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Leader Perspectives on Systems-Level Implementation Studies

Wexford Institute (Wexford) and Loyola Marymount University’s Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) jointly conducted an external evaluation of the Sobrato Early Academic Language Model (SEAL) Replication Model that began in 2013-14, was implemented through 2016-17, and continued implementation and sustainability efforts since then. To gain information on the level of SEAL implementation and sustainability in these districts and their participating schools five studies were conducted, all utilizing instruments aligned to the Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI)¹.

Summary of key findings from each of the five studies on leaders’ perspectives on system-level implementation:

- **Study #1 - Depth of Implementation (DOI) District and Site-Level Profiles (Brief 1):**
  - Increased levels of classroom implementation of EL research-based practices
  - An analysis of site-level systems ratings by district revealed that, while there is a range of mean scores across schools within a given district, three out of five districts are Approaching Consistency in implementing the SEAL Model after two years of implementation, as measured by the DOI Tool

- **Study #2 - SEAL District Leader and Principal Spring 2018 Implementation Survey Results (Brief 2):**
  - Districts and School sites implementing SEAL at partial to consistent levels
  - Approximately two-thirds of SEAL district leaders perceived district implementation of SEAL at consistent to sustainability levels
  - About half of SEAL principals reported their schools implemented SEAL at consistent to sustainability levels

- **Study #3 - Screw District Leader and Principal Fall 2019 Implementation and Sustainability Results (Brief 3):**
  - Districts and Schools sites implementing and sustaining SEAL approaching consistent levels
  - Approximately two-thirds of SEAL district leaders perceived district implementation of SEAL at the consistent level (none at the sustainability level)
  - Approximately 60% of principals indicated their schools implemented SEAL at consistent to sustainability levels
  - District leaders and principals had high levels of agreement on SEAL impact they had seen on instruction and for children, teachers, and families

- **Study #4 - SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey Results (Brief 4):**
  - Coach-Facilitator role increases the Site-level implementation of the SEAL Model
  - Addressing structural and interpersonal barriers supports the SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ role
  - Collective knowledge and ownership at the systems-level increases their degree of SEAL Model implementation

- **Study #5 - Leader Perspectives of Depth of Implementation for DOI AREA 1B (Brief 5):**
  - High levels of articulation, coherence, and intentional planning for sustainability
  - High levels of agreement related to SEAL articulation and coherence, intentional planning, and values, goals, and principles for sustainability and refinement
  - Leaders report low levels of use of the DOI or classroom data to analyze the impact of SEAL practices

¹ The SEAL DOI tool was developed to capture data on the levels of implementation of the SEAL Model and can be used at the project, district, and site level. The tool is comprised of six focus areas that are measured on a four-point scale ranging from Level 1 (no implementation) to Level 4 (sustainable implementation).
Research Focus

In 2010 the Wallace Foundation\(^2\) supported an evaluation study “to identify the nature of successful education leadership and to better understand how much leadership can improve educational practices and student learning” (Louis & Leithwood, 2010). The framework that guided that study (shown in Figure 1) is based on earlier evidence of the systemic factors influencing student learning outcomes.

**Figure 1**

*Leadership Influences on Student Learning*

Selected key findings from the study are highlighted below.

**School and District Leadership**

“School leadership, from formal and informal sources, helps to shape school conditions (including, for example, goals, culture, and structures) and classroom conditions (including the content of instruction, the size of classrooms, and the pedagogy used by teachers)” (Louis & Leithwood, 2010).

District policies and practices around instruction are sufficiently powerful that they can be felt, indirectly, by teachers as stronger and more directed leadership behaviors by principals. Higher performing districts tend to be led by district staff who coordinate district support for school improvement across organizational units (e.g., supervision, curriculum and instruction, staff development, human resources) in relation to district priorities, expectations for professional practice, and a shared understanding of the goals and needs of specific schools.

Collective leadership has a stronger influence on student achievement than individual leadership.

The SEAL Replication Model, as described by the SEAL Logic Model, is a systemic approach to develop and sustain high-quality programs for English Learners (EL). District and school leadership have long been recognized as critical parts of our complex public education system. Because of the critical roles district and school leadership play in successfully implementing and sustaining programs, including SEAL, part of the four-year SEAL Research and Evaluation Design focused on the systemic nature of district and school leadership across SEAL districts and schools. The focus was limited to data collection through surveys for district leaders, principals and SEAL coach-facilitators. The research briefs in **Section 2** report on findings from the five studies, which included examination of the perspectives of SEAL district leaders, principals, and coach-facilitators.

---

The data collection instruments for the studies were aligned to the DOI tool, which reflects the SEAL Logic Model components and implementation research. The CEEL team led the redesign of the SEAL DOI, as part of this research effort, between 2015 and 2017, using both an implementation science framework\(^3\) and adapted Innovation Configuration Map processes\(^4\). The DOI focuses on six areas. In addition to its use as a basis for the research instruments, it was introduced to SEAL districts and schools as a formative tool to collect evidence and identify areas to deepen and refine SEAL implementation within and across sites.

The five studies capture data about the implementation of the SEAL Replication Model at the project, district, and site level, using processes and instruments reflecting the DOI. Originally the first four studies were designed as independent studies to provide feedback to SEAL on leader perspectives of SEAL implementation levels. The fifth study, a cross-research analysis, was designed in 2019 to determine the feasibility of connecting common data points from Studies 2, 3, and 4. That analysis found common data points related to DOI Area 1B: Leadership: Site Level Systems. Figure 2 provides an overview of the alignment between the leader perspectives studies and the DOI Tool.

**Figure 2**
**Leaders’ Perspectives on Systems-Level Implementation Studies and Alignment to SEAL DOI Tool**

### Leaders Perspectives Briefs:

**Study 1:** Depth of Implementation District and Site-Level Profiles (Brief 1)
*DOI Areas 1, 2, 3, and 6*

**Study 2:** SEAL District Leader and Principal Spring 2018 Implementation Survey Results (Brief 2)
*DOI Areas 1-6*

**Study 3:** SEAL District Leader and Principal Fall 2019 Implementation and Sustainability Results (Brief 3)
*DOI Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6*

**Study 4:** SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey Results (Brief 4)
*DOI Areas 1-6*

**Study 5:** Leader Perspectives of Depth of Implementation for DOI Area 1B (Brief 5)
*DOI Area 1*

### SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Alignment

**Area 1:** Leadership

**Area 2:** Professional Learning

**Area 3:** Curriculum

**Area 4:** Instruction

**Area 5:** Environment

**Area 6:** Family Partnerships

---


Leader Perspectives and Depth of Implementation Study 1: SEAL Depth of Implementation (Brief 1)

The SEAL Depth of Implementation study (Brief 1) sought to answer the following research question: **What differences are found in the implementation of SEAL practices across schools and/or districts, as measured by the revised SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool?** To answer this question, a SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool was developed by the LMU-CEEL research team to measure the degree of implementation of the SEAL Model across schools and districts as part of the continuous improvement process. The DOI Tool allows for a mixed-methods approach to answer the research question; for this study, only the quantitative data were analyzed. The DOI Tool allows the user to collect data and other evidence for district- and site-level SEAL implementation in six areas: (1 A) District-Level Leadership, (1B) Site-Level Leadership, (2) Professional Learning, (3) Curriculum, (4) Instruction, (5) Environment, and (6) Family Partnerships. Implementation level ratings are assigned on a four-point scale ranging from Level 1 (**no implementation**) to Level 4 (**sustainable implementation**). Five SEAL districts in California fit the sampling criteria for this study. A district composite means was calculated for each district from the overall mean scores for DOI Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6. An analysis of site-level systems ratings by district reveals that although there is a range of mean scores across schools within a given district, three out of five districts are **approaching consistency** in implementing the SEAL Model after two years of implementation, as measured by the DOI Tool. Key findings are highlighted in Figure 3 below:

**Figure 3**
 Comparison of Composite District Means for DOI Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Level 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Implementation</td>
<td>Partial Implementation</td>
<td>Consistent Implementation</td>
<td>Sustainable Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
<td>1.00–1.49</td>
<td>1.50–1.99</td>
<td>2.00–2.49</td>
<td>2.50–2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partial</strong></td>
<td>2.00–2.49</td>
<td>2.50–2.99</td>
<td>3.00–3.49</td>
<td>3.50–3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approaching</strong></td>
<td>3.50–3.99</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| District A | (Composite Mean = 2.82) | ![Visual Indicator] |
| District B | (Composite Mean = 2.97) | ![Visual Indicator] |
| District C | (Composite Mean = 2.46) | ![Visual Indicator] |
| District D | (Composite Mean = 2.43) | ![Visual Indicator] |
| District E | (Composite Mean = 2.64) | ![Visual Indicator] |

*Note. Given the scope of this study, the research team considered the feasibility of data collection and limited the focus to four of the six SEAL DOI areas.*

For more information about this study and a more detailed description of findings, read the Leader Perspectives on System-Level Implementation Study 1: SEAL Depth of Implementation (Brief 1).
The SEAL District Leader and Principal Spring 2018 Implementation Survey Results Brief sought to answer the following research question: **In 2018, what were the perceptions of SEAL district leaders and principals regarding levels of implementation of the SEAL Model, based on the SEAL DOI tool?** The district leader and principal surveys were aligned to each other and to each area of the DOI (Areas 1-6). Survey data from both role groups were summarized and analyzed to find areas of agreement—both in items rated highest by both groups, and items rated lowest by both groups. Figure 4 below displays key findings for this study.

**Figure 4**
*Leader Perspectives Related to SEAL Implementation in Spring 2018 – All DOI Areas*

- District level: - SEAL is integrated into district systems and practices  
  - District policies align with SEAL values and/or goals  
  - Resources are allocated for the implementation of SEAL  
  - Districts conduct intentional planning to implement and sustain SEAL  

- Site level: - Greater teacher collaboration  
  - Teachers promote use of academic vocabulary and complex language structures  
  - More joyful, confident, and engaged students

Additionally, district leaders and principals also agreed that SEAL is supported at the district level through: district policies aligned with SEAL values and goals; resource allocation for the implementation of SEAL; district intentional planning to implement and sustain SEAL; and, integration of SEAL into district systems and practices.

For more information about this study and a more detailed description of findings, read the District Leader and Principal Spring 2018 Implementation Survey Results (Brief 2).
Leader Perspectives on Systems-Level Implementation Study 3: SEAL District Leader and Principal Fall 2019 Implementation and Sustainability Survey Results (Brief 3)

The SEAL District Leader and Principal Spring 2019 Implementation and Sustainability Survey Result Brief sought to answer the following research question: **In 2019, what were the perceptions of SEAL district leaders and SEAL principals regarding levels of implementation and sustainability of the SEAL Model, based on the SEAL DOI tool?** The district leader and principal survey were aligned to each other and to the DOI Areas 1A and 1B. Survey data from both role groups were summarized and analyzed to find areas of agreement on survey items rated highest and lowest by both groups. Figure 5 highlights key findings of leaders’ perspectives of SEAL impact and implementation at their respective districts and schools.

**Figure 5**
*District and Site Leader Perspectives on Impact and Implementation, Fall 2019*

**High levels of Agreement**
DOI Areas 1, 2, 3, 5, 6

**Leadership**
- Allocation of resources, district policies, and intentional district planning are conducted to sustain SEAL
- District and site leaders work together to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability

**Teachers**
- Greater teacher collaboration and improvements in teaching for ELs
- Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction
- Improvements in teaching for ELs

**Students**
- Greater access and engagement with academic content
- Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production
- More joyful, confident, and engaged students

**Families**
- Strengthened family engagement

**District-level**
- District policies, planning, and resources to support and sustain SEAL
- District and site collaboration to implement and sustain SEAL
- District provides guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity
- PD for teachers new to SEAL

**Site-level**
- Knowledge of evidence-based practices and measures were not consistently used to select assessments and monitor EL progress
- DOI is not used consistently to gather data about SEAL implementation, continuous improvement, sustainability

For more information about this study and a more detailed description of findings, read the Teacher Development and Implementation SEAL District Leader and Principal Fall 2019 Implementation and Sustainability Survey Results (Brief 3).
Leader Perspectives and Depth of Implementation Study 4: SEAL Coach-Facilitator Skills and Implementation (Brief 4)

The role of the SEAL Coach-Facilitator is to support teacher implementation of EL research-based classroom practices. They extend SEAL teachers’ professional learning, facilitate unit development, conduct classroom observations, and provide demonstration lessons. SEAL Coach-Facilitators attend professional learning sessions alongside their classroom teachers. Additionally, SEAL Coach-Facilitators attend statewide SEAL network trainings that provide professional learning on the foundations of the SEAL Model, implementation considerations, tools for site-based support and reflection, and other information on current initiatives and policies related to EL teaching and learning. The SEAL Coach-Facilitator plays an integral role in the site-level implementation of the SEAL Model. Therefore, the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Skills and Implementation Study (Brief 4) was designed to answer the following research question: What are SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ perceptions about (1) their skills, and (2) the overall effectiveness of SEAL Model implementation at the site- and classroom-levels? Use of a SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey allowed for a mixed-methods approach to explore this research question. Figure 6 illuminates key findings.

Figure 6
Coach-Facilitators’ Perceived Skills and Implementation of the SEAL Model – Key Findings

Addressing Structural and Interpersonal Barriers Supports SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ Role

- Develop coaches’ knowledge about SEAL in advance of their work with teachers
- Build relationships before coaching
- Manage coaching responsibilities

“[We need] for our district to be more involved in the SEAL implementation at our school. Good leadership that understands and respects the coaches’ priorities.”

Collective Knowledge and Ownership at the Systems-Level Increases Degree of SEAL Model Implementation

- Deepen leaders’ understanding of the SEAL Model
- Increase district support and involvement

“[We need] for our district to be more involved in the SEAL implementation at our school. Good leadership that understands and respects the coaches’ priorities.”

For more information about this study and a more detailed description of findings, read the Leader Perspectives on System-Level Implementation Study #4: SEAL Coach-Facilitator Skills and Implementation (Brief 4).
The Cross-Research Analysis: Leader Perspectives of SEAL Site-Level Implementation and Sustainability Study (Brief 5) sought to answer the following research question: **What are the perceptions of district leaders, principals, and coach-facilitators regarding site-level implementation of the SEAL Model?** To answer this question, CEEL and Wexford conducted a cross-research analysis of descriptive statistics from datasets obtained from the following surveys: (1) CEEL’s Coach-Facilitator Survey, (2) Wexford’s Principal Survey, (3) Wexford’s District Leader Survey, (4) Wexford’s Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey, and (5) Wexford’s District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey. CEEL and Wexford utilized the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool to guide the investigation on the perspectives of site and district leaders who began SEAL implementation from 2013-14 through 2015-16. Specifically, DOI Area 1B Site-Level Leadership and its indicators were used as a framework for their cross-research analysis. Overall, results appear to indicate perceptions of sustainability and refinement vary by role, frequency, and effectiveness. Key findings for other site-level leadership indicators related to SEAL implementation and sustainability are highlighted in Figure 7 below:

**Figure 7**

*Leader Perspectives of SEAL Site-Level Implementation and Sustainability – Key Findings*

For more information about this study and a more detailed description of findings, read the full Leader Perspectives and Depth of Implementation Study 5: Cross-Research Analysis- Leader Perspectives of SEAL Site-Level Implementation and Sustainability Study (Brief 5).
Conclusion

Section 2 of the report presents findings from five related studies on leaders’ perspectives of district-level and site-level implementation of the SEAL Replication Model from 2014–2019. The findings from the five studies indicate: 1) implementation of SEAL at the sites and districts ranged mostly from the partial to consistent levels of implementation; 2) there was high agreement that intentional planning occurred and that district and site collaboration were being implemented; 3) collective knowledge and ownership at the systems-level increases implementation of the SEAL Model; 4) the coach-facilitator plays an important leadership role in the implementation of the SEAL Model, and addressing structural and interpersonal barriers supports that role. The full Leader Perspectives on Systems-Level Implementation studies are captured in the five research briefs that follow (Briefs 1-5). Section 2 appendices provide supplementary information, including instruments as well as additional statistical data and research findings.

The four-year research and evaluation effort, focused on SEAL replication in 67 schools in 12 districts. In the broader picture of school reform efforts, the SEAL Model can be viewed as a large-scale, school-wide replication model, in which a lead agency like SEAL acts as a “hub” for support of the adoption of its model by a network of districts and schools. This type of replication model has aspects similar to those of SEAL replication being implemented at the schools and districts represented in the five studies. The lead agency, schools, and districts are linked together by a common design for learning, working, and leadership. Rather than rapid adoption, this type of replication model is, “a long-term enterprise in which program providers and schools collaborate to produce, use, improve, and retain practical knowledge” (Peurach & Glazer, 2011).

Researchers have identified strategies that lead to higher levels of implementation for large-scale implementation. Those strategies have already been used, to some degree, at SEAL schools. In large-scale replication efforts, it is typical for there to be variability in how the model is implemented at each school. Those variations can occur around factors related to all of the areas of the DOI. Some of that variability and the similarities in implementation across schools and districts are apparent in leader perspectives described in the five research briefs.

---

This Brief is based on the 4-Year External Research and Evaluation Study conducted by the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University and Wexford Institute for the Sobrato Family Foundation.

http://www.wexford.org  
http://soe.lmu.edu/centers/ceel/  
http://www.sobrato.com/SEAL
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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 (EL) 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 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 addressed three broad areas: (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 2.

Figure 1
SEAL Research and Evaluation Final Report Overview

Section 2, Brief 1 - Research Focus
This research and evaluation brief presents findings from the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) study intended to document evidence of systems change and sustainability of the SEAL model based on district- and site-leader perspectives. Data were collected from 43 SEAL leaders responsible for SEAL model implementation at 18 schools in five SEAL districts. We report on perceived levels of system-wide SEAL implementation across these sites. Part one provides an overview of the purpose and study methods, including approach, instrumentation, and participants. Part two presents descriptive findings related to perceived levels of SEAL
Part One: Study Methods and Participants

Purpose
The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to describe the process for the development of the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) tool and (2) to describe how the DOI tool was used to examine levels of implementation of SEAL practices across schools and districts. In order to answer the research question for this study, the CEEL Research team first developed the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) tool intended to measure the degree of implementation of the SEAL model. The Research and Evaluation Advisory collaborated with SEAL District Relations Administrators and Lead Trainers to determine the applied use of the SEAL DOI tool. The ultimate objective of this study is to report the use of the DOI tool in determining levels of implementation of the SEAL Model to support both continuous improvement and sustainability.

A Two-pronged Approach to Examining Leader Perspectives on SEAL Systems-Level Implementation
Over the 4-year period, CEEL employed a two-pronged approach to enact this study. Phase One addressed instrument development, content validation, and protocols for the use of the DOI tool. A SEAL-wide DOI field test was conducted during this phase. Phase Two encompassed an applied use of the SEAL DOI tool to conduct the study (see Figure 2). Accordingly, this second phase allowed the team to pilot the SEAL DOI and corresponding protocols on a larger scale.

Figure 2
SEAL DOI Tool Development and Study Phases

- **PHASE ONE:** SEAL DOI Tool Development, Field Test, and Content Validation (Sept. 2015 - Dec. 2017)
  1. Identified key SEAL research-based implementation components to establish SEAL DOI areas
  2. Redesigned SEAL DOI Tool in consultation with SEAL Model development team
  3. Convened key SEAL lead trainers and coaches to review relevance of DOI indicators and descriptors
  4. Conducted SEAL DOI Field Test and refined SEAL DOI Administration and Interview Protocols
  5. Achieved SEAL DOI Content Validation

- **PHASE TWO:** SEAL Depth of Implementation Study (Sept. 2018 - June 2019)
  1. Developed and refined SEAL DOI pilot protocols to conduct study
  2. Using purposeful sampling criteria, identified SEAL district and school DOI study participants
  3. Identified interviewers, including SEAL district relations administrators, lead trainers, and coordinators to conduct DOI Interviews
  4. Conducted DOI protocol and procedures training for interviewers
  5. Conducted DOI Interviews and data collection
  6. Conducted interviewer rating calibration sessions
  7. Engaged in iterative cycles of data collection and analysis
Phase One: Development of the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool
The CEEL team led the redesign of the SEAL DOI tool between 2015 and 2017 using both an implementation science framework¹ and adapted Innovation Configuration Map processes². The development team used qualitative content validation processes to ensure that SEAL DOI tool constructs and associated indicators were aligned with the research-based practices and strategies identified in the SEAL Model, along with implementation science processes and scales. The resultant SEAL DOI tool is intended to capture data on the levels of implementation of the SEAL Model and can be used at the project, district, and site level (see Section 2 - Appendix A SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool). The SEAL DOI tool is comprised of six focus areas and corresponding key indicators of classroom and instructional practices. These six areas align EL research-based practices, evidenced in SEAL’s Foundational Principles and Eleven High Leverage Practices. Levels of implementation are measured across a four-point scale (see Table 1).

### Table 1
**SEAL DOI Levels of Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4:</strong> Sustainable Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation is <strong>consistently strong overall</strong> and actions that support longevity of implementation are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3:</strong> Consistent Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation is <strong>strong overall</strong>; a few inconsistencies in implementation may be evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2:</strong> Partial Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation is <strong>weak overall</strong>; a few emerging strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1:</strong> No Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation is <strong>not evident or very minimal</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEAL districts and schools strive to achieve sustainable levels of SEAL implementation. As detailed in Section 1 of this report, SEAL Model replication activities take place over the course of three years, and include a two-year professional learning cycle for each participant role: teacher, coach facilitator, principal, district leader, and others as identified by the district. Because the SEAL Model necessitates refined and deeper-level learning to occur beyond the foundational three years, SEAL and participating districts may expand professional learning to address additional needs and ensure continuity in order to attain the highest level of implementation—sustainable implementation. The SEAL DOI Tool provides an overall composite definition for **sustainable implementation** that represents facets of all six areas:

- All stakeholders can explain and advocate for the SEAL Model, its research base, and implementation strategy.
- The SEAL Model is maintained over time with sufficient fidelity to the model.
- Leadership and stakeholders plan for and address staff turnover to ensure sustainability.
- Policies support sustainability of the SEAL Model, including governance and resources (human, fiscal).
- The SEAL Model is adaptable to the shifting ecology of the district/school while maintaining fidelity to the model.

---


SEAL project, district, and school leaders and stakeholders can gather evidence using the SEAL DOI Tool to determine progress toward achieving **sustainability** and use the aforementioned level of implementation descriptors to monitor, report, or reflect on their progress.

**Phase Two: The SEAL DOI Study Participants and Data Collection Processes**

The CEEL team collaborated with the SEAL Leadership team to identify a sampling of districts and schools for the SEAL DOI study. Predetermined sampling criteria included the following: (1) longevity with SEAL (3+ years), (2) SEAL model implementation plan at the district and site-level, (3) 20–25% or more EL Population, (4) archived OPAL© Classroom Observation and/or Teacher Survey sampling, (5) representation across counties, and (6) representation of various geographic areas (e.g., city, suburban, etc.). Based on these criteria, five SEAL districts located within four different counties across the state of California were identified and 18 schools selected to be part of this study.

Given the scope of this study, the research team considered the feasibility of data collection and limited the focus to four of the six SEAL DOI areas as follows:

- **Area 1:** Leadership (1A: District-Level Systems; 1B: Site-Level Systems)
- **Area 2:** Professional Learning
- **Area 3:** Curriculum
- **Area 6:** Family Partnerships

Data collection occurred between December 2018 and June 2019. Ten directors, district relations administrators, and lead/coordinating trainers who work across SEAL Model schools were identified as SEAL DOI Interviewers and were an integral part of the data collection process due to their association with, and continued leadership of SEAL implementers. Data were collected from 43 individuals at 18 schools within these five SEAL districts. Figure 3 details the data collection sample, corresponding interviewers, participants, and processes.

**Figure 3**

**SEAL DOI Study Data Collection Sample and Processes**

Prior to conducting interviews with study participants, SEAL DOI interviewers attended two training sessions focused on the use of the SEAL DOI Tool interview protocols and DOI rating sheet to ensure consistency of its application and calibration of scores. See Section 2 - Appendix B—D for interview protocols and processes. Each
rater scored the indicators pertaining to each Area on a scale of 1 (No Implementation) to 4 (Sustainable Implementation).

In addition to data collection via interviews, interviewers determined a district/school’s rating based on other artifacts and on-going observations given their association with the district/school throughout the implementation. These other data sources include information obtained during implementation check-in meetings, anecdotal notes collected during school/classroom walkthroughs, participant attendance records, and instructional artifacts such as teacher-developed unit plans and materials.

Scores for the indicators within an Area were used to obtain an overall score for each area. It is important to note the four-point scale corresponds to the DOI tool’s level of implementation scale (Table 1). Rating sheets were submitted to CEEL. The research and evaluation team reviewed each rating sheet and provided feedback or asked clarifying questions of the interviewers.

Part Two: SEAL DOI Study Findings

This section presents quantitative findings based on an analysis of SEAL DOI ratings obtained from interviewers/raters. Ratings were used to calculate an aggregate implementation score across the full sample. That is, all interviews with a rating score for a DOI Area and its indicators were averaged to determine a full sample mean implementation score and overall composite score. Further, an aggregate implementation score by district (i.e., includes only the scores of the school in the district) was calculated. The results include scores by DOI Area and indicators.

District-Level Leadership and Perceived Levels of Implementation

Table 2 delineates results for perceived levels of SEAL leadership and implementation at the district-level (SEAL DOI Area 1A Leadership: District-Level Systems). Ratings for this area were obtained based on interviews with district leads. Interviewers were conducted by SEAL District Relations Administrators (DRAs) or Directors. As stipulated in Table 1, SEAL DOI ratings are calculated on a scale of 1 (lowest level) to 4 (highest level). When mapping mean scores onto levels of implementation, the scale ranges are described as follows (see Figure 4).

Figure 4

SEAL DOI Rating Scale and Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Implementation</td>
<td>Partial Implementation</td>
<td>Consistent Implementation</td>
<td>Sustainable Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Approaching Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Approaching Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00–1.49</td>
<td>1.50–1.99</td>
<td>2.00–2.49</td>
<td>2.50–2.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on district leaders’ perspectives related to the three indicators in the DOI Area 1A category, overall aggregate results (see Table 2 below) indicate that implementation of the SEAL Model is Approaching Consistent Implementation across the sample. However, it is important to note that three districts were rated at the Consistent Implementation level or higher (Districts A, B, and E), indicating that implementation is strong.
overall, although a few inconsistencies in implementation may be evident. One district (District D) is Approaching Consistent implementation and another district (District C) scored at Partial Implementation.

Table 2
DOI AREA 1A: District-Level Systems for Five Sample SEAL Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1.1 District policies &amp; decisions consider SEAL values and goals</th>
<th>1.2 Articulation, continuity, and coherence</th>
<th>1.3 Shared ownership</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District C^a</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Two SEAL DRAs/Directors interviewed District C leaders to obtain a rating for DOI Area 1A due to a transition in oversight role of this district. A composite DOI Area 1A rating for this district is a mean score based on two ratings.

Site-Level Leadership and Perceived Levels of Implementation
In addition to the district-level ratings, several areas of the SEAL DOI Tool were utilized in this study to provide insights on site-level leadership and levels of implementation for a total of 18 schools. Ratings from multiple interviewers assigned to obtain information from district and site level leaders contributed to the calculation of DOI site-level system ratings for five districts. The SEAL DOI areas pertaining to site-level systems and their corresponding definitions are as follows:

Table 3 demonstrates the aggregated results for the SEAL Model Replication for the sampled districts and schools for each of the DOI site-level systems areas. In some cases, there was more than one interviewer that contributed ratings for each of the areas and their respective indicators. Specifically, for Areas 1B and 6 both the District Relations Administrators/Directors and Lead/Coordinating Trainers interviewed site level personnel (principal + coach) to obtain information in order to rate these areas. For Areas 2 and 3 only the Lead/Coordinating Trainers posed questions to coaches to obtain information used to rate these areas. All scores that were submitted by a rater for an Area were included in this analysis. The results show that Area 3 Curriculum is the highest level of implementation (Mean = 3.00) whereas the lowest level of implementation is in SEAL DOI Area 1B Leadership: Site-Level Systems (Mean 2.46).
Table 3
Aggregate School Implementation Levels Across Sample Districts in Area 1B, 2, 3, and 6 (5 Districts; 18 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA 1B LEADERSHIP: SITE-LEVEL SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall AREA 1B Results (N=36)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 School policies &amp; decisions consider SEAL values &amp; goals</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Articulation, continuity, and coherence</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Planning to ensure refinement &amp; sustainability</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA 2 PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall AREA 2 Results (N=18)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Learning culture focused on EL research-based practices</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Reflective practice</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA 3 CURRICULUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall AREA 3 Results (N=18)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Standards-based &amp; interdisciplinary</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Comprehensive development of thematic units</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Curriculum plans &amp; thematic units reviewed &amp; refined</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA 6 FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall AREA 6 Results (N=36)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Communication between teachers and families</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Family participation</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITE MEAN</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a “N” represents the number of ratings recorded for each of the Areas. For example, for Area 1B and 6 a total of 36 ratings were obtained across all school sites because in some cases multiple interviews were conducted with several site-level representatives (e.g. principal + coach); these yielded multiple ratings that were averaged to obtain a mean score for each indicator.*

Site-Level Leadership: District Implementation Profiles
A composite means was calculated for each respective district derived from the overall mean score for Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6. An analysis of site-level leadership ratings by district reveals that although there is a range of mean scores across schools within a given district, the composite means scores indicate that three out of five districts are Approaching Consistency in implementing the SEAL model, as measured by the DOI Tool. Tables 4–8 present findings by district.
### Table 4
**District A (5 schools) Overall Levels of Implementation: DOI Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1B Leadership: Site Level Systems</th>
<th>Area 2 Professional Learning</th>
<th>Area 3 Curriculum</th>
<th>Area 6 Family Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.64 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.83 Approaching Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.64 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.17 Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.36 Partial</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.00 Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPOSITE MEAN SCORE: 2.82**

### Table 5
**District B (3 schools) Overall Levels of Implementation: DOI Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1B Leadership: Site Level Systems</th>
<th>Area 2 Professional Learning</th>
<th>Area 3 Curriculum</th>
<th>Area 6 Family Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.50 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.67 Approaching Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.67 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.33 Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.50 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPOSITE MEAN SCORE: 2.97**
### Table 6
**District C (2 schools) – Overall Levels of Implementation: DOI Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1B</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Site Level Systems</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Family Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.75 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.00 Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.50 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.00 Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.50 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.00 Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPOSITE MEAN SCORE: 2.46**

### Table 7
**District D (3 schools) – Overall Levels of Implementation: DOI Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1B</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Site Level Systems</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Family Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.50 Approaching Consistency</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.33 Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.17 Partial</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.33 Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.17 Partial</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.00 Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPOSITE MEAN SCORE: 2.43**
Table 8
District E (5 schools) – Overall Levels of Implementation: DOI Areas 1B, 2, 3, and 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1B</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Site Level Systems</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Family Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.44 Partial</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.50 Approaching Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.44 Partial</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.50 Approaching Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.22 Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Mean</td>
<td>2.37 Area Mean</td>
<td>2.50 Area Mean</td>
<td>3.00 Area Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPOSITE MEAN SCORE: 2.64**
Comparison of High versus Low Implementing Districts based on DOI Area 1A Rating

Despite scoring high in SEAL DOI Area 1A Leadership: District-Level Systems, several schools within these districts scored at lower levels of implementation across DOI Areas that pertain to Site-Level leadership (Area 1B), Professional Learning (Area 2), Curriculum (Area 3), or Family Partnerships (Area 6). As illuminated in Figures 5 and 6, there was visibly great variation among school-level implementation ratings.

