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FROM: TONY THURMOND, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Update on the California Spanish Assessment Score Interpretation Study.

## Summary of Key Issues

This Memorandum provides a summary of the California Spanish Assessment Score Interpretation Study. Refer to Attachment 1 for the California Spanish Assessment Score Interpretation Study Report.

## Background

The California Spanish Assessment (CSA) is a new computer-based assessment for students in grades three through twelve, which replaces the Standards-based Tests in Spanish. The CSA is an optional test intended to measure students’ Spanish reading/language arts skills in reading, writing mechanics, and listening, and is aligned with the California Common Core State Standards (CCSS) en Español. The test-taking population includes students receiving instruction in Spanish and students seeking a measure that recognizes their Spanish-specific reading, writing mechanics, and listening skills.

In preparation for the first release of local educational agencies’ (LEAs) 2018–2019 CSA data and Student Score Reports, the contractor, Educational Testing Service (ETS), conducted the CSA Score Interpretation Study. The purpose of this study was to examine how educators from different Spanish programs could interpret and use the results of the CSA in conjunction with the Smarter Balanced English language arts/literacy (ELA) assessment, as both assessments predesigned to measure the same student’s reading/language arts skills in either Spanish or English, in addition to skills specific to the Spanish language. The CSA is aligned with the CCSS en Español, which includes linguistic augmentations specific to the Spanish language, and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment is aligned to the CCSS for ELA. Given that both assessments are aligned with similar standards, it is important to examine how educators in different bilingual programs throughout California might interpret the results of these two assessments.

This CSA Score Interpretation Study was conducted in July and August 2019 and included 51 educators from varying Spanish language programs who participated in one of 10 focus group interviews. A qualitative method was used to focus on the aggregate perception of educators in different Spanish programs. The three research questions that guided this study were:

1. In what ways are educators likely to interpret the results from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment?
2. What additional information would educators need to interpret these scores together?
3. How would educators use the scores from both assessments?

## Findings

After analyzing the data, the three following recurring themes emerged, which were closely aligned with the aforementioned research questions: perceptions of the scores; using the scores together; and helping parents understand the scores.

When discussing the perceptions of both scores, educators placed equal importance on the results of both assessments. Educators thought it to be most useful to gather information on what students are able to do in each language and which skills could transfer from one language to the other. Working together with their English counterparts to interpret both assessment results emerged as a priority amongst the majority of educators that participated in this study.

When discussing using the scores together, educators indicated that the information could provide them with a richer understanding of students’ biliteracy development, inform student placement decisions and instructional practices, tracking progress over time, and evaluating local Spanish programs. Furthermore, LEAs saw value in receiving guidance that could identify areas of improvement and potential professional development.

Moreover, the educators noted that interpreting the scores together could assist parents and guardians in understanding the relationship between the two assessments regarding the skills that are assessed and how the scores are reported. The educators also recommended that parents could be provided with information on the process of becoming biliterate and how skills in one language could transfer to learning an additional language.

Overall, the educators suggested providing guidance to LEAs in the following areas: information about both assessments; a comparison of the scale score ranges and achievement levels for both assessments; information on how to interpret the two Student Score Reports side-by-side; suggestions on how to assist stakeholders in the interpretation of results from both assessments; examples of best practices; and student and program attributes to consider.

In addition, the educators indicated that they would like the capability to search and compare results within the school and LEA to inform how they can augment their Spanish and English reading language arts programs to better support their students’ skills. They also recommended the development of parent resources that include information on bilingual programs and models along with a summary of literature on biliteracy development.

Lastly, educators were interested in knowing more about the characteristics of the Spanish programs in California and the students who are enrolled in these programs and are taking the CSA. The educators highlighted the need for guidance from the state on which attributes to include when describing their students, schools, and programs.

## Suggestions for Further Study

As a result of the CSA Score Interpretation Study, ETS is proposing an additional study to examine the main characteristics of the target test-taking population for the CSA and the attributes and characteristics of the programs in which they are enrolled. The CDE will provide information about the proposed study at a later date, and the study would likely be conducted after the next administration of the CSA.
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**1. Executive Summary**

This report has been prepared for the California Department of Education (CDE) by Educational Testing Service (ETS) under the Task 9 special studies of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) contract.

The California Spanish Assessment (CSA) is a new computer-based assessment for students in grades three through twelve that replaces California’s former primary language test, the Standards-based Tests in Spanish. It is a voluntary test intended to measure students’ Spanish reading/language arts skills, specifically in reading, writing mechanics, and listening, and is aligned with the California Common Core State Standards (CCSS) en Español. The targeted test-taking population includes students receiving instruction in Spanish, and students seeking a measure that recognizes their Spanish-specific skills as measured by the CSA.

Students who take the CSA likely will also take the Smarter Balanced English language arts/literacy (ELA) assessment and will have scores for both assessments. Consequently, the purpose of the CSA score interpretation study was to examine how teachers and administrators from different Spanish programs (e.g., [two-way dual immersion, one-way dual immersion, Spanish enrichment, Spanish as a foreign language](#Program_Types)) would interpret the results from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment. The three research questions that guided this study were as follows:

1. In what ways are educators likely to interpret the results from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment?
2. What additional information would educators need to interpret these scores together?
3. How would educators use the scores from both assessments?

Using a focus group methodology and a CDE-approved interview protocol, ETS conducted 10 digitally recorded focus group interviews with 51 participants (refer to Section 7 for details on how participants were selected and Appendix B for information on participants), with this goal: to learn how teachers and administrators from different Spanish programs would interpret and use the scores from both the CSA and Smarter Balanced ELA assessment. The interviews were conducted in July and August 2019, and each interview lasted approximately 75 minutes. The key findings and suggestions for future work are as follows:

* **Interpreting the results from the two assessments**. The educators suggested that in order to interpret results from the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment together, educators should give both scores the same importance, and scores should be interpreted from a holistic bilingual perspective—what students have learned in each language, what they have learned in both languages, and which skills they can transfer from one language to the other. Spanish teachers who co-teach with English teachers will need to work together to interpret these scores so they can determine what they need to do to support their students. Moreover, all the interviewed educators agreed that the best way to interpret these scores is to disaggregate the scores (overall score) by grade level and different subgroups, including students’ language and educational background, English learner (EL) status, and length of time in the program.
* **Additional Information Needed to Interpret the Two Scores Together**. Educators commented they could consider additional information to help them better understand the scores on both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment. Their understanding might be enhanced, for example, by learning how similar or different the two assessments are in terms of which skills they measure, how they measure those skills, and what information is reported. Equally important is understanding the literature supporting the type of bilingual or Spanish programs they participate in and the literature explaining how students become biliterate (e.g., how long it takes to become biliterate, how one language supports the other one, etc.). Finally, it is very important to know who the students are (e.g., language background, educational background, etc.) and the type of school and program in which they are enrolled. This information could be used to help other stakeholders (e.g., parents, guardians, students, district personnel) interpret the scores on these two assessments.
* **Potential uses for the two scores**. According to the educators, the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment scores could be used together for multiple purposes, such as: to gain a broader, richer understanding of students’ biliteracy development; to inform instruction (e.g., identify areas that need improvement, plan instructional interventions, determine resources needed to support students’ biliteracy development, etc.); to place students; and to track their literacy development in both languages over time. The scores also could be used to assist in determining whether students are on track to earn the State Seal of Biliteracy. Lastly, these scores could be used for program evaluation and improvement, as well as making comparisons with similar programs in order to allow programs to collaborate and learn from each other.
* **For future consideration**. Considerations for future work include the conducting of a research study to better understand the student population and the attributes to describe the programs which students are enrolled in that participate in the CSA. Equally important to consider is the provision of guidance to educators in terms of how they can interpret the two scores side by side, the additional information they would need to better interpret these scores, how they can assist other stakeholders in interpreting the scores on both assessments, and how best to use these two scores.

**2. Background**

A component of the CAASPP System, the CSA is an optional assessment that replaces the Standards-based Tests in Spanish and is aligned with the California CCSS en Español. This new computer-based assessment, which is for students in grades three through eight and high school, measures a student’s Spanish reading/language arts skills, specifically in reading, writing mechanics, and listening. The target test-taking population for the CSA consists of students who speak Spanish as their primary language, as well as those who are learning Spanish as an additional language.

It is likely that students who take the CSA also take the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment, so they will have scores for both assessments. The Smarter Balanced ELA assessment also is part of the CAASPP System and is based on the CCSS for ELA. It is a computer-based assessment for all students in grades three through eight and grade eleven.

Given that these two assessments both are measures of a student’s reading/language arts skills and are aligned with similar standards—the CCSS en Español is a translated and linguistic augmented version of the CCSS for ELA—it is important to examine how educators in different Spanish programs might interpret and use the results of these two assessments.

**3.** **Study Purpose**

The goal of this study was to examine how teachers and administrators from different Spanish programs could interpret and use the results from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment.

**4.** **Research Questions**

To obtain information on how teachers and administrators would interpret and use the results from both the CSA and Smarter Balanced assessment, ETS conducted a study to answer the following research questions:

1. In what ways are educators likely to interpret the results from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment?
2. What additional information would educators need to interpret these scores together?
3. How would educators use the scores from both assessments?

**5.** **Methodology**

ETS employed a focus group methodology with the goal of learning how teachers and administrators from different Spanish language programs (e.g., two-way dual language, one-way dual language, Spanish enrichment, and Spanish as a foreign language) could interpret and use the scores from both the CSA and Smarter Balanced ELA assessment. The focus group interviews provided an opportunity to expand the number of participants and capture a wide range of meanings and perceptions (Fontana and Frey 2000; Morgan 1997).

The focus group interviews were conducted online, in English, in July and August 2019. Each interview lasted approximately 75 minutes. A CDE-approved focus group interview protocol was developed to guide all the discussions. Each focus group interview was led by one of two ETS interviewers. The two interviewers met one week prior to the beginning of the study to learn how to use the online video platform, how to send out invitations to the participants, and how to audio record the sessions. The two interviewers also reviewed the goals of the study, the questions in the interview protocol, and discussed the general guidelines for conducting the focus group interviews. The ETS interviewers were research scientist Alexis Lopez and senior research assistant Florencia Tolentino.

**6. Materials**

ETS prepared all the materials for the focus groups interview study. All the materials used for this study were in English only. Each of these documents was reviewed and approved by the CDE. The following materials were used:

* Consent form
* Online participant background questionnaire
* Focus group interview protocol

The consent form for the teachers and the administrators included information about the nature of the study as well as its benefits and risks. All the participants were required to return the signed consent form to ETS via email prior to the start of the study.

The participant background questionnaire was implemented on an online survey platform and used to recruit participants for this study. In this questionnaire, prospective participants stated their interest in participating in the study and also provided personal background information (e.g., gender, age, educational background, teaching experience, contact information, etc.) and information about their Spanish language instructional program (e.g., type of program, role in the program, course they taught or supervised in the program, grade levels they worked with, length of time in the program, classes offered in Spanish, etc.). The window to complete the online questionnaire was four weeks.

The focus group interview protocol included questions about the participants’ Spanish programs, how they could interpret the results from score reports for both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment, additional information needed to understand the results, the combinations of scores they expected from their students, and how they could use the results from both assessments.

**7. Sampling**

The target sample for this study were educators in different bilingual and Spanish language programs (e.g., two-way dual language, one-way dual language, Spanish enrichment, and Spanish as a foreign language). [Appendix A](#Appendix_A) contains information about these programs. These programs were selected based on the programs that participated in the CSA field study in 2018. The initial targeted sample included 72 participants—36 teachers and 36 administrators. Because most of the students who participated in the CSA field test were from dual language immersion programs, ETS included more educators from this type of program.

An invitation to participate in this study was sent out to CAASPP test site coordinators, local educational agency (LEA) CAASPP coordinators, and CSA test administrators. They forwarded this invitation to Spanish teachers and administrators (principals, assistant principals, program coordinators, testing coordinators, etc.) in different programs such as two-way dual language immersion, one-way dual language immersion, developmental bilingual, Spanish enrichment, and Spanish as a foreign language. Prospective participants were asked to complete a short online background questionnaire. The questionnaire asked prospective participants to state their willingness to participate in the focus group interviews and to provide contact information (e.g., email address, phone number, etc.) and personal background information (e.g., gender, age, etc.). The survey was designed to elicit responses about prospective participants’ programs, their roles in the programs, how long they had been in the programs, and the courses they taught or were responsible for in their schools.

ETS received 252 responses from potential participants. Initially, 51 respondents were screened out because they did not teach any courses in Spanish, had been recently hired by the school, or were teaching exclusively in kindergarten through grade two. ETS contacted the remaining 201 potential participants via email to gather information about their availability and to complete and sign the consent form. A total of 63 educators signed and returned the consent form; however, only 58 of them confirmed their availability and were scheduled for a focus group interview meeting. In total, 51 participants participated in the focus group interview meetings.

