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Introduction to the SEAL Model and the 4-Year Research and Evaluation Effort

The Sobrato Early Academic Language Model (SEAL) is a preschool through third grade model that powerfully develops students’ language, literacy, and academic skills within the context of a whole-school initiative. This intensive approach to language and literacy education is woven into all aspects of the school day where English Learners and native English students learn together. The Model was first piloted in three schools in the Silicon Valley and an initial evaluation of the Model showed significant impact on student achievement, teacher practice, and parent literacy activities. As a result of these pilot findings, SEAL developed a Replication Model, a comprehensive whole-school reform that is implemented systematically and that includes teachers, coaches, principals, district leaders, and families.

Loyola Marymount University’s Center for Equity for English Learners and the Wexford Institute conducted an external evaluation of the SEAL preschool through third grade Replication Model from fall 2015–fall 2019. This comprehensive research and evaluation study focused on (1) Leader Perspectives and Depth of Implementation, (2) Teacher Development, and (3) Student Outcomes. Twelve districts and 67 schools across California participated. This Research and Evaluation Final Report presents findings that will allow the SEAL team to institute its short- and long-term evaluation and research agenda based on the SEAL Logic Model and desired results for project management, decision-making, refinement, and expansion.

The SEAL Research and Evaluation Final Report is comprised of five sections presented in a series of briefs (see Figure 1) to maximize usability for multiple stakeholders. This brief is part of Section 4.

Section 4, Brief 9 – Research Focus
This research and evaluation brief presents findings on student’s English language development (ELD) and academic outcomes based on results of three student sample groups for the following California state assessments—California English Language Development Test ( CELDT), English Language Performance Assessment for California (ELPAC), and California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress-Smarter Balanced Assessments for English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics (SBAC).

Student records from eleven¹ SEAL districts were collected to evaluate the outcomes of students taught by SEAL teachers from 2014-15 through 2018-19. Within this brief, there are four parts. Part One describes the

---

¹ Eleven SEAL districts participated in the research and evaluation.
study’s purpose, participants, and methods. Part Two presents findings that summarize ELD outcomes on CELDT and ELPAC. Part Three reports findings that summarize SBAC student outcomes. Part Four, the final section, provides a summary of findings and implications.

---

**SEAL Students’ English Language Development and Academic Outcomes**

**Research and Evaluation Question**

What are the 2018-19 outcomes, in English language development, English language arts, and mathematics of SEAL students, who began Kindergarten (or grade K) in 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 and have remained in a SEAL school in the same district?

---

### Part One: Study Methods and Participants

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze the English language and academic outcomes of students in SEAL classrooms using the following assessments

- *California English Language Development Test* (CELDT), the California English language proficiency assessment was administered to English Learners (ELs) annually as a summative assessment from 2014-15 through 2016-17.
- *English Language Proficiency Assessment for California* (ELPAC), the California English language proficiency assessment was given to ELs as a summative assessment in 2017-18 and 2018-19.
- *California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress* (Smarter Balanced Assessments for English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics) (SBAC) was given annually to SEAL students beginning in the third grade.

#### Participants

Data were collected for 63 SEAL schools in eleven districts for three student sample groups:

- group A (Kindergarten through grade 4),
- group B (Kindergarten through grade 3), and
- group C (Kindergarten through grade 2).

The student data are longitudinally matched for these students as they began Kindergarten in SEAL classrooms and continued in SEAL schools through their final grade. Kindergarten through grade 3 teachers in these schools participated in the SEAL two-year professional development (PD) program.

The treatment rate of students was based on the amount of SEAL PD their teachers had completed. A full description of how the treatment rate is calculated is included in Section 4 – Appendix C. Table 1 provides a visual representation of the three student sample groups and the years in which teachers completed the two-year SEAL PD and are considered fully trained (shaded cells).

Students in Group A, in grades K-3 had a treatment rate of 88%. They had teachers in Kindergarten who had completed only one year of the training, and teachers in grades 1 through 3 who had completed 2 years of training. The calculated training rate of Group A teachers is 88%; students were enrolled in classrooms with

---

1 A total of 12 districts participated in the SEAL Replication Model, from 2013-14 through 2018-19. Eleven of the 12 districts provided data for all years requested and are included in the data analysis in this brief.
teachers that had 7 of 8 years of SEAL PD = 88% (2 years of SEAL PD training possible per year for each of the 4 years, Kindergarten through grade 3, makes a total of 8 years of possible PD).

Students in Group B, in grades K-3, were comprised of two subgroups, one with a treatment rate of 88% and one with a treatment rate of 100%. One subgroup had teachers that completed 88% of PD, similar to Group A. The other student subgroup had teachers who each had completed 2 years of training for each of the four years, for a total of 8 of 8 years of PD = 100%.

Students in Group C, in grades Kindergarten through grade 2, were also comprised of two subgroups. One subgroup had a teacher training rate of 100%, with teachers who had each completed 2 years of training each of the three years (Kindergarten through grade 2), for a total of 6 of 6 possible years of training (2 years of PD training possible x 3 years = 6 years of possible PD). The training rate of the other subgroup is 83%; students were enrolled in Kindergarten with teachers with one year of training, and in grades 1 and 2 with teachers who had completed 2 years of training for a total of training years of 5, out of 6 possible years of training (5 of 6 years of PD = 83%).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Sample Group</th>
<th>SEAL Cohort Treatment Rate</th>
<th>Student grade level and year</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1 Yea</td>
<td>2 Yea</td>
<td>3 Yea</td>
<td>4 Yea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1 Yea</td>
<td>2 Yea</td>
<td>3 Yea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1 Yea</td>
<td>2 Yea</td>
<td>3 Yea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1 Yea</td>
<td>2 Yea</td>
<td>2 Yea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1 Yea</td>
<td>2 Yea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td>2 Years PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The shaded areas show grades/years in which students are in classrooms with fully trained SEAL Teachers. 2 Years of PD = fully trained.

Schools in the study varied in their percentages of socio-economically disadvantaged (SED²) students. (SED rates for each school are listed in Section 4 – Appendix A.) SED percentages varied from 15% to 97% across the schools in the three sample groups. Mean SED percentages were calculated for each sample group based on the SED rates for all schools in each group. The 2018-19 California SED rate was 61%, in comparison:

- Group A schools had a mean SED rate of 77%, with 11 of 12 (92%) schools above the California rate.
- Group B schools had a mean SED rate of 70%, with 20 of 33 (61%) schools above the California rate.
- Group C schools had a mean SED rate of 65%, with 24 of 48 (50%) schools above the California rate.

Table 2 shows the total number of students included in this analysis for each district, by student sample group. For further details related to the students in the study, including demographics, school enrollment totals, reclassification rates, and total eligible for free and reduced meals for 2018-19, please refer to Section 4 – Appendix A.

² School 2018-19 SED rates were collected publicly available data on the California Department of Education’s (CDE) website.
Table 2
Total Number of SEAL Students by District and Sample Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara USD</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo USD</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove SD</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City SD</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael City Schools</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin McKinley SD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View ESD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Union SD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen SD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy USD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas USD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore USD a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student data was not available for this district and therefore is not a part of the analysis in this brief.

Figure 2 presents a description of the three student sample groups in this study, including:

- students’ beginning and ending grade levels, the year they began SEAL participation in grade K,
- the number of SEAL districts and schools represented in the student sample,
- the student cohort treatment rate that describes the amount of SEAL training teachers received,
- the outcome data included in this analysis, and
- the mean SED rate for schools represented in each sample group.

