the core content areas: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies, as well as Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and supports for multilingual learners. This Framework will be used to inform the development of the Maryland HQIM evaluation rubrics and to train Maryland HQIM reviewers. Given its centrality to MSDE’s curriculum and instructional strategy to meet the goals of the Blueprint, MSDE seeks the approval from the State Board of Education to adopt the proposed HQIM Framework document to become the foundation of how high-quality instructional materials are identified in Maryland, including the Key Criteria described within each document.

Executive Summary
This presentation will provide information on the following:

1. HQIM Landscape and Background
2. Research Findings
3. MSDE HQIM Theory of Action
4. MSDE HQIM Selection Frameworks Overview and Stakeholder Engagement
5. MSDE HQIM Selection Framework Adoption Request


**EDUCATOR SUPPORTS**

**Educator Knowledge**

The first session features state and local educational leaders who have led strong literacy adoption and implementation efforts and will inform us about strengths and gaps in foundational literacy materials, instructional guidance needs for teachers, procurement issues, and criteria for adoptions specific to English learners/MLLs.

The panelists are:

Angélica Infante-Green, Rhode Island Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education
Farah Assiraj | فراح أسيراج CEO and Founder for carEDucation Consulting, Chief of Teaching and Learning for the Council of the Great City Schools
Altagracia Delgado, Executive Director of Multilingual Services for Aldine Independent School District in Houston, TX
Cathy Pressnell, Literacy Coordinator for Grades3-6 with Murfreesboro City Schools in Murfreesboro, TN
Diana Fedderman, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning School District of Palm Beach County
The Science of Reading for English Learners (Part III)

In Part I of this blog series, we talked about the research surrounding the Science of Reading for English learners as well as the skills that a proficient reader needs to comprehend text. We highlighted the importance of developing oral language for English learners. We also uncovered some critical differences—alphabet and print conventions, text conventions, phonology, and orthography—between English, Spanish, and Arabic, the three most common home languages spoken by American students. In Part II, we dug a bit deeper into the stages of language acquisition and the need to understand key student characteristics. We provided some actionable steps for reading instruction for English learners. These components stem from teacher knowledge; however, teacher knowledge is only part of supporting English learners’ literacy development. In this final installment of the blog series, we discuss additional critical components that should be considered when implementing the Science of Reading for English learners to ensure they are successful when learning to read in English.

Figure 1. Council of the Great City Schools framework for English learner literacy development

The Council of the Great City Schools proposes a framework to support a “Comprehensive and Connected Approach” for the literacy development of English learners (Figure 1). This framework includes teacher knowledge and an envisioned learning experience where
foundational skills (see Blog I) are embedded into meaningful grade-level content. In order for this to happen, there needs to be district support for the professional development of all teachers—not just the English learner teacher—along with guidance documents and instructional materials that support English learners. Moreover, supporting English learners must be addressed, starting with quality Tier 1 instruction.

“Quality Tier I instruction is realized by teachers who are equipped with knowledge and resources to develop learning activities that model the use of the English language—especially disciplinary academic language—and center on meaning-making to build students’ understanding of grade-level content and how the English language works” (Council of the Great City Schools, 2023, p. 29).
In a recent podcast between Dr. Louisa Moats (a Science of Reading expert) and Dr. Claude Goldenberg (a bilingual literacy expert), they discussed the implications of a 2014 study that found that teachers who were effective with students in general were also more effective with English learners. A teacher’s general effectiveness was more important than if they had an English learner certification. This emphasizes the importance of teachers understanding the Science of Learning and Teaching and effective instructional practices, such as direct, explicit, systematic instruction with sufficient guided practice and feedback (Loeb et al., 2014). The notion of the importance of the Science of Teaching was reiterated in another podcast between Dr. Louisa Moats and Dr. Anita Archer (an expert in explicit instruction), where they agree that good instruction, regardless of subject, is systematic and explicit; it has a sequence of gaining attention, input, question, response, monitoring, feedback, and adjusting. Drs. Moats and Archer also address the need for high-quality instructional materials to support the teacher so the teacher can focus on applying effective instructional practices using the content from high-quality instructional materials.

So, how does one ensure that English learners are receiving the quality Tier 1 instruction needed to ensure success? Start by asking questions and collecting data.

- Does the district have an envisioned learning experience?
- Do teachers have the critical knowledge?
- Is the district providing support through professional development related to English learners and effective Tier 1 instructional practices?
- Does the district have guidance documents that clearly articulate how English learners will be supported?
- Does the district provide high-quality instructional materials that clearly address the needs of English learners?

When key structures are in place at the school and district level, the likelihood that English learners will succeed in developing language and reading skills increases. These structures can be referred to as implementation drivers, which include competencies needed to carry out the evidence-based practices and organizational processes needed.
### Friday, April 26, 2024 • Town and Country Resort, San Diego, California

#### TIME
4:00 pm - 6:00 pm

#### SESSION INFORMATION
Early Check-In and Networking • Town and Country Foyer

### Saturday, April 27, 2024 • Town and Country Resort, San Diego, California

#### TIME
7:30 am - 8:45 am
Registration Check-In and Breakfast • Town and Country Foyer

8:45 am - 9:00 am
Summit Welcome • Golden State Ballroom
Dr. Maria Murray, President and CEO, The Reading League
Kari Kurto, National Science of Reading Project Director, The Reading League
Martha Hernandez, Executive Director, Californians Together

9:00 am - 10:00 am
Virtual Keynote • Golden State Ballroom
Dr. Stanislas Dehaene, Professor, Collège de France

10:15 am - 11:45 am
Neuroscience and Research: The Knowledge Base • Golden State Ballroom
Moderator: Dr. Claude Goldenberg, Nomellini & Olivier Professor of Education, Emeritus, in the Graduate School of Education at Stanford University
Panelists: Dr. Fumiko Hoeft, Campus Dean, and Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), UConn Waterbury; Professor of Psychological Sciences, University of Connecticut; Director of Learning Engineering and Neural Systems Laboratory, UConn/UCSF
Dr. Young-Suk Kim, Professor and Senior Associate Dean at the School of Education, University of California, Irvine
Dr. Ioulia Kovelman, Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan
Dr. Magaly Lavadenz, Leavcey Presidential Endowed Chair in Moral and Ethical Leadership & Executive Director, Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL), Loyola Marymount University

11:45 am - 12:00 pm
Panel #1 Table Discussions • Golden State Ballroom

12:00 pm - 1:00 pm
Lunch • Town and Country Foyer

1:00 pm - 2:00 pm
Assessment: Equitable Assessment Data to Understand EL/EB Student Needs • Golden State Ballroom
Moderator: Dr. Lillian Duran, Professor, Department of Special Education and Clinical Sciences, University of Oregon
Panelists: Dr. Deni Basaraba, Instructor, College of Education, Education Policy and Leadership, University of Oregon
Dr. Margo Gottlieb, Co-Founder and Lead Developer, WIDA at the Wisconsin Center for Education Research
Dr. Jeannette Mancilla-Martinez, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Education, Associate Professor, Vanderbilt University
Dr. Linda Siegel, Professor Emeritus, The University of British Columbia

2:00 pm - 2:15 pm
Panel #2 Table Discussions • Golden State Ballroom

2:15 pm - 3:45 pm
Connecting Research to Classroom Practice: Using the Knowledge Base and Assessments to Inform Classroom Practice • Golden State Ballroom
Moderator: Dr. Elsa Cárdenas-Hagan, President of Valley Speech Language and Learning Center
Panelists: Dr. Jeremy Miciak, Associate Research Professor, University of Houston
Dr. Laurie Olsen, Researcher, Author in Dual Language/English Learner Education, Founder and Strategic Advisor, SEAL
Dr. Francesca Smith, Dual Language and Literacy Instructional Coach
Magdalena Zavalia, Co-Founder, Intelexia

3:45 pm - 4:00 pm
Panel #3 Table Discussions • Golden State Ballroom

4:00 pm - 4:30 pm
Snack Break • Town and Country Foyer

4:30 pm - 5:45 pm
Leadership and Systems: Putting it All Together to Develop Sustainable Evidence-Aligned Systems • Golden State Ballroom
Moderator: Dr. Tracy Weeden, CEO and President, Neuhaus Education Center
Panelists: Farah Assiraj, Chief of Teaching and Learning, Council of the Great City Schools
Melody Ilk, Literacy and School Improvement Consultant, Literacy Transformations, LLC
Dr. Alba Ortiz, Professor Emeritus, University of Texas at Austin
Dr. Ellen Stubbie Kester, CCC-SLP President and Co-founder, Bilinguistics

5:45 pm - 6:00 pm
Summit Closing and Thank You Address • Golden State Ballroom
SOCIAL MEDIA
CGCS English Learners Team on Social Media

November 2023 – February 2024
Gabriela Uro and David Lai from our EL Team shared at the @writingproject National Pathway Conference how CGCS has bolstered the dissemination of resources to support writing instruction by developing new PD courses. Learn about the Council's courses at: cgcs.org/Page/667.

At the @writingproject National Pathway Conference, EL experts from @elgcs (@GCSchoolsNC) and @my_pcs shared their experiences in piloting new CGCS PD courses focused on teaching writing using cognitive strategies. For current course offerings, visit: cgcs.org/Page/667.
Join us in Minneapolis for #BIRE24, the Council's largest annual meeting of bilingual, immigrant, and refugee education directors! Visit cgcs.org/UpcomingConfer... for information and to register.
CGCS @GreatCitySchls · May 6
Our Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee Education (#BIRE24) Directors Meeting school visits, hosted by @SPPS_News, kicked off this morning! Participants are on their way to observe and learn #ELL instructional practices in nine schools across St. Paul.

CGCS @GreatCitySchls · May 7
Yesterday, we wrapped up a day of #BIRE24 school visits in @SPPS_News with a debrief and discussion, allowing participants to learn how St. Paul implemented #ELL programs. There were so many impressive examples of co-teaching and home language integration! Now, onto day 2!
CGCS @GreatCitySchls • May 7

After remarks from @MPS_News Multilingual Programs Executive Director Muhidin Warfa, we’re off to visit nine schools in our #BIRE24 host district to continue our learning of innovative #ELL programs and practices.

CGCS @GreatCitySchls • May 8

This morning, #BIRE24 officially commences! We are so excited for all the learning and collaboration over the next couple of days to advance #ELL education in the Great Cities. Special thanks to our host committee from @MPS_News!
“When districts come together, we do great work for our students.” - @SPPS_News Superintendent Joe Gothard welcomed #BIRE24 attendees on behalf of the Council’s leadership and shared the importance of working together as the Council of the Great City Schools.

