MODERATOR: Well, good morning, everyone.

MAN: Good morning.

WOMAN: Good morning.

MODERATOR: It's good to see everybody here. I think it's going to be a very good session this morning. Kenji Hakuta is Lee J. Jacks professor of education at Stanford University where he taught graduate students and ELL teacher credential candidates since 1989 except for three years when he served as founding dean of the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts at the new University of California at Merced. And, Kenji, you'll be glad to know we have several University of California interns from around the system.

Raise your hands, so he'll know who you are. Yes. Very good. We have quite a partnership with the University of California at NEA, and we love our interns from there, as well as our others. We love all our children. Dr. Hakuta has been very active in education policy. He's testified before Congress and other public bodies on language policy, the education of language minority students, affirmative action and higher education, and improvement of quality and educational research.

For the past three years, he has worked with the San Francisco Unified School District, the middle school science teachers through the Strategic Education Research Partnership to improve access to science text for English language learners. And I should also say I'm sure San Francisco is very happy today for several other reasons also.

Dr. Hakuta founded and co-directs Stanford's online certification program called the Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development or the Classroom Teacher of English Learners, excuse me, the California Teacher of English Learners. I guess the acronyms are CLAD and CTEL. Did I get that right? All right. The CLAD and CTEL certification program has provided over 2,000 teachers with their ELL certification.

He created WordSift, a free online resource in support of students and teachers in the visualization of textual and academic vocabulary. Dr. Hakuta earned his Ph.D. in experimental psychology from Harvard and began his career as a development psychologist at Yale. He is an elected member of the National Academy of Education, a fellow of the American Educational Research Association, and a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

He is the author of many research papers and books, including the *Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism*. He is truly a scholar and a great person, and I think you're going to enjoy him. And we're so appreciative of having him at the National Education Association. So let's give him that NEA welcome. Welcome, Dr. Hakuta.

DR. KENJI HAKUTA: Thank you very much and good morning, and welcome to the UC contingent. I am a, even though I'm at Stanford now, I am an incredible fan and supporter of the master plan system in California that really provides access through the

community college CSU and UC system. And it was really quite an honor to participate in the founding of the tenth campus of the system.

I was there as a dean, which was really my only administrative stint, and I acquired great admiration for people who do administration work. And I decided after a few years that I was not naturally cut out for that, I was just not, but I did develop great admiration for people who managed to herd cats with great dexterity. It's a pleasure to be here, and I'm going to try to keep this casual if I can.

And so what I'm trying to do is, I guess I'm a researcher mostly, and I try to have my, what motivates me in the research that I do is to do things that have some practical or policy implication. And I do this sort of in the way in which surfers might surf. I'm not a surfer, but I imagine that's what surfers do, which is they don't make the waves, right, but you look for the waves to kind of ride.

And I think working in kind of policy practice contexts as a researcher and sort of the practitioner of the application of research in those areas, you know, you sort of have to have a little bit of a surfer mentality, which is picking the right waves to ride. And I think that's also sort of a lesson in leadership as well.

You know, the Council of Great City Schools just did kind of a case study of some school districts that was having success with English language learners, and, in part, some of the good leadership that got exercise there was really taking advantage of certain opportunities that came up and then really making something of that. And I think that's sort of one way to think about it.

And so I think the context of ESEA reauthorization conversations that are going on, the discussions around the common core standards, and other policy contexts that we might talk about do provide kind of a background around which you can think about kind of key issues.

Another sort of interesting policy context in which I'm going to start off this talk is also the activity level of the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Education, has picked up recently, as you've probably been following in the papers, Boston, LAUSD. Several states have been getting calls from the Office for Civil Rights around the enforcement of LAUSD, *LAUSD v. Nichols*, and this is the Supreme Court decision around, based in San Francisco.

This photo comes from that era of San Francisco in the 1970s, which taught, which basically is, it's the English language learner version of *Brown v. Board*, except it's really not about desegregation. It's about appropriate access to education, both through English language development and through access to content instruction for English language learners.

And OCR's enforcement of this is really based on the, an appeals court decision known as *Castañeda*. And the *Castañeda* decision, I don't, I'm not a lawyer, but I will just talk just a little bit of legalese, which is that the *Castañeda* is based on the Equal Educational Opportunities Act provision around national origin equality of access to education.

