
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2016

An Analysis of School-District Level Policy and Guidelines Related to English Language Learners' Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses

Marjorie Ceballos
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Ceballos, Marjorie, "An Analysis of School-District Level Policy and Guidelines Related to English Language Learners' Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses" (2016). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 5053.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/5053>



University of
Central
Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

AN ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT-LEVEL POLICY AND GUIDELINES
RELATED TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS' ENROLLMENT AND
ACHIEVEMENT IN ADVANCED COURSES

by

MARJORIE CEBALLOS
B.S. University of Central Florida, 2000
M.P.A. University of Central Florida, 2006

A dissertation in practice submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the College of Education and Human Performance
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2016

Major Professor: Rosemarye Taylor

© 2016 Marjorie Ceballos

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of school district policy, guidelines, and practices related to the enrollment and achievement of English learners (EL) in advanced coursework in middle school and high school in a large urban school district in the United States.

There is a dearth of research on the effect that school district-level policies, guidelines, and practices have on the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced courses in middle school and high school. Existing research on ELs provides information on this group's academic achievement on national and state standardized measurements of achievement (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012) such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, and other state standardized assessments in the United States. However, there is an absence of research concerning this group's achievement in advanced courses at the middle school and high school levels. Moreover, there is also an absence of research on this group's achievement on college-level examinations (e.g., Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate).

This study contributed to the body of knowledge on the impact of educational policy, guidelines, and recommended practices on student acceleration, specifically the acceleration of ELs through their enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework at the middle school and high school level in the United States. The analysis of this group's enrollment and achievement consisted of (1) an examination of the group's enrollment from 2009-2014 in advanced coursework in grades 6-12, (2) an analysis of this group's

achievement in advanced coursework from 2009-2014 in grades 6-12, and (3) an examination of school district policy via school district policy and guideline documents and school-based curriculum guides.

Initial findings from the analysis completed point to an uneven EL course enrollment in advanced coursework in mathematics, English, science, and social studies across the 57 schools included within the study from 2009-2014. At the high school level, EL course enrollment in advanced coursework is small; the high school with the highest proportion of EL course enrollment had 9.7 percent EL course enrollment. Overall, EL course enrollment comprised 4.5 percent of advanced course enrollment in 19 high schools. At the middle school level, however, EL advanced course enrollment was proportionately larger; the middle school with the highest proportion of EL course enrollment had 25.3 percent EL advanced course enrollment. Overall, EL course enrollment comprised 7.0 percent of advanced coursework course enrollment in 38 middle schools. In terms of Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) EL course enrollment, AP EL course enrollment was 3.0 percent from 2011-2014 and IB EL course enrollment was 0.2 percent from 2012-2014.

EL achievement in advanced coursework as measured by final letter grade in advanced courses was high; EL high school achievement by final letter grade achievement of A, B, or C was 85 percent and EL middle school achievement by final letter grade of A, B, or C was 91 percent in advanced courses. In Advanced Placement exam scores, EL score of 3 or higher was 54 percent, while non-EL score of 3 or higher

was 47 percent. In IB, EL score of 4 or higher was 71 percent, while non-EL score of 4 or higher was 81 percent.

Analysis of school district policy and guideline documents and school curriculum guides emphasized the central role of the school district in ensuring that schools followed national and state laws applicable to ELs in the United States. The school district policy and guideline documents analyzed guaranteed ELs' equal access to academic programs within the school district but only made one specific reference to enrollment of ELs in advanced coursework in the form of Advanced Placement. School curriculum guides analyzed demonstrated elements of access to advanced coursework for ELs. The curriculum guides analyzed contained varying degrees of identified access elements, demonstrating schools' autonomy in determining the academic trajectories of their students within the parameters of applicable national and state laws.

For my family.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Any worthwhile endeavor begins with a spark. Completion of this doctoral degree would not have occurred had it not been for the spark ignited by my teaching experiences at Colonial High School and by two very special students, Kevaughn Browne and Jessica Rojas. I thank them and all the hard-working educators with whom I have had the good fortune to teach and grow professionally, imbued in practices grounded in access and equity for all students.

I also want to thank Dr. Rosemarye Taylor to whom I am forever indebted. Her advice, feedback, and the opportunities she provided for me academically contributed immeasurably to my academic and professional growth. The members of my committee, Dr. Lee Baldwin, Dr. Walter Doherty, and Dr. Joyce Nutta, were an integral part of the dissertation process, and I thank them for all the feedback and edits they always provided with a smile to ensure that my study was strong.

To all the members of Cohort IV, thank you for all of the support that you gave me throughout this process. It was comforting and reassuring to know that if there was something I did not know or a doubt I had, I could reach out to any of you for support and advice. I cannot thank each of you enough, especially Hilary Buckridge and Karen Lipscomb, who helped me process ideas to verbalize them effectively. Also, a special thank you to Rachel Haynes who kept me connected to class when I had surgery, ensuring that I did not fall behind.

The past three years were a time of unprecedented growth that informed and honed my practices as a researcher and instructional leader to better serve young people everywhere. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	xiv
CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Significance of Study	4
Definition of Terms.....	4
Conceptual Framework.....	8
Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses	8
English Learners and School District Policies and Guidelines.....	11
Instructional Leadership and English Learner Achievement: Practices for Inclusion	12
State and Federal Policy.....	14
Consent Decree of 1990.....	14
Elementary and Secondary Education Act: No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top Fund.....	18
WIDA and English Language Acquisition	21
Research Questions.....	23
Limitations	25
Delimitations.....	26
Assumptions.....	26
Methodology	27
Procedures.....	27
Population and Sample	29
Instrumentation and Sources of Data.....	30
Data Collection	31
Data Analysis	31
Organization of Study.....	33
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	34
Introduction.....	34
Federal and State Cases: Advancing English Learners’ Educational Policy	36

Lau v. Nichols.....	36
League of United Latin American Citizens et al. v. State Board of Education	37
Federal and State Policy and EL Education.....	38
Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974.....	38
Elementary and Secondary Education Act: No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top Fund.....	39
Access to High Standards Act (NCLB) and College and Career Ready (RTTF). 40	
WIDA and English Language Acquisition Policy	40
School District Policy and English Learners	42
School Districts and English Learners: Policy Models.....	43
Wisconsin.....	44
California	46
Instructional Leadership and English Learners.....	47
National and State Educational Leadership Standards	48
Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards	48
Florida Principal Leadership Standards	50
Instructional Leadership Development for English Learners	50
Northeastern United States: School Leadership Preparation and English Learners	51
California: Urban Principal Preparation Programs and ELs.....	52
Instructional Leadership Practices and ELs’ Inclusion.....	53
English Learner Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses.....	56
Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses	56
English Learner Enrollment in Advanced Courses.....	57
English Learners’ Achievement and Enrollment in Advanced Courses: National Trends	58
English Learner Achievement and Enrollment in Advanced Courses: State Level	59
California	59
Pennsylvania	62
Illinois	63
Schools and English Learner Achievement and Enrollment in Advanced Courses	64
Summary.....	65

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	68
Introduction.....	68
Design of the Study.....	68
Research Questions	69
Selection of Participants	69
Instrumentation	70
Data Collection	71
University Protocol	72
Large Urban School District Protocol.....	72
Quantitative.....	73
Qualitative.....	73
Data Analysis	74
Quantitative Data Analysis	75
Qualitative Data Analysis	77
Procedural Fidelity.....	78
Summary.....	79
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	81
Introduction.....	81
Research Questions	82
Population	82
Participant Demographics.....	83
Testing the Research Questions	87
Research Question 1	87
EL Advanced Placement Enrollment.....	88
EL International Baccalaureate Enrollment.....	91
EL High School Advanced Coursework Enrollment.....	93
EL Middle School Advanced Coursework Enrollment	96
Research Question 2	99
EL Advanced Placement Achievement	100
EL International Baccalaureate Achievement	105
EL High School Advanced Coursework Achievement	108
EL Middle School Achievement.....	112

Research Question 3	117
EL Access Elements	117
Large Urban School District Policy Documents.....	120
Large Urban School District EL District Plan	121
School Visit Monitoring Tool for Program Effectiveness	124
Procedural Handbook.....	126
Middle School and High School Curriculum Guides	130
Middle School Curriculum Guides	132
High School Curriculum Guides.....	135
Additional Analysis	140
Advanced Placement English Learner Course Enrollment and Achievement.....	140
Limited Former Advanced Placement Course Enrollment and Achievement....	141
Limited Yes Advanced Placement Course Enrollment and Achievement	142
High School English Learner Advanced Coursework Course Enrollment and Achievement	144
Limited Former High School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement	144
Limited Yes High School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement	145
Middle School English Learner Advanced Coursework Course Enrollment and Achievement	146
Limited Former Middle School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement	147
Limited Yes Middle School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement	148
Enrollment and Achievement: School Demographic Variables	149
High Enrollment and Low Achievement	150
High Enrollment and High Achievement	151
Low Enrollment and Low Achievement.....	153
Low Enrollment and High Achievement	155
Summary	156
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS	161
Introduction.....	161
Summary of the Study	161

Statement of the Problem.....	163
Methodology.....	163
Population.....	164
Instrumentation.....	165
Data Collection.....	165
Discussion of the Findings.....	165
Research Question 1.....	165
Research Question 2.....	169
Research Question 3.....	171
Implications for Practice.....	174
Recommendations for Further Research.....	179
Conclusion.....	181
APPENDIX A ADVANCED PLACEMENT COURSE ENROLLMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT TABLES.....	184
APPENDIX B INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE COURSE ENROLLMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT TABLES.....	188
APPENDIX C HIGH SCHOOL ADVANCED COURSEWORK ENROLLMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT.....	192
APPENDIX D MIDDLE SCHOOL ADVANCED COURSEWORK ENROLLMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT.....	195
APPENDIX E INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	199
APPENDIX F ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS APPROVAL.....	201
REFERENCES.....	203

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Research Questions and Data Sources	33
Table 2 Percentage of EL Student Population Participating in EL Programs: Highest Concentrations	44
Table 3 Instructional Leadership Indicators	55
Table 4 Research Questions and Data Sources	75
Table 5 Advanced Placement Course Enrollment Student Demographic Variables (N = 55,782)	84
Table 6 International Baccalaureate Course Enrollment Student Demographic Variables (N = 3,798)	85
Table 7 High School Advanced Course Enrollment Demographic Variables (N = 349,246)	86
Table 8 Middle School Advanced Course Enrollment Demographic Variables (N = 262,744)	87
Table 9 Chi-Square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in Advanced Placement (AP) 2011-2014.....	89
Table 10 English Learner Advanced Placement (AP) Course Enrollment in 19 High Schools 2011-2014.....	90
Table 11 Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in International Baccalaureate (IB) 2012-2014.....	92
Table 12 English Learner International Baccalaureate (IB) Course Enrollment in Five High Schools 2012-2014.....	93
Table 13 Chi-Square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in Advanced Coursework 2009-2014.....	94
Table 14 English Learner Advanced Course Enrollment in 19 High Schools 2009-2014.....	95
Table 15 Chi-Square Results and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in Advanced Coursework 2009-2014	96
Table 16 Middle School English Learner Advanced Course Enrollment in 38 Middle Schools 2009-2014.....	98
Table 17 Chi-Square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in Advanced Placement (AP) 2011-2014.....	101
Table 18 Chi-Square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Placement Achievement 2011-2014	102
Table 19 Nineteen High Schools' Disaggregate Advanced Placement Exam Achievement: Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2009-2014.....	104
Table 20 Chi-square Results and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in International Baccalaureate (IB) 2012-2014.....	106
Table 21 Chi-Square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for International Baccalaureate Achievement in Five High Schools 2012-2014	106

Table 22 Five High Schools’ Disaggregate International Baccalaureate Exam Achievement: Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2012-2014.....	107
Table 23 Chi-Square Results and Descriptive Statistics English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in High School Advanced Coursework 2009-2014.....	109
Table 24 Chi-Square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Coursework Achievement 2009-2014 in 19 High Schools	110
Table 25 Nineteen High Schools’ Disaggregate Advanced Course Achievement by Grades: Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2009-2014 .	112
Table 26 Chi-square Results and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in Middle School Advanced Coursework 2009-2014	113
Table 27 Chi-square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Coursework Achievement in 16 Middle Schools 2009-2014.....	114
Table 28 Thirty-Eight Middle Schools’ Disaggregate Advanced Coursework Achievement by Grades: Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2009-2014	116
Table 29 English Learner Access Elements: School District Documents and Curriculum Guides	120
Table 30 Large Urban School District 2013-2014 English Learner District Plan Elements and Guidelines	123
Table 31 EL Access Elements: School Visit Monitoring Tool.....	125
Table 32 EL Access Elements: Procedural Handbook	127
Table 33 EL Access Elements: Curriculum Guides Elements.....	131
Table 34 Middle School Curriculum Guide Focus on English Learners Coded Elements N = 8	133
Table 35 Middle School Access Statements N=5.....	135
Table 36 High School Curriculum Guide Focus on English Learners Coded Elements N = 19.....	137
Table 37 High School Access Statements N = 10	139
Table 38 Advanced Placement Limited Former High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2011-2014 N=5.....	142
Table 39 Advanced Placement Limited Yes High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2011-2014 N=5	143
Table 40 High School Advanced Courses Limited Former High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2009-2014 N=5.....	145
Table 41 High School Advanced Courses Limited Yes High Enrollment Courses 2009-2014 N=5	146
Table 42 Middle School Limited Former High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2009-2014 N = 5	148
Table 43 Middle School Limited Yes High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2009-2014 N=5	149
Table 44 High Enrollment and Low Achievement Demographic Variables: High School 18 and Middle School 16 2013-2014.....	151

Table 45 English Learner High Enrollment and High Achievement School Demographic Variables: High School 8 and Middle School 35 2013-2014	152
Table 46 English Learner Low Enrollment and Low Achievement School Demographic Variables: High School 7 and Middle School 13 2013-2014	154
Table 47 English Learner Low Enrollment and High Achievement School Demographic Variables: High School 19 and Middle School 12 2013-2014	156
Table 48 Limited Yes and Limited Former Advanced Placement (AP) Course Enrollment in 19 High Schools 2011-2014	185
Table 49 Nineteen High Schools' Aggregate Advanced Placement Exam Achievement: English Learners and Non-English Learners 2011-2014.....	186
Table 50 Advanced Placement Exam Mean Scores and Standard Deviations: Limited Former, Limited Yes, and Non-English Learners in 19 High Schools 2011-2014.....	187
Table 51 International Baccalaureate (IB) Limited Yes and Limited Former Course Enrollment 2012-2014 in Five High Schools	189
Table 52 Five High Schools' Aggregate International Baccalaureate (IB) Exam Achievement 2012-2014	190
Table 53 International Baccalaureate Exam Mean Scores and Standard Deviations: Limited Former and Non-English Learners in Five High Schools 2012-2014.....	191
Table 54 Limited Yes and Limited Formers Advanced Course Enrollment in 19 High Schools 2009-2014.....	193
Table 55 Nineteen High Schools' Aggregate Advanced Course Achievement by Grades 2009-2014	194
Table 56 Limited Yes & Limited Former Advanced Course Enrollment in 38 Middle Schools 2009-2014.....	196
Table 57 Chi-square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Coursework Achievement in 38 Middle Schools 2009-2014.....	197
Table 58 Thirty-Eight Middle Schools' Aggregate Advanced Course Achievement by Grades 2009-2014.....	198

CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS

Background of the Study

Metropolitan Orlando, whose metro area is comprised of Orange, Seminole, Lake, and Osceola Counties, has the largest population growth of any urban area in the United States as measured by the Orlando Metropolitan Statistical Area (Metro Orlando Economic Development Commission, 2014). This population growth includes increases in the proportion of Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and other races as defined by the United States Census Bureau (2013). This area is the third largest growing minority population in the United States. This change in demography presents special challenges to pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade public schools as it represents changes in the demographics of the school age children and their learning needs.

