

**Central Texas ELL Collaborative  
Rubric on High Functioning Campuses for English Language Learners (ELLs)**

Dear Educator:

Welcome to the ***Central Texas ELL Collaborative Rubric on Highly Functioning Campuses for English Language Learners***.

The Central Texas ELL Collaborative developed the *Rubric on High Functioning Campuses for ELLs* as a tool to enable conversation among district leaders, principals, and school faculty around what a highly functioning campus for ELLs should look and feel like. Please use the rubric as a tool for communicating and deliberating expectations for public schools in their service to the fastest-growing student population in Central Texas.

The *Rubric* is a research-based tool developed in fall of 2009 and piloted in spring 2010 by members of the Central Texas ELL Collaborative (listed below). The Collaborative designed the *Rubric* to be useful to elementary, middle and high school campuses. The *Rubric* is comprised of five categories, which are: Leadership, Teacher Work (Curriculum, Instruction, & Assessment), Accountability, Community Engagement, and School Climate. For each category, there are descriptions of the evidence needed to show that a school:

- is *excellent* in their service to ELLs;
- is *good* in their service to ELLs; or
- *needs additional support, knowledge and resources* to serve ELLs.

The research supporting the development of the *Rubric* can be found in the rubric bibliography. (See Appendix A). Future iterations of the *Rubric* will include an appendix of specific strategies and best practices suggested by the members of the Collaborative.

Below are recommendations by members of the Collaborative in using the *Rubric*.

**Who should use the *Rubric*?**

District leaders such as a Bilingual/ESL Director and campus principals should use the *Rubric*. Teaching faculty and community members may also be part of a campus process to use the *Rubric* to examine their school's efforts in serving ELLs.

**What time of year should the *Rubric* be used? How should it be used?**

During the summer (June- August), the Bilingual/ESL Director contacts principals of campuses where s/he would like use the *Rubric* to guide conversation around what a highly functioning campus for ELLs should look and feel like. The principal and director decide together on a time for a campus walkthrough with the *Rubric* in fall.

In the fall, the Bilingual/ESL director and the principal walk through campus together reflecting on each characteristic in the *Rubric*. The principal may or may not have teachers and community members participate in this process.

***The conversation between the director and campus faculty should focus on campus strengths and challenges, issues highlighted through the rubric, and what professional learning opportunities might help faculty and administrators serve ELL students and families.***

In early winter (January-February), the Bilingual/ESL director follows up with the principal to discuss how improvement strategies are working.

In the following summer, the process repeats with the ideal that with each subsequent year, the director and principal find ways to strengthen the efforts by the administrators and teachers as well as understand what district resources are especially helpful in this work.

The Central Texas ELL Collaborative is chaired by Dr. Rosalinda Barrera, Dean of Education at Texas State University and includes the following districts and partners:

- Austin ISD
- Bastrop ISD
- Eanes ISD

- Hays ISD
- Manor ISD
- Lake Travis ISD
- Pflugerville ISD
- Round Rock ISD
- San Marcos CISD
- E3 Alliance
- UT Elementary Charter
- Texas Education Agency
- Texas State University at San Marcos
- University of Texas at Austin

We thank all who assisted in the development of the 2010-11 Rubric.

The *Rubric* is a work in progress that the Collaborative will revise and edit each year as we learn more about what makes campuses exemplary in serving their ELL students. If you have any recommendations or suggested revisions, please e-mail [ateske@e3alliance.org](mailto:ateske@e3alliance.org).