Figure 2
SEAL Student Sample Groups

Student Sample Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>N = 586</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 districts</td>
<td>13 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELDT-ELPAC, K-Gr 4 SBAC, Gr 3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 1880</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% and 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELDT-ELPAC, K-Gr 3 SBAC Gr 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 2709</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% and 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELDT-ELPAC, K-Gr 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Language Classification
This study disaggregates data by the following student language classifications: English Learners (EL), Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP), Initially Fluent English Proficient (IFEP), English Only (EO) students, and a combined group that includes EL and RFEP students, also known as Ever-EL students. Figure 3 presents the 2018-19 language classification distribution of each of the student sample groups. Language classification totals by district and school for each student sample group can be found in Section 4 – Appendix E. A summary of reclassification data is located in Section 4 – Appendix F.

Figure 3
2018-19 Language Classification for Student Sample Groups

Group A, with a treatment rate of 88%, is comprised of 382 grade 4 Ever-ELs in 2018-19 distributed across four SEAL districts.

Group B, with treatment rates of 88% and 100%, is distributed across seven SEAL districts, and consists of 1,086 Ever-ELs in grade 3 in 2018-19.

Group C, with treatment rates of 83% and 100%, includes 1,499 grade 2 Ever-ELs in 2018-19, distributed across ten SEAL districts.

By the end of 2018-19, Group B (3rd graders) had the most RFEP students with 38%, followed by Group A (4th graders) with 34%. Group C, whose students were second graders in 2018-19, had 15% RFEPs.
Methods

Longitudinal student data were collected from eleven SEAL districts to evaluate the outcomes of students taught by SEAL teachers from 2014-15 through 2018-19. SEAL student evaluation groups were formed based on the year they began Kindergarten and the amount of training teachers have completed. Student sample Groups A, B, and C, analyzed for this study and in Study 2 (Brief 10), include student cohorts that received full or almost full SEAL treatment. All three groups have CELDT and ELPAC assessment data, while Groups A and B include SBAC data. Section 4 – Appendix D includes a full description of the methods used to select the student sample group.

Student assessment scores were analyzed to determine ELD and academic outcomes for each student sample group. The following summaries and analyses were conducted on the student CELDT and ELPAC assessment data:

- results for student sample groups A, B, and C: 1) at pre-assessment (grade K on CELDT) and final assessment in (grade 2, 3, or 4 on ELPAC), and 2) progress of students on ELPAC, by CELDT proficiency level at beginning of Kindergarten,
- student performance of 1) student sample groups on ELPAC 2017-18 and 2018-19, and 2) progress of students, by ELPAC performance level, from 2017-18 to 2018-19, and
- comparison of SEAL ELs in the sample groups to California ELs on ELPAC 2017-18 and 2018-19.

The following summaries and analyses were conducted on the student SBAC English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics data:

- outcomes and progress of student sample Group A (grades 3 and 4) by language classification,
- summary of outcomes of student sample Group B (grade 3) results by language classification,
- the relationship between ELPAC proficiency and SBAC performance for Groups A and B,
- comparison of the performance levels of SEAL sample groups A and B Ever-ELs to California Ever-ELs on 2018-19 SBAC, and
- comparison of the performance levels of SEAL sample groups A and B RFEPs to California RFEPs on 2018-19 SBAC.

CELDT results are summarized by the percent of students scoring at each of the five CELDT proficiency levels: 1 (beginning), 2 (early intermediate), 3 (intermediate), 4 (early advanced), and 5 (advanced). ELPAC outcomes are summarized by the percent of students scoring at each of the four ELPAC performance levels that ranged from: 1 (minimally developed), 2 (somewhat developed), 3 (moderately developed), and, 4 (well developed). SBAC outcomes are summarized for ELA and mathematics, separately, by the percent of students scoring at each of the four SBAC levels that ranged from: 1 (exceeded), 2 (met), 3 (nearly met), and, 4 (not met). Outcomes for all assessment results were disaggregated by language classification (EL, RFEP, IFEP and EO) for each grade level.

Limitations

The limitations of this study include:

- The SEAL Replication Model implementation occurred across three cohorts of students that each began implementation during different time frames and while the model underwent continued refinement.
• In spring 2018, California replaced CELDT, the state English language proficiency assessment, with the ELPAC. The transition included teacher training to conduct the assessments, preparation for and assessing the students, which may not have been done consistently across schools and districts.

• Beginning with the 2018-19 ELPAC administration, the threshold scale scores were adjusted by California’s State Board of Education. Therefore, performance level data for 2017-18 were recoded with 2018-19 performance level ranges in order to be able to make comparisons between the two years of data. (See Section 4 – Appendix I)

See Section 4 – Appendix B for additional limitations to the study.

Part Two: English Language Development Outcomes

Part Two reports quantitative findings based on the analysis of CELDT Overall and ELPAC Summative Overall matched scores for 2015-2019. To measure progress on the 2018 and 2019 ELPAC assessment, the matched scores for Ever-EL students were also examined. (For additional details about these analyses, see Section 4 – Appendices H and I.) These results include the total number of students that were classified as RFEP students, indicating that the student has achieved proficiency in English. Once classified as fluent English proficient, the student no longer takes the ELPAC, thus, the percent of RFEP students is shown as the fifth and final proficiency level for students. Part Two describes:

• growth of Ever-ELs from the year students began Kindergarten through 2018-19
• the comparison of SEAL 2018 and 2019 Ever-EL outcomes as measured by the ELPAC
• the comparison of SEAL EL 2018-19 outcomes on the ELPAC to the California EL outcomes

Growth of Ever-ELs as Measured by the CELDT and ELPAC

**Group A Ever-ELs: CELDT-ELPAC Growth from 2015-2019**

Figure 5 presents the ELD results for Group A, comprised of 368 Ever-ELs with matched scores. In grade K, 71% scored at beginning and early intermediate levels on the CELDT. By fourth grade, 35% were RFEP level, 47% scored at moderately developed to well developed levels, while 19% scored in the two lowest-performance levels on the ELPAC.

**Figure 5**

**CELDT-ELPAC Overall English Language Development Growth from Grade K to Grade 4**

**Group A Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 368)**
Table 3 displays the CELDT to ELPAC growth for Group A students by cross-tabulating the students CELDT proficiency level at grade K on CELDT with their ELPAC score in grade 4. Of the 36% (n = 133) scoring at beginning level on CELDT in grade K, by fourth grade: 22 (17%) were RFEP level, and on the ELPAC, 22 (17%) scored well developed, 45 (34%) scored moderately developed, and 34 (26%) scored somewhat developed. Remaining at the lowest level of proficiency were 10 (8%) students who were at beginning level on CELDT in grade K and scored at minimally developed on ELPAC in grade 4.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELDT proficiency levels</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>Grade 4 ELPAC performance levels</th>
<th>RFEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early advanced and advanced</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
<td>Minimally developed: 0</td>
<td>Somewhat developed: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>95 (26%)</td>
<td>Minimally developed: 0</td>
<td>Somewhat developed: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intermediate</td>
<td>129 (35%)</td>
<td>Minimally developed: 0</td>
<td>Somewhat developed: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>133 (36%)</td>
<td>Minimally developed: 0</td>
<td>Somewhat developed: 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Light red shading highlights students that scored at the two highest proficiency levels on ELPAC. Light blue shading highlights students that are RFEP.

As highlighted in Table 3, there were groups of students at each of the grade K CELDT proficiency levels who scored at moderately or well developed (light red shading) on ELPAC or were RFEP (light blue shading) by grade 4. All students scoring early advanced and advanced on CELDT in grade K (n = 11), scored well developed on ELPAC (n = 3, 27%) or were RFEP (n = 8, 73%) by grade 4. At the intermediate level on CELDT in grade K (n = 95), over half, 54 (57%) were RFEP and 36 (38%) scored moderately developed or well developed on ELPAC by grade 4. Of the 129 students in grade K who scored at early intermediate on CELDT, 67 (52%) scored at moderately or well developed on ELPAC and 43 (33%) were reclassified by grade 4. Of 133 students scoring at beginning on CELDT in grade K, 67 (51%) scored moderately or well developed on ELPAC and 22 (17%) moved to RFEP by grade 4.