These changes are particularly impactful as related to the percentage of English learners in the school systems. During the 2005-2006 school year 8.3% of Florida's school age children were categorized as English learners as defined by Florida State Statute. To be identified as an English learner, a student must demonstrate limited English proficiency skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing (English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficiency Students of 2014). One large urban school district in the Orlando Metropolitan Statistical Area witnessed the highest increase in percentage of English learners, increasing from 6.9% eligible students during the 1997-1998 school year to 19.7% during the 2006-2007 school year (Florida Department of

Education, 2007). Since the 2006-2007 school year, the percentage of English learners in this same large urban school district decreased to 13%. Although there has been a decrease since the 2007-2008 school year, the percentage of English learners is very similar to that of other large urban school districts in the state of Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2014c).

English learners in urban school districts around the nation lag behind their monolingual counterparts as measured by the National Center for Education Statistics with 96% scoring at basic competency levels or below (as cited in Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). School districts or state-level policy decisions advocate for or mandate instructional models that do not account for the diversity of the English learner population (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). The diversity of English learners includes first-, second-, and third-generation learners. In this context, policy decision focus solely on increasing student achievement on state standardized assessments, while not considering the differentiated needs of the English learner population (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). Policy decisions that promote mandated instructional models present a problem for the English learner population in the Orlando Metropolitan Statistical Area because the models increase the achievement gap between this group and their monolingual counterparts (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). One result is that English learners' access to and achievement in advanced courses is limited. The stagnation of the English learners' academic achievement will have an impact on this group's college and career readiness as delineated by the language and literacy demands of the Common Core

State Standards (Lee, Quinn, & Valdes, 2013) as well as this group's ability to add to the Orlando Metropolitan Statistical Area's economic development.

Statement of the Problem

There is a dearth of research on the effect school district-level policies, guidelines, and practices have on the enrollment and achievement of English learners in advanced courses in middle school and high school. Existing research on English learners provides information on this group's academic achievement on national and state measurements of achievement (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012), such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress and the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. However, there is an absence of research concerning this group's achievement in advanced courses at the middle school and high school levels. Moreover, there is an absence of research on this group's achievement on college-level examinations (e.g., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Advanced International Certificate of Education).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of school district policy, guidelines, and practices related to the enrollment and achievement of English learners in advanced coursework in middle school and high school.

Significance of Study

This study contributed to the body of knowledge on the impact of educational policy, guidelines, and recommended practices on student acceleration, specifically the acceleration of English learners. The findings of this study could be used by school districts to shape the policies, guidelines, and practices that govern their organizations. This study addressed an improvement in the crafting of school district policies, guidelines, and practices as they relate to the academic acceleration of English learners.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this analysis, it was necessary to define the terminology utilized in the State of Florida with regards to English learners and advanced coursework as defined by state statutes. To this end, definitions of terminology related to the Consent Decree (1990) are discussed first, followed by statutory definitions of advanced coursework.

The Consent Decree

In 1990 the case of *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. the Florida Board of Education and the Florida Department of Education* resulted in the Consent Decree. The Consent Decree is the State of Florida's framework for compliance with federal and state laws that deal specifically with English learners (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). Below follows definitions of those terms, which are germane to this analysis.

Consent Decree This document encompasses 10 state and federal laws, which ensure the civil rights of English learners within education in the State of Florida. This document ascertains that policies and guidelines are in place, which ensure comprehensible instruction for English learners in all school districts across the state (Florida Department of Education, 2014a).

Limited English Proficiency or Limited English Proficient A designation used to identify English learners. There are four definitions that meet this designation under state and federal law: 1. Individuals born outside the United States for whom English is not the native language. 2. Individuals who speak a language other than English in their homes. 3. Individuals who are American Indian or Alaskan Natives who come from environments where languages other than English have had an impact on their ability to be proficient in English. 4. Individuals who have difficulty, for a variety of different reasons, speaking, writing, reading, or listening to English, which does not allow them the opportunity to be successful in instructional environments where English is the language of instruction (Florida Department of Education, 2014a).

Limited Former (LF) A student who is no longer in the English learner program and is monitored for two years following removal from the program (School Board of Broward County, 2012).

Limited Yes (LY) A student who is an English learner and is enrolled in classes specifically designed for English language learners (School Board of Broward County, 2012).

School District Level Policy and Guidelines Per the Consent Decree, each school district in the State of Florida is required to submit an English language learner school district plan, which allows the Department of Education to monitor compliance with all applicable state and federal laws. The school district plan is the guiding document that establishes the policies, guidelines, and recommended practices for each school district. Within the English language learner school district plan, each district must have provisions for program compliance monitoring, equal access, and program effectiveness, using the measures outlined in the Consent Decree (Florida Department of Education, 2014a).

Advanced Middle School and High School Coursework

The State of Florida delineates the courses in which students in grades 6-12 may enroll to be considered to be on an advanced academic track. For the purposes of this study, only specific courses will be considered as advanced coursework to establish the parameters of this analysis.

Middle School Accelerated Courses These are courses offered at the secondary level in grades 6-10. The Middle Years Programme (MYP), a preparatory program for the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme, in which students take prescribed courses within the program in language acquisition, language and literature, individuals and societies, sciences, mathematics, arts, physical and health education, and design (International Baccalaureate Programme, 2014). The Cambridge Pre-Advanced International Certificate of Education Program (AICE) is similar in scope to the Middle Years Programme in that it prepares middle school student to participate in the

Cambridge AICE Diploma program, once students reach ninth grade (Cambridge International Examinations, 2015).

High School Accelerated Courses These are courses offered at the secondary level in grades 9-12, which allow students the opportunity to earn college credit. Accelerated courses considered for this analysis are those offered through Advanced Placement, the Cambridge AICE Diploma program, and the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (Articulated Acceleration Mechanisms of 2014).

Honors-Level Courses These are courses identified as level 3 courses in the Florida Course Code Directory in the areas of mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies (Florida Department of Education, 2014b). To receive a level 3 designation, honors-level courses must be approved by the State University System and Department of Education as having a rigorous curriculum and performance standards (Florida House of Representatives, 2011).

Conceptual Framework

English learners, like other minority groups within school districts, are impacted by the policies, guidelines, and practices adopted by school-based and school-district instructional leaders related to advanced courses. At the school level, English learners are affected by the inclusive instructional practices adopted by school principals, which have a bearing on this group's enrollment and achievement in advanced courses. Principal preparation programs have started to address inclusive leadership practices as social justice theory has been infused into instructional leadership development (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014), impacting the academic advancement of all learners. At the school district level, English learners are impacted by policies and guidelines adopted based on applicable federal and state policy, perceptions of second language acquisition, and English learner performance on standardized assessments.

Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses

Increasing overall student enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework has been one of the goals of school districts in the United States in recent years, particularly the participation of groups that typically are underrepresented (Flores & Gomez, 2011). One of the mechanisms that has been used most commonly to measure enrollment, namely because of its widespread use in high schools across the country, is

The College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) Program. Within the AP program, there has been a drive to increase the enrollment and achievement of minority groups, particularly that of Hispanics and African Americans. According to the AP Report to the Nation for Florida (2013), in 2003 only 9.7% of African American students and 22% of Hispanic students were enrolled in AP classes. In 2013, 14.6% of African American students and 27 % of Hispanic students were enrolled in AP classes.

This growth in enrollment in advanced coursework was due to a commitment on the part of instructional leaders to adopt an open access approach, which widened the scope of students considered for courses such as AP beyond only those students who were considered to be in the top echelon of their schools (Flores & Gomez, 2011). The main agent for opening access was to engage in instructional leaders and teachers in a curricular alignment process from the middle school to high school level to ensure that students had the prerequisite skills to participate and succeed in AP courses (Flores & Gomez, 2011).

Although there has been an increase in the percentage of minorities in advanced courses, there is a persistent underrepresentation of English learners in advanced courses (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Studies in California indicate that the lack of English learners in advanced courses is due to their placement in English learner programs. One particular study found that students placed in English learner programs were 45% less likely to enroll in advanced science courses and 48% less likely to enroll in advanced social studies classes (Callahan, 2005). Lack of English learner participation was due to

mechanisms in place at the school level, which inhibited English learners' access to advanced courses.

Kanno and Kangas's qualitative study at a Pennsylvania public high school found several school-based practices that discouraged English learners from participating in advanced courses (2014). First, the researchers found that curricular decisions for English learners were being made primarily by the English Language Learner Department of the school (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Due to decisions made by this department, English learners were either placed in sheltered academic classes or were later mainstreamed to remedial academic classes when exited from the English learner program. Also, English learners were unable to participate in advanced courses because of low scores on the state standardized assessment. Guidance counselors used the results of standardized assessments as tool for making curricular decisions about student placement (Kanno & Kangas, 2014).

Secondly, Kanno and Kangas (2014) found that the perception of English learners held by guidance counselors and teachers also hindered this group's progress. For example, English learners were not placed in advanced courses because of fears that they would not be able to manage the copious amounts of reading and writing and would be unsuccessful because of academic pressures. Moreover, guidance counselors thought that teachers of advanced courses would be unwilling to make linguistic accommodations for English learners (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Kanno and Kangas posited that the conditions experienced by English learners at this high school were generalizable to other

high schools in the country, limiting overall enrollment in advanced courses for English learners throughout the United States (2014).

English Learners and School District Policies and Guidelines

English learners in urban school districts throughout the nation lag behind their monolingual counterparts as measured by the National Center for Education Statistics with 96% scoring at basic competency levels or below (as cited in Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). In the 21st century context of public education in the United States, English learners' home language is viewed as problem, rather than as a resource to accelerate student performance (Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011). Because of this perception, English learners are often separated from other students within the settings of their schools. This separation is intentional in school districts and supported by school district policies and guidelines. The purpose is to provide English learners with specialized services to accelerate language acquisition and resolve the perceived language deficit. However, this practice has negative effects in that it prevents English learners from having exposure to real language experiences in the target language (Li, 2012). Moreover, English learners typically are placed in remedial classes upon arrival under the assumption that language will be a barrier to the students' success in advanced coursework (Turner & Dandridge, 2014). Additionally, the resources available in the English learner or remedial classroom may not be at the same level of rigor as those used

by their monolingual counterparts, thereby, impacting performance on standardized assessments (Li, 2012).

Additionally, the academic achievement of English learners' is further compounded when the assumption is made that English learner groups are comprised solely of immigrants to the United States (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). This, however, is not the case. The majority of English learners are second- or third-generation immigrants to this country (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). Consequently, this particular group of English learners is impacted greatly by pedagogical assumptions made by school-based administrators and teachers about this group. Specifically, school-based administrators utilize only one approach to instruct these students, which results in decreased academic achievement among this subgroup. Walqui and Pease-Alvarez (2012) argue that "to be effective...teachers need to realize that English learners are not a monolithic group" (p. 299). To date, school-based administrators and teachers have few professional learning models predicated on sound research, and instead exhort teachers to follow mandated models more focused on pacing and testing rather than on the English learners' language development (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012).

Instructional Leadership and English Learner Achievement: Practices for Inclusion

Hoerr (2007) defines the instructional leader as the principal who is the "educational visionary, offering direction and expertise to ensure that students learn" (p. 84). Instructional leadership development focuses on the need for principals to be directly involved in improving instruction and learning within schools. This is

particularly true as school leaders are expected to narrow the achievement gap between majority and minority student groups in school districts as requirements of NCLB, RTTF, and applicable state statutes. Typically, this expectation has focused on issues of race; for example, Latino and African-American students lag behind their Caucasian counterparts in mathematics and reading skills and in their likelihood to complete high school and college (Haycock, 2001, as cited in Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). Closing the achievement gap, therefore, is an issue that not only addresses race but also other subgroups within a school, including English learners (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). To address the issue, Reihl (2009) advocates for instructional leaders to adopt and implement inclusive practices, which ensure the academic achievement of diverse groups within a school.

Instructional leaders, particularly principals, are the in the best position to address these inequities and affect positive change in a school. Reihl (2009) argues that school principals must change the established routines and make diversity closely linked to core instructional practices in the schools. Failure to do so negates the process of transforming a school into a more inclusive one. This can be accomplished by establishing clear goals for inclusion school-wide, allocating resources accordingly, and promoting practices which improve all students' learning and achievement (Reihl, 2009).

Inclusive practices not only center on instructional practices and allocation of resources, but also include the development of a school culture and climate committed to inclusive practices. This is particularly true of teachers in urban settings, where the largest portion of English learner groups reside. Teacher capacity is developed when

teachers think themselves capable of meeting inclusion goals and are able to see tangible results rendered as the goals are implemented (Reihl, 2009). To build teacher capacity, school principals capitalize on professional learning communities within the school to develop teaching quality and raise student achievement (Reihl, 2009). Finally, school principals must solidify inclusion practices within the school culture by implementing research-based inclusive administrative strategies, such as ensuring the school's structure ascertains equal access and effective instruction for all students and personalizing instruction for students rather than treating minorities, including English learners, as a homogeneous group (Katz, 1999 as cited in Reihl, 2009).

State and Federal Policy

State and federal policy have influenced the academic acceleration of English learners in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade education through laws that promote inclusive practices. In the state of Florida, for example, the Consent Decree of 1990 laid the groundwork for English learners' education and acceleration. At the federal level, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and subsequent reauthorizations of the act in 2001 and 2009 established federal mandates, which have had a bearing on school district policy and guidelines as they relate to underrepresented groups and English learners.

Consent Decree of 1990

In 1990, the landmark case of *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) et al. v. State Board of Education Consent Decree* (1990) established the

framework for the academic advancement of English learners in the pre-kindergarten to twelfth grade public education system in the State of Florida. The settlement of the case enumerated specific provisions that would ensure that English learners' civil rights were protected within the public education system in Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). The Consent Decree provides specific guidelines for the identification of English learners as they enter the public school system, the manner in which compliance with the Consent Decree should be measured, equal access to academic programs within the public school system, the personnel who should monitor and provide instruction to English learners, and the manner in which academic advancement and achievement will be measured for English learners (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). The stipulations contained within the Consent Decree have resulted in the creation of policies, guidelines, and recommended practices by school districts to ascertain that English learners are afforded all the rights and protections contained within the Consent Decree of 1990 and enforced by Florida Statute 1003.56 (2014).

Equal Access to Appropriate Programming

School districts across the state are required to submit Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plans, which must be approved by the Florida State Board of Education. Within the LEP plans, school districts must provide evidence of English learner instruction via English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and comprehensible instruction in the core subject areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science. If available, English learners have access to instruction in the home

language. Moreover, English learners with special needs have access to all programs to which English Proficient students are entitled. This includes programs that are for remediation and for dropout prevention (*LULAC v. State Board of Education Consent Decree*, 1990).

Equal Access to Appropriate Categorical and Other Programs for LEP Students

LULAC v. State Board of Education Consent Decree (1990) ascertains that all English learners in the State of Florida have access to all programs funded by federal or state monies. Therefore, all English learners are entitled to compensatory programs, exceptional education programs, early childhood programs, vocational programs, and adult education program regardless of the level of English proficiency an English learner may have when he or she enters the program. Additionally, this stipulation also provides for any remediation English learners may need to pass state assessments. This provision includes dropout program inclusion for English learners and necessary accommodations as well as student services such as counseling.