**Figure 5**  
*High Implementing Districts in Area 1A (Score of 3.00 or higher) (Districts A, B, and E)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth of Implementation Site-Level Areas</th>
<th>RATING SCALE RANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONE</strong></td>
<td>1.00–1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROACHING PARTIAL</strong></td>
<td>1.50–1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTIAL</strong></td>
<td>2.00–2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROACHING CONSISTENT</strong></td>
<td>2.50–2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSISTENT</strong></td>
<td>3.00–3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROACHING SUSTAINABLE</strong></td>
<td>3.50–3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSTAINABLE</strong></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA 1B Site-level Systems**  (n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1: No Implementation</th>
<th>Level 2: Partial Implementation</th>
<th>Level 3: Consistent Implementation</th>
<th>Level 4: Sustainable Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="House" /></td>
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<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="House" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="House" /></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA 2 Professional Learning**  (n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1: No Implementation</th>
<th>Level 2: Partial Implementation</th>
<th>Level 3: Consistent Implementation</th>
<th>Level 4: Sustainable Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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<td><img src="image4.png" alt="House" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA 3 Curriculum**  (n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1: No Implementation</th>
<th>Level 2: Partial Implementation</th>
<th>Level 3: Consistent Implementation</th>
<th>Level 4: Sustainable Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 6 Family Partnerships**</th>
<th>Level 1: No Implementation</th>
<th>Level 2: Partial Implementation</th>
<th>Level 3: Consistent Implementation</th>
<th>Level 4: Sustainable Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rater for District E, School 3 did no provide a rating for Area 2 and 3 due to insufficient information.

In contrast, we examined site-level area ratings for districts that scored at the lower implementation levels for district system-level indicators. Figure 6 shows that the majority of schools in these districts scored at the partial or approaching consistent implementation levels.
Figure 6
Low Implementing Districts in AREA 1A (Score of 2.99 or lower) (Districts C and D)

![Diagram showing levels of implementation]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth of Implementation Site-Level Areas</th>
<th>None 1.00–1.49</th>
<th>Approaching Partial 1.50–1.99</th>
<th>Partial 2.00–2.49</th>
<th>Approaching Consistent 2.50–2.99</th>
<th>Consistent 3.00–3.49</th>
<th>Approaching Sustainable 3.50–3.99</th>
<th>Sustainable 4.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA 1B Site-level Systems (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA 2 Professional Learning (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA 3 Curriculum (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6 Family Partnerships (n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 - Appendix E presents the SEAL DOI rating results for each district. School-level results are included and aggregated by DOI Area and indicator. These may provide additional insights and serve to guide discussion related to other areas of inquiry.

Part Three: Summary of Findings and Implications

This research and evaluation brief reports on the two-pronged approach to this study to answer the research question: What differences are found in the implementation of SEAL practices across schools and/or districts, as measured by the revised SEAL Depth of Implementation tool?

Findings related to the DOI Tool

- The development of the SEAL Depth of Implementation and corresponding procedures for its applied use are valuable in documenting promising evidence of the levels of implementation of the SEAL model in replication schools and districts.
- SEAL DOI interviewers play key roles in the SEAL implementation process.
  - As such, they were able to engage in SEAL interview processes with district and site-level leaders as well as access implementation artifacts to substantiate SEAL DOI ratings.
- SEAL DOI usage protocols supported data collection and rating processes.
Implications related to the use of the SEAL DOI Tool

- Intentional use of the SEAL DOI has the potential to generate evidence-based data to help ongoing monitoring, refinement, and sustainability of the SEAL model.
- SEAL DOI protocols and procedures will need to be consistently applied, requiring strategic planning and support for those engaging in the process.
  - This includes adhering to criteria for selection of interviewees at the district level.
- SEAL DOI rater and training sessions can be strengthened by the use of sample artifacts, evidence, videos, or other data sources to discuss variation in SEAL Model implementation while calibrating ratings.
- SEAL management leaders can and should serve as informants throughout the process.

Findings related to implementation of SEAL practices in sampled districts and schools

- SEAL DOI Area 1A Leadership: District-Level Systems results for the overall sample indicate that districts (N=5) are Approaching Consistent Implementation.
- The highest implementation score was in SEAL DOI Area 3 Curriculum (Mean = 3.00).
- The lowest implementation score was in SEAL DOI Area 1B School-level Systems (Mean = 2.46).
- Aggregate school data within each district indicate that despite districts scoring high in SEAL DOI Area 1A Leadership: District-Level Systems, several schools within these districts scored at lower levels of implementation across other DOI Areas.

Implications related to the implementation of the SEAL Replication Model to Advance Systems-Level Continuous Learning

- SEAL DOI users may select key focus areas to explore similarities and differences in perceived levels of implementation by role type: district leaders, principals, coaches, and/or lead teachers.
- SEAL management can identify benchmarks during the SEAL professional learning cycles to introduce and use the SEAL DOI Tool:
  - To create a sense of ownership and confidence among district and school staff in identifying perceived levels of system-wide implementation.
  - To engage in dialogue around increasing levels of implementation to achieve sustainability.

This Brief is based on the 4-Year External Research and Evaluation Study conducted by the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University and Wexford Institute for the Sobrato Family Foundation
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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 2.

Figure 1
SEAL Research and Evaluation Final Report Overview
Section 2, Brief 2 – Research Focus
This research and evaluation brief provides findings from the SEAL District Leader Survey and the SEAL Principal Survey administered in June 2018. We report on a sample of respondents across seven SEAL districts and 34 SEAL schools. Part One provides an overview of the study methods and participants. Part Two presents descriptive findings for a select number of survey items. Part Three provides a summary of findings and related implications.

Systems-Level Impacts of the SEAL Model as Perceived by Principals and District Leaders
Research and Evaluation Questions
In 2018, what were the perceptions of SEAL district leaders and principals regarding levels of implementation of the SEAL Model, based on the revised SEAL DOI tool?

Part One: Study Methods and Participants

Purpose
In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and the Loyola Marymount University’s Center for Equity for English Learners, the Wexford Institute developed the SEAL District Leader Survey and SEAL Principal Survey. The survey items were developed to align with each other and around the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI). The DOI Tool is organized along six areas listed below, each with Indicators that describe the SEAL Model:

1. Leadership
2. Professional Learning
3. Curriculum
4. Instruction
5. Environment
6. Family Partnerships

The purpose of the surveys was to gain
- the perspectives of district leaders as to the implementation of SEAL at the district level and across the SEAL schools in their respective district,
- the perspectives of principals as to the implementation of SEAL at the district level and at the SEAL schools for which they are principal, and
- a deeper understanding about respondents’ background and experience as educators and leaders.

Methods
Surveys were constructed with parallel items to gain responses indicating the perspectives of both district leaders and principals on all items, which were related to the DOI Indicators. Responses were summarized by:
- comparison of highest- and lowest-rated survey items
- response mean score comparison in order they appeared on survey
- response mean scores in descending order
Limitations
There are two limitations that could affect the interpretation of the results: (1) the varying length of time the respondents had worked with SEAL, and (2) the principal response rate. See additional details about the participant samples below.

Participants
A total of 15 (of 16) SEAL District Leader Survey responses were collected, yielding a 94% completion rate based on information provided by the SEAL Leadership Team. Of 67 possible respondents, the SEAL Principal Survey collected 34 responses, yielding a 51% completion rate. SEAL district leaders and principals, whose district or school participated in the SEAL Replication Model for two or more years, were administered their respective survey in June 2018. As shown in Figure 2, 67% of district leader respondents indicated their district began participating in SEAL before or since 2013-14, while 38% and 41% of Principal respondents were in schools that began participating in SEAL in 2014-15 and 2015-16, respectively.

![Figure 2](image)

*Figure 2*
**Year in which District or School Started Participating in SEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District Leaders, N=15</th>
<th>Principals, N=34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14*</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All participants surveyed represent schools and/or districts that started participating SEAL in 2013-14 through 2015-16. A few respondents reported they participated in SEAL activities before the 2013-14 school year.

Most district leaders (79%) have worked with SEAL as a district leader for three or more years, and over half (53%) have six or more years of experience as a district administrator. Of the 34 principals who responded, 40% have two to five years of principal experience, 41% have eleven years or more, and 63% reported working with SEAL as principal for three or more years (see Figure 3 and Figure 4).
Figure 5 summarizes Principal participation in SEAL activities. A majority of Principals (82%) indicated attending all or most of the principal convenings and 55% noted that they attended all or most of the Instructional Rounds.

**Figure 5**  
**Frequency of Principal Participation in SEAL Activities (N = 34)**
Part Two: Findings

Comparing Perspectives about SEAL Implementation
To identify similar perspectives between district leaders and principals, items for the two respondent groups were listed in descending order of their means. The ten highest-rated and ten lowest-rated items for both respondent groups were identified and compared; six items were found in common from the highest-rated and two from the lowest rated (see Tables 1 and 2). The highest rated items by both groups were mostly related to teachers, while lowest rated items were related to data use and use of primary language.

Table 1
Similar Perspectives: Highest-Rated Items by Both Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items with Highest Mean Ratings</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Teacher collaboration ^a</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are standards-based and interdisciplinary ^b</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers implement SEAL units that are thematically and intentionally organized to develop language ^b</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers promote the use of academic vocabulary ^b</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers promote the use of complex language structures ^b</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More joyful, confident, and engaged students ^a</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree
^b District Leader rating scale: 1 = none, 2 = a few schools, 3 = some schools, 4 = all schools. Principal rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

Table 2
Similar Perspectives: Lowest Rated Items by Both Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items with Lowest Mean Ratings</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes, and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language instruction or support is used intentionally in all English Learner program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a District Leader rating scale: 1 = none, 2 = a few schools, 3 = some schools, 4 = all schools
^b Principal rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree
SEAL Implementation at the District Level

Figure 6 shows district leader perceptions about their districts’ level of SEAL implementation. Sixty-four percent indicated their districts were implementing SEAL at the two highest implementation levels: consistent and sustainability.

Figure 6
District Leader Perceptions related to the level of SEAL Implementation at their District (n = 14)

Highlighted below are reflections from district leaders about the level of SEAL Implementation at their districts.

**District Leaders: Positive, Increased or Improved SEAL Implementation at the District Level (n = 7)**

**Respondents indicating partial implementation of SEAL at their respective district**

“This year we have included our SEAL coaching and staff in our District wide PD around ELD and incorporated SEAL into our EL master plan.”

“We are coming to the final year of implementation and are developing a district-wide sustainability plan. We continue to work with our site administrators to further align SEAL to school-wide practices. Selected strategies have been included in our instructional units for summer programming.”

“Time is allocated for teachers to have weekly collaboration meetings during the school day focused on their SEAL implementation. Coaches continue to have ongoing collaboration meetings to support each other. Principals, district leaders and coaches actively participate in SEAL convening meetings. Summer Bridge continues to be a priority and included in summer planning and budgeting. More and more teachers are asking to be coached and mentored from the SEAL coach. With budget decreases, district continues to allocate funding for SEAL coaches.”

**Respondents indicating consistent implementation of SEAL at their respective district**

“Now that teachers have a better understanding of what the strategies are, they are asking questions that are about the "why" behind a strategy. They are seeing the big picture of how it all works together including designated ELD.”

“Participation in convenings and instructional rounds. LCAP has goals specifically written about SEAL implementation. PD plan includes SEAL. All coaches are SEAL trained. Coach role is clearly defined (job description) and coach evaluation includes SEAL implementation.”
A comparison of district leader and principal perceptions related to overall district planning for SEAL is shown in Figure 7. A majority (over 75%) of both respondent groups agree or strongly agree that their districts conducted intentional planning to implement and sustain SEAL. They also indicate that SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district. Also worth noting, is the difference in responses between the two groups; the percentage of district leaders responding strongly agree is between 8% and 25% greater than that of principals.

**Figure 7**
*Comparison of District Leaders and Principal Perceptions: Integration and Intentional Planning for SEAL at the District Level*

Highlighted below are examples of positive SEAL implementation at the district level reported by principals that strongly agree intentional district planning is conducted at their district to improve and sustain SEAL implementation.

**Principals: Increased or Improved SEAL Implementation at the District Level (n=4)**

Principals who strongly agree “intentional district planning” is conducted to both improve the implementation of SEAL and to sustain SEAL. Below are district level examples of positive, increased, or improved SEAL implementation:

**Coaching, Teacher Planning, Additional PD**

“This year the science coach has begun working with some of the SEAL coaches. They have been working together to understand how SEAL integrated into the new ELA curriculum.”

“SEAL is embedded into our School Plans for Student Achievement and all of our PD. Districtwide expectations on how classrooms should look and what strategies are used reflect SEAL indicators.”

“Each school is provided with a SEAL coach. Money is set aside each year for teaching planning. NEW ELA [textbook] adoption was aligned over the summer to incorporate SEAL units.”

“SEAL coaches have been provided additional PD to build and support their skill in coaching peers. Planning time for SEAL teachers has been negotiated in the current contract for teachers.”
As shown in Figure 8, while all district leaders agree or strongly agree that resources are allocated for SEAL, only 79% of principals indicated they agree and strongly agree. Both respondent groups reported similarly to the item on policies and decisions regarding SEAL.

**Figure 8**
*Comparison of District Leader and Principal Perceptions: District Resources and Policies Related to SEAL Implementation*

**SEAL Implementation at the School Level**
An equal number of principals (47%) indicated their respective schools are implementing SEAL at either the partial implementation or the consistent implementation level (see Figure 9). None of the principal respondents reported implementing SEAL at the minimal level.

**Figure 9**
*Principal Perceptions related to the Level of SEAL Implementation at their School (N = 34)*
Highlighted below are examples of SEAL implementation reported by principals that indicated their respective school was implementing SEAL at either a partial implementation or consistent implementation level.

**Principals: Increased or Improved SEAL Implementation at their School (N = 15)**

Principals provided the following examples of positive, increased, or improved SEAL Implementation at their respective school:

**Principals indicating partial implementation of SEAL at their school**

“Our teaching staff is very excited about the implementation. As an administrator, it has been difficult to integrate SEAL practices with other initiatives at the school.”

“More grade level teams have completed SEAL training and work together to refine the units. School has purchased leveled books aligned with SEAL themes to be used for Guided Reading - we have them in a shared library (since last year) - teachers were able to order more books for the next school year aligned to their SEAL themes both for their classroom libraries and the shared library.”

**Principals indicating consistent implementation of SEAL at their school**

“Units are consistently implemented across grade levels at the school site and teachers are employing SEAL strategies and visual supports on a regular basis as part of this implementation. As a result of SEAL teacher planning days, teachers have been allocated the time and support in order to continue with deeper implementation of units and strategies. During walkthroughs I am able to see that SEAL Strategies are in place in order to support our students with their overall language development and content area literacy.”

“Collaboration has been so valuable this school year, giving our teachers an opportunity to discuss, plan, refine SEAL lesson/implementation. Coaches have offered their support to grade level teams and teachers have been very receptive to that support.”
SEAL Implementation at the Classroom Level

On survey items related to the implementation of SEAL at the classroom level, district leaders and principals responded similarly about the standards-based, thematic units that are intentionally organized to develop language and their use of strategies designed to gather formative information on student progress. Figures 10 and 11 summarize their responses.

**Figure 10**

District Leader Perceptions about SEAL Implementation at the Classroom Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total district leaders responding (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 62% reported teachers at <em>all schools</em> implement SEAL standards-based units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 54% indicated teachers <em>some schools</em> use formative data on student progress to adjust instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 62% indicated teachers at <em>some schools</em> implement SEAL thematic units intentionally organized to develop language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11**

Principal Perceptions about SEAL Implementation at the Classroom Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total principals responding (N = 34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A majority of principals <em>agree</em> that teachers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement SEAL units that are standards-based (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement SEAL units that are thematically and intentionally organized to develop language (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use strategies designed to gather formative information on student progress (84%) and adjust instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3: Summary of Findings and Implications

Findings: Similar Perspectives of District Leaders and Principals

Strengths. Based on similar perspectives of district leaders and principals, survey results indicate the following areas as strengths of SEAL implementation in districts, schools, and classrooms:

There were three areas that included the highest-rated items by both groups

- overall effects of SEAL on teachers and student -- greater teacher collaboration, and more joyful, confident and engaged students
- implementation of SEAL units -- SEAL teachers implement SEAL units that are standards-based, interdisciplinary, and thematically and intentionally organized to develop language
- language development - teachers promote the use of academic vocabulary, and the use of complex language structures

District alignment and support of SEAL implementation were identified as strengths by over three-fourths of respondent agree or strongly agree that:

- their districts conducted intentional planning to implement and sustain SEAL
- district policies align with SEAL values and/or goals, and SEAL is integrated into district systems and practices
- resources are allocated for the implementation of SEAL

Respondents indicated that teachers implement SEAL standards-based thematic units that are intentionally organized to develop language. They also indicated that teachers use of formative data on student progress to adjust instruction.

Areas for Improvement. Based on similar perspectives of district leaders and principals, their responses indicate the following areas of SEAL implementation, the lowest rated items, that could be improved:

- data use to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation
- primary language instruction or support used intentionally in all EL program models (i.e. Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream)

Findings: District and School Levels of SEAL Implementation

District leaders rated their districts’ levels of implementing SEAL. More than half indicated that districts are at the consistent implementation level. About one-third indicated that districts are at the partial implementation level. Only one district leader indicated his/her district was at the sustainability level.

Principals rated their schools’ levels of implementing SEAL. Approximately half indicated their schools are the partial implementation level. Approximately half indicated their schools are at the consistent implementation level. Only two principals indicated their schools are at the sustainability level.

Findings: Principal Participation in SEAL Activities

Principals indicated they attended all or most of these types of sessions: principal convenings (82%), and instructional rounds (55%). Principals attended none of the sessions for: unit development days (33%), summer bridge (25%), instructional rounds (15%), and SEAL Professional Development Modules (9%).
Implications

Principals are expected to attend SEAL principal convenings and instruction rounds. Eighty-two percent of Principals indicated that they attended all or most of the sessions of the principal convenings. Fewer principals (55%) indicated that they attended all of most of the session of the instructional rounds. The frequency of principal participation in these SEAL activities may be related to the level of implementation of SEAL at their schools. There may need to be more specific agreements made with districts and principals regarding principal participation in SEAL activities.

District leaders and principal responses related to data use for continuous improvement indicated a need to strengthen that area. District and principal convenings and other SEAL support activities could help to strengthen the use of data for continuous improvement, and for sustainability. Principal and district leader convenings could also be helpful forums, providing participants with opportunities to share the indicators and action steps that have helped move SEAL to consistent implementation or toward sustainability. For example, one district leader cited the following as that district’s indicators of the positive, consistent implementation of SEAL:

- principal participation in convenings and instructional rounds
- LCAP goals include SEAL implementation
- professional development plan includes SEAL
- all coaches are SEAL trained
- coach role is clearly defined (job description) and coach evaluation includes SEAL implementation

The indicators they share could also be linked to the DOI, leading into professional development on how that instrument could be used to provide continuous improvement data.
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 2.

Figure 1
SEAL Research and Evaluation Final Report Overview

Section 2, Brief 3 – Research Focus
This research and evaluation brief presents findings from the SEAL District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey and the SEAL Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey administered in June 2018. It is part of a large study of Systems-Level Impacts of the SEAL Model, which includes information from District Leaders, Principals, and Coach Facilitators. For this brief, a SEAL district leader is defined as the administrative lead of SEAL implementation in each participating district. The respondent
sample was taken across 9 SEAL districts and 23 SEAL schools. Part One provides an overview of the study methods and participants. Part Two presents findings for items that were rated highest and lowest by respondents. Part Three provides a summary of findings and related implications.

**Systems-Level Impacts of the SEAL Model as Perceived by Principals and District Leaders**

**Research and Evaluation Questions**

In 2019, what were the perceptions of SEAL district leaders and principals regarding levels of implementation and sustainability of the SEAL Model, based on the revised SEAL DOI tool?

**Part One: Study Methods and Participants**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study, conducted in 2019 as a follow-up to the *SEAL District Leader and Principal Spring 2018 Implementation Survey Results* study, was to assess implementation and efforts toward sustainability of SEAL in districts that began implementation of the SEAL Model in 2013-14 through 2015-16. Data were collected from SEAL district leaders and SEAL principals, to better understand

- respondents’ background and experience as educators and leaders,
- the perspectives of district leaders as to the level of implementation SEAL and needs for supporting sustainability of SEAL at the district level, and
- the perspectives of principals as to the levels of implementation of SEAL and needs for supporting SEAL at the district level and at the SEAL schools for which they are principal.

**Methods**

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and the Loyola Marymount University’s Center for Equity for English Learners, the Wexford Institute developed the SEAL District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey (see Section 2 – Appendix J) and the Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (see Section 2 – Appendix L). The survey items were developed so that the two surveys aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI). The DOI Tool is organized around six areas listed below, each with Indicators that describe the SEAL Model:

1. Leadership
2. Professional Learning
3. Curriculum
4. Instruction
5. Environment
6. Family Partnerships

Both surveys included 37 common items focused on district lead and principal respondents’ perspectives of implementation and sustainability of SEAL at the district level (See Section 2 – Appendix J and L). The principal survey included an additional 22 items (see Section 2 – Appendix L) on their perspectives of implementation and

---

1 SEAL Research & Evaluation Brief 2 - Study #2, SEAL District Leader and Principal Spring 2018 Implementation Survey Results
sustainability of SEAL at each of their schools. District leaders and principals rated survey items utilizing a Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). Both surveys were conducted anonymously online. Item responses for both surveys were summarized (see Section 2 – Appendices K and M) by

- percentage of responses by response category for each item in each survey, and
- mean response score where appropriate for items in each survey.

Limitations of the Data Analysis
The return rate for the principals was only 37%, and more heavily representing schools that began SEAL implementation in 2015-16 (57%). The largest percentage of district leader respondents (42%) came from districts that began implementing SEAL in 2013-14. Therefore, the two data sets are not representative of the same group of districts and schools.

Participants
SEAL survey participants were current district leaders and principals whose districts and schools were part of the SEAL Model Replication beginning in 2013-14 through 2015-16. Figure 2 shows that a total of 71% of district leaders and 42% of principals represented districts that joined SEAL in 2013-14 or 2014-15, while 57% of principals represent schools that began in SEAL in 2015-16.

Figure 2
Year in which District or School Started Participating in SEAL

A total of 14 district leaders responded to the survey, representing 9 of the 12 districts, yielding a 75% completion rate. A total of 23 (of 63) principal responses were collected on the principals’ survey, yielding a 37% completion rate. Most district leaders (71%) have worked with SEAL as a district leader for 3 or more years. Of the district leaders responding, one had one year of experience as a district administrator, 50% had between two and five years experience, 29% had between six and ten years experience, and 14% had more than ten years of experience. Of the 23 principals who responded, 96% have been SEAL principals for 3 or more years, and 61% had 6 or more years of experience as a principal (see Figures 3 and 4).
Participation in SEAL Activities
Figure 5 summarizes principal participation in SEAL activities. 91% reported attending most or all of the principal convenings sessions and 52% indicated attending most or all of the instructional rounds sessions.

Figure 5
Frequency of Principal Participation in SEAL Activities
Part Two: Findings

Similar Perspectives of SEAL Implementation and Sustainability at the District Level

Eight items were identified that were highest-rated and five items that were lowest-rated by district leaders and principals, using a 4-point rating scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). Highest- and lowest-rated items were grouped according to the DOI Indicators indicated on Figure 6 below.

Figure 6
DOI Indicators Around which Highest- and Lowest-Rated Items Were Grouped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 1 – LEADERSHIP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAL leadership at district and site levels ensures support, resources and alignment of the Model for depth of implementation and sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AREA 1A – LEADERSHIP: District-Level Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1: District policies and decisions take into consideration SEAL values, goals, and principles across schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2: Articulation, continuity and coherence exists between SEAL and other initiatives, programs/key services, and resources across all sites, including preschool through grade 3 and articulation to grades 4 and 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.3: Shared ownership exists between district office staff, principal and coach/facilitator to work effectively together to support and lead SEAL implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 2 – PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators are engaged in collaborative professional learning focused on designing and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction for English Learner success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1: The learning culture is committed to professional development and collaborative curriculum design and planning focused on EL research-based practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the eight highest-rated items, shown on Table 1, five were related to Indicator 1.1, one related to Indicator 1.2, one related to Indicator 1.3 and one related to Indicator 2.1. Ratings are highlighted in blue if the items were rated equally by both respondent groups and highlighted in red to show which group rated the item higher. District leader mean ratings for these items ranged from 3.4 to 3.6, and Principal mean ratings ranged from 3.1 to 3.3.

Table 1
Similar Perspectives: Highest-Rated Items by Both Respondent Groups, by DOI Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items with Highest Mean Ratings</th>
<th>Mean Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOI Indicator 1.1 District Decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, as action items and expenditures in the LCAP</td>
<td>3.6 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL</td>
<td>3.5 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals</td>
<td>3.4 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL</td>
<td>3.4 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity</td>
<td>3.3 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **DOI Indicator 1.2 Articulation & Coherence** | 3.4 3.1 |
| SEAL is aligned with other district initiatives |  |

| **DOI Indicator 1.3 Systemic Shared Ownership** |  |
| SEAL Principals and District Leaders agree that they and Coach Facilitators work together and with other District Staff to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability | 3.3 3.3 |

| **DOI Indicator 2.1 Professional Learning Culture** |  |
| Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation, and sustainability | 3.4 3.2 |

Note. Light blue shading = mean ratings for both groups are the same; light red shading = group with higher rating
Survey item rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree
Of the five lowest-rated items, three were related to DOI Indicator 1.1 and two related to DOI Indicator 1.2. District leader means for these items ranged from 2.7 to 2.9 (see Table 2). Principal means ranged from 2.4 to 2.7.

Table 2
Similar Perspectives: Lowest-Rated Items by Both Respondent Groups, by DOI Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items with Lowest Mean Ratings</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>District Leaders N = 14</th>
<th>Principals N = 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI 1.1 District Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide EL progress monitoring and analysis of data.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI 1.2 Articulation and Coherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade 3 classrooms.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kinder.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Light blue shading = mean ratings for both groups are the same; light red shading = group with higher rating
Survey item rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

Additional analysis was conducted to determine if there were substantial differences between the district leaders’ and principals’ responses to each item. When comparing the means for the two groups for each item, no items were found for which the difference in the means was more than 0.5 on the 4-point Likert scale of responses. The slight differences in the means in most cases were due to a larger percentage of district leaders’ than principals’ who responded strongly agree.
Overall Perceptions about the Level of SEAL Implementation
District Leaders and principals were asked to rate the overall level of SEAL implementation in their district and principals were also asked to rate the level of implementation in their school, using these categories (defined in Figure 7): minimal implementation, partial implementation, consistent implementation, or sustainability.

Figure 7
Survey Response Categories: Levels of SEAL Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation</td>
<td>Exploration of elements of the SEAL Model occurs, resulting in some degree of awareness across stakeholder groups. Minimal information about the SEAL Model is provided. A minimal plan for change to occur at multiple levels is evident (e.g., practice level, administrative level, systems-level, family partnerships). Initial identification of resources occurs (human, fiscal) to prepare for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementation</td>
<td>Elements of the SEAL Model are communicated to some stakeholders and there is an initial level of awareness. Information about the SEAL model implementation is accessible. Initial change and implementation of the SEAL Model is evident at some levels (e.g., practice level, administrative level, systems-level, family partnerships). Some resources (human, fiscal) are identified and available for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Implementation</td>
<td>All stakeholders can explain the SEAL Model, its research base, and its implementation strategy. New learning around all elements of the SEAL Model is mostly integrated into practitioner, organizational, and community practices, policies, and procedures. Resources (human, fiscal) are mostly prioritized and consistently available for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>All stakeholders can explain and advocate for the SEAL Model, its research base, and its implementation strategy. The SEAL Model is maintained over time with sufficient fidelity to the SEAL Model. Leadership and stakeholders plan for and address staff turnover to ensure sustainability. Policies support the sustainability of the SEAL Model, including governance and resources (human, fiscal). The SEAL Model is adaptable to the shifting ecology of the district and school, while maintaining fidelity to the SEAL Model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEAL Implementation at the District Level
Figure 8 presents the summary of responses of SEAL district leaders and principals regarding their perspectives of the level of SEAL implementation in their school districts. Overall, Principals rated the district implementation higher than the district leaders, with 26% of principals rating their districts at the sustainability level, compared to 0% of district leaders rating their districts at the sustainability level.

Figure 8
District Leader and Principal Perceptions Related to the Level of SEAL Implementation at their District
**SEAL Implementation at the School Level**

Principals were asked to rate the overall level of SEAL implementation in their schools, using response categories of *minimal implementation, partial implementation, consistent implementation*, or *sustainability*. Figure 9 presents the principals’ responses. A majority (57%) of principals indicated that their schools were at the *consistent implementation* level.

**Figure 9**

*Principal Perceptions related to the Level of SEAL Implementation at their School (n = 23)*

To better understand the impact of SEAL at the districts and schools, principals and district leaders were both asked to respond to survey items about the impact of SEAL that they had observed. Tables 3 and 4 present the impact items with district leaders’ and principals’ means. Ratings for both respondent groups are similar (shading in blue on Tables 3 and 4), with the greatest difference being that district leaders indicated a higher rating of strengthening parent engagement (*M* = 3.4), than did principals (*M* = 3.0).

**Table 3**

*District Leader and Principal Perspectives of SEAL Impact on Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater student access and engagement with academic content</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More joyful, confident, and engaged students</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater English language proficiency among ELs</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater academic achievement of ELs</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Spanish language proficiency</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Light blue shading = mean ratings for both groups are the same; light red shading = group with higher rating

Survey item rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree
Table 4
District Leader and Principal Perspectives of SEAL’s Systemic Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 14</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened family engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater teacher collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in teaching for English Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Light blue shading = mean ratings for both groups are the same; light red shading = group with higher rating
Survey item rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

District Leaders’ and Principals’ Current and Planned Efforts for SEAL Sustainability

District leaders identified these as focal areas in their effort to sustain SEAL: district-wide planning; school-wide consistency; program development; and, principal and teacher professional development and support. Some comments from district leaders related to sustainability are shown below. Principals indicated they are taking steps in these areas to sustain SEAL: putting SEAL central in school structures and site plans; implementing SEAL to a higher level and consistently across classrooms; centralizing SEAL resources at schools; refinement of units; teacher professional development; and, “SEAL refresh” for teachers and principals, including new principals. Principals’ comments related to sustainability are shown below.

District Leader and Principal Comments Related to SEAL Sustainability

“Bringing together district and site administrators to create a working group to set goals and next steps for sustainability and continued PD needs”

“From the District perspective, there is inconsistency in implementation levels by the site as well as principal support for sustainability. This has to do with the school site administrator’s familiarity and knowledge of the SEAL framework. We are planning Principal sessions for sustainability support. SEAL coaches are meeting with principals to provide coaching and/or PD for teachers, Tk-3. For new principals, SEAL Coach Facilitator will provide an in-person PD.”

“There is a focus on scaling SEAL TK-6 at all participating sites. We are looking to build upon our SEAL program to fully develop a bilingual model program.”

“One of the issues we still struggle with is the fact that there are a few teachers that do not implement as fully as we would like. We’ve had a lot of table discussion about that today”

“We need to support teachers in NGSS/STEAM/PBL implementation; and make the alignment with their strategies in place, clear and explicit.”

Principal Comments Related to SEAL Sustainability at Their School Sites

“I feel our school has deeply implemented SEAL, but we still need to expand to 4/5.”

“In order to maintain SEAL in our campus we have created a resource room that has as its main focus SEAL as the driving force. It was and is being constructed through the support of administration and a SEAL coach.”

“Promote instructional scaffolding that supports comprehension, engagement, participation, and inclusion. Commit to meeting weekly with my ELTP to discuss and implement use of the Roadmap.”