“We value all of our students for their uniqueness... You, [#ELL educators], stand in the gap to make sure all our students have what they need.” - Dr. Lisa Sayles-Adams, @MPS_News Superintendent, delivered opening remarks on leveraging language as an asset at #BIRE24.
Former St. Paul Superintendent Valeria Silva delved into the challenges and opportunities of leading in times of change—and explained why courageous leadership is essential to elevate outcomes for English learners. So many valuable tips for our #BIRE24 attendees!

“Our country cannot continue to survive without people willing to do the hard work… [The children of immigrants] are going to be educated! We’re going to train all teachers. We’re going to serve all kids.” - Former St. Paul Superintendent Valeria Silva at #BIRE24
Education professionals are under unprecedented stress. Human Performance and Well-being Expert Leaun Hodges explains the various stress personalities and helps #BIRE24 participants harness this knowledge for stress management.

The Council’s Research Team and presenters from @MPS_News shared considerations for collecting and using English learners data to support and enhance outcomes. This conversation previewed the data-based inquiry process for our new #BIRE24 challenge of practice sessions.
CGCS @GreatCitySchls · May 9

#BIRE24 is more than a meeting! We’ve assembled leading experts and practitioners to tackle the most pressing challenges in #ELL education. Our challenge of practice overview panel highlighted current work in the field on newcomers, MTSS, access to rigor, and oracy.

CGCS @GreatCitySchls · May 9

Now at #BIRE24, award-winning journalist and @democracynow host Juan González (@juango68) underscores the importance of critical thinking and affirming narratives in teaching about world and U.S. history to understand the push and pull factors of migration across the globe.
"Today’s schools, given their huge and growing Latino enrollments, have a special duty to rectify mistakes of the past and provide their students a more accurate and positive sense of Latino contributions to U.S. society." - @juango68, @democracynow host, at #BIRE24

Professor @OkheeLee_of @nyusteinhardt shares curricular units developed by the Science And Integrated Language (SAIL) Project to promote science and language learning for all students, including #ELLs, and the important shift to doing science using language at #BIRE24.
The NYC SAIL team demonstrates how teachers integrate language development in **NGSS**-aligned instruction through science investigations at **#BIRE24**, supporting the agency of **ELLs** and all students in doing science using language as a product of understanding.

Cleveland Metropolitan School District (@CLEMetroSchools) shared work led by its Multilingual Multicultural Education Department to provide non-traditional opportunities to receive credit for courses taken abroad and accelerated pathways to earn credit for graduation at **#BIRE24**.
English learners need and are capable of instructional rigor, especially in math and science, as we heard earlier today at #BIRE24. @dcpublicschools and @OmahaPubSchool shared how they’re raising expectations for all students and ensuring access to grade-level content.
Job-embedded coaching helps to meet the varied professional learning needs of distinct groups of teachers, including general education teachers, to serve ELLs. @SPPS_News and @GSchoolsNC @ellgcs shared innovative professional development approaches at BIRE24.

Collaboration breeds success for ELLs. At BIRE24, @MPS_News shared efforts to foster a collaborative environment that integrates language development and core academic instruction. @dps_k12 shared a journey of collaboration across departments to co-create a vision for success.
At #BIRE24, participants met to tackle challenges of practice related to newcomers, MTSS, access to rigor, oracy, and #ELL service models. Today, the challenge of practice groups shared their progress and strategized for additional learning and improvement.

Building on this morning’s #BIRE24 PD session, @GCSchoolsNC @elgcs shared how they incorporated the National Writing Project (NWP)/Council hybrid courses on Teaching Academic Writing to #ELLS in professional learning and guided participants through a learning activity.
"Feels like coming home every year!" We agree. Thank you to all the #BIRE24 attendees who joined us in Minneapolis. Remain connected with our #ELL work on social media and at cgcs.org/ELL. We are grateful to have you as part of our family!
Gabriela Uro, CGCS Director of ELL Policy and Research, participated on a panel hosted by the National Research & Development Center to Improve Education for Secondary English Learners. Panelists discussed factors impacting #ELL education and how educators can effect change.
**Mentions, Citations, and Presentations of Council of the Great City Schools English Learners Documents**

March 2024 to May 2024

**State Education Agencies, Offices, and Support Centers**

**Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi (Region 7 Comprehensive Center)**

Folsom, J., Goertzen, H., Norman-Goins, K., & Region 7 Comprehensive Center. (2024, May 1). *The science of reading for English learners (Part III).*

[https://region7comprehensivecenter.org/the-science-of-reading-for-english-learners-part-iii/](https://region7comprehensivecenter.org/the-science-of-reading-for-english-learners-part-iii/)

As the third part of a blog series on the “science of reading for English learners,” this piece references and includes an image of the Council’s theory of action for implementing a “comprehensive and connected” approach to foundational skills instruction for ELs. The foundational skills framework is cited in the reference list.

**Maryland**

Wright, C. M. (2024, April 30). *Adoption of high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) identification frameworks* [Memo to Members of the State Board of Education].


The memo to members of the Maryland State Board of Education seeking approval to adopt a newly developed materials selection framework, authored by Interim State Superintendent of Schools Carey Wright, includes a citation of the Council’s mathematics framework within the “Research & Scholarship Supporting the Framework” section of the supporting document entitled "Mathematics High-Quality Instructional Materials Selection Framework.”

**New York**

Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages, New York State Education Department. (2024, April). Leading the instructional shift in linguistically diverse schools. *Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages Newsletter.*

The article references the need for a “comprehensive and connected approach” to foundational skills development for English learners as discussed in the Council’s framework for foundational skills instruction. In the reference list, a citation of the document is included.

**Articles**


The article references the role of oral language development in literacy instruction, discussed in the Council’s framework for foundational skills instruction for English learners, and includes a citation for the document.

**Presentations**


Council of the Great City Schools Chief of Teaching and Learning Farah Assiraj presented the foundational skills framework during a panel discussion at the Reading League’s summit.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NBXb96UprMo&list=PLa6Gq6ljSp7xB- -Dx5zHYamOwFL4Hz6K&index=1

Council of the Great City Schools Chief of Teaching and Learning Farah Assiraj presented the foundational skills framework during a webinar hosted by the English Learners Success Forum.
BIRE MEETING
### Meeting Agenda

**Monday, May 06, 2024 – St. Paul School Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast and Check-In</td>
<td>NORWAY 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>School Visits – Pre-Registered Attendees Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm – 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm – 5:30 pm</td>
<td>School Visit Debrief</td>
<td>NORWAY 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday, May 07, 2024 – Minneapolis School Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast and Check-In</td>
<td>NORWAY 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>School Visits – Pre-Registered Attendees Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm – 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm – 5:30 pm</td>
<td>School Visit Debrief</td>
<td>NORWAY 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 pm – 7:00 pm</td>
<td>Pre-Meeting Reception</td>
<td>FINLAND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, May 08, 2024**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>DENMARK COMMONS FJORDS 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 8:30 am</td>
<td>Minneapolis Welcome</td>
<td>SCANDINAVIAN 3,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presenters:**
- Lisa Sayles-Adams, Superintendent, Minneapolis
- Joe Gothard, CGCS Executive Committee Member, Superintendent, St. Paul

**8:30 am – 9:00 am**

**Welcome and Meeting Logistics**

The Council’s English Learners (EL) Team will welcome attendees and provide an overview of the meeting logistics. Participants will learn about the Challenge of Practice Work Sessions—dedicated daily time to work on a challenge of practice in small groups with the assistance of expert thought-partners.

**Presenters:**
- Gabriela Uro, Director of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS
- David Lai, Manager of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS

**9:00 am – 10:00 am**

**Courage to Lead Complex Shifts**

This session will frame and set the tone for BIRE 2024. Former St. Paul Superintendent Valeria Silva will delve into the challenges and opportunities of leading in times of change—and explain why courageous leadership is essential to elevate outcomes for English learners.

**Presenter:**
- Valeria Silva, Leadership Consultant (Former Superintendent, St. Paul)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am – 10:15 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:15 am – 12:15 pm | **Navigating Complexity and Well-being**  
Education professionals are under unprecedented stress. Human Performance and Well-being Expert Lauren Hodges will explain the various stress personalities and help participants harness this knowledge for stress management.  
**Facilitator:** Gabriela Uro, Director of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS  
**Presenter:** Lauren Hodges, Consultant, Performance on Purpose |
| 12:15 pm – 1:15 pm | **Lunch**  
**Location:** Scandianvian 3,4 |
| 1:15 pm – 2:15 pm | **Framing with Data and Evidence of English Learner Performance**  
The challenge of practice work sessions will engage participants in reflecting on current EL performance and planning to monitor and evaluate new strategies. The Council’s Research Team will provide an overview of the English learners data landscape and the CGCS Academic KPI project. Minneapolis Public Schools will discuss data use and infrastructure, highlighting district-level challenges and considerations for collecting and using EL data to support and enhance EL education. District leaders will discuss the evolution of data practices centered around English learners (ELs), highlighting the integration of student information systems and specialized data platforms.  
**Facilitator:** David Lai, ELL Policy and Research Manager, CGCS  
**Presenters:**  
Akisha Osei Sarfo, Director of Research, CGCS  
Patti Lagos, K-12 Multilingual Content Lead, Minneapolis  
Wes Nemenz, K-12 Multilingual Content Lead, Minneapolis  
Megan Demorest, K-12 Multilingual Content Lead, Minneapolis |
| 2:15 pm – 3:15 pm | **Overview of the Challenges of Practice**  
Experts and practitioners will provide an overview of the challenge of practice topic areas, highlighting the importance of each topic, discussing persistent challenges, and sharing available, relevant resources. The overview will help participants select a topic area for the challenge of practice work sessions.  
**Facilitator:** Gabriela Uro, Director of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS  
**Presenters:**  
Newcomers – Jen Chard, City University of New York  
MTSS & ELs—Julie Esparza-Brown, Portland State University  
Access to Rigor—Okhee Lee, New York University  
Oral Language Development – Aida Walqui, National Research and Development Center to Improve Education for Secondary ELs  
EL Service Models—David Lai, CGCS |
| 3:15 pm – 3:30 pm | **Break**  
**Location:** Scandianvian 3,4, Scandianvian 1,2, Norway 1,2,3, Fjords 4, Copenhagen |
| 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm | **Challenge of Practice: Problem Definition**  
Participants will select an area of focus and determine a challenge of practice based on an examination of current practices and the extant data or metrics that substantiate the identified challenge of practice.  
**Assigned on Site:** |

---

**Note:** The document contains a table with a schedule of events and their details. The table provides a clear layout of the sessions, including the time slots, topics, and facilitators/presenters for each event. The schedule covers various topics such as complexity and well-being, data and evidence of English learner performance, and the challenges of practice.
Oslo

**Facilitators:**
- Gabriela Uro, Director of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS
- David Lai, ELL Policy and Research Manager, CGCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:00 pm – 5:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Break and Transition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Denmark Commons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 pm – 6:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Welcome Reception</strong></td>
<td><strong>Denmark Commons</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, May 09, 2024**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 4:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Denmark Commons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td><strong>Breakfast</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fjords 1, 2, 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 9:00 am</td>
<td><strong>Understanding Demographic Shifts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scandinavian 3, 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Award-winning journalist Juan González, host of *Democracy Now!*, a daily, global, independent news hour—will present on the importance of understanding the geopolitical forces, and specifically the role of the U.S., that result in newcomers arriving in U.S. schools. His recently updated publication *Harvest of Empire* underscores the importance of promoting critical thinking and affirming narratives in teaching about world and U.S. history to build an understanding of the push and pull factors of migration across the globe. Participants will receive a copy of his book.