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

LEADERSHIP			
Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources
<p><b><u>ADMINISTRATORS</u></b></p> <p>1. Define goals for faculty and students with specific emphasis on student language acquisition</p> <p>2. Are knowledgeable in ELL needs &amp; learning strategies and have ensured faculty are knowledgeable and utilize these strategies</p> <p>3. Value faculty growth and show obvious support to “do the job well” and accountability to “do the job right”</p> <p>4. Share in problem-solving for campus and student gains in language achievement</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) has goals for ELL and native-speaker student language acquisition and/or raising student achievement for both populations through language acquisition efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/> Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) has goals for raising student achievement by increasing language and literacy skills.	<input type="checkbox"/> Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) goals have little or no mention of student language acquisition or raising academic achievement through language acquisition.
	<input type="checkbox"/> At least ½ of the faculty refer to campus goals for ELL and native-speaker language acquisition when discussing their work.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1/3 or less of the faculty refer to campus goals around language acquisition & student achievement when discussing their work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators do not cite or are inaccurate in their citations of state/federal requirements for ELL education.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators speak on-the-record the need to balance what is required due to state/federal mandates with faculty efforts to ensure success for ELL student language acquisition & academic achievement.	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators speak on-the-record the need for faculty to meet required state/federal mandates and the school to meet ELL academic achievement goals.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators meet with faculty at least once a semester for their input on effective strategies (as shown through student data) to increase student language acquisition and/or student academic achievement for both ELL and native-speaker students. (This may be done through a taskforce that meets year round.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators set up one or two faculty taskforces or committees to address specific challenges or difficulties with ELL language acquisition & academic success.	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators provide faculty with classroom programs thought to help ELL student achievement.
	Comments:		

2010-11 Continuum for Highly Functioning Campuses for English Language Learners  
 Central Texas English Language Learner Collaborative ♦ Released March 30, 2010.

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources
<p><b><u>FACULTY</u></b></p> <p>5. Set own professional goals</p> <p>6. Are responsible for each student to increase in language skills &amp; literacy regardless of teaching assignment</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty set own professional goals, and <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> or more have at least one goal addressing student language acquisition and literacy.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty <u>in each subject area</u><sup>1</sup> can describe their role in raising student language acquisition, literacy levels, or academic achievement in language arts.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty set own professional goals but less than <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> have specific goals around student language acquisition or literacy.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Less than <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> of the faculty can describe their role in student language acquisition and/or raising student literacy levels.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Teachers do not set own professional goals.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> In conversation, only language arts and ELL teachers describe their role and responsibility in student language acquisition and literacy.</p>
<p>Comments:</p>			
<p><b><u>CAMPUS PROGRAMS</u></b></p> <p>7. Show obvious integration of faculty work towards increase of language learning &amp; literacy</p> <p>8. Show fidelity to current theory and logic of how students learn language and become literate</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus programs directly address CIP goals on student language acquisition <u>and</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are used by over <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> of the faculty on a daily basis <u>and</u></li> <li>• employ current theory<sup>2</sup> on how students learn language and become literate.</li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus programs, either in whole or with specific elements, address CIP goals for language acquisition or raising student achievement in language arts <u>but</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\frac{1}{3}</math> or less of faculty actively employ these programs <u>and/or</u></li> <li>• campus efforts do not adhere to current theory or logic<sup>2</sup> on how students learn language and become literate.</li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus programs offer no specific efforts around or contribution towards CIP goals for language acquisition or raising student achievement in language arts.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty can describe how specific campus programs contribute to student language acquisition by showcasing student work or by explaining connections to current theory<sup>2</sup> around language acquisition.</p> <p>Comments:</p>			

<sup>1</sup> Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Health/Physical Education, Special Education, and Language Arts

<sup>2</sup> Appendix B—to be released in future iterations of this rubric—will document theories held in consensus by the CT ELL Collaborative.