Of the 51 participants, 28 of them were administrators (15 principals, 6 assistant principals, 6 program coordinators, and 1 test coordinator) and the other 23 were Spanish teachers. The educators were from four different Spanish language programs: 34 in two-way dual language immersion programs (18 with the 90/10 model, 3 with the 80/20 model, 1 with the 60/40 model, and 12 with the 50/50 model), 4 in one-way dual language immersion programs (2 with the 90/10 model and 2 with the 50/50 model), 5 in Spanish enrichment programs, and 8 in Spanish as a world language programs (half of these programs also included courses in Spanish for heritage speakers). Most of the participants, 80.4 percent (or 41), were female. Their ages ranged from 25 to 69 (with a mean of 45.8) and their time in the program ranged from 1 to 29 (with a mean of 8.6) years. According to the participants, 76.5 percent (or 39) of these programs were aligned with the CCCS en Español. Additional information about all 51 participants is provided in [Appendix B](#Appendix_Participants).

**8. Procedures**

ETS conducted 10 focus group interviews with 51 participants. The initial plan was to schedule meetings according to role (administrator or teacher) and Spanish language program. However, this was logistically difficult to accomplish. [Appendix B](#Appendix_Participants) contains additional information about each of the 10 meetings.

Each interview was conducted in English by a single researcher via an online teleconference and lasted approximately 75 minutes. All the focus group sessions were audio recorded and transcribed. The same interview protocol was used in all 10 meetings to ensure methodological consistency (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison 2017). At the beginning of each meeting, the researcher who moderated the focus interview stated the goal of the study and the expectations for the meeting. Then, the participants described their educational programs and explained which information about their programs and their students was essential in order to interpret the scores on the two assessments. The participants went on to discuss how they could interpret the two scores together and what additional information would be needed to help them and other stakeholders interpret the two scores. Next, the participants discussed how they could use the two scores together and the types of decisions they could make based on the two scores. Finally, the participants discussed the different types of score combinations in the two assessments that they could expect from their students so they could think about the information they would need to help them understand these combinations of scores for different subgroups of students.

Established guidelines were followed to keep the conversations focused, to avoid having a few participants control the conversations and to encourage passive participants to contribute (Fontana and Grey 2000). A standardized interview protocol was developed, and experienced interviewers were assigned to facilitate these meetings. Participants were informed that all their comments were confidential and would be used only for research purposes; they were assigned a participant number to keep their participation anonymous. These strategies generated free-flowing exchanges about the educators’ perceptions on how to interpret and use the two assessments together. To help participants prepare for the focus group meetings, ETS shared the topics that were expected to be discussed in the meetings ahead of time (Morgan, 1997).

**9. Coding and Analysis**

A qualitative method was used to analyze all the focus group sessions (Charmaz 2014; Miles and Huberman 1994). The focus was not on individual educator-level analysis but rather on the aggregate perceptions of educators in different programs (Fontana & Grey, 2000). All the audio recordings were transcribed verbatim and analyzed with the aim of capturing similarities and differences across participants in how they would interpret and use the two assessment scores. The first phase of the analysis involved two ETS researchers independently reading all the interview transcripts twice to gain more familiarity with the data (Tesch 1990). After repeated reading of all the interview transcripts, the two researchers used a grounded open coding process (Charmaz 2014; Richardson 2000; Wertz et al. 2001) to independently generate a preliminary set of codes as well as a series of notes on themes emergent in the data. The two researchers met to compare and discuss their preliminary codes and themes to determine whether they had arrived at similar data interpretations. Disagreements in the preliminary coding were resolved through discussion, and consensus was reached, as suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1990).

After the researchers reached agreement on the content of the revised coding scheme, they proceeded to code the first interview independently. The two researchers met again to discuss their coding scheme, and slight revisions were made after reaching consensus. Subsequently, both researchers independently coded one more interview using the revised coding scheme. The two researchers met again and made slight additional modifications to the coding scheme. After coding one more interview, the two researchers met again to compare and discuss their coding. In this meeting, the two researchers reached the conclusion that the level of agreement between them was acceptable and they were confident in the coding scheme they had developed as suggested by Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, and Pedersen (2013). The first researcher proceeded to code the remaining seven interviews. After all 10 interviews were coded, the second researcher reviewed the coding and then met again with the first researcher to discuss all the coding. The two researchers used this coding to identify categories of recurring themes that indicated how the educators could interpret and use the scores from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA. The three recurring themes were closely aligned with the topic addressed in each of the three research questions: interpreting the two scores together, additional information needed to interpret the two scores, and potential uses for the two scores. An overview of the coding scheme is provided in table 1 on the following page.

**Table 1. Overview of the Coding Scheme**

| **Themes** | **Codes** |
| --- | --- |
| How to interpret the two scores | * Give same importance to both assessments (10) * Interpret using a holistic bilingual lens (10) * Ensure collaboration of Spanish and English teachers (10) * Break down scores for each domain (10) * Break down scores for student subgroups (10) |
| Additional information needed to interpret the two scores | * Overlap between the two assessments (10) * Research about their bilingual model (7) * Research about biliteracy development (10) * Information about their school (10) * Information about their program (10) * Information about student demographics (7) * Information about students’ language background (10) * Information about students’ educational experiences (10) |
| How the two scores could be used together | * Identify students’ strengths (10) * Identify students’ weaknesses (10) * Identify skills that students need to focus on (10) * Identify resources needed to support students (5) * Identify type of interventions needed (6) * Place or group students (4) * Measure biliteracy development over time (8) * Inform other stakeholders (4) * Earn State Seal of Biliteracy (4) * Support ELs (10) * Identify if ELs have special needs (4) * Evaluate and improve their programs (8) * Identify areas for professional development (5) * Learn from similar programs (6) |

*Note:* The number in parenthesis indicates the number of focus group meetings in which this code appeared.

**10. Limitations of the Study**

ETS recruited only participants who were easy to reach for this study (e.g., educators who had previously participated in other CSA meetings or studies and suggested colleagues). Furthermore, only educators who signed and returned the consent form were able to participate in this study. Although ETS was able to recruit 51 educators from four different Spanish language instructional programs for this study (two-way dual language immersion, one-way dual language immersion, Spanish enrichment, and Spanish as a foreign language), most of the participants were from two-way dual language immersion programs (34 of the 51 participants, or 67 percent) which are the most representative in California. Additionally, most of the students who participated in the CSA pilot and field test studies and the first operational CSA in April 2019 were in two-way dual language immersion programs.