Monitoring Issues

LULAC v. State Board of Education Consent Decree (1990) also provides for the monitoring of English learners' education pertaining to federal and state mandates encompassed within the settlement agreement. Monitoring mandated by the Consent Decree includes compliance monitoring, equal access under the Florida Educational Equity Act monitoring, and program efficacy monitoring (1990). Within this scope of work, the Florida Department of Education is responsible for monitoring compliance of: (1) home language survey administration (2) national origin (3) assessment of aural and

oral language (4) assessment of English language reading and writing proficiency (5) evidence of LEP committee (6) application of reclassification procedures and post reclassification monitoring procedures. Monitoring also includes evidence of ESOL instruction for English learners to gain proficiency in English and implementation of comprehensible instruction in the core subject areas of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The Florida Department of Education conducts compliance audits through the Division of Public Schools. This entity is responsible for auditing, reporting, providing recommendations, and issuing corrective actions when school districts are out of compliance per the Consent Decree. School districts are obliged to report any actions taken either on the recommendations or corrective actions.

Outcome Measures

Finally, *LULAC v. State Board of Education Consent Decree* (1990) ensured that the Florida Department of Education created an evaluation system to measure the implementation and fulfillment of state and federal law. The primary purpose of the outcome measures is to evaluate equal access and program effectiveness. Under the equal access provision, English learners' participation in categorical programs, participation in special programs in the Florida Education Finance Program, and participation in targeted academic program are monitored. Program effectiveness, on the other hand, strives to measure the proficiency of English learners in comparison to non-English learners. Program efficacy, therefore, is based on a commensurate level of achievement between English learners and non-English learners. To be considered effective under the Consent Decree, English learners must be progressing through a

school district's pupil progression plan at the same rate as non-English learners. The key indicators for program efficacy are: rate of retention based on student performance, graduation rates, dropout rates, grade point average, and state assessment test scores. Moreover, entry and exit from the ESOL program data based on home language at the school district level is compared against aggregate data from the state.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act: No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top Fund

Federal mandates also have played a role in the creation of policies, guidelines, and recommended practices for English learners throughout the United States. Since the turn of the century, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in 2001 named No Child Left Behind Act and Race to the Top Fund in 2009 are the major impetus for the influence of federal mandates on school district policy.

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2001 introduced the measure of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for subgroups in public education, including English learners (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). As defined by NCLB, English learners are meeting AYP when this group is making progress toward meeting a state's student achievement standards (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). The purpose of this provision was to narrow the achievement gap among disadvantaged groups, which tended to be lower than that of advantaged groups.

Race to the Top Fund (United States Department of Education, 2010) also included English learners as an identified subgroup of interest to increase academic achievement. The Race to the Top Fund (RTTF) program provides funding in the form

of grants for English learner programs that are innovative and supportive of practices that promote language acquisition through instruction (United States Department of Education, 2010). Moreover, it provides for professional learning funding for teachers in the content areas to improve English learners' academic achievement. Like NCLB and the Consent Decree, RTTF required the creation of an evaluation system to measure the academic progress of English learners.

Access to High Standards Act

Both NCLB and RTTF sought to improve academic standards for students and improve student achievement across several subgroups, including English learners. Accelerated academic achievement of disadvantaged groups was addressed explicitly by NCLB through the Access to High Standards Act (NCLB, 2001). This subsection of NCLB supported state and local school districts in increasing the participation and achievement of all students—especially disadvantaged students—in Advanced Placement courses offered by the College Board. The purpose was to create a larger and more diverse cadre of students who was able to participate in Advanced Placement coursework and was able to achieve passing scores on the examinations, receiving college credit (NCLB, 2001).

College and Career Ready

Ensuring the college and career readiness of students upon graduation from high school regardless of several factors, including language background is a major tenet of RTTF (United States Department of Education, 2010). Building on the ideology espoused by the National Governors Association Center, RTTF promotes new standards

and assessments in all states that allow all students to have a “well-rounded education to contribute as citizens in our democracy and thrive in a global economy” (United States Department of Education, 2010, p. 1). Similarly, RTTF also makes specific references to Advanced Placement coursework and International Baccalaureate programs for students as methods of acceleration for all students. In this provision, RTTF makes explicit the necessity of increasing participation and achievement of low-income students in accelerated coursework.

Language Development Standards

In 1990 the primary concern was to ensure the civil rights of English learners within the public school system. *LULAC v. State Board of Education Consent Decree* (1990) coded this into Florida State law. Although the decree provided for equal access to all programs and comprehensible instruction, it did not include language development standards, which would have promoted the creation of policies, guidelines, and recommended practices that would accelerate English learners’ academic coursework. To address language development standards and their assessment across the nation, two separate consortiums were formed—the World-class Instructional Design (WIDA) and Assessments and the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21). The purpose of both these consortiums was to create language development standards and assessments there were aligned with the Common Core State Standards. In June of 2014, Pam Stewart, the Florida Commissioner of Education, recommended that WIDA English Development Standards be adopted.

WIDA and English Language Acquisition

The WIDA English Language Development (ELD) Standards move language acquisition beyond the measures of speaking, listening, reading, and writing in English—as measured currently by Florida’s Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)—to measuring English learners’ academic language development in the core areas of mathematics, language arts, science, social studies, and social and instructional language (Bugajski & Sedgeman, 2013). The shift to the WIDA ELD standards demonstrate the importance of measuring the development of academic language because of its impact on performance of English learners on assessments like the Florida Standards Assessments, ACT, SAT, and other assessments that require sophistication in academic language development (Taylor, Watson, & Nutta, 2014).

WIDA’s ELD standards and its ACCESS assessment allows for a precise degree of measurement of academic language development and proficiency (WIDA, 2014a). The WIDA levels of proficiency are divided into six discrete levels that begin at the elementary levels of language acquisitions, where English learners are learning “everyday words,” phrases, and sentences and progress through advanced levels of language acquisition and academic language development where English learners have a grasp of “technical and abstract” content language, are able to construct “complex sentences,” and use language for specific purposes (Taylor et al., 2014, p. 51). As states implement the Common Core State Standards, the alignment between the demands of Common Core and the ELD standards (Taylor et al., 2014) will prove critical to the academic advancement of English learners.

Thirty-six states have adopted the WIDA ELD standards by 2015 with all but two of the states utilizing the consortium's ACCESS assessment to measure the English language and academic language acquisition of students (WIDA, 2014a). WIDA started as a grant to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction as part of the Enhanced Assessment Grant program established by NCLB's Title III provision. To develop the English Language Proficiency Standards and the ACCESS assessment, the consortium partnered with The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), an organization whose main objective is to promote language learning and cultural sensitivity (CAL, 2015). WIDA began to utilize its standards and assessment in 2004 in six states. In 2012, WIDA revised its English Language Proficiency Standards and introduced the ELD standards aligned to the member states' content standards, Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards (WIDA, 2014b).

WIDA's philosophy on the academic advancement of English learners is predicated on their "Can Do Philosophy" and their "Guiding Principles of Language Development" (WIDA, 2014b, p. 1). These philosophies espouse the principle that English learners have "established knowledge, skills, and ways of seeing and understanding the world from their homes or their communities" (WIDA, 2014b, p. 4). Language development, using the espoused philosophies, draws upon English learners' skills, knowledge, and views to develop their formal and informal language registers across academic subject areas (WIDA, 2014b). According to WIDA's framework (2014b), school leaders who approach English learner instruction from this perspective

will have a complete understanding of language development in K-12 education across core subject areas, accelerating English learners' academic progress.

Research Questions

At the core of curricular decisions made for English learners are the federal and state policies and guidelines, which guide the creation of policy and guidelines for this group at the school district level. In turn, school district-level policies and guidelines are utilized by school leaders to make academic decisions impacting English learners. School district policies and guidelines also affect instructional leadership practices at the school level, which influence the academic achievement of English learners. Research on English learners as a group has focused primarily on policy decisions that promote mandated instructional models and the subsequent achievement of this group on national and state standardized assessments (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012). However, there is limited research on the effect of school district-level policies, guidelines, and practices on the enrollment and achievement of English learners in advanced courses at the middle school and high school level. The impact of school district policies and guidelines on English learners' enrollment and achievement in advanced courses was timely because school district policies and guidelines and instructional leadership practices have a bearing on this group's college and career readiness as defined by the Common Core State Standards. This research study, therefore, examined the relationship of school district policy, guidelines, and recommended practices on the enrollment and

achievement of English learners in advanced coursework in middle school and high school.

The research questions listed below guided this research on the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school.

1. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and English learners enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?
2. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and English learner student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?
3. What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for English learners in middle school and high school?

The research questions listed above and in the methodology portion of this chapter were constructed to study the relationship between school district policy, guidelines, and practices and the enrollment and achievement of English learners in advanced coursework in middle school and high school. To begin, the research study determined the proportion of English learners enrolled in advanced coursework in middle schools and high schools in the Large Urban School District in relation to the overall student population enrollment in advanced coursework. Secondly, the study also examined the achievement of English learners in advanced coursework in proportion to the achievement of the overall student population in middle school and high school in advanced coursework. Thirdly, a review of the Large Urban School District's policies

and guidelines as represented by archival documents were reviewed and analyzed to determine the policies and guidelines that govern English learners' access to advanced coursework in middle school and high school.

Limitations

1. Although all school districts in the State of Florida are required to submit English Learner District Plans based on the Consent Decree, school districts across the state may have additional policies and guidelines in place, which have an effect on the enrollment and achievement of English learners in advanced high school coursework.
2. The population of English learners analyzed for this study resides within one large urban school, affecting the generalizability of the results to other English learner populations within the state and across the country.
3. There are many variables outside of the control of the researcher, which may have had an impact on the English learner enrollment and achievement in advanced high school coursework. These variables may have included: other school district policies, guidelines, or recommended practices which impact overall student participation and achievement in advanced high school coursework and school-based practices employed by school-based administrators to increase student achievement.

Delimitations

The delimitations used by this researcher serve the express purpose of focusing the purpose and scope of the study on English learners and their participation and achievement in advanced middle school and high school coursework. Specifically, this researcher sought to analyze English learners' enrollment and achievement in high school courses that permits them to earn college credit or are considered advanced level coursework through the level 3 designation. The researcher omitted courses that permit students to earn dual enrollment college credit or industry certifications. This limitation did not allow for the generalizability of the results to all English learners enrolled in advanced high school courses as defined by state statute. Dual enrollment college credit and industry certifications are included as part of the accelerated coursework as outlined by the state (Articulated Acceleration Mechanisms of 2014).

A second delimitation placed on this study by this researcher was the exclusion of non-traditional schools from the analysis. This study focused solely on traditional schools within the Large Urban School District. Non-traditional schools, such as charter schools and virtual schools were excluded from this analysis to control for variables that may be non-existent in traditional school settings.

Assumptions

1. In this analysis, it was logical to assume that English learner school district policy, guidelines, and recommended practices were predicated on the

requirements set forth by the Consent Decree and monitored by the Florida Department of Education.

2. It was anticipated that the Large Urban School District policies, guidelines, and recommended practices had an impact, to some degree, on English learners' enrollment and achievement in advanced high school courses.

Methodology

This study employed the use of a mixed-methods approach to analyze the enrollment and achievement of English learners in advanced middle school and high school coursework and to examine the school district policies and guidelines for access to advanced courses in middle school and high school. The purpose of the mixed-methods approach was to add the component of explanatory design in a qualitative approach to provide additional information for the quantitative dimension of the study (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). The enrollment and achievement of English learners in advanced middle school and high school coursework were analyzed quantitatively to determine if there was a difference in this group's proportion of enrollment and achievement in comparison to the overall student population.

Procedures

The execution and completion of this study was a two-part process that addressed the research questions encompassed in the study. First, historical data were collected on the enrollment and academic achievement of LY and LF English learners in advanced

middle school and high school courses. Per the Consent Decree, these two groups of English learners are monitored by the Department of Education for the purposes of compliance (2014). The data collected was inclusive of a five-year period, starting with the 2009 school year and ending in 2014 school year. The data included enrollment and academic achievement in the Middle Years Programme, the Cambridge Pre-AICE program, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, the Cambridge AICE Diploma, and advanced courses in grades 6-12 in mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies. Academic achievement in the aforementioned advanced courses included scores on administered examinations for applicable courses and final grades earned for courses not culminating in an examination.

Secondly, a historical research approach was taken to analyze archival documents that detailed the Large Urban School District's policies and guidelines as they related to the enrollment and academic achievement of English learners in advanced courses in grades 6-12. The archival documents were primary resource documents created by school district-level administrators to guide school-based administrators and other school-based personnel in implementing English learners' academic progression plans. Policy and guideline documents were analyzed for the guidance they provide on compliance requirements required by the Consent Decree. Moreover, policy and guideline documents were analyzed to determine the guidance the documents provided regarding college and career readiness for English learners. Additionally, school-based documents in the form of curriculum guides for middle school and high school were

collected for this analysis. Archival information collected was categorized to demonstrate the relevancy of the data to the research question in this study (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Population and Sample

The populations of study for this analysis were English learners in a large urban school district. Participants in this study were selected based on enrollment in advanced courses in grades 6-12 from 2009-2014. Additionally, participants were identified as either English learners or non-English learners. These criteria were used to conduct the analysis on enrollment and achievement in advanced middle school and high school courses.

During the period when this study was completed, the English learner population in the Large Urban School District was representative of students from 196 different countries who speak 161 different languages (Large Urban School District, 2014). Given the diversity of the English learner population sample in the Large Urban School District, the results were generalizable to other English learner populations in large urban school districts and small urban school districts. However, it is important to note that this English learner population was not be similar enough in composition and to satisfy other ecological conditions to make the results of the analysis generalizable to English learner populations that are primarily composed of American Indian or Alaskan Natives.

Instrumentation and Sources of Data

This analysis utilized both quantitative and qualitative instrumentation to collect all relevant data for this study. Quantitative data were collected via enrollment and the academic test scores for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate and the final grade assigned for advanced courses. Qualitative data were collected via document analysis of policy and guideline documents and curriculum guides at the district- and school-level.

Achievement Tests Data were collected from the Large Urban School District's database on the enrollment and achievement of English learners categorized as Limited Yes or Limited Former during the school years 2009-2014 in Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Program. The data included enrollment figures for each school year outlined in the study, the number of English learners participating in Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate in the same time period, and the achievement of English learners on Advanced Placement examinations and International Baccalaureate examinations as measured by test score.

Achievement in Advanced Coursework Data were collected from the Large Urban School District's database on the enrollment and achievement of English learners classified as Limited Yes and Limited Former during the school years 2009-2014 in advanced courses in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science in grades 6-12. The data included enrollment figures for each school year included in the study, the

number of English learners who participated in advanced courses, and the achievement of English learners in advanced courses as measured by final grade earned in the course.

Data Collection

The data for this analysis were collected via document analyses of policy and guideline documents during the fall of 2015. Historical data for the school years between 2009 and 2014 was collected during the same time period.

Data Analysis

Research question 1 data analysis focused on the relationship between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and English learners enrolled in advanced courses in grades 6-12. To complete the analysis, a chi-square test of goodness of fit was applied to determine if there was a relationship between the overall student population and English learner population and each group's enrollment in advanced courses. Tables were constructed to display the results of the chi-square for goodness of fit.

Analysis of research question 2 data analysis focused on the relationship between the proportion of overall student achievement and English learner achievement either by final grade or examination grade. Advanced Placement, AICE, and IB courses were analyzed by examination grade, since they culminate in an exam. Advanced courses not culminating in an examination were analyzed using final grade in the course. To conduct the analysis, a chi-square test of independence was applied to determine if there was a relationship between the overall student population and the English learner population

and each group's achievement in advanced courses. Tables were constructed to communicate the results of the chi-square test of independence.

Analysis of research question 3 focused on an examination of the Large Urban School District's policy and guidelines for access to advanced coursework for English learners in middle school and high school. Throughout the course of the analysis, school district-created policy papers and guidelines were examined to identify patterns or themes within the documents (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The emergence of patterns or themes lead to the creation of categories that were used to synthesize and evaluate the data gathered from the documents.