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

TEACHER WORK (Curriculum, Instruction, & Assessment)			
Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources
<p><b><u>FACULTY</u></b></p> <p>1. Instruct for conceptual understanding (Note: Not clear on how to describe this so no mention across the columns.)</p> <p>2. Use native language and culturally relevant topics during instruction</p> <p>3. Instruct using high-yield strategies for ELLs (e.g., mapping, visual support, vocabulary support, etc.)<sup>3</sup></p> <p>4. Articulate learning goals for both content and language acquisition. Daily instruction addresses grade-level TEKS and ELPS</p> <p>5. Study their students' outcomes and revise lessons &amp; individual student learning plans</p>	<p><b>Campus walkthroughs show <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> classrooms or more with</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty incorporating native language and culturally relevant topics during lessons.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Bulletin boards showcasing student work using the high-yield strategies for ELLs<sup>3</sup>.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning goals posted for both content <u>and</u> language acquisition.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Instruction that targets grade-level content with scaffolding towards language acquisition goals <u>or</u> provides scaffolding towards both grade-level content and language acquisition goals.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Campus walkthroughs show at least <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> classrooms with</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty incorporating native language and culturally relevant topics during lessons.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Bulletin boards showcasing student work using the high-yield strategies for ELLs<sup>3</sup>.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning goals posted for both content <u>and</u> language acquisition.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Instruction that targets grade-level content with scaffolding towards language acquisition goals <u>or</u> provides scaffolding towards both grade-level content and language acquisition goals.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Campus walkthroughs show at least <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> classrooms with</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty <u>not</u> incorporating native language and culturally relevant topics during lessons.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>No</u> bulletin boards showing student work using the high-yield strategies for ELLs<sup>3</sup>.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Learning goals posted for content <u>or</u> language acquisition, but not both.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Instruction not targeting grade-level content <u>or</u> lack of scaffolding for language acquisition goals.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Conversations with teachers shows that <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> or more</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use assessment data to reflect on and                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• revise content of instruction,</li> <li>• increase relevancy of instruction to student cultural &amp; linguistic origins, and</li> <li>• decrease bias of assessments towards native-English speakers.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Conversations with teachers show that <math>\frac{1}{3}</math> or less</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use assessment data to reflect on and                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• revise content of instruction,</li> <li>• increase relevancy of instruction to student cultural &amp; linguistic origins, and</li> <li>• decrease bias of assessments towards native-English speakers.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Conversations with teachers show that</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty efforts may or may not include using assessment data to modify lesson or unit plans to better fit student language needs.</li> </ul>
	<p>Comments:</p>		

<sup>3</sup> Appendix B—to be released in future iterations of this rubric—will document high-yield strategies held in consensus by the CT ELL Collaborative.

2010-11 Continuum for Highly Functioning Campuses for English Language Learners  
 Central Texas English Language Learner Collaborative ♦ Released March 30, 2010.

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources
<p><b><u>ADMINISTRATORS</u></b></p> <p>6. Provide resources for ELL learning &amp; success (teacher assignments, learning labs, specialized language programs, teacher professional development, and so on)</p> <p>7. Collaborate with peer teachers—bilingual, ESL, <u>and</u> subject area teachers</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus walkthroughs show an infusion of resources towards ELL learning &amp; success<sup>4</sup>, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulletin boards dedicated to student writing or vocabulary work as well as student cultural &amp; linguistic origins</li> <li>• ¾ or more of the classrooms with hardcopy resources supporting ELL and native-speaker student language acquisition<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• ¾ or more of the faculty can describe professional development that increased their ability to cultivate student language acquisition and/or identify students in need of intervention for language acquisition &amp; literacy</li> <li>• Campus-based instructional coach(es) or dean of instruction for language &amp; literacy</li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus walkthroughs show at least three instances of campus resources supporting student language acquisition<sup>4</sup>, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulletin boards dedicated to student writing or vocabulary work</li> <li>• Language learning lab</li> <li>• ELL students assigned to teachers with most substantial record and/or credentials</li> <li>• Campus-wide professional development day(s) devoted to student language acquisition and literacy</li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus walkthroughs show scant resources specific to language acquisition for ELL and native-speaker students<sup>4</sup>.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> ELL teachers meet at least once a week to plan instruction with both other ELL teachers and subject area teachers.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> ELL teachers meet at least several times a month to strategize with other ELL teachers.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> ELL teachers work in isolation or with few opportunities (less than twice a month) to strategize or plan lessons with other ELL teachers or subject area teachers.</p>
<p>Comments:</p>			

<sup>4</sup> Appendix B—to be released in future iterations of this rubric—will document resources supporting ELL learning and success and resources supporting student language acquisition held in consensus by the CT ELL Collaborative.