“School instructional rounds for teachers to observe each other.”
District Leaders’ and Principal’s Perspectives on SEAL Sustainability
District leaders identified what they need from SEAL leadership to sustain SEAL: professional development; support for coach-principal collaboration; further definition and description of teacher practices; resources; and, assessment support. District leaders’ and principals’ comments about their sustainability perspectives are shown below.

Principals identified what they need from SEAL leadership to sustain SEAL at their school sites: professional development; refreshers for administrators and teachers who have been involved with SEAL for a number of years; and, support of new teachers, coaches, and administrators. They also need support in expanding SEAL into grades 4, 5, and 6. Principals are hopeful that the resources available on TORSH will continue and be expanded. Principals’ comments about their needs to sustain SEAL are provided below.

**District Leader Comments on Needs from SEAL to Support Sustainability**

“Ongoing support for coaches and admin.”

“A crash course on SEAL as a district administrator so I can effectively support my principal’s.”

“Perhaps, consulting time to support our coaches in creating explicit alignment between NGSS pedagogy and SEAL instructional practices.”

“Concrete observable teacher practices defined and outlined for walkthroughs.”

“Coordinated and vetted resources to support scaling. I appreciate the collection of resources on TORSH.”

“Assessment topics are of interest as I believe the assessment practices do not align to SEAL Philosophy”

**Principal Comments on Needs from SEAL to Support Sustainability**

“Alignment of SEAL units with grade level ELA standards. Is there a tool that connects the dots for teachers so that we move from the SEAL block to SEAL classroom, specifically balanced literacy components.”

“Continued information and how to support teachers that are just beginning the journey and seem overwhelmed by all of the strategies and information pertaining to English learners.”

“I would need further assistance on identifying most effective writing strategies within the SEAL modules and sample videos to show to our teachers.”

“Support with enhancing SEAL with STEM.”

“We will soon be adopting a new ELA curriculum and my coach and I wondering how we will incorporate it into our SEAL units.”

**Necessary Conditions to Sustain SEAL**
District leaders identified these conditions necessary to sustain SEAL:

- leadership and support from superintendent level and other district administrators
- further development of a systemic SEAL infrastructure, including policies, district and site plans that integrate SEAL programmatically and for budgets to sustain the Model
- collaboration within and across role groups
- site specific site professional development
- additional funding to sustain coaching and release time
Part 3: Summary of Findings and Implications

Findings: Similar Perspectives of District Leaders and Principals on SEAL Implementation and Sustainability
The overall mean for the district leaders was 3.1 and the principals was 3.0. Five items related to SEAL implementation and sustainability were identified as highest-ranked items by both district leaders and principals, and five were identified as lowest-ranked items by both groups.

Highest-rated items are related to DOI Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 2.1. District leader means for the items ranged from 3.4 to 3.6. Principal means for the items ranged from 3.1 to 3.3:
- resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, as action items and expenditures in the LCAP
- resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL
- district policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals
- SEAL is aligned with other district initiatives
- intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL
- there is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity
- SEAL principals and coach facilitators work with other district staff to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability
- teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation, and sustainability

Lowest-rated items are related to DOI Indicators 1.1 and 1.2. District leader means for these items ranged from 2.7 to 2.9. Principal means for the items ranged from 2.4 to 2.7:
- knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide English Learners (EL) progress monitoring and analysis of data
- the DOI tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability
- knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments
- there is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade 3 classrooms
- there is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kindergarten

Findings: District and School Levels of SEAL Implementation
SEAL district leaders and principals rated SEAL implementation in their districts at these levels: *minimal implementation*, *partial implementation*, *consistent implementation*, and *sustainability*. Principal rated the district implementation higher than district leaders. Sixty-four percent of district leaders indicated their districts were implementing SEAL at the *consistent implementation* level and none at the *sustainability* level, while 35% of principals indicated *consistent implementation* and 26 % indicated *sustainability* level. Principals also rated their own school’s level of SEAL implementation. A majority of principals (57%) indicated that their schools were at the *consistent implementation* level, while 39% were at the *partial implementation* level and 4% were at the *sustainability* level.
Findings: Similar Perspectives of District Leaders and Principals on SEAL Impact

Both groups rated these items about student impact with a mean of 2.9 or above on a 4.0 (Strongly Agree) scale.

- greater student access and engagement with academic content
- more joyful, confident, and engaged students
- greater English language proficiency among ELs
- greater teacher engagement and satisfaction
- greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students
- greater academic achievement of ELs

District leaders and principals rated these items about teacher and district impact with a mean of 2.9 or above:

- strengthened family engagement
- greater teacher collaboration
- improvements in teaching for ELs
- greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms
- high levels of implementation of the SEAL Model

Implications

Respondents identified areas of need to move districts and schools to the sustainability level: creating more coherence with SEAL and other initiatives across grade levels, including into grades 4-6 in some schools; and, providing time for planning to support districts and schools in renewing systemic support. It seems that sustainability is being addressed in the LCAP, but that continued support from SEAL is needed for implementation and sustainability at the school and classroom levels.

The surveys were conducted before SEAL schools moved to distance and hybrid learning options, in response to COVID 19. Professional development and collaboration among educators is even more critical now, to ensure teachers have built capacity to continue their in-classroom SEAL instructional strategies or use them in a virtual environment, in order to safeguard rigorous instruction for ELs. Because remote learning requires parents supporting instruction at home, SEAL schools may need to increase their engagement with families to help parents learn how to support the SEAL strategies and student learning outcomes. Providing assessments that are more aligned with SEAL instructional strategies, that can monitor student progress, is also critical. All of these interventions can work toward reducing learning loss for ELs and increase equitable learning opportunities during this crucial time.

This Brief is based on the 4-Year External Research and Evaluation Study by the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University with Wexford Institute conducted for the Sobrato Family Foundation.
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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 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 2.

Figure 1
SEAL Research and Evaluation Final Report Overview

Section 2, Brief 4 - Research Focus
The focus of this research and evaluation brief is on the results of the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey and reports on SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ abilities and perceptions to support the implementation of the SEAL Model and practices at the site- and classroom-levels. It includes aggregate findings from the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey administered in spring 2017 and 2018. Part one of this brief provides an overview of the purpose, methods, instrumentation, and participants. Part two includes descriptive findings of how the Coach-Facilitator role is supported. Part three describes the role of Coach-Facilitators in supporting the implementation of SEAL at the classroom level. Part four provides results from survey items on the effectiveness of implementation. The final section provides a summary of findings and implications.
Coach-Facilitator Development and Implementation
Research and Evaluation Question

What are SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ perceptions about (1) their skills, and (2) the overall effectiveness of SEAL Model implementation at the site- and classroom-levels?

Part One: Study Methods and Participants

Participants
SEAL Coach-Facilitators who supported site-level implementation in schools where SEAL had been implemented for three or more years were invited to participate in the survey. In the SEAL Model, SEAL Coach-Facilitators are district employees who facilitate teacher implementation of SEAL classroom practices. They extend SEAL teachers’ professional learning, support thematic unit development, conduct observations, provide demonstration lessons, and employ active questioning. SEAL Coach-Facilitators also serve to support the site administrator in school-wide implementation, at the discretion of the district/school. A total of 43 surveys were collected from spring 2017 (n=22) and spring 2018 (n=21) representing a 96% response rate based on information provided by the SEAL Leadership Team.

Instrument - Coach-Facilitator Survey
The CEEL research team developed the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey (see Section 2 – Appendix N). It consists of 34 predominantly close-ended items plus four open-ended items organized into three sections: (1) demographic data; (2) SEAL Coach-Facilitator role, coaching culture, and support; and (3) effect on implementation of SEAL Model and practices. The survey allowed for quantitative descriptive statistics to depict Coach-Facilitator practices as well as a qualitative description of their successes, barriers, and ideas for improvement. However, not all participants responded to all survey items.

Research Design and Data Analysis
Use of the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey allowed for a mixed-methods approach to address the research question above. Descriptive statistics were performed for the quantitative analysis in order to examine SEAL Coach-Facilitator demographic information and for Likert-scale items related to Coach-Facilitators’ perspectives on how SEAL professional development supported their role and skill development. For the qualitative component, the research team used content analytic procedures¹ to analyze open-ended responses. This approach provided insights on levels of implementation of the SEAL Model as well as the role of the SEAL Coach-Facilitator in support of implementation.

Who are the SEAL Coach-Facilitator survey respondents?
Figures 2 and 3 provide background information on the SEAL Coach-Facilitators who completed a survey.

Nearly two-thirds have taught 11 years or more in K–12 and 55% have taught 11 years or more in grades PreK–3. In addition, more than three-fifths have been involved in the implementing the SEAL Model for 3 or more years and nearly all of their schools have been involved in SEAL implementation for 3 or more years.

All SEAL Coach-Facilitators have either Bilingual or English Learner Authorization. Nearly three-fifths (61%) of Coach-Facilitators reported having a Bilingual Authorization (Bilingual/Cross-cultural and Academic Language Development). Additionally, nearly one-third (30%) had an English Learner Authorization, with nine percent holding a Cross-cultural and Academic Language Development (CLAD)/English Learner Authorization (see Section 2 – Appendix O for additional Coach-Facilitator demographics).

Part Two: Support for the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Role

Part Two presents findings on the utility of Coach-Facilitators’ professional development and the frequency of engagement in activities that support the enactment of the SEAL Coach-Facilitator role. SEAL Coach-Facilitators are expected to attend professional learning sessions alongside their classroom teachers (see Section 1 Narrative for explanation of SEAL professional learning cycles). Additionally, SEAL Coach-Facilitators attend statewide SEAL network trainings that provide professional learning on the foundations of the SEAL model, implementation considerations, tools for site-based support and reflection, and other information on current initiatives and policies related to EL teaching and learning.

To what extent does SEAL Professional Development support the SEAL Coach-Facilitator role?

Figure 4 delineates several types of SEAL professional development sessions and resources and reports on what SEAL Coach-Facilitators found to be most helpful toward supporting their development of knowledge and skills to enact the defined SEAL Coach-Facilitator role. Figure 5 details the frequency of engagement in professional development and other support activities to develop coaching skills.
Coach-Facilitators reported high levels of helpfulness for professional development sessions, support, and resources.

**Figure 4**
*Helping Increase SEAL Coaches’ Knowledge about the SEAL Model and Practices (N=33)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>SEAL Model, Vision, and Goals and Research Base</th>
<th>SEAL Pedagogical Practices and Strategies</th>
<th>SEAL PD Modules</th>
<th>SEAL Coach Convenings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Model, Vision, and Goals and Research Base</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** SEAL Coach Convenings provide role-specific support.

**Figure 5**
*Frequency of and Engagement in Activities to Develop Coaching Skills (N=32)*

- **Most Frequent:** Coach collaboration across SEAL schools
- **Least Frequent:** Activities to support development of coaching skills and reflection on identified areas of growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times per year</th>
<th>1-2 times per semester</th>
<th>1-2 times per month</th>
<th>1-2 times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet with other SEAL coaches for professional learning</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with school leaders to identify areas of focus</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in co-planning for coaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read professional literature to develop coaching skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and debrief examples of coaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend SEAL or other PD to develop coaching skills and areas of growth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Three: SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ Role in Supporting SEAL Implementation at the Classroom Level

This section describes the ways SEAL Coach-Facilitators reported how they support SEAL implementation at the classroom level. Coach-Facilitators were asked to gauge the frequency of their engagement in key activities that promote leadership and/or support SEAL implementation (see Figure 6 and Figure 7).

**Figure 6**
*Professional Development and Other Support for SEAL Implementation (N=32)*

![Professional Development and Other Support for SEAL Implementation](image)

Helping teachers obtain SEAL resources and materials occurs most frequently, on a weekly basis.

Facilitating and supporting data analysis occurs less frequently.

**Figure 7**
*Frequency of In-Classroom Coaching and Guidance for Teacher Reflection (N=32)*

![Frequency of In-Classroom Coaching and Guidance for Teacher Reflection](image)

Informal visits to observe, check-in, and provide support occurs most frequently, on a weekly basis.

Co-teaching and examining artifacts as sources of evidence occur least frequently.
SEAL Coach-Facilitators were asked to identify any gaps in the SEAL Coach-Facilitator role that, if filled, could maximize their impact on the implementation of the SEAL Model. They were also asked to describe the barriers they encounter in providing in-class support. The following finding and supporting themes emerged from the qualitative analysis:

**Finding 1. Addressing Structural and Interpersonal Barriers Supports SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ Role**

**Develop coaches’ knowledge about SEAL in advance of their work with teachers**

“I think coaches should have a crash course of all modules over a summer before being asked to coach SEAL implementation at a high level. Spending time in a classroom where SEAL is fully integrated would be helpful, as would a timeline of what and how best [to] support each strategy after its introduction.”

**Build relationships before coaching**

“It takes time to build relationships, and it takes more time to coach. It also takes support of the site administrator and district administrators.”

“Teachers [are] unwilling to have someone they are unfamiliar with come into the classroom.”

**Manage coaching responsibilities**

“As a coach, and when there’s not much support staff, you are pulled in many different directions and it is hard to find enough time to go into the classroom.”

“In a small district, the ‘burden’ of preparing for, facilitating, and following up from Unit Development Days encroached upon availability to coach, co-plan, model, etc. Also, the materials management piece in Year 2 became an excessive time burden without clerical support.”

**Part Four: Perceived Effectiveness for Classroom and School-Level Implementation**

In this section, the findings highlight the level of implementation of the SEAL Model and respondents’ perceived effectiveness to influence classroom- and school-level implementation. Figure 8 demonstrates the lowest and highest survey items in relation to the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) tool (see Section 2 – Attachment O for full survey results). The DOI tool consists of six focus areas that align with SEAL’s Foundational Principles and Eleven High Leverage Practices. They include: (1) Leadership, (2) Professional Learning, (3) Curriculum, (4) Instruction, (5) Environment, and (6) Family Partnerships. See Section 2, Brief 1 for more information about the SEAL DOI Tool and Study. Figure 9 and Figure 10 present the highest (57%) and lowest (30%) survey items related to Coach-Facilitators’ perceptions on the effectiveness of their functions and school-wide impact.
Coach-Facilitators’ Perceptions on the Effectiveness of SEAL implementation

Figure 8
Perceived Impact of SEAL Depth of Implementation in Target Areas, Highest and Lowest Items (N=30)

- Depth of Implementation: The lowest items (from L-R) mapped onto Area 6 Family Partnerships, Area 4D Instruction, and Area 1 Leadership.
- The highest Items (from L-R) mapped onto Area 5 Environment, Area 4A, and Area 4 Instruction.

Figure 9
SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ Self-Perceptions (or confidence) on Areas of Coaching Effectiveness - Highest and Lowest (N=30)
Figure 10

**Perceived Impact as Coach-Facilitator, Highest and Lowest (N=30)**

Note. Number of respondents ranged from 22–30, based on applicability of some items (e.g. Improvement for Spanish proficiency)

SEAL Coach-facilitators’ insights about how to increase implementation of the SEAL Model at high levels are revealed in the following finding, accompanied by representative quotes from the field:

**Finding 2. Collective Knowledge and Ownership at the Systems-Level Increases Degree of SEAL Model Implementation**

**Leaders’ deeper understanding of the SEAL Model**

“Clear understanding of how the SEAL strategies build on and relate to one another. Clear understanding of the role of Performance Tasks in informing instruction during the six-week unit...Awareness of potential pitfalls of strategies and implementation beforehand.”

**District support and involvement are key**

“Plenty of trainer support and more importantly, district support—both financially and otherwise.”

“[We need] for our district to be more involved in the SEAL implementation at our school. Good leadership that understands and respects the coaches’ priorities.”
Part Five: Summary of Findings and Implications

The findings presented in this research and evaluation brief highlight SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ professional development as well as their perspectives on the effectiveness to support the implementation of the SEAL Model at the school and classroom-levels. The following presents general findings and implications.

SEAL Coach-Facilitators’ Skills and Practices

- Meeting with other SEAL Coaches was the most frequent activity that supported Coach-Facilitators’ professional learning, coaching skills, and SEAL implementation efforts.
- Coach-Facilitators most frequently conducted informal visits to observe, check-in, and provide support for obtaining resources and materials.

Effectiveness of Coaching Support and Classroom and Site-Level Implementation

- Coach-Facilitators felt they were most effective when modeling SEAL instructional practices, refining SEAL thematic units, and assisting teachers in developing SEAL thematic units.
- Coach-Facilitators felt they had the most impact when promoting greater student engagement, teacher collaboration, and joy of learning.
- The highest levels of SEAL implementation aligned to the DOI included:
  - Strategies to increase student collaboration and dialogue (DOI Area 5 Environment),
  - Use of academic vocabulary and complex language structure (DOI Area 4A Instruction), and
  - Opportunities and structure to support language development through the use of draw, dictate, and write strategies (DOI Area 4C Instruction).

Implications: Improving Support and Levels of Implementation

- Coach-Facilitators need assistance to address the barriers they encounter in supporting teachers. In particular:
  - Helping to build relationships with teachers, and
  - Balancing multiple roles.
- Coach-Facilitators’ perception of their effectiveness can be addressed by deepening their knowledge of the SEAL Model and practices, helping to manage responsibilities, and leveraging school/district support.
- More opportunities are needed for Coach-Facilitators to collaborate with site and district leaders to support the implementation of the SEAL Model.

This Brief is based on the 4-Year External Research and Evaluation Study by the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University with Wexford Institute conducted for the Sobrato Family Foundation.


Brief 4 Recommended Citation: Lavadenz, M., & Armas, E. (2020). SEAL coach-facilitator skills and implementation perceptions. In Center for Equity for English Learners, Loyola Marymount University & Wexford Institute, Sobrato Early Academic Language (SEAL) Model: Final report of findings from a four-year study (Section 2, Brief 4). doi: https://doi.org/10.15365/ceel.seal2020
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 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 2.

Figure 1
SEAL Research and Evaluation Final Report Overview

Section 2, Brief 5 – Context and Research Focus

The SEAL Replication Model includes a component that focuses specifically on building alignment and systemic capacity in and across SEAL districts and sites (see Section 1 Narrative, SEAL Logic Model). Over the course of the foundational three years, districts and schools who engage in SEAL Model implementation receive information, professional development, and planning guidance. This is coupled with support for district
leaders, principals, and coach-facilitators to develop policies, programs, practices, and resources to create an affirming climate, implement SEAL, develop leadership, and a community of leaders. During the final phase of this 4-year research and evaluation effort (2019-2020), the SEAL Research and Evaluation Advisory\(^1\) recommended that the CEEL and Wexford teams conduct a Feasibility Study (see the Section 1 Narrative for more information) in order to identify data intersects and the viability of cross-research analysis. It was determined that an investigation of leader perspectives of site-level implementation presented a worthwhile avenue to explore replication-wide perspectives on site-level leadership as measured by the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool, Area 1B (see Section 2, Brief 1 for more information).

As such, this research and evaluation brief presents cross-research findings from surveys conducted by CEEL and the Wexford Institute to identify ways in which SEAL leaders facilitate site-level implementation to ensure a systemic approach to SEAL Model. The surveys contained some similar items, aligned to the SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool—Leadership Area 1B. The items focused on evaluating leaders’ perspectives on site-level leadership implementation and sustainability practices within SEAL districts. Part One of this brief provides a description of the SEAL Model Leadership component and the DOI. Part Two is an overview of the purpose, methods, instruments, and survey respondents. Part Three includes findings related to the district and site leaders’ perspectives on systemic SEAL replication model implementation. The final section provides a summary of findings and implications.

### Leaders Perspectives on Systems-Level Implementation Research and Evaluation Research Question

**What are the perceptions of district-leaders, principals, and coach-facilitators regarding site-level implementation of the SEAL Model?**

### Part One: Descriptions of the SEAL Model Leadership Component and DOI

The SEAL Replication Model prioritizes engagement and development of district- and site-level leadership to support systemic and sustainable implementation. Three leadership roles are identified as part of the district implementation processes—one at the district level and two at the site-level (principal and coach). In some districts, multiple persons at the district-level support and facilitate site-level implementation. The SEAL district-level team provides district-wide support critical for site-level implementation of the SEAL Model. This includes active participation in SEAL Model leadership professional learning activities to build an understanding of the model and high-leverage pedagogical practices in order to facilitate alignment, articulation, and communication across sites. There is an expectation that district leaders monitor and support site-level administrators and coach-facilitators in making connections to other district initiatives and in leveraging resources to support implementation focused on SEAL’s values, goals, and principles.

SEAL Site Principals participate in professional learning to be able to understand the SEAL pedagogical practices and incorporate them into observations, walkthroughs, and feedback to teachers. Principals also make connections between SEAL and other initiatives related to PreK–3 and instructional/curricular improvement and facilitate information flow between efforts to help teachers see the connection. Throughout the implementation process, principals allocate time for SEAL professional learning, engage with coach-facilitators,

---

\(^1\) The SEAL Research and Evaluation Advisory was primarily comprised of the LMU-CEEL and Wexford evaluation teams, in addition to the SEAL Founding Director, Executive Director, Director of Research and Evaluation, Research Associate, and Director of Innovation and Strategic Design.
and facilitate collaborative planning for teachers. There is also an expectation to align the use of resources for PreK–3 classroom materials and PreK–3 parent education with the SEAL pedagogical practices.

Also, at the site-level, the SEAL Coach-Facilitator works closely with the district and site leadership and with the SEAL team to: understand the culture, practices, strengths and needs of the school site and tailor SEAL implementation to be maximally effective for each site. SEAL Coach-Facilitators support teacher implementation of EL research-based classroom practices. They extend SEAL teachers’ professional learning, facilitate unit development, conduct classroom observation, and provide demonstration lessons. SEAL Coach-Facilitators attend professional learning sessions alongside their classroom teachers. Additionally, SEAL Coach-Facilitators attend statewide SEAL network trainings that provide professional learning on the foundations of the SEAL model, implementation considerations, tools for site-based support and reflection, and other information on current initiatives and policies related to EL teaching and learning. The SEAL Coach-Facilitator plays an integral role in the site-level implementation of the SEAL Model.

All SEAL stakeholders—leaders and non-leaders alike, are expected to self-evaluate and reflect on their implementation practices and engage in data-based improvement cycles as they work towards the goal of sustainability of the SEAL Model. To facilitate this, CEEL developed a SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool.

**Depth of Implementation Tool**

The SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool is intended for all stakeholders to reflect on and record evidence for levels of implementation of the SEAL Model. The SEAL DOI Tool is organized along six areas. The DOI Tool allows stakeholders to rate the areas along four levels of implementation ranging from Not Implementing to Sustainability. The goal of the SEAL Model implementation is to attain sustainability. Sustainability in the DOI Tool is defined as: a school or district where stakeholders can explain and advocate for the SEAL Model, its research base, and implementation strategy. Additionally, it is expected that the SEAL Model is maintained over time with sufficient fidelity, and that leadership and stakeholders plan for and address staff turnover. Policies support sustainability of the SEAL Model, including governance and resources (human, fiscal), and the SEAL Model is adaptable to the shifting ecology of the district/school, while maintaining fidelity to the model. See Section 2 – Appendix A for the full DOI Tool.

With leadership as an integral area of the DOI Tool; it is bifurcated into two areas: Area 1A – District Level, and Area 1B – Site Level—each with three indicators of sustainability that are parallel between levels as shown in Figure 2 below. As mentioned above, Area 1B was selected as the focal area for cross-research analyses given the robust data sources obtained by the CEEL and the Wexford evaluation teams, allowing the SEAL Research and Evaluation Advisory an opportunity to investigate perspectives specific to site-level systems and implementation.
Figure 2: 
SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool – Area 1 Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 1A – LEADERSHIP: District-Level Systems</th>
<th>AREA 1B – LEADERSHIP: Site-Level Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Indicators</td>
<td>Description of Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI Indicator</td>
<td>DOI Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District policies and decisions take into</td>
<td>School policies and decisions take into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration SEAL values, goals, and</td>
<td>consideration SEAL values, goals, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles across schools.</td>
<td>principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation, continuity and coherence</td>
<td>Site leadership articulates, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exists between SEAL and other initiatives,</td>
<td>sustains coherence between SEAL and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs/key services, and resources</td>
<td>other initiatives, programs/key services,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across all sites, including preschool</td>
<td>and resources across preschool through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through grade three and articulation to</td>
<td>grade three classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grades four and five.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership exists between district</td>
<td>Intentional site planning ensures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office staff, principal, and coach/facilita</td>
<td>sustainability and refinement in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tor to work effectively together to support</td>
<td>to understand/assess the impact of SEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and lead SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 serves to draw parallels between indicator 1.1 and indicator 1.4—both seek policies and decisions that consider SEAL values, goals, and principles. Similarly, indicator 1.2 and indicator 1.5 are about coherence between SEAL and other initiatives within their respective levels. Indicator 1.6 calls for assessment of the impact of SEAL practices at the school-level and indicator 1.3 sets the expectation, at the district-level, for support of this work. The findings presented later in this brief are organized around the site level indicators in the DOI Tool that illuminate the perspectives of leaders who are responsible for the implementation of the SEAL Model. For further insight on district and site-level leader perspectives, refer to Section 2, Briefs 1–4).

Part Two: Methods and Study Participants

Methods

Five surveys, developed independently by CEEL and Wexford, allowed for a mixed-methods approach to the research question above. During the survey development phase, items were intentionally aligned to the SEAL DOI Tool (see Section 2 – Appendix F, H, J, L, and N for survey instruments). At the inception of this cross-research analysis, CEEL and Wexford evaluation team members identified survey items that were the same or very similar in both the CEEL Coach-Facilitators Survey and the Wexford Institute Principal and District Leader Surveys. The teams then created an extensive data file that grouped and analyzed data collected from survey items that specifically related to the three DOI Area 1B indicators identified in Figure 2 above. Later, Wexford created and conducted the Principal and District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Surveys, aligned with the earlier surveys. Data from these subsequent surveys were added to the data file. Quantitative results across similar item types were compared by role-type. Next, qualitative data were analyzed to uplift
corresponding leader voices. Figure 3 provides a visual representation of the overall process, followed by steps further detailing cross-analysis procedures.

The CEEL and Wexford teams engaged in several steps to enact the cross-research analyses processes. These are delineated here:

**Step 1:** Conducted a cross-research analysis to identify data collected by each organization related to SEAL site-level leadership Indicators as identified in AREA 1B of the DOI Indicators 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6 (see Figure 2 above).

**Step 2:** Through the cross-research analysis, identified the following five instruments that provided data related to site-level leadershipDOI Indicators 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6:

a. **CEEL Coach-Facilitator Survey (Spring 2017 and Spring 2018):** The LMU-CEEL research team developed the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey (see Section 2 – Appendix N). It consists of 34 predominantly close-ended items plus four open-ended items organized into three sections: (1) demographic data; (2) SEAL Coach-Facilitator role, coaching culture, and support; and (3) effect on implementation of SEAL Model and practices.

b. **Wexford Principal Survey (Spring 2018):** In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and the LMU-CEEL research team, Wexford Institute developed the SEAL Principal Surveys (see Section 2 – Appendix F) in alignment with the DOI, to, among other things, gain the perspectives of Principals as to the implementation of SEAL at the schools for which they were Principal.

c. **Wexford District Leader Survey (Spring 2018):** Similarly, this survey (see Section 2 – Appendix H) was developed to gain the perspectives of District Leaders as to the implementation of the SEAL Model at the SEAL schools in their district.

d. **Wexford Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (Fall 2019):** This survey (see Section 2 – Appendix J) used some of the same questions as the Spring 2018 Principal Survey to gain the Principals’ perceptions as to the implementation and sustainability of the SEAL Model at the schools for which they were Principal.

e. **Wexford District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey (Fall 2019):** Similarly, this survey (see Section 2 – Appendix L) was developed to gain the perspectives of District Leaders as to the implementation and sustainability of the SEAL Model at their district SEAL schools.

Note that the data collection was conducted over a period of two and one-half years. The Coach-Facilitator Survey was administered in Spring 2017 and Spring 2018. The Principal and District Leader Surveys were administered in Spring of 2018 and Fall of 2019.
**Step 3:** Grouped the data from the five surveys around each of the site-level leadership DOI indicators (1.4, 1.5, and 1.6). Conducted cross-data comparison of quantitative results by role-type (district leaders, principal, coach-facilitator). Conducted a content check verification to ensure that grouped data mapped onto the elements of each of the DOI indicated. Retained relevant items for final analyses.

**Step 4:** Analyzed previously coded qualitative data relevant to DOI Indicators 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6 to uplift corresponding leader voices.

**Participants**

Administrators/staff in schools where SEAL had been implemented for three or more years were invited to participate in the various surveys. Participants were either district leaders, site-leaders/principals, or coach-facilitators. See Figure 4 for more information.

**Spring 2017 and 2018 Coach-Facilitator Survey**

A total of 43 surveys were collected from spring 2017 (n=22) and spring 2018 (n=21) yielding a 96% completion rate based on information provided by the SEAL Leadership Team. SEAL coach-facilitators who supported site-level implementation in schools where SEAL had been implemented for three or more years were invited to participate in the survey.

**Spring 2018 District Leader and Principal Survey**

A total of 15 (of 16) District Leader Survey responses were collected, yielding a 96% completion rate based on information provided by the SEAL Leadership Team. Of 67 possible respondents, the Principal Survey collected 34 responses (51% completion rate). SEAL district leaders and school principals, whose district or school participated in the SEAL Replication Model for three or more years, were administered the survey in June 2018. Survey respondents represented schools/districts that joined SEAL before 2013-14 through 2014-15, including one district leader whose district began participating in SEAL in 2015-16.

**Fall 2019 District Leader and Principal Implementation and Sustainability Surveys**

A total of 14 district leader responses were collected on the District Implementation and Sustainability Survey. These 14 respondents represented 9 of the 11 districts, yielding an 82% completion rate. Respondents were current district leaders in districts whose schools were part of the SEAL Model Replication, in Cohorts 1 (implementation beginning 2013-14), 2 (implementation beginning 2014-15), or 3 (implementation beginning 2015-16). A total of 23 (out of a possible 63) principal responses were collected on the Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey, yielding a 37% completion rate. Respondents were current principals whose schools were in Cohort 1, 2, or 3 of the SEAL Replication Model. There may have been different participants in the fall 2019 survey versus the 2018 survey due to changes in district and site-level leadership across years, and because even personnel who remained in the same positions may not have all responded to both surveys.
Part Three: Survey Findings about Site-Level Leadership

Findings from the five surveys showed some differences within role types that may be attributed to the timing of the survey administration. Due to changes in district and site-level leadership over the years, the following data summaries include the data from the Coach-Facilitator Survey, the 2019 District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey, and the 2019 Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey. Data from the 2018 District Leader Survey and the 2018 Principal Survey were used if relevant items were not included in the 2019 surveys. For findings from across all five surveys, see Section 2 – Appendix P.

Findings from Data Related to DOI AREA 1B – SEAL Values, Goals and Principles

**Indicator 1.4 School policies and decisions take into consideration SEAL values, goals, and principles.**

Data from the surveys were grouped, by role type, around two types of survey items related to Indicator 1.4:
- Perceptions about SEAL values, goals, and principles
- Collaboration

Table 1 below provides a summary of the data aligned to Indicator 1.4. See Section 2 – Appendix P for additional findings.
Table 1
Summary of SEAL Leader Perspectives related to Indicator 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Coach-Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of SEAL Values, Goals and Principles</td>
<td>43% of all of our schools have SEAL values, goals, and principles reflected in SEAL schools/classrooms a</td>
<td>96% agree or strongly agree that school policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals</td>
<td>94% feel SEAL model, vision, goals, and research base are helpful/very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>93% agree or strongly agree that SEAL principals and coach-facilitators work with other district staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation</td>
<td>95% agree or strongly agree that SEAL principals and coach-facilitators work with other district staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability</td>
<td>45% participate in discussions about coherence and alignment of SEAL and other site and district-level initiatives 1-2/month (35%); 1-2/week (10%); 1-2/reporting period (26%); 1-2/year (23%); Never (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Responses are from the 2018 District Leader and Principal Survey. At the request of SEAL leadership, this item was not included in the 2019 Sustainability survey.