Table 1

Research Questions and Data Sources

	Research Question	Data Source
1	What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and English learners enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?	Large Urban School District Data, 2009-2014
2	What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and English learner student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?	Large Urban School District Data, 2009-2014
3	What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for English learners in middle school and high school?	Large Urban School District Archival Documents, 2009-2014

Organization of Study

This analysis was reported in five chapters. Chapter 1 provided an overview of the analysis. Chapter 2 provided a review of the literature and research that were relevant to the analysis. Chapters 3 and 4 covered the methods and procedures of the study and provided an analysis of the data. Finally, the fifth and final chapter of the analysis provided a summary of the data, the implications for policy and practice, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Since 2003, the number of English Learners (EL) in public school systems across the country has been on the rise, growing from 8.7% in 2003 to 9.2% in 2014 with the majority of ELs concentrated in the urban centers of California (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Historically, the academic advancement of ELs in public school systems in the United States has been bound to compliance issues related to federal and state law derived from litigation in federal and state courts (Lau v. Nichols, 1974; LULAC v. State Board of Education Consent Decree, 1990). In turn, laws at the state level led to the creation of school district policy and guidelines that impacted the school-based practices related to ELs' enrollment and achievement in academic coursework.

To complete this review of the literature, a database search was conducted utilizing resources from the University of Central Florida. The databases included: Education Full Text, ERIC, Linguistic and Language Behavior Abstracts, Taylor and Francis, Sage Premier, and ABI/INFORM. The keywords used to search the databases were: English learners, English language learners, limited English proficient, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, accelerated coursework, advanced coursework, course-taking patterns, instructional leadership, school district policy, school district guidelines, district policy, school-based practices, enrollment, academic achievement, diverse students, immigrant students, school leadership, tracking, ESL, language

minority, education policy, school district leadership, district leadership, urban school districts, and principals. The researcher reviewed the literature online and in print journals, including: *Education and Urban Society*, *Educational Policy*, *Teachers College Record*, *American Educational Research Journal*, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *The Journal of Educational Research*, and *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Additionally, the researcher used the books available at the University of Central Florida library. Using the keyword search previously listed, books were selected and included in this literature review.

The Internet was also used to conduct research for the literature review. Websites that were accessed were those of the U.S. Department of Education, the Florida Department of Education, the National Center for Education Statistics, Florida State Statutes, the Florida House of Representative, The College Board, the International Baccalaureate Program, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the University of Chicago, the University of California at Berkeley, US Educational Law, and World-class Instructional Design and Assessment.

The review of the literature consists of four sections, each focusing on the literature pertinent to a specific question with the research study. The first section of the literature review addresses literature related to federal and state cases, which established subsequent educational policy for ELs. In section two of the literature review, literature related to school district policies and guidelines governing access to advanced courses for ELs in middle school and high school are discussed. Section three of the literature

review discusses literature on instructional leadership for ELs and its relationship to school-based practices for the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced courses. The final section of the literature review considered the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework and the factors influencing ELs' enrollment and achievement trends.

Federal and State Cases: Advancing English Learners' Educational Policy

Federal cases and states cases form the framework for English learner (EL) state- and school district-level educational policy. Starting in 1974 with the seminal United States Supreme Court case of *Lau v. Nichols* and culminating in Florida with the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. State Board of Education Consent Decree of 1990, the advancement of ELs' academic development was ensured in states' public pre-kindergarten through 12th grade educational systems.

Lau v. Nichols

In 1970, Chinese American plaintiffs brought a lawsuit forth against the San Francisco Unified School District, contending that 1,800 Chinese Americans were exposed to educational inequalities in the school system because of the school district's English-only language policies (Sugarman & Widess, 1974). The English-only school district policies impacted Chinese ELs because "from the first, then, non-English-speaking students are doomed to poor achievement, illiteracy, and disproportionately high drop out rates" (Sugarman & Widess, 1974, p. 160). Prior to this lawsuit,

educational supports in school districts across the country were uneven or non-existent as was the case in San Francisco Unified School District (Sugarman & Widess, 1974). The United States Supreme Court concurred that educational supports for ELs were necessary to ensure ELs' academic achievement; furthermore, to not provide educational programs for ELs violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 because it discriminated against students on the basis of national origin (Lau v. Nichols, 1974).

League of United Latin American Citizens et al. v. State Board of Education

In 1990, the framework for the academic advancement of ELs in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade was established through the case of *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) et al. v. State Board of Education Consent Decree* (1990). The settlement of the case enumerated specific provisions that would ensure that ELs' civil rights were protected within the public education system in Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). The Consent Decree provides specific guidelines for the identification of ELs as they enter the public school system, the manner in which compliance with the Consent Decree should be measured, equal access to academic programs within the public school system, the personnel who should monitor and provide instruction to ELs, and the manner in which academic advancement and achievement will be measured for ELs (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). The stipulations contained within the Consent Decree have resulted in the creation of policies, guidelines, and recommended practices by school districts to ascertain that ELs are afforded all the

rights and protections contained within the Consent Decree of 1990 and enforced by Florida Statute 1003.56, ensuring ELs' academic advancement (2014).

Federal and State Policy and EL Education

Federal acts and state laws were born of the national and state cases that preceded them. The subsequent laws passed because of the outcome of various cases played a role in the creation of policies, guidelines, and recommended practices for ELs throughout the United States. At the federal level, the Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974, the Elementary and Secondary Education of 1964 and subsequent reauthorizations of the act in 2001 and 2009 impacted ELs' academic advancement. In Florida, adopted educational policies for EL education impact ELs' academic advancement most notably through the 2014 adoption of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development Standards (ELD).

Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974

The Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974 was the federal government's response to the *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) decision (US Education Law, 2015). The EEOA required states to provide equal educational opportunities to ELs. In doing so, it required state educational agencies to devise educational programs that met the needs of ELs (US Education Law, 2015). Language within the EEOA was vague and left to state educational agencies to interpret in conjunction with the input of local school boards to create educational programs for ELs (US Education Law, 2015). The EEOA is contained within the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1964.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act: No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top Fund

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964 known as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2001 introduced the measure of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for subgroups in public education, including ELs (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). As defined by NCLB, subgroups are meeting AYP when a subgroup is making progress toward meeting a state's student achievement standards. The purpose of this provision was to narrow the achievement gap among disadvantaged groups, including ELs, whose achievement tended to be lower than that of advantaged groups.

Race to the Top Fund (United States Department of Education, 2010) also included ELs as an identified subgroup of interest to increase academic achievement. The Race to the Top Fund (RTTF) program provided funding in the form of grants for EL programs that were innovative and supportive of practices that promote language acquisition through instruction (United States Department of Education, 2010). Moreover, it provided for professional learning funding for teachers in the content areas of mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts to improve ELs' academic achievement in the core content subject areas. Like NCLB and the Consent Decree, RTTF required the creation of an evaluation system to measure the academic progress of ELs, impacting state and local school district policy.

Access to High Standards Act (NCLB) and College and Career Ready (RTTF)

NCLB and RTTF sought to improve academic standards for students and improve student achievement across several subgroups, including ELs. Accelerating the academic achievement of disadvantaged groups was addressed explicitly by NCLB through the Access to High Standards Act (NCLB, 2001). This subsection of NCLB supported state and local school districts in increasing the participation and achievement of all students—especially disadvantaged students—in Advanced Placement courses offered by the College Board to create a larger and more diverse cohort of students in advanced coursework culminating in college credit (NCLB, 2001).

RTTF, like NCLB, ensured the college and career readiness of all students upon graduation from high school, including ELs (United States Department of Education, 2010). Building on the ideology espoused by the National Governors Association Center, RTTF promoted new standards and assessments in all states that allowed all students to have a “well-rounded education to contribute as citizens in our democracy and thrive in a global economy” (United States Department of Education, 2010, p. 1). RTTF also made specific references to Advanced Placement coursework and International Baccalaureate programs for students as methods of enrolling and increasing student achievement in advanced coursework.

WIDA and English Language Acquisition Policy

In response to the requirements of NCLB and RTTF, states began adopting the WIDA ELD standards. By 2015, thirty-six states had adopted the WIDA ELD standards

and ACCESS assessments—with the exception of two member states—to measure the English language and academic language acquisition of students (WIDA, 2014a). WIDA began to utilize its standards and assessment in 2004 in six states. In 2012, WIDA revised its English Language Proficiency Standards and introduced the ELD standards aligned to the member states' content standards, Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards (WIDA, 2014b).

Florida adopted WIDA's ELD standards in 2014 (Epline, 2014). The WIDA English Language Development (ELD) Standards move language acquisition beyond the measures of speaking, listening, reading, and writing in English—as measured until 2015 by Florida's Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)—to measuring ELs' academic language development in the core areas of mathematics, language arts, science, social studies, and social and instructional language (Bugajski & Sedgeman, 2013). The shift to the WIDA ELD standards demonstrate the importance of measuring the development of academic language because of its impact on the performance of ELs on assessments like the Florida Standards Assessments, ACT, SAT, and other assessments that require sophistication in academic language development (Taylor, Watson, & Nutta, 2014). Through WIDA's ELD standards, ELs will use their existing skills, knowledge and views to develop their formal and informal language registers across academic subject areas (WIDA, 2014b).

School District Policy and English Learners

Federal and state cases and acts had a bearing on educational policies adopted and implemented in school districts across the United States. A review of the literature yielded the predominant local school district policy trends related to ELs' academic advancement. The policy trends fall within theories of action for change in urban school districts (McAdams & Katzir, 2013). Theories of action for urban school districts are defined to provide a framework for the Wisconsin and California school district case studies, whereby these school districts enacted policies to provide access to advanced coursework for ELs.

Performance/Empowerment Model This model attempts to mediate between accountability and autonomy of schools within a school district (McAdams & Katzir, 2013). In this model, the school district serves as the hub for professional learning and resources, while schools "are the units of change" (McAdams & Katzir, 2013, p. 5). Schools have autonomy within this model to allocate resources and make instructional decisions tailored to their individual schools.

Managed Instruction Model This model places the majority of the decision-making process of instruction in the hands of a school district's central office. The assumption within this model is that the school district's high mobility rate and lack of teacher proficiency in teaching necessitates the direct involvement of the school district to standardize "all instructional policies, procedures, and practices across the entire school system" (McAdams & Katzir, 2013, p. 6).

Managed Performance/Empowerment The last model blends both the performance/empowerment model and the managed instruction model. In this context, schools earn autonomy from the school district policy and guidelines based schools' performance (McAdams & Katzir, 2013). Therefore, a school would start with the full implementation of the school district's policies and guidelines and move away from mandated policy, once it demonstrates success in terms of student achievement (McAdams & Katzir, 2013).

School Districts and English Learners: Policy Models

The number of ELs enrolled in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 increased nation-wide from 8.7% in 2003 to 9.2% in 2013 or approximately 4.4 million students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015), influencing school districts' policies and guidelines to related to ELs' academic achievement. The highest percentages of ELs are located in six states: Alaska, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas. The District of Columbia and Florida also report a high concentration of ELs in their student population. Currently, ELs in urban school districts throughout the nation lag behind their non-EL counterparts (Walqui & Pease Alvarez, 2012). The 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress measures of reading and mathematics point to a persistent achievement gap between ELs and non-ELs of 45 points and 41 points respectively on the assessment for grade 8 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). School districts responded to EL achievement gaps in various ways dependent upon their theory of action and the demands of NCLB and RTTF.

Table 2

Percentage of EL Student Population Participating in EL Programs: Highest Concentrations

State	Percentage of EL Student Population	Number of Students
California	22.8	1.3 million
New Mexico	15.8	53,000
Nevada	15.7	84,000
Texas	15.1	740,000
Alaska	11.3	14,000
District of Columbia	10.3	5,000
Florida	9.0	242,000

Note. Number of students is rounded to nearest thousand. Adapted from “Number and percentage of public school students participating in programs for English learners, by state: Selected years, 2002-2003 through 2012-2013,” by National Center for Education Statistics, 2014, *Digest of Education Statistics 2014*, Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_204.20.asp?current=yes

Wisconsin

A case study of two school districts in Wisconsin showcases school districts’ response to EL demographic changes in their student population utilizing either a conservative lens or a liberal lens (Turner, 2015), resulting in the creation of school district policies that provided access to advanced coursework for ELs. School districts in Wisconsin adopted differing EL models, which converged on similar EL model elements including: language acquisition models, professional learning for cultural awareness,

strategic planning to address achievement gaps, marketing of the district-adopted EL strategy to the public, and parental and community engagement programs (Turner, 2015). The connecting thread among the elements of the implementation models adopted by the school districts rested upon the impetus to close the achievement gap between ELs and their non-EL counterparts (Turner, 2015). To achieve this, school districts chose to start two-way bilingual immersion programs and International Baccalaureate programs in their schools to meet the needs of both ELs and the general population of students (Turner, 2015). Additionally, the school district viewed professional learning for teachers as the main agent for closing the EL achievement gap.

Changes in school district policy in Wisconsin met with resistance from teachers and the community. To respond, school districts utilized a managed instruction theory of action (McAdams & Katzir, 2013) and cited federal and state mandates, which necessitated school district policies that were responsive to the needs of ELs (Turner, 2015). Existence of federal and state laws provided school districts with the language and marketing to “mitigate teacher and community resistance, making way for schools to respond to immigrant and EL populations (Turner, 2015, p. 27). To include minority populations in the crafting of school district policy, district leaders included Latino and African American community leaders in defining problems encountered by this community and formulating answers to these problems through district leaders’ “meaning-making” (Turner, 2015, p. 24).

California

In California, a case study of a school district in Berkley demonstrated the manner in which district leadership mitigated changes in school board policy regarding academics based on pressures exerted by school board members, principals, and teachers (Trujillo, 2012). The performance/empowerment context (McAdams & Katzir, 2013) impacted the policies and guidelines that were enacted to increase the level of rigorous, standards-based, advanced coursework. Under the guidance of the deputy superintendent, departments responsible for curriculum and instruction initiated changes to introduce rigorous, standards-based, advanced curriculum, particularly for ELs. However, teacher unions, school board members, principals and teachers challenged curriculum changes (Trujillo, 2012).

The overarching theme of the challenges was that rigorous curriculum would be too arduous for struggling learners and ELs (Trujillo, 2012). For example, the curriculum department sought to introduce changes to the enrollment patterns of students by opening access to advanced courses to all students (Trujillo, 2012). Prior to this initiative, the school district had maintained an enrollment pattern of small cohorts of students enrolling in advanced courses of whom few students were ELs or Latino (Trujillo, 2012). The school district abandoned the initiative after teachers and principals voiced their complaints to the school board, resulting in maintenance of the status quo (Trujillo, 2012). In light of this performance/empowerment district context (McAdams & Katzir, 2013), several initiatives were either abandoned or implemented in a lesser form

(Trujillo, 2012). Implementation of these school district policies could have impacted access to advanced courses for ELs.

The case studies found in the review of the literature demonstrate the school district policy contexts related to the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework. The literature points to school districts that create EL policy for access to advanced coursework under the managed instruction theory of action successfully implement policy initiatives. In this framework, policies and guidelines providing access to advanced coursework rely on research-based language acquisition models, international programs of study, and professional learning for teachers (Trujillo, 2012). School districts, however, which operate under the performance/empowerment model of action (McAdams & Katzir, 2013) implement policy initiatives that provide little to no access to advanced coursework for ELs. In this context, principals and teachers reduced the original intent of the policy initiatives to a set of policy guidelines that did not benefit ELs and other underrepresented groups with regards to enrollment in advanced coursework (Trujillo, 2012).

Instructional Leadership and English Learners

The instructional leader is defined as the principal who is the “educational visionary, offering direction and expertise to ensure that students learn” (Hoerr, 2007, p. 84). Instructional leadership development focuses on the discrete knowledge, skills, and abilities principals must possess and execute to improve instruction and learning for all students in schools. Since the passage of NCLB, RTTF, and various state statutes, the

role of principals has changed from that of a manager responsible for facilities to that of the individual primarily responsible for the quality of teaching and learning within a school building (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015). A school principal, therefore, is the progenitor of inclusive school-based practices that ascertain the academic achievement of various student groups within a school (Reihl, 2009).