At the time of the study, the CSA Student Score Reports had not yet been released to the educators who participated in the study. Therefore, the participants were not able to describe how they had interpreted and used CSA and ELA scores. Rather, the participants talked about the different ways in which they were likely to interpret the two assessment scores and how they could potentially use these two scores.

Despite these limitations, during the 10 focus group meetings ETS was able to collect rich, in-depth information about how the educators would interpret the scores using data from the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment together. ETS also collected additional information that would help the educators and other stakeholders to interpret these two scores, and discussed potential uses for these two assessments.

**11. Findings**

The findings of the study are presented in this section and are organized by research questions. Included is information about how educators likely would interpret the scores on the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessments together, other information that would be useful for them and other stakeholders (e.g., parents, guardians, district personnel, etc.) to understand the relationship between the two scores, and different ways educators could potentially use the two scores together. When appropriate, we report differences in interpretation among program types. No differences in interpretation were found between administrators and teachers.

**Research Question 1: In what ways are educators likely to interpret the results from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment?**

This subsection presents different strategies educators could use to interpret the scores from the CSA in combination with the scores from the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment. These strategies include giving equal importance to both assessments, using a [holistic bilingual lens](#Holistic_Bilingual) to interpret the scores, interpreting the scores as a team (English and Spanish educators), and disaggregating scores to identify trends for several subpopulations.

**Give the Same Importance to Both Assessments**

The educators in all the focus group meetings agreed that to interpret the scores on the CSA and Smarter Balanced ELA together, schools should give both scores equal importance. This implies that instruction in both languages is equally valued by the school and that both assessments provide valuable information about the students’ biliteracy development. It was discussed in all the interview meetings with bilingual educators that schools tend to give more importance to English instruction than to Spanish instruction, so they needed to find ways to place the same value for Spanish to recognize that developing literacy in Spanish is important and that students need access to quality literacy instruction in Spanish. Likewise, in three of the focus groups, Spanish enrichment and Spanish as a foreign language educators stated that Spanish instruction is often regarded simply as elective coursework.

Educators in all the focus group interviews stated that they have a very positive perception of the CSA and like that this assessment is aligned with the CCCS en Español. From what they know about the CSA (e.g., their participation in CSA meetings, the online practice tests, and comments from their students), they believe the CSA is a very rigorous assessment. They thought if the CSA were as rigorous as the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment, they would be able to interpret both scores side by side. In a way, interpreting the CSA in combination with the Smarter Balanced ELA validates the learning of Spanish and recognizes the importance of becoming bilingual and biliterate. A principal at a kindergarten through grade five school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 12) explained the value of putting the CSA scores side by side with the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment:

[Having] A statewide assessment like the CSA validates that knowledge, the learning of Spanish. It’s a validation that biliteracy is about both languages and giving equal footing to both, because everyone talks about the SBAC,[[1]](#footnote-1) and CSA is just coming out right now, and in our district meetings they’re like, Oh, that’s right, but we’ll talk about that once we get the scores.

Moreover, the educators in all the focus group meetings commented that to interpret both scores together, the two assessments also needed to have similar rigor and importance. They pointed out that the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment is well-regarded and is already valued in their schools. Because the CSA is a new assessment and is not mandatory for all students, it would take some time for it to be valued similarly. However, the educators indicated that because both assessments are standards-based and rigorous, schools would potentially give them the same importance in the near future. One of the principals at a K–8 school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 8) talked about the potential for both assessments to have equal value:

It’s an opportunity to finally house some sort of a major commitment to the Spanish development or proof of the Spanish development of our students and we haven’t had that before. We’d had also several different ways to try to, like, prove that the children are efficient. So, I mean that’s meaningful as well, you know, obviously this is the progress we expect them to have in English, but if we’re really, truly leaving our division [between English and Spanish] that most of us have or bilingual education, then we finally have a measure that’s equal or close to it for both languages. I think that’s very important.

**Use a Holistic Bilingual Lens to Interpret the Two Scores**

All the focus groups discussed that the best way to interpret these two scores together is from a holistic bilingual perspective (Hopewell and Escamilla 2014), implying that the rich linguistic practices and multiple literacies of bilingual students are valued. This means that educators should look at the two scores globally to determine how much their students are developing their literacy skills. For example, the two scores could indicate how much the students have developed their literacy skills in English, in Spanish, and in both languages. Educators also could look at the relationship between skills across languages, how they complement each other, and whether these skills can be transferred from one language to the other. This practice is in contrast to an interpretation that is more in line with the deficit perspective, which calls for educators to simply use the results to compare which score is higher or lower. For example, one of the Spanish teachers in a two-way dual language immersion program (Participant 7) explained how the two scores would be interpreted using a holistic biliteracy lens:

I just wanted to say something about the panic of how the data is going to be rolled out and presented to families and districts and schools… If we present the data from a comparative point of view, low and high, we’re already perpetuating this idea that the kids are low in one and high in the other or low in both. So, I’m wondering … if we can present the data more from a gross perspective.… Like why do they have to be so comparative? Why can’t it be more holistic from a biliteracy lens and I know there’s a lot of research around looking at biliteracy achievement data from an additive point of view and not perpetuating this low–high kind of paradigm, right? So, just something to think about perhaps the way the data is presented in what the kids can do in English and what the kids can do in Spanish and one biliteracy score. I know that’s like super progressive but it’s something that I think would really alleviate some of the misconception that our English language learners are struggling in both, you know, because I hear a lot of that, you know, here in my district. Oh, they’re low in Español and they’re low in English, you know, and so we’re feeding into that if the data is presented in a comparative form.

**Interpret Scores Collaboratively**

It was stated in all the focus group interviews that the best way to interpret the two scores would be for both English and Spanish teachers to interpret them together as a team, even if the English teachers do not have knowledge of Spanish. This would provide English and Spanish teachers the opportunity to discuss what the two scores mean, how one score informs the other, and how they would use this information to support the literacy development of their students in both languages. The educators in dual language immersion programs commented that it is customary to have school-wide meetings at the beginning of each school year to discuss their students’ assessment scores (e.g., Smarted Balanced ELA and mathematics) to determine how each teacher can support the students in developing their skills. The educators stated that they were very excited about the possibility of including the CSA scores in these meetings to show what their students have accomplished in Spanish. An assistant principal at a kindergarten through grade six school with a dual language program (Participant 45) explained how the Spanish teachers in her school would like to share the CSA results in these meetings:

We always start the school year with looking at our CAASPP scores so that teachers, obviously or as like a team, they always get the ELA scores to see how the students are progressing in English, but I know our Spanish teachers feel a little left out and they want to make sure that they had information or data of how they’re progressing in Spanish.