Principals and coach-facilitators report high levels of agreement that school policies and decisions take SEAL values, goals, and principals into consideration or are helpful to them. District leaders in the 2018 survey have a lower level of agreement. District leaders and principals have high levels of agreement with statements about collaborating across levels to ensure alignment (93% and 95%). However, these perceptions do not align with the frequency of this collaboration reported by coach-facilitators (45% participate in discussions about coherence and alignment 1-2 times per month or more and 55% participate less frequently).

Qualitative data indicate that district leaders expressed concern about the cost and sustainability of the SEAL model and its cross-level collaboration. Principals and coach-facilitators offered specific examples of how policies and decisions are made regarding school programs and initiatives that align with the SEAL Model—a positive indicator for the adaptability of the SEAL Model itself and simultaneously supportive of district leader concerns.
Leadership Voices – Representative Quotes

**District Leaders**

“We need resources to sustain coaching and release time. SEAL is an expensive model well worth the funding but in districts with declining enrollment, cuts need to be made.”

“From the District perspective, there is inconsistency when it comes to implementation levels by the site as well as principal support for sustainability. This has to do with the school site administrator’s familiarity and knowledge of the SEAL framework. We are planning to hold principal sessions for sustainability support. Also, SEAL coaches are meeting with principals to provide coaching and/or PD for TK-3 teachers. For new principals, the SEAL coach-facilitator will provide an in-person PD.”

**Principals**

“Our site plans for sustainability by planning unit development days in advance, and revisiting SEAL principles and practices during staff meetings.”

“We have been intentional as we develop plans to have a greater school focus on STEM and ensure that this program change enhances our SEAL implementation.”

**Coach-Facilitators**

“SEAL and ICLE [International Center for Leadership] are becoming aligned at our site because teachers and I have worked together to ensure that rigorous, relevant questioning is a part of our units and we have shared that information with our principal. Coaches have helped with this alignment too at UDDs.”

“We have just adopted a new language arts program this month and will be looking through the materials to see how we can align the materials we will have to our existing units. The new adoption will present a challenge, but it is kind of exciting to see how everything will fit together. In the past, we have used district grade level blueprints for language arts, Thinking Maps, and Creative Curriculum to inform our units.”

Findings Related to DOI AREA 1B – SEAL Model Articulation and Coherence

**Indicator 1.5 Site leadership articulates, and sustains coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, programs/key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms.**

Data from the surveys were grouped, by role type, around two types of survey items related to Indicator 1.5:

- Perceptions of coherence between SEAL and other initiatives/services/resources across PreK–3rd grade classrooms
- Centering SEAL in decision-making processes

Table 2 below provides a summary of the data aligned to Indicator 1.5. See Section 2 – Appendix P for additional findings.
Table 2
Summary of SEAL Leader Perspectives related to Indicator 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Coach-Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Coherence and Alignment between SEAL and other initiatives/services/resources PreK–3rd grade</td>
<td><strong>86%</strong> agree or strongly agree there is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK–3rd grade classrooms</td>
<td><strong>70%</strong> agree or strongly agree there is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK–3rd grade classrooms</td>
<td><strong>70%</strong> feel increased coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across PreK–3rd grade classrooms are effective or highly effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centering SEAL in decision-making process</td>
<td><strong>64%</strong> of all of our schools consider the SEAL Model when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment</td>
<td><strong>79%</strong> agree or strongly agree the SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment</td>
<td><strong>67%</strong> feel participating in discussions about coherence and alignment of SEAL and other site and district-level initiatives/professional development is effective or highly effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Responses are from the 2018 District Leader and Principal Survey. At the request of SEAL leadership, this item was not included in the 2019 Sustainability survey.

Overall, district leaders, principals, and coach-facilitators report high levels of agreement with statements about the presence of coherence, alignment, and centering of SEAL to PreK–3rd grade school initiatives/services/resources; district leaders have the highest level of agreement.

Coach-facilitators were asked about their perceptions about the effectiveness of participating in discussions about coherence and alignment. Although district leaders and principals agree that SEAL is considered in the decision-making process, only 67% of SEAL coach-facilitators felt effective in their discussions. Coach-facilitators described some of their struggles in aligning SEAL to other initiatives/services/resources below.

**Leadership Voices – Representative Quotes**

**Coach-Facilitators**

“My site has a lot going on. For the most part, initiatives are aligned and everyone and everything works well together. It is the time and depth that each initiative requires of each of the stakeholders that gets tricky.”

“We are beginning to see alignment. One of the roadblocks is that many teachers needed to be trained in all the different initiatives first before they could begin to see how things could be integrated. I’m hoping that next year we will begin to see this happen more.”

“There needs to be discussions with all Teachers on Special Assignments to support all initiatives. Principals need to be held accountable for implementation and then teachers as well.”
Findings Related to DOI AREA 1B – Intentional Sustainability and Refinement

*Indicator 1.6 Intentional site planning ensures sustainability and refinement in order to understand/assess the impact of SEAL practices*

Data from the three surveys were grouped, by role type, around three types of survey items related to Indicator 1.6:

- Intentional planning
- Use of DOI/Data Analysis
- Levels of implementation of the SEAL Model

Table 3 below provides a summary of the data aligned to Indicator 1.5. See Section 2 – Appendix P for additional findings.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Coach Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intentional Planning</td>
<td>64% agree or strongly agree their schools have increased collaboration and</td>
<td>83% agree or strongly agree their schools have increased collaboration and</td>
<td>90% rate themselves as effective or highly effective as a SEAL Coach-Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design</td>
<td>intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design</td>
<td>significantly impact increased collaboration and intentional planning based on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEAL Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of DOI/Data Analysis</td>
<td>50% agree or strongly agree that the Depth of Implementation tool is used to</td>
<td>39% agree or strongly agree that the Depth of Implementation tool is used</td>
<td>22% facilitate and support data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and</td>
<td>to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement</td>
<td>(to support SEAL Implementation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td>and sustainability</td>
<td>1-2/month – 1-2/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Implementation</td>
<td>86% agree or strongly agree that they have seen high levels of</td>
<td>83% agree or strongly agree that they have seen high levels of</td>
<td>72% rate their impact as effective or highly effective for ensuring high levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of the SEAL Model at their schools</td>
<td>implementation of the SEAL Model at their schools</td>
<td>of implementation of the SEAL Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a high level of agreement between district leaders and principals that they had seen high levels of implementation of the SEAL Model at their schools, and coach-facilitators indicated their impact was effective for ensuring high levels of implementation. Coach-Facilitators felt more effective in intentional planning time and collaboration than in levels of implementation to support sustainability and refinement. Furthermore, across role types, there were low levels of use of data to assess the impact of SEAL practices either through the use of the DOI or at the classroom-level.
Part Four: Summary of Findings and Implications

The findings delineated in this research and evaluation brief highlight leader perspectives on the depth of implementation for Area 1B of the SEAL DOI Tool. There were high levels of agreement for some areas related to Indicator 1.4 – SEAL Values, Goals, and Principals, 1.5 – Articulation and Coherence, and 1.6 – Intentional Sustainability and Refinement. Overall, results appear to indicate that perceptions of sustainability and refinement vary by role, frequency, and effectiveness. At the site-level, coach-facilitators indicated lower ratings for collaboration to enact these, including discussion around decision-making. Across role types, there were low levels of use of the DOI or classroom data to analyze the impact of SEAL practices for refinement and sustainability. The following presents a summary of findings by indicators:

Results Related to DOI AREA 1B – 1.4 SEAL Values, Goals, and Principles
- Role types closest to classroom implementation have higher levels of agreement about school policies and decisions taking SEAL values and goals into consideration.
- District leads and principals have high levels of agreement regarding statements about their cross-level collaboration leading to site-level decision-making.
- Less than half (45%) of SEAL coach-facilitators participate in discussions about coherence and alignment of SEAL and other site and district-level initiatives 1–2 times per month or more frequently.

Results Related to DOI AREA 1B – 1.5 Articulation and Coherence
- Overall, district leaders, principals, and coach-facilitators report high levels of agreement with statements about the presence of coherence, alignment, and centering of SEAL to PreK–3rd grade school initiatives/services/resources; district leaders have the highest level of agreement.
- Although district leaders and principals agree that SEAL is considered in the decision-making process, only 67% of SEAL coach-facilitators feel effective in their discussions about articulation and coherence.

Results Related to DOI AREA 1B – 1.6 Intentional Sustainability and Refinement
- District leaders and principals agree that they see high levels of implementation of the SEAL Model at their schools; coach-facilitators indicated their impact was effective for ensuring high levels of implementation.
- Coach-Facilitators felt more effective in intentional planning time and collaboration than in levels of implementation to support sustainability and refinement although only 22% of coaches facilitate and support data analysis to support implementation.
- Across role types there were low levels of use of the DOI or classroom data to analyze the impact of SEAL practices.

Implications about Site-Level Leadership based on Survey Responses

Our analysis of site-leader perspectives points to implications for replication at both the systems level as well as for particular role types. Short- and mid-term outcomes as outlined in the SEAL Logic Model include infrastructure and capacity development to regularly monitor SEAL Implementation at the site level.

District-level and Site-level Leaders:
- Emphasize SEAL values, goals, and principles in district-wide ongoing professional learning to support principals who indicated the need to have additional professional development and planning opportunities with other principals.
• Create intentional and consistent spaces for district and site-level leaders to refresh their focus on SEAL, and to clarify and agree upon what the Consistent and Sustainability Levels mean in terms of classroom practices and related policies.

• Coordinate cross-district articulation and support for SEAL site-level leaders. Given that more than half of principals indicated their schools were at a level of Consistent Implementation (57%) or Sustainability (4%), exemplar practices from schools at these levels can be uplifted.

• Use the SEAL DOI Tool district-wide to document evidence for principals who rated their schools at the Consistent Implementation Level, given they seemed to have greater clarity about what consistent implementation of SEAL looks like in classrooms, and the type of teacher collaboration that supports that.

• Schedule and plan more consistent opportunities for coach-facilitators to collaborate with site and district leaders to engage in decision-making processes that support the implementation of the SEAL Model.

**SEAL Management (Project-wide Leaders):**

• Identify benchmarks during the SEAL professional learning cycles to introduce and use the SEAL DOI Tool for all leadership roles—district leader, site principals, and coach-facilitators:
  - To create a sense of ownership and confidence among district and school staff in identifying perceived levels of system-wide implementation.
  - To engage in dialogue around increasing levels of implementation to achieve sustainability.

• Use the SEAL Logic Model to refine and support decision-making processes at the project level that impact district and site-level leader roles and responsibilities.

• Use the information from coach-facilitators, principals, and district leaders related to implementing SEAL at a Consistent Level to support the determination of fidelity measures related to the DOI areas, to enable future research and evaluation studies that take into account levels of fidelity.

• Document site-level profiles that exemplify practices that contribute to sustainable levels of implementation.

---

This brief is based on the 4-Year External Research and Evaluation Study conducted by the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University and Wexford Institute for the Sobrato Family Foundation.
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Section 2: Leader Perspectives on System-Level Implementation Studies
Appendices
The SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool is intended for all stakeholders: teachers, coaches, and leaders at the project, district, and site-levels to reflect on and record evidence for levels of implementation of the SEAL Model. The purpose of the SEAL DOI Tool is multi-dimensional and allows stakeholder teams to:

- **Identify and examine levels of implementation** of the SEAL Model within and across classrooms and school sites.
- **Conduct a system-wide reflection on evidence of implementation** based on information gathered from classroom walkthroughs, site-visitations, coach and teacher reflection sessions, and curriculum templates. Variations related to implementation are identified in order to guide and focus actions for implementation.
- **Review and discuss data sources** in order to strengthen and refine SEAL implementation. The DOI is meant as a reflective tool used to evaluate implementation at the program level, not at the individual level.

The SEAL DOI Tool is organized around six areas addressed in the SEAL Model, and aligned with research-based elements for English Learner education. For each of the six DOI areas, the tool delineates key indicators, examples of supporting evidence, and depth of implementation descriptors.

### S2. Appendix A
**SEAL Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool**
AREA 2 – PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Educators are engaged in collaborative professional learning focused on designing and continuously improving of curriculum and instruction for English Learner success.

The following aspects of SEAL professional learning should be considered to generate sources of evidence for this area: models, coaching, coach coverings, unit development days, Summer Bridge, technical assistance, etc.

Reflection Question: What significant changes have you observed with regards to the SEAL professional learning areas?

Record specific sources of evidence using short phrases or brief notes to provide as much detail as possible.

AREA 2 OVERALL RATING:

INDICATOR 2.1 The learning culture is committed to professional development and collaborative curriculum design and planning focused on EL research-based practices.

EVIDENCE:

Sample Descriptions:
- Teachers engage in reflective practice to improve their teaching practices.
- Collaboration among teachers and the principal.
- Professional development activities are regularly planned.

Indicators 2.1 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

AREA 3 – CURRICULUM

SEAL curriculum is interdisciplinary, engaging, and text-rich, bolstering students’ language development through thematic units.

Reflection Questions:
- What elements of the curriculum are present as evidence of the quality and comprehensiveness of the SEAL Thematic Units developed by teachers?
- How do teachers and instructional leaders review and refine curriculum?

Record specific sources of evidence using short phrases or brief notes to provide as much detail as possible.

AREA 3 OVERALL RATING:

INDICATOR 3.1 The curriculum is standards-based and interdisciplinary, integrated throughout the day (language arts, English Language Development, social studies, science, and the arts), and organized thematically with intentionality related to language development.

EVIDENCE:

Sample Descriptions:
- Thematic units are designed and implemented to integrate language and content areas.
- Language objectives and content knowledge are interwoven in thematic units.

Indicators 3.1 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

INDICATOR 3.2 The comprehensive development of each thematic unit is guided by a planning template and identifies key language, key vocabulary, and how concepts will be taught and language developed through all parts of the day and learning environments.

EVIDENCE:

Sample Descriptions:
- Thematic units are planned and delivered with hands-on activities.
- Vocabulary and key language are integrated throughout.

Indicators 3.2 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

AREA 4 – INSTRUCTION

Research-based high leverage practices are enacted in SEAL classrooms.

Reflection Question:
- What instructional practices are evident across the curriculum?
- What do classroom practices and instructional materials support and extend students’ content and language learning?
- What successes are evident that support the development of learning, speaking, reading, and writing across the curriculum?

Several sources can be used to identify and record evidence for each instructional element. These include: (1) SEAL Walk-Throughs (2) SEAL Coach Facilitator classroom observations; (3) SEAL team observations; (4) District and site-level leadership observations; (5) Teachers’, Coachers’, and principals’ end of year reflections.

Record specific sources of evidence using short phrases or brief notes to provide as much detail as possible.

AREA 4A – INSTRUCTION: Rich Complex Oral and Academic Language

EVIDENCE:

INDICATOR 4.1 Teachers promote the use of academic and complex language to encourage students to elaborate using more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and complex language structures.

EVIDENCE:

Sample Descriptions:
- Teachers model the use of descriptive vocabulary in their own speaking.
- Teachers use complex sentences in their instruction.

Indicators 4.1 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

INDICATOR 4.2 All students are actively engaged in producing language, and the majority of instructional time allows for student talk rather than teacher talk.

Sample Descriptions:
- Classroom procedures and activities provide frequent opportunities for students to engage in social, academic, and independent discussions.

Indicators 4.2 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

INDICATOR 4.3 Students are exposed to and engaged in rich and academic complex language throughout the day.

Sample Descriptions:
- Students have opportunities to engage with complex language in a variety of settings.

Indicators 4.3 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

AREA 4B – INSTRUCTION: Text Engagement

EVIDENCE:

INDICATOR 4.1 Texts are selected and used to engage students in noticing, thinking about and appreciating good, interesting and expressive writing.

Sample Descriptions:
- Texts are selected to engage students in reading and writing.

Indicators 4.1 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

INDICATOR 4.2 Students become engaged in reading texts related to themes.

Sample Descriptions:
- Students are engaged in reading texts related to themes.

Indicators 4.2 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

INDICATOR 4.3 Shared, Guided and Independent Reading texts relate to themes.

Sample Descriptions:
- Teachers model texts related to themes.

Indicators 4.3 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability

AREA 4C – INSTRUCTION: Foundational Skills

EVIDENCE:

INDICATOR 4.1 Foundational skills are taught and reinforced with intentionality and are integrated with thematic content highlighted through numerous SEAL strategies.

Sample Descriptions:
- Teachers model and practice foundational skills.

Indicators 4.1 Rating:
- Not Implementing
- Partial Implementation
- Competent Implementation
- Sustainability
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### AREA 4D – INSTRUCTION: Writing

**Key Indicators and Descriptors**

**AREA 4D OVERALL RATING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Sample Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers regularly analyze written, shared, group, and independent writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students write in a variety of contexts, including for information, opinion, and creative expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are encouraged to revise and edit their writing to improve its clarity and effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 4.8** Children have multiple opportunities and supports to draw, dictate, and write about what they have learned, and experienced know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Children write in a variety of contexts, including for information, opinion, and creative expression. |
- Students are encouraged to revise and edit their writing to improve its clarity and effectiveness. |

### AREA 4E – INSTRUCTION: Primary Language Affirmation, Instruction & Support

**Key Indicators and Descriptors**

**AREA 4E OVERALL RATING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Sample Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers actively recognize, name, and celebrate student's use and mastery of two languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are encouraged to use both languages in the classroom and at home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 4.9** Bilingual or biliteracy is celebrated, affirmed, and encouraged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Teachers actively recognize, name, and celebrate student's use and mastery of two languages. |
- Students are encouraged to use both languages in the classroom and at home. |

**Indicator 4.10** Primary language instruction and support are used intentionally in all EL program models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Teachers actively recognize, name, and celebrate student's use and mastery of two languages. |
- Students are encouraged to use both languages in the classroom and at home. |

### AREA 5 – ENVIRONMENT

**SEAL schools and classrooms are affirming learning environments for students, educators and parents to engage in and support strong language and literacy development.**

**Induction Questions:**

- How do intercultural instruction evident in the curriculum and instruction? How do classroom practices support and extend students’ ownership of learning? How do collaborative skills developed and embodied in regular classroom practice?

**Racial specific source(s) of evidence using short phrases or brief notes to provide as much detail as possible.**

### AREA 5 – ENVIRONMENT

**Key Indicators and Descriptors**

**AREA 5 OVERALL RATING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Sample Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students engage in real-world and authentic learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are provided with opportunities to apply what they have learned in real-world contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 5.1** Interdisciplinary instruction is reflected in the physical environment and resources available to students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The classroom environment is engaging, student-centered, reflective of the themes, and designed to support student learning and discussion about the content. |
- The classroom environment includes “thinker’s corners,” “discovery centers,” and “language play centers (LPCs)” aligned to the themes. |
- The environment is cozy and inviting, with spaces for students to engage in various capacities and content. |

**Indicator 5.3** Collaborative practice and teamwork are evident throughout the instructional day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Students are engaged in collaborative activities, sharing ideas, strategies, and resources. |
- Students work in small groups to solve problems, complete assignments, and discuss their thinking. |

**Indicator 5.4** The student-centered environment affirms and reflects cultural and linguistic diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Students are encouraged to use their home language(s) and cultural practices in the classroom. |
- Students are provided with opportunities to share their cultural heritage and perspectives. |

---
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AREA 6 – FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

SEAL schools and classrooms are affirming environments that provide avenues for parents to support strong language and literacy development at home and school.

Family partnerships can be evidenced at the district, school, or classroom level. The SEAL Model includes expectations for strong home communication and regular opportunities for home-school collaboration.

Reflection Question: What significant changes have you observed regarding family partnerships as a result of SEAL implementation?

Record specific sources of evidence using shortphrases or brief notes to provide as much detail as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR 6.1 Regular communication occurs between teachers and families to promote engagement and participation in students’ education.</th>
<th>EVIDENCE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions: The School Teacher communicates with families about the benefits of bilingualism and the importance of continuing to use the home language. Thematic units include several “homework” assignments related to the theme designed to promote engagement and dialogue with the family. Regular and multiple forums for teachers-home communication are established (e.g., weekly newsletters, parent-teacher, bilingual boards, home visits, and family assignments related to the themes being studied).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6.1 Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Implementation</td>
<td>Partial Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR 6.2 Families participate in a variety of activities during and after school designed to engage families in the child’s education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Descriptions: Home-school shared resources such as Thematic Unit overviews and key vocabulary translation lists in English and primary language are available. Opportunities are frequently scheduled for families to visit the class or school to see children performing and celebrate student learning. Families are asked for input to design, develop, coordinate and carry out activities and events supporting classroom learning. Families come to the classroom and use their home language to teach maps, read books and conduct activities related to language and literacy. Families are given a variety of options and opportunities for how to contribute to the class (e.g., creating materials at home, etc.). Family Science Nights, Literacy Nights, and Community Celebrations provide opportunities for families to come to school to experience hands-on learning related to the major themes being studied. Families are invited to workshops to learn about activities that promote literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6.2 Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you!
The DOI Tool includes six focus areas. Data collection across these six areas involves different participant groups as delineated in the figure below. Given the scope of this study, the research team considered the feasibility of data collection and limited the focus to four of the six SEAL DOI areas as follows:

- **Area 1**: Leadership
- **Area 2**: Professional Learning
- **Area 3**: Curriculum
- **Area 6**: Family Partnerships

### S2. Appendix B
**Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool Data Collection Process**

- **Area 1 – Leadership**
  - **Interviewer**: SEAL District Relations Coordinator
  - **Interviewee(s)**: District Leadership Site-Level Principal

- **Area 2 – Professional Learning**
  - **Interviewer**: SEAL Coordinating Trainer
  - **Interviewee**: SEAL Coach Facilitator

- **Area 3 – Curriculum**
  - **Interviewer**: SEAL Coordinating Trainer
  - **Interviewee**: SEAL Coach Facilitator

- **Area 6 – Family Partnerships**
  - **Observer**: SEAL Coach Facilitator
  - **Observee**: SEAL Teachers

**SEAL Research Director**
- Reviews Evidence, Oversees Assignment of Ratings.

**SEAL Research Director**
- Collects ratings, Calculates average.
The SEAL District Leader/Site Leader Interview Protocol was developed by the LMU Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) as part of the Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool data collection processes. Once conducted, interviewers determine a rating score substantiated by evidence statements from interview notes and other supporting documents/artifacts. Ratings and key notes are transferred to an electronic rating sheet and converted into a score along a 4-point scale for each area. The protocol was frontloaded with detailed directions and a detailed script to ensure consistency and to standardize data collection across interviewers given that, by design, interviewers for the DOI Tool were from the SEAL Leadership and Management Teams.

S2. Appendix C
Depth of Implementation (DOI), SEAL District Leader/Site Leader Interview Protocol

### INTERVIEW INSTRUCTIONS:

**Before scheduling the interview:**
1. Consult with the SEAL Research Director to review interviewer selection criteria and procedures.
2. For research/evaluation purposes, coach facilitators are interviewed if the school site has completed the SEAL 3-year training cycle.
3. Be sure to send an email detailing the process and include the consent form/link.
4. Include sealflp.org and sealleadership@sealflp.org in email communication to track interview schedules. Update the google doc interview tracking sheet: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AQL7QYQdIYs9ZGZ0TEFZQU1VQVZjZnltcHlPaGJ0ZGx5ZnI#gid=7
5. Review the DOI Tool areas emphasized in this interview and remember that the interview is only one source of evidence that will be used to provide a rating on the DOI Tool.

**Before beginning the interview:**
1. Thank the interviewer and explain that the responses will be shared with the SEAL, District Lead and SEAL Research Director to record a description of the SEAL Depth of Implementation as well as to determine levels of implementation for each DOI area.
2. Confirm that the interviewer has completed the electronic consent form.
3. If you are recording the interview, be sure to inform the interviewer that the recording will be used for research purposes only and information will be reported in aggregate form.
4. Clarify that your ROLE in this interview process is different from your role as SEAL Coordinating Trainer. As such, you will follow the interview protocol carefully to ensure consistency in research/data collection processes.

**Follow the protocol.** Ask each question in order, just as it is written, allow interviewee to answer fully. Redirect or rephrase the question if they go off topic.

**When to follow up.** Ask follow-up questions if they're required for getting the interviewee to answer the question directly and fully. A good, all-purpose follow-up to use when an answer is minimal is “Can you elaborate?” Ask for clarifications if something is unclear.

**When to request an example.** If the interviewee has already provided an example when answering a question, there is no need to re-prompt, although it is always okay to ask for additional examples.

**If interviewee inadvertently advances to a later topic.** If interviewee provides an answer to a question that is coming up later in the interview, either:
1. Let him/her respond fully, then when you get to the question in the protocol confirm the answer (see below for strategies);
2. say you’ll get back to that item a little later in the interview; make a note on the protocol so that when you get to that question you can say something like, “OK, you started telling me about XXX a few minutes ago…”.

**If the interviewee has already answered a question.** If you know the interviewee has already answered a question in the context of answering a previous question, here are your options:
1. Say, “I think you provided an answer to this question, but let me just be sure… (state the question)”
2. Say, “I believe you’ve covered this already, but if someone were to ask you directly, (state the question), how would you respond?”
3. Omit the question and state clearly that the question was not asked but you know the answer because it was answered elsewhere or the answer was obvious due to something the interviewee had said. Cite and cross-reference relevant parts of the interview.

**Manage time carefully.** There are 3 AREAS in the protocol. You have to spend NO MORE than an average of 10 mins on each AREA; otherwise you will go over the 30 mins – 1 hour limit for the interview. Be aware of time. Take a watch or timer with you.

Take notes during the interview so you can track responses and refer back to them as needed, e.g., “A few minutes ago you mentioned that… I’d like to go back to that now.”

---

**OPENING SCRIPT.** “Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed as part of the SEAL Depth of Implementation data gathering. We are conducting this data collection to understand the processes and changes that have taken place to improve systems and instructional programs for English Learners as a result of SEAL Implementation in your district/school. Your perspective is extremely important for helping us understand the impact of the project. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions, and you are certainly under no obligation to answer. We simply want your perspectives as a district/site administrator. I am confirming that you completed an electronic consent form and that we will record this session for informational purposes only. All data collection across interviews will be reported in aggregate form. [If concern is expressed about recording or participating, acknowledge that the interviewee has the right to withdraw from the process at any point during the interview]

I hope to complete the interview as efficiently as possible—by taking no longer than 30 minutes – 1 hour. Therefore, I’ll keep us on track with questions and timing and follow the interview protocol carefully to ensure consistency in the research/data collection processes. As a reminder, my ROLE in this interview process is different from my roles as a SEAL District Relations Administrator/Coordinating Trainer.

From time to time I may summarize what I’m hearing, then ask if I’ve represented your answer accurately. I’ll be asking you about: 1) District Leadership; 2) Site-Level Leadership; and 3) Family Partnerships. Do you have any questions about the process before we begin?”
## PART 1. DISTRICT-LEVEL LEADERSHIP (DOI AREA 1A)

1) What type of district-level support and leadership have you observed and provided in implementing SEAL?
   a. Please give me some examples.

2) Are there initiatives/plans to address the needs of ELs taking place in your district that are aligned to the SEAL model? Explain.

3) What have been the obstacles? Any areas of concern?

## PART 2. SITE-LEVEL LEADERSHIP (DOI AREA 1B)

1) What type of site-level support and leadership have you observed and provided in implementing SEAL?
   a. Please give me some examples.

2) Are there initiatives/plans to address the needs of ELs taking place in your school(s) that are aligned to the SEAL model? Explain.

3) What have been the obstacles? Any areas of concern?

## PART 3. FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS (DOI AREA 6)

1) What significant changes have you observed regarding family partnerships as a result of SEAL implementation? Think about district-wide, school-wide and classroom level examples

4) What have been the obstacles? Any areas of concern?

## OPEN QUESTIONS (DOI TOOL AREAS 2, 3)

1) How would you describe changes in professional learning for teachers of English Learners as a result of your district/school’s participation in SEAL?

2) What are the most significant changes in curriculum implementation for English Learners in your district/at your school site as a result of your participation in SEAL?

## GENERALIZABILITY CHECK

To what extent do you think the views you have expressed today represent those of your district/school as a whole?

## WRAP-UP

Thank the interviewee and explain that the responses will be shared with the SEAL District Lead and SEAL Research Director to record a description of the SEAL Depth of Implementation as well as to determine levels of implementation for each area.
The SEAL Coach-Facilitator Interview Protocol was developed by the LMU Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL) as part of the Depth of Implementation (DOI) Tool data collection processes. Once conducted, interviewers determine a rating score substantiated by evidence statements from interview notes and other supporting documents/artifacts. The protocol was frontloaded with detailed directions and a detailed script to ensure consistency and to standardize data collection across interviewers given that, by design, interviewers for the DOI Tool were from the SEAL Leadership and Management Teams. Interviewees were instructed to ask for information specific to each site in cases where the Coach-Facilitator oversees more than one site.

S2. Appendix D
Depth of Implementation (DOI), SEAL Coach-Facilitator Interview Protocol

**SEAL Coach Facilitator Interview Protocol**

**Depth of Implementation Tool**

**Before scheduling the interview:**
1. Consult with the SEAL Research Director to review interviewee selection criteria and procedures.
2. For research/evaluation purposes, coach facilitators are interviewed if the school site has completed the SEAL 3-year training cycle.
3. Be sure to send an email detailing the process and include the consent form(s).
4. Include ceel@lmu.edu and interviewprotocol@lmu.edu in email communication to track interview schedules.
   Update the google docs interview tracking sheet: [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0ApxZeHer4NqvbHlHc3F5N2xhNzBSSnl0OFVJQlBOSzJrUysnENTy#new]
5. Review the DOI Tool area emphasized in this interview and remember that the interview is only one source of evidence that will be used to provide a rating on the DOI Tool.

**INTERVIEW INSTRUCTIONS (CONDUCTED BY SEAL COORDINATING TRAINER):**

**Before beginning the interview:**
1. Thank the interviewee and explain that the responses will be shared with the SEAL District Lead and SEAL Research Director to record a description of the SEAL Depth of Implementation as well as to determine levels of implementation for each DOI area.
2. Confirm that the interviewee has completed the electronic consent form.
3. If recording the interview, be sure to inform the interviewee that the recording will be used for research purposes only and information will be reported in aggregate form.
4. Clarify that your ROLE in this interview process is different from your role as SEAL Coordinating Trainer. As such, you will follow the interview protocol carefully to ensure consistency in the data collection processes.
5. Follow the protocol. Ask each question in order, just as it is written, allow interviewee to answer fully. Redirect or rephrase the question if it gets off-topic.

**When to follow up:**
Ask follow-up/elaboration questions if they are required for getting the interviewee to answer the question directly and fully. A good, all-purpose follow-up to use when an answer is minimal is “Can you elaborate?” Ask for clarifications if something is unclear.

**When to request an example:**
If the interviewee has already provided an example when answering a question, there is no need to re-prompt, although it is always ok to ask for additional examples.

If interviewee inadvertently advances to a later topic, the interviewee provides an answer to a question that is coming up later in the interview, either:
1. let/refrain respond fully, then when you get to the question in the protocol confirm the answer (see below for strategy)
2. say you’ll get back to that item a little later in the interview, make a note on the protocol so that when you get to that question you can say something like, “Oh, you started telling me about IXX a few minutes ago...”