**Presenter:**
Juan González, Journalist, *Democracy Now!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 10:00 am</td>
<td><strong>English Learners Succeeding in Mathematics and Science</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scandinavian 3, 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Science And Integrated Language (SAIL) is an NSF-funded NYC project to develop NGSS-aligned instructional materials that constitute a yearlong fifth-grade curriculum for students and teachers to promote science and language learning for all students, including English learners. The [NYU SAIL](#) team will describe the SAIL project and its findings about the important shift to doing science using language. Additionally, the team will demonstrate how science learning and language learning overlap.

**Facilitator:**
David Lai, Manager of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS

**Presenters:**
- Okhee Lee, Professor, New York University
- Abigail Schwenger, Research Associate, NYU SAIL Team
- Iovanna Williams, Teacher, Mount Eden Children's Academy (NYC), NYU SAIL Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am – 10:15 am</td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scandinavian 3, 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am – 11:15 am</td>
<td><strong>Concurrent Breakout Sessions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scandinavian 3, 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEM Education and Language Development**
The NYU SAIL team will share concrete examples of how EL teachers support science learning through language development and discuss how to support the integration of language development in science education.

**Presenters:**
- Okhee Lee, Professor, New York University
- Abigail Schwenger, Research Associate, NYU SAIL Team
- Iovanna Williams, Teacher, Mount Eden Children's Academy (NYC), NYU SAIL Project

**Breakout 1**

**Supporting Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education**

Cleveland Metropolitan School District will share the research and committee work led by the Multilingual Multicultural Education Department to establish the EL High School Acceleration Program that provides non-traditional opportunities for students to receive credit for courses.
taken abroad and accelerated pathways to earn credit for high school graduation and workforce preparedness.

Albuquerque Public Schools will share how the Newcomer Summer Program for students in grades 6-12 came into being through leveraging partnerships with Albuquerque’s local refugee resettlement agency and multiple community partners, and funding from multiple sources. The program offers a diverse curriculum, including math, social studies, English, music, and art, supplemented by weekly field trips to local cultural sites and instruction in navigating local transportation. Participants will learn about the program’s two-year successes in facilitating academic, cultural, and social integration for newcomers and SIFE.

FACILITATOR:

_Megan Demorest, K-12 Multilingual Content Lead, Minneapolis_

PRESENTERS:

_Jose Gonzales, Executive Director, Multilingual Programs, Cleveland_
_Anthony Baca, Refugees and Newcomer Supports Program Manager, Albuquerque_

**Breakout 3**

**DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAMS**

Minneapolis Public Schools will highlight key factors for successfully implementing dual language programs at the secondary level. Chicago Public Schools’ Language and Culture Office and English Learners Success Forum (ELSF) will share their collaborative experience in developing and using new guidelines for selecting high-quality Spanish Language Arts materials.

PRESENTERS:

_Maureen Dowling, Roosevelt High School DL Coordinator, Minneapolis_
_Olimpia Bahena, Deputy Chief of Language and Cultural Education, Chicago_
_Rebecca Blum Martinez, National Dual Language Advisor, ELSF_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15 am – 11:25 am</td>
<td><strong>Transition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25 am – 12:25 pm</td>
<td><strong>Materials Review Session I</strong></td>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakout 1</td>
<td><strong>AMPLIFY</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scandinavian 1,2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakout 2</td>
<td><strong>CURRICULUM ASSOCIATES</strong></td>
<td><strong>Norway 1,2,3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakout 3</td>
<td><strong>ENGAGE2LEARN</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fjords 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakout 4</td>
<td><strong>TALKINGPOINTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scandinavian 3,4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:25 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fjords 1,2,3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm – 2:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Instructional Rigor Across Content Areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scandinavian 3,4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District of Columbia Public Schools will share an approach to prepare and support teachers to scaffold math instruction for multilingual learners within Tier 1, 2, and 3 settings. The approach ensures that math lessons for multilingual learners include intentional scaffolding without diluting the content. Progress monitoring data used to show evidence that MLs are learning and growing in mathematics will be shared.

Omaha Public Schools will describe the professional learning provided to all teachers, centered on *High Expectations: Ensuring Students Achieve Academic Goals*. The presenter will share how the EL Office—a key member of the professional learning team—collaborated across content areas and departments to design and deliver the professional learning series focused on effective scaffolding across disciplines. Participants will learn how the district is leveraging PLCs to accelerate student achievement.

FACILITATOR:

_Aimee Fearing, Senior Officer of Academics, Minneapolis_
**Presenters:**

Maria Austria, Director of Curriculum Strategy and School Supports, District of Columbia

Jaimie Cogua, EL Coordinator, Omaha

---

**2:30 pm – 4:00 pm**

**Challenge of Practice Work Session:**

The second day of the challenge of practice practicum/exercise will be devoted to elaborating on the proposed responses or solutions to the identified challenge of practice, detailing specific actions needed, required district resources and support, as well as anticipating intended and unintended outcomes for distinct stakeholders. District teams will weigh all of these factors to select the final response or solution to be implemented.

**Facilitator:**

Gabriela Uro, Director of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS

---

**Work Sessions:**

- Newcomers
- MTSS & ELs
- Access to Rigor
- Oral Language Development
- EL Service Models

---

**4:00 pm – 4:15 pm**

**Break**

---

**4:15 pm – 5:15 pm**

**Student Voices to Inform Services and Instruction**

In two 30-minute panels, Minneapolis Public Schools and St. Paul Public Schools students will share their aspirations and experiences within English learner programs in the post-pandemic context. The panelists will inform participants about bright spots in programs and raise potential blind spots or persisting challenges to address.

**Facilitator:**

Corina Pastrana, District Program Facilitator, Bilingual Seals Program, Minneapolis

---

**5:15 pm – 5:30 pm**

**Break and Transition**

---

**5:30 pm – 9:00 pm**

**Group Activity – WhirlyBall – Dress Comfortably**

- Departure Bus from Hotel: Royal Sonesta Main Entrance @ 5:30 PM
- Return Bus to Hotel: WhirlyBall Main Entrance @ 8:15 PM

---

**Friday, May 10, 2024**

**7:00 am – 8:00 am**

**Breakfast**

---

**8:00 am – 9:00 am**

**Innovative and Effective Professional Development Approaches**

St. Paul Public Schools will share the effort underway to provide job-embedded coaching through deliberate cross-departmental collaboration that meets the varied professional learning needs of distinct groups of teachers, including general education teachers and teachers working with distinct typologies of English learners. Council staff and Guilford County Schools will provide an update on the Teaching Academic Writing to ELs professional learning courses, co-developed with the University of California, Irvine (UCI) Pathway to Academic Success Project, including findings from Guilford’s experience with the pilot courses and timeline for course development completion.

**Facilitator:**

Farah Assiraj, Chief of Teaching and Learning, CGCS

---

**Presenters:**

Sophie Ly, Assistant Director, Office of Multilingual Learners, St. Paul

David Loi, Manager of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS

Soledad Lardies-Dunst, EL Coordinator, Guilford County
9:00 am – 10:00 am  
**Breakout 1**  
**Breakout 2**  
**Breakout 3**  
**Breakout 4**  
**MATERIALS REVIEW SESSION II**  
Scandinavian 3,4  
Scandinavian 1,2  
Norway 1,2,3  
Fjords 4  
Copenhagen  
Oslo  
**Just Right Reader**  
**Renaissance Learning**  
**ThinkCERCA**  
**Ellevation Education**  
**Scandinavian 1,2**  
**Norway 1,2,3**  
**Fjords 4**  
**Scandinavian 3,4**  

10:00 am – 11:30 am  
**CHALLENGE OF PRACTICE FINAL WORK SESSION**  
The third day of the challenge of practice practicum/exercise will be devoted to detailing the next steps of an overall plan to address the challenge of practice as part of a broader implementation plan. District teams will also outline a corresponding communication plan that generates buy-in and sustained organizational support/resources to achieve the desired outcomes.  
**WORK SESSIONS:**  
- Newcomers  
- MTSS & ELs  
- Access to Rigor  
- Oral Language Development  
- EL Service Models  

11:30 am – 12:30 pm  
**CHALLENGE OF PRACTICE WRAP-UP: ACTION PLANS AND NEXT STEPS**  
Scandinavian 3,4  
District teams will present the results of the challenge of practice practicum/exercise. A district team from each focus area will present the identified challenge of practice, the proposed response/solution with examples of detailed steps and resource requirements, and describe the draft communication plan. Non-presenting district teams will share their work via flipcharts posted around the room. Time for a gallery walk will be provided at the end of the session.  
**Facilitator:**  
*Gabriela Uro*, Director of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS  
**Presenters:**  
Volunteer District Teams (Selected on Site)  

12:30 pm – 1:30 pm  
**LUNCH**  
Fjords 1,2,3  
Scandinavian 3,4  

1:30 pm – 2:30 pm  
**BREAKING DOWN SILOS**  
Scandinavian 3,4  
Minneapolis Public Schools will share efforts to foster a collaborative environment that integrates language development and core academic instruction to ensure students in dual language programs receive comprehensive support throughout their educational experience.  
Denver Public Schools will share a journey of examining collaboration across academic departments to co-create a vision for success and an action plan for effective school support, with a focus on welcoming a significant influx of new arrivals. Participants will learn about the professional learning, tools, resources, and supports for developing lessons that embed effective supports for multilingual learners across content areas.  
**Facilitator:**  
*Maria Rollinger*, Deputy Senior Officer of Academics, Minneapolis  
**Presenters:**  
*Maria Froud-Martinez*, K-12 DL Coordinator, Minneapolis  
*Valeria Praga-Rodriguez*, Director of MLE Program Design & Development, Denver  
*Sarah Grimm-Masson*, Director of MLE Performance, Accountability, & Systems Optimization, Denver  

2:30 pm – 3:15 pm  
**COUNCIL UPDATE: TEACHING ACADEMIC WRITING TO ELs COURSE OVERVIEW**  
Scandinavian 3,4  
Guilford County Schools will share how they incorporated the National Writing Project (NWP)/Council hybrid courses on *Teaching Academic Writing to ELs* in professional learning
and the resulting impact—and guide participants through a learning activity demonstration using the course materials.