National and State Educational Leadership Standards

To ensure principals are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to affect positive outcomes in teaching and learning, states adopted both national and state standards to drive the development of future educational leaders and to evaluate principals' performance within a school setting (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015; Florida Department of Education, 2015).

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards were developed during the 1990s and adopted in 1996, creating a set of national standards for educational leaders (Canole & Young, 2013). By 2005, 46 states had adopted the standards, using the standards in the development of their own state leadership standards for the development and evaluation of school administrators (Canole & Young, 2013). In 2008, the ISLLC standards were revised to reflect the demands of NCLB on school administrators (Canole & Young, 2013).

The Council of Chief State Officers (2015) decided to revise the standards again in 2013 in response to national developments that placed new demands on school

administrators. The national developments included: the creation and adoption of the Common Core State Standards, which required school administrators to ensure that students are college and career ready; the passage of RTTF, which required school administrators to become fluent in data discussions, ensure standards-based instruction, and evaluate teachers using new teacher evaluation models; and the passage of the Blueprint for Reform, which required schools to ensure that all students received a “world-class education” (Canole & Young, 2013, p. 9); and the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Program, which allowed states the flexibility to eschew select requirements of NCLB in exchange for state-developed plans for educational improvements (Canole & Young, 2013).

In 2015, the Council of Chief State School Officers released a draft of the ISLLC 2015 Model Policy Standards for Educational Leaders, which are predicated on transformational leadership ideals (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015). The 2015 iteration of the ISLLC standards, if adopted, will “ensure that educational leaders are equipped with the vital knowledge, skills, and dispositions to transform our schools into places that empower students to take ownership of their learning, emphasize the learning of content, and the application of knowledge to real-world problems, and value the differences each student brings to the classroom” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015, p. 4). There are seven standards for the ISLLC 2015, which address the themes of student achievement, academic program development, professional learning for staff, inclusion, resource allocation, community outreach, and effective operations (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015).

Florida Principal Leadership Standards

In 2005, Florida adopted its own educational leadership standards through the creation of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) in rule 6A-5.080, which set forth Florida's framework for the development and evaluation of school administrators' instructional leadership (State of Florida Department of State, 2010). In 2011, FPLS standards were revised, impacting school administrator development programs and the evaluation systems used by Florida school districts to assess school administrators' performance (State of Florida Department of State, 2010). There are 10 standards within four domains that create the framework in Florida for the development of school administrators (Florida Department of Education, 2015). The four domains include student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behaviors (Florida Department of Education, 2015).

Instructional Leadership Development for English Learners

At the national level, the ISLLC standards drive the development of state standards, which impact the school administrator preparation programs and the development of instructional leaders (Canole & Young, 2013). Instructional leadership and the school-based practices implemented for student access and achievement in advanced coursework begin in school leadership preparation programs at colleges of education across the country. School leadership development program research revealed two divergent trends in EL instructional leadership development.

Northeastern United States: School Leadership Preparation and English Learners

A research study completed on the EL course content of a school leadership preparation program in a public university in the northeastern United States demonstrated that future school administrators are prepared inadequately to tackle EL issues (Baecher, Knoll, & Patti, 2013). The study utilized a survey instrument and document analysis of course syllabi to determine the extent to which the school leadership preparation program focused on EL issues (Baecher et al., 2013). The survey instrument items developed measured the background experience of participants with regards to instructional or personal experiences with ELs to determine participants' perspectives on EL instruction, to determine the course content focusing on ELs, and to determine participants' interest in EL professional learning (Baecher et al., 2013). Results demonstrated that participants' perceptions remained consistent irrespective of whether the participant was a student or program faculty. In categorizing results into "no opportunity to focus," "discussed briefly," and "explored in depth" (Baecher et al., 2013, p. 291) participants reported that in 6 of 15 categories related to EL education they were able to explore EL topics in depth 4% to 8% of time in the preparation program.

Analysis of course syllabi revealed that school leadership curriculum provided opportunities for EL instructional leadership development primarily during the internship seminar component of the program (Baecher et al., 2013). Students were required to observe lessons and determine effectiveness of EL instructional strategies utilized based on students' research of these strategies through required readings from various organizations, including the Center for Applied Linguistics (Baecher et al., 2013).

Participants indicated that further professional learning was needed regarding development of academic language for ELs, assessment accommodations for ELs, differentiating instruction for ELs, and ELs in special education programs (Baecher et al., 2013).

California: Urban Principal Preparation Programs and ELs

In California there is a focus on the development of instructional leaders who consider the needs of all learners, especially those of underserved learners like ELs, in principal preparation programs. As mentioned previously, the school age EL population of California is 1.3 million, creating a need to address the instructional needs of ELs in the state. A qualitative study of the two principal preparation programs—one at the University of California, Berkeley and the other at the University of California, Los Angeles—demonstrated the influence of social justice theory on instructional leadership development for underserved populations (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). The principal preparation programs known as the Principal Leadership Institute (PLI) were created to address the needs of diverse learners, including ELs, in California’s urban centers where the majority of diverse learners are concentrated (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). The overarching construct of the PLI was that increases in student achievement are a direct result of systems and structures within schools that support students’ growth (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). In the PLI construct, an “equity focus is fundamental to leadership” (Tredway, Stephens, Leader-Picone & Hernandez, 2012, p. 5).

Curriculum within the program is predicated on a social justice leadership approach, particularly regarding issues of equity (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). Students in

the program are required to write and create “cultural autobiographies, neighborhood mapping, analyses of English Learner profiles in respective schools, and equity audits” (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014, p. 155) for the purposes of analyzing their schools’ profiles. Moreover, students analyze issues faced by ELs and other disadvantaged groups via available data sources (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). Instructional leadership for teacher development is an important component of this program, providing students the opportunity to practice coaching teachers and providing “equity-focused feedback” to teachers (Trujillo, & Cooper, 2014, p. 155).

Students also engage in research projects that require them to identify a problem of equity within their settings and construct a research question to address that problem, propose a solution, implement the solution, and analyze the results of the solution (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). Social justice leadership development in this program is measured through the Leadership Connection for Justice in Education (Tredway et al., 2012) rubric developed by the faculty coordinators at the University of California, Berkeley. The rubric addresses instructional leadership for social justice through “presence and attitude, identity and relationships, equity and advocacy, curriculum and instruction, organization and systems, change and coherence, and assessment and accountability” (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014, p. 156).

Instructional Leadership Practices and ELs’ Inclusion

The ISLLC and FLPS standards require that instructional leaders meet the needs of all learners within their schools (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015; Florida

Department of Education, 2015), including ELs. To do so, school principals link diversity to the core instructional practices of the school to affect change in the established routines of their schools (Reihl, 2009). The proposed changes to the ISLLC standards point to a need for transformative leadership to create schools that are inclusive and guarantee “better outcomes for students” (Council of Chief State Officers, 2015, p. 3). The creation of Leadership Connection for Justice in Education (LCJE) rubric and the emphasis on ELs within the PLI program in California (Tredway et al., 2012; Trujillo & Cooper, 2014) signal a rising need to ensure that school-based practices are inclusive and lead to positive outcomes for students, particularly ELs. ISLLC, FPLS, and LCJE all provide concrete indicators of instructional leadership practices at the school level that affect all learners.

The school-level indicators for the standards contained within this literature review are grouped by the indicators of: student achievement, instruction and assessment, professional learning, inclusion, resource allocation, community outreach, and effective operations (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015). The indicators are derived from the seven ISLLC 2015 standards because since 1996, the ISLLC standards have served as the basis for the development of state leadership standards and school administrator development and evaluation systems (Canole & Young, 2013).

Table 3

Instructional Leadership Indicators

Instructional Leadership Indicators	ISLLC (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015)	FPLS (Florida Department of Education, 2015)	Leadership Connection for Justice in Education (Tredway et al., 2012)
Student Achievement	Define the school vision for student achievement with all stakeholders	Create a school climate where there are high expectations for all students	Represent the core values of the community in a shared vision for student outcomes
Instruction and Assessment	Implement rigorous curriculum and assessments based on academic standards	Ensure student learning and achievement through standards-based instruction	Are the “principal-teacher” (p. 40), setting high expectation and equitable assessments
Professional Learning	Cultivate the professional learning of staff.	Use professional learning to achieve specific school goals and objectives	Ensure both formal and informal professional learning for staff
Inclusion	Create school environments where all students are motivated and encouraged to meet their full potential.	Create student-centered environments where diversity is a resource	Are culturally responsive and speak of their own culture
Resource Allocation	Ensure staff has all resources to promote students’ achievement	Use financial resources to address instructional needs	Ascertain school goals are addressed through policies, procedures, and fiscal resources
Community Outreach	Build relationships with students’ families and school community	Include the community in the school’s work	Are advocates for all stakeholders with the school community
Effective Operations	Leaders maintain effective managerial practices	Use resources to ensure safe and effective schools	Encourage stakeholders to be active participants in efficient operations

Note: Instructional leadership indicators are derived from the proposed 2015 ISLLC Standards. Adapted from “ISLLC 2015: Model Policy Standards for Educational Leaders” by the Council of Chief State School Officers, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2015/RevisedDraftISLLCStandards2015.pdf>

English Learner Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses

ELs, like other groups within school districts, are impacted by the policies, guidelines, and practices adopted by school district-level and school-level instructional leaders in relation to enrollment and achievement in advanced courses. At the school district level, ELs are impacted by policies and guidelines adopted based on perceptions of second language acquisition and ELs' performance on standardized assessments. At the school level, English learners are affected by the inclusive instructional practices adopted by school principals, which have a bearing on this group's enrollment and achievement in advanced courses.

Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses

Increasing overall student enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework has been an emerging goal of school districts in the United States, particularly the participation of groups that typically are underrepresented in advanced courses (Flores & Gomez, 2011). Because of its widespread use, The College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) Program has been a mechanism used to measure enrollment of underrepresented groups. There has been a movement within the AP program to increase the enrollment and achievement of minority groups, particularly that of Hispanics and African Americans. According to the AP Report to the Nation for Florida (2014), in 2003 only 9.7% of African American students and 22% of Hispanic students were enrolled in AP classes. In 2013, 14.6% of African American students and 27 % of Hispanic students were enrolled in AP classes.

This growth in enrollment in advanced coursework was due to a commitment on the part of school districts to adopt an open-access approach, which widened the scope of students considered for courses such as AP beyond only those students who were considered to be in the top echelon of their schools (Flores & Gomez, 2011). The main agent for opening access was to engage instructional leaders and teachers in a curricular alignment process from the middle school to high school level to ensure that students had the prerequisite skills to participate and succeed in AP courses (Flores & Gomez, 2011). One of the tools espoused by the College Board to open access to AP coursework for students is the AP Potential diagnostic tool (The College Board, 2012). The AP Potential tool utilizes students' scores on the College Board's PSAT/NMSQT assessment to generate predictive student rosters personalized for schools, which provides information to school districts and schools on students who may potentially achieve a passing score of 3 on an AP exam (The College Board, 2012).

English Learner Enrollment in Advanced Courses

Although there has been an increase in the percentage of underrepresented groups in advanced courses, there is a persistent underrepresentation of ELs in advanced courses (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Studies in California indicate that the lack of ELs in advanced courses is due to their placement in ELs programs. Students placed in ELs programs were 45% less likely to enroll in advanced science courses and 48% less likely to enroll in advanced social studies classes (Callahan, 2005). Lack of EL enrollment in advanced

courses was due to mechanisms in place at the school district level and school level, which inhibited ELs' access to advanced courses as discussed previously.

English Learners' Achievement and Enrollment in Advanced Courses: National Trends

A national research study completed using data from U.S. National Center for Education Statistics from 2007, tracked a national sample of high school students as they started their sophomore year in the 2001-2002 school year and tracked students through graduation in 2005 (Callahan, Wilkinson, & Muller, 2010). The purpose of the national study was to determine: the effects of placement within an English EL program and having that designation attached to the students' profiles; the effects on the students' enrollment in college preparatory courses in mathematics, science, and social science; and the impact of the EL designation and enrollment on overall grade point average and mathematics achievement.

Results of the national study found that students who had an EL designation were underrepresented in enrollment in science college preparatory courses at a rate of 49%, in mathematics courses at a rate of 56%, and in social studies courses at a rate of 36% (Callahan et al., 2010). ELs' placement in advanced mathematics courses was the least affected by the EL designation. However, mathematics achievement as measured by course grade and standardized achievement tests of ELs during grade 12 were demonstrably lower when compared to non-EL students enrolled in advanced mathematics classes (Callahan et al., 2010; Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003). ELs, on average, achieved a grade point average that was 0.18 points lower and scored 4 points lower on mathematics standardized assessments (Callahan et al., 2010). The grade point

average impact for ELs began early in grades 9 and 10 with ELs' grade point average being .10 less of a point lower than that of non-EL students (Callahan et al., 2010).

ELs' academic achievement was affected the longer they were classified as ELs (Callahan et al., 2010). ELs' course schedules demand that these students enroll in classes that are designated for ELs, limiting the options available to them to enroll in advanced courses in science and social studies (Callahan et al., 2010). The strongest determinant of enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework is EL designation as schools try to comply with federal and state laws (Callahan et al., 2010; Turner, 2015; No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; Consent Decree of 1990). The study also found that schools located in low-socio economic areas with a high proportion of exceptional education students and Asians are more likely to have more students designated as ELs (Callahan et al., 2010).

English Learner Achievement and Enrollment in Advanced Courses: State Level

Studies conducted at the state level mirror the trends evidenced at the national level. Quantitative and qualitative studies completed in California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois demonstrate the achievement gaps experienced by ELs as measured by state assessments and the influence of the achievement gap on ELs' access to and achievement in advanced coursework.

California

A study on middle school mathematics placement and later high school achievement in mathematics in California elucidates the impact of ELs' course

enrollment on their academic trajectory. EL students in high school tend to have lower scores in mathematics than non-ELs in high school (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003). Researchers in this study found that enrollment patterns of ELs were affected by their language proficiency and immigrant status. EL students tended to be placed in lower level or remedial math classes in middle school leading to their continued placement in these classes once ELs reached high school (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003). The course track students were placed in for mathematics in grade 8 was a determinant for achievement on standardized mathematics assessment in grade 9 (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003). ELs placed in remedial mathematics courses in middle school scored 26 points lower on standardized assessments in grade 9 than their non-EL peers (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003). Conversely, EL students who were placed in advanced mathematics in grade 8 scored 8 points higher than their EL peers enrolled in regular classes on the grade 9 mathematics assessment (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003).

Language proficiency status, therefore, had an impact on mathematics achievement because of the enrollment pattern of ELs (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003). Furthermore, ELs also scored 14 points lower than their non-EL counterparts enrolled in the remedial mathematics classes. The measure of mathematics achievement for this study was the California Test of Basic Skills (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003).

A policy analysis utilizing the results of California's Stanford Achievement Test, Version 9 (SAT 9) also demonstrated the impact of the achievement gap on ELs' course enrollment as they progress from elementary grades to secondary grades (Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan, 2003). A policy review on the state of ELs in

California found that there were more ELs enrolled in secondary schools than in elementary schools, comprising 18% of the secondary student population of that state (Gándara et al., 2003). The results of the SAT 9 revealed that ELs scored below proficiency levels as early as third grade and that achievement continued to decline as ELs proceed into the secondary grades, scoring up to 40 percentage points below their non-EL counterparts on the exam (Gándara et al., 2003). In reading portion of the SAT 9, former ELs continued to lag behind their non-EL counterparts, scoring 50 points lower on the mean scale score in grade 8. By grade 11, “current and former English learners are reading at the same level as English only students between grades 6 and 7, a gap of about 4 and one half years” (Gándara et al., 2003, p. 6).