Group B Ever-ELS: CELDT-ELPAC Growth from 2016-2019

The ELD results for Group B, with a total of 1,048 Ever-ELS, are shown in Figure 6. In grade K, 64% scored at beginning and early intermediate levels on the CELDT. By grade 3, 39% were RFEP level, and on the ELPAC 33% scored at moderately developed to well developed and 29% at minimally developed to somewhat developed.
The CELDT to ELPAC growth for Group B students by cross-tabulating the students’ CELDT proficiency level at grade K with their ELPAC score in grade 3 is displayed in Table 4. Of the 34% (n = 356) of students scoring at the beginning level on CELDT in Kindergarten, and by third grade: 76 (21%) were RFEP level, and on the ELPAC, 9 (3%) students scored well developed, 93 (26%) scored moderately developed, and 122 (34%) scored somewhat developed. There were 56 (16%) who scored at beginning level in Kindergarten on the CELDT, who remained at the lowest level of proficiency the ELPAC.5

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELDT proficiency levels Grade K</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>Grade 3 ELPAC performance levels</th>
<th>RFEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early advanced and advanced</td>
<td>50 (4%)</td>
<td>Minimally developed</td>
<td>Somewhat developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>325 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>26 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intermediate</td>
<td>317 (30%)</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
<td>76 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>356 (34%)</td>
<td>56 (16%)</td>
<td>122 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Light red shading highlights students that scored at the two highest proficiency levels on ELPAC. Light blue shading highlights students that are RFEP.

Table 4 highlights the groups of students at each of the grade K CELDT proficiency levels who scored at moderately or well developed (light red shading) on ELPAC or were RFEP (light blue shading) by grade 3. Of the 50 students scoring early advanced and advanced on CELDT in grade K, by grade 3: 9 (18%) students scored moderately or well developed on ELPAC and 40 (80%) were RFEP by grade 3. At the intermediate level on CELDT in grade K (n = 325), over half, 189 (58%) were RFEP and 108 (34%) scored moderately or well developed on ELPAC by grade 3. Of the 317 students in grade K who scored at early intermediate on CELDT, 125 (39%) scored at moderately or well developed on ELPAC and 104 (33%) were reclassified by grade 3. Of

---

5 Thirty of the 56 received special education services in grade 3.
356 students scoring at *beginning* on CELDT, 102 (29%) scored at *moderately or well developed* on ELPAC and 176 (21%) were *RFEP* by grade 3.

**Group C Ever-ELS: CELDT-ELPAC Growth from 2017-2019**

Group C consists of 1,452 Ever-EL students. Figure 7 reports their CELDT-ELPAC growth from 2017 to 2019. In grade K, 65% scored at *beginning* and *early intermediate* levels on the CELDT. By second grade, 16% were *RFEP* level, and on the ELPAC 58% scored at *moderately developed* to *well developed* and 26% scored at *minimally developed* to *somewhat developed*.

**Figure 7**

*CELDT-ELPAC Overall English Language Development Growth from Grade K to Grade 2*

*Group C Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 1452)*

Table 5 displays the CELDT to ELPAC growth for Group C students by cross-tabulating the students’ CELDT proficiency level at grade K with their ELPAC score in grade 2. Of the 33% (n = 485) scoring at *beginning* level on CELDT in grade K, by second grade: 27 (6%) were reclassified as fluent, and on the ELPAC, 35 (7%) students scored *well developed*, 197 (41%) scored *moderately developed*, and 180 (37%) scored *somewhat developed*. A total of 46 (10%) students remained at the lowest level of proficiency, scoring *minimally developed* on ELPAC.6

**Table 5**

*CELDT-ELPAC Overall English Language Development Growth from Grade K to Grade 2*

*Group C Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 1452)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELDT proficiency levels</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>Grade 2 ELPAC performance levels</th>
<th>Grade 2 ELPAC performance levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimally developed</td>
<td>Somewhat developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early advanced and advanced</td>
<td>100 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>402 (28%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>29 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intermediate</td>
<td>465 (32%)</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
<td>104 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>485 (33%)</td>
<td>46 (10%)</td>
<td>180 (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Light red shading highlights students that scored at the two highest proficiency levels on ELPAC. Light blue shading highlights students that are RFEP.

---

6 Twenty-eight of the 46 students received special education services in grade 2.
There were groups of students at each of the grade K CELDT proficiency levels who scored at *moderately* or *well developed* (light red shading) on ELPAC or were *RFEP* (light blue shading) by grade 2, highlighted in Table 5. Of the 100 students scoring *early advanced* and *advanced* on CELDT, by grade 2: 55 (55%) students scored *moderately* or *well developed* on ELPAC and 39 (39%) were *RFEP* level. At the *intermediate* level on CELDT in grade K (n = 402), 102 (25%) were *RFEP* and 271 (67%) scored *moderately* or *well developed* on ELPAC by grade 2. Of the 465 students in grade K who scored *early intermediate* on CELDT in grade K (n = 402), 102 (25%) were *RFEP* and 271 (67%) scored *moderately* or *well developed* on ELPAC.

**Comparison of 2018 and 2019 Ever-EL Outcomes as Measured by the ELPAC**

The ELD progress of Ever-EL students from 2017-18 to 2018-19 was determined by analyzing ELPAC results. These results include the total number of students that were classified as *RFEP* students, indicating that the student has achieved proficiency in English. Once classified as fluent English proficient, the student is no longer administered the ELPAC. The results show *RFEP* level as a fifth and final proficiency level for students. Figures 8-10 report the ELPAC outcomes for Ever-EL students with matched scores in 2017-18 and 2018-19. (For more details about these analyses, see Section 4 – Appendix I.)

**Figure 8**

*ELPAC Overall Outcomes for Group A Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 368)*

By grade 4, 35% had reclassified as fluent, an increase of 13% from grade 3. Almost half (47%) scored at *moderately developed* or *well developed*. There were 19% of students at the two lowest levels.

Of the 97 (26%) students that scored at *somewhat developed* in grade 3, by grade 4, 11% scored *well developed*, 45% scored *moderately developed*, 41% scored *somewhat developed*, and 2% scored *minimally developed*.

Of the 19 (5%) students that scored at *minimally developed* in grade 3, 16% scored *moderately developed*, 26% scored *somewhat developed*, and 58% remained at *minimally developed* in grade 4.

---

7 Twenty-eight of the 46 students received special education services in grade 2.
8 Five of the 11 received special education services in grade 4.
By grade 3, 39% were RFEP level, an increase of 25% from grade 2, and 33% scored moderately developed or well developed. There were 29% of students at the two lowest levels.

Of the 297 (28%) students that scored somewhat developed in grade 2, by grade 3, 3% were reclassified as fluent and another 33% scored moderately developed or well developed, 54% scored somewhat developed, and 11% scored minimally developed.

Of the 50 (5%) students that scored at minimally developed in grade 2, 6% scored moderately or well developed, 20% scored somewhat developed, and 74% remained at the same level.

By grade 2, 16% were reclassified as fluent and 58% at moderately developed or well developed. There were 26% of students at the two lowest levels.

Of the 492 (34%) of students in this group that scored at somewhat developed in grade 1, by grade 2, 54% scored moderately developed or well developed, 44% scored somewhat developed, and 2% scored at minimally developed.

Of the 120 (8%) students that scored at minimally developed in grade 1, 1% were reclassified, 8% scored moderately or well developed, 51% scored somewhat developed, and 41% remained at minimally developed in grade 2.

---

Note. ELPAC 2017-18 results were recoded with 2018-19 ELPAC threshold ranges.

---

9 Twenty-seven of the 37 received special education services in grade 4.

10 Thirty of the 49 received special education services in grade 2.
Figure 11 displays the grade 3 ELPAC outcomes for Group A (2017-18) and Group B (2018-19), and grade 4 outcomes for Group A (2018-19). It should be noted, that Group A and B differ in their, 1) sample size (Group A, n = 368; Group B, n = 1048), 2) SED rate (Group A, 77%; Group B, 70%), and 3) teacher training/student treatment rate (Group A, 88%; Group B 88% and 100%).