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

ACCOUNTABILITY				
Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources	
<b><u>ADMINISTRATORS</u></b>				
1. Clearly articulate the needs and goals for ELL language learning and academic achievement in all subject areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators state specific goals for ELL student success in both acquisition of language skills and grade-level achievement in core subject areas.		<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators speak of the need to raise student achievement for ELL students.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators monitor ELL exiter student results and provide feedback to campus LPAC on exiter academic performance.			
	Comments:			
<b><u>ADMINISTRATORS &amp; FACULTY</u></b>				
2. Articulate the goals of the ELL language programs clearly and consistently	<input type="checkbox"/> ¾ or more of administrators & faculty are similar in their description of academic performance goals and expectations for ELL students acquiring language skills.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least ½ of administrators & faculty are similar in their description of performance goals and expectations for ELL students acquiring language skills.	<input type="checkbox"/> Only ELA and ELL faculty and their administrators articulate similar performance goals and expectations for ELL students acquiring language skills.	
	3. Speak in similar terms of the value for all students to succeed in language proficiency and literacy	<input type="checkbox"/> ¾ or more of administrators & faculty can explain how campus programs contribute to expectations & goals for ELL students.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least ½ of administrators & faculty can explain how campus programs contribute to expectations & goals for ELL students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Only ELA and ELL faculty and their administrators can explain how campus programs contribute to expectations & goals for ELL students.
		<input type="checkbox"/> ¾ or more of the administrators & faculty express the necessity for ELL and native-speaker students to be proficient or highly skilled in speaking, listening, writing, and reading academic English.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least ½ of administrators & faculty express the necessity for all students to be proficient or highly skilled in speaking, listening, writing, and reading academic English.	<input type="checkbox"/> Only ELA and ELL faculty and their administrators express the necessity for all students to be proficient or highly skilled in speaking, listening, writing, and reading academic English.
	4. If the district has a language learning policy, articulate goals & efforts consistent to this policy across district campuses	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator & faculty goals and efforts around student language learning are consistent with at least 90% of board policy for student language learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator & faculty goals and efforts around student language learning are less than 90% consistent with board policy for student language learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator & faculty goals and efforts around student language learning are inconsistent with board policy for student language learning.
		Comments:		

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources
<p><b><u>ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY &amp; STAFF</u></b></p> <p>5. Demonstrate a culture of “whatever it takes”</p> <p>6. Demonstrate a culture of <u>preventing academic failure among ELLs</u> rather than <u>remediation of ELLs</u></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Administrator &amp; faculty have a process to examine data from programs meant to raise ELL and native-speaker language proficiency and academic achievement <i>and</i> determine what works, what needs adjustment, and what is discontinued.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Administrators &amp; faculty use data to examine the effectiveness of programs meant to raise ELL and native-speaker language proficiency and academic achievement, <i>but</i> programs remain the same or change due to district directives.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Administrators &amp; faculty use anecdotes or self-reports to decide what programs “work” for ELL students. Programs change according to staff or district interpretations of “what is best for students”.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> School-wide efforts around language acquisition and literacy (tutoring, reading programs, book clubs) have administrator, faculty &amp; staff participants.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least ½ of the faculty are active in school-wide efforts around language acquisition and literacy (tutoring, reading programs, book clubs).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> School-wide efforts around language acquisition and literacy (tutoring, reading programs, book clubs) involve less than ½ of the faculty or mostly involve ELA or ELL faculty.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus tutoring programs involve high-yield strategies for ELL students, are available at many different times of the week (before school, after school, and/or Saturdays), <i>and</i> offer opportunities for both ‘catching up’ and for enrichment.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus tutoring programs target struggling learners, have special sections for ELL students, and are available at many different times of the week (before school, after school, and/or Saturdays).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The campus does not have a tutoring program or the campus tutoring program involves less than 1/3 of the faculty.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least 1/2 of the students—both ELL and native-speaker—express the feeling that campus faculty want them to succeed.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least 1/3 of the students—both ELL and native-speaker—express the feeling that campus faculty want them to succeed.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Few students, whether ELL or native-speaker—express the feeling that campus faculty want them to succeed.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Each faculty member has means to assess ELL and native-speaker students at the start of the school year to identify struggling learners and prescribe early interventions for academic success. Administrators expect faculty to turn in their list of ‘target’ students by the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter.</p>		
	<p>Comments:</p>		