Leaders in California’s schools make decisions about students’ enrollment in courses based partly on student achievement on standardized assessments (Gándara et al., 2003). Although the achievement gap between ELs and their non-EL counterparts was evident through the results of the SAT 9, there was very little emphasis placed on ELs’ learning needs in professional learning available to teachers (Gándara et al., 2003). Teachers in California reported that only 7% of their professional learning time was spent addressing ELs’ instructional needs (Gándara et al., 2003).

ELs in California typically enrolled in more English as a Second Language classes, limiting their access to other core content curriculum (Gándara et al., 2003). To elucidate, non-ELs’ school transcripts showed that 58% of the courses taken are meant for college and career readiness (Gándara et al., 2003). ELs’ transcripts, conversely,

evidenced only 21% of their enrollment is in college and career readiness courses (Gándara et al., 2003).

Pennsylvania

A qualitative study at a Pennsylvania public high school found several school-based practices, which discouraged ELs from participating in advanced courses (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Researchers found that the EL department of the school made the curricular decisions for EL students rather than the instructional leader of the school (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Due to decisions made by EL department, EL enrollment consisted of placement in sheltered academic classes or mainstreaming of ELs to remedial academic classes when ELs exited from the EL program. Enrollment in advanced courses did not occur because of ELs' low scores on state standardized assessments, which were used by guidance counselors as a tool for students' enrollment decisions (Kanno & Kangas, 2014; Gándara et al., 2003).

Perception of ELs held by both guidance counselors and teachers limited ELs' academic progress (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Advanced course enrollment was not considered an option for ELs at this Pennsylvania high school because of the perception that ELs would not be able to manage the academic demands of advanced coursework and would succumb to the academic pressures, resulting in ELs' academic failure (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). Moreover, guidance counselors thought that teachers of advanced courses would be unwilling to make linguistic accommodations for ELs, adding to the factors that would lead to academic failure (Kanno & Kangas, 2014). ELs' academic experiences at this high school likely are generalizable to other high schools in the United

States, limiting enrollment and achievement for ELs in advanced courses (Kanno & Kangas, 2014).

Illinois

A research report on the state of ELs in Chicago Public Schools found that grade 9 proficiency in core content classes of mathematics, science, language arts and social studies was a predictor of high school graduation (Gwynne, Stitzel Pareja, Ehrlich, & Allensworth, 2012). Hispanic students in Chicago Public Schools, on average, earned lower grades as evidenced by their grade point averages, impacting their college and career readiness (Gwynne et al., 2012). By and large, recently identified EL students had higher grade point average than students who had been ELs since before entering grade 6—“long-term” ELs (Gwynne et al, 2012, p. 2). Recently designated ELs had a mean grade point average of 2.1, while long-term ELs had a mean grade point average of 1.8 (Gwynne et al., 2012).

In the Chicago Public School system, all core content area classes of mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies were considered “college preparatory courses” (Gwynne et al., 2012, p. 27). Students whose standardized test scores did not meet the prescribed proficiency level in language arts or mathematics were required to take remedial courses that covered basic skills in these content areas (Gwynne et al., 2012). A greater proportion of long-term ELs enrolled in these remedial courses with close to 50% of long-term ELs taking a remedial mathematics course (Gwynne et al., 2012).

The research report on Chicago Public Schools suggests that long-term ELs are more likely to enroll in remedial classes in science and mathematics, while recent ELs are

likely to enroll in remedial language arts classes only (Gwynne et al., 2012). Long-term ELs, therefore, are less likely to meet proficiency standards by the end of grade 9 (Gwynne et al., 2012). This impacts ELs' ability to enroll in advanced courses.

Schools and English Learner Achievement and Enrollment in Advanced Courses

Although at the national and state level research points to a persistent underrepresentation of ELs in advanced courses predominantly due to the achievement gap, there is existing research on a grassroots example of attempts by an individual school to provide access to advanced courses for ELs with varying results. An ethnographic research study conducted at a California high school over a six-year period sought to analyze the factors that led to the successful inclusion of ELs within an IB Diploma Programme (Mayer, 2012). Results showed that several school-based factors led to the success of the IB program for ELs including: an open enrollment practice; staff's willingness to learn about students' cultural and linguistic traditions; setting high expectations for students during high school and for post-secondary education; and implementing supportive school structures, such as tutoring, to ensure students' success (Mayer, 2012).

In spite of support structures for ELs at the school level, school district structures were not supportive of ELs' inclusion in the IB program. Initially, the school district leadership was supportive of the high school's inclusive IB practices, stating that the objective was to involve EL students in advanced coursework, regardless of whether or not the EL student achieved a passing score on an IB exam. However, the school district soon responded to pressures from state and federal mandates to close ELs' achievement

gap on standardized assessments after the school district had failed consistently in meeting state benchmarks (Mayer, 2012). This paradigm shifted financial resources away from the IB program to remedial instruction and impacted the district's support of the principal's IB program at the California high school (Mayer, 2012). The erosion in financial and policy support resulted in the inability of the principal to dedicate resources to IB. Instead, the principal was required to dedicate resources to remedial instruction for those students who did not meet state testing benchmarks in grade 10 (Mayer, 2012).

Summary

The review of the literature discussed the existing literature on the relationship between school district policy and guidelines and the school-based practices related to the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework at the secondary level. National and state educational policy is influenced at the national level by *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) and in Florida by the Consent Decree of 1990. Federal educational policy for ELs was created shortly after the *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) decision in the form of the Equal Education Opportunities Act (1974) and affirmed by NCLB (2001) and RTTF (2009).

State educational policies for ELs developed from these acts and shaped the manner in which school districts adopted policies to ensure the academic achievement of their EL populations. The majority of these efforts by school districts centered on policies that focused on closing the achievement gap of ELs in relation to their non-EL peers (Callahan et al., 2010; Gwynne et al., 2012). There have been school districts, however, that made attempts to move beyond achievement gap measures to include ELs

in advanced coursework with mixed results. Success of EL school district policies for advanced coursework depended upon the school districts' theories of action (McAdams & Katzir, 2013). Access to advanced coursework for ELs takes place when school districts adopt and implement policies using the managed instruction model (McAdams & Katzir, 2013).

School district policy and guidelines in turn influence the adoption of school-based practices by instructional leaders in schools. Instructional leaders use national and state leadership standards to guide their work with teachers and students within a school. The ISLLC standards (2015) at the national level have a bearing on the state-adopted leadership standards such as the FPLS (2015) in Florida. Although both set of standards make references to the academic achievement of all students within a school building and are at the core of school leadership preparation programs at the universities, there is little evidence of ELs' needs addressed within school leadership preparation programs (Baecher et al., 2013). This trend, however, is starting to change. In California there is an emerging focus on ELs through the PLI initiative in the state's urban leadership preparation programs (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). The PLI program developed a set of standards that specifically develop a social justice leadership perspective in future leaders predicated on the ideal of equity for all students (Trujillo & Cooper, 2014).

The enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework evidences the influence of school district policy and school-based practices. Organizations such as the College Board (2012) use tools such as AP Potential to motivate school districts and schools to adopt an open access approach. However, this tool, like other tools used by

school districts and by individual schools, relies upon students' achievement on standardized assessments (Gándara et al., 2003; Gwynne et al., 2012; Kanno & Kangas, 2014). The achievement gap experienced by ELs leads to their underrepresentation in academic courses considered as necessary for college preparation (Callahan et al., 2010). Enrollment patterns for ELs become an issue because of the achievement gap on standardized tests, leading to ELs' placement in remedial or regular classes in middle school and high school (Gándara et al., 2003; Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003; Callahan et al., 2010; Gwynne et al., 2012; Kanno & Kangas, 2014).

Individual schools and school districts made attempts to enroll students in advanced coursework independent of the achievement gap experienced by ELs (Mayer, 2012; Turner, 2015). The success of the attempts to enroll ELs in advanced coursework rested upon the support given to schools by the school district. In the case of an individual school, changes in school district policy and subsequent use of fiscal resources resulted in the dismantling of the school's attempt (Mayer, 2012). Systemic change, however, proved successful for ELs when school districts supported policies to advance EL academic achievement (Turner, 2015).

This literature review has proven the importance of legislation and resulting school district policy on ELs' enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework in middle school and high school.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of school district policy, guidelines, and practices related to the enrollment and achievement of English learners (EL) in advanced coursework in middle school and high school as stated in chapter 1. The methodology conducted to complete this study is presented in this chapter. This chapter is divided into six sections: (a) the design of the study, (b) the selection of participants, (c) the instrumentation, (d) data collection, (e) data analysis, and (f) summary.

Design of the Study

This study employed the use of a mixed-methods approach to analyze the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced middle school and high school coursework, to examine the school district policies and guidelines for access to advanced courses in middle school and high school, and to analyze the school-based practices utilized for the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced courses. The purpose of the mixed-methods approach was to add the component of explanatory design in a qualitative approach to provide additional information for the quantitative dimension of the study (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). To this end, school district policy and guideline documents and middle school and high school curriculum guides were analyzed qualitatively. The enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced middle school and

high school coursework were analyzed quantitatively to determine if there was a difference in this group's proportion of enrollment and achievement in comparison to the overall student population.

Research Questions

The research questions listed below guided this research on the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school.

1. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and ELs enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?
2. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and EL student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?
3. What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for ELs in middle school and high school?

Selection of Participants

The population of study for this analysis was ELs at the middle school and high school levels. Participants for this study were selected based on enrollment in advanced courses in grades 6-12 from 2009-2014 in the Large Urban School District's 38 traditional middle schools and 19 traditional high schools to conduct an analysis on the proportion of ELs' enrollment and achievement in advanced middle school and high

school courses in relation to the overall enrollment and achievement of students in advanced coursework in middle school and high school. Participants were identified as EL or non-EL.

Instrumentation

This analysis utilized both quantitative and qualitative instrumentation to collect all relevant data for this study. Quantitative data were collected via enrollment and the academic test scores for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate and the final grade assigned for advanced courses. Qualitative data were collected through document analyses of EL policy and guideline documents and curriculum guides at the district- and school-level.

Achievement Test Data were collected from the Large Urban School District's database on the enrollment and achievement of ELs categorized as Limited Yes or Limited Former during the school years 2009-2014 in Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Program. The data included enrollment figures for each school year outlined in the study, the number of ELs enrolled in Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate in the same time period, and the achievement of ELs on Advanced Placement examinations and International Baccalaureate examinations as measured by test score.

Achievement in Advanced Coursework Data were collected from the Large Urban School District's database on the enrollment and achievement of ELs classified as Limited Yes (LY) and Limited Former (LF) during the school years 2009-2014 in

advanced courses in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science in grades 6-12. The data included enrollment figures for each school year included in the study, the number of ELs who participated in advanced courses, and the achievement of ELs in advanced courses as measured by final grade earned in the course.

English Learner Policy and Guideline Documents A historical research approach was taken to analyze archival documents that detail the Large Urban School District's policies and guidelines as they relate to the enrollment and academic achievement of English learners in advanced courses in grades 6-12. The archival documents were primary resource documents created by school district-level administrators to guide school-based administrators and other school-based personnel in implementing ELs' academic progression plans. Policy and guideline documents were analyzed for the guidance they provide on compliance requirements required by the Consent Decree. Moreover, policy and guideline documents were analyzed to determine the guidance the documents provided regarding college and career readiness for ELs. Archival information collected was categorized to demonstrate the relevancy of the data to the research question in this study (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Data Collection

This study utilized a mixed-methods approach to collect all relevant data for the analysis. The two methodologies employed will be discussed separately.

University Protocol

Prior to beginning the collection of data, an application outlining the parameters of the study was submitted to the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board on May 31, 2015. The application submitted to the institutional review board included all of the information contained within chapter one of this research study. Additionally, the institutional review board required the completion of courses on ethics in research available on the CITI site. The required courses were completed in the spring of 2015. Institutional Review Board approval was received on June 24, 2015.

Large Urban School District Protocol

An application to conduct research was submitted to the Large Urban School District's data and research department via the Large Urban School District's Institutional Review Board. The application contained the particulars of this study as outlined in Chapter 1, including the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, research questions, instrumentation, consent forms, potential benefits and risks to the school district, and the intended audience of the study. Additionally, the application to conduct research contained the names of the courses and accompanying course codes from the Florida Course Code Directory (2014) in the core content areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science in grades 6-12. Moreover, the application to conduct research contained all of the names of the 19 high schools and 38 middle schools included in the study to report the enrollment and achievement by number and percentage

at each of the schools. The application was submitted to the Large Urban School District on June 26, 2015. Data were received in September 2015.

Quantitative

Historical data were collected on the enrollment and academic achievement of LY and LF ELs in advanced middle school and high school courses. Per the Consent Decree, these two groups of ELs are monitored by the Department of Education for the purposes of compliance (2014). The data collected were inclusive of a five-year period, starting with the 2009 school year and ending in 2014 school year. All of the data collected was duplicated data, representing multiple records of advanced coursework enrollment per student. The data included enrollment and academic achievement in the Middle Years Programme, the Cambridge Pre-AICE program, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, the Cambridge AICE Diploma, and advanced courses in grades 6-12 in mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies. Academic achievement in the aforementioned advanced courses included scores on administered examinations for applicable courses and final grades earned for courses not culminating in an examination.

Qualitative

Archival Policy and Guideline Documents

The following steps were taken in the data collection methods from school district-level and school-level policy and guideline documents.

1. School-district personnel in the Multilingual Department of the Large Urban School District were contacted to acquire archival policy and document guidelines provided to middle schools and high schools for ELs.
2. School-district personnel in the Guidance Department of the Large Urban School District were contacted to acquire curriculum guides made available to middle school and high school students and parents.
3. School-district policy and guideline documents not acquired via the Multilingual Services Department were accessed online.
4. Curriculum guides for schools not available through the school district office were requested through the assistant principal for instruction and head guidance counselor for the middle school and high school.
5. Curriculum guides not acquired via school-district or school-level personnel were accessed online.

Data Analysis

The analysis of this study applied a mixed-methods approach of quantitative and qualitative measures for data collection and data analysis. The data analyses methods selected were based on the research questions guiding this study. The two methodologies utilized for this study are explained separately.

Table 4

Research Questions and Data Sources

	Research Question	Data Source	Variables	Data Analysis
1	What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and ELs enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?	Large Urban School District Data, 2009-2014	Independent variables: LY and LF status and enrollment in advanced coursework	Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit
2	What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and EL student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?	Large Urban School District Data, 2009-2014	Independent variables: LY and LF status and achievement in advanced coursework	Chi-Square Test of Independence
3	What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for ELs in middle School and high School?	Large Urban School District Archival Documents, 2009-2014	Emergent themes related to access to advanced courses for ELs	Document analysis via Grounded Theory Research (Glaser & Strauss, 2008; Moustakas, 1994; Bowen, 2009)

Quantitative Data Analysis

Research question 1 data analyzed the relationship between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and ELs enrolled in advanced courses in grades 6-12. To complete the analysis, a chi-square test for goodness of fit was applied to determine if there was a relationship between the overall student population and EL population and each group's enrollment in advanced courses. The chi-square goodness of fit test was selected because the results of the test determined if the overall student and

EL population's proportions of enrollment in advanced courses were comparable to the proportions overall student and EL population from 2009-2014 (Steinberg, 2011). The chi-square test for goodness of fit was conducted using the SPSS program. The data were analyzed to determine if there was an observed difference between the overall student population enrolled in advanced courses and students categorized as LY and LF status enrolled in advanced courses. The analysis was done for the 38 middle schools and 19 high schools in the study. To determine if there was an observed difference, a tabled critical value of had to be met or exceeded at $\alpha = .05$. Tables and figures were constructed to display the results of the chi-square test for goodness of fit for each of the identified areas of advanced coursework enrollment and reported in chapter 4.