And this decision, the *Castañeda* decision, helped interpret what appropriate action was. And this, the judge in that case, Judge Randall, wrote an opinion, which, I've never met Judge Randall, but I, has become sort of a hero to me as a researcher working in this field, because she sat back and, actually, without even a lot of expertise or opinions expressed by plaintiffs, just came up with the standards for how a, you

know, how a district or state should respond to the presence of English language learners appropriately.

And her standards, and the reason why this is important is that these standards, even though that it's not the law of the land, was adopted by OCR quite early on and is used in the enforcement of LAUSD, and so that's why it's, that's important. And the first bit is whether the school system is pursuing a program informed by an educational theory recognized as sound. So the sound educational theory part brings research into the practice that's, that districts are expected to do.

Furthermore, there's an implementation piece that whatever theory it is has to be implemented. If you're going to have bilingual education, you should implement it with a bilingual teacher. That would be a good idea. The fact I'm saying that means that that actually doesn't happen always, and so you should be able to demonstrate the implementation. And then results, I mean, that's the third piece, right? And so after a period of time, it has to be implemented.

And there's a fourth piece, which is in there, which is that you have to, if you don't get the results, which is often the case, then you have to go and look at the implementation and revise, reform that or even change your theory but that you do have to have a theory of action. And I think that our field is really kind of privileged to have this decision that there has to be some kind of theory behind the work that you do and that, you know, you've got to have implementation.

And this is what OCR uses to, you know, to investigate complaints and to look at the education that we provide to English language learners. And that's, you know, I think we don't use this enough, but it does, as a researcher, I'm very grateful, because it is in there. I noted a couple of dates. There's, it's '84, '85, '90, '91. OCR has reiterated through their policy memoranda that that's what they're doing. And so it really gives us a, you know, a position to work from.

Now in terms of, so the kinds of questions that I wanted to address, and these are sort of addressed in the briefing memo, which I apologize for the somewhat abstract sounding tone of the thing. I was told five pages, and, you know, so I tried to limit it to that. And so it kind of has a cryptic sound to it. But the, you know, theory really doesn't have to be a very far-flung thing. It, I mean, often it's bilingual versus English only. Language of instruction is one kind of theory.

So you don't have to go back to, you know, Kant or, you know, Aristotle to get the theory. You know, we're really talking about, you know, theory like, you know, use native language or not, things like that. And, unfortunately, the theory around bilingual instruction is just consumed. It's taken the oxygen out of the air, because it's also a, you know, kind of a lightning rod issue for politics and for kind of wedge kind of issues to politics.

And the kinds of questions I want to raise here really is, are more, I think, pragmatic, or they're hopefully useful to the field. And so, you know, one question is this reasonable normative expectations for English language proficiency development using different definitions and measures of language proficiency. And this is something that actually has been in the policy environment for a long time.

I remember, this makes me sound old, I'm sure, especially to the interns who are here, but they, in the early '80s, I was brought, it was the first time I had any policy experience when I was a psychology professor at Yale, and I was brought to

Washington to testify in front of the Senate Education Panel around bilingual education and reauthorization.

And I remember Senator Pell from the Pell Grants asking me, you know, about how long it should take kids, he should expect kids to learn, it should take for children to learn English. And we really didn't have good data that, only by . . . you know, the typical academic thing, but I gave a number of three to five years depending on the kid, conditions, this and that, and he goes I disagree, it should be six months.

And the six month thing was, you know, that, but the reason why this is important policy-wise is that, you know, there were time caps placed on how long programs there were, you know, children would have services available under this Title VII, which is now Title III of ESEA. And so this timeframe issue does pop up in these policy discussions.

And California and Arizona and Massachusetts have an English-only law, which prohibits the use of native language and instruction except under individual appeal and certain conditions. And all of those initiatives, which were kind of propagated by Ron Unz were, carry an expectation of one year for special programs for English language learners. So it's really a, you know, kind of a policy-relevant piece.