Grade 3 outcomes were similar for Groups A and B: 72% of Group B Ever-ELs were RFEP, or scored well developed or moderately developed, compared to 68% of Group A Ever-ELs at those same levels. Group B Ever-ELs, however, had a larger percentage of students that were RFEP or scored well developed (46%) compared to Group A (31%).

By grade 4, Group A increased the percentage of students at RFEP and well developed from 31% to 54% and decreased the percentage of students scoring at minimally and somewhat developed levels from 31% to 20%. The percentage of Group A students scoring minimally developed also decreased slightly from grade 3 to grade 4; part of that group are students identified with special needs.

Figure 11
ELPAC Grade 3 and 4 Ever-EL Outcomes: Comparison of Group A to Group B

Note. Group A and B differ in their: 1) sample size, 2) SED rate (Group A, 77%; Group B, 70%); and 3) teacher training/student treatment rate (Group A, 88%; Group B 88% and 100%).
ELPAC 2018-19 Outcomes: SEAL ELs Compared to California ELs
The 2019 ELPAC outcomes for SEAL Group A ELs were compared to their California EL counterparts and are displayed in Figures 12 and 13.

Figure 12
Comparison of Group A ELs to California ELs on 2018-19 ELPAC Overall Performance Levels

As shown in Figure 12, 72% of SEAL grade 4 ELs scored at proficient levels (moderately developed and well developed) compared to 65% of California ELs.

Figure 13
Comparison of Group A ELs to California ELs on 2017-18 and 2018-19 ELPAC Overall Scale Scores

The mean scale scores from grade 3 to grade 4 increased for both SEAL ELs and California ELs. SEAL EL scores, however, were higher than those of California ELs in both years (Figure 13).

Note. Grade 3 SEAL Grp A, n = 286. Grade 4 SEAL Grp A, n = 241. Grade 3 California ELs, n = 114,289. Grade 4 California ELs, n = 101,800.
Figures 14 and 15 present the 2018-19 ELPAC outcomes for SEAL Group B ELs were compared to their California EL peers.

**Figure 14**
*Comparison of Group B ELs to California ELs 2018-19 ELPAC Overall Performance Levels*

As shown in Figure 14, 54% of Group B SEAL grade 3 ELs scored at *moderately developed* and *well developed* on the 2018-19 ELPAC compared to California grade 3 ELs at 51%.

**Figure 15**
*Comparison of Group B ELs to California ELs on 2017-18 and 2018-19 ELPAC Overall Scale Scores*

The California EL mean scale score remained unchanged from grade 2 to grade 3 (Figure 15). The SEAL EL mean scale score in grade 2 was approximately the same as that of California ELs and in grade 3 was higher than that of California ELs.

*Note.* Grade 2 SEAL Grp B, n = 903. Grade 3 SEAL Grp B, n = 639.
Grade 2 California ELs, n = 128,076. Grade 3 California ELs, n = 100,096.
The 2018-19 ELPAC outcomes for SEAL Group C ELs were compared to their California EL peers and are shown in Figures 16 and 17.

**Figure 16**
*Comparison of Group C ELs to California ELs 2018-19 ELPAC Overall Performance Levels*

As shown in Figure 16, 69% of Group B SEAL grade 2 ELs scored at *moderately developed* and *well developed* on the 2018-19 ELPAC compared to 39% of California grade 3 ELs.

**Figure 17**
*Comparison of Group C ELs to California ELs on 2017-18 and 2018-19 ELPAC Overall Scale Scores*

SEAL ELs and California ELs had similar mean scale scores in grade 1, as presented in Figure 17. By grade 2, the SEAL EL mean scale score was higher than that of California ELs.

*Note.* Grade 1 SEAL Grp C, n = 1401. Grade 2 SEAL Grp C, n = 1219. Grade 1 California ELs, n = 146,516. Grade 2 California ELs, n = 116,054.
SEAL English Language Development: Overall Outcomes and Progress

Progress from CELDT to ELPAC
Overall, about 1/3 of each student sample group scored at beginning level on CELDT in grade K. Across all three groups, over 50% of students who scored at beginning level on CELDT in grade K, scored at the two highest levels of proficiency on ELPAC (moderately developed and well developed) or were RFEP by 2018-19 (the final year of the study):

- Group A, grade 4: 68% (34% at RFEP or well developed, and 34% at moderately developed);
- Group B, grade 3: 50% (24% at RFEP or well developed, and 26% at moderately developed);
- Group C, grade 2: 54% (13% at RFEP or well developed, and 41% at moderately developed).

A small percentage of students (between 8% and 16% of each sample group) that started at beginning level on CELDT in grade K, remained at minimally developed on ELPAC, however, these were mostly students receiving special education services.

Progress on the ELPAC from Grade 3 to Grade 4
- With a larger group size, higher teacher training and student treatment rates, and a lower SED rate, Group B grade 3 Ever-ELs (2018-19) outperformed Group A grade 3 Ever-ELs (2017-18). Group B Ever-ELs had a larger percentage of students that were RFEP or scored well developed (46%) compared to Group A (31%). Group B also had fewer students at the two lowest ELPAC proficiency levels (29%) than Group A (31%).
- By grade 4, Group A Ever-ELs made adequate progress; a majority of students were RFEP or scored in the two highest proficiency levels and decreased the percentage of students scoring at the two lowest levels. The percentage of Group A students scoring minimally developed also decreased slightly from grade 3 to grade 4.
- Group A and B students at the minimally developed level were partially comprised of students identified with special needs.
- Ever-EL Students that were RFEP or scored well developed on ELPAC in 2018-19 included,
  - Group A, grade 4, 54% (SED rate = 77%, treatment rate = 88%)
  - Group B, grade 3, 46% (SED rate = 70%, treatment rate = 88% and 100%)
  - Group C, grade 2, 33% (SED rate = 65%, treatment rate = 83% and 100%)

Comparison of SEAL EL 2018-19 ELPAC Performance Levels to California ELs
SEAL ELs in Groups A, B and C had larger percentages of ELs in the two highest levels (moderately and well developed combined) and smaller percentages of ELs in the two lowest levels (minimally and somewhat developed combined), than did their grades 2, 3 and 4 California EL counterparts.
Part Three: Academic Outcomes

Part Three presents the 2018 and 2019 SBAC ELA and mathematics outcomes for Ever-EL students in Groups A and B. Group A SBAC scores are reported by language classification to determine progress from grade 3 to grade 4 and is comprised of 253 Ever-EL, 106 IFEP, and EO students with matched scores. Group B is comprised of 814 Ever-EL, 574 IFEP, and EO students with grade 3 scores only. Group C, second graders in 2018-19, did not have SBAC results because SBAC testing starts in grade 3. Part Three describes

• 2018-19 SBAC outcomes for sample groups A and B, by language classification group
• comparison of Group A growth from grade 3 to grade 4 (2017-18 to 2018-19), for Ever-ELs, and separately for EO/IFEP
• analysis of Groups A and B SBAC outcomes by ELPAC performance level
• comparison of Groups A and B 2018-19 SBAC outcomes with those of California ELs

SBAC English Language Arts Outcomes

Figure 18 presents the 2018-19 SBAC ELA outcomes for Group A. As a combined group, 41% of Ever-ELs scored at met or exceeded. When RFEP and EL students are analyzed as distinct groups, 79% of RFEP students met or exceeded standards and performed better than any of the other three groups.