**If the interviewee has already answered a question:**
If you know the interviewee has already answered a question in the context of answering a previous question, here are your options:
1. Say: “I think you provided an answer to this question, but let me just be sure... [state the question]”
2. Say: “I believe you’ve covered this already, but if someone were to ask you directly, [state the question], how would you respond?”
3. Outline the question and state clearly that the question was not asked but you know the answer because it was answered elsewhere, or the answer was obvious due to something the interviewee had said.

**Manage time carefully.** There are 3 parts in the protocol. You have to spend NO MORE than an average of 10 mins on each part, otherwise you will go over the 30 mins – 1 hour for the interview. Be aware of time. Take a watch or timer with you.

**Take notes during the interview** so you can track responses and refer back to them as needed, e.g., “A few minutes ago you mentioned that... I’d like to go back to that now.”

**OPENING SCRIPT:** “Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed as part of the SEAL Depth of Implementation data gathering. We are conducting this data collection to understand the processes and changes that have taken place to improve systems and instructional programs for English Learners as a result of SEAL Implementation in your district/school. Your perspective is extremely important for helping us understand the impact of the project. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions, and you are certainly under no obligation to answer. We simply want your perspectives as a SEAL Coach Facilitator. I’m confirming that you completed an electronic consent form and that we will record this session for informational purposes only. All data collection across interviews will be reported in aggregate form. If you are uncomfortable or do not want to answer a question, please let me know. I will respect your request. I will be recording this interview for the purpose of data collection, and you are under no obligation to answer. If you are uncomfortable or do not want to answer a question, please let me know. I will respect your request. I will be recording this interview for the purpose of data collection, and you are under no obligation to answer. I hope to complete the interview as efficiently and as possible—by taking no longer than 30 minutes – 1 hour.

Therefore, I’ll keep on track with questions and timing and follow the interview protocol carefully to ensure consistency in the data collection processes. As a reminder, my ROLE in this interview process is different from my role as a SEAL Coordinating Trainer.

From time to time I may summarize what I’m hearing, then ask if I’ve represented your answer accurately. I’ll be asking you about: 1) Professional Learning; 2) Curriculum and; 3) Family Partnerships. Do you have any questions about the process before we begin?"
### PART 1. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING (DO NOT AREA 2)

**IF THE COACH FACILITATOR OVERSEES MORE THAN ONE SITE, BE SURE TO INCLUDE INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO EACH SITE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE #1</th>
<th>SITE #2</th>
<th>SITE #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. What aspects of SEAL professional learning have supported the implementation of SEAL at your site (e.g. mentors, coaching, coach meetings, unit development days, technical assistance, coaching)?
   - Describe how.

2. What has been done to align SEAL and other district/school-level professional development efforts?
   - Explain.

3. What have been the obstacles? Any areas of concern?

### PART 2. CURRICULUM (DO NOT AREA 3)

**IF THE COACH FACILITATOR OVERSEES MORE THAN ONE SITE, BE SURE TO INCLUDE INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO EACH SITE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE #1</th>
<th>SITE #2</th>
<th>SITE #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Describe some successful challenges from the way the SEAL curriculum has been developed and planned.

2. Describe the quality and completeness of the SEAL thematic units teachers have developed to-date.

3. How do teachers at your site conduct ongoing review and refinement of curriculum?

4. What have been the obstacles? Any areas of concern?

### PART 3. FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS (DO NOT AREA 4)

**IF THE COACH FACILITATOR OVERSEES MORE THAN ONE SITE, BE SURE TO INCLUDE INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO EACH SITE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE #1</th>
<th>SITE #2</th>
<th>SITE #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. What significant changes have you observed regarding family partnerships as a result of SEAL implementation? Think about district-wide, school-wide and classroom level examples.

2. What have been the obstacles? Any areas of concern?

### OPEN QUESTIONS (DO NOT AREA 2)

**IF THE COACH FACILITATOR OVERSEES MORE THAN ONE SITE, BE SURE TO INCLUDE INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO EACH SITE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE #1</th>
<th>SITE #2</th>
<th>SITE #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. What type of support and evidence of DISTRICT-LEVEL leadership have you observed? Are there areas of concern? If so, explain.

2. What type of support and evidence of SITES-LEVEL leadership have you observed? Are there areas of concern? If so, explain.

### GENERALIZABILITY CHECK

To what extent do you think the views you have expressed today represent those of the SEAL team in your school/district as a whole?

### WRAP-UP

Thank the interviewee and explain that the responses will be shared with the SEAL District Lead and SEAL Research Director to record a description of the SEAL Depth of Implementation as well as to determine levels of implementation for each area.
Section 2 – Appendix E
Depth of Implementation (DOI) Rating Results by District

Tables E1–E5 below detail DOI rating results for each of the five California school districts that participated in our investigation of the Depth of Implementation (DOI) of the SEAL Model. The scores were derived from various artifacts, observations, and in large part from interviews with school leads, and Coach-Facilitators. Interviewers consisted of various members of the SEAL Leadership and management teams. School-level results are aggregated by DOI Area and indicator. These may provide additional insights and serve to guide discussion related to other areas of inquiry.

S2. Table E1
DOI Ratings for District A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>AREA 1B: SITE-LEVEL SYSTEMS</th>
<th>1.4 School policies &amp; decisions consider SEAL values and goals</th>
<th>1.5 Articulation, continuity, and coherence</th>
<th>1.6 Planning to ensure refinement &amp; sustainability</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>AREA 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</th>
<th>2.1 EL research-based practices</th>
<th>2.2 Reflective practice</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach (n=2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach (n=2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table E1 (cont’d)

**DOI Ratings for District A**

**AREA 3 - CURRICULUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer *</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>3.1 Standards-based and interdisciplinary</th>
<th>3.2 Comprehensive development of thematic units</th>
<th>3.3 Curriculum plans &amp; thematic units reviewed</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach (n=2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach (n=2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA 6: FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer *</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>6.1 Communication between teachers and families</th>
<th>6.2 Family participation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach (n=2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach (n=2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DRA= District Relations Administrator; DT=District Trainer; DISD=Director of Strategic Design—all members of SEAL leadership and management.
### S2. Table E2

**DOI Ratings for District B**

#### AREA 1B: SITE-LEVEL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>1.4 School policies &amp; decisions consider SEAL values and goals</th>
<th>1.5 Articulation, continuity, and coherence</th>
<th>1.6 Planning to ensure refinement &amp; sustainability</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>2.1 EL research-based practices</th>
<th>2.2 Reflective practice</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 3 - CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>3.1 Standards-based and interdisciplinary</th>
<th>3.2 Comprehensive development of thematic units</th>
<th>3.3 Curriculum plans &amp; thematic units reviewed</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 6: FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>6.1 Communication between teachers and families</th>
<th>6.2 Family participation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a DRA= District Relations Administrator; DT=District Trainer; DISD=Director of Strategic Design—all members of SEAL leadership and management.*
### S2. Table E3

**DOI Ratings for District C**

#### AREA 1B: SITE-LEVEL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>1.4 School policies &amp; decisions consider SEAL values and goals</th>
<th>1.5 Articulation, continuity, and coherence</th>
<th>1.6 Planning to ensure refinement &amp; sustainability</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>2.1 EL research-based practices</th>
<th>2.2 Reflective practice</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 3 - CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>3.1 Standards-based and interdisciplinary</th>
<th>3.2 Comprehensive development of thematic units</th>
<th>3.3 Curriculum plans &amp; thematic units reviewed</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 6: FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>6.1 Communication between teachers and families</th>
<th>6.2 Family participation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a DRA= District Relations Administrator; DT=District Trainer; DISD=Director of Strategic Design—all members of SEAL leadership and management.
## S2. Table E4

### DOI Ratings for District D

#### AREA 1B: SITE-LEVEL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>1.4 School policies &amp; decisions consider SEAL values and goals</th>
<th>1.5 Articulation, continuity, and coherence</th>
<th>1.6 Planning to ensure refinement &amp; sustainability</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>2.1 EL research-based practices</th>
<th>2.2 Reflective practice</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 3 - CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>3.1 Standards-based and interdisciplinary</th>
<th>3.2 Comprehensive development of thematic units</th>
<th>3.3 Curriculum plans &amp; thematic units reviewed</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREA 6: FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>6.1 Communication between teachers and families</th>
<th>6.2 Family participation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DRA= District Relations Administrator; DT=District Trainer; DISD=Director of Strategic Design—all members of SEAL leadership and management.
### S2. Table E5

**DOI Ratings for District E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>School Policies &amp; decisions consider SEAL values and goals</th>
<th>Articulation, continuity, and coherence</th>
<th>Planning to ensure refinement &amp; sustainability</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>EL research-based practices</th>
<th>Reflective practice</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA 3 - CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer a</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Standards-based and interdisciplinary</th>
<th>Comprehensive development of thematic units</th>
<th>Curriculum plans &amp; thematic units reviewed</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table E5 (cont’d)

### DOI Ratings for District E

**AREA 6: FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interviewer(^a)</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>6.1 Communication between teachers and families</th>
<th>6.2 Family participation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>SEAL Trainer</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rater for School 3 was unable to provide a score for Areas 2 and 3.

\(^a\) DRA= District Relations Administrator; DT=District Trainer; DISD=Director of Strategic Design—all members of SEAL leadership and management.
Section 2 - Appendix F
SEAL District Leader 2018 Survey Instrument

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL District Leader Survey and the SEAL Principal Survey 2018 (See Section 2–Appendix H). The survey items were developed so that the two surveys aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI). Both surveys included items focused on district lead and principal perspectives of implementation of SEAL at the district and site-level. The District Leader Survey consisted of these sections:

- Part A: Experience with SEAL (2 questions)
- Part B: Experiences as an Administrator (4 questions)
- Part C: Experience as a Teacher (3 questions)
- Part D: Education and Authorization (3 questions)
- Part E: District-Level Implementation of SEAL (4 questions)
- Part F: Site-Level Implementation of SEAL (18 questions)

S2. Appendix F
SEAL District Leader 2018 Survey Instrument
Section 2 | Appendix F

SEAL District Leader 2018 Survey Instrument

Part D: Education and Authorisation

11. My highest degree is:
   - [ ] BA/BSc
   - [ ] MA or M.Ed.
   - [ ] EdD or Ph.D.
   - Other (please specify):

12. I hold the following authorizations for English Learners: (Please check all that apply.)
   - Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential w/ Authorization or CLAD Endorsement
   - Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential w/ Bilingual Authorization or CLAD Endorsement
   - Bilingual Education Specialist Credential with English Learner Authorization
   - CLAD Certificate
   - Bilingual Authorization
   - Language Development Specialist (LDI) Certificate
   - ELD Authorization
   - Language Certificate of Competence (LCC)
   - Dual Language Teaching Credential in World Language (LDL) continuum
   - Supplementary Authorization in English as a Second Language (ESL) or Introductory ESL

13. Our district has participated in SEAL since:
   - 2010-11
   - 2014-15
   - 2017-18

Please refer to the following chart to answer Question 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Overall at this time, which of the four levels of implementation best describes your district’s implementation of SEAL in your district?
   - Minimal Implementation
   - Consistent Implementation
   - Partial Implementation
   - Sustainability

17. Are there barriers that are preventing greater implementation of SEAL in your district?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, please describe the barriers and explain what support or changes would be needed to reduce the barriers.
S2. Appendix F (continued)
SEAL District Leader 2018 Survey Instrument

22a. Teachers promote the use of academic vocabulary.
22b. Teachers promote the use of complex language structures.
22c. Teachers use open-ended and higher-order questions to encourage students to elaborate, use more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and language structures.

23a. Teachers engage students in reading, talking about, and appreciating good, interesting, and expressive writing.
23b. Teachers explicitly teach children reading comprehension strategies across texts using literature and informational texts related to the theme.

24a. Teachers implement strategies to ensure students produce authentic writing across the curriculum.
24b. Student writing is published and celebrated.

25. Please give examples of an increase or improvement in Curriculum and Instruction:
**SEAL District Leader 2018 Survey Instrument**

**Section 2 | Appendix F (continued)**

**SEAL District Leader Feedback Survey**
May-June 2018

Please indicate how many of the SEAL schools in your district have participated in SEAL for at least 3 years (excluding this year) reflect the following SEAL indicators, or mark Don't Know. Select one response for each item.

**36. Family Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>A Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36a. Regular communication occurs between teachers and families to promote engagement and participation in students education.</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36b. The school/teacher communicates with families about the benefits of bilingualism and the importance of continuing to use the home language.</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36c. Parents participate in a variety of activities during and after school designed to engage families in the child’s education.</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Ratings" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Please give examples of an increase or improvement in Family Partnerships:

---

35. How are you currently monitoring and measuring progress of SEAL implementation?

---

34. Are you going to refine how you measure progress of SEAL implementation? If so, how?

---

33. Are there any other factors or information you would like to communicate to SEAL?
In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL District Leader Implementation Survey. The survey items were developed so that this survey and the SEAL Principal Implementation Survey (See Section 2–Appendix H) aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI).

Of 15 SEAL Cohort 1–3 school districts, 15 district leaders responded to this survey. However, not all district leaders provided responses to all the survey items. The response percentages given are based on the total number of respondents for each survey item. Tables G1–G13 display self-reported demographics by district leader respondents. Tables G14–G36 present district leaders’ perspectives on the implementation of SEAL at the district and school levels. Tables G37-G39 list the district level and site level implementation survey items by mean rating.

S2. Table G1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin McKinley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table G2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table G3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Administrator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G4

**Experience as a District Administrator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G5

**District Administrator Responsibilities for SEI or ELM Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G6

**District Administrator Responsibilities for Bilingual Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G7

**Principal Experience at the Following Grade Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G8
**Teacher Experience at the following Grade Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G9
**Teaching Experience in a Bilingual Program at the following Grade Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G10
**Teaching Experience in an SEI and/or ELM Program for ELs at the following Grade Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G11
**Highest Degrees Reached by District Leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Achieved</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA or BS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA or M.Ed.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table G12
**Authorizations Held for English Learners by District Leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential with L Authorization or CLAD Emphasis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential with a Bilingual authorization or BCLAD Emphasis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist Instruction Credential with English Learner Authorization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Cross-cultural Specialist Credential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAD Certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Authorization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development Specialist (LDS) Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCLAD Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject Teaching Credential in World Language: ELD content area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Authorization in English as a Second Language (ESL) or Introductory ESL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential with L Authorization or CLAD Emphasis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## S2. Table G13
**District Participation in SEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 2013-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G14

*District Leaders’ Perception of Their District’s Implementation of SEAL at the District Level (N=15)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared version of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (<em>i.e.</em> Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (<em>i.e.</em> Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. SEAL is aligned with other District Initiatives.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Resources are allocated for implementation and continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Intentional district planning is conducted to improve the implementation of SEAL.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table G15

District Leaders’ Examples of Increased/Improved SEAL Implementation at the District Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased dissemination in district</td>
<td>“This year we have included our SEAL coaching and staff in our district wide PD around ELD and incorporated SEAL into our EL master plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased district-wide alignment and planned sustainability</td>
<td>“We are coming to the final year of implementation and are developing a district-wide sustainability plan. We continue to work with our site administrators to further align SEAL to school-wide practices. Selected strategies have been included in our instructional units for summer programming.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased participation, collaboration and continued funding</td>
<td>“Time is allocated for teachers to have weekly collaboration meetings during the school day focused on their SEAL implementation. Coaches continue to have ongoing collaboration meetings to support each other. Principals, district leaders and coaches actively participate in SEAL convening meetings. Summer Bridge continues to be a priority and included in summer planning and budgeting. More and more teachers are asking to be coached and mentored from the SEAL coach. With a 2-million-dollar budget decrease, district continues to allocate funding for SEAL coaches.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased support</td>
<td>“Literacy coaches to support SEAL strategies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased teacher understanding</td>
<td>“Now that teachers have a better understanding of what the strategies are, they are asking questions that are about the &quot;why&quot; behind a strategy. They are seeing the big picture of how it all works together including designated ELD.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table G16

District Leaders’ Perception of Their District’s Level of Implementation of SEAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Implementation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table G17

District Leaders’ Assert or Dissent of SEAL Implementation Barriers in Their Districts and Their Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Responses</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### District Leaders’ Descriptions of Barriers and What Changes Would be Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in leadership</td>
<td>“Change in leadership is a current barrier; I am not sure what would be needed to reduce the barrier.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision makers’ lack of direct experience with SEAL</td>
<td>“Decision makers do not have or benefit from direct experiences in classrooms with SEAL methods and chain of command is strictly reinforced and followed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding/Budget</td>
<td>“Budget.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Funding.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Funding for coaching has been compromised with the budget reductions instituted for 18-19. “It will be a challenge to maintain ongoing support.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Funding. Teachers wanting to participate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Our biggest barrier is monetary.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased implementation</td>
<td>“I am interested in implementing the appropriate strategies at the secondary level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased teacher workload</td>
<td>“Ongoing issues about the additional workload SEAL causes for classroom teachers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of unified participation from site principals</td>
<td>“Difference in principal understanding, accountability and expectations at the site.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of participant buy-in and participation</td>
<td>“Some belief that &quot;it does not work&quot;. So, not all have the same level of implementation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of principal participation and staff numbers</td>
<td>“Reduction in coaches. Principal expectation and monitoring. Subs available for training and UDD.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G19

**District Leaders’ Perception of Site Level Systems (n=14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>A Few (%)</th>
<th>Some (%)</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL values, goals, and principles are reflected in our SEAL schools/classrooms.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The value of bilingualism and cultural diversity is communicated in our school/classrooms.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EL program models <em>(i.e. Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream)</em> are articulated and implemented.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. EL program models are monitored and evaluated.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. There is coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The Coach/Facilitator has dedicated and sufficient support for SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Overall, Intentional planning is used to understand and assess the overall impact of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Site plans focus on implementation and refinement of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Site plans focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. PD and communities of practice focus on implementation and refinement SEAL practices.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guides selection of assessments and analysis of data.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Regular meetings between district and school staff are held to discuss depth of implementation and identify areas of strength and need.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G20

**District Leaders’ Examples of Increased/Improved SEAL Implementation at the School Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create common language</td>
<td>“All schools are now implementing SEAL which will strengthen implementation and create common language.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection aligned with other initiatives</td>
<td>“All sites now have received training so it is easier to leverage principal discussion around implementation data collection aligned with other initiatives.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand across grade levels at school site</td>
<td>“Expanding to 4/5 at Holly Oak”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand across grade levels at school site</td>
<td>“With collaboration being added this school year, there has been an explicit effort to articulate SEAL strategies across grade levels at each school site.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved principal support</td>
<td>“Principals are more knowledgeable of how to support SEAL implementation at their school sites. The principal convenings are a great resource.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased growth opportunities</td>
<td>“Instructional leadership can improve and ownership from district to site is an opportunity for growth.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G21

**District Leaders’ Perception of Professional Learning (n=13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n</th>
<th>A Few n</th>
<th>Some n</th>
<th>All n</th>
<th>Don’t Know n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL School PD systems and time allotted for SEAL PD allow for continuous improvement to strengthen and deepen SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(62%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers engage in reflective practice to identify and strengthen professional areas of growth related to SEAL.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(38%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers are responsive to peer or coach classroom observers, including SEAL Coach Facilitators and Trainers.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G22

**District Leaders’ Examples of Increased/Improved SEAL Professional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased participation and support for site leaders</td>
<td>“Increased participation of site leaders attending SEAL Convening. Implementation of instructional rounds is assisting leaders in looking for depth of implementation of SEAL strategies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased PD for all cohorts</td>
<td>“The district has supported six unit-development days for all cohorts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased teacher planning time</td>
<td>“Principals have allowed continuing teachers additional planning time to support unit development and designated ELD lessons.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G23

**District Leaders’ Perception of Curriculum (n=13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>A Few n</th>
<th>A Few (%)</th>
<th>Some n</th>
<th>Some (%)</th>
<th>All n</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know n</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are standards-based and interdisciplinary.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are integrated throughout the day.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers implement SEAL units that are thematically and intentionally organized to develop language.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Designated ELD is content-based to include what students need to know to be successful across the curriculum.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Teachers have a Year-Long Plan to address and integrate the standards across curricular areas.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G24

**District Leaders’ Perception of Rich, Complex Oral and Academic Language Instruction (n=13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>A Few n</th>
<th>A Few (%)</th>
<th>Some n</th>
<th>Some (%)</th>
<th>All n</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know n</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers promote the use of academic vocabulary.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers promote the use of complex language structures.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers use open-ended and higher order questions to encourage students to elaborate, using more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and language structures.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G25

**District Leaders’ Perception of Text Engagement Instruction (n=13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n</th>
<th>None (%)</th>
<th>A Few n</th>
<th>A Few (%)</th>
<th>Some n</th>
<th>Some (%)</th>
<th>All n</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know n</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers engage students in noticing, talking about and appreciating good, interesting and expressive writing.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers explicitly teach children reading comprehension strategies across texts using literature and informational text related to the theme.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G26

**District Leaders’ Perception of Writing Instruction (n=13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n (%)</th>
<th>A Few n (%)</th>
<th>Some n (%)</th>
<th>All n (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers implement strategies to ensure students produce authentic writing across the curriculum.</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students’ writing is published and celebrated.</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G27

**District Leaders’ Examples of Increased/Improved Curriculum and Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added writing instruction support and implementation</td>
<td>“We have added support this year to writing instruction that supports planning across schools. This adds to calibration of implementation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater district-wide implementation; new ELA/ELD literacy program aligns with SEAL units</td>
<td>“There is greater implementation throughout the district in all grades; very few classrooms are not showing progress implementing SEAL. Our current area of support in the integration of our new ELA/ELD literacy program so that it aligns with our SEAL units; we have made great progress.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print-rich classrooms and increased use of leveled informational text</td>
<td>“Print-rich classrooms- anchor charts that serve as a resource for student learning. Increased use of leveled informational text.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developed units have the standards at the forefront and Teachers understand the standards</td>
<td>“Teachers have a deep understanding of the history/social studies standards, as well as, the Next Generation Science Standards. The units that have been developed have the standards at the forefront.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G28

**District Leaders’ Perception of Primary Language Affirmation, Instruction, and Support (n=13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n (%)</th>
<th>A Few n (%)</th>
<th>Some n (%)</th>
<th>All n (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers, children and families celebrate, affirm, and encourage biliteracy or bilingualism.</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Primary language instruction or support is used intentionally in all EL program models <em>(i.e. Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream)</em>.</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers follow an articulated EL program model <em>(i.e., Dual Language, Bilingual, SEI), as indicated by classroom instruction, resources, materials, and use of language (primary and/or English)</em>.</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G29

#### District Leaders’ Perception of Assessment (n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n (%)</th>
<th>A Few n (%)</th>
<th>Some n (%)</th>
<th>All n (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers use strategies designed to gather formative information on student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.</td>
<td>13 0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Summative assessments are recorded based on students’ demonstration of mastery through culminating activities including oral presentations, collaborative projects, and written work.</td>
<td>13 0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G30

#### District Leaders’ Perception of Environment (n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None n (%)</th>
<th>A Few n (%)</th>
<th>Some n (%)</th>
<th>All n (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Interdisciplinary instruction is reflected in the physical environment and resources available to students.</td>
<td>13 0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The environment is student-centered and affirms and reflects cultural and linguistic diversity.</td>
<td>13 0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Collaborative practice and teamwork are evident throughout the instructional day.</td>
<td>13 0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table G31

#### District Leaders’ Examples of Increased/Improved Affirmation and Use of Primary Language, Assessment, and Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication with bilingual classes; closer to DLI implementation</td>
<td>“Continued dialogue with and between our bilingual classes as we move closer to DLI implementation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of teachers implementing</td>
<td>“We are in the area of MOST teachers implementing and understanding how to implement throughout the instructional day.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table G32

District Leaders’ Perception of Family Partnerships (n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Regular communication occurs between teachers and families to promote engagement and participation in students’ education.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The school/teacher communicates with families about the benefits of bilingualism and the importance of continuing to use the home language.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Families participate in a variety of activities during and after school designed to engage families in the child’s education.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table G33

District Leaders’ Examples of Increased/Improved Affirmation and Use of Primary Language, Assessment, and Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallery walks</td>
<td>“Most sites continuing with gallery walks.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery Walks; extracurricular literacy programs</td>
<td>‘SEAL Gallery Walks. Summer and afterschool Biliteracy Programs.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery walks and Parent workshops</td>
<td>“Parent workshops and gallery walks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery walks; Principals support teachers with family connections</td>
<td>“Gallery walks have been a success. They are calendared at the unit development days, and principals follow up to support teachers in connecting with families.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent classes; opportunities to practice conversational English</td>
<td>“Charla Cafés. Parent Leadership classes.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G34
**District Leaders’ Perception of Impact at SEAL Schools as a Result of Implementation of the SEAL Model (n=12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>7 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. More joyful, confident and engaged students.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Greater students access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Greater English language proficiency.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Greater impact on students in other areas <em>(affective, attendance, etc.)</em></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (62%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table G35

**District Leaders’ Examples of Their Current Progress Monitoring and Measuring of SEAL Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach Implementation Tool</td>
<td>“Coaches have completed the Implementation Tool for all sites.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment and Principal feedback</td>
<td>“Principal feedback. Monitoring student progress on specific indicators of our Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations and conversations</td>
<td>“Walkthroughs, conversations in PLC, and goals to use the DOI tool for next year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Coach observations</td>
<td>“Walkthroughs with principals and coaches.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals and other district staff via High Leverage Pedagogical Practices</td>
<td>“The principals and other district staff including coaches do focused observations using the High Leverage Pedagogical Practices as the lens.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized evaluations via CDE</td>
<td>“CELDT, ELPAC, DRA, STAR Ren.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## S2. Table G36

**District Leaders’ Description of Refined Measures of Progression of SEAL Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>“DOI tool”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Goal to focus intentionally on goal areas from the DO tool for walkthroughs next year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Looking into this for 18-19”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>“We do need to look at progress on teacher level. Depth of implementation and students overall progress. By site is not helpful unless all teachers are in year 4 for example.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Yes, in development.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table G38

*Results for District Level Implementation Survey Items, by Mean Rating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Level Implementation Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 1 = <em>strongly disagree</em> to 4 = <em>strongly agree</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared version of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SEAL is aligned with other District Initiatives.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources are allocated for implementation and continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intentional district planning is conducted to improve the implementation of SEAL.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results for Site Level Implementation Survey Items, by Mean Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Level Implementation Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 1 = <em>none</em>, 2 = <em>a few schools</em>, 3 = <em>some schools</em>, 4 = <em>all schools</em></td>
<td>District Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>N = 15</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SEAL values, goals, and principles are reflected in our SEAL schools/classrooms.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The value of bilingualism and cultural diversity is communicated in our school/classroom.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EL program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream) are articulated and implemented.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EL program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream) are monitored and evaluated.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Coach/Facilitator has dedicated and sufficient support for implementation.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall, intentional planning is used to understand and assess the impact of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Site plans focus on implementation and refinement of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Site plans focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PD and communities of practice focus on implementation and refinement SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guides selection of assessments and analysis of data.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SEAL School PD systems and time allotted for SEAL PD allow for continuous improvement to strengthen and deepen SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers engage in reflective practice to identify and strengthen professional areas of growth related to SEAL.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers are responsive to peer or coach classroom observers, including SEAL Coach Facilitators and Trainers.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are standards-based and interdisciplinary.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are integrated throughout the day.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers implement SEAL units that are thematically and intentionally organized to develop language.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Designated ELD is content-based to include what students need to know to be successful across the curriculum.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Teachers have a Year Long Plan to address and integrate the standards across curricular areas.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Level Implementation Survey Items</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale:</strong> 1 = <em>none</em>, 2 = <em>a few schools</em>, 3 = <em>some schools</em>, 4 = <em>all schools</em> \nDistrict Leaders N = 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Teachers promote the use of academic vocabulary.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teachers promote the use of complex language structures.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teachers use open-ended and higher order questions to encourage students to elaborate, using more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and language structures.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Teachers engage students in noticing, talking about and appreciating good, interesting and expressive writing.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teachers explicitly teach children reading comprehension strategies across texts using literature and informational text related to the theme.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Teachers implement strategies to ensure students produce authentic writing across the curriculum.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Students’ writing is published and celebrated.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Teachers, children and families celebrate, affirm, and encourage biliteracy or bilingualism.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Primary language instruction or support is used intentionally in all EL program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Teachers follow an articulated EL program model (i.e., Dual Language, Bilingual, SEI), as indicated by classroom instruction, resources, materials, and use of language (primary and/or English).</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Teachers use strategies designed to gather formative information on student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Summative assessments are recorded based on students’ demonstration of mastery through culminating activities including oral presentations, collaborative projects, and written work.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Interdisciplinary instruction is reflected in the physical environment and resources available to students.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The environment is student-centered and affirms and reflects cultural and linguistic diversity.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Collaborative practice and teamwork are evident throughout the instructional day.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Regular communication occurs between teachers and families to promote engagement and participation in students’ education.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The school/teacher communicates with families about the benefits of bilingualism and the importance of continuing to use the home language.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Families participate in a variety of activities during and after school designed to engage families in the child’s education.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table G39

### Results for Site Level Impact Survey Items, by Mean Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Level Impact Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>District Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More joyful, confident and engaged students.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Greater student access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Greater English language proficiency.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 - Appendix H
SEAL Principal 2018 Survey Instrument

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL Principal Survey. The survey items were developed so that this survey and the SEAL District Leader Survey 2018 (See Section 2–Appendix F) aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI). SEAL principals, whose district participated in the SEAL Replication Model for three or more years, were administered this survey in June 2018. The survey consisted of the following sections:

- Part A: Experience with SEAL (3 questions)
- Part B: Experiences as a Site Administrator (5 questions)
- Part C: Experience as a Teacher (3 questions)
- Part D: Experience as a District Administrator (3 questions)
- Part E: Education and Authorization (2 questions)
- Part F: District-Level Implementation of SEAL (4 questions)
- Part G: Site-Level Implementation of SEAL (18 questions)

S2. Appendix H
SEAL Principal 2018 Survey Instrument
S2. Appendix H (continued)

SEAL Principal 2018 Survey Instrument

20. Are there barriers that are preventing greater implementation of SEAL in your district?
   Yes. ☐ No. ☐

If no, please describe the barriers and what support or changes would be needed to reduce the barriers:

21. The school in which I am principal has participated in SEAL since:

---

Part C: SEAL Implementation in Our School and Classroom

Please refer to the following chart to answer Question 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of implementation</th>
<th>Level of facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal implementation</td>
<td>Exploration of elements of the SEAL Model occurs, resulting in some degree of awareness across schoolwide groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal information about the SEAL Model is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimal plan for changes is created (e.g., practice level, administration, teachers, schoolwide family partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial implementation is limited to the principal. Need to prepare for full implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial implementation</td>
<td>All elements of the SEAL Model are communicated to some stakeholders and there is at least a level of awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information about the SEAL Model is implemented and initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial changes/implementation of the SEAL Model is evident at some level (e.g., practice level, administration, teachers, schoolwide family partners).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some resources (e.g., SEAL guides) are identified and available for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full implementation</td>
<td>All stakeholders are engaged in the SEAL Model, its research base, and implementation planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New learning around the elements of the SEAL Model is rigorously integrated into practices, organizational and community practices, goals, and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources to successfully implement the SEAL Model are identified and are available for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained implementation</td>
<td>All stakeholders are engaged and advocate for the SEAL Model in their research base and implementation strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SEAL Model is maintained over time with sufficient fidelity to the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and administration (e.g., staff turnover) ensure sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full support sustainability of the SEAL Model, including governance and resources, is evident (i.e., full).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SEAL Model is accessible to the principal and staff at all levels (i.e., systemic and classroom).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Overall, at this time, which of the four Levels of Implementation best describes the implementation of SEAL in your school?
   ☐ Minimal implementation ☐ Partial implementation ☐ Sustained implementation ☐ Sustained implementation

23. Are there barriers that are preventing greater implementation of SEAL in your school?
   Yes. ☐ No. ☐

If no, please describe the barriers and explain what support or changes would be needed to reduce the barriers:

---

Part D: SEAL Implementation in Our School and Classroom

Please indicate how well each indicator below describes your school’s implementation of SEAL at the school/classroom level, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Please select one response for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership: Site-Level Systems</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24a. SEAL values, goals, and principles are reflected in our SEAL framework.