It's part of the theory of *Castañeda*, you know, how long should you expect, because you would conduct, for example, content instruction differently depending on if it's one year, five years, ten years, because you wouldn't want, you know, if it's really, truly one year, you could imagine a reasonable program in which you attend to English language development at the sacrifice of content as Arizona, for example, is trying to institute, whereas, you know, holding back content for five years is not a reasonable thing to do.

And so it is a relevant thing. And in some of my work, I've tried to do this. This is fairly early work in which we tried to map how long, taking a district that's considered quite successful in educating English language learners, how long does it take over the grade span. So if you take a group of kids who start in a school in kindergarten as identified as an English language learner, how long does it take?

And I guess this, we were having a little bit of compatibility problems between my machine and the PowerPoint here, but, anyway, so depending on the kind of language capacity you're talking about, you could have anywhere from so this is the percentage of kids or the proportion of kids over, you know, starting in kindergarten to up by sixth grade are, attain that, so you can see that, let's say if you use 80%, that's going to be somewhere around 3, you know, 3 years.

If you use other criteria that include academic criteria for reclassification, that is, no longer being English learners, you have up to about, you know, 6 to 7 years for 80% of the kids. And this might be, let's say, a best-case scenario. So as it turns out, I wasn't lying to Senator Pell even though I didn't have this access to this data that somewhere between, you know, three to four to seven years may be a reasonable expectation even under fairly ideal conditions. We have similar data from present day.

You know, this is, I'm going to talk a little bit about this community of Sanger, California. Anybody know Sanger, California? You raise your hand if you know where Sanger, California is. No. Anyway, it's outside Fresno. Do you know where Fresno is? Yeah. They grow raisins there, or they grow grapes that they turn into raisins. Anyway, they, but it's outside of Fresno.

And I didn't know of Sanger until I went to Merced to start the campus and then went up and down the valley trying to recruit students to come to Merced. But Sanger is a small community with about, and its school district has about 11,000 students, which, in California, is a medium-sized district. But Sanger has had a lot of success recently, and it's gained a lot of attention nationally.

And you'll hear more about Sanger, I'm sure, just because people are paying attention to, you know, they were about, in 2003, in district PI, and all of their schools were really struggling. They have a large number of English language learners, almost all Hispanic or Hmong.

And they have really turned around the district, and they're now all out of PI status, and they're, so people have been paying attention to the, not just because it's a single school, but it's a whole district, albeit a small district, but it happens to be things, interesting things are happening sort of district wide. And so I've been looking at their data and collaborating with them on understanding their performance of their interns.

These are individual kids and their growth over time on the California English language development. You can see that, I mean, the point of this is that if you look at the individual level, you certainly see variations in patterns. There are individuals underlying these data. And so here you also see that this is sort of a reverse survival or inverse survival plot.

And this just shows, and you can translate this into your own state's system in terms of proficiency levels on the state English language development test, and so they go, you know, from, in California, they go from levels one, two, three, four, five, and then once you're at five, you can be, if you meet other criteria, you're reclassified from being English learner to proficient.

And this is just looking at the probability over time in this district, which, again, is doing quite well now for English learners, how long it's taking them to learn English. And so to get to level two and three you can see happens quite quickly within, you know, two to three years, right? And then this is really the struggle, which is getting, this is getting to beyond intermediate.

So getting from intermediate to proficient on that test, which involves mostly the reading and writing, the literacy components, and that test is aligned so that, it's suppose to align to the English language arts content. It doesn't exactly, but it's intended to. You can see that then that's the piece that takes quite a bit of time so that let's say after five years you're about, your probability is about 50%, right? And to get to about 80% takes about 7 years.

And then re-designation, which is sort of meeting more, further academic criteria, takes, you know, takes even longer. The point is they're getting there, but the timeframe expectations really do have to be set around a relatively long period of time. And then it's complicated, because depending on the district, you have more, you know, people kind of coming in and out, etc., but even taking the, at least the stable population is a good starting point.

Another question that I think is quite important, and part of it is raised by states adopting English language proficiency standards, which was, kind of came in with No Child Left Behind and the assessments, the, what is academic language, and how could teachers at all grade levels and credential areas, subject areas, specialties, provide academic language growth?

So, you know, paying attention to English language development brought up the concept of that's not the only reason why, but, you know, people in the last few years have really been talking about academic language as opposed to, I don't know quite what it is, nonacademic language.