Figure 18
2018-19/Grade 4 SBAC English Language Arts Outcomes, Group A

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 SBAC ELA outcomes for Group A Ever-ELs and EO/IFEP are exhibited in Figure 19 and Figure 20. By grade 4, 41% of Ever-ELs and 35% of IFEP/EO students-scored at met or exceeded on SBAC ELA. From grade 3 to grade 4, the percentage of Ever-ELs scoring met or exceeded increased from 31 to 41%, while EO/IFEO increased from 33% to 35%. There was also no decrease in the percentage of students in the lowest level for each student group, with percentages at not met ranging from 36% to 43% across both groups.
The 2018-19 SBAC ELA outcomes for Group B are reported in Figure 21. Similar to the SBAC ELA results for Group A, Group B RFEP students performed better than any of the language classification groups. 68% of RFEP students met or exceeded standards, 53% of IFEP/EO students. There were also considerably fewer RFEP students (8%) at the not met level compared to other groups.

**Figure 21**

2018-19/Grade 3 SBAC English Language Arts Outcomes, Group B

SBAC English Language Arts Outcomes by ELPAC Performance Level

Figure 22 reports the cross-tabulation of SBAC ELA scores by ELPAC performance levels for grade 3 and grade 4 for Group A Ever-ELs. In an analysis of the relationship between SBAC and ELPAC performance levels, almost all of the students scoring exceeded or met on the SBAC in both years were students who were RFEP or who scored moderately or well developed on the ELPAC. By grade 4, students who scored not met on the SBAC had scored at all levels of the ELPAC and some had been reclassified as RFEP.
In grade 3, 31% of Group A Ever-ELs scored exceeded (9%, n = 24) or met (22%, n = 55) on the SBAC ELA and by grade 4 the percentage meeting or exceeding standards increased to 41% (n = 104). Of the 104 students who met or exceeded standards on the SBAC, the analysis of their ELPAC performance levels shows that 96% were students that scored well developed (21%, n = 22) on ELPAC or were RFEP (75%, n = 67). Another 13% (n = 14) scored moderately developed on ELPAC. No students who scored at minimally developed on ELPAC met or exceeded standards on SBAC ELA, and 1 student (less than 1%) scored somewhat developed on ELPAC and met the SBAC ELA standard in grade 4.

In an analysis of the ELPAC performance levels of the 23% (n = 59) of students who scored nearly met on the grade 4 SBAC ELA, 53% were either RFEP (22%, n = 13) or scored well developed on ELPAC (31%, n = 18). Another 47% scored moderately developed (39%, n = 23) or somewhat developed (8%, n = 5) on ELPAC and nearly met the grade 4 SBAC ELA standard. There were no students who scored minimally developed on ELPAC that scored nearly met on SBAC ELA.

And of the 36% (n = 90) of students that did not meet the SBAC ELA standard, 6% (n = 5) were RFEP, 9% (n = 8) scored well developed on ELPAC, 42% (n = 38) scored at moderately developed, 36% (n = 32) scored somewhat developed, and 8% (n = 7) scored minimally developed on ELPAC.

A small percentage of students in grade 3 and in grade 4, scored at the nearly met or not met levels, as shown in Figure 22. In grade 3, 7% (n = 17) RFEP students scored nearly met on SBAC ELA and in grade 4, a total of 7% at nearly met (5%, n = 13) and not met (2%, n = 5) levels. It is possible that students may have been reclassified early, at the end of grades K, 1, or 2 using the CELDT or early in grade 3 using the 2017-18 ELPAC, and may not have been sufficiently fluent to make adequate progress on the SBAC ELA in grade 4.

**Figure 22**
2018 and 2019 SBAC English Language Arts Outcomes by ELPAC Overall Performance Levels and RFEP Group A Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 253)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3-2017-18</th>
<th>SBAC English Language Arts</th>
<th>Grade 4-2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 24 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>55 (22%)</td>
<td>68 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 84 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly met</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 84 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 90 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** ELPAC 2017-18 performance levels were recoded with 2018-19 ELPAC threshold ranges. SBAC 2017-18 outcomes cross-tabulated by ELPAC 2017-18 performance levels. SBAC 2018-19 outcomes cross-tabulated by ELPAC 2018-19 performance levels.
The cross-tabulation of SBAC ELA scores by ELPAC performance levels for grade 3 Group B Ever-ELs (n = 814) is presented in Figure 23. Almost all of the students scoring exceeded or met on the SBAC were RFEP or scored moderately or well developed on the ELPAC. By grade 3, students who scored not met on the SBAC had scored at all levels of the ELPAC and some had been reclassified as RFEP.

**Figure 23**
2018-19/Grade 3 SBAC English Language Arts Outcomes by ELPAC Overall Performance Levels and RFEP
Group B Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 814)

On the 2017-18 SBAC ELA for grade 3, a total of 33% (n = 270) of Group B Ever-EL students scored at met or exceeded levels. Of those students that met or exceeded the mathematics standard (n = 270), 86% were students that scored well developed (11%, n = 30) on ELPAC or were RFEP (75%, n = 203), and 13% were students that scored moderately developed (n = 26) on ELPAC. Students who scored at minimally developed on ELPAC did not meet or exceed standards on SBAC ELA and only 1 student (less than 1%) that scored somewhat developed on ELPAC met the ELA standard on SBAC grade 3.

In an analysis of the ELPAC performance levels of the 29% (n = 235) of students who nearly met the grade 3 SBAC ELA standard, 31% (n = 73) of the students were RFEP and 11% (n = 27) scored well developed on ELPAC. Another 57% scored moderately developed (44%, n = 104) and somewhat developed on ELPAC (13%, n = 31). There were no students scoring nearly met on ELPAC that did not meet the grade 3 ELA standard on SBAC.

Of the 38% (n = 309) of Group B Ever-ELs that scored not met on SBAC ELA, 9% of the students were RFEP (8%, n = 24), scored well developed on ELPAC (1%, n = 3), 27% (n = 84) scored moderately developed, and 47% (n = 145) scored somewhat developed on ELPAC. And 17% of students who scored minimally developed on ELPAC did not meet the ELA standard for grade 3.

As shown in Figure 23, with a total of 12% of RFEP students scoring at the nearly met and not met levels on SBAC ELA by grade 3, students may have been reclassified prematurely in grades K-2 and may not have been sufficiently fluent to make adequate progress on the SBAC ELA in grade 3. Group A had a similar finding for RFEP students scoring at the two lowest performance levels of the SBAC ELA.
SBAC English Language Arts: SEAL Outcomes Compared to California

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 SBAC ELA outcomes for SEAL students in Group A were compared to the outcomes of their California counterparts. In grades 3 and 4, SEAL Ever-ELs and SEAL RFEPS performed better than their California peers, as shown in Figures 24 and 25.

Figure 24 shows, 31% of grade 3 SEAL Ever-ELs scored at met or exceeded standards compared to 36% of grade 3 California Ever-ELs. At the not met level, there were 36% of SEAL Ever-ELs compared to 38% of California Ever-ELs.

In grade 4, 41% of SEAL Ever-ELs scored at met or exceeded standards compared to California Ever-ELs at 38%. At the not met level, there was a smaller percentage of SEAL Ever-ELs (36%) compared to the California Ever-ELs (41%).

As shown in Figure 25, 71% of grade 3 SEAL Ever-ELs scored at met or exceeded standards compared to 69% of grade 3 California Ever-ELs. At the not met level, there were no SEAL Ever-ELs compared to 9% of California Ever-ELs.

In grade 4, 79% of SEAL RFEPs scored at met or exceeded compared to California RFEPs at 69%. A smaller percentage of SEAL RFEPs (6%) scored at not met, with California RFEPs at 11%.
The 2019 SBAC outcomes for 3rd grade SEAL Group B students were compared to their California third grade peers. The outcomes show that there were higher percentages of SEAL RFEPs scored at \textit{met} or \textit{exceeded} on SBAC ELA compared to their California counterparts.

Figure 26 displays the results of the 2019 SBAC ELA assessment for third grade SEAL Ever-ELs and California ELs. A total of 33\% of SEAL Ever-ELs scored at \textit{met} or \textit{exceeded} standards compared to California Ever-ELs at 37\%.