24b. The role of differentiation and cultural diversity is communicated in our school/classroom.

24c. ESL program models (i.e., Oral Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Development) are articulated and implemented.

24d. ESL program models (i.e., Oral Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Development) are monitored and evaluated.

24e. There is coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across schools through grade levels.

24f. The SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment.

24g. The chief administrator has delegated and sufficient support for implementation.

24h. Overall, intentional planning is used to understand and assess the impact of SEAL.

24i. Site plans focus on implementation and refinement of SEAL practices.

24j. Site plans focus on sustaining SEAL practices.

24k. Site plans focus on implementing and refinement of SEAL practices.

24l. Site plans focus on sustaining SEAL practices.

24m. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for SEAL guides selection of assessment and analysis of data.

24n. Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and sustainability and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation.

24o. Regular meetings between district and school staff are held to discuss depth of SEAL implementation and identify areas of strength and need.
S2. Appendix H (continued)
SEAL Principal 2018 Survey Instrument

26. Please give examples of increased or improved SEAL implementation at our School:

27. Please give examples of an increase or improvement in SEAL Professional Development:

28. Curriculum

29. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are standards-based and interdisciplinary.

30. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are integrated throughout the day.

31. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are thematically and intentionally integrated across language.

32. Designated SEAL is content-based to indicate what students need to know to be successful across the curriculum.

33. Teachers have a SEAL Long-Range Plan to address the standards across a curricular area.

34. Instruction: Process Complex Oral and Nonverbal Language

35. Instruction: Text Engagement

36. Instruction: Writing

37. Please give examples of an increase or improvement in Curriculum and Instruction:

38. SEAL Principal Feedback Survey Spring 2018

39. Personal Learning

40. Professional Learning

41. SEAL School Site teams and time allotted for SEAL Site teams improve in strength and design SEAL implementation.

42. Teachers engage in reflective practice in their and strengthen professional areas of growth related to SEAL.

43. Teachers are responsive to peer or coach-classroom observers, including SEAL Coach Facilitators and Trainers.

44. Please indicate how well each indicator below describes your school’s implementation of SEAL at the school/classroom level, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Please select one response for each item.

45. Please select one response for each item.
## S2. Appendix H (continued)

### SEAL Principal 2018 Survey Instrument

**SEAL Principal Feedback Survey**  
**Spring 2018**

Please indicate how well each indicator below describes your school’s implementation of SEAL at the school/classroom level, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Please select one response for each item.

**37. Family Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37a. Regular communication occurs between teachers and families to promote engagement and participation in student education.

37b. The school/teacher communicates with families about the benefits of English Language and the importance of continuing to use the home language.

37c. Families participate in a variety of activities during and after school designed to engage families in the child’s education.

38. Please give examples of an increase or improvement in Family Partnerships:

---

39. I have seen this level of impact at our school as a result of the implementation of the SEAL Model. Select one response for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39a. Higher levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.

39b. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.

39c. Improved instruction for English Learners.

39d. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.

39e. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.

39f. Greater teacher collaboration.

39g. Greater alignment, complexity, and amount of language production among students.

39h. More joyful, confident, and engaged students.

39i. Greater student access and engagement with academic content.

39j. Greater academic achievement of ELs.

39k. Greater English language proficiency.

39l. Greater Spanish language proficiency.

39m. Greater impact on students in other areas (attendance, etc.)

39n. Strengthened family engagement.

40. How are you currently monitoring and measuring progress of SEAL implementation?

---

41. Are you going to reflect how you measure progress of SEAL implementation? If so, how?

---

42. Are there any other factors or information you would like to communicate to SEAL?
Section 2 - Appendix I
SEAL Principal Implementation Survey Data 2018

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL Principal Implementation Survey. The survey items were developed so that this survey and SEAL District Leader Implementation Survey (See Section 2–Appendix G) aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI).

Of 67 SEAL Cohort 1–3 schools, 34 principals responded to this survey. However, not all the principals provided responses to the survey items. The response percentages are based on the total number of respondents for each survey item. Tables I1–I17 exhibit self-reported demographics by principal survey respondents. Table I18–I43 present principal perspectives on the implementation of SEAL at the district and school levels. Tables I45–I47 list the district level and site level implementation survey items by mean rating.

S2. Table I1

Principal Respondents by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogswell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Acres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Roble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mayne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Dell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Manor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkview (Mountain View SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakamoto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cayetano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerdale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetia Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voorhis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table I2

*Years Working as a SEAL Principal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I3

*Principal Participation in SEAL Activities During the Three Years of SEAL Implementation (N = 34)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>None of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>Some of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>Most of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>All of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Principal Convenings (two per year)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Instructional Rounds</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Professional development for SEAL Modules</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unit Development Days</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Summer Bridge</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I4

*Principal’s Previous Positions With SEAL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Administrator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I5

*Experience as a Principal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table 16
Principal’s Responsibilities for Structured English Immersion Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table 17
Principal’s Responsibilities for Bilingual Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table 18
Principal’s Experience at the Following Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table 19
Principal’s Experience as an Assistant Principal at the following Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**S2. Table I10**  
*Principal’s Experience as a Teacher at the following Grade Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table I11**  
*Principal’s Teaching Experience in a Bilingual Program at the following Grade Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table I12**  
*Principal’s Teaching Experience in an Structured English Immersion for ELs at the following Grade Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table I13**  
*Principal’s Previous Experience as a District Administrator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table I14

*Principal’s Previous Experience as a District Administrator Responsible for English Learner Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table I15

*Principal’s Previous Experience as a District Administrator Responsible for Bilingual Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table I16

*Highest Degrees Reached by Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Achieved</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA or BS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA or M.Ed.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. D. or Ph.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table I17

*Authorizations Held for English Learners by Principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential with L Authorization or CLAD Emphasis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential with a Bilingual authorization or BCLAD Emphasis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist Instruction Credential with English Learner Authorization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Cross-cultural Specialist Credential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAD Certificate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Authorization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development Specialist (LDS) Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCLAD Certificate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject Teaching Credential in World Language: ELD content area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Authorization in English as a Second Language (ESL) or Introductory ESL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table I18

**Principals’ Perception of Their District’s Implementation of SEAL at the District Level (N = 34)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>25 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared version of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>24 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>18 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (i.e. Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (i.e. Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. SEAL is aligned with other District Initiatives.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Resources are allocated for implementation and continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>23 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>21 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Intentional district planning is conducted to improve the implementation of SEAL.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>23 (68%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table 119

**District Leaders’ Examples of Positive, Increased/Improved SEAL Implementation at the District Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Examples of positive, increased, and/or improved SEAL implementation in districts | **AB Days dedicated to focus on English Learners and the ELD/ELA frameworks. SEAL is strengthened as part of our own district trainings.**  
All schools are now participating  
**Dedicated planning days for grade levels to collaborate, build units, observe, etc...**  
**District leader budget for deepening SEAL implementation.**  
**During FOSS / NGSS training, SEAL schools will refine units and integrate the engineering standards, ...**  
**Each School is provided with a SEAL coach. Money is set aside each year for teacher planning. New ELA adoption was aligned over the summer to incorporate SEAL units.**  
**Five schools are now SEAL schools; Coaches are working and collaborating with each other to support teachers implementing SEAL strategies; Meetings are scheduled to discuss SEAL and its implementation**  
**Full-time Coaching, planning days and PD built in.**  
**Hands-on support by TOSAs that are assigned to each school.**  
**Implementation of SEAL team meetings whereby Principals, Coaches and Ed. Services come together once a month to discuss SEAL implementation, progress and ideas for monitoring fidelity of SEAL and how to support teachers.**  
**Intentional planning at the district level is conducted between the district administrator who oversees English Language Learner programs and the English Language Teaching Partners (ELTPs). They meet regularly to plan for improvement of implementation and sustainability of SEAL. The value of this collaboration and the testament to the value of SEAL is evidenced by our number of students reclassifying this year in Oak Grove.**  
**Our district SEAL coaches are well trained in SEAL strategies and offer my teachers effective ongoing support.**  
**Participating in instructional rounds across different sites in the District allows our principals and District administrators to see that SEAL practices are in place and in use with students as schools move forward into deeper levels of implementation. This is also evident with the classroom environments at the site level as we can see the evidence of these practices in place with the students as staff continue to implement and refine their units.**  
**Recently, additional planning/prep days were scheduled for SEAL teachers. More Gallery walks throughout the district.**  
**SEAL coaches have been made full time to support balanced literacy.**  
**SEAL coaches have been provided additional PD to build and support their skill in coaching peers.**  
**Planning time for SEAL teachers has been negotiated in the current contract for teachers.**  
**SEAL is embedded into our SPSAs and all of our PD. District wide expectations on how classrooms should look and what strategies are used (what the district calls the "Platinum Ticket") reflect SEAL indicators.**  
**SEAL schedules are more or less coordinated with the P-3 initiative schedules for PD (this is a county program that spans several school districts). New writing implementation of Lucy Calkins units of study will be coordinated with SEAL and the units will be re-ordered in order to coordinate with our SEAL units.**  
**Systematic and continued training for new teachers as well as continuing teachers**  
**The district has supported our SEAL through funding, and supporting the professional development days that the SEAL teachers take part in.**  
**This year the science coach has begun working with some of the SEAL coaches. They have been working together to understand how SEAL integrated into the new ELA curriculum.**  
**N/A**}
### S2. Table I20

**District Leaders’ Affirm or Dissent of SEAL Implementation Barriers in Their Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table I21

**District Leaders’ Perceptions of Implementation Barriers in Their Districts and Needed Support/Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation barriers in districts and needed support and/or changes</td>
<td>Budget; Substitutes: Resistance to Increased Workload w/out Pay Increase; and Perceptions &amp; Experience of SEAL as Developmentally or State Preschool Inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget. Availability of coaches. Uninterrupted service and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost, time, capacity to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased Funding due to Deficit Spending; Lack of Planning Time; Resistance to SEAL based on forced full District Implementation; and Board and Teacher’s Union Desire to Eliminate Teachers on Special Assignment(potential elimination of coaches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of time for Principal Training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding - removal of funding for the SEAL TOSA, removal of funding for weekly release time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding is always a barrier. We have a structure to continue to provide training to new teachers but funding to continue to support ongoing implementation has been impacted. Leadership change at the district level has changed and those changes have created barriers - in adjustments, messaging, implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t find District barriers. Only barriers are teachers that are slow to implement some things with more rigors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to use more of my site budget for grade level and cross grade level planning; however, substitutes are a huge issue, and getting all teachers at a grade level to agree to work after hours or on Saturdays (paid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In order for coaches to be deployed to school sites for more time during the week, it would be wonderful to see a scenario where our coaches could be on site for more than a couple of days per week for more consistency/continuity with further implementation. As this likely relates to funding and budgets, this may not be possible to accomplish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It does not support 4th and 5th grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been difficult to integrate the NEW Wonders ELA program with SEAL. Further exploration and with around this integration is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of substitutes in the district often make it difficult for all grade level teachers to attend module training or UDD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Subs needed. Recognize and acknowledge that SEAL teachers are creating units, and doing more, above and beyond, what non-SEAL teachers are doing. Time during District PD for SEAL teachers to work with their team to collaborate to refine units, create interim assessments, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New leadership in the Ed. Services Dept. Emphasis of LPAC is being placed on Math rather than ELA/ELD/SEAL. The support needed is a safe environment to share concerns on how we keep moving forward to continue the needed support for implementation of SEAL. Our teachers have come so far, and I very concerned that coaching support may not be provided for the 2018-19 school year and beyond. 2. Collaboration pilot will not continue for the 2018-19 school year. Collaboration is critical for implementation of SEAL. Need to brainstorm ideas on how collaboration can be provided to teachers within the school day next school year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One is financial :0( Also, it is hard to develop and support SEAL at the current sites with teacher turnover (another thing we can’t control :0( ) It would be nice to have PD time differentiated so that SEAL teachers can come together across the district.

Speaking of SEAL implementation at the site level, purchasing support for recommended and approved supplies, materials, field trips, manipulatives, etc. would be very beneficial to have as a quick reference for purchasing from approved vendors. When teachers can feel the support, and hassle for acquisition can be minimized, I think there will be greater success in regular implementation.

Subs are EXTREMELY hard to get for modules and planning for SEAL- because of teacher attrition, the District is considering limiting SEAL training to tenured teachers which would severely impact SEAL implementation at my school site.

Sufficient coaching time for classroom teachers. Teacher turn over for trained SEAL teachers.

The barriers are around the amount of time SEAL coaches are allotted to support the work at the school sites. Another barrier is the teacher turnover.

The integration of district adopted reading program

The union has become very much "against" the SEAL model. Sadly, we have had to “defend”, protect, and advocate for the model to continue.

There is not an alignment between Balanced Literacy approach, Writers and Readers Workshop and SEAL implementation. Teachers are feeling overwhelmed.

Time, money and competing initiatives with county.

Union fostering a climate of separatism and using SEAL as a negotiating token. For example, teachers are asked to not allow to be recorded when presenting model SEAL lesson or for the purpose or team learning, even if they agree personally.

Yes, I believe that if our district went through 5th grade with the SEAL program, we could have a consistent SEAL message at each site and it would be easier to sustain.

---

S2. Table I22

**Principal’s School Participation in SEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 2013-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I23

**Principals’ Perception of Their School’s Level of Implementation of SEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementation.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Implementation.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I24

**Principals’ Affirm or Dissent of SEAL Implementation Barriers in Their Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### District Leaders’ Perceptions of Implementation Barriers in Their Schools and Needed Support/Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Implementation barriers in schools and needed support and/or changes | Again, some teachers are slow to fully implement.  
Consistent access to Module training as a team  
Cost, time, other things to teach and do as identified by data and evidence  
Decreased Funding due to Deficit Spending; Lack of Planning Time; Resistance to SEAL based on forced full District Implementation; Board and Teacher’s Union Desire to Eliminate Teachers on Special Assignment (potential elimination of coaches); and Lack of time for Principal Training.  
Eighty percent (80%) of the school is proficient and advanced, so it would be helpful to get more information about gradual release and what that would look like in terms of advanced learners.  
Funding and Time.  
Greater cohesion among various district departments.  
Integration with other programs/initiatives being presented to the school. Upper grade teachers are not part of the program. Difficult to provide whole school PD and school wide conversations.  
Many new teachers to the school over the past several years.  
More release time for teachers to collaborate and plan and discuss the units of study (separate from UDD). More coaching time needed, based on new staff and different staff needs. Our coach is amazing, but she is pretty overworked!  
Multiple initiatives. Teacher overload. Unions desire to eliminate TSA which would have an impact on coaches. Funding at the site level to continue to support planning.  
New staff learning and implementing strategies consistently  
Not all teachers have participated in Summer Bridge. The participation in Summer Bridge has such an impact on the mindset, skill and practice of the classroom teachers who have been part of Summer Bridge. We are working with SEAL coaches on how to duplicate the experiences of Summer Bridge during the regular year through lesson studies and opportunities for lesson refinement, debriefing and shared practice.  
SEAL coach for the past 3 years. This year the SEAL coach was new and inadequate in coaching skills and SEAL knowledge. Last year, had 10% SEAL coaching.  
See the previous comment about teacher attrition.  
Shortage of Subs; Time out of the classroom for teachers; and Having different cohorts in the school at different years.  
Staff turnover  
Teacher apathy, minimal funding, and lack of substitutes are all limiting factors to greater implementation.  
The amount of time allotted for the SEAL coach is a barrier. Teacher turnover is another barrier.  
Time constraints to be more engaged in the PD and planning that our teachers are provided. Union fostering a climate of separatism and using SEAL as a negotiating token. For example, teachers are asked to not allow to be recorded when presenting model SEAL lesson or for the purpose or team learning, even if they agree personally.  
Time for teachers to plan and greater collaboration between admin and coach.  
Time for the SEAL coach to model or provide feedback.  
Time. With new reading text adoption, teachers are somewhat overwhelmed. The struggle has been in how to implement (aligning everything) and spending time planning and reflecting on successes and challenges.  
We are closing...[school is closing] |
## Table 126  
### Principals’ Perception of Site Level Systems (N = 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL values, goals, and principles are reflected in our SEAL schools/classrooms.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>26 (76%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The value of bilingualism and cultural diversity is communicated in our school/classrooms.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>23 (70%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EL program models (i.e. Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream) are articulated and implemented.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>20 (65%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. EL program models are monitored and evaluated.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. There is coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The Coach/Facilitator has dedicated and sufficient support for SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Overall, Intentional planning is used to understand and assess the overall impact of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>19 (56%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Site plans focus on implementation and refinement of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>22 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Site plans focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. PD and communities of practice focus on implementation and refinement SEAL practices.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>24 (71%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guides selection of assessments and analysis of data.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>10 (30%)</td>
<td>19 (58%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Regular meetings between district and school staff are held to discuss depth of implementation and identify areas of strength and need.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**S2. Table I27**  
Principals’ Examples of Increased or Improved SEAL Implementation at Their Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of increased or improved SEAL implementation at the school level</td>
<td>As a new principal to the site, I have observed consistent SEAL practices being used in the classroom. Our site will continue with the SEAL 4th and 5th grade program in the next school year. Coach is key for us. Collaboration has been so valuable this school year, giving our teachers an opportunity to discuss, plan, refine SEAL lesson/implementation. Coaches have offered their support to grade level teams and teachers have been very receptive to that support. Dedicated PD days for grade levels to reflect deeper, build units, observe, etc. Monthly walkthroughs to observe and give feedback to SEAL. District provides a roadmap and facilitates PD for sites. Gallery walks for Open House. Language function walls. Grades preschool-3rd grade have implemented most of the strategies. There is a marked difference among classes, but this can be explained by the amount of time teachers have been exposed to the strategies. I can tell that implementation has been successful, and students seem more engaged and connected to learning. K-2nd grade teachers have completed module training, focus is on refinement. 3rd grade teachers are entering their 2nd year of module training. Summer Bridge Professional Development - 8 teachers participated. Laura, our SEAL coach, has done a better job this year for Selby coordinating Unit Development and SEAL planning days which has led to increased implementation. More grade level teams have completed SEAL training and work together to refine the units. School has purchased leveled books aligned with SEAL themes to be used for Guided Reading - we have them in a shared library (since last year) - teachers were able to order more books for the next school year aligned to their SEAL themes both for their classroom libraries and the shared library. One (1) dedicated SEAL Coach, but only for Garfield &amp; Selby Lane. Our teaching staff is very excited about the implementation. As an administrator, it has been difficult to integrate SEAL practices with other initiatives at the school. SEAL strategies are visible in all K-3 Classrooms. Units are consistently implemented across grade levels at the school site and teachers are employing SEAL strategies and visual supports on a regular basis as part of this implementation. As a result of SEAL teacher planning days, teachers have been allocated the time and support in order to continue with deeper implementation of units and strategies. During walkthroughs I am able to see that SEAL Strategies are in place in order to support our students with their overall language development and content area literacy. We have one highly effective and collaborative team that are faithfully collaborating and implementing SEAL at my site. This team is doubly unified around SEAL implementation and incorporation of technology into the teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table I28
Principals’ Perception of Professional Learning (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL School PD systems and time allotted for SEAL PD allow for continuous improvement to strengthen and deepen SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>19 (59%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers engage in reflective practice to identify and strengthen professional areas of growth related to SEAL.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>28 (88%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers are responsive to peer or coach classroom observers, including SEAL Coach Facilitators and Trainers.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>27 (84%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I29
Principals’ Examples of an Increase or Improved SEAL Professional Development

| Theme Example of increased or improved SEAL professional development | Full-time site coaches. Having more available subs to release teachers for planning has been helpful. Teachers don’t want to plan after school. Having an exceptional SEAL coach has allowed for on-demand PD during PLCs. I can add that PDs have been very beneficial, as well as the UDD with other school sites. My concern is that we are required to do so much at the district level, that level of engagement and interest can be influenced for extreme workload. I have observed some increase - but not consistently - teachers are engaged and enthusiastic when at the modules. Some teachers implement what they have learned immediately and some not. I have seen (on walk throughs) evidence of strategies teachers have learned. At some grade levels I have seen collaborative planning. More teachers are now requesting of SEAL TOSAs to do model lessons in their classrooms. Principal has benefitted from attending SEAL Principal’s convening trainings and to continue gaining knowledge through gaining acumen and knowledge from observations and walkthroughs at other school sites both in and outside of the District. Substitute coverage has improved this year, enabling for teachers to be released for planning/training more consistently. Same as above in terms of the number of unit/planning days by grade level...We have had better substitute coverage which is a dramatic improvement this school year enabling all teachers to plan. Another improvement this year was Laura(our SEAL coach) organized a visitation to another school site to observe the Bilingual Transfer strategies so our teachers could see it “in action”. San Pedro has worked hard to integrate our ELA scope and sequence standards into our SEAL units so that teachers are able to use the SEAL strategies to reinforce those standards. We will continue to work during planning days to establish end of unit evaluation tools that can be used to assess students on the mastery of ELA standards as well. SEAL unit PD’s and SUDD days have been so critical and valuable for teachers. Teachers are vocal & assertive about their needs for support. This all depends heavily on the value of the site coach. | Statement |
**S2. Table I30**  
*Principals’ Perception of Curriculum (n = 32)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are standards-based and interdisciplinary.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>23 (72%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are integrated throughout the day.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers implement SEAL units that are thematically and intentionally organized to develop language.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>23 (74%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Designated ELD is content-based to include what students need to know to be successful across the curriculum.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>23 (72%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Teachers have a Year-Long Plan to address and integrate the standards across curricular areas.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (29%)</td>
<td>16 (52%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table I31**  
*Principals’ Perception of Rich, Complex Oral and Academic Language Instruction (n = 32)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers promote the use of academic vocabulary.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>21 (66%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers promote the use of complex language structures.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>23 (74%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers use open-ended and higher order questions to encourage students to elaborate, using more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and language structures.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>24 (77%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table I32**  
*Principals’ Perception of Text Engagement Instruction (n = 32)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers engage students in noticing, talking about and appreciating good, interesting and expressive writing.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>24 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers explicitly teach children reading comprehension strategies across texts using literature and informational text related to the theme.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>25 (78%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table I33

Principals’ Perception of Writing Instruction (n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers implement strategies to ensure students produce authentic writing across the curriculum.</td>
<td>29 0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
<td>19 (66%)</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students’ writing is published and celebrated.</td>
<td>29 0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
<td>19 (66%)</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I34

Principals’ Examples of Increased/Improved Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of increased or improved curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>At the school we are using Writers Workshop, Students’ writing is celebrated during that time. Collaborative Conversations are evident in all classrooms. Instruction has become more targeted to meet the needs of language learners. It is hard to answer these questions as all of my teachers are all over the map on this SEAL strategies are reflected in all segments of the daily schedule. Teachers are implementing writing workshop Teachers need to continue to work to integrate SEAL throughout their instructional day. In addition, teachers REALLY NEED WORK on ELD - I still hear so much &quot;we do ELD all day&quot;. There needs to be deeper work done on how designated ELD needs to happen daily- and there needs to be an articulated scope and sequence for ELD. Writing is an area of growth for us. We do too much scaffolded writing and are moving into PD around units of study that will help support more authentic student writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I35

Principals’ Perception of Primary Language Affirmation, Instruction, and Support (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers, children and families celebrate, affirm, and encourage biliteracy or bilingualism.</td>
<td>32 1 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>16 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Primary language instruction or support is used intentionally in all EL program models (i.e. Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>32 1 (3%)</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>14 (44%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers follow an articulated EL program model (i.e., Dual Language, Bilingual, SEI), as indicated by classroom instruction, resources, materials, and use of language (primary and/or English).</td>
<td>30 2 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>19 (63%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table I36
Principal’s Perception of Assessment (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers use strategies designed to gather formative information on student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.</td>
<td>31 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>26 (84%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Summative assessments are recorded based on students’ demonstration of mastery through culminating activities including oral presentations, collaborative projects, and written work.</td>
<td>32 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>26 (81%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I37
Principal’s Perception of Environment (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Interdisciplinary instruction is reflected in the physical environment and resources available to students.</td>
<td>32 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>26 (81%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The environment is student-centered and affirms and reflects cultural and linguistic diversity.</td>
<td>32 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>22 (69%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Collaborative practice and teamwork are evident throughout the instructional day.</td>
<td>29 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>20 (69%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I38
Principal’s Examples of an Increase/Improvement in Affirmation and Use of Primary Language, Assessment, and Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Examples of increased or improved affirmation and use of primary language, assessment, and environment | 80-20 Bilingual Model; Small group activities are formative assessments; and Unit-related materials.  
A strength at Selby is that all grade levels plan together regardless if they are Immersion or English only teachers.  
All grade levels have common thematic SEAL units and it is visible in the classrooms in my weekly walk-throughs, on parent tours, and gallery walks. WE could continue to improve on celebrating linguistic diversity throughout the year as it seems to be most prevalent at the beginning of the school year.  
Classrooms are student centered and focus on supporting students to gather information from the walls  
For our Mandarin Immersion program only.  
Input charts, chants are present in classrooms.  
More small-group instruction is observed during walkthroughs. Teachers meet to collaborate, discuss data, and plan instruction.  
SEAL teachers plan together and walkthroughs reflect common themes and materials. |
Some grade level teams are very intentional in affirming the culture and language that our students bring with them to school each day. All teachers do a nice job with Affirmations and presenting a classroom environment that reflect the culture of our students, however use of primary language is not an emphasis. Our staff must work on assessments that reflect the work of SEAL. We have begun discussion of including a performance task with each unit and what those might look like at each grade level.

We have seen an increase of multicultural activities that reflect students' culture, language and values (in SEAL classrooms). I only wish we can continue and provide these opportunities to grades 4 and 5.

We need to recruit more teachers that look like the kids

While the classrooms fully reflect student individualism, work and SEAL themes, there is no affirmation of bilingualism since there are so few teachers that even speak Spanish - much less there is no primary language instruction.

S2. Table I39

Principals’ Perception of Family Partnerships (n = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Regular communication occurs between teachers and families to promote engagement and participation in students’ education.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>24 (75%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The school/teacher communicates with families about the benefits of bilingualism and the importance of continuing to use the home language.</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (32%)</td>
<td>18 (58%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Families participate in a variety of activities during and after school designed to engage families in the child’s education.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>22 (69%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The total number of respondents for this table is 32 (N=32) and the response range for each survey item is 32 to 31.

S2. Table I40

Principals’ Examples of an Increase or Improvement in Family Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of increased or improved family partnerships</td>
<td><strong>Attendance at Gallery Walks and Parent Education Events has improved.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family participation is limited because of the bus situation at our school, since we are a neighborhood school 4 miles from the neighborhood that we serve. However, our parents do participate and we are working to coordinate shuttle bus service on gallery walk days. We are limited in the conversation about bilingualism as a staff, since very few of the teachers can actually communicate in Spanish. However, we use all resources to communicate the value of home culture and language to our families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gallery Walks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallery Walks are well-attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallery walks. Family Engagement Classes for parents/families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>greater participation at school activities specifically gallery walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I answered this question based on our bilingual program teachers and structure. We are working towards this level of partnerships based on language in our SEI classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Newsletters, family nights</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parenting Classes, Women’s group, Family Fun Night.

Parents participate in Reclassification Training by district ELD TOSA. Parent Committees have been given the opportunity to do walkthroughs with Principal to observe SEAL classrooms in action.

SELAC family engagement continues to be a priority for school, SLT and PTO. Having a bilingual community liaison/Bilingual secretary funded by the LCAP demonstrates CSO commitment to supporting all families.

There have been some workshops for parents focused on how to help or work with their child. Some of the teachers communicate regularly with their students’ parents via electronic or paper newsletter. Some communicate regularly with some of their parents in informal conversations.

Three (3) RAR workshops per site, 2 DRDP conferences (have already been in place)

We have had way more parent participation since we are implementing home-school connection activities, projects related to the units taught, etc.

When directed by the principal, teachers send home the unit letter and hold the culminating family activity. Beyond SEAL, parent engagement opportunities are planned.

### S2. Table I41

**Principals’ Perception of Impact at SEAL Schools as a Result of the SEAL Model Implementation (n = 32)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>32 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
<td>31 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>21 (68%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td>32 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>25 (78%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>32 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>23 (72%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>30 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>22 (73%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>32 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students</td>
<td>31 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>21 (68%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. More joyful, confident and engaged students.</td>
<td>29 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>20 (69%)</td>
<td>8 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Greater students access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>30 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>29 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>20 (69%)</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Greater English language proficiency.</td>
<td>30 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
<td>24 (25%)</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Greater impact on students in other areas <em>(affective, attendance, etc.).</em></td>
<td>24 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (13%)</td>
<td>20 (83%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>26 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>18 (69%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table I42  
**Principal’s’ Examples of Their Current Progress Monitoring and Measuring of SEAL Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of current progress monitoring and measuring of SEAL implementation</td>
<td>As a site we do a few SEAL walks in the classrooms with a few observations of SEAL lessons. Classroom Observations, Gallery Walks, Daily Walk throughs Classroom walk-throughs with SEAL coach. Classroom walk-though observations CSTP Evaluations Instructional walk throughs, classroom visits Left many blank because many are unknown SEAL walk-through’s with coaches; Instructional rounds held at my school in April; and Monthly SEAL leadership meetings. That would be my next steps. To develop/create a tool to measure the progress. As of today, I have focused on implementation of strategies. The current monitoring is done via walkthroughs and team collaborative notes. Progress is measured by our district diagnostic assessment (DORA) and by __ This is an area of need. A lot of this data is subjective and used to meet student need - but not hard data to analyze. This is the big question... Through observation and discussion during evaluation or planning conferences. Informal discussions with teachers. I have also asked some of the SEAL trained teachers to share information or strategies at staff meetings. Walkthroughs We aren’t measuring it explicitly, but using diagnostics and looking at our EL subgroup. I would like to have a tool to measure the progress of SEAL Weekly walk throughs, weekly meetings with SEAL coach, and year-long planning to coordinate units. With a New Tool I developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table I43  
**Principal’s’ Description of Refined Measures of Progress of SEAL Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refined measures of progress of SEAL implementation</td>
<td>I need to be more aware of SEAL implementation in classrooms, I already have a plan to work with new SEAL coach for next year. I think using the new tool that we were given at the Principals’ Convening will be helpful with this. I would like to implement the use of a reflective tool/rubric for teachers to use and include teachers in site walk-throughs. I would like to. I think the DOI tool will be great! In future school planning we will keep SEAL as part of one of our sire’s focus and not just use District PD time for SEAL collaboration. Our focus is going to be on writing next year and how it increases authentic writing. Training’s like the one today, collaboration with colleagues, learning more about the district’s plan. Using DOI document with Coaching Staff Waiting to see if we can use the DOI as a reflection tool - would love to see the information arranged in a rubric vs a checklist because it is much more user friendly. Yes . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes, it is in our plan to hold a whole SEAL team’s reflective session to put plans in place at the end of this school year.

Yes, review and explore additional means of assessing language development and literacy in relation to SEAL unit and strategy implementation.

Yes, with the new DOI tool.

Yes. I am not sure how, but would love the support at the SEAL leadership level.