And I think the point I wanted to make here today is just that if you ask a content teacher what academic language is, like a, you know, high school science teacher or a middle school, you know, math teacher, it's the content glossary in their textbook. That might be considered academic language. But, you know, we've, even, and so that's vocabulary, and it's sort of limited to their content area.

But academic language, we now know, has, you know, a component, which is, you know, there are words like analyze, which, or analysis, which, or synthesis, which cut across subject areas and aren't usually parts of everyday conversation, everyday language, except for academic, when you're talking about academic subjects and that there is sort of, even within vocabulary, words that kind of cut across subject areas.

And that's called academic word list, and that's sort of a special set of words that we should pay attention to. But also there's sort of structures that are used within subjects that we need to also pay attention to that teachers of the subject need to be aware of that, you know, so I just pulled out a simple example here from a science text about at what temperature did the reaction stop? How can you tell?

You know, the structure of at what blank is something that you find quite commonly in sort of quantitative references to, or linguistic references to visualized graphs like this that have quantitative dimensions, right, and at what point, at what whatever. And, in fact, something like this is embedded in the common core standards as part of the English language arts now around reading and writing in the sciences.

So this is an example, I just throw this up as an example of scientific language that's academic. A little bit of advertising here. You mentioned WordSift, and what, so I've been working with teachers trying to help them become better masters of academic language, because they're not, I mean, you know, most science teachers, you know, they say sort of elementary, I'm sure at the NEA you'd know this saying about how the elementary teachers love their students, and the secondary teachers love their subjects.

And they really see themselves as sort of, you know, teachers of, you know, physics and chemistry, etc., or biology or world history and not as teachers of academic language. And technology does provide, this is one area where I think technology really can serve in the advancement of that goal, because there is this whole field called natural language processing. There's the World Wide Web.

There's just a huge amount of resources available to help identify. And I'm working right now with ETS on the development of something called Language Muse, which is a, you know, which applies really heavy duty natural language processing technology to texts that you can enter and then adapt and modify, etc.

So you can take textbooks, which tend to be quite unreadable, I mean, I don't know who came up with these readability levels, but they don't work for me, or else my reading level's very low when I read middle school science textbooks, because I can't understand much of what's in there, but you try to adapt them.

And WordSift is one, is mine, and it's basically a tool to help teachers visualize text or key vocabulary in the text, so what it is is it's just a box into which you can paste any text. And here I just pasted in sample text, and you don't know what the text is

about, but it will produce a cloud of words, basically it's generically called a tag cloud. You've seen this, Wordle does this, you know, in an artistic way, and looks at this, so you now know that this text probably has something to do with natural selection, right?

And it happens to be the Wikipedia entry on natural selection. And then you can do things with this, like you can identify, this is alphabetized, and the most common words are big, which is how you kind of know the topic of it. But you can also do things like you can identify words. I mentioned academic words earlier.

There's a list of academic words that's been worked on by the field, and these are the words that sort of cut across subject areas, published mechanism, individual evolutionary generation research, survived theory. Those are words that are, kind of cut across subject areas. And then there, you know, you've probably heard of the Marzano list.

Robert Marzano has a list of content area sort of themes, and you can identify the science words that show up in the Marzano, we've modified or adapted Marzano's list, but that's essentially what that is. You can see words that appear typically in math, and those tend to be math words. You can also do things like you could sort this thing so that you can sort them from the most common to the most rare words, so the common words are things like time to work, life, new, etc.

Those are, this is referencing this gigantic Google word frequency list in the English language, and so, and words like aliel, Darwin, Wallace, Galapagos, lielle, genetic, those are less common. So, and what teachers can do is they quickly can identify what the, sort of the less common words are in here which kids are unlikely to know. They can print this out and use it as a quick assessment of vocabulary, etc. The other thing that this does is it links to visual resources.

So you can take something like selection, and when you click on it, it links to Google Images, their search, and also to the visual thesaurus, which is, it's a commercial product, but it's basically if you're interested in the dictionary definition, you can pull it up, etc. There are other things that you can do, but I'm not going to bore you with it.