**Facilitator:**
*David Lai, Manager of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS*

**Presenters:**
*Vanina Hackett, EL Lead, Guilford County*
*Soledad Lardies-Dunst, EL Coordinator, Guilford County*
*Carlos Bartesaghi, EL Coordinator, Guilford County*

## EVENING ON YOUR OWN

### Saturday, May 11, 2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 9:00 am</td>
<td><strong>Breakfast</strong></td>
<td>NORWAY 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 9:30 am</td>
<td><strong>Council Projects Update</strong></td>
<td>NORWAY 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing projects will be shared for discussion and feedback. Attendees will be invited to share pressing issues to inform upcoming projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am – 10:00 am</td>
<td><strong>BIRE Debrief and 2025 Planning</strong></td>
<td>NORWAY 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals, issues, and venues for future meetings will be discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td><strong>Meeting Adjournment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1 Please indicate your role.

Answered: 68   Skipped: 0

**Answer Choices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central office administrator or leader</td>
<td>85.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based administrator or leader</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL instructional coach or resource teacher</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, professor, or consultant</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph showing the distribution of responses among different roles.
Q2 Please indicate the primary focus of your current work.

Answered: 68  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Development</td>
<td>13.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Education</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area: English Language Arts/Literacy</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area: Math or Science</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, Assessment, or Research</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Program Administration (i.e., Coordinator, Director, etc.)</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>16.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 How would you describe the content of the following GENERAL SESSIONS?

Answered: 64  Skipped: 4
INNOVATIVE AND EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL...

CHALLENGE OF PRACTICE WRAP-UP: ACT...

BREAKING DOWN SILOS (Maria Froud-Martin...)

COUNCIL UPDATE: TEACHING...
2024 BIRE Meeting Evaluation - Minneapolis

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

- Very Helpful
- Helpful
- Somewhat...
- Not Helpful
- Did Not Attend
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURAGE TO LEAD COMPLEX SHIFTS (Valeria Silva, Leadership Consultant (Former Superintendent, St. Paul))</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.94%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAVIGATING COMPLEXITY AND WELL-BEING (Lauren Hodges, Consultant, Performance on Purpose)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMING WITH DATA AND EVIDENCE OF ENGLISH LEARNER PERFORMANCE (Akisha Osei Sarfo, Director of Research, CGCS; Patti Lagos, K-12 Multilingual Content Lead, Minneapolis; Wes Nemenz, K-12 Multilingual Content Lead, Minneapolis; Megan Demorest, K-12 Multilingual Content Lead, Minneapolis)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERVIEW OF THE CHALLENGES OF PRACTICE (Newcomers — Jen Chard, City University of New York; MTSS &amp; ELs—Julie Esparza-Brown, Portland State University; Access to Rigor—Okhee Lee, New York University; Oral Language Development – Aida Walqui, National Research and Development Center to Improve Education for Secondary ELs; EL Service Models—David Lai, CGCS)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.69%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING DEMOGRAPHIC SHIFTS (Juan González, Journalist, Democracy Now!)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH LEARNERS SUCCEEDING IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE (Okhee Lee, Professor, New York University; Abigail Schwenger, Research Associate, NYU SAIL Team; Iovanna Williams, Teacher, Mount Eden Children's Academy (NYC), NYU SAIL Project)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.94%</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL RIGOR ACROSS CONTENT AREAS (Maria Austria, Director of Curriculum Strategy and School Supports, District of Columbia; Jaimie Cogua, EL Coordinator, Omaha)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>45.31%</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT VOICES TO INFORM SERVICES AND INSTRUCTION (Corina Pastrana, District Program Facilitator, Bilingual Seals Program, Minneapolis)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.69%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INNOVATIVE AND EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES (Sophie Ly, Assistant Director, Office of Multilingual Learners, St. Paul; David Lai, Manager of ELL Policy and Research, CGCS; Soledad Lardies-Dunst, EL Coordinator, Guilford County)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>45.31%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGE OF PRACTICE WRAP-UP: ACTION PLANS AND NEXT STEPS</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>26.56%</td>
<td>32.81%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREAKING DOWN SILOS (Maria Froud-Martinez, K-12 DL Coordinator, Minneapolis; Valeria Praga-Rodriguez, Director of MLE Program Design &amp; Development, Denver; Sarah Grimm-Masson, Director of MLE Performance, Accountability, &amp; Systems Optimization, Denver)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL UPDATE: TEACHING ACADEMIC WRITING TO ELS COURSE OVERVIEW (Vanina Hackett, EL Lead, Guilford County; Soledad Lardies-Dunst, EL</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>DID NOT ATTEND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 How would you describe the content of the following BREAKOUT SESSIONS?

Answered: 64   Skipped: 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Education and Language Development</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th>Not Helpful</th>
<th>Did Not Attend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Okhee Lee, Professor, New York University; Abigail Schwenger, Research Associate, NYU SAIL Team; Iovanna Williams, Teacher, Mount Eden Children's Academy (NYC), NYU SAIL Project)</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>51.56%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jose Gonzales, Executive Director, Multilingual Programs, Cleveland; Antonio Baca, Refugees and Newcomer Supports Program Manager, Albuquerque)</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language Programs</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maureen Dowling, Roosevelt High School DL Coordinator, Minneapolis; Olimpia Bahena, Deputy Chief of Language and Cultural Education, Chicago; Rebecca Blum Martinez, National Dual Language Advisor, ELSF)</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 In general, how would you describe the mix of general session and breakout speakers?

Answered: 64    Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOO MANY</th>
<th>JUST RIGHT</th>
<th>NOT ENOUGH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban district presenters</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside experts/researchers</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>70.31%</td>
<td>26.56%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff presenters</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>90.63%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Based on your learning in the general and breakout sessions, please indicate the amount of change you plan to make in the listed areas.

Answered: 64   Skipped: 4

- Attention to EL data to monitor...
- Doing science using language as evidence ...
- Instructional rigor and access in...
- EL access to specialized programs (e....
- Collaboration with content-area...
- Obtaining feedback from English...
### Evaluation of Changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>No Changes</th>
<th>Some Changes</th>
<th>Major Changes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention to EL data to monitor achievement and promote district</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
<td>60.94%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing science using language as evidence of learning and understanding</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
<td>59.38%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional rigor and access in mathematics</td>
<td>29.69%</td>
<td>64.06%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL access to specialized programs (e.g., talented &amp; gifted, CTE,</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>59.38%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrichment/acceleration programs)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with content-area offices for scaffolding across</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>26.56%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciplines</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining feedback from English learners</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
<td>60.94%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-embedded coaching and professional development on supporting</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs in content-area classes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing instruction for English learners</td>
<td>29.69%</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching about Latino and other ethnic minorities' contributions to</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. history</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 Were there sufficient opportunities to interact with colleagues, share information, and discuss lessons learned during the general and breakout sessions?

Answered: 64    Skipped: 4

**ANSWER CHOICES** | **RESPONSES**
--- | ---
YES, there were sufficient opportunities for interaction, sharing, and discussion. | 68.75%  44
NO, I would like to see MORE opportunities for interaction, sharing, and discussion. | 31.25%  20
N/A - No Opinion | 0.00%  0
TOTAL | 64
Q8 Which materials review sessions did you attend? (Check all that apply.)

Answered: 64  Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amplify</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Associates</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellevation Learning</td>
<td>29.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage2Learn</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Right Reader</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Learning</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TalkingPoints</td>
<td>32.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThinkCERCA</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Did Not Attend</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 64
Q9 What factor/s impacted your decision of materials review sessions to attend (or decision to not participate in the materials review sessions)? (Select all that apply.)

Answered: 64    Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of material/s presented</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with material/s (e.g., already adopted, rejected in prior review, etc.)</td>
<td>29.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in vendor/company overall</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of session description (e.g., clarity, specificity, etc.)</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to role in district</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials adoption cycle in district (e.g., adoption cycle passed, etc.)</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 64
Q10 Please provide any comments about the BIRE 2024 sessions in the area below (e.g., format, length of sessions, speakers, etc.). If you would like us to follow up with you, please include your name and email address.

Answered: 31    Skipped: 37
Q11 Regarding your experience in the instructional materials review sessions, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Answered: 45    Skipped: 23
Vendors: The vendors were open to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 - Strongly...</th>
<th>1 - Disagree</th>
<th>2 - Agree</th>
<th>3 - Strongly...</th>
<th>N/A - No Opin.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CGCS Criteria Frameworks: I felt comfortable applying the Council's frameworks and criteria to assess the quality of EL supports in instructional materials.</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>24.44%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGCS Criteria Frameworks: I felt comfortable applying the Council's frameworks and criteria to articulate suggestions for desired features in instructional materials.</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: Sufficient time was provided for me to review materials and to provide feedback to the vendors.</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors: The vendors provided sufficient details about the products/ideas for which they were seeking feedback.</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>57.78%</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors: The vendors were open to receiving feedback from district reviewers.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>42.22%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12 In which days of the challenge of practice exercise/practicum did you participate? (Select all that apply.)

Answered: 45    Skipped: 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>62.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Did Not Participate</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 45
Q13 In which challenge of practice topic area group did you participate?