Analysis of research question 2 data focused on the relationship between the proportion of overall student achievement and EL achievement either by final grade or examination grade, if the course culminated in an exam. To conduct the analysis, a chi-square test of independence was applied to determine if there was a relationship between the overall student population and the EL population and each group's achievement in advanced courses. The chi-square test of independence was selected because the results of the test determined if there was relationship between the proportion of overall student achievement and EL achievement based on observed and expected frequencies (Steinberg, 2011). The chi-square test of independence was completed using the SPSS program. The data were analyzed to determine if there was an observed difference between LY and LF status and achievement in advanced courses. The analysis was done for the 38 middle schools and 19 high schools in the study. To determine if there was an

observed difference, a tabled critical value had to be met or exceeded at $\alpha = .05$ at each school site. Tables and figures were constructed to communicate the results of the chi-square test of independence and were reported in chapter 4.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Analysis of research question 3 focused on an examination of the Large Urban School District's policy and guidelines for access to advanced coursework for ELs in middle school and high school. Throughout the course of the analysis, school district-created policy papers and guidelines were examined to identify patterns or themes within the documents (Fraenkel et al., 2012). Additionally, curriculum guides from 38 middle schools and 19 high schools were analyzed for patterns and themes within the document.

The document analysis utilized Glaser and Strauss's grounded research theory (Glaser & Strauss, 2008; Moustakas, 1994; Bowen, 2009). Using this research methodology for grounded research, documents were analyzed using superficial examination, thorough examination, and interpretation thereby combining content analysis and thematic analysis (Bowen, 2009). Thematic analysis of the policy and guideline documents required "coding for each sentence or phrase, sorting codes, making comparisons among categories, and ultimately constructing a theory" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 4). In this way, themes were identified within the document, coded, categorized, and utilized to construct a theory grounded in text of the documents that required this researcher to utilize constant comparative method as explained by Glaser and Strauss (2008). As the document analyses continued and reached completion, categories were

reviewed and categories were either added or eliminated based on the data gathered from the documents (Bowen, 2009).

The phenomenological reduction process employed condensed the data to the most important parts, representing what was “texturally and essential in its phenomenal and experiential components” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 94). In this way, the theory developed from the document analyses was delimited, leading to a generalizable theory that is specific in “variables and formulation,” “scope,” and “theoretical saturation” (Glaser & Strauss, 2008, p. 111-112). The theory was developed from this process, delineating the prevalent themes of the document analyses (Glaser & Strauss, 2008). The recurrent themes and categories were reported in chapter 4. Implications of the identified themes and categories were reported in chapter 5 as well as implications for future research.

Procedural Fidelity

To ensure procedural fidelity, this researcher took steps to ensure the objectivity of the data and the generalizability of the results. For the quantitative analysis, this researcher collected frequency data from the Large Urban School District’s database regarding enrollment and achievement of ELs categorized as LY and LF and of overall student enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework in 38 middle schools and 19 high schools. To introduce rigor and objectivity into the data analysis, chi-square tests for goodness of fit and independence were completed on the frequencies of enrollment and achievement respectively in advanced coursework in the identified middle schools

and high schools in the Large Urban School District. Using these statistical tests allowed this researcher to determine if ELs categorized as LY and LF in the Large Urban School District's middle schools and high schools observed and expected frequencies for enrollment and achievement were statistically significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level.

For the qualitative analysis, a conjunctive, mixed-method triangulation approach was taken in ensuring the validity and generalizability of the results (Howe, 2012). This approach seeks to triangulate quantitative and qualitative data (Howe, 2012).

Triangulation between the qualitative method of the document analyses relied on Denzin's (1970) seminal work on triangulation, as explained by Torrance (2012). First, different data sources were utilized to gather all of the data for this study to answer the research question. The qualitative measure consisted of document analyses of policy and guideline documents and curriculum guides regarding ELs at both the district level and the school level. For the document analyses, this researcher used Glaser and Strauss's (2008) grounded research theory to guide the analysis of the documents.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the purpose of this research and presented the research questions. This study employed a mixed-methods approach to answer the research questions. Data were collected for the Large Urban School District's database for schools years 2009-2014 and analyzed using a nonparametric statistical test: the chi-square test of independence. Instrumentation for this study was discussed as well as data collection and data analysis methods for each of the research questions. Finally,

procedural fidelity was discussed, including steps taken to ensure objectivity, validity, and generalizability through the use of objective statistical tests and triangulation.

Results of the data analysis are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the current study, which focused on the relationship of school district policy, guidelines, and practices related to the enrollment and achievement of English learners (EL) in advanced coursework in middle school and high school. The purpose of this study was achieved by examining (1) the proportion of enrollment of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school, (2) the proportion of achievement of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school, and (3) reviewing school district policy and guideline documents and middle school and high school curriculum guides.

Chapter 4 starts with a review of the research questions and the methodology described in chapter 3. Then, descriptive statistics on demographic variables regarding ELs are presented. Following the descriptive statistics, the presentation of the findings is arranged by the research questions. To answer research questions one and two, chi-square tests and descriptive statistics were used to analyze middle school and high school EL course enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework. For research question three, analyses of school-district and school-level policy and guideline documents and middle school and high school curriculum guides were conducted.

Research Questions

A mixed-methods approach was employed to complete the present study.

Quantitative measures were used to answer questions one and two. To answer research question three, a qualitative approach was used to complete the document analyses.

Specifically, this study encompassed the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and ELs enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?
2. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and EL student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?
3. What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for ELs in middle school and high school?

Population

The population for this study consisted of ELs and non-ELs enrolled in advanced coursework between the school years 2009-2014 in grades 6-12 in the Large Urban School District (LUSD). For this analysis, advanced coursework enrollment was divided into four identified areas: Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), high school advanced coursework in mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies, and middle school advanced coursework in mathematics, language arts, science and social studies. The population consisted of 671,569 advanced coursework course

enrollment records of which ELs' course enrollment comprised 35,683 and non-ELs' course enrollment comprised 635,886. The largest cohort of course enrollment records were concentrated in high school advanced coursework ($n = 349,245$), followed by middle school advanced coursework ($n = 262,744$), AP coursework ($n = 55,782$), and IB coursework ($n = 3,798$).

Participant Demographics

Data provided by the Large Urban School District (LUSD) included demographic information for the course enrollment records in advanced coursework. Demographic information was disaggregated by the four areas of Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework to include gender, ethnicity, and poverty as measured by free and reduced lunch status for all course enrollment records included in the analysis as displayed in Tables 5 through 8. English learner (EL) course enrollment records demonstrated that the majority of EL course enrollment was female in AP (56%), IB (86%), and high school advanced coursework (55%), while in middle school advanced coursework, the majority was male (51%). The majority of EL course enrollment was Hispanic for AP (71.6%), high school advanced coursework (62.5%), and middle school advanced coursework (65.8%). In IB, however, the majority was black (86%). EL free and reduced status was high for AP (71%), IB (100%), high school advanced coursework (73%), and middle school advanced coursework (82%).

Demographic trends in gender were similar for ELs in high school and middle school advanced coursework area as shown in Tables 6 and 7. Ethnicity demographics differed for non-ELs with the majority being white in AP (46.4%), IB (34%), high school advanced coursework (43.7%), and middle school advanced coursework (46.2%). Free and reduced lunch status also differed for non-ELs in AP (33%), IB (36%), high school advanced coursework (40%), and middle school advanced coursework (47%). The free and reduced lunch status was proportionately higher for ELs.

Table 5

Advanced Placement Course Enrollment Student Demographic Variables (N = 55,782)

		EL (%)	Non-EL (%)
Gender	Female	56	55
	Male	44	45
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0.2	0.6
	Asian	12.9	10.8
	Black	9.5	14
	Hispanic	71.6	25.3
	Multiracial	0.1	2.9
	White	5.7	46.4
Free and Reduced Lunch Status	Yes	71	33
	No	29	67

Note. Demographic information is based on Advanced Placement course enrollment records from 2011-2014.

Table 6

International Baccalaureate Course Enrollment Student Demographic Variables (N = 3,798)

		EL (%)	Non-EL (%)
Gender	Female	86	60
	Male	14	40
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0	.07
	Asian	14	24.2
	Black	86	18.7
	Hispanic	0	20.6
	Multiracial	0	1.9
	White	0	64
Free & Reduced Lunch Status	Yes	100	36
	No	0	64

Note. Demographic information is based on advanced course enrollment records from 2012-2014.

Table 7

High School Advanced Course Enrollment Demographic Variables (N = 349,246)

		EL (%)	Non-EL (%)
Gender	Female	55	54
	Male	44	45
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0.1	0.6
	Asian	14	7
	Black	15.9	19.9
	Hispanic	62.5	26.3
	Multiracial	0.5	2.6
	White	7.1	43.7
Free and Reduced Lunch Status	Yes	73	40
	No	27	60

Note. Demographic information is based on advanced course enrollment records from 2009-2014.

Table 8

Middle School Advanced Course Enrollment Demographic Variables (N = 262,744)

		EL (%)	Non-EL (%)
Gender	Female	49	53
	Male	51	47
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0.1	0.5
	Asian	11	6.7
	Black	15	19.0
	Hispanic	65.8	24.3
	Multiracial	0.9	3.3
	White	7.2	46.2
Free and Reduced Lunch Status	Yes	82	47
	No	18	53

Note. Demographic information is based on advanced course enrollment records from 2009-2014.

Testing the Research Questions

Research Question 1

What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and ELs enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?

To answer research question 1, a quantitative approach was utilized to analyze the enrollment data for advanced coursework in grades 6-12. The enrollment data requested from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) reflected the school years spanning from 2009 to 2014 and included enrollment data from the school district's 19 traditional high schools and 38 middle schools. The data were disaggregated into AP course enrollment,

IB course enrollment, and high school and middle school advanced coursework enrollment in the core subject areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science. To analyze the data collected, SPSS version 23 for Macintosh software was used to complete chi-square tests and descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and proportions of course enrollment in grades 6-12. Furthermore, Microsoft Excel was utilized to organize the disaggregated data from SPSS on the 19 high schools and 38 middle schools.

EL Advanced Placement Enrollment

Data collected from the Large Urban School District on Advanced Placement (AP) course enrollment spanned years 2011 to 2014. Although data had been requested from 2009 to 2014, the Large Urban School District (LUSD) only had historical data from 2011 to 2014 on file. The data analyzed here reflect data available from the 2011 to 2014 school years.

The chi-square test of goodness of fit was used to compare the actual English learner (EL) course enrollment in AP coursework and the expected enrollment based on the proportion of ELs in the LUSD's population from 2009-2014. The expected enrollment percentages were based on the average proportion (21.7%) of EL LUSD enrollment from 2009-2014. The chi-square goodness of fit result $\chi^2(1, n = 100) = 20.54, p < .001$ for course enrollment demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of AP course enrollment for ELs and non-ELs for all 19 high schools in the LUSD as shown in Table 9. The statistically significant difference in the proportion of

enrollment indicated that non-EL AP course enrollment was higher than EL AP course enrollment.

Table 9

Chi-Square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in Advanced Placement (AP) 2011-2014

AP Course Enrollment	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Observed	3%	97%
Expected	21.7%	78.3%

Note. $\chi^2 = 20.54$, $df = 1$. Observed percentages represent percentages of EL and non-EL course enrollment. Expected percentages represent LUSD percentage EL average from 2009-2014. *** $p < .001$

Descriptive analysis of EL ($n = 1,696$) and non-EL ($n = 54,086$) AP course enrollment frequencies was conducted for each of the 19 high schools and are reported in Table 10. Differences reported in enrollment are due likely to the size of each school’s population and indicative of the range of the population. The descriptive analysis found that two high schools, HS 11 (16.7%) and HS 16 (7.2%), had the highest proportion of AP course enrollment, followed by HS 8 (7.0%) and HS 2 (6.8%). HS 1 and HS 9 both had less than 1 percent of EL AP course enrollment in AP classes. The remaining 13 high schools’ proportion of EL AP course enrollment ranged from 5.0 percent to 1.0 percent.

Table 10

English Learner Advanced Placement (AP) Course Enrollment Incidences in 19 High Schools 2011-2014

Rank	High School	Total AP Course Enrollment (<i>f</i>)	EL Enrollment in AP Courses (<i>f</i>)	EL Enrollment in AP Courses (%)
1	HS 11	592	99	16.7
2	HS 16	2,025	146	7.2
3	HS 8	5,816	405	7.0
4	HS 2	2,803	190	6.8
5	HS 17	984	49	5.0
6	HS 18	2,137	95	4.4
7	HS 4	1,885	50	2.7
8	HS 13	5,470	145	2.7
9	HS 7	990	26	2.6
10	HS 10	4,447	98	2.2
11	HS 3	1,779	36	2.0
12	HS 6	3,688	67	1.8
13	HS 12	1,434	26	1.8
14	HS 5	3,000	44	1.5
15	HS 14	4,734	69	1.5
16	HS 15	4,733	65	1.4
17	HS 19	4,390	49	1.1
18	HS 9	2,555	20	0.8
19	HS 1	2,175	17	0.8
	Total	55,782	1,696	3.0

Note. AP = Advanced Placement. Table is rank ordered by EL Enrollment in AP Courses percentage.

Further analysis was conducted to determine the proportion of Limited Yes (LY) and Limited Former (LF) course enrollment in AP coursework in LUSD's 19 high schools. When the data were disaggregated into the proportions of LY ($n = 590$) and LF ($n = 1,106$) course enrollment in AP coursework, the descriptive data analysis demonstrated that the majority of EL course enrollment in AP coursework were of the LF designation in 18 of the 19 high schools as shown in Table 48 (Appendix A, p. 185).

However, HS 11 differed in this regard as the high school's AP course enrollment demonstrated a higher proportion of LYs (10.1%) than LFs (6.6%) in AP coursework.

EL International Baccalaureate Enrollment

Data collected from the LUSD on International Baccalaureate (IB) enrollment spanned the years 2012 to 2014. Although data had been requested from 2009 to 2014, the Large Urban School District (LUSD) only had historical data for IB from 2012 to 2014 on file. The data analyzed here reflect data available from the 2012 to 2014 school years. IB data is inclusive of course enrollment records from the five LUSD high schools implementing the IB program.

The chi-square goodness of fit result $\chi^2(1, n = 100) = 25.171, p < .001$ for course enrollment demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of IB course enrollment for ELs and non-ELs for all five IB high schools in the LUSD as shown in Table 11. The statistically significant difference in the proportion of enrollment indicated that non-EL IB course enrollment was proportionately higher than EL IB course enrollment.

Table 11

Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in International Baccalaureate (IB) 2012-2014

IB Course Enrollment	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Observed	1%	99%
Expected	21.7%	78.3%

Note. $\chi^2 = 25.171$, $df = 1$. Numbers in parenthesis indicate column percentages. Observed percentages represent percentages of EL and non-EL course enrollment. Actual observed percentages for EL (0.2%) and Non-EL (99.8%). Expected percentages represent LUSD percentage EL average from 2009-2014. *** $p < .001$.

Descriptive analysis of EL ($n = 7$) and non-EL ($n = 3,791$) IB course enrollment frequencies was conducted for each of the five IB high schools and are reported in Table 12. Differences reported in enrollment are due likely to the size of each school's population and indicative of the range of the population. HS 17 (1.1%) had the highest proportion of enrollment, followed by HS 19 (0.1%). HS 6, HS 18, and HS 7 did not have EL course enrollment represented from 2012-2014. The IB high schools did not have students with the Limited Yes designation represented in their IB course enrollment; however, the IB high schools did have students with the Limited Former (LF) designation represented.