In four of the focus group meetings, educators in Spanish enrichment and Spanish-as-a foreign-language programs discussed that jointly comparing these two scores would be an opportunity to foster more collaboration between Spanish and English departments. These educators commented that middle school and high school, Spanish and English teachers in Spanish enrichment and Spanish-as-a foreign-language programs are usually in different departments and tend to work independently.

**Examine Disaggregated Scores**

In all the focus group meetings educators said they would like to be able to disaggregate student data into subpopulations; for example, by program type (two-way immersion, one-way immersion, transitional bilingual, Spanish enrichment, Spanish as a foreign language, etc.), [bilingual model](#Program_Types) (90/10, 80/20, 50/50), grade, language background (Spanish speakers vs. Spanish learners, EL status, home language, etc.), demographics (socioeconomic status, ethnicity, country of origin, length of time in the U.S., etc.), or educational background (formal education in home country, length of time in program, etc.). The educators explained that disaggregating scores would help them identify important trends and patterns over time and recognize any emerging similarities or differences within and among subpopulations. A principal in a school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 50) described how her school would disaggregate the scores by subgroups to examine their performance in both languages:

I think looking at having both the English and the Spanish results could give me a lot of information about how the student is doing in terms of being enrolled in the dual immersion program especially looking at, you know, the past history of scores and other data points we might have about the student and seeing, you know, what the student’s strengths are, what the student’s areas for growth are and again, we can also look at it program-wide if we see how our students are doing. We always break down by, you know, what was … their original home language whether they entered the program as a Spanish speaker and English speaker. So, we’re looking at that how they’re doing in both languages.

**Research Question 2: What additional information would educators need to interpret these scores together?**

In this subsection, information is presented about educators’ perceptions on what else is needed to interpret the scores from the two assessments. Additional information might include knowing the relationship between the two assessments, how students become biliterate, the background of the students, and the characteristics of the programs in which they are enrolled. The educators explained that this information would help them understand differences in scores and differences in patterns of biliteracy development in both languages and across subgroups. They noted that key school stakeholders (school administrators and teachers) already know this information. However, they would need to share this information with other stakeholders (e.g., some parents or guardians, district personnel, the community in general, etc.) or remind them about it to help them make better sense of the two scores.

**Understanding the Relationship Between the Two Assessments**

In all the focus group meetings the educators pointed out that understanding the relationship between the two assessments would help them make better sense of the two scores. This includes understanding the overlap and the differences between the two assessments in terms of the skills that are assessed, how these skills are assessed, the claims that are made, and the information that is reported (e.g., achievement levels, score ranges, and subscores). The educators commented that this information also would be shared with other stakeholders to help them better understand the two scores. A teacher in a high school with a Spanish enrichment program (Participant 7) explained how important it is to understand the relationship between the two assessments:

We really need to understand the two assessments and what they report. We need to know the overlap between the two. I mean, we know they are not exactly assessing the same thing. But regardless, there’s a lot of overlap, right? We need more details on how the data is going to be, like, laid out. Is it going to be by domain like in English? Or is it going to be just like a raw score?

**Understanding How Students Become Biliterate**

In six of the focus group meetings, the educators in dual language programs stated that having a clear understanding about the research on how students become biliterate would also help them to interpret the scores on both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment; for example, understanding that developing biliteracy skills is a complex and dynamic process that takes several years and can be done in a wide range of educational and social contexts. It is also important to realize that becoming biliterate differs from becoming literate in only one language as students use all their linguistic resources, and that developing literacy skills in one language informs developing literacy skills in the other language. This information also could be shared with other stakeholders (e.g., teachers, administrators, district personnel, parents, guardians, and students) to help them understand these two scores. One of the Spanish teachers at an elementary school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 8) explained how she would share information about biliteracy research with other stakeholders to help them understand the scores on the two assessments:

I would direct them [other stakeholders] to the research behind our bilingual program, a dual immersion program. And what the research had been proven to say …Yeah. I would go back to the research because a lot of these times in third grade, parents do panic that they have to take this assessment and what if they don’t pass it, or we have to remind them of the program that they’re in and the benefit and to you know, the sacred time that they have that eventually they will progress.

In seven of the focus group meetings, the educators in dual language programs also said that it is important to share information with other stakeholders about their bilingual program model to explain or remind them about expected scores and different trajectories for biliteracy. An assistant principal at an elementary school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 43) talked about the importance of reminding parents and guardians about the bilingual model they have at school, noting, ‘I think explaining the model of your program over and over and over again. If you are a 90/10 program, the outcomes at 4th grade might look different if you’re 50/50 program especially on the English side. So, consistently reminding people of the model and what the focus of the program is.’

**Understanding Who the Students Are and the Programs in Which They Are Enrolled**

In all the interview meetings, it was discussed that there are many bilingual and Spanish programs in California that vary according to students’ language and educational background, program goals, and classes offered. Therefore, perhaps it is not surprising that the educators agreed that knowing who the test takers are and which program they are enrolled in could facilitate test score interpretation for both assessments. They explained that some of the stakeholders who are directly involved in the program already had this information, but they would need to share it with other stakeholders who were not necessarily familiar with their programs (e.g., parents and guardians). Useful information follows that could be considered to allow valid interpretation of the scores and the different patterns of biliteracy development. In the discussions below, the number of meetings, given in parentheses, indicates the number of focus group meetings in which this information was discussed as being important.

**Language background of the students**. Because both native Spanish speakers and native English speakers participate in bilingual and Spanish programs, the educators in all the focus group interviews thought it was important to know the students’ Spanish status (e.g., Spanish speaker or Spanish learner) and English learner status (current EL, long-term EL, reclassified, non-EL). Similarly, in six of the meetings it was discussed that it is also important to know the language that students speak at home.

**Educational background of the students**. The focus groups discussed that students from Spanish-speaking countries come to the U.S. with diverse educational experiences. Thus, it is important to know the previous educational experiences of CSA test takers. For example, some of the groups discussed the importance of knowing whether the student has had formal instruction in Spanish in a Spanish-speaking country (six meetings), how long the student has been enrolled in the bilingual or Spanish program (seven meetings), whether the student was previously enrolled in a bilingual program, and whether the student is enrolled in any other types of Spanish program such as Spanish enrichment or Spanish as a foreign language (three meetings).