Answered: 58   Skipped: 10

**ANSWER CHOICES** | **RESPONSES**
--- | ---
Newcomers | 27.59% | 16
MTSS & ELs | 15.52% | 9
Access to Rigor | 18.97% | 11
Oral Language Development | 25.86% | 15
EL Service Models | 12.07% | 7

**TOTAL** | **58**
Q14 With whom did work during the challenge or practice exercise/practicum? (Select all that apply.)

Answered: 58  Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert thought-partner</td>
<td>37.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees from other districts</td>
<td>77.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees from own district</td>
<td>53.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Worked alone</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 58
Q15 Based on your experience, how productive do you think the challenge of practice exercise/practicum would be for the following types of attendees?

Answered: 58  Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY PRODUCTIVE</th>
<th>PRODUCTIVE</th>
<th>NOT PRODUCTIVE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole district team</td>
<td>59.65%</td>
<td>29.82%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial team from district</td>
<td>26.79%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16 When did you read the Challenge of Practice materials (i.e., protocols and topic summaries)? (Select all that apply.)

Answered: 58   Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the meeting</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the meeting</td>
<td>62.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Did not read the materials</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 58
Q17 What did you find to be beneficial about the challenge of practice exercise/practicum experience? (Select all that apply.)

Answered: 58  Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time to process learning and issues</td>
<td>46.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging ideas with colleagues</td>
<td>81.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to process and plan with district team members</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing new perspectives and challenges</td>
<td>72.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to engage/consult with experts</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice presenting challenges and solutions</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in a structured problem-solving process</td>
<td>37.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/practicing new protocols</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 58
Q18 How helpful was it to have the following types of thought-partners?

Answered: 56  Skipped: 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area Expert (e.g., researcher or academic)</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHA...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area Expert (e.g., researcher or academic)</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - NO OPINION OR DID NOT HAVE THOUGHT-PARTNER</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District Practitioner</th>
<th>VERY HELPFUL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHA...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District Practitioner</td>
<td>44.64%</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - NO OPINION OR DID NOT HAVE THOUGHT-PARTNER</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.02
Q19 General Comments Regarding Challenge of Practice Exercise/Practicum

Answered: 18   Skipped: 50
Q20 What topics would you most like to learn about or discuss at BIRE 2025?

Answered: 39   Skipped: 29
Q21 Where would you like to see BIRE 2025 take place? Please pick your TOP TWO choices.

Answered: 61   Skipped: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>34.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>65.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, KY</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>18.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>54.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 61
Q22 Which of the following weeks in May 2025 will work for you to attend BIRE 2025? (Select all possibilities.)

Answered: 61    Skipped: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Week - May 5-10</td>
<td>78.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Week - May 12-17</td>
<td>59.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents: 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23 General Comments Regarding BIRE 2025

Answered: 14    Skipped: 54
Challenge of Practice
Practicum/Exercise:
Daily Activities and Protocols

Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee
Education Directors Meeting

May 8-10 | 2024
INTRODUCTION

Three-Day Challenge of Practice Practicum/Exercise

The three-day Bilingual, Immigrant, and Refugee Education (BIRE) Meeting provides dedicated time to work on a challenge of practice. Each day offers a 1.5-hour session framed around meeting specific goals that culminate in a gallery walk and presentations on Friday. Teams may need to meet outside of the designated work sessions.

Protocols to Support the Work

Numerous protocols and guides exist for identifying challenges of practice and performing root cause analyses. School districts may have their own protocols and guides. This document references specific elements of common protocols to support the daily activities. The appendix includes full descriptions of and links to the several commonly used protocols and guides that are referenced in the document.

Many protocols for root cause analysis are derived from the manufacturing and sales industries, while others are derived from the public sector—public policy or public administration. Where possible, the protocols are adapted to better fit the challenges and organizational issues of public education.

Preparing for the Challenge of Practice Practicum/Exercise

Before engaging with colleagues in a collaborative process to examine the root causes for key challenges, consider issues of pressing concern or priority areas. Among the many protocols, the Consultancy Protocol (Center for Leadership and Education Equity, 2021) delineates steps and suggested questions that guide introspection to articulate or frame the dilemma.

In the Consultancy Protocol, challenges or issues are called dilemmas or puzzles. This protocol helps educators think more expansively about a particular, concrete dilemma—“an issue that raises questions, an idea that seems to have conceptual gaps, or something about process or product that you just can’t figure out.” The protocol can help participants see and describe the dilemmas that are prevalent in their work, as well as help others understand and deal with the identified dilemmas. (See Appendix B for the four steps delineated in the protocol to help educators identify and frame the dilemma or issue.)

---
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DAY ONE

Determine the Challenge of Practice and the Intended Outcome

The first day is devoted to determining (1) the challenge of practice based on an examination of current practices and (2) extant data or metrics that substantiate the identified challenge of practice as requiring attention. (See Appendix A for measures and data sources to consider.)

- **Determine the Challenge of Practice**
  - What do the existing data show?
  - What problems have already been flagged?

- **Examine Evidence and Data Substantiating the Challenge of Practice**
  - How long has the problem existed?
  - What is the impact of the problem? (See Step 2 of Bardach’s *Eightfold Path* in Appendix D.)
  - What are the concrete signs or indicators that suggest a problem?

Addressing a challenge of practice involves identifying possible root causes. A root cause analysis will help answer the following questions about the problem—

- What are the precursors (e.g., choices or actions) to the problem?
- What conditions contribute to the problem?

**Root Cause Analysis Protocols**

*The Five Whys* is a technique that asks “Why?” five times to answer the questions above and others that arise while unpacking the multiple factors that contribute to an existing problem. (See Appendix C.)

*Cause and Effect Diagrams,* also called fishbone or Ishikawa diagrams, allow for the listing of multiple factors that may explain a complex challenge or problem. (See Figure 1.) The multiple factors, then, fuel thinking about multi-layered responses that tackle specific causes of the problem.

---

2 Fishbone or Ishikawa, diagrams are used to display the many factors that may be contributing to a problem. Many of these processes and diagrams emerged within the manufacturing and sales industries, requiring some adaptations to apply them to the realm of education.
Examining the organizational elements of the district using the McKinsey 7-S Framework can help identify some contributing factors to a problem. Table 1 shows the seven elements of the framework adapted for the education context. (See Appendix E for specific questions that can be asked for each of the elements.)

Table 1. The Seven Elements of the McKinsey 7-S Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HARD ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> a school district’s plan for setting and achieving its goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure:</strong> how a school district is organized (e.g., how departments and teams are structured, including who reports to whom, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems:</strong> the daily activities and procedures that educators and staff use to get the job done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOFT ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared values:</strong> the core values of a school district/department/school, which encompass its expectations for teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style:</strong> the style of leadership adopted at each and all relevant levels of the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff:</strong> the teachers, educators, and staff and their general capabilities and qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills:</strong> the knowledge base of the organization’s employees and their ability to implement this knowledge to elevate student achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DAY TWO

Responses for Desired Outcomes

The two goals for the second day are—

- to elaborate on the details of the proposed solutions or courses of action and
- to weigh the proposed responses to determine which will proceed (i.e., are most feasible).

Goal #1: Details for Implementation

Identify possible responses or courses of action that focus on a distinct factor, or a combination of contributing factors, identified during the root cause analysis phase. Determine the resources required to implement the proposed responses or solutions, such as additional research, cross-functional engagement, staffing, and funding. (See Steps 3 and 5 of Bardach’s Eightfold Path in Appendix D.)

What by Whom, and by When. Identify all the district educators/staff involved (accountability/research, administrators, central office, principals, content area leads, counselors, human resources (HR), chief financial officer (CFO), etc.

Specify how each person or office will contribute to executing the proposed responses or solutions to address the challenge of practice. Incorporate these details into a theory of change or action that explains how the proposed response or solution will address the challenge of practice and underscores why addressing the problem is important. (See Steps 4 and 8 of Bardach’s Eightfold Path in Appendix D.)

Systems. Identify which daily activities and procedures will evolve, change, or go away with the proposed solution to the challenge of practice. (See McKinsey 7-S Framework in Appendix E.)

Resource Requirements. Consider the various types of resources the proposed solutions will require, including staff time, funds, and data.

- **Data:** Which data and from which department/staff?
- **Implementation Resources:** What and how much? (See Table 2.)
- **External Justification/Guidance:** What are the relevant sources to support the proposed solutions and theory of action/change (e.g., research, state law/policy, federal law, Council of the Great City Schools reports, U.S. Department of Justice, etc.)?
Anticipated Desired and Unintended Impacts. For each of the proposed responses or solutions, anticipate the impact it will have on all affected parties. (See Step 5 of Bardach’s Eightfold Path in Appendix D.) A sample brainstorming chart is shown in Table 3.

A chart of inputs, outputs, and outcomes (i.e., logic model) may help summarize the implementation considerations. (See Table 4.)
Table 4. Logic Model Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Strategies and Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What resources are or could reasonably be available?</td>
<td>What will the activities, events, and such be?</td>
<td>What are the initial products of these activities?</td>
<td>What changes are expected?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Goal #2: Weighing Proposed Responses/Solutions to Make Final Selection**

For each proposed response, weigh the trade-offs and unintended consequences (e.g., necessary resources, staffing, funding, scheduling, etc.) against the intended outcomes (i.e., to address the challenge of practice). Understanding the trade-offs, including who is affected by them, will help in deciding between alternatives and planning how to generate buy-in. Map these pros and cons for the affected parties/stakeholders to develop a realistic sense of implementation and success for proposed responses or courses of action. Decide which proposed response or course of action will be taken. (See Steps 6 and 7 of Bardach’s *Eightfold Path* in Appendix D.)
DAY THREE

Determine Next Steps

The third day focuses on creating preliminary plans and determining the next steps to bring about the necessary change to implement the proposed response to the identified challenge of practice. The plans will address where to start, who to involve, and how to generate buy-in. The plans and next steps might include and consider the following—

- **Goal #1: Strategically Know the District.** Identify the organizational elements of the school district/department/office to inform a strategy for buy-in and sustained improvement to achieve the desired change in practice.

- **Goal #2: Detail Next Steps in Overall Plan.** Layout initial details of the implementation plan.

- **Goal #3: Develop Communication Plan and Execute from the Start.** Delineate the communication plan, including a budget justification, to obtain resources and support from key stakeholders—internal and external—for a successful implementation. Begin executing the communication plan from the outset of the process.

**Goal #1: Strategically Know the District**

Strategically knowing the district involves having a deep understanding of the culture and norms, formal policies, and unspoken rules that drive how the district operates. This knowledge should inform preliminary plans in addition to the necessary communication efforts. Several organizational elements of the *McKinsey 7-S Framework* can help focus the organizational inquiry. (See Appendix E.)