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT			
Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources
<p><b><u>PARENTS</u></b></p> <p>1. Are active part of the school community</p> <p>2. Respect &amp; value teachers</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Parents <u>and</u> members of the community are involved in the campus as tutors, role models, book club leaders, and so on.	<input type="checkbox"/> Parents are involved in the campus through bake sales, office work, chaperoning, teacher appreciation events, and so on. (Attendance of athletic events does not count.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Parents typically visit campus when requested to meet with an administrator or faculty member.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Parents and family members (siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles) come to Campus Parent nights.		
	Comments:		
<p><b><u>FACULTY</u></b></p> <p>3. Respect &amp; value parents</p> <p>4. Maintain consistent communication, both positive &amp; negative feedback on their children</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> At least ¾ of the faculty call, write or meet each parent more than the once a semester to discuss positive and negative aspects of students' academic achievement and behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least ½ of the faculty call, write or meet each parent more than the once a semester to discuss positive and negative aspects of students' academic achievement and behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty typically call parents to inform them of a failing report card grade, an assignment for detention, or a disciplinary referral.
	<input type="checkbox"/> English-only faculty have ready access to resources or staff for assistance in talking to non-English speaking parents.	<input type="checkbox"/> English-only speaking faculty enlist bilingual staff to help converse with non-English speaking parents.	
	Comments:		

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

Desired Characteristics	Excellent	Good	Needs Additional Support, Knowledge and/or Resources
<p><b><u>ADMINISTRATORS &amp; FACULTY</u></b></p> <p>5. Provide frequent opportunities for collaborative or two-way communication (rather than informative or one-way communication) with parents</p> <p>6. Engage parents &amp; community members in many ways and relationships are asset-based (rather than deficit-based)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Administrators meet with parents at the parent request and without an appointment. Interpretation by a school staff member is always available.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Administrators have monthly meetings with parents to inform parents of helpful information for their children.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> There is no calendar of events for parents to come to the school and meet administrators and faculty.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus Parent nights occur at least twice a year, involve at least ¾ of the faculty, and showcase student performances, academic work, or recognition for academics &amp; school participation.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus Parent nights occur at least twice a year, involve at least ¾ of the faculty, and showcase student performances, academic work, or recognition for academics &amp; school participation.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Parent meetings with school personnel primarily occur during Back-to-School night, Parent Conference days, for disciplinary referrals or removals, or meetings on academic placement.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Administrators hold meetings at least twice a year with parents to discuss emerging data patterns in student achievement, discipline, and attendance and to problem-solve on how to increase and sustain student academic achievement.</p>		
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Administrators and/or faculty meet with small groups of parents – at campus, a church/synagogue hall, or parent home—to discuss ways to help students with academic and social pressures, difficulties and age-appropriate expectations.</p>		
	<p>Comments:</p>		

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

**School Climate** (The SCHOOL CLIMATE category is more subjective than the other categories. For each category in this section, please select a rating and then list your evidence for that rating.)

**1. School Climate for *All Can Learn***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff clearly articulate high expectations for students and one another.</li> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff explicitly model strategies for learning, model high aspirations, and show obvious love of reading.</li> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff, through actions and deeds, show the belief that "All children can learn".</li> </ul>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (much evidence)   <input type="checkbox"/> Good (some evidence)   <input type="checkbox"/> Needs support &amp; strategies (little or no evidence)</p>
	<p><b>Evidence &amp; Comments</b></p>	

**2. Value for *Cultural and Linguistic Diversity***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff describe cultural &amp; linguistic diversity as an asset rather than a problem.</li> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff welcome and include all school community members (parents, teachers, administrators, and classified staff).</li> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff reflect the diversity of the students attending this school.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (much evidence)   <input type="checkbox"/> Good (some evidence)   <input type="checkbox"/> Needs support &amp; strategies (little or no evidence)</p>
	<p><b>Evidence &amp; Comments</b></p>	

(See Appendix A for the research base to this rubric. Appendix B, to be released later, will document strategies and methods valued by CT ELL Collaborative.)