**Student demographics**. The educators stated that it is important to know the student demographics to understand who the students are. For example, it was discussed in some of the focus group interviews that it would be important to know the socioeconomic status of their students in terms of the percentage of students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged (six meetings), the ethnicity of the students (eight meetings), whether the students are receiving special education services (four meetings), and the grade students were when they enrolled in a school in the United States for the first time (eight meetings).

**Description of the schools**. The educators in all the focus group interviews thought it was important to know which schools the test takers are enrolled in and discussed different attributes that could be used to describe the schools. Examples included the type of school, because there are different types in California (six meetings); where the school is located, as it provides valuable information about student demographics (eight meetings); the total number of students in the school, because it is important to know how many students the program is serving (eight meetings); the percentage of students in the school who are enrolled in the program, because some schools have school-wide programs and others do not (eight meetings); and the number of students who took the CSA, given that it is a voluntary assessment (eight meetings).

**Description of the Spanish programs**. Because the students taking the CSA are enrolled in different Spanish programs, all the focus groups discussed that it is important to know the characteristics of the programs. The educators mentioned different attributes of these programs. Examples included the year the program started in the LEA (seven meetings), the bilingual model used (i.e., 90/10, 80/20, 70/30, and 50/50) (nine meetings), grades in which the program started and ended (nine meetings), the classes that were offered in English and in Spanish (10 meetings), and who had access to their programs. It was explained that some programs required all students to start the program in kindergarten, while others accepted students at any grade (four meetings).

**Research Question 3: How would educators use the scores from both assessments?**

This subsection provides information about the educators’ perceptions on potential uses for the scores from both the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment. It describes how the educators could use the two scores together to inform instruction, to measure biliteracy development over time, to inform other stakeholders about their programs, to help students earn the State Seal of Biliteracy, to learn more about the biliteracy development of ELs, to evaluate and improve their programs, and to learn what other programs are doing.

**To Inform Instruction**

The focus groups discussed how the scores on both assessments could be used to inform their instructional practices. For example, the two scores could be used to identify students’ strengths, the areas or skills that need improvement, and the skills to focus on for the following academic school year. Some of the groups discussed other ways of using the two scores together to inform instruction. Five groups commented that the two scores would be used to determine which resources are needed to support students in both languages. In six groups, the educators said that the two scores would be used to determine the type of interventions that are needed to support students’ biliteracy development. In three of the focus groups, the educators in Spanish-as-a-foreign-language high school programs stated that they would use the scores on the CSA to make placement decisions to determine which Spanish class students should take (e.g., Spanish 1, Spanish 2, or AP Spanish). One of the principals in a kindergarten through grade six school with a two-way dual language immersion program (Participant 42) described how her school could use the two scores to determine which areas to focus on and the resources needed to support students:

We are going to all have to take a look at our programs and start seriously addressing the holes that we might be having in their curriculum and looking for additional resources and then like somebody mentioned, is where we are going to provide that intervention. Is that going to be in the Spanish or in the English and at what grade?

In five of the interview meetings, the educators commented that the content of the CSA could have a positive impact on their curriculum and the instruction of Spanish. They agreed that the CSA is a very rigorous assessment that is aligned to the CCSS en Español, even for their Spanish speakers. Given that the CSA is aligned to the CCSS en Español, they believed more Spanish and bilingual programs would start aligning their instructional programs with the CCCS en Español.

A teacher in a high school with a Spanish enrichment program (Participant 20) discussed how the CSA could influence her instructional practices, commenting, ‘It [the CSA] can definitively inform your instruction as a teacher. Because I thought it to be a pretty rigorous test. We too can up the rigor maybe if necessary, in, our classrooms to make sure that we are giving them the rigor needed to be actually literate in Spanish.’

However, the educators in one of the focus groups with dual language program administrators pointed out that, in terms of writing, the CSA only assesses writing mechanics, so, it is important to focus their instruction on all the skills stated in the CCCS en Español.

**To Measure Literacy Development in Both Languages Over Time**

In all the interview meetings, the educators stated that they anticipate different patterns of scores for the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment within programs (e.g., low on both assessments, high on one assessment and low on the other one, or high on both assessments). Regardless of the pattern of biliteracy development, they expect their students to continue developing their literacy skills in both languages. Consequently, the educators commented that these two scores could be used to measure their students’ literacy development in the two languages over time. A testing coordinator in an elementary school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 13) explained the types of scores they anticipate on both assessments and how they could use these scores to measure students’ literacy development in both languages:

Just speaking for the 50/50 model. I would hope that we get similar growth on both the Spanish and English components of the assessment. So, if it is, again, like everyone else said. If you don’t have that, then you’d have a look at the program again and we can evaluate parts of it. But yeah, I expect similar growth and I expect that would be a big selling point to a community that’s demanding this, immersion programs, whichever model you have, but at our school we have a 50/50.

Moreover, some of the educators in dual language immersion programs explained in four of the interview meetings that they also would like to use these two scores to track their students’ progress over time, even after the students have left their programs. These educators expect that their former students will show steady growth in the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment over time. However, they also would like to verify that their literacy skills in Spanish are not decreasing over time, even if they are no longer in a bilingual program. One of the assistant principals in an elementary school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 45) described how her school would like to use these two scores to track the biliteracy development of their current and former students, saying ‘We are the only dual language school within our district. We want to determine how effective our program is. We are looking for data in regards to how well those students who started from kinder or first grade who are now exiting, who have now exited our school, how well has their Spanish has developed throughout the years.’

**To Inform Other Stakeholders About Their Programs**

In four of the focus group meetings, the educators in dual language programs explained that they would use the scores on these two assessments to inform other stakeholders (e.g., parents/guardians) about their bilingual programs and about the biliteracy development of their students. For example, one of the principals at an elementary school with a dual language program (Participant 37) said that they could use these two scores to communicate with parents, and to inform them about how their children are developing literacy skills in both languages. She remarked, ‘Just serving as another way to communicate to our stakeholders, our parents, to be able to demonstrate the proficiency in both languages in a different way that is more like the baseline, it’s what we’ve done, it’s across state and so forth.’

These educators also commented that they would use these two scores to communicate with their students. Educators stated that it was very important to share the results with their students so the students could determine how much they had learned in both languages. A principal at a kindergarten through grade eight school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 24) described how the two scores could inform students about their biliteracy development:

I think looking at the scores allows us to see where the students … where their strengths and weaknesses are, but it also gives us the opportunity to find relevance, to help them understand why they’re learning certain concepts. So, I think they can be used to find the relevance in the students’ learning, to help them understand why they’re learning what they’re learning and how it serves them.