- **Structure:** How is the school district organized (e.g., how departments and teams are structured, including who reports to whom, etc.)? Who and which departments need to be involved and brought on board for the desired change?

- **Shared Values:** How will the proposed response or solution be aligned with the core values of a school district/department/school, specifically related to expectations for teaching and learning for English learners (ELs)? What is the state of shared responsibility for the educational success of English learners? How can the proposed responses and solutions succeed and help foster shared responsibility?

- **Style:** What is the recommended approach to introduce the proposed solution and get buy-in from staff, given the style of leadership at each and all relevant levels of the district, especially to strategize how to enlist colleagues and senior staff for support?
Use knowledge and insights emerging from the examination of the school district/department/office’s organizational elements to—

- **Build a coalition.** Build a coalition or team of influential people whose power comes from a variety of sources, including job title, status, expertise, and political influence. This ‘change coalition’ works as a team to build urgency and momentum around the need for change. The coalition can include key partners who are not district staff, such as parents, business roundtable members, and immigrant working groups. (See Step 2 of Kotter’s 8-Step Change Model in Appendix F.)

- **Enable action by removing barriers.** Consider steps to remove or mitigate the impact of obstacles that may slow progress or create roadblocks to progress. Identify processes or structures that are getting in the way of change. (See Step 5 of Kotter’s 8-Step Change Model in Appendix F.)

**Goal #2: Detail Next Steps in Overall Plan**

When delineating the next steps (what by whom, and when), it is helpful to keep in mind two of the organizational elements described in the *McKinsey 7-S Framework*.

- **Staff:** How will teachers, educators, and staff receive the proposed response or solution; and what are the implications concerning their general capabilities and qualifications?

- **Skills:** What is the knowledge base of the organization’s employees and their ability to implement this knowledge to elevate student achievement? What knowledge/training is needed (by EL office staff, other offices, etc.) to build capacity?

See Appendix E (*McKinsey 7-S Framework*) for additional questions to help craft an implementation plan.

**Plan for Successive Wins.** Include in the overall plan achievable short-term goals that will generate early wins to energize staff to persist and sustain support. Recognize, collect, and communicate wins—early and often—to track progress and energize individuals to persist. Without achievable short-term goals, critics and naysayers can undermine the progress and efforts. Incorporate time into the plan for an iterative approach, enabling the team to thoroughly analyze each success, leverage what worked well, and identify areas for improvement. (See Steps 6 and 7 of Kotter’s 8-Step Change Model in Appendix F.)

**Plan for Enduring Institutional Change.** Build into the plan the time, space, staffing, and intention to examine the improvement process and resulting successes to evaluate existing systems and processes that need to be revised to support and reinforce the new behaviors, mindsets, and ways of working. Enlisting key members of the ‘change coalition’ provides valuable insights into existing systems and processes important to foster shared ownership and secure necessary changes/improvements. (See Steps 2 and 8 of Kotter’s 8-Step Change Model in Appendix F.)
Goal #3: Develop Communication Plan and Execute from the Start

Effective and clear communication is a component of major change models, continuously occurring throughout any change process.

- Define the challenge of practice and create a sense of urgency to address the problem using compelling and convincing communication about the problem backed by evidence (Bardach’s Steps 1 and 2; Kotter’s Step 1).

- Communication should convey and elaborate on the multiple factors that contribute to the challenge of practice (Five Whys; Bardach’s Step 2; Kotter’s Step 5) and the importance of addressing the problem.

- Be clear about the logic for how the recommended response will address the challenge of practice. This clarity is key for enlisting the support of supporters and stakeholders who will implement the changes (Bardach’s Step 4; Kotter’s Steps 2, 3, and 4).

- Tell a story, communicating from the beginning (the three points above) and throughout the implementation, to inform the process and to sustain support. Communicate a unified message—often, consistently, and early—about the successive wins and progress of implementation in ways that are strategic and relevant for various audiences and stakeholders (Bardach’s Steps 4 and 8; Kotter’s Steps 4, 6, and 7).
APPENDIX A

Measures and Data Sources to Consider

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and ELs

- Student achievement—formative and summative
- Evaluation of interventions
- Attendance
- Discipline referrals
- Graduation rates
- Course placement (access to higher-level courses)
- Student observation reports
- Behavior plans
- Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) screeners

EL Access to Rigor

If possible, the examined data would include data for other student groups, such as non-EL rate of participation.

- Algebra completion by grade 8/9 rates
- Advanced Placement (AP) or specialized course enrollment rates (participation and completion)
- AP scores of three or higher
- Teacher certification rates, years of experience, etc., for ELs and other students
- Participation rates in enrichment programs (e.g., STEM, robotics, etc.)
- Referral process (qualitative data)
- Language proficiency requirements, if applicable
Oral Language Development

- Student achievement—formative and summative
- Lesson plans—integration of opportunities for oral language use and development
- Student/classroom observations for quantity and quality of oral language production
- Any assessments that capture oral language throughout the year (i.e., not only the annual English language proficiency assessment)

EL Service Models

- Enrollment by type of EL program and/or school
- Student achievement—formative and summative—by service model
- Teacher certification rates, years of experience, etc., by EL program model
- Graduation rates
- Placement in advanced courses

Newcomers

- Enrollment by year of arrival
- Student achievement—formative and summative
- Attendance
- Inventory of assigned teachers by certification status, years of experience, etc.
- Graduation rates
- Course placement
APPENDIX B
Consultancy Protocol

The Consultancy Protocol supports individual introspection. Before engaging with colleagues in a collaborative process to examine the root causes for key challenges, consider issues of pressing concern or priority areas. Among the many protocols, the Consultancy Protocol (Center for Leadership and Education Equity, 2021) delineates steps and suggested questions that guide introspection to articulate or frame the dilemma.

In the Consultancy Protocol, challenges or issues are referred to as dilemmas or puzzles. This protocol helps educators think more expansively about a particular, concrete dilemma. A dilemma, within the Consultancy Protocol, is described as: “an issue that raises questions, an idea that seems to have conceptual gaps, or something about process or product that you just can’t figure out.” This protocol assumes that dilemmas have identifiable tension, cross over many parts of the education process, and some may be illustrated by samples of student or adult work. The protocol’s two main purposes are—

• to develop participants’ capacity to see and describe the dilemmas that impede their work, and
• to help participants understand and deal with the identified dilemmas.

Four steps are delineated to help educators identify and frame the dilemma or issue—

1. Think about the dilemma;
2. Do reflective writing around a set of questions that may be helpful to think about—personal, stakeholder, assumptions, etc.;
3. Frame the focus question; and
4. Critique the question, which helps identify the problem or dilemma.

Reference

---

3 The Consultancy Protocol is among the various protocols listed on Harvard’s DataWise website (https://datawise.gse.harvard.edu/courses-and-materials) to assist educators in collaborative problem-solving.

APPENDIX C

The Five Whys Technique

The *Five Whys* is an iterative interrogative technique used to explore the cause-and-effect relationships underlying a particular problem. It was developed at Toyota Industries in the 1930s to solve problems in the design and production of automobiles by Sakichi Toyoda, the Japanese industrialist, inventor, and founder of Toyota Industries. The *Five Whys* technique was popularized in the 1970s and is still used by Toyota.

The *Five Whys* is most effective when used to resolve simple or moderately difficult problems.5 “Counter-measures,” rather than “solutions,” are identified because counter-measures aim to prevent the problem/issue from arising again (MindTools, 2024). Solutions are seen as more narrowly addressing the symptoms of the problem/issue.

Videos and Resources


Consortium for Public Education. (2021, October 15). *Design thinking for education, ep. 15: The five whys* [Video]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p7jyg4kk44o

MindTools. (2024). *5 whys*. https://www.mindtools.com/a3mi00v/5-whys
APPENDIX D

Bardach’s Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving

In A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis—The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, Eugene Bardach (2011) outlined eight steps to practical policy analysis. This problem-solving process draws from public policy rather than from the manufacturing and sales industries. The protocol’s eight steps below have been adapted for use in school district settings.

STEP #1
Define the challenge of practice. Identify and clearly define a relevant problem that needs to be addressed.

STEP #2
Assemble evidence. Gather data that serve as evidence for the problem and indicate possible causes, remembering that in education a challenge of practice is rarely explained by a single factor. Gathering data will likely entail reading district documents, including studies and statistical reports, speaking with colleagues, producing EL-relevant data, etc. Bardach (2012) recommends focusing the data collection on only those data that can be turned into “information” that has some bearing on the problem; it can be easy to go astray.

STEP #3
Develop solutions/responses. Generate alternative courses of action, strategies, or solutions to address the challenge of practice. Potential solutions may focus on a distinct factor, or a combination of contributing factors, identified in the root cause analysis phase. Identify the resources required to implement proposed responses or solutions.

STEP #4
Articulate the theory of action (plotline). Build a “story” about the challenge of practice (problem) that clearly articulates the theory of action along two interconnected but separable plotlines—the analytic and the evaluative.

- **Analytic**—Encompasses all the facts and disinterested projections of consequences. The analytic plotline will reason about whether X, Y, or Z is likely to happen (Bardach, 2011).

- **Evaluative**—Encompasses value judgments. Subjectivity and social philosophy have freer play. There may be disagreements. It is in the evaluative plotline that we learn whether we think X or Y, or Z is good or bad for the world (Bardach, 2011).
The evaluative plotline helps to convince others that the identified challenge of practice is important to address while the analytic plotline lays out the logic for how the recommended solution will address the challenge of practice.

**STEP #5**

**Project the outcomes.** Project all the outcomes (or impacts) for each of the alternative solutions on all interested/affected student groups, staff, families, stakeholders, etc. Be sure to include both intended or unintended outcomes or impacts.

**STEP #6**

**Confront the trade-offs.** For each proposed response or course of action, weigh the trade-offs and unintended consequences (e.g., necessary resources, staffing, financial cost, scheduling, etc.) against the intended outcomes (i.e., to address the challenge of practice). Understanding the trade-offs, including who is affected by them, will help in deciding between alternatives and planning to generate buy-in. Map these pros and cons for the affected parties/stakeholders to develop a realistic sense of implementation.

**STEP #7**

**Decide!** Decide what to do based on the analysis in Step 6 or simulate decision-making. The lack of clarity on trade-offs, implementation, etc., at this step can make decision-making difficult. Thus, this step can be considered a check for how thoroughly the preceding steps were conducted. Proponents of solutions must be able to convince themselves of the plausibility of implementation and success for some course of action to be able to convince others—especially decision-makers—that it is worthwhile.