But you can, and so there are these technology tools that are Web-based, free, available, helps, you know, but basically the thing is that you need to still provide the support of how to use this appropriately, but they're there. And you can do, you know, with Language Muse and others, they're, you know, they're, I think technology has a large role potential for helping out here. So that's sort of academic language.

The other, another question might be the relationship between English language proficiency and academic content development. So, you know, we think of English language learners in, sometimes in sort of sequential ways, and policy sometimes works in that way.

That is, you know, first you learn English, and then you're going to get content, which is especially a problem when you have kids arriving later on in their schooling with varying amounts of backgrounds in formal education in the content areas. But if you think sequentially, you sort of say, well, you know, we have an English program first, English language development program, and then later, attend to content.

And that, and then you've got sort of more simultaneous approaches and, but what the relationship is between English language proficiency and academic content development we're just really starting to scratch the surface of, but partly that's driven

by the availability of data that came about, you know, systematic data around English language development, I mean, from the state tests that were developed under NCLB and then the content tests.

And then this will all, of course, be further fueled in the context of common core standards. And we'll talk a bit about the common core standards later. But what does that relationship look like? And, actually, it turns out most districts that have the data do have the ability to do this sort of an analysis. And this just kind of gives you a sense, first of all, in terms of English language proficiency development what it looks like.

And this is just, let me see if I can talk through this without completely boring the people who aren't interested in this, because they're already bored, so it doesn't matter. And so this is just distribution on the levels. Remember, I said there were five levels on the English proficiency test, and so this just shows that at, say this is second, third, fourth up through seventh grade.

At second grade, these kids, and this is cross-sectional data, but the distribution looks like this, which is most kids are at the intermediate level. Okay. And then at seventh grade, you're, this is the district in which they're pushing most of the kids into levels four and five. So they're really, you know, think of this like laying linoleum, you know. You've got this bubble, and you're sort of pushing it along and getting it out. The other, getting the bubbles out, and the, so that's the linoleum analogy.

Then the other thing is that these data points actually represent a time trend, so there's from 2003 to 2009. And so, and these show the midpoints of those. And you can see that, what you want to see is, you know, sort of a decline in the lower levels, right, and an increase in the higher levels over time, because that suggests that there's change happening with sort of more on the higher end. So you see this, right down here's a really happy kind of trend.

You might see here in sixth grade where over time they're really getting kids, more and more of them, into the higher levels of proficiency, and you're sort of seeing a decrease in the lower levels, right, so that's kind of what you want to see with respect to English language proficiency development. Then how does that map on to content proficiency? And you could look, see that here.

So here is the green dots, so these are second through seventh grade, and the green dots are math, are English language arts, and the blue dots are English language arts, or math, I'm sorry. So green is English language arts. Blue is math. They're doing better on the state standard scale on math than in English, which is very common. And you see this, so there are several things to notice here. One is that all the lines are moving up so that there is an upward trend on the scale score on these tests.

Proficiency levels, state proficiency is at 350, so that, you know, I'll show you a graph like that draws it, but you can see that they are actually getting to proficiency as they move up on the English language proficiency trend. So that's the other thing to notice in this graph. And I guess the point, the meta point here is that we now have the kind of data to allow us to look at these sorts of relationships. It's not required by, you know, accountability systems to do this, but it is, you know, you are able to look at this.

So what you're really finding is, you know, if you put the English language development, so I just took third, fifth, and seventh, because it's easier to see the trends. So this is the earlier English language development sort of distributions shifting from third to seventh more and more. So you're getting more kids into English language

proficiency, and then this is just the average. I took the dots off. And this is the math, and this is the English, and this is proficiency level, right?

So by the time the kids are at four or five, you're kind of getting there in terms of proficiency, and you're getting more of those kids as this shift in distribution shows. And then this last graph just shows where the English-only kids are in that district. So, basically, the English-only kids are right around the, you know, kind of moving up towards proficiency. And, you know, the, so those are the bubbles. The straight lines are the English learners.

And so they're, in the long rate, they're doing better than the English-only kids, which isn't surprising, because they're the fast, they're the quick, you know, they're the jackrabbits. They're just out front. And there are, you know, there are sort of fewer of these kids at that proficiency level, and these are the jackrabbits here, and they're just jumping out ahead. And then as you go up in the, a little, you know, the higher grades, they become more and more comparable to the English-only kids.