3. School Climate of Nurturing for Academic Success		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff are compassionate towards students and one another, yet hold everyone accountable for student achievement.</li> <li>• Administrators, faculty and staff, through actions and deeds, demonstrate a school culture of inquiry and learning.</li> <li>• Administrators and faculty work towards ELLs proportionately represented in GT, IB, AP, Pre-AP and magnet school programs.</li> <li>• Administrators and faculty continually update teaching strategies to reach all students regardless of student culture &amp; linguistic origins.</li> </ul>	<b>Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (much evidence) <input type="checkbox"/> Good (some evidence) <input type="checkbox"/> Needs support & strategies (little or no evidence)
	<b>Evidence &amp; Comments</b>	

## Appendix A

### Central Texas ELL Collaborative Rubric on High Functioning Campuses for English Language Learners Bibliography

- Aleman, D., Johnson, J.F., Jr., & Perez, L. (2009, April). Winning Schools for ELLs. *Educational Leadership*, 66-69.
- Asmus, E.P. (1999). Rubrics: Definitions, Benefits, History and Types. 1-2. Retrieved from <http://www.music.miami.edu/assessment/rubricsdef.html>
- Asmus, E.P. (1999). Rubrics: Parts of Rubrics. 1-2. Retrieved from <http://www.music.miami.edu/assessment/rubricsParts.html>
- August, D., Barnett, S., Christian, D., Fix, M., Frede, E., Francis, D., & Rivera, C. (2009, March 20). The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Recommendations for Addressing the Needs of English Language Learners. 1-23. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/integration/files/ELL-Stimulus-Recommendations.pdf>
- August, D., Barnett, S., Christian, D., Fix, M., Frede, E., Francis, D., & Rivera, C. (2009, March 20). The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Recommendations for Addressing the Needs of English Language Learners, Executive Summary. 1-4. Retrieved from <http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/ARRA/ELL%20Stimulus%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>
- Coor, Lattie F., (2008). Latino Children Can Beat the Odds...but district leadership and support is required. *ASBA Journal*, 19-21. Retrieved from <http://www.beattheoddsinstitute.org/news/stories/bto-winter08ASBAJournal.pdf>
- Edmonds, R. & Lezotte, L. (n.d.). *California Center for Effective Schools. Connections for Success: Effective School Correlates*. Retrieved from <http://effectiveschools.education.ucsb.edu/index.html>
- Gort, M. (2002). Review of the book *Lessons from High-Performing Hispanic Schools: Creating Learning Communities*, P. Reyes, J.D. Scribner, & A.P. Scribner. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1), 1-5. Retrieved from [http://brj.asu.edu/content/vol25\\_no4/html/art12.htm](http://brj.asu.edu/content/vol25_no4/html/art12.htm)
- Ortiz, A.A. (2002). Prevention of School Failure and Early Intervention for English Language Learners. In A.J. Artiles & A.A. Ortiz (Eds.), *English Language Learners with Special Education Needs* (pp. 31-48). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Ovando, C. J., (2001, April). Beyond "Blaming the Victim": Successful Schools for Latino Students. [Review of the book *Lessons from High-Performing Hispanic Schools: Creating Learning Communities*, P. Reyes, J.D. Scribner, & A.P. Scribner]. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 29-31+39. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3594471>
- ¿Por Qué Algunas Escuelas Con Estudiantes Latinos...de Fracaso y Otras No? (n.d.). Retrieved from Center for the Future of Arizona website: <http://www.arizonafuture.org/research/pdf/bto-espanol.pdf>
- Reyes, P., Scribner, J.D., & Scribner, A. P. (Eds.). (1999). *Lessons from High-Performing Hispanic Schools: Creating Learning Communities*. Critical Issues in Educational Leadership Series. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Waits, M. J., Campbell, H. E., Gau, R., Jacobs, E., Rex, T., Hess, R. K., . . . Phillips, L. (2006, March). *Why some schools with Latino children beat the odds...and others don't*. Retrieved from Arizona State University, Morrison Institute for Public Policy website: <http://morrisoninstitute.asu.edu/publications-reports/BeatTheOdds-SomeSchoolsWithLatinoChildrenDoWell-SomeDont/view?searchterm=why+some+schools+with+latino>