**STEP #8**

**Tell your story.** Using the theory of action/change developed in Step #4, build a “story” to explain the challenge of practice, the importance of addressing it, and how the proposed responses will produce desired results. Depending on the challenge of practice, the audience may be internal to the EL Office or include other curricular departments, the budget director/CFO, school administrators, teachers, senior central office staff, the superintendent, etc. Therefore, a differentiated communication approach will be necessary to attain buy-in for the proposed response or course of action.

**References and Resources**


APPENDIX E

McKinsey 7-S Framework

The *McKinsey 7-S Framework* can be useful to help examine an organization’s ability to implement change. Developed in the late 1970s by former consultants at McKinsey & Company, the framework identifies seven elements to examine how the various parts of an organization work together. The seven elements, listed below, need to balance and reinforce each other for organizations to perform well.6,7 They are adapted for school settings in this document.

- **Hard elements:** Strategy, structure (organization charts and reporting lines), and systems (formal processes and its systems)
- **Soft elements:** Shared values, skills, style, and staff

The *McKinsey 7-S Framework* contains four steps, leading to broader organizational change focused on responding to the challenge of practice—

- **Step #1:** Start with your shared values. Are they consistent with your structure, strategy, and systems? If not, what needs to change?
- **Step #2:** Look at the hard elements—the strategy, structure, and systems. How well does each one support the others? Identify where changes need to be made.
- **Step #3:** Look at the soft elements—shared values, skills, (leadership) style, and staff. Do they support the desired hard elements? Do they support one another? If not, what needs to change?
- **Step #4:** Adjust and align the elements through an iterative process of making adjustments and analyzing how the adjustments impact other elements and their alignment. A proposed response to a challenge of practice will have a better chance of succeeding if the various elements are aligned and reinforce each other.

A few helpful questions that can serve as a starting point to think through some of the elements less obvious in school district settings are—

**Systems**

a. What are the main systems that support the school district/department/office? Consider student information systems (SIS), early warning indicator systems, budget and HR systems, communications and document storage (e.g., translation, lesson plans, etc.), etc.

b. Where are the controls (i.e., feedback loops) and how are they monitored and evaluated?

c. What internal rules and processes does the team use to stay on track?

---


Style

a. How participative/collaborative is the management/leadership style in the office/department/district?

b. Do staff/team members tend to be siloed or collaborative?

c. Are there formal teams functioning within the office/district or are they mostly nominal groups?

Staff

a. What specializations and knowledge areas are represented within the team?

b. What positions need to be filled?

c. Are there gaps in required competencies?

Skills

a. What are the strongest skills and knowledge bases represented within the district office/team?

b. Are there any skill/knowledge gaps?

c. What is the department/office/team known for doing well?

d. Can the current staff/team members carry out the task?

e. How are skills and knowledge monitored and evaluated for continuing capacity building?
John Kotter, Harvard Business School Emeritus Professor, researched how leaders and organizations bring about organizational change. From his findings, he introduced an eight-step change model in 1995. Though grounded mostly in the context of private-sector companies and organizations, some of the steps can be helpful to bring about change in school districts, considering the guardrails and constraints of the public sector, shaped by state and federal laws and fiscal stewardship of public funds.

**STEP 1:**

Create a Sense of Urgency. Develop a sense of urgency around the need for change to spark initial motivation and movement.

**STEP 2:**

Build a Guiding Coalition. Convince people that change is necessary. Build a coalition or team of influential people whose power comes from a variety of sources, including job title, status, expertise, and political influence. This ‘change coalition’ should have a good mix of people and work as a team to build urgency and momentum around the need for change.

**STEP 3:**

Form a Strategic Vision. Provide a clear vision that individuals can easily grasp, remember, and buy into. It’s important to have a clear link between what individuals are being asked to do and the vision towards which all are working.

**STEP 4:**

Enlist a Volunteer Army. Large-scale change can only occur when people rally around achieving a common goal. At an individual level, they must want to actively contribute. Collectively, they must be unified in the pursuit of the goal.

**STEP 5:**

Enable Action by Removing Barriers. Remove obstacles, human or otherwise, that slow things down or create roadblocks to progress. Identify processes or structures that are getting in the way of change.

---

STEP 6:

Create Short-term Wins. Recognize, collect, and communicate wins—early and often—to track progress and energize individuals to persist. Without achievable short-term goals, critics and naysayers can undermine the progress and efforts.

STEP 7:

Sustain Acceleration. Sustain acceleration by building on successive wins. Each success provides an opportunity to build on what went right and what may need to be improved.

STEP 8:

Institute Change. Articulate the connections between new behaviors and organizational success, sustaining them until they replace old habits. Evaluate systems and processes to ensure management practices reinforce the new behaviors, mindsets, and ways of working.
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English Learner Service Models

Define the Challenge of Practice

**Key Questions**

- What is the district’s service model to provide English language development (ELD) and access to grade-level content?

- How does the district ensure the service models are delivered by qualified teachers who are well-supported by principals and all curriculum departments, not only the English Learner (EL) Office?

- How does the district ensure consistent support for English learners (ELs) across grade levels and schools, both in English language development and language support in content areas?

**Possible Areas of Focus**

a. Pre-K to early elementary coherence of ELD and literacy instruction

b. Secondary ELD/EL service model

c. Service models for specific typologies of ELs—newcomers, students with interrupted formal education (SIFE), dually identified students, etc.

d. ELD delivery: integrated, designated, co-teaching, dual language (DL), etc.

e. ELD connected to grade-level content

f. Staffing allocations by service model, English language proficiency (ELP) level, etc.
   1) Teacher allocations
   2) Counselor/other staffing allocations
   3) Ensuring service when using itinerant teachers
Background and Contextual Considerations

The 2018 Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Brief on EL program models examines the common program models in U.S. K-12 schools and organizes these into three main categories, under which additional models fall. The brief includes general descriptions of these models, acknowledging the vast variation in their implementation across schools.2

**Dual Language**

- Developmental bilingual, maintenance bilingual, or one-way immersion
- Two-way immersion, dual immersion, or dual language immersion

**Transition Bilingual Education (TBE)**

- Early exit
- Late exit

**English Only**

- Classroom ESL/ESOL/ENL/ELD
- Content-based ESL
- Co-teaching
- Pull-out
- Push-in
- Sheltered English Instruction/SDAIE/SIOP
- Structured English Immersion

The key questions presented in Table 1 by Sugarman (2018) can help in examining or further refining EL models of service. Table 1 shows how three broad categories of EL program models—dual language, transitional bilingual education, and English only—differ along various dimensions, such as language goals and the use of partner languages. Understanding the differences between models can aid districts in identifying feasible models and taking stock of the models that exist.

---

2 MPI lists Newcomer under TBE and English Only. The list in this document omits Newcomer because “newcomer” is a student typology rather than a program. Newcomer students can be served in any of the listed program models.
### Table 1. Key Features of Three Broad Categories of EL Program Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the language goals?</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
<th>Transitional Bilingual Education</th>
<th>English Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism and biliteracy in English and a partner language</td>
<td>Proficiency and literacy in English; partner-language proficiency to a limited degree</td>
<td>Proficiency and literacy in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How much is the partner language used? | At least 50 percent of instruction in elementary, and at least two periods per day in secondary | Initially 50 to 90 percent, tapering to less than 50 percent | Students’ home languages may be used informally, but not usually systematically |

| When does it start and how long does it last? | At a minimum, the program runs K-5, though PreK-12 is recommended | One to five years long, and may start in any grade | As long as needed, may start in any grade |

| Are ELs integrated with non-ELs? | ELs and non-ELs are integrated in two-way immersion; ELs only in developmental bilingual programs | ELs taught separately until they transition to general education classes | ELs and non-ELs are integrated to varying degrees |

| What is the relationship between EL instruction and general education? | All classes and content areas covered by the dual language program in elementary; in secondary, this varies by model | Varies, but transitional bilingual programs typically comprise all or most classes and content areas | English-only programs typically include specialist-taught periods or co-taught classes, with ELs otherwise integrated with non-ELs in general education classes |

| What are some of the program models that fit this category? | ▪ Developmental bilingual (also maintenance bilingual, one-way immersion) ▪ Two-way immersion (also dual immersion, dual language immersion) | ▪ Early exit ▪ Late exit ▪ Newcomer | ▪ Classroom ESL (also ESOL, ENL, or ELD) ▪ Content-based ESL ▪ Co-teaching ▪ Newcomer ▪ Pull out ▪ Push in ▪ Sheltered English instruction (also SDAIE or SIOP) ▪ Structured English immersion |

**Notes:** ESL = English as a second language, ESOL = English for speakers of other languages, ENL = English as a new language, ELD = English language development. In dual language and transitional bilingual programs, the partner language is the language other than English. SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English) and SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) are generally known by their acronyms and are two common models of sheltered instruction.


English Language Development and Content Integration

An important aspect of any EL program/service model is how it supports goals for English language development (ELD) and content learning. The goals and preferred/feasible models impact the relationships between content-area and EL teachers. The sharing of the responsibility for language and content development between content-area and EL teachers is most closely reflected in the integration of content and ELD instruction. On one extreme, EL teachers (and the EL program generally) might focus on English language development with little connection to content instruction. On the other hand, ELD can be tightly linked with the grade-level content taught by content-area teachers.

Reflection tool. Table 2 can be used to indicate where a district’s EL program model falls along the spectrum of ELD and content integration, facilitating reflection on desired changes or improvements. Recognizing that EL service models can vary by grade level, the table provides columns for three grade-band levels and two EL typologies.

Table 2. Degree of ELD and Content Integration by Grade Band and Student Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Newcomers</th>
<th>Beginning English Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Development (ELD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic/Remedial Skills (ELA/Math)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-level ELA with Language Support (ELD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-level Non-ELA Content with Language Support (ELD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-level Content without Language Support (ELD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigating Linguistic Isolation: English Learner and Non-EL Integration

Another important feature of an EL program/service model is how much interaction it fosters between English learners and their English-speaking peers. This interaction helps mitigate linguistic isolation and provides ELs ample opportunities to practice their budding English language skills. Student placements in neighborhood schools, availability of ESL/bilingual-certified or trained teachers, EL program placement, and other factors can hinder the creation of stable opportunities for the desired interactions. Nevertheless, schools and districts are known to be creative in creating opportunities for interaction between ELs and non-ELs.