Figure 27 presents the 2018-19 results for third grade SEAL and California RFEPs on SBAC ELA. 68\% of SEAL RFEPs \textit{met} or \textit{exceeded} the mathematics standard compared to 64\% of California RFEPs. Also, smaller percentages of SEAL RFEP students (8\%) scored at \textit{not met} than California RFEPs (11\%).

SBAC Mathematics Outcomes
The 2018-19 SBAC mathematics outcomes for Group A are shown in Figure 28. RFEP students outperformed all of the language classification groups with 65% who met or exceeded the SBAC mathematics standard in grade 4. RFEP students also had the smallest percentage of students who had not met the grade 4 SBAC mathematics standard.

**Figure 28**

*2018-19/Grade 4 SBAC Mathematics Outcomes, Group A*

![SBAC Mathematics Outcomes, Group A](image)

Figures 29 and 30 report the 2018 and 2019 SBAC mathematics outcomes for Group A Ever-EL and IFEP/EO students. By grade 4, 37% of Ever-ELs and 32% of IFEP/EO students scored at met or exceeded on SBAC mathematics. Both groups decreased the percentage of students scoring not met: Ever-ELs from 32% to 29% and EO/IFEPs from 36% to 28%.

**Figure 29**

*SBAC Mathematics Outcomes, Gr 3 to Gr 4*  
*Group A Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 253)*

**Figure 30**

*SBAC Mathematics Outcomes, Gr 3 to Gr 4*  
*Group A EO/IFEP Students with Matched Scores (n = 106)*

Figure 31 reports the grade 3 outcomes on the SBAC mathematics assessment for students with matched SBAC mathematics scores in Group B. Similar to the findings for Group A, RFEP students performed better than EL, and IFEP/EO students, with 73% scoring met or exceeds standards. RFEP students also had the smallest percentage of students (7%) not meeting the grade 4 SBAC mathematics standard.

Figure 31
2018-19/Grade 3 SBAC Mathematics Outcomes
Group B Students with Matched Scores

SBAC Mathematics Outcomes by ELPAC Performance Level

Figure 32 reports the cross-tabulation of SBAC mathematics scores by ELPAC performance levels for grade 3 and grade 4 for Group A Ever-ELs. In an analysis of the relationship between SBAC and ELPAC performance levels, a large percentage of the students scoring exceeded or met on the SBAC in both years were students who were RFEP or who scored moderately or well developed on the ELPAC. Group A had similar outcomes on the SBAC ELA.

Figure 32
2018 and 2019 SBAC Mathematics Outcomes by ELPAC Overall Performance Levels and RFEP
Group A Ever-ELs with Matched Scores (n = 253)

Note. SBAC 2017-18 outcomes by ELPAC 2017-18 performance levels. ELPAC 2017-18 performance levels were recoded with 2018-19 ELPAC threshold ranges. SBAC 2018-19 outcomes by ELPAC 2018-19 performance levels.

In grade 3, 41% of Group A Ever-ELs scored exceeded (13%, n = 34) or met (28%, n = 71) on the SBAC mathematics. By the end of grade 4 the percentage of students meeting or exceeded standards decreased slightly to 37% (n = 94). Of the 94 students that scored met or exceeded on the 4th grade SBAC mathematics, 81% were students that scored well developed (22%, n = 21) on ELPAC or were RFEP (59%, n = 55). Another 19% (n = 18) that scored moderately developed on ELPAC also met the mathematics standard for grade 4. There were no students who scored at minimally developed and somewhat developed on ELPAC that met or exceeded standards on SBAC mathematics.

In an analysis of the ELPAC performance levels of the 34% (n = 86) of students who nearly met grade 4 standards on the SBAC mathematics, 31% (n = 27) were RFEP and 23% (n = 20) scored well developed on ELPAC. Another 47% scored moderately developed (39%, n = 23) or somewhat developed (8%, n = 5) on ELPAC and nearly met the grade 4 SBAC mathematics standard. There were no students who scored minimally developed on ELPAC that scored nearly met on SBAC mathematics.

And of 29% (n = 73) of students that did not meet the SBAC mathematics standard, 4% were RFEP (n = 3), 10% (n = 7) scored well developed on ELPAC, 40% (n = 29) scored at moderately developed, 38% (n = 28) scored somewhat developed and 8% (n = 6) scored minimally developed on ELPAC.

Similar to the findings for Group A Ever-ELs on SBAC ELA, a small percentage of RFEP students scored at the nearly met or not met levels on grade 3 and grade 4 SBAC mathematics. A total of 3% RFEP students scored at the nearly met level on SBAC mathematics in grade 3, and 12% at nearly met and not met levels in grade 4. Premature reclassification in earlier grades may have had an impact on student’s fluency and ability to make adequate progress on the SBAC mathematics in grade 4.
Figure 33 reports the cross-tabulation of SBAC mathematics scores by ELPAC performance levels for grade 3 Group B Ever-ELs. In an analysis of the relationship between SBAC and ELPAC performance levels. Almost all of the Group B students scoring exceeded or met on the SBAC were RFEP or scored moderately or well developed on the ELPAC, similar to Group A on mathematics.

For Group B, in grade 3 on the 2017-18 SBAC mathematics, a total of 40% (n = 330) of students scored at met or exceeded levels. Of those students that met or exceeded the mathematics standard, 78% were students that scored well developed on ELPAC (11%, n = 36) or were RFEP (67%, n = 221), and 18% (n = 58) were students that scored moderately developed on ELPAC. There were 2 students (1%) that scored minimally developed on ELPAC and 4% (n = 13) that scored somewhat developed that met the grade 3 mathematics standard on SBAC.

In an analysis of the ELPAC performance levels of the 27% (n = 222) of students who nearly met the grade 3 SBAC mathematics standard, 26% (n=57) of the students were RFEP, 9% (n = 20) scored well developed on ELPAC, 42% (n = 94) scored at moderately developed, and 21% (n = 46) scored somewhat developed on ELPAC, and 2% (n = 5) scored minimally developed and did not meet the mathematics standard for grade 3.

Of the 32% (n = 262) of Group B Ever-ELs who scored not met on SBAC mathematics, 10% of the students were either RFEP (8%, n = 22) or scored well developed (2%, n = 4) on ELPAC, 27% (n = 72) scored moderately developed, 45% (n = 118) scored somewhat developed, and 18% (n = 46) scored minimally developed on ELPAC.

A total of 10% of RFEP students scored at the nearly met and not met levels on SBAC mathematics by grade 3. Students may have been reclassified prematurely and therefore not sufficiently fluent to meet the third grade mathematics standard. Group A had a similar finding for RFEP students scoring at the two lowest performance levels of SBAC mathematics.
SBAC Mathematics Outcomes Compared to California

The 2017-18 and 2019 SBAC Mathematics outcomes for SEAL Ever-ELs and RFEPs in Group A were compared to the outcomes of their California peers. As shown in Figures 34 and 35, SEAL Ever-ELs and RFEPs scored better than their California counterparts.

In grade 3 (Figure 34), 41% of SEAL Ever-ELs scored met or exceeded mathematics standards compared to 39% of grade 3 California Ever-ELs. There was a smaller percentage of SEAL Ever-ELs (32%) at the not met level, compared to California Ever-ELs (35%).

Figure 34 also shows that in grade 4, 37% of Group A SEAL Ever-ELs scored at met or exceeded mathematics standards compared to California Ever-ELs at 34%. At the not met level, there were 29% of SEAL Ever-ELs compared to 32% of California Ever-ELs.

Figure 35 shows that in grade 3, 87% of SEAL RFEPs scored at met or exceeded on SBAC mathematics, substantially higher than the percentage of California RFEPs (69%). At the not met level, there were no SEAL RFEPs compared to the 9% of California RFEPs.