**To Help Students Earn the State Seal of Biliteracy**

The educators in Spanish enrichment and Spanish-as-a-foreign-language programs stated in four of the focus group meetings that they liked that the CSA is a voluntary assessment that any student can take, even if they are not enrolled in a Spanish or bilingual program. The educators in Spanish as a foreign language programs highlighted that not all the students in their programs take the Advanced Placement (AP) Spanish assessment. They explained that for the most part, the only students taking large-scale Spanish assessments in their programs are those enrolled in AP Spanish. They stated that the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment would allow students to earn the California State Seal of Biliteracy even if they do not take AP Spanish. The State Seal of Biliteracy is an academic recognition for graduating high school students who have demonstrated a high level of proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in English and another language. Earning the California State Seal of Biliteracy could be a motivating factor for students to learn Spanish and to perform well on the CSA.

Similarly, two educators in middle schools with Spanish enrichment programs explained that they had no current assessment to provide students with a pathway to a Seal of Biliteracy in high school. The pathway to the Seal of Biliteracy is an award for elementary and middle school students to reward engagement in the pursuit of language skills in two or more languages or for attainment of a specified level of biliteracy. Thus, these two scores could also be used to help them determine whether these students are on the right path toward the State Seal of Biliteracy. A principal at a kindergarten through grade eight school with a Spanish enrichment program (Participant 3) shared that these two assessments could be used to help students earn the State Seal of Biliteracy or show a pathway to the Seal of Biliteracy and to recognize and value these students’ language background and their educational experiences:

Having the CSA, I think really helps provide us the common assessment that we could use across the different grade levels and across different cities in California so that we would be able to provide the same measures, especially now with the Seal of Biliteracy or the pathway [to the] Seal of Biliteracy to measure that. I honor the fact that this work has been done and so we’re now moving forward and being able to have that measure of bilingual programs throughout the state, even if a school does not offer the bilingual program, that the children will still be able to use that or that the parents could request, ‘I want my child to take the CSA. It’s somewhat of a cultural enrichment as well, not just academic that you provide the children with a pride that I’m able to do this even though I’m not in a formal Spanish-speaking classroom, but I’m able to get recognized for my biliteracy. I think this could be the greatest benefit that the CSA could bring to our school site.

**To Learn More About the Biliteracy Development of English Learners**

In all the interview meetings, educators shared that there were many ELs in their programs. They stated that using these two scores together would represent a more robust and valid means of understanding the biliteracy development of ELs, including long-term ELs. Thus, the educators shared that these two assessments would inform them on how the students’ literacy development in Spanish could support their literacy development in English. A principal in an elementary school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 38) explained that the scores on both assessments would provide information that educators could use to support all their students, including ELs, noting, ‘We’ve been trying to do a better job to monitor the equity piece of our programs. So, I think having that Spanish assessment is another way to gather more data within our program so that we are servicing the needs of all of our students.’

**To Evaluate and Improve Their Programs**

In five of the focus group meetings, educators in dual language programs stated that the scores from both assessments would be used to evaluate and strengthen their bilingual programs. The two scores would potentially provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of their programs as they show what students can do in both languages. The results would show what areas in their programs need improvement. Five of the educators in dual language immersion programs shared that their schools had recently—three to five years ago—started bilingual programs. These educators stated that these two scores would be used to validate their decision to implement a bilingual program and the model they selected. They also explained that these scores would be used to show their community what their students are learning in their new bilingual program. One of the principals in an elementary school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 12) explained how they would use these two assessments to validate the decisions they made regarding their bilingual program:

But if you’re showing the growth in Spanish, you can see that yes, look at their literacy level on Spanish. They’re third grade level. All of research shows that it’s going to take some time for them to outperform everyone else. We’re only up to fifth grade now. But it validates the research. And so, with people that have been holding their breath to make sure that we’re doing the right thing, it’s an added piece of data that will support the research we’ve based our programs on.

In five of the focus group interviews, it was suggested that educators would use the scores on both assessments to determine the type of professional development training their teachers need to better support their students. A bilingual coordinator—in the same interview meeting—who works at an elementary school in a dual language program (Participant 15) explained her plan to support her teachers:

‘Our goal is to reach out to organizations like CABE’s [California Association for Bilingual Education] professional development to help train our teachers on the areas, for example, of writing mechanics, if that comes up to be a deficit in the Spanish language arts. We want to make sure that our teachers are trained fully so that our ultimate goal does come to fruition and for us is in our district, it is to ensure that our students are participating in the dual language immersion program are bilingual, biliterate, by the time they are through with their kindergarten through twelve education.’

**To Learn What Other Programs Are Doing**

In eight of the focus group meetings, educators discussed using the two scores to learn how other schools are implementing their programs, the resources they have, the challenges they have faced, and how they have overcome some of these challenges. They also discussed the importance of having the opportunity to collaborate and support each other. An assistant principal at a high school with a two-way bilingual program (Participant 26) highlighted the importance of comparing themselves to schools that have similar characteristics, saying, ‘Comparing data among other districts and across the district provides us with important information to learn more from other schools’ program structure. But if we are not similar in school size, number of years, etc., then this data can be problematic.’

Another educator, a principal at a kindergarten through grade six school with a two-way dual language program (Participant 13), explained how schools could use these scores to create a learning community:

That’s why it’s important to have that baseline across the state and to be able to share those resources and to be able to look at those beacons out there that are doing amazing things. To learn from, because that’s ultimately what we’re doing to learn from each other, how to best serve our students and who is similar like us in demographics that we can go look at and learn from.

**12. Summary and Conclusions**

This section summarizes the findings of the study. The educators who participated in the focus group interviews provided suggestions on how the two assessments—the CSA and the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment—could be interpreted together. The educators’ suggestions included giving the two assessment scores the same importance, interpreting the scores from a holistic bilingual perspective, interpreting the scores collaboratively, and comparing different subgroups. The educators also discussed the additional information needed to help them interpret the two scores together, including knowledge of the relationship between the two assessments, how students become biliterate, the background of the students, and the characteristics of the programs in which they are enrolled.

More specifically, these educators indicated that the scores from these two assessments could be used for multiple purposes and suggested potential uses for the two scores together. For example, they could be used together to inform instruction, to measure biliteracy development over time, to inform other stakeholders about the programs, to help students earn the State Seal of Biliteracy, to learn more about the biliteracy development of ELs, to evaluate and improve the programs, and to learn what other programs are doing.