**Reflection tool.** Table 3 can be used to reflect on the integration of ELs and non-ELs within the existing service model for various instructional purposes or content areas (shown in Column 1) to help reveal possible challenges of practice. The table enables separate reflections by grade band—elementary, middle, and high—and EL typology.

**Table 3. EL and Non-EL Integration by Instructional Approach/Setting, Grade Band, and Student Typology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Newcomers</th>
<th>Beginning English Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Development (ELD)</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-level ELA with Language Support (ELD)</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-level Non-ELA Content with Language Support (ELD)</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-level Content without Language Support (ELD)</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic/Remedial Skills (ELA/Math)</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
<td>□ ELs only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
<td>□ ELs w/ non-ELs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Measures and Data Sources

- Enrollment by type of EL program and/or school
- Student achievement – formative and summative – by service model
- Teacher certification rates, years of experience, etc., by EL program model
- Graduation rates
- Placement in advanced courses

Sources


Newcomers

Newcomers is a broad umbrella topic that encompasses a vast array of potential challenges of practice. The Council's survey on newcomer concerns surfaced the following challenges related to district processes for meeting the academic and non-academic needs of newcomers—

A. Many districts lack a clear definition for identifying newcomer students.

B. Screening processes for identifying newcomers, their knowledge, and needs are insufficient for tailoring specific responses.

C. Guidance for program placement of newcomers to address both academic needs and provide social-emotional support is unclear.

D. Instruments, protocols, and professional learning to better understand the unique needs of newcomer students are needed to design more effective and efficient responses.
   - Type of need: academic, social-emotional, and resources
   - Student-facing vs. adult-related: instruction, professional development for educators and administrators, etc.

An overarching district goal related to newcomers is to have processes in place for identifying and supporting newcomers to meet their unique needs in strategic ways that foster shared responsibility and the efficient use of existing resources and programs.

Council Newcomer Survey: Selected Findings

Consistent with the findings of other reports on newcomers, the responding Council-member districts used a variety of terms and definitions to designate newcomers. This lack of consistency for definitions across member districts leads to some important cautions for the interpretation and use of the survey responses—

- Estimating an aggregate number of newcomers across districts would likely result in an overcount due to broad definitions used in some districts.
- Given the variance of contexts and purposes for which “newcomer” designations are made, districts should be cautious of adopting another district's definition without carefully reviewing how the definition would serve its own purposes.

Districts that have the discretion to craft their own definitions should be clear about the purpose for making such a determination and the programmatic implications for identified newcomers. Clarity of purpose and programmatic implications for students is important, whether districts engage in refining an existing definition and identification process or establishing an entirely new definition and screening protocol.
**Topic A. Definitions for Newcomers**

The top three student characteristics—as reported by 54 districts—used to define a newcomer are: 1) students who were born abroad and have low English proficiency; 2) Title III (ESEA); and 3) asylees/refugees. (See Figure 1.)

**Figure 1. Types of Student Groups Included in District Definition of Newcomers (N = 49)**

Not only are the terms used differently; districts vary in the number of criteria used to indicate that a student is a newcomer. (See Figure 2.)

**Figure 2. Criteria Used to Identify Students as Newcomers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONE Criterion (10)</th>
<th>Time from arrival (10):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less than 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enrolled under 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enrolled 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less than 36 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWO Criteria (18)</th>
<th>Time of arrival &amp; ELP (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign-born &amp; time from arrival (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLIFE &amp; ELP (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THREE Criteria</th>
<th>Age, time from arrival, ELP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade, time from arrival, ELP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born, time from arrival, ELP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Of 54 responding districts, five districts were excluded from the figure above because their unique definitions did not fall into the given student groups.
Topic B. Purpose of Identifying Students as Newcomers

District responses for why they identify students as newcomers include the following—

Designing targeted programs or support services

State or federal agency data collection and reporting

Evaluating targeted programs or support services

Intra-district data collection and reporting (e.g., monitoring and projecting enrollment)

Seeking governmental grants/funding (e.g., Title III)

Seeking non-governmental grants/funding (e.g., non-profits, foundations, universities, etc.)

The purpose/s for identifying students as newcomers is/are connected to the criteria used in the definition and identification processes, and determine subsequent actions related to placement, programming, funding, etc. Table 1 provides examples of these connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions for state ACCOUNTABILITY purposes</td>
<td>ESSA definition and/or state definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING for immigrant and/or newcomer students</td>
<td>Relevant definitions to determine eligibility for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-designed, dedicated INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>Educational needs, staffing requirements, program placement, instructional support, access to educational opportunities, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-designed, RESPONSIVE SUPPORTS (mental health, socioeconomic, legal, etc.)</td>
<td>Culturally responsive and appropriate services, staffing, location of services, wrap-around support (e.g., transportation), etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| District DATA COLLECTION for funding advocacy, enrollment projections, and evaluation | Federal, state, and funder definitions to apply for funds  
Data infrastructure, including student information system (SIS) containing fields useful for program evaluation, data/research staff who are knowledgeable of EL typologies, etc. |
Topic C. Concerns Reported in Council Newcomer Survey

The survey respondents largely identified similar priority areas (i.e., concerns) facing the students deemed to be newcomers. Notably, many of these priority areas are not exclusive to newcomers.

Academic Needs

- Low literacy levels in any language
- Major gaps in content-area knowledge
- Low levels of English proficiency

Socio-emotional Needs

- Food/housing insecurity
- Unmet socio-emotional needs impeding ability to participate in class
- Needed assistance adjusting to U.S. schools

Performance and Accountability

- Lack of motivation to stay in school
- Low standardized test performance
- Over-age, under-credited

Key Questions Related to Determining Academic and Socio-emotional Needs

If the district’s purpose for screening is to meet academic-related programmatic needs of newcomers:

1. How will screening results inform placement in courses?
   a. Awarding credit: transcript evaluation
   b. Ensuring access to rigor

2. How will screening results inform eligibility for newcomer centers/strands?
   a. Clear eligibility criteria
   b. Time in program
   c. Academic content and wrap-around supports
If the district’s purpose for screening is to identify socio-emotional-related programmatic needs of newcomers (services):

1. How do screening protocols differentiate needs unique to newcomers as opposed to shared needs with other student groups?

2. How are screening results used to help identify gaps in existing programs and supports that fail to address newcomer needs (e.g., design, capacity, staffing, language/cultural barriers, etc.)?

Possible Areas of Focus

- Protocols for screening and identifying students as newcomers
- Academic needs of newcomers
- Socio-emotional needs of newcomers
- Performance and accountability concerns for newcomers

Related Measures and Data Sources

- Enrollment by year of arrival
- Student achievement—formative and summative
- Chronic absenteeism rates
- Assigned teachers by certification status, years of experience, etc.
- Graduation rates
- Course placement

Additional Reading and Resources


**Oral Language Development**

Oral language development is central to supporting overall literacy development and English language acquisition for multilingual learners. An outsized focus on and use of standardized, usually computer-based assessments, as well as computer-based products tends to limit the time and opportunities devoted to oral language development.

**Key Questions**

- How are time and instruction devoted to oral language development for English learners (ELs) measured and monitored?
- How well do students perform on the speaking and listening domains of the English proficiency assessment?
- How much do ELs currently engage in content-based conversations with peers and teachers? In which content areas?
- How do materials/computer programs support (or hinder) oral language development for ELs?
- How is oral language development currently integrated with district literacy efforts?

**Possible Areas of Focus**

Challenges of practice related to oral language, based on self-assessment of current practices to systematically and strategically support oral language development for ELs, may include one or more of the following—

- Oral language development in English language development (ELD) instruction
- Instructional time for oral language development in content-area classrooms
- Professional development to support mindset shifts of school and district leaders to value oral language development
- Capacity of teachers or instructional coaches to implement instructional practices for oral language development
- Professional development for effective instructional practices to facilitate instructional conversations and foster oral language development

---

4 The Council’s report on *Foundational Literacy Skills Instruction for English Learners* expounds on the importance of oral language development and provides the research to support this expanded vision of foundational literacy skills instruction for ELs.
Related Measures and Data Sources

Measures of progress in oral language development typically involve—

- Standardized summative assessments; and
- Formative assessments.

Resources


Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

Effective multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) protocols provide English learners (ELs) access to robust Tier I instruction that includes academic language development and timely and appropriate interventions, which may involve screening for disabilities.

Key Questions

- How do district multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) protocols provide English learners access to robust Tier I instruction that includes academic language development?
- How do district multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) protocols provide timely and appropriate interventions designed for English learners?
- How do district multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) protocols provide timely and appropriate supports, which may involve screening for disabilities?

Possible Areas of Focus

Areas that need attention may include—

- Departmental coordination with EL/ML office
- Referral and screening for special education
- Linguistically appropriate interventions

Related Measures and Data Sources

- Student achievement—formative and summative
- Evaluation of interventions
- Attendance
- Discipline referrals
- Graduation rates
- Course placement (access to higher-level courses)
- Student observation reports
- Behavior plans
- Social Emotional Learning (SEL) screeners
Resources


English learners (ELs) must have access to grade-level content and rigorous pathways for post-secondary success. A major ongoing challenge is improving educator capacity and district systems to provide English development support within the context of rigorous grade-level content instruction.

**Key Questions**

- What barriers do ELs face to access specialized programs?
- What screening instruments and protocols are used to ensure ELs access specialized programs?
- How are general education teachers in specialized programs trained and supported to teach ELs?
- In which content areas, rigorous pathways, and specialized schools/programs are EL teachers assigned to support ELs?

**Possible Areas of Focus**

Challenges of practice related to access to rigor, ascertained through an examination of content areas, pathways, schools, etc., in which ELs need greater/improved access, may include—

- Barriers to entry that are hurdles to expanding access: departmental coordination, information dissemination, professional development, staffing, etc.
- Access to gifted and talented programs, magnet schools, and select and/or test-in schools
- Access to rigorous content for high school graduation and post-high school success
- Referral to and EL support in rigorous pathways—college/STEM/career

**Related Measures and Data Sources**

If possible, the examined data would include data for other student groups, such as the non-EL rate of participation.

- Algebra completion by grade 8/9 rates
- Advanced Placement (AP) or specialized course enrollment rates (participation and completion)
- AP exam scores of three or higher
- Teacher certification rates, years of experience, etc., for ELs and other students
- Participation rates in enrichment programs (e.g., STEM, robotics, etc.)
- Referral process (qualitative data)
- Language proficiency requirements, if applicable