In grade 4, 65% of RFEPs met or exceeded the mathematics standard, slightly higher than California RFEPs at 62%. There was also a smaller percentage of SEAL RFEPs (4%) not meeting standards compared to California (9%).
The grade 3 SBAC mathematics outcomes for SEAL students in Group B were compared to the outcomes of their grade 3 California counterparts. As shown in Figures 36 and 37, there were higher percentages of SEAL RFEPs (73%) scoring at met and exceed standards compared to California RFEPs (66%).

**Figure 36**
*Comparison of Group B Ever-ELs to California Ever-ELs on 2018-19 SBAC Mathematics*

![Comparison of Group B Ever-ELs to California Ever-ELs on 2018-19 SBAC Mathematics](image)

SEAL grade 3 Ever-ELs and California Ever-ELs scored almost the same on the 2018-19 SBAC mathematics assessment as presented in Figure 36. 40% of SEAL Ever-ELs and 41% of California Ever-ELs scored at *met* or *exceeded* standards.

**Figure 37**
*Comparison of Group B RFEPs to California RFEPs on 2018-19 SBAC Mathematics*

![Comparison of Group B RFEPs to California RFEPs on 2018-19 SBAC Mathematics](image)

Figure 37 displays the comparison of SEAL Group B RFEPs to California RFEPs on the 2018-19 SBAC mathematics. 73% of RFEPs scored *met* or *exceeded* compared to 66% of California RFEPs. There was also a smaller percentage of SEAL RFEPs at the *not met* level compared to California.
SEAL Student Academic Overall Outcomes and Progress

**SBAC English Language Arts Outcomes by 2018-19**

For Group A Ever-ELs (with a mean SED rate of 77% and a treatment rate of 88%), by grade 4:
- 41% scored at the met or exceeded levels, an increase of 10% from 31% in grade 3.
- the percent of students at the not met level remained the same (36%) in both years.

For Group B Ever-ELs (SED rate of 70% and treatment rate of 88% and 100%) in grade 3:
- 33% of scored at the met or exceeded and 29% were at the nearly met level.

**SBAC Mathematics Outcomes by 2018-19**

For Group A Ever-ELs, by grade 4:
- 37% scored at the met or exceeded levels, a 4% decrease from 41% in grade 3.
- the percent of students scoring not met decreased by 3% (grade 3, 32%; grade 4, 29%)

For Group B Ever-ELs, in grade 3:
- 40% of Ever-ELs scored at the met or exceeded levels and 27% scored nearly met.

**Analysis of SBAC English Language Arts by ELPAC or RFEP Levels for Group A in 2018-19**

Of the 104 students who met or exceeded standards on the SBAC ELA:
- 96% were RFEP or scored well developed on ELPAC, and another 13% scored moderately developed on ELPAC.
- No students who scored at minimally developed on ELPAC met or exceeded on SBAC ELA, and one student (less than 1%) scored somewhat developed on ELPAC and met the grade 4 ELA standard.

Of the 59 students who scored nearly met,
- 53% of the students were either RFEP (22%) or scored well developed on the ELPAC (31%).

Of 4th graders who scored not met,
- 15% of the students were either RFEP (6%) or scored well developed on the ELPAC (9%).

**Analysis of SBAC Mathematics by ELPAC or RFEP Levels for Group A in 2018-19**

Of the 94 students that scored met or exceeded on the grade 4 SBAC mathematics:
- 81% were RFEP or scored well developed on ELPAC and another 19% scored moderately developed on ELPAC.
- No students who scored at somewhat developed or minimally developed on ELPAC met or exceeded standards on SBAC.

Of the 34% of students who nearly met standards on the SBAC,
- 54% were RFEP or scored well developed on ELPAC, 47% scored moderately developed and 39% scored somewhat developed on ELPAC.
- There were no students who scored minimally developed on ELPAC that scored nearly met on SBAC mathematics.

Of 29% of students who scored not met on the SBAC,
- 4% were RFEP, and on ELPAC, 10% scored well developed, 40% scored moderately developed, 38% scored somewhat developed and 8% scored minimally developed.

**Comparison of SEAL RFEPs to California RFEPs on 2018-19 SBAC ELA and SBAC Mathematics**

- SEAL RFEPs in Group A (in grades 3 and 4) and Group B (grade 3) had larger percentages of students who met and exceeded standards in ELA and mathematics compared to California RFEPs.
- SEAL RFEPs also had smaller percentages scoring at the nearly met and not met levels in ELA and mathematics than their California counterparts.
Part Four: Summary of Findings & Implications

English Language Development Findings

While research and discussions continue about how to define English language proficiency for ELs, how to assess it, the length of time it takes for ELs to become proficient and the factors that affect that length of time, research indicates that “ELs require several grades or years to be rated proficient—5-7 years is frequently reported.”

Studies also indicate that 10% to 45% of ELs “lack full proficiency in English even by the upper elementary grades, when general academic instruction has become complex, abstract, and dependent on sophisticated uses of English for academic purposes.” (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017.) In order to prevent Long Term English Learners (ELs who have been enrolled in a U.S. school for six or more years), ELs would be reclassified by the end of fifth grade. Thus, to be on target for that goal, a majority of third grade students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools since Kindergarten, would need to be reclassified as RFEP or score at the moderately developed or well developed levels of the ELPAC. By fourth grade, ideally the percentages of ELs who have been reclassified or scoring at those two highest levels of ELPAC, would be a good deal greater than at grade 3, with a very small percentage at the not met level.

The following are key findings related to SEAL EL progress on English language development. The first two findings highlight the general patterns of English language development across all three groups. The last two findings focus on ELD progress in Groups A and B only, since these groups have been exposed to five years (Group A, grades K-4) or 4 years (Group B, grades K-3) of English language development instruction.

These factors are important to consider as they are related to the findings about SEAL EL progress:

- The average socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) rates for schools represented in each of the sample groups (A, B and C) are higher than the state average.
- The transition from the CELDT to the ELPAC (as the state English proficiency assessment for ELs) did not allow for pre-post comparisons of certain types.
- The ELPAC, administered for the first time in 2017-18 may not have been administered consistently across schools and districts, because of differences in training to administer the assessment, and the differences in experience levels of assessors.
- SEAL ELs in SEI programs in Kindergarten scored significantly higher in English proficiency than ELs in BIL programs.

**ELD Finding 1: Pre- to post-assessment growth**

There is a general pattern of movement to higher levels of proficiency for all three groups. All three groups begin with the majority of ELs scoring in the lowest two levels on the CELDT in K. By the end of the study, the majority of ELs in each group are scoring in the highest two proficiency levels on ELPAC, or have already been reclassified.

**ELD Finding 2: SEAL ELs compared to California ELs**

SEAL ELs in Groups A, B and C all score higher than the state average on ELPAC mean scale scores, in the final year of the study. Based on proficiency levels, SEAL ELs in Groups A, B and C had larger percentages of ELs in the two highest levels of moderately and well developed combined, and smaller percentages of ELs in the two lowest levels of minimally and somewhat developed combined, than did their grades 2, 3 and 4 California EL counterparts.

---

ELD Findings 3 and 4: Preventing Long-Term ELs
Finding 3. The overwhelming majority of ELs in both Groups A and B appear to be on track for reclassification by the time they finish elementary school. 82% of 4th graders in Group A and 72% of 3rd graders in Group B are scoring at the highest two proficiency levels or have already been reclassified.

Finding 4. SEAL ELs have made good progress toward proficiency and reclassification by the end of third and fourth grade, and in comparison, to California ELs, SEAL ELs had larger percentages scoring at the top two levels of ELPAC and fewer students at the lower two proficiency levels of ELPAC. However, there are still too many (Group A, 23% and Group B, 33%) SEAL ELs scoring at somewhat developed.

Academic Outcomes: SBAC ELA and Mathematics
A summary of key findings for ELA and mathematics, for the two student sample groups (Groups A and B) that were assessed on the SBAC, are highlighted below.