The comments and suggestions from the educators indicated a desire to use the scores from the CSA in combination with the scores from the Smarter Balanced ELA assessments. They also indicated a need for more information to help correctly interpret the scores. The educators did not indicate how they would like to receive guidance, but they specified areas of need, such as information on how to interpret the two scores side by side, what additional information should be included to better interpret these scores, and how the educators could assist other stakeholders in interpreting the scores on both assessments.

Finally, although these educators were not explicitly asked about the variety of bilingual and Spanish programs in place in California, they indicated a desire to understand who the students taking the CSA are and the characteristics of the programs in which they are enrolled. The educators highlighted the need for guidance on which attributes to include when describing the students, their schools, and their programs. To better understand the student population and the attributes to describe the programs that participate in the CSA, ETS suggests conducting a study to examine the main characteristics of the target test-taking population for the CSA and the characteristics and attributes of the programs in which this population is enrolled.
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**14. Appendix A: Description of Spanish Programs**

This section presents descriptions for different California Spanish programs.

**Dual Language Immersion Programs**

Dual language immersion programs in California are educational programs in which students are taught literacy and content in two languages (e.g., English and Spanish). The most common dual language immersion programs—two-way immersion and one-way immersion—are described as follows:

* **Two-way dual language immersion programs**. This type of program specifically enrolls a balance of native English speakers and native speakers of the target language (e.g., Spanish).
* **One-way dual language immersion programs**. This type of program typically enrolls one type of learner, either native English speakers or native speakers of the target language.

**Dual Language Models**

There are several variations of dual language programs: 90/10, 80/20, 70/30, 60/40, and 50/50 (Soltero, 2004). Most models start in kindergarten and with each additional school year, the target language is increased by 10 percent until students receive instruction for 50 percent of the day in English. For most of these dual language models, the goal is to keep the 50/50 ratio once it is reached.

These five variations of dual language programs are described as follows:

* **90/10 models**. The target language (e.g., Spanish) is used for 90 percent of the school day. The other 10 percent of instruction is in English.
* **80/20 models**. The target language is used for 80 percent of the school day. The other 20 percent of instruction is in English.
* **70/30 models**. The target language is used for 70 percent of the school day. The other 30 percent of instruction is in English.
* **60/40 models**. The target language is used for 60 percent of the school day. The other 40 percent of instruction is in English.
* **50/50 models**. The target language and English are used equally. The 50/50 ratio is maintained until the end of the program.

**Spanish Enrichment Programs**

Several schools in California also offer Spanish enrichment programs. In programs of this type, schools offer courses in Spanish to support ELs until they are reclassified. Spanish courses include Spanish language arts, mathematics, and science, among others.

**Spanish-as-a Foreign-Language Programs**

Schools in California offer courses in different languages, including Spanish, to provide students with opportunities to fulfill the graduation and college admissions requirements for a language other than English. Spanish-as-a foreign-language programs offer several courses that lead to the development of linguistic and cultural proficiencies in Spanish. Examples include Spanish 1, Spanish 2, Spanish for Spanish or heritage speakers, and AP Language and Culture, among others.

**15. Appendix B: Focus Group Participants**

**Table B.1. Participants in Focus Group Interview 1**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P1 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Program coordinator |
| P2 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Assistant principal |
| P3 | Spanish enrichment | K–8 | Principal |
| P4 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Spanish teacher |
| P5 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Spanish teacher |
| P6 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Program coordinator |

**Table B.2. Participants in Focus Group Interview 2**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P7 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P8 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P9 | 90/10 two-way-dual immersion\* | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P10 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | K–8 | Spanish teacher |

\*Indicates that the program started less than five years ago.

**Table B.3. Participants in Focus Group Interview 3**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P11 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Principal |
| P12 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Principal |
| P13 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion\* | K–5 | Testing coordinator |
| P14 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–6 | Principal |
| P15 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Program coordinator |
| P16 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–6 | Spanish teacher |

\*Indicates that the program started less than five years ago.

**Table B.4. Participants in Focus Group Interview 4**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P17 | 50/50 one-way dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P18 | 60/40 two-way dual immersion | 6–8 | Spanish teacher |
| P19 | 50/50 one-way dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P20 | Spanish enrichment\* | 9–12 | Program coordinator |

\*Indicates that the program started less than five years ago.

**Table B.5. Participants in Focus Group Interview 5**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P21 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | K–8 | Principal |
| P22 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | TK–8 | Principal |
| P23 | 50/50 two-way-dual immersion\* | K–8 | Principal |
| P24 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | K–6 | Principal |
| P25 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Principal |
| P26 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | 9–12 | Assistant principal |

\*Indicates that the program started less than five years ago.

**Table B.6. Participants in Focus Group Interview 6**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P27 | Spanish enrichment | K–6 | Spanish teacher |
| P28 | Spanish enrichment | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P29 | Spanish enrichment | 9–12 | Spanish teacher |
| P30 | 80/20 two-way dual immersion | K–8 | Principal |

**Table B.7. Participants in Focus Group Interview 7**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P31 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Assistant principal |
| P32 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Spanish teacher |
| P33 | Spanish as a foreign language | 9–12 | Spanish teacher |
| P34 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | PK–5 | Program coordinator |

**Table B.8. Participants in Focus Group Interview 8**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P35 | 90/10 one-way dual immersion\* | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P36 | 80/20 one-way dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P37 | 90/10 two-way-dual immersion\* | K–6 | Principal |
| P38 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P39 | 90/10 two-way-dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P40 | 50/50 two-way-dual immersion | K–6 | Spanish teacher |
| P41 | 90/10 two-way-dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |

\*Indicates that the program started less than five years ago.

**Table B.9. Participants in Focus Group Interview 9**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P42 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–6 | Principal |
| P43 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–6 | Assistant principal |
| P44 | 80/20 two-way dual immersion | K–6 | Principal |
| P45 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | K–6 | Assistant principal |
| P46 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Spanish teacher |
| P47 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion\* | K–5 | Spanish teacher |

\*Indicates that the program started less than five years ago.

**Table B.10. Participants in Focus Group Interview 10**

| **Participant** | **Program Type** | **Grades** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P48 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–5 | Program coordinator |
| P49 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–12 | Assistant principal |
| P50 | 50/50 two-way dual immersion | 6–8 | Principal |
| P51 | 90/10 two-way dual immersion | K–8 | Principal |

1. The SBAC is the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)