I happen to do research in another area, which is around the cognitive benefits of bilingualism, and I happen to believe that there are some bilingualism effects in here, that is, the kids who become early in bilingualism and then develop proficiency in two languages, would be, actually, you'd kind of expect them to do better on certain things than English-only kids. But this isn't a bilingual program.

This is, you know, this is, the program this district has is an English, it's an Unz district as Proposition 227 got bilingual education in most districts, and this is one of them. But it does paint that picture of kind of the strong relationship between English proficiency development and the academic content and the fact that data are available. Another, you know, just a look in terms of long-term consequences, and California doesn't have a great exit exam, but this is the high school exit exam.

We have, it's called the CAHSEE, and it's basically seventh, eighth grade English language arts and math tests, and so they kind of align to that. And it's given at tenth grade, and then it's sort of given, you have several chances to take it. And I think the state English learner passing rate for CAHSEE is somewhere around 40%. And this just shows, we call this the swarming bee, so we have all these metaphors for our visualization, you know, linoleum and actually the earlier one was alligators.

We were talking about the alligator gap, which is the, you know, the difference between the English and the math, right, and the slopes, and so that's the alligator mouth opening. This district happens to be doing really well with their math, and so, anyway, that's the alligator mouth thing. But these are the swarming bees.

And the swarming bees, this basically takes one cohort, a longitudinal cohort of kids during this seven-year period from 2003 to 2009 where they're, this is in tenth grade, and it plots them, maps backwards from tenth back to fourth grade. And this is their, the swarming bee is their English language development test.

And level six are kids who have been reclassified, so this, you know, in this swarm of bees, you know, they'll, this group here, this proportion, were already reclassified by fourth grade, right, and then they move up this way. And then you can sort of say, okay, of the, and in tenth grade, they take the CAHSEE, the exit exam, and those who passed are in black, and those who didn't pass either the English or the math are the colored ones, right.

And the red failed both, and then the blues failed math, and the greens failed English language arts but passed the other. And then you can look backwards and say, okay, where were those kids earlier on, right, and so that's kind of what this graph shows.

The relationship here is, you know, basically around fourth, fifth, sixth grade, you know, that period of getting kids out of level, the intermediate level, so these are, what these numbers are is the percentage of kids in the intermediate or below than this group here who ultimately did not pass CAHSEE in tenth grade, so roughly one in five of this group, so still the risk there is not that great. You know, you're still at, you know, four in five chance that you'll pass CAHSEE.

Here, you're getting to like four in ten roughly, and then it really increases after that. So this, you know, it really sort of puts a red flag at levels, you know, at the fifth, sixth grade around getting, moving beyond intermediate, which is also linked to how you're going to start doing on the English language arts and the math areas.

So, you know, that's just kind of another way of looking at the data in terms of long-term impact and then using this data to think about school practice and how you do that, and that's one of the things that Sanger seems to do quite well. So let me turn then to what Sanger and other districts seem to be doing.

And this is really a pretty fragile research base but one in which I think it's so important to understand the context in which teachers are teaching English language learners as well as more generally just teaching students. So the question of what can the school and district leadership do to support effective instruction for English language learners, and these pictures just are pictures I randomly took in the course of hanging around schools.

But there are a couple of studies I might single out and others that aren't here, but I just kind of throw them up. In the coffee session earlier, a bunch of us were talking about the Chicago Consortium work by Tony Bryk and others, including, well, this one, actually, doesn't have John Easton as a, oh, no, there he is. There's John Easton as the last author there.

But anyway, that, even though that is not a study that focused on school organization for English language learners, but it, you know, Chicago has schools that pay significant proportions of them, and we could certainly learn from their work around school organization. There are others that I would just point out.

This is, the Council of Great City Schools did a case study of a number of fairly successful school districts looking historically back at kind of what they were doing compared to other districts that didn't seem to be doing as well. And then this similar English learners different results, which was a study that EdSource did, which is an outfit in California, a nonprofit that looks at basically school policy in California.

And that was a study looking at a sample of elementary schools, and then, subsequently, they did a study of middle schools looking at surveys of teachers and principals around school practice and then mapping the responses to that to English learner outcomes on the standards-based and the English language development test.