SBAC Finding 1: SEAL Ever-ELs compared to California Ever-ELs
In most cases, SEAL Ever-ELs performed comparably or slightly better than California ELs on the state's ELA and mathematics tests. Compared to their state Ever-EL peers,

- Group A Ever-ELs in grade 4 scored higher on SBAC ELA (41% met or exceeded standards compared to 38% of California Ever-ELs) and SBAC mathematics (37% met or exceeded standards compared to 33% of California Ever-ELs)
- Group B Ever-ELs scored similarly on SBAC mathematics (40% and 41% met and exceeded standards, respectively). California Ever-ELs scored higher on SBAC ELA, with 37% scoring at met or exceeded compared to 33% of SEAL Ever-ELs.

SBAC Finding 2: SEAL RFEPs compared to California RFEPs in 2017-18 and 2018-19
SEAL RFEPs in Group A grades 3 and 4 and Group B Grade 3 had larger percentages of students who met and exceeded standards, and smaller percentages of students who scored at the nearly met and not met levels in ELA and mathematics than their California counterparts.

SBAC Finding 3: SEAL RFEPs compared to SEAL EO/IFEP students
SEAL RFEPs in both Groups A and B outperformed SEAL EO/IFEP students. This finding is consistent with data on RFEF performance in California.

SBAC Finding 4: SBAC Ever-EL performance from Grade 3 to Grade 4
In ELA, ten percent more Ever-ELs met or exceeded the ELA standard in grade 4 (41%) than in grade 3 (31%), but the percentage of Ever-ELs at the not met level remained the same in those grades (36%). In mathematics, a smaller percentage of Ever-ELs in Group A met or exceeded the mathematics standard in grade 4 than in grade 3 (37% vs. 41% in grade 3), but a smaller percentage scored at the not met level in grade 4 than in grade 3 (29% vs. 32% in grade 3).

SBAC Outcomes by ELPAC Performance Level
SBAC ELA and mathematics scores were cross-tabulated by ELPAC performance levels for Group A and Group B Ever-ELs. Findings about the relationship between SBAC and ELPAC performance levels are presented below.
SBAC Finding 5: SEAL Ever-ELs scoring at met or exceeded levels on SBAC ELA and their ELPAC levels
Overall, in Groups A and B, a majority of Ever-ELs scoring at met or exceeded levels on the SBAC ELA (Group A = 96%, Group B = 86%) are students who scored at moderately or well developed levels on the ELPAC or were RFEP.

SBAC Finding 6: Grade 4 SEAL RFEP performance on SBAC ELA
For Group A, on the grade 4 SBAC ELA:
- Of the 104 students who met or exceeded standards on the SBAC, 96% were RFEP or students who scored well developed (21%) on ELPAC. Another 13% scored moderately developed on ELPAC.
- Of the 59 students who nearly met standards on the SBAC, 53% of the students were either RFEP (22%) or scored well developed (31%) on ELPAC.
- Of the 90 students who scored not met on the SBAC, 15% of the students were either RFEP (6%) or scored at the well developed (9%) on the ELPAC.

SBAC Finding 7: SEAL Ever-ELs scoring at met or exceeded levels SBAC mathematics and their ELPAC levels
Overall, in Groups A and B, most Ever-ELs scoring at met or exceeded levels on the SBAC mathematics (Group A = 81%, Group B = 78%) are students who scored at moderately or well-developed levels on the ELPAC or were RFEP.

SBAC Finding 8: Grade 4 SEAL RFEP performance on SBAC mathematics
For Group A, on the grade 4 SBAC mathematics:
- Of the 94 students who met or exceeded grade 4 standards on SBAC, 81% were students who scored well developed (22%) on ELPAC or were RFEP (59%), and 19% scored moderately developed on ELPAC.
- Of the 86 students who nearly met standards on the SBAC, 54% were RFEP (31%) or scored well developed (23%) on ELPAC, and another 47% scored moderately developed.
- Of 73 students who scored not met on the SBAC, 14% of the students were either RFEP (4%) or scored well developed (10%) on the ELPAC.

Implications
Variations on Student Outcomes Across Districts and Schools
In large-scale implementation efforts such as replication of the SEAL Model, there are many factors that can affect systemic implementation at schools and districts, such as the limitations of this study, including:
- Implementation timeframe and model refinement. Districts and schools in the study were part of cohorts that began implementation during different time frames 2013-14 to 2016-17, and while the model underwent continued refinement.
- Changes in primary language programs. Some districts and schools were refining or expanding their bilingual/dual language programs at the same time as this evaluation project was being conducted.
- Professional learning data. Because consistency and accuracy of collection of this data increased over the four years of the study, evaluators relied on project leads or self-reported attendance records to verify minimum professional learning completion targets.
- Level of implementation. Evaluators did not have representative data assessing the classroom implementation, and had only anonymous self-reported data from principals on implementation levels at their schools.
- Change in State English Language Proficiency Assessment. The change from the CELDT to the ELPAC during this study, did not allow for some types of pre-post analyses. Additionally, the first administration of the ELPAC may not have been conducted consistently across school sites because of differences in training and experience of the assessors.
Future Research and Evaluation

Design Focus Areas
State assessment instruments, ELPAC and SBAC, do not capture all of the effects of SEAL on student learning, professional development and family engagement. School site and district administrators have indicated observing the following outcomes, as a result of the implementation of the SEAL model at their sites. They would be important areas to focus on in future research and evaluation:

- greater student access and engagement with academic content
- more joyful, confident, and engaged students
- greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students
- strengthened family engagement
- greater teacher engagement and satisfaction
- greater teacher collaboration and improvements in teaching for ELs
- greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms

Future studies should also focus on students in third through fifth grade, who are not making adequate progress toward proficiency, to understand specifically:

- what skills they have not developed in listening, speaking, reading, and writing that are needed to become proficient,
- how designated and integrated ELD programs need to be adjusted to meet student needs,
- the SEAL instructional strategies that should be employed in ELD and across the school day, and
- how best to prepare and support teachers in implementing the needed ELD programs and use the SEAL instructional strategies.

Other valuable research and evaluation areas to consider include understanding how to best build on gains children make in PreK and TK to increase growth in grades K through 3, following students beyond grade 5 to examine longer-term outcomes, and learning how to better support long term ELs and ELs with special learning needs.

Research Design Considerations
To limit the variability of schools within any given study, future research of the SEAL model could focus on groups of schools that are similar in selected variables, such as: their EL enrollment (demographics, typologies, primary languages, language proficiency at Kindergarten); teacher, principal and district lead turn-over rate; district and school support of SEAL alignment to classroom instruction throughout the school day; district and school degree of commitment to fully supporting professional development, including that for incoming teachers; and, the types and rates of family engagement.

An option for future investigations, is a case study approach that would incorporate qualitative and quantitative data, connects student progress with other measurable variables, and could include:

- **Tools for measuring implementation, sustainability and impact of SEAL**
  Use the SEAL Depth of Implementation tool in interviews and surveys, similar to its use in the 4-year research and evaluation. Develop and refine tools to measure student progress in the areas that go beyond the scope of the state assessments. Develop rubrics for specific types of student work that could provide additional analyses of student growth than do the state assessments, especially for...
young children. Similarly, there might be other tools that could be developed to provide additional information on family engagement.

- **District and school instructional curriculum and instruction that affect the implementation of SEAL**
  Possibly through a self-assessment and external assessment process, describe and assess the overall quality of bilingual, dual language, and structured immersion programs, and in relationship to the designated and integrated English language development. Support the alignment of these with the SEAL Model.

- **Scheduling of teacher and student assessment data collection**
  Use a design that measures teacher implementation in some regular pattern, annually if possible, while teachers are participating in the SEAL professional development, and as students are completing the final grade level in which they are receiving SEAL instruction and the year after.
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