



District or School Level ESOL Language Program Self-Assessment

Adapted from CCSSO EL Collaborative Working Group's EL Program Evaluation Resource (in press)

Program Element	Beginning / Approaching Requirements District/School is just beginning to serve ELs and/or is approaching compliance. See Dear Colleague Letter , EL Language Programs – State Guidance , and ESOL Language Program Summary Guidance .	Partial Implementation Some, but not all, elements of full implementation are present.	Full Implementation Meets federal and state requirements and incorporates elements of evidence-based best practice. Program staffing is stable and sufficient, there are systems in place at all levels (Identification, instruction, assessment, etc.). There is a general understanding across the district/school of the ESOL program and supports.	Reflection on Current Status and Next Steps <i>In this box, it may be helpful to rate your level of implementation. 1 = beginning/approaching compliance, 2 = partial implementation (some elements of full implementation present), and 3 = full implementation. Please also use this space to identify next steps to improve the program element.</i>
Policy (language use, equity, etc.)	Deficit-based language is used and there is a lack of consideration for ELs in district or school level policies.	ELs are inconsistently considered in policy and guidance documents. Language used to describe EL students is mixed.	Staff regularly utilize asset-based terminology, framing and mindsets when referring to multilingual EL students and their families. Policies are scrutinized for bias.	Rating and next steps:
Identification / Screening Process	Inconsistent use of state home language survey (HLS) to identify potential ELs, new to US schools, for screening. Inconsistent process for identification of transfer students' status.	System is in place for identification but is not well-documented. System for identification does not include consistent training with the appropriate intake staff.	District/School is adhering to statewide guidance for identification. HLS questions are asked of every enrollee and kept in the student's cumulative file. The HLS will be provided to the new district/school if the student transfers. There is a documented system for identification that includes intake,	Rating and next steps:

	Lack of an identified staff member for screening / investigating incoming students' status.		<p>screening for students new to US schools, formal identification as EL and placement in ESOL language supports.</p> <p>The system/school includes consistent training with the appropriate intake staff to ensure the system runs effectively.</p>	
ESOL Program Type (Integrated or Designated English Language Development or ELD, Dual Language Immersion or DLI, etc.)	Staff are unsure of the program type, or the program type is unspecified.	Program types are specified, and staff have surface-level knowledge of the program type.	Staff can articulate the aspects/characteristics of the chosen program type.	Rating and next steps:
Student Schedules / Placements	Students follow the typical general education schedule. Minor tweaks to the students' schedule occur when needed.	<p>There is a process in place to guide course placement, but EL students do not have consistent access to culturally responsive and appropriately certified teachers, etc.</p> <p>EL students have access to some, but not all, advanced level courses.</p>	<p>Process in place for how to appropriately place students (e.g. age appropriate, in teams where EL students are clustered, with culturally responsive/appropriately certified teachers, etc.). Previous course history in the student's country of origin is used to award credit and determine appropriate placement.</p> <p>Students have access to grade-level and advanced level courses. See USED/OCR's Ensuring Meaningful Participation in Advanced Coursework.</p> <p>Equal opportunities to participate meaningfully in programs and activities, whether curricular, co-</p>	Rating and next steps:

			<p>curricular or extracurricular are evident.</p> <p>When parents opt out, there is a system in place to teach English in alternate ways and track the students' academic and social growth.</p>	
ESOL Staffing	There are ESOL staff vacancies or there are staff working on emergency or provisional certificates.	<p>The ESOL staffing level is increasing, but not yet at the optimal staff/student ratio for the district or state.</p> <p>Staff are in place but are not aligned to the ESOL program type.</p>	<p>Fully staffed with all appropriately certified and endorsed personnel (met district or state's staff-to-student ratio), and staffing is aligned to the chosen EL program type.</p> <p>The school or district includes EL specific practices into staff expectations or evaluations.</p>	Rating and next steps:
Identified District or School-level EL Leader	An EL school- or district-level lead is not identified.	<p>A lead in the school or district is identified, but some staff are unsure who is the lead.</p> <p>Leader is identified, but has little expertise, influence and/or visibility.</p>	<p>The leader has been identified and has relevant expertise. People across the division know whom to contact for support.</p>	Rating and next steps:
General Educator EL Expertise	General education staff may know that there are ELs in their classrooms, but there is little to no understanding about what to do to meet their language related needs.	General education staff know some but not all the state English language development (ELD) standards (WIDA Framework).	<p>General education staff are well versed in the state ELD standards and have a repertoire of strategies to utilize in their classrooms to support ELs.</p> <p>The school or district has incorporated EL specific</p>	Rating and next steps:

		ELs are briefly addressed in staff expectations or evaluations.	components into staff expectations or evaluations.	
Professional Learning (PL)	<p>EL specific PL is not offered; offerings are disconnected conferences.</p> <p>EL focused PL is generally not implemented.</p>	<p>Some high-quality EL professional learning opportunities are available, but not offered consistently.</p> <p>There are consistent EL professional learning opportunities, but they are not evidence based or asset focused.</p>	<p>Content area teachers have the resources, skills, and knowledge to address the needs of EL students in their classrooms.</p> <p>Content teachers are trained in specific methodologies to provide EL students with meaningful access to the content.</p> <p>Administrators who evaluate EL program staff are adequately trained to meaningfully evaluate whether EL teachers are appropriately employing their training in the classroom.</p> <p>There is an established system for both ESOL staff and general education staff that includes a comprehensive plan for PL that includes accountability measures like walk-throughs to ensure implementation.</p>	Rating and next steps:
Curricular Materials	<p>Teachers are using teacher-created curricular materials.</p> <p>Teachers may just be helping students complete their classwork</p>	<p>There is an ELD curriculum in place, but it is not used consistently.</p> <p>ESOL staff are not included in decisions related to content curriculum.</p>	<p>There is a core ELD curriculum in place that is research-based and aligns with state ELD standards. Curriculum is used consistently.</p> <p>ESOL staff are consulted on decisions related to content curriculum. See guidelines for</p>	Rating and next steps:

	without intentional ELD instruction.		content considerations for ELs here . When co-teaching, additional supplemental materials are available for teacher use that are aligned to the core curriculum.	
English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Processes	A school level assessment lead for the ELP assessment has not been identified. The process for administering the assessment is new or not well established.	A school level assessment lead has been identified and is beginning to develop a systematic process.	There is a clear and systematic written process for ELP assessment. The process includes the identification of a person that is leading the effort, clear timelines, methods for communication and a plan to ensure that appropriate personnel are trained. The school-level assessment lead's role does not conflict with the continuation of EL services.	Rating and next steps:
Family Engagement	EL families are treated like non-EL families. Translation and interpretation services are not offered or are offered only at conferences and individualized education program (IEP) meetings.	Translation is offered inconsistently and/or only in some languages. There is a process to share updates and information with families of ELs, but not to gain their input or build strong relationships.	There is a system that includes consistent two-way communication with families of ELs. The school or district has a clearly communicated Language Access Plan that is consistently implemented. Example plans are available here .	Rating and next steps:
EL Program Exit Protocols and Former EL Monitoring	A consistent and integrated system for ensuring ELs are exited/reclassified per	A system is in place for reclassification but is not well-documented or communicated.	There is a written and clearly articulated system that is implemented to effectively exit ELs students from EL programs	Rating and next steps:

	<p>state and district procedures is not in place.</p> <p>Former ELs are not identified, and a monitoring system is not in place.</p>	<p>There is minimal progress monitoring of students after exiting.</p>	<p>when they have demonstrated the necessary level of proficiency for your state.</p> <p>Upon exit, there is a system in place to monitor the students' academic and social growth over the following two years.</p>	
<p>Articulated Goals for EL programs (ELP)</p>	<p>Only ELP assessment data is reviewed, or minimal data points are reviewed (state provided).</p>	<p>Multiple data points are considered alongside ELP data, but only by ESOL staff and leaders. These additional data are not integrated with broader school level or district efforts.</p>	<p>The annual continuous improvement areas of focus include elements that focus on EL students' needs and are aligned to the area of focus for improvement across the district.</p> <p>Multiple data points are reviewed throughout the year to inform goals and objectives.</p>	<p>Rating and next steps:</p>
<p>EL Focus is Integrated across Programs and Systems Special education, Administration, Gifted, General education, Specials, etc.).</p>	<p>There is a general lack of understanding across the leadership team regarding the needs and rights of ELs.</p> <p>Administrators are not involved in EL training, systems, etc.</p>	<p>Inconsistent attempts at collaboration and/or co-teaching.</p> <p>Administrators understand EL services but are not actively fostering shared responsibility for EL students.</p>	<p>EL educators are provided time and structures to collaborate with other teachers and specialists. EL teachers are included in IEP planning and meetings for dually identified ELs.</p> <p>Administrators are well-versed in the strategies that teachers should use in their classrooms. EL focused walk-throughs happen regularly.</p>	<p>Rating and next steps:</p>

Program Evaluation Activities

Evaluation Activities	Process Evaluation	Summative Evaluation
Coordinate evaluations	Plan for which processes need to be evaluated.	Plan for which data will be used in summative evaluation.
Engage in classroom walk-throughs or complete shadowing protocols	<p>Check for use of integrated content and language objectives.</p> <p>Walk-through focus includes “look-fors” that are indicative of the initiative focus for professional learning.</p>	Reflect on the summarized themes of the walk-through data to identify next steps.
Facilitate focus groups/interviews	Optional: Depending on areas of focus in the evaluation, data from surveys could shed light on some of the questions that focus groups or interviews address.	Optional: Depending on areas of focus in the evaluation, data from surveys could shed light on some of the questions that focus groups or interviews address.
Design and administer surveys	Optional: Depending on areas of focus in the evaluation, data from focus groups or interviews could shed light on some of the questions that surveys address.	Optional: Depending on areas of focus in the evaluation, data from focus groups or interviews could shed light on some of the questions that surveys address.
Review quantitative data reports	Run maintenance reports. Do all students in the student information system have screener data?	Push for broad queries (attendance and participation/performance in advanced coursework, in addition to achievement and proficiency data).
Analyze all data	Identify areas for improvement to ensure processes run as intended.	Refer to long-term and short-term indicators of success.
Review district, state, and federal policies	Check for appropriate implementation of state identification/reclassification policies.	Consider whether the program is effective, pursuant to third prong.
Report findings	Reported when requested.	Distribute findings widely and make decisions based on data.
Acting on findings	Prioritize next steps and implement collaboratively.	Prioritize next steps and implement collaboratively.