### S2. Table I44
**Principals’ Additional Information/Communication to SEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional information to be conveyed to SEAL</td>
<td>Can we reduce the number of days out of the classroom for training’s? Can we work with universities to have credential candidates graduate SEAL ready? Can we have SEAL use their influence to get grants or scholarships for teachers of color?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster the idea of integration as a key for the sustainability of SEAL. Foster the idea of spending more funds on time for teams to plan and debrief not just at district-level PD but as school-site level. This needs to be a district-wide initiative so it is consistent across all schools. With that, district-level admin must focus on identifying ways to support site administrator’s time as they are many competing initiatives and tasks at hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am so grateful for your amazing support and look forward to your continued support of SEAL at FUSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do want to appreciate the SEAL team guidance, PDs and other activities that are allowing our teachers to become more effective and engaging educators. Looking forward to next year! Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel like it did not benefit implementation and culture across the district surrounding SEAL to do a full district implementation though I understand why SLZ pushed this initiative in this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have enjoyed the opportunity to learn more about these strategies as an instructional leader so that I can support deeper levels of implementation of the SEAL strategies and units at my school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I LOVE SEAL - don’t want to seem negative at all - I just want us to be able to do it better and to have accountability for how we are implementing so that we can prove that we are doing the right thing by our kids. I also am very concerned about the professional capacity of teachers to develop and provide small group designated ELD - I think our kids are not getting enough ELD to systematically address language issues and I am concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One thing that would help some of my teachers is to have stressed to them that SEAL strategies should be integrated throughout the entire school day. My teachers limit SEAL to their Science or Social Studies instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please continue to study, align with &amp; refine State Preschool instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEAL coach key to moving staff forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the questions pertaining to bilingual or dual language immersion programs do not pertain to me. Maybe an N/A response choice should be offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can we reduce the number of days out of the classroom for training’s? Can we work with universities to have credential candidates graduate SEAL ready? Can we have SEAL use their influence to get grants or scholarships for teachers of color?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**S2. Table I45**  
*Results for District Level Implementation Survey Items, by Mean Rating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Level Implementation Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 1 = <em>strongly disagree</em> to 4 = <em>strongly agree</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared version of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SEAL is aligned with other District Initiatives.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources are allocated for implementation and continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intentional district planning is conducted to improve the implementation of SEAL.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SEAL values, goals, and principles are reflected in our SEAL schools/classrooms.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The value of bilingualism and cultural diversity is communicated in our school/classroom.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. EL program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream) are articulated and implemented.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. EL program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream) are monitored and evaluated.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results for Site Level Implementation Survey Items, by Mean Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Level Implementation Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There is coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Coach/Facilitator has dedicated and sufficient support for implementation.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall, intentional planning is used to understand and assess the impact of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site plans focus on implementation and refinement of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Site plans focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PD and communities of practice focus on implementation and refinement SEAL practices.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guides selection of assessments and analysis of data.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Regular meetings between district and school staff are held to discuss depth of SEAL implementation and identify areas of strength and need.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SEAL School PD systems and time allotted for SEAL PD allow for continuous improvement to strengthen and deepen SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers engage in reflective practice to identify and strengthen professional areas of growth related to SEAL.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers are responsive to peer or coach classroom observers, including SEAL Coach Facilitators and Trainers.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are standards-based and interdisciplinary.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SEAL Teachers implement SEAL units that are integrated throughout the day.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers implement SEAL units that are thematically and intentionally organized to develop language.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Designated ELD is content-based to include what students need to know to be successful across the curriculum.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers have a Year Long Plan to address and integrate the standards across curricular areas.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers promote the use of academic vocabulary.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Level Implementation Survey Items</td>
<td>Mean Rating Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree</td>
<td>N = 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers promote the use of complex language structures.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Teachers use open-ended and higher order questions to encourage students to elaborate, using more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and language structures.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Teachers engage students in noticing, talking about and appreciating good, interesting and expressive writing.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teachers explicitly teach children reading comprehension strategies across texts using literature and informational text related to the theme.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teachers implement strategies to ensure students produce authentic writing across the curriculum.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Students’ writing is published and celebrated.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teachers, children and families celebrate, affirm, and encourage biliteracy or bilingualism.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Primary language instruction or support is used intentionally in all EL program models (i.e., Dual Language, Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, Structured English Immersion, English Language Mainstream).</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Teachers follow an articulated EL program model (i.e., Dual Language, Bilingual, SEI), as indicated by classroom instruction, resources, materials, and use of language (primary and/or English).</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Teachers use strategies designed to gather formative information on student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Summative assessments are recorded based on students’ demonstration of mastery through culminating activities including oral presentations, collaborative projects, and written work.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Interdisciplinary instruction is reflected in the physical environment and resources available to students.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The environment is student-centered and affirms and reflects cultural and linguistic diversity.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Collaborative practice and teamwork are evident throughout the instructional day.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Regular communication occurs between teachers and families to promote engagement and participation in students’ education.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The school/teacher communicates with families about the benefits of bilingualism and the importance of continuing to use the home language.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Families participate in a variety of activities during and after school designed to engage families in the child’s education.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results for Site Level Impact Survey Items, by Mean Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Level Impact Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 1 = <em>strongly disagree</em> to 4 = <em>strongly agree</em></td>
<td>N = 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the SEAL design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More joyful, confident and engaged students.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Greater student access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Greater English language proficiency.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 - Appendix J

SEAL District Leader 2019 Implementation and Sustainability Survey Instrument

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey and the Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (see Section 2–Appendix L). The survey items were developed so that the two surveys aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI). Both surveys included 37 common items focused on district lead and principal respondents’ perspectives of implementation and sustainability of SEAL at the district level. The District Leader Survey consisted of these sections:

- Part A: Experience as an Administrator (5 questions)
- Part B: Experience with SEAL (3 questions)
- Part C: District-Level Implementation of SEAL (4 questions)
- Part D: Site-Level Impact as a Result of Implementation of SEAL (2 questions)
- Part E: Additional Feedback on SEAL Sustainability and Student Learning (4 questions)

S2. Appendix J

SEAL Implementation and Sustainability District Leader Survey Instrument 2018-2019
S2. Appendix J (continued)

SEAL Implementation and Sustainability District Leader Survey Instrument 2018-2019

Part B: About Your Participation in SEAL

6. I have worked with SEAL as a District Leader (including 2018-2019) for:
   - [ ] 1 year
   - [ ] 2 years
   - [ ] 3 or more years

7. Previously, I worked with SEAL in the following capacity[ies]:
   - [ ] District Administrator
   - [ ] Teacher
   - [ ] Principal
   - [ ] Assistant Principal
   - [ ] Other (Please Specify)

8. As a District Leader, I have participated in the following SEAL activities:

   - [ ] District Leaders Conferences
   - [ ] Principal Conferences
   - [ ] Instructional Rounds
   - [ ] Professional development for SEAL Modules
   - [ ] Unit Development Days
   - [ ] Summer Bridge

SEAL Implementation and Sustainability District Leads Survey: 2019

Part C: Implementation and Sustainability of SEAL at the District Level

9. Overall, at this time, which of the four levels of implementation below best describes the implementation of SEAL in your district?

   Please select only ONE level of implementation for your district.

   - [ ] Minimal Implementation
   - [ ] Initial Implementation
   - [ ] Initial Change
   - [ ] Mature Implementation

10. Please indicate how well each indicator below describes the IMPLEMENTATION and SUSTAINABILITY of
    SEAL at the DISTRICT LEVEL, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

    | Strongly | Disagree | Agree | Strongly |
    |---------|----------|-------|---------|
    | Disagree | Agree | NA    |

11. Please indicate how well each indicator below describes the IMPLEMENTATION and SUSTAINABILITY of
    SEAL at the DISTRICT LEVEL, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

    | Strongly | Disagree | Agree | Strongly |
    |---------|----------|-------|---------|
    | Disagree | Agree | NA    |

Section 2 | Appendix J
S2. Appendix J (continued)
SEAL Implementation and Sustainability District Leader Survey Instrument 2018-2019

SEAL Implementation and Sustainability District Leads Survey: 2019

12. Please indicate how well each indicator below describes the IMPLEMENTATION and SUSTAINABILITY of SEAL at the DISTRICT LEVEL, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement:

12a. District leadership now to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.

12b. Principals now to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.

12c. Teachers now to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.

12d. Coaches now to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.

12e. Coaches/ELL teachers have dedicated time to support SEAL sustainability (e.g., FTE at a minimum).

12f. There is coordination and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and measures across preschool through kindergarten.

12g. There is coordination and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and measures across TK through grade three classrooms.

12h. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELL team selection of assessments.

12i. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for progress monitoring and analysis of data.

Part D: Impact on Schools as a Result of the Implementation of the SEAL Model

13a. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.

13b. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.

13c. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.

13d. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.

13e. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.

13f. Greater teacher collaboration.

13g. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students.

Part E: Additional Feedback on SEAL Sustainability and Student Learning

15. Please provide any additional information about your current or planned SEAL sustainability efforts not captured in the previous questions.

16. Please describe what support you need from SEAL to sustain any of the areas above.

17. What are the conditions you believe are necessary to sustain SEAL in the district and at the school sites? Please provide examples.

Thank you for completing this survey! Your input is valuable and much appreciated!
Section 2 - Appendix K
SEAL District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey Data 2019

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey and the Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (see Section 2–Appendix L). The survey items were developed so that the two surveys aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI).

Of 19 SEAL Cohort 1–3 school districts, 14 district leaders responded to this survey. The response percentages given are based on the total number of respondents for each survey item. Tables K1–K8 exhibit self-reported demographics for district leader respondents. Tables K8–K18 present respondent perceptions related to the implementation and sustainability of the SEAL Model at their respective districts and schools. Table K19 and K20 list the district level and site level implementation and sustainability survey items by mean rating.

S2. Table K1

District Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Union SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalinga-Huron USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Joint USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlimart SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Elementary SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin McKinley SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy USD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Plains USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno Park SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael City Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara USD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table K2

District Leaders’ Current Title/Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director (i.e., EL Programs, C&amp;I, Educational Services)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table K3

*District Administrator’s Responsibilities for Structured English Immersion Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table K4

*Years Working as a SEAL District Administrator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table K5

*Experience as a Principal at the Following Grade Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table K6

*Experience With SEAL as a District Leader*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**S2. Table K7**

*Previous Positions Within SEAL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Administrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table K8**

*District Leader’s Participation in SEAL Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>None of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>Some of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>Most of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>All of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District Leaders Convenings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Principal Convenings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional Rounds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Professional development for SEAL Modules</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Unit Development Days</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Summer Bridge</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table K9**

*District Leaders’ Perception of Their District’s Level of Implementation of SEAL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Implementation.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table K10

**District Leaders’ Perception of Implementation and Sustainability at the District Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared vision of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>6 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (e.g. Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>12 (86%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (e.g. Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>11 (79%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## S2. Table K11

**District Leaders’ Perception of Implementation and Sustainability at the District Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL is aligned with other District Initiatives.</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff to lead and support SEAL sustainability.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Site plans focus on sustainability of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability.</td>
<td>14 n (0%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table K12

**District Leaders’ Perception of Implementation and Sustainability at the District Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>(%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>(%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. District leadership new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Principals new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Coaches new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Coaches/Facilitators have dedicated time to support SEAL sustainability (0.5 FTE at a minimum).</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kinder.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>11 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide EL progress monitoring and analysis of data.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table K13

**District Leaders’ Perception of Impacts on SEAL Schools as a Result of Implementation of the SEAL Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>11 (79%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (93%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table K14

**District Leaders’ Perception of Impacts on SEAL Schools as a Result of Implementation of the SEAL Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. More joyful, confident and engaged students.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>13 (93%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Greater student access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>13 (93%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Greater English language proficiency among ELs.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>13 (93%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
<td>14 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.).</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (86%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table K15

**District Leader’s Additional Information About Current or Planned SEAL Sustainability Efforts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current or Planned SEAL Sustainability Efforts</td>
<td>Bringing together district and site administrators to create a working group to set goals and next steps for sustainability and continued PD needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From the District perspective, there is inconsistency when it comes to implementation levels by the site as well as principal support for sustainability. This has to do with the school site administrator’s familiarity and knowledge of the SEAL framework. At MVSD we are planning Principal sessions for sustainability support. Also, SEAL coaches are meeting with principals to provide coaching and/or PD for teachers, Tk-3. For new principals (3 new principals this year) SEAL Coach Facilitator will provide an in-person PD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GUSD has created a district-wide leadership team to help with sustainability, re-iterate common focus areas that are consistent throughout the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the issues we still struggle with is the fact that there are a few teachers that do not implemented as fully as we would like. We’ve had a lot of table discussion about that today. I almost felt like I wanted a category between agree and disagree. I most I didn’t want to say I disagreed but I agree somewhat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a focus on scaling SEAL TK-6 at all participating sites. We are looking to build upon our SEAL program to fully develop a bilingual model program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We need to support teachers in NGSS/STEAM/PBL implementation; and make the alignment with their strategies in place, clear and explicit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table K16

**District Leader’s Perception of Support Needed from SEAL for Sustainability of Current or Planned Efforts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Needed from SEAL for Sustainability of Current or Planned Efforts</td>
<td>Assessment topics are of interest as I believe the assessment practices do not align to SEAL Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete observable teacher practices defined and outlined for walkthroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued opportunities for our coaches and principals to collaborate with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated and vetted resources to support scaling. I appreciate the collection of resources on TORSH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would love a crash course on SEAL as a district administrator so I can effectively support my principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing support for coaches and admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps, consulting time to support our coaches in creating explicit alignment between NGSS pedagogy and SEAL instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table K17
District Leader’s Perception of Necessary Conditions to Sustain SEAL in the District and at School Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Conditions Necessary to Sustain SEAL in the District and at School Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common goals, articulation between grades, link to data, and teachers sharing best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued focus and collaboration among leaders at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued support for time for facilitated collaboration - UDDs. Ongoing 2-3 days per year. However, the sub availability has impacted our ability to sustain this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having on site trainers for this work would be important as we move to sustainability. Not sure how we become sustainable if our PD has to be outside our district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that most educators want to be successful and provide optimal opportunity and instruction for all students. Districts need to develop systems and practices that help teachers/administrators reach these goals. Sometimes initiatives are viewed as layering on top of instead of contributing to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need resources for sustain coaching, release time. SEAL is an expensive model well worth the funding but in districts with declining enrollment, cuts need to be made. I am not sure about paying for releasing teachers twice a month to plan. Hard without subs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared leadership and collaboration between sites and the district. Focused coaching cycles that are not “one offs”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support from the principal and their belief in SEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The superintendent must indicate how SEAL fits in the strategic plan. Additionally, support must be given in order to expand and/or sustain the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This comes from Leadership support. Our Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent understand the significance of supporting our EL students in the community we serve. That is evident by the initiatives and instructional framework that we have in our District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table K18
District Leader’s Perception of Changes in Student Learning Since SEAL Implementation in Their Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Changes in Student Learning Since SEAL Implementation in District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging classrooms  Student participation high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movement away from worksheets and quiet classrooms to environments of joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our English Learners in the primary grades are out performing students in non-SEAL schools in terms of reclassification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEAL is a great program. The burning question in our district among our teacher union reps and stakeholders is how it supports literacy. Do you have any research on the impact on reading? I know SEAL is good for kids! I know it helps develop the language skills to support reading. But we need some research on how SEAL schools help overall academic achievement. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are more engage in their classrooms. They are speaking more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students at SEAL schools are experiencing higher reclassification rates. Families are connecting via student gallery walks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are so much more aware of how to engage students. Chants is one of the things I hear mentioned in almost every training that I do that is unrelated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, students are utilizing research-based practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table K19

**Results for District Level Implementation and Sustainability Survey Items, by Mean Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Level Implementation Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared vision of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SEAL is aligned with other District Initiatives.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff to lead and support SEAL sustainability.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Site plans focus on sustainability of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Coaches new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Coaches/Facilitators have dedicated time to support SEAL sustainability (0.5 FTE at a minimum).</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. District leadership new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kinder.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Principals new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide EL progress monitoring and analysis of data.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table K20

**Results for Site Level Impact Survey Items, by Mean Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Level Impact Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Leaders</strong></td>
<td>N = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More joyful, confident and engaged students.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Greater student access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Greater English language proficiency among ELs.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 - Appendix L

SEAL Principal 2019 Implementation and Sustainability Survey Instrument

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey and the Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (See Section 4–Appendix J). The survey items were developed so that the two surveys aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI). Both surveys included 37 common items focused on district lead and principal respondents’ perspectives of implementation and sustainability of SEAL at the district and school levels. The Principal Survey consisted of these sections:

- Part A: Experience as an Administrator (5 questions)
- Part B: Experience with SEAL (3 questions)
- Part C: SEAL Implementation/Sustainability at the District Level (4 questions)
- Part D: SEAL Implementation/Sustainability at the School Level (4 questions)
- Part E: Impact on School Site as a Result of the Implementation of the SEAL Model (2 questions)
- Part F: Additional Feedback on SEAL Sustainability and Student Learning (3 questions)

S2. Appendix L

SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey Instrument 2018-2019

[Survey Instrument Images]
S2. Appendix L (continued)
SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey Instrument 2018-2019

Part B: About Your Participation in SEAL

6. I have worked with SEAL as a principal (including 2013-20) for:
   - 1 year
   - 2 years
   - 3 or more years

7. Previously, I worked with SEAL in the following capacity(ies) (Please select all that apply):
   - Assistant Principal
   - Coach
   - Teacher
   - Other (Please specify)

8. As a Principal, I have participated in the following SEAL activities:
   (Please indicate your level of participation by indicating one response for each activity)

   a) District Leaders Conferences
   b) Principal Conferences
   c) Instructional Rounds
   d) Professional Development for SEAL Modules
   e) Unit Development Days
   f) Summer Bridge

Implementation and Sustainability of SEAL at the District Level

10. Please indicate how well each indicator below describes the IMPLEMENTATION and SUSTAINABILITY of SEAL at the DISTRICT Level, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10a. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared vision of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, ESL).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10e. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, ESL).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey: 2019

Part C: SEAL Implementation/Sustainability at the DISTRICT Level

5. Overall at this time, which of the four levels of Implementation below best describes the implementation of SEAL at your District?

   Please select ONE level for your DISTRICT:

   - Minimal Implementation
   - Basic Implementation
   - Partial Implementation
   - Comprehensive Implementation

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: SEAL is not implemented at all.
   - Basic Implementation: SEAL is implemented in some ways but not consistently throughout the District.
   - Partial Implementation: SEAL is implemented consistently across multiple areas.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: SEAL is implemented comprehensively and consistently across all areas.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: Little or no conscious effort is made to sustain SEAL.
   - Basic Implementation: Efforts are made to sustain SEAL, but not consistently.
   - Partial Implementation: Efforts are made to sustain SEAL and are consistent across multiple areas.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Efforts are made to sustain SEAL consistently across all areas.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No closed-door focus is given to sustainability.
   - Basic Implementation: Some closed-door focus is given to sustainability.
   - Partial Implementation: More focus is given to sustainability.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Sustainability is a major theme in all discussions.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No Chain of Command support for sustainability is in place.
   - Basic Implementation: Some Chain of Command support for sustainability is in place.
   - Partial Implementation: More Chain of Command support for sustainability is in place.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strong Chain of Command support for sustainability is in place.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support for SEAL sustainability is given in budget.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support for SEAL sustainability is given in budget.
   - Partial Implementation: Stronger support for SEAL sustainability is given in budget.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support for SEAL sustainability is given in budget.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No formal plans or processes are in place for sustainability.
   - Basic Implementation: Some formal plans or processes for sustainability are in place.
   - Partial Implementation: Stronger formal plans or processes for sustainability are in place.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible formal plans or processes for sustainability are in place.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: Little or no developed or visible plan for the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Basic Implementation: Some developed or visible plan for the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Partial Implementation: More developed or visible plan for the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible developed or visible plan for the sustainability of SEAL.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: Little or no visibility of the SEAL model.
   - Basic Implementation: Some visibility of the SEAL model.
   - Partial Implementation: More visibility of the SEAL model.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible visibility of the SEAL model.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No stakeholders have been involved in the sustainability process.
   - Basic Implementation: Some stakeholders have been involved in the sustainability process.
   - Partial Implementation: More stakeholders have been involved in the sustainability process.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible involvement of stakeholders in the sustainability process.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No system is in place for the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Basic Implementation: Some system is in place for the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Partial Implementation: Stronger system is in place for the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible system is in place for the sustainability of SEAL.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No resources have been invested in the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Basic Implementation: Some resources have been invested in the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Partial Implementation: More resources have been invested in the sustainability of SEAL.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible resources have been invested in the sustainability of SEAL.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from administration.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from administration.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from administration.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from administration.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from board or community.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from board or community.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from board or community.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from board or community.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from parents or families.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from parents or families.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from parents or families.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from parents or families.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from students.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from students.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from students.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from students.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from teachers.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from teachers.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from teachers.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from teachers.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from partners.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from partners.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from partners.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from partners.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from the community.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from the community.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from the community.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from the community.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from the media.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from the media.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from the media.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from the media.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from external organizations.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from external organizations.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from external organizations.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from external organizations.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from external partners.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from external partners.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from external partners.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from external partners.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from the District Office.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from the District Office.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from the District Office.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from the District Office.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from the State Office.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from the State Office.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from the State Office.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from the State Office.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from higher education.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from higher education.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from higher education.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from higher education.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from foundational entities.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from foundational entities.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from foundational entities.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from foundational entities.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from national organizations.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from national organizations.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from national organizations.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from national organizations.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from international organizations.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from international organizations.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from international organizations.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from international organizations.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from philanthropy.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from philanthropy.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from philanthropy.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from philanthropy.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from advocacy groups.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from advocacy groups.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from advocacy groups.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from advocacy groups.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from community organizations.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from community organizations.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from community organizations.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from community organizations.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from business.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from business.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from business.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from business.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from local government.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from local government.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from local government.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from local government.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from local community.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from local community.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from local community.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from local community.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from local business.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from local business.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from local business.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from local business.

   Description:

   - Minimal Implementation: No support or engagement from local government.
   - Basic Implementation: Some support or engagement from local government.
   - Partial Implementation: More support or engagement from local government.
   - Comprehensive Implementation: Strongest possible support or engagement from local government.
## SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey Instrument 2018-2019

### Part D: SEAL Implementation/Sustainability at Your SCHOOL

**SEAL Implementation at Your School**

* 13. Overall at this time, which of the four levels of implementation below best describes the implementation of SEAL in your school?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation</td>
<td>Minimal implementation of SEAL is evident at the school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Integration</td>
<td>Initial integration of SEAL is evident at the school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Full implementation of SEAL is evident at the school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Implementation</td>
<td>Advanced implementation of SEAL is evident at the school site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEAL Sustainability at Your School**

* 14. Please indicate how well each indicator below describes the IMPLEMENTATION and SUSTAINABILITY of SEAL at your SCHOOL, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14a. SEAL is aligned with other school initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b. My school collaborates with other schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within my school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14d. Involuntary school planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14e. Our school site plan focuses on sustainability of SEAL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey: 2019

- 19. Please indicate how well each indicator below describes the IMPLEMENTATION and SUSTAINABILITY of SEAL at your SCHOOL, by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19a. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b. The depth of implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19c. Resources are allocated for coordination of SEAL practices, action items, and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19d. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19e. Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19f. Coaches/Facilitators have dedicated time to support sustainability (0.5 FTE at a minimum)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19g. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through K, TK, and grades one through three classrooms.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19h. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19i. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs that are utilized by classroom teachers.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19j. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs that are utilized by classroom teachers.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey: 2019

- 17. I have seen this kind of impact at our school as a result of the implementation of the SEAL Model. (Please select one response for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17a. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c. Improved classroom instruction for English Learners.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17d. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17e. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17f. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17g. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey: 2019

- 18. I have seen this kind of impact at our school as a result of the implementation of the SEAL Model. (Please select one response for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18a. More joyful, confident, and engaged students.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b. Greater student access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d. Greater English language proficiency among ELs.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18e. Greater ESOL, language proficiency.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18f. Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.).</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18g. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEAL Implementation and Sustainability Principal Survey: 2019

- 19. Please provide any additional information about your current or planned SEAL sustainability efforts not captured by the previous questions.

- 20. Please describe what support you need from SEAL to sustain any of the areas above.

- 21. How has student learning changed since SEAL implementation? Please provide examples.

*Thank you for completing this survey! Your input is valuable and much appreciated!*
Section 2 - Appendix M
SEAL Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey Data 2019

In consultation with the SEAL Leadership Team and LMU-CEEL, Wexford developed the SEAL Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey and the District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey (see Section 2–Appendix J). The survey items were developed so that the two surveys aligned with each other and with the SEAL Depth of Implementation Tool (DOI).

Of 67 SEAL schools in twelve districts, 23 principals responded to the survey. The response percentages are based on the total number of respondents for each survey item. Tables M1–M7 exhibit self-reported demographics by principal respondents. Tables M8–M21 present respondent perceptions related to the implementation and sustainability of the SEAL Model at their respective districts and schools. Tables M22 and M23 list the district level and site level implementation and sustainability survey items by mean rating.

S2. Table M1
Principal Respondents by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Union SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Elementary SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin McKinley SD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View SD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove SD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City SD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael City Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Table M2
Years of Experience as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M3

**Principals’ Experience by Grade Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M4

**Years of Experience as a Principal Responsible for Structured English Immersion Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M5

**Years of Experience as a Principal Responsible for Bilingual Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M6

**Years Working as a SEAL Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M7

**Principals’ Previous Positions With SEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M8

**Principals’ Participation in SEAL Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>None of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>Some of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>Most of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
<th>All of the Day(s) or Session(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. District Leader Convenings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Principal Convenings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional Rounds</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Professional Development for SEAL Modules</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Unit Development Days</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Summer Bridge</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M9

**Principals’ Perception of the Level of Implementation of SEAL in Their District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementation.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Implementation.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M10

**Principals’ Perception of SEAL Implementation and Sustainability at the District Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared vision of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (e.g. Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>11 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (e.g. Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M11

**Principals’ Perception of SEAL Implementation and Sustainability at the District Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL is aligned with other district Initiatives.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>11 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Site plans focus on sustainability of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**S2. Table M12**  
*Principals’ Perception of SEAL Implementation and Sustainability at the District Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>23 0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability.</td>
<td>23 1 (4%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>23 0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>23 0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. District leads new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>23 0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>23 0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>23 0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Coaches/Facilitators have dedicated time to support sustainability. (0.5 FTE at a minimum)</td>
<td>23 1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kinder.</td>
<td>23 1 (4%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade 3 classrooms.</td>
<td>23 1 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across all TK-5/6 classrooms.</td>
<td>23 2 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (48%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments.</td>
<td>23 2 (9%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide EL progress monitoring and analysis of data.</td>
<td>23 1 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2. Table M13**  
*Principals’ Perception of SEAL Implementation at Their School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Implementation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementation.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Implementation.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M14

**Principals’ Perception of SEAL Implementation and Sustainability at Their School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. School policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My school collaborates with other SEAL schools.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. There is school guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There is school guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (e.g. Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. School leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (e.g. Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M15

**Principals’ Perception of SEAL Implementation and Sustainability at Their School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SEAL is aligned with other school Initiatives.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My Coach Facilitators and I work with District staff to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within my school.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Intentional school planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Our school site plan focuses on sustainability of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table M16

*Principals’ Perception of SEAL Implementation and Sustainability at Their School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Coaches/Facilitators have dedicated time to support sustainability. (0.5 FTE at a minimum)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kinder.</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across all TK-5/6 classrooms.</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>11 (48%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide EL progress monitoring and analysis of data.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M17

**Principals’ Perception of Impact at Their School as a Result of Implementation of the SEAL Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>20 (87%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S2. Table M18

**Principals’ Perception of Impact at Their School as a Result of Implementation of the SEAL Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. More joyful, confident, and engaged students.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Greater student access and engagement with academic content.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Greater English language proficiency among ELs.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.).</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Strengthened family engagement.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (22%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional Information from Principals About Current or Planned SEAL Sustainability Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a newly merged school, there are a number of teachers that were trained in SEAL but not really implementing at a high level. My work this year is getting common understanding and alignment of SEAL practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at our gallery walks has been a great way to engage parents as part of the school community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For our Tk-8th grade school, we have embedded into our school mission statement SEAL framework in Tk-3 and AVID framework into our 4th-8th grades. To have a consistent path of implementation and transition between lower and upper grades we have set writing as a school-wide ELA goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel our school has deeply implemented SEAL, but we still need to expand to 4/5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to maintain SEAL in our campus we have created a resource room that has as its main focus SEAL as the driving force. It was and is being constructed through the support of administration and a SEAL coach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was difficult to answer some of the questions on this survey due to a great variance in SEAL strength of implementation among my teachers. In some classes it is very strong - in others it is not. We are working on consistency and continuity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our site plans for sustainability by planning unit development days in advance, and revisiting SEAL principles and practices during staff meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Promote instructional scaffolding that supports comprehension, engagement, participation, and inclusion. 2. Commit to meeting weekly with my ELTP to discuss and implement use of the Roadmap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School instructional rounds for teachers to observe each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strong support from the District SEAL Teacher On Special Assignment (TOSA) has been beneficial to our TK-3 grade teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need for sustainability for those at 5 years plus. As the SEAL model has evolved, there is a need to provide an update for teachers. The plan is to coordinate with district to engage in a site PD to refresh and revive SEAL units either through a release date or in June.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my second year at my site, and even though I have an abundance of experience with EL students, SEAL is new to me. Thus, gauging the sustainability of practice at my site is somewhat fuzzy as I continue to learn about SEAL myself. However, I do see some gaps in our sustainability as teachers in different cohorts finish their training. Also, turn-over and / or teacher leaves for various reasons (for example medical) add to the gaps that need attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are currently working on refining our SEAL units to ensure that SEAL classrooms have all of the components of balanced literacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have been intentional as we develop plans to have a greater school focus on STEM and ensure that this program change enhances our SEAL implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have implemented K-3 pretty heavily, you see the void in the 4th and 5th grades. We need to have an aligned K-5 model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M20