So, I mean, looking across these sorts of studies, one might summarize that, you know, this, these characteristics of schools and districts are fairly, it should sound familiar to those who kind of followed the effective schools' literature, that is, you know, things like school-wide vision and culture, but, especially, you know, I mean, it is

significant to think about this in the context of English language learners, because often the problematic practices at the school level have been where it's sort of these students and then those students, you know, the English-only kids, and then you've got the English learners.

And they're, you know, I mean, the extreme example would be, you know, a school I'm familiar with, I won't name it, in which it's even symbolically marked by having the English learners in a trailer, right, and the physical building being the non-English learner program. And so you get, you know, sort of de facto segregation, which is symbolically marked by the, you know, trailer status.

In this particular building, actually, school, actually, the trailers might have been better than the building, but, still, it's, the, but really a school-wide vision, I think, is important, and, you know, especially in schools in which English learners are a significant part of the program, you know, that that's, you know, I don't know of any studies that have done this, but I think there are very different organizational issues, cultural issues within the school depending on whether you're, you know, a small minority of the kids are English learners versus about half versus all or close to all.

And schools do vary a lot along that dimension. But I think there are leadership challenges there. Staff capacity and focus, especially around, you know, what might be called standards-based instruction and the inclusion of English learners in standards-based instruction. Stable leadership, especially at the district level, seems so important and lacking, of course. You know, districts are, the turnover in districts is very problematic in terms of providing stability over time.

And in the case of Sanger, that was, I think, a really key element was that it was a district that went from having basically the superintendent of the year to having the same person there for, you know, almost a seven, eight year period up until now. So I think that's an important one to look at. I think the emphasis, the key word here is and, which is, you know, the focusing on English language development and the core curriculum.

You know, I think that's so important, because the, that's the concern right now about Arizona's policy of four hours of English language development instruction for English learners. You know, one is the timeframe expectation in terms of how quickly kids will learn English, but the other is in the course of a day, what proportion of instruction will be taken up by English language development. And this is sort of under something like a Berlitz philosophy, that is, immerse the kids, and then you'll get there.

But then when you're doing that, you are sacrificing the core curriculum. There's just no way around it. You could, you know, touch on the core curriculum, but you're not teaching the core curriculum. So whatever good standards-based curriculum would have is really left out without focusing on the and. Use of assessment and data. That shouldn't be that surprising, but it's quite interesting, for example, in Sanger, to see the extent to which they have incorporated that into the school culture.

So what happens, the district is very much a true believer in the PLC model, you know, DuFour is their sort of god and so forth, and I'm, you know, I don't know DuFour's training at all, but I've heard about it, and I could, you know, I'm sure I could be fine without it, but I could also believe it.

But here, my conclusion is really that, and this isn't based on anything other than my impressions from spending quite a bit of time there, that it's really the belief, you

know, having a strong belief is, seems to be helping drive the stability and the kind of the, you know, the belief of the teachers that this is really going to help and the school leadership, the principal, I mean, and this is a district-wide vision that's been cultivated. They all have their own, their PLCs, and things happen in their PLCs.

That's the other piece that I think is, you know, not just having PLCs for PLCs' sake, but they are having these learning communities, and, folks, again, data's a huge part of that. It's part of that discussion. And not only that, they decided that they're unhappy with the annual assessments. They've got sort of, you know, kind of, they've contracted with those people who create these mini-CSTs and the mini-selts(?) that this, you know, small versions around which they get quick feedback.

And the PLCs kind of cluster around it. So I think that's quite, but having that belief, a coherent belief system and then using assessment and data in that context is quite remarkable. I'm not sure if it's a cause and effect or what the causal factor is there, but I could certainly see that supporting and being consistent with the research that others have reported.

And then the parents, community, and then the trust even within the school, which especially Bryk and others talk about in terms of relational trust, and that sort of element is really quite key. And so I think those are important pieces of the organizational kind of package. And I guess those are just kind of the questions and thoughts I had, I wanted to share with you. I'd love to hear questions, and I don't know how much time, if I overextended my time allocated, but . . .

WOMAN: Do you have time you could go over some questions?

DR. HAKUTA: Okay. Great.

WOMAN: First, could we have a round of applause?