**Principals’ Support Needed From SEAL to Sustain Current or Planned SEAL Sustainability Efforts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An accessible SEAL coach – she has so many district commitments that</td>
<td>An accessible SEAL coach – she has so many district commitments that she is NOT even close to .50. It is closer to 15%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she is NOT even close to .50. It is closer to 15%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of SEAL units with grade level ELA standards. Is there a</td>
<td>Alignment of SEAL units with grade level ELA standards. Is there a tool that connects the dots for teachers so that we move from the SEAL block to SEAL classroom, specifically balanced literacy components?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool that connects the dots for teachers so that we move from the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL block to SEAL classroom, specifically balanced literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>components?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to support new teachers and coach’s with professional</td>
<td>Continue to support new teachers and coach’s with professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued UDD days to continue building on and improving units.</td>
<td>Continued UDD days to continue building on and improving units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need additional training in the modules myself. Having access to</td>
<td>I need additional training in the modules myself. Having access to Torsh will do a lot to help me to better understand the various strategies and the DOI of SEAL. I also welcome any training aimed at “new” principals joining the SEAL community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsh will do a lot to help me to better understand the various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies and the DOI of SEAL. I also welcome any training aimed at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“new” principals joining the SEAL community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to explore Torsh as a resource for myself and teaching staff.</td>
<td>I need to explore Torsh as a resource for myself and teaching staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish we would have rolled SEAL out K-5 initially, we are</td>
<td>I wish we would have rolled SEAL out K-5 initially, we are struggling to get the 4th and 5th on board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struggling to get the 4th and 5th on board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot;</td>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot; 2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer, etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as good at the training...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers</td>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot; 2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer, etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as good at the training...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer,</td>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot; 2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer, etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as good at the training...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it</td>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot; 2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer, etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as good at the training...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo</td>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot; 2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer, etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as good at the training...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as</td>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot; 2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer, etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as good at the training...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good at the training...</td>
<td>I would love to have a SEAL trainer come and do some &quot;booster&quot; 2-hour staff development sessions for our trained SEAL teachers to keep them up to date, e.g., Heather on Designated ELD, Transfer, etc. We have a number that were trained years ago and I think it would be helpful with depth of implementation especially as a Demo site...I now Katie and I are working with them, but we are not as good at the training...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would need further assistance on identifying most effective</td>
<td>I would need further assistance on identifying most effective writing strategies within the SEAL modules and sample videos to show to our teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing strategies within the SEAL modules and sample videos to</td>
<td>I would need further assistance on identifying most effective writing strategies within the SEAL modules and sample videos to show to our teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show to our teachers.</td>
<td>I would need further assistance on identifying most effective writing strategies within the SEAL modules and sample videos to show to our teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is crucial that now that SEAL has online resources these</td>
<td>It is crucial that now that SEAL has online resources these continue to be kept up. In addition, having refreshers would be helpful via our TOSAs and the SEAL team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continue to be kept up. In addition, having refreshers would be</td>
<td>It is crucial that now that SEAL has online resources these continue to be kept up. In addition, having refreshers would be helpful via our TOSAs and the SEAL team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful via our TOSAs and the SEAL team.</td>
<td>It is crucial that now that SEAL has online resources these continue to be kept up. In addition, having refreshers would be helpful via our TOSAs and the SEAL team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more additional initiatives that derail SEAL (ex: Reader’s</td>
<td>No more additional initiatives that derail SEAL (ex: Reader’s Workshop, new Social Studies and Science curriculum); re-evaluate which coaches are best suited to sustain SEAL; Superintendent and district leadership need to hold ALL sites (and site leaders) more accountable for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop, new Social Studies and Science curriculum); re-evaluate</td>
<td>No more additional initiatives that derail SEAL (ex: Reader’s Workshop, new Social Studies and Science curriculum); re-evaluate which coaches are best suited to sustain SEAL; Superintendent and district leadership need to hold ALL sites (and site leaders) more accountable for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which coaches are best suited to sustain SEAL; Superintendent and</td>
<td>No more additional initiatives that derail SEAL (ex: Reader’s Workshop, new Social Studies and Science curriculum); re-evaluate which coaches are best suited to sustain SEAL; Superintendent and district leadership need to hold ALL sites (and site leaders) more accountable for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district leadership need to hold ALL sites (and site leaders)</td>
<td>No more additional initiatives that derail SEAL (ex: Reader’s Workshop, new Social Studies and Science curriculum); re-evaluate which coaches are best suited to sustain SEAL; Superintendent and district leadership need to hold ALL sites (and site leaders) more accountable for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more accountable for SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>No more additional initiatives that derail SEAL (ex: Reader’s Workshop, new Social Studies and Science curriculum); re-evaluate which coaches are best suited to sustain SEAL; Superintendent and district leadership need to hold ALL sites (and site leaders) more accountable for SEAL implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with enhancing SEAL with STEM.</td>
<td>Support with enhancing SEAL with STEM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support from the TOSA consistently extended to our educational</td>
<td>The support from the TOSA consistently extended to our educational team through various practices, such as calendared SEAL planning days off-campus, ongoing professional development, classroom demonstrations, and calendared monthly meetings with the site principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team through various practices, such as calendared SEAL planning</td>
<td>The support from the TOSA consistently extended to our educational team through various practices, such as calendared SEAL planning days off-campus, ongoing professional development, classroom demonstrations, and calendared monthly meetings with the site principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days off-campus, ongoing professional development, classroom</td>
<td>The support from the TOSA consistently extended to our educational team through various practices, such as calendared SEAL planning days off-campus, ongoing professional development, classroom demonstrations, and calendared monthly meetings with the site principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrations, and calendared monthly meetings with the site</td>
<td>The support from the TOSA consistently extended to our educational team through various practices, such as calendared SEAL planning days off-campus, ongoing professional development, classroom demonstrations, and calendared monthly meetings with the site principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal.</td>
<td>The support from the TOSA consistently extended to our educational team through various practices, such as calendared SEAL planning days off-campus, ongoing professional development, classroom demonstrations, and calendared monthly meetings with the site principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will soon be adopting a new ELA curriculum and my coach and I</td>
<td>We will soon be adopting a new ELA curriculum and my coach and I wondering how we will incorporate it into our SEAL units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wondering how we will incorporate it into our SEAL units.</td>
<td>We will soon be adopting a new ELA curriculum and my coach and I wondering how we will incorporate it into our SEAL units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**S2. Table M21**

*Principals’ Perceptions About How Student Learning has Changed Since SEAL Implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have had in-depth discussions with my K - 3 teachers about using SEAL units as their ELA program. We have decided to move away from district-based assessments and using running records as formative assessments until such a time that assessment components from SEAL are more widely available to us.</td>
<td>More language across the board. Teachers report when using strategies more joyful learning and more enjoyable teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our students’ academic vocabulary has increased significantly and its reflected on our district assessments such as DORA. I would venture to say that this foundation has helped our kids expand language use. However, the challenge at hand is still one that is multifaceted and comprehension continues to be an area of need for our students.</td>
<td>Since implementing SEAL, students are more engaged and interacting with their learning. The room environment is a resource and not a “display.” The level of language has been greatly enhanced and expectations have increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are familiar with strategies across grade levels allowing them greater access to the curriculum.</td>
<td>Students are making stronger connections to their units of study, and expanding their vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are more engaged. I notice higher level vocabulary in student conversations. Parents are connected through family projects and Gallery Walks.</td>
<td>Students who have been part of SEAL since Head Start just took the SBAC this past year and we see that they have increased levels of success in the area of academic language/vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers collaborate and intentionally plan. Teachers also share with other teachers who are not teaching SEAL. SEAL strategies are incorporated in other subject areas and used at grade levels not involved with SEAL. Families participate at Gallery Walks. Students are speaking in more complete sentences and have a more developed academic vocabulary.</td>
<td>Teacher capacity and confidence in culturally responsive teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students’ oral academic vocabulary and writing have improved. Thematic instruction and scaffolding allows for more comprehension and access of content, standards and development of academic language and second language (Spanish and English). I notice more variety of grouping strategies, e.g., whole group carpet, Pair Share, small group at tables and &quot;centers&quot; where there is flexible seating going on. There is more joy for learning and also more rigor.</td>
<td>There is a definite increase in joyful student learning in our SEAL classrooms. Students have gained self-confidence in their ability to guide their own learning by utilizing supports throughout the classroom and they are excited to show what they know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my 3rd year at our school and implementation happened 5 years ago, so hard to compare pre-SEAL implementation to post SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>We have a clearer focus on ELD and on the statewide focus on Language Learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M22
*Results for District Level Implementation and Sustainability Survey Items, by Mean Rating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Implementation and Sustainability Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 1 = <em>strongly disagree</em> to 4 = <em>strongly agree</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. District policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District schools participating in SEAL collaborate to ensure a shared vision of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is district guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is district guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. District leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SEAL is aligned with other district Initiatives.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within the district.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intentional district planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Site plans focus on sustainability of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. District leads new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Coaches/Facilitators have dedicated time to support sustainability. (0.5 FTE at a minimum)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kinder.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade 3 classrooms.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across all TK-5/6 classrooms.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide EL progress monitoring and analysis of data.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table M23

*Results for Site Level Implementation and Sustainability Survey Items, by Mean Rating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Level Implementation Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 1 = <em>strongly disagree</em> to 4 = <em>strongly agree</em></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> = 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. School policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My school collaborates with other SEAL schools.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is school guidance, support and oversight about research-based programs and services for ELs.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is school guidance and support for the value of bilingualism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School leaders define and implement articulated English Learner (EL) program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School leaders monitor and evaluate articulated English Learner program models (e.g., Dual Language Immersion, Bilingual, SEI).</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SEAL is aligned with other school Initiatives.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My Coach Facilitators and I work with District staff to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SEAL is integrated into systems and practices within my school.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intentional school planning is conducted to sustain SEAL.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Our school site plan focuses on sustainability of SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PD and communities of practice focus on sustaining SEAL practices.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Resources are allocated for continuation of SEAL practices, action items and expenditures in the LCAP.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Resources are allocated in the LCAP for ongoing EL needs using valid measures of EL progress.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers new to SEAL are provided with professional development related to the SEAL Model, its implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Coaches/Facilitators have dedicated time to support sustainability. (0.5 FTE at a minimum)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through kinder.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across all TK-5/6 classrooms.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures for ELs guide selection of assessments.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Knowledge of valid and reliable practices and measures guide EL progress monitoring and analysis of data.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Level Implementation Survey Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Greater consistency and alignment across SEAL classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Greater rigor, complexity, and amount of language production among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>More joyful, confident, and engaged students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Greater student access and engagement with academic content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Greater academic achievement of ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Greater English language proficiency among ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Greater Spanish language proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Greater impact on students in other areas (affective, attendance, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Strengthened family engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The LMU-CEEL Research and Evaluation Team developed the SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey to gather information on how SEAL professional development supported their role and skill development. Coach-Facilitators who supported SEAL implementation in at least one SEAL School site where the SEAL Professional Development cycle was completed (3+ years) were invited to participate in the survey. The survey consisted of the following categories:

- Part I. Demographic Data (9 questions)
- Part II. SEAL Coach Facilitator Role, Coaching Culture and Support: Coaching duties, focus, support, resources, and development (13 questions, 54 items)
- Part III. SEAL Coach Facilitator Perceived Effect on Implementation of SEAL Model and Practices, including Depth of Implementation (8 questions, 47 items)
- Part IV. Open Ended Questions (4 questions)

S2. Appendix N
SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey
S3. Appendix N (cont’d)

SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey

PART II: SEAL COACH FACILITATOR ROLE, COACHING CULTURE, AND SUPPORT

A. What percentage of your time is identified exclusively for SEAL Coach Facilitator duties on a monthly basis?
Follow-up question: Of the time you spend in your SEAL Coach Facilitator role, indicate percentages for how your time is divided.

- 1. Instructional Coach (modeling lessons, observing, providing feedback, etc.)
- 2. Attending Professional Development, including Modules, Coach Conferences and other SEAL Coach Facilitator PD
- 3. Attending non-SEAL Professional Development
- 4. Planning Unit Development Days (UDDs)
- 5. Facilitating Unit Development Days (UDDs)
- 6. Materials ordering, researching, thematic unit preparation
- 7. Meeting with principals and other district leaders
- 8. Parent Engagement
- 9. Other (Please Specify):

PERCENTAGE

B. Indicate the number of different schools in which you have worked with SEAL teachers during the 2015-17 academic year.

1 2 3 4 5

C. Indicate the number of teachers that you have supported as a SEAL coach over the 2015-16 academic year.

1 2 3 4 5

D. Please provide information about how you prioritize your provision of services to different types of teachers. Rank the following according to how much time you spend providing in-classroom support. Rank from HIGHER PRIORITY to LOWER PRIORITY.

- Teachers who ask for support.
- Teachers you identify for targeted support based on formative classroom observations.
- Teachers the site administrator identifies as needing support.
- Beginning teachers (less than three years in the classroom).
- Teachers in their first year of SEAL implementation.
- Other (Please Specify):

E. Rate the level of support and usefulness you believe each of the following SEAL partners has provided during the 2015-17 academic year in order for you to be as effective as possible in your role as a SEAL Coach Facilitator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little/Nice</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAL - Leadership (L. O'Leary, A. Hurwitz, J. Analla, P. Delaney)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Principal - Site 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Principal - Site 2 (if you have only one site - leave blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Principal - Site 3 (if you have only one site - leave blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Rate the level of openness that teachers have exhibited in your role as a SEAL Coach Facilitator at each of your sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little/Nice</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAL teachers - Site 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL teachers - Site 2 (if you have only one site - leave blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL teachers - Site 3 (if you have only two sites - leave blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**S3. Appendix N (cont’d)**

**SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT OF COACH FACILITATOR</th>
<th>1-2 times per year</th>
<th>1-2 times per semester/reporting period</th>
<th>1-2 times per month</th>
<th>1-2 times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet with school principal or other site-investigator to identify areas of focus as I coach and facilitate SEAL Implementation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and discuss examples of coaching</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in co-planning for coaching</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in reflective feedback sessions for continuous improvement and development in my role as a SEAL Coach Facilitator</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with other SEAL coaches for my own professional learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend SEAL or other professional development events focused on developing coaching processes and skills</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read professional literature focused on development coaching processes and skills</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN-CLASSROOM COACHING AND GUIDANCE FOR TEACHER REFLECTION</th>
<th>1-2 times per year</th>
<th>1-2 times per semester/reporting period</th>
<th>1-2 times per month</th>
<th>1-2 times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule and visit SEAL teachers to observe implementation of SEAL practices and strategies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with teachers upon request to pre-plan a strategy or lesson</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop by informally to observe, check-in and provide support</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine student or teacher artifacts as sources of evidence during a post-observation conference</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model lessons for SEAL teachers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teach with SEAL teachers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C-1 Please rate the following items based on how effective (or confident) you are with your SEAL Facilitator Coaching role to support the implementation of essential SEAL practices.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 1 - LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating in discussions about coherence and alignment of SEAL and other site and district-level initiatives/professional development</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 2 - PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate a learning culture centered on professional development and collaborative curriculum design focused on SEAL research-based practice</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support teachers to engage in reflective practice to identify and strengthen professional areas of growth</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 3 - CURRICULUM</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement a curriculum that is standards-based, interdisciplinary and integrated throughout the day</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S3. Appendix N (cont’d)
#### SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Appendix N</th>
<th>SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### C.2 Please rate the following items based on how effective (or confident) you are with your SEAL Facilitator Coaching role to support the implementation of essential SEAL practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 4 A - INSTRUCTION: RICH, COMPLEX ORAL AND ACADEMIC LANGUAGE</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of academic vocabulary and complex language structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use open-ended and higher order questions to encourage students to elaborate, using more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and language structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 4 B - INSTRUCTION: TEXT ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage students in noting, talking about and appreciating good, interesting and expressive writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement daily, designated time frames for students to engage in shared and independent reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 4 C - INSTRUCTION: WRITING</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities and structures for students to draw, dictate, and write about what they have learned, experimented and know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement strategies to ensure students produce authentic writing across the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 4 D - PRIMARY LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT, INSTRUCTION AND SUPPORT</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate, affirm, and encourage literacy or biliteracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use primary language or support intentionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 5 - ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirm and reflect cultural and linguistic diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure interdisciplinary instruction is reflected in the physical environment and resources available to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use strategies to incrooo student collaboration or dialogue among students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI AREA 6 - FAMILY PARTNERSHIP</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote family partnerships and parent engagement/participation in students’ education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Unit Development Days</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist teachers in selecting appropriate themes, goals, and standards to develop SEAL Thematic Units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and support the effective use of ELD and content standards to support the development of Integrated ELD in SEAL Thematic Units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and support the effective use of ELD standards to develop complementary Designated ELD lessons embedded in SEAL Thematic Units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in opportunities to refine SEAL Thematic Units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create environments where teachers reflect openly on their instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers set grade and objectives aimed at improving their instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect evidence during classroom observations that can be shared with the SEAL teacher to identify areas of refinement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model SEAL instructional practices for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model.</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Need More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources accessed through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased coherence and alignment in curriculum planning within and across grade levels in preschool through third grade classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning based on the SEAL Model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in teaching for English Learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in student academic achievement in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in language proficiency and growth for English Learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in Spanish proficiency, if applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in Spanish proficiency, if applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased joy in learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater student engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater teacher collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased family/community engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S3. Appendix N (cont’d)

**SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, what do you feel it takes for SEAL Coach Facilitators to support the implementation of SEAL at high levels?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are some of the gaps in the SEAL Coach Facilitator role that you feel need to be addressed in order to maximize the impact/effect on overall SEAL implementation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What advice would you give SEAL Coach Facilitators in other districts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there any other factors or information you would like to communicate to SEAL?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you! If you would like to be contacted to provide further information, please provide your name and contact number here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CONTACT NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you!
Appendix O
SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey Results

The SEAL Coach-Facilitator Survey (Section 2 – Appendix N) was administered in 2017 and 2018. A total of 22 surveys were collected in 2017 and 21 surveys were collected in 2018 for a total of 43 surveys. SEAL coach-facilitators were asked a series of questions to gather demographics data. As detailed in Brief 4, nearly two-thirds (n=28) have taught 11 years or more in K-12 and 55% (n=24) have taught 11 years or more in PreK-3rd grade. More than three-fifths (n=35) have been involved in the SEAL effort for three or more years and nearly all of their schools (n=41) have been involved in SEAL implementation for three or more years. Additionally, over half (n=28, n=26) have a Master’s degree and CLAD/English Learner Authorization, respectively. Tables O1–O3 provide complete demographic information on coach-facilitators (N=43) who completed the survey. Tables O4–O11 exhibit coach-facilitator practices, perceptions about their skills, and perceptions about the overall effectiveness of the SEAL Model.

S2. Table O1
SEAL Coach-Facilitator - Highest Degree Obtained and Teacher Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>English Learner Authorization</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>BCC/BLCAD/Bilingual Authorization</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>CLAD/English Learner Authorization</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.*

S2. Table O2
SEAL Coach-Facilitator - Number of Years Taught in K-12 vs PreK-3rd Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th># Years Taught in K-12</th>
<th># of Years in Grades PreK - 3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.*
### S2. Table O3
**SEAL Coach-Facilitator - Number of Years in SEAL Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th># Years in SEAL (Coach)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># Years in SEAL (School)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 Years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.*

### S2. Table O4
**SEAL Coach-Facilitator Priority Level of Support - Rank Order based on Teacher Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers who ask for support.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers the site administrator identifies as needing support.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers you identify for targeted support based on formative classroom observations.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in their first year of SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning teachers (less than three years in the classroom).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The ranking is based on a 5-point scales (LOWER PRIORITY= 1 to HIGHER PRIORITY=5). Not all overall survey respondents answered this set of questions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.*
### S2. Table O5
**SEAL Coach-Facilitators Frequency of In-Classroom Coaching and Teacher Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 times per year</th>
<th>1-2 times per semester/reporting period</th>
<th>1-2 times per month</th>
<th>1-2 times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule and visit SEAL teachers to observe implementation of SEAL practices and strategies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with teachers upon request to pre-plan a strategy or lesson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop by informally to observe, check-in and provide support</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine student or teacher artifacts as sources of evidence during a post-observation conference</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
<td>12 (37%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model lessons for SEAL teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teach with SEAL teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>12 (37%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Not all survey respondents answered this set of questions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

### S2. Table O6
**SEAL Coach-Facilitator Perceptions about the Helpfulness of Professional Development, Support, and Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not Helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Model, Vision, and Goals and Research Base</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Pedagogical Practices and Strategies</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>27 (82%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Professional Development Modules</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>23 (70%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Coach Convenings</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>18 (55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional development on creating and supporting contexts for adult learners</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (38%)</td>
<td>13 (54%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2. Table O7
Development of Coach-Facilitator Skills and Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership and Support</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Never n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per year n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per semester/reporting period n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per month n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per week n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet with school principal or other site-level instructional leader to identify areas of focus as I coach and facilitate SEAL implementation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and debrief examples of coaching</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in co-planning for coaching</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in evaluative feedback sessions for continuous improvement and development in my role as a SEAL Coach Facilitator</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12 (38%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with other SEAL coaches for my own professional learning</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
<td>11 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend SEAL or other professional development session focused on developing coaching processes and skills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (66%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read professional literature focused on development coaching processes and skills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>13 (41%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Not all overall survey respondents answered this set of questions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

S2. Table O8
Coach-Facilitator Leadership and Support for SEAL Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership and Support</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Never n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per year n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per semester/reporting period n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per month n (%)</th>
<th>1-2 times per week n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating in discussions about coherence and alignment of SEAL and other site and district-level initiatives/professional development</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>8 (26%)</td>
<td>11 (35%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide professional development to SEAL teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead SEAL Unit Development Days</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
<td>16 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers obtain SEAL resources and materials</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>14 (44%)</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate and support data analysis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other duties (e.g. student assessment, classroom coverage)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Not all overall survey respondents answered this set of questions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
### S2. Table O9

**Effect of SEAL Coach-Facilitator Role on the Implementation of the SEAL Model and Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEAL Practices</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Highly Effective n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 1 - LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in discussions about coherence and alignment of SEAL and other site and district-level initiatives/professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 2 - PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate a learning culture committed to professional development and collaborative curriculum design focused on EL research-based practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support teachers to engage in reflective practice to identify and strengthen professional areas of growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI 3 - CURRICULUM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a curriculum that is standards-based, interdisciplinary and integrated throughout the day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI 4A - INSTRUCTION: Rich, Complex Oral and Academic Language</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>17 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of academic vocabulary and complex language structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of open-ended and higher order questions to encourage students to elaborate, using more precise and sophisticated vocabulary and language structures.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 4B - INSTRUCTION: TEXT ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage students in noticing, talking about and appreciating good, interesting and expressive writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement daily, designated time frames for students to engage in shared and independent reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 4C - INSTRUCTION: WRITING</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>17 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities and structures for students to draw, dictate, and write about what they have learned, experienced and know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement strategies to ensure students produce authentic writing across the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 4D - INSTRUCTION: Primary Language Affirmation, Instruction and Support</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate, affirm, and encourage biliteracy or bilingualism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use primary language or support intentionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 4E - INSTRUCTION: ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use strategies to gather formative information, including students' oral and written output to adjust instruction accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use summative assessment data (e.g. culminating activities, oral presentation, collaborative projects, written work) to examine level of mastery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 5 - ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
<td>17 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirm and reflect cultural and linguistic diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S2. Table O9 (cont’d)

**Effect of SEAL Coach-Facilitator Role on the Implementation of the SEAL Model and Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEAL Practices</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Highly Effective n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure interdisciplinary instruction is reflected in the physical environment and resources available to students.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use strategies to increase student collaboration or dialogue among students.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>17 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI AREA 6 - FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote family partnerships and parent engagement/participation in students' education.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table O10

**Perceived Effectiveness of SEAL Coaching Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach Facilitator Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Highly Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Need More Info n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Unit Development Days</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist teachers in selecting appropriate themes, goals, and standards to develop SEAL Thematic Units</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and support the effective use of ELD and content standards to support the development of Integrated ELD in SEAL Thematic Units</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and support the effective use of ELD standards to develop complementary Designated ELD lessons embedded in SEAL Thematic Units</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in opportunities to refine SEAL Thematic Units</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (57%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create environments where teachers reflect openly on their instructional practices</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers set goals and objectives aimed at improving their instruction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect evidence during classroom observations that can be shared with the SEAL teacher to identify areas of refinement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model SEAL instructional practices for teachers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>19 (63%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## S2. Table O11

**Perceived Effectiveness of SEAL Coach-Facilitator Impact on Implementation of SEAL Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Impact</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Highly Effective n (%)</th>
<th>Need More Info n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (24%)</td>
<td>14 (48%)</td>
<td>7 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased coherence and alignment in curriculum planning within and across grade levels in preschool thru third grade classrooms</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning based on the SEAL Model</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in teaching for English Learners</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in student academic achievement in English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in language proficiency and growth for English Learners</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement for Spanish proficiency, if applicable</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>10 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in Spanish academic achievement, if applicable</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased joy in learning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater student engagement and participation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater teacher engagement and satisfaction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater teacher collaboration</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>17 (57%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased family/community engagement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P
SEAL Leader Perspectives on Depth of Implementation Area 1B

The SEAL Replication Model prioritizes engagement and development of district- and site-level leadership to support systemic and sustainable implementation. Three leadership roles are identified as part of the district implementation processes—one at the district level and two at the site-level (principal and coach). An investigation of site-leader perspectives lead to the development of five surveys:

1. CEEL Coach-Facilitator Survey (Spring 2017 and Spring 2018)
2. Wexford Principal Survey (Spring 2018)
3. Wexford District Leader Survey (Spring 2018)
4. Wexford Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (Fall 2019)
5. Wexford District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey (Fall 2019)

The tables in this appendix are organized by DOI Area 1B indicators as follows:

- Tables P1–P3 are aligned to DOI Area 1B indicator 1.4
- Tables P4–P5 are aligned to DOI Area 1B indicator 1.5
- Tables P6–P8 are aligned to DOI Area 1B indicator 1.6

S2. Table P1
SEAL Leader Perceptions of SEAL Values, Goals, and Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Principal Survey</td>
<td>SEAL values, goals, and principles are reflected in our SEAL schools/classrooms.</td>
<td>Mean: 3.09 76% Agree; 18% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>School policies and decisions reflect SEAL values, and/or goals.</td>
<td>Mean: 3.10 83% Agree; 13% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 District Leaders Survey</td>
<td>SEAL values, goals, and principles are reflected in our SEAL schools/classrooms.</td>
<td>Mean: 3.36 50% Some of our schools; 43% All of our schools 1-None to 4-All of Our Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=34); Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=23); District Leaders Survey (n=14).

* There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.
### S2. Table P2
**SEAL Leader Perceptions of Collaboration Between District Leaders, Principals, and Coach Facilitators to Support SEAL Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017, 2018 Coach-Facilitator Survey</td>
<td>Meet with school principal or other site-level instructional leader to identify areas of focus as I coach and facilitate SEAL implementation</td>
<td>44% 1-2/month - 1-2/week Never to 1-2 times per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Principal Survey</td>
<td>SEAL District Leader and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.26 68% Agree; 29% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.3 65% Agree; 30% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 District Leaders Survey</td>
<td>SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff and myself to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.27 60% Agree; 33% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>SEAL Principals and Coach Facilitators work with other District Staff to lead and support SEAL implementation.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.29 57% agree; 36% strongly agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=34); Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=23); District Leaders Survey (n=15); District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=14)

a There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.

### S2. Table P3
**SEAL Leader Frequency/Perceptions of District and School Staff Meetings to Discuss Areas of Strength and Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017, 2018 Coach-Facilitator Survey</td>
<td>Meet with school principal or other site-level instructional leader to identify areas of focus as I coach and facilitate SEAL implementation</td>
<td>44% 1-2/month - 1-2/week Never to 1-2 times per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Principal Survey</td>
<td>Regular meetings between district and school staff are held to discuss depth of SEAL implementation and identify areas of strength and need.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.44 44% Agree; 3% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 District Leaders Survey</td>
<td>Regular meetings between district and school staff are held to discuss depth of SEAL implementation and identify areas of strength and need.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.29 21% Some of our schools; 57% All of our schools 1-None to 4-All of Our Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=34); District Leaders Survey (n=14)

a There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.
### S2. Table P4

**Perceptions of Coherence between SEAL and Other Initiatives/Services/Resources Across PreK–3rd Grade Classrooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Result a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017, 2018 Coach-Facilitator Survey</td>
<td>Increased coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms</td>
<td>70% Effective/Highly Effective Not Effective to Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Principals Survey</td>
<td>There is coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.82 61% Agree; 12% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.8 57% Agree; 13% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 District Leaders Survey</td>
<td>There is coherence between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across preschool through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.14 36% Some of our schools; 43% All of our schools 1-None to 4-All of Our Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>There is coherence and coordination between SEAL and other initiatives, key services, and resources across TK through grade three classrooms.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.9 79% Agree; 7% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4–Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=33); District Leaders Survey (n=14); Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=23); District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=14). |

*a There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.

### S2. Table P5

**Perceptions of Coherence and Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Result a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017, 2018 Coach-Facilitator Survey</td>
<td>Participating in discussions about coherence and alignment of SEAL and other site and district-level initiatives/professional development</td>
<td>67% Effective/Highly Effective Scale: Impact Not Effective to Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals Survey</td>
<td>The SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.94 58% Agree; 21% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Leaders Survey</td>
<td>The SEAL Model is considered when new initiatives are brought into our school, to establish coherence and alignment.</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.14 7% Some of our schools; 64% All of our schools 1-None to 4–All of Our Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=33); District Leaders Survey (n=14). *a There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.
### S2. Table P6

**Perceptions about the Use of Data to Support and/or Monitor SEAL Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach-Facilitator Survey</td>
<td>Facilitate and support data analysis (to support SEAL Implementation)</td>
<td>22%: 1-2/month - 1-2/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never - 1-2 times per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals Survey</td>
<td>Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation. (site level systems)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42% Agree; 3% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability. (indicator describes the implementation and sustainability of SEAL at your schools)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39% Agree; 0% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Leaders Survey</td>
<td>Data is used to monitor SEAL implementation and outcomes and inform continuous improvement of SEAL implementation. (site level systems)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21% Some of our schools; 43% All of our schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-None to 4-All of our schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>The Depth of Implementation tool is used to gather data about SEAL implementation and inform continuous improvement and sustainability. (indicator describes the implementation and sustainability of SEAL at the district level)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43% Agree; 7% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=33); Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=23); District Leaders Survey (n=14); District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=14).

* There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.
### S2. Table P7

**Perceptions about Collaboration and Intentional Planning to Support SEAL Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Result a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach-Facilitator Survey</td>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning based on the SEAL Model (as a SEAL Coach Facilitator, the impact of my implementation of SEAL)</td>
<td>90% Effective/Highly Effective Not Effective - Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals Survey</td>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design (We have seen this kind of impact at our school)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.87 68% agree; 10% strongly agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design. (We have seen this kind of impact at our school)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.0 61% Agree; 22% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Leaders Survey</td>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design (We have seen this kind of impact at our SEAL schools)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 3.50 50% agree; 50% strongly agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey</td>
<td>Increased collaboration and intentional planning between district and site leaders, based on the SEAL design. (We have seen this kind of impact at our SEAL schools)</td>
<td>Mean Response: 2.8 50% Agree; 14% Strongly Agree 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=34); District Leaders Survey (n=15); Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=23); District Leaders Survey (n=15); District Leader Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=14). a There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.*
### S3. Table P8

**Perceptions about Levels of Implementation of the SEAL Model**

| Survey                                | Item                                                                 | Result  \\  
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Coach-Facilitator Survey             | High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model (as a SEAL Coach Facilitator, the impact of my implementation of SEAL) | 72%    
|                                       |                                                                     | Effective/Highly Effective |
|                                       |                                                                     | Not Effective - Highly Effective |
| Principals Survey                    | High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model (We have seen this kind of impact at our school) | Mean Response: 2.94     
|                                       |                                                                     | 63% Agree; 16% Strongly Agree |
|                                       |                                                                     | 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree |
| Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey | High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model. (We have seen this kind of impact at our school) | Mean Response: 2.9    
|                                       |                                                                     | 74% Agree; 9% Strongly Agree |
|                                       |                                                                     | 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree |
| District Leaders Survey              | High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model (We have seen this kind of impact at our SEAL schools) | Mean Response: 3.08 |
|                                       |                                                                     | 75% Agree; 17% Strongly Agree |
|                                       |                                                                     | 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree |
| District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey | High levels of implementation of the SEAL Model (We have seen this kind of impact at our SEAL schools) | Mean Response: 2.9 |
|                                       |                                                                     | 79% Agree; 7% Strongly Agree |
|                                       |                                                                     | 1-Strongly Disagree to 4-Strongly Agree |

**Note.** Coach-Facilitator Survey (n=43); Principal Survey (n=32); District Leaders Survey (n=15); Principal Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=23); District Leaders Survey (n=12); District Leaders Implementation and Sustainability Survey (n=14).

* There was variation in response by item as respondents may have skipped a question.