Table 12

English Learner International Baccalaureate (IB) Course Enrollment Incidences in Five High Schools 2012-2014

Rank	High School	Total IB Course Enrollment (<i>f</i>)	EL Enrollment in IB Courses (<i>f</i>)	EL Enrollment in IB Courses (%)
1	HS 17	549	6	1.1
2	HS 19	1,327	1	0.1
3	HS 6	1,008	0	0
4	HS 18	764	0	0
5	HS 7	150	0	0
	Total	3,798	7	0.2

Note. IB = International Baccalaureate. Table is rank ordered by EL Enrollment in IB Courses percentage.

Further analysis was conducted to determine the proportion of LF course enrollment in IB coursework in LUSD’s five IB high schools. When the data were disaggregated into the proportions of LY and LF course enrollment in IB, the data analysis demonstrated that only LFs ($n = 7$) were enrolled in IB coursework in HS 17 and HS 19 as shown in Table 51 (Appendix B, p. 189). The five IB high schools did not have LY course enrollment in IB courses.

EL High School Advanced Coursework Enrollment

Data collected from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) on advanced coursework course enrollment in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science enrollment spanned the school years 2009 to 2014.

The chi-square test for goodness of fit result $\chi^2(1, n = 100) = 16.371, p < .001$ for course enrollment demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of

high school advanced coursework course enrollment for ELs and non-ELs for all 19 high schools in the LUSD as shown in Table 13. The statistically significant difference in the proportion of enrollment indicated that non-EL advanced course enrollment was higher than EL course enrollment.

Table 13

Chi-Square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in Advanced Coursework 2009-2014

High School Advanced Coursework Enrollment	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Observed	5%	95%
Expected	21.7%	78.3%

Note. $\chi^2 = 16.371$, $df = 1$. Observed percentages represent percentages of EL and non-EL enrollment. Actual observed percentages for EL (4.5%) and Non-EL (95.5%). Expected percentages represent LUSD percentage average from 2009-2014. *** $p < .001$.

Descriptive analyses of EL ($n = 15,695$) and non-EL ($n = 333,550$) high school advanced course enrollment frequencies were conducted for each of the 19 high schools and are reported in Table 14. Differences reported in enrollment are due likely to the size of each school's population and indicative of the range of the population. HS 11 (9.7%) had the highest proportion of EL course enrollment, followed by HS 18 (8.9%) and HS 16 (8.8%). HS 19 (1.5%) and HS 5 (1.4%) had the lowest proportion of EL advanced course enrollment. The remaining 14 high schools had EL advanced course enrollment that ranged from 8.2 percent to 1.9 percent.

Table 14

English Learner Advanced Course Enrollment Incidences in 19 High Schools 2009-2014

Rank	High School	Total Advanced Course Enrollment (f)	EL Enrollment in Advanced Courses (f)	EL Enrollment in Advanced Courses (%)
1	HS 11	7,474	726	9.7
2	HS 18	22,222	1,984	8.9
3	HS 16	19,674	1,726	8.8
4	HS 17	14,032	1,145	8.2
5	HS 2	11,280	911	8.1
6	HS 8	18,317	1,425	7.8
7	HS 13	32,847	1,283	3.9
8	HS 10	27,635	1,071	3.9
9	HS 12	13,393	519	3.9
10	HS 7	3,864	149	3.9
11	HS 4	16,717	620	3.7
12	HS 7	24,079	867	3.6
13	HS 6	21,425	741	3.5
14	HS 14	24,462	834	3.4
15	HS 3	15,942	455	2.9
16	HS 1	11,992	234	2.0
17	HS 9	18,798	351	1.9
18	HS 19	23,444	350	1.5
19	HS 5	21,648	304	1.4
	Total	349,245	15,695	4.5

Note. Table is rank ordered by EL Enrollment in Advanced Courses percentage.

Further analysis was conducted to determine the proportion of Limited Yes (LY) and Limited Former (LF) course enrollment in advanced coursework in LUSD's 19 high schools. When the data were disaggregated into the proportions of LY ($n = 5,175$) and LF ($n = 10,520$) course enrollment in advanced coursework, the data demonstrated that the majority of EL course enrollment were of the LF designation in all of the Large Urban School District's 19 high schools as shown in Table 54 (Appendix C, p. 193). HS 11 (3.7%) and HS 16 (3.6%) had the highest proportion of LY course enrollment in

advanced coursework. HS 19 (0.3%) and HS 5 (0.2%) had the lowest proportion of LY course enrollment. HS 18 (6.8%) had the highest proportion of LF course enrollment.

EL Middle School Advanced Coursework Enrollment

Data collected from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) on advanced coursework enrollment in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science course enrollment for middle school spanned the school years from 2009 through 2014.

The chi-square test for goodness of fit result $\chi^2(1, n = 100) = 12.679, p < .001$ for course enrollment demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of middle school advanced course enrollment for ELs and non-ELs for all 38 middle schools in the LUSD as shown in Table 15. The statistically significant difference in the proportion of enrollment indicated that non-EL advanced course enrollment was higher than EL course enrollment.

Table 15

Chi-Square Results and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Course Enrollment in Advanced Coursework 2009-2014

Middle School Advanced Course Enrollment	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Observed	7%	93%
Expected	21.7%	78.3%

Note. $\chi^2 = 12.679, df = 1$. Observed percentages represent percentages of EL and non-EL enrollment. Expected percentages represent LUSD percentage average from 2009-2014.. *** $p < .001$.

Descriptive analyses of EL ($n = 18,285$) and non-EL ($n = 244,459$) middle school advanced course enrollment frequencies were conducted for each of the 38 middle

schools and are reported in Table 16. Differences reported in enrollment are due likely to the size of each school's population and indicative of the range of the population. MS 35 (25.3%) had the highest proportion of EL advanced course enrollment, followed by MS 18 (19.0%) and MS 6 (16.8%). MS 23 (1.3%) and MS 12 (0.9%) had less than two percent EL advanced course enrollment. The remaining 33 middle schools had EL advanced course enrollment that ranged from 14.7 percent to 2.2 percent.

Table 16

*Middle School English Learner Advanced Course Enrollment Incidences in 38 Middle Schools**2009-2014*

Rank	Middle School	Total Advanced Course Enrollment (f)	EL Enrollment in Advanced Courses (f)	EL Enrollment in Advanced Courses (%)
1	MS 35	3,950	998	25.3
2	MS 18	10,635	2,024	19.0
3	MS 6	3,638	610	16.8
4	MS 5	7,709	1,134	14.7
5	MS 31	4,741	690	14.6
6	MS 38	6,333	814	12.9
7	MS 36	4,573	585	12.8
8	MS 27	2,157	258	12.0
9	MS 4	8,063	931	11.5
10	MS 37	4,295	465	10.8
11	MS 25	2,266	245	10.8
12	MS 21	6,409	647	10.1
13	MS 19	9,721	748	7.7
14	MS 16	6,606	491	7.4
15	MS 29	9,251	664	7.2
16	MS 33	4,431	314	7.1
17	MS 26	7,493	496	6.6
18	MS 20	15,705	1,027	6.5
19	MS 34	10,826	615	5.7
20	MS 3	8,089	450	5.6
21	MS 2	6,170	292	4.7
22	MS 32	6,371	279	4.4
23	MS 8	6,422	281	4.4
24	MS 30	3,511	143	4.1
25	MS 9	9,460	380	4.0
26	MS 7	11,020	403	3.7
27	MS 24	10,110	366	3.6
28	MS 22	9,583	331	3.5
29	MS 10	2,006	64	3.2
30	MS 14	6,997	219	3.1
31	MS 13	6,892	212	3.1
32	MS 11	4,062	117	2.9
33	MS 17	12,739	366	2.9
34	MS 1	8,383	210	2.5
35	MS 15	12,391	270	2.2
36	MS 28	3,007	67	2.2
37	MS 23	3,660	49	1.3
38	MS 12	3,065	29	0.9
	Total	262,744	18,285	7.0

Further analysis was conducted to determine the proportion of Limited Yes (LY) and Limited Former (LF) enrollment in advanced coursework in LUSD's 38 middle schools. When the data were disaggregated into the proportions of LY ($n = 3,532$) and LF ($n = 14,753$) course enrollment in advanced coursework, the data demonstrated that the majority of EL course enrollment were of the LF designation in all of LUSD's 38 middle schools as shown in Table 56 (Appendix D, p. 196). MS 18 (5.3%) and MS 5 (3.7%) had the highest proportion of LY course enrollment in advanced coursework. Twenty of the 38 middle schools had less than one percent LY course enrollment in advanced coursework.

Research Question 2

What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and EL student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?

To answer research question 2, a quantitative approach was used to analyze achievement data for advanced coursework in grades 6-12. The achievement data requested from the Large Urban School District reflected the school years 2009 to 2014 and included achievement data by grade and exam as applicable for each course for each of the school district's 19 traditional high schools and 38 middle schools. Course enrollment records that did not include an exam score or final letter grade were removed from the analysis; a total of 321 records were removed from the analysis in high school

and middle school advanced coursework achievement. The data were disaggregated into AP achievement by exam score, IB achievement by exam score, and high school and middle school advanced coursework achievement by final letter grade in the core subject areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science. To analyze the data collected, SPSS version 23 software for Macintosh was used to complete chi-square tests and descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and proportions of achievement of ELs and non-ELs in grades 6-12. Furthermore, Microsoft Excel was utilized to organize the disaggregated data from SPSS on the 19 high schools and 38 middle schools.

EL Advanced Placement Achievement

Data collected from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) on Advanced Placement (AP) achievement spanned the school years 2011 to 2014. Although data had been requested from 2009 to 2014, the Large Urban School District only had historical data from 2011 to 2014 on file.

The chi-square test of independence results $\chi^2(1, n = 55,782) = 32.75, p < .001$ for AP exam achievement demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of AP exam achievement for English learners (EL) and non-English learners for all 19 high schools in the LUSD as shown in Table 17. The statistical differences in proportions of achievement indicated a higher proportion of EL achievement on AP exams.

Table 17

Chi-Square Test and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in Advanced Placement (AP) 2011-2014

AP Course Achievement	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Score 3 or Higher	909 (54%)	25,180 (47%)
Score 2 or Lower	787 (46%)	28,906 (53%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 32.75$, $df = 1$. Numbers in parenthesis indicate column percentages. *** $p < .001$

Chi-square tests of independence conducted for each of the 19 high schools revealed statistically significant differences in proportions of AP exam achievement in eight of the high schools as shown in Table 18. In the eight high schools that demonstrated statistical differences in proportions of achievement, seven of the high schools had EL achievement that was proportionately higher than non-EL achievement and one high school, HS 15, had non-EL achievement that was proportionately higher than EL achievement. However, in 11 of the 19 high schools, chi-square values did not demonstrate statistically significant differences in proportions of achievement as shown in Table 18. In these 11 high schools, the lack of statistical significance in differences of proportions of achievement indicated that EL achievement was proportionately similar to non-EL achievement.

Table 18

Chi-Square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Placement Achievement 2011-2014

High School	Chi-square Value	<i>DF</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>p</i>
HS 7	.004	1	990	.950
HS 19	.154	1	4,390	.695
HS 9	.544	1	2,555	.457
HS 4	.620	1	2,175	.432
HS 18	2.18	1	2,137	.140
HS 6	2.63	1	3,688	.105
HS 12	2.79	1	1,434	.095
HS 3	3.70	1	1,779	.084
HS 1	3.30	1	2,175	.070
HS 17	3.29	1	984	.070
HS 13	3.70	1	5,615	.055
HS 14	5.70	1	4,734	.002
HS 10	7.89	1	4,447	.005
HS 5	8.64	1	3000	.003
HS 15	11.84	1	4,733	.001
HS 8	12.09	1	5,816	.001
HS 2	15.42	1	2,803	.000
HS 16	120.34	1	984	.000
HS 11	42.41	1	592	.000

Descriptive analyses of EL ($n = 1,696$) and non-EL ($n = 54,086$) AP exam achievement frequencies were conducted for each of the 19 high schools and are reported in Table 49 (Appendix A, p. 186). HS 11 (10.8%) and HS 16 (4.5%) had the highest proportion of AP EL exam achievement in proportion to the overall number of AP exams taken at each high school by ELs and non-ELs.

Further descriptive analysis of the disaggregated achievement data within the EL and non-EL subgroups revealed that within the EL score subgroup (53.6%) had a higher

proportion of passing scores on an AP exam of 3 or higher when compared to that of non-ELs (46.6%) across the 19 high schools as shown in Table 19. Individually, HS 5 (81.8%) had the highest proportion of EL scores of 3 or higher, followed by HS 14 (81.2%). HS 7 (7.7%) and HS 17 (0%) had the lowest proportion of EL AP exam achievement. The remaining 15 high schools' EL scores of 3 or above ranged from 68.0 percent to 17.6 percent.

Table 19

*Nineteen High Schools' Disaggregate Advanced Placement Exam Achievement:
Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2009-2014*

High School	EL Scores 3 or Above (%)	EL Scores 2 or Below (%)	Non-EL Scores 3 or Above (%)	Non-EL Scores 2 or Below (%)
HS 5	81.8	18.2	60.0	40.0
HS14	81.2	18.8	67.7	32.4
HS 19	68.0	32.0	66.7	33.3
HS 11	64.6	35.3	30.2	69.8
HS 16	62.3	37.7	21.7	78.3
HS 2	61.1	38.9	46.3	53.7
HS 13	60.0	40.0	51.9	48.1
HS 12	57.7	42.3	41.4	58.6
HS 10	57.1	42.9	42.9	57.1
HS 9	55.0	45.0	46.7	53.3
HS 18	50.5	49.5	42.9	57.1
HS 8	50.1	49.1	41.3	58.7
HS 3	50.0	50.0	36.5	63.5
HS 6	40.3	59.7	31.0	69.0
HS 15	36.9	63.1	58.1	41.9
HS 4	36.0	64.0	30.8	69.2
HS 1	17.6	82.4	39.2	60.8
HS 7	7.7	92.3	7.4	92.6
HS 17	0.0	100.0	6.3	93.7
Total	53.6	46.4	46.6	53.4

Note. Proportions of achievement within EL ($n = 1,696$) and Non-EL ($n = 54,086$) subgroups for AP exams completed.

Final analysis of the AP exam achievement data consisted of descriptive statistics to determine the mean and standard deviations of scores for Limited Former (LF), Limited Yes (LY), and non-ELs. The descriptive analysis points to a higher mean score for LFs ($M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.44$) and for LY mean scores ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.40$). Non-ELs, on the other hand, had a slightly lower mean score ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 1.24$) than LFs and LYs. When analyzed by individual school, as shown in Table 50 (Appendix A, p. 187),

the mean scores of LFs and LYs were higher than that of non-ELs as is the case with HS 15, HS 18, HS 12, HS 5, and HS 4. LF AP exam scores were separated by one standard deviation in 15 of the high schools, and LY AP exam scores by less than one standard deviation in six of the high schools, pointing to a clustering of AP exam scores within the LY subgroup. Non-EL mean AP exam scores tended to be lower or similar in 15 of the 19 the high schools. Non-EL mean exam scores were higher in HS 3, HS 7, HS 1, and HS 19.

EL International Baccalaureate Achievement

Data collected from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) on International Baccalaureate (IB) exam achievement spanned the years from 2012 through 2014. Although data had been requested from 2009 through 2014, the Large Urban School District only had historical data from 2012 to 2014 on file.

The chi-square test of independence results $\chi^2(1, n = 3,789) = .379, p > .10$ for IB exam achievement did not demonstrate statistically significant differences in the proportions of IB exam achievement for English learner (EL) and non-English learners in the five IB high schools as shown in Table 20. This lack of statistical significance in differences of proportions of achievement indicated that EL achievement was proportionately similar to non-EL achievement on IB exams.

Table 20

Chi-square Results and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in International Baccalaureate (IB) 2012-2014

IB Course Achievement	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Score 4 or Higher	5 (71%)	3,057 (81%)
Score 3 or Lower	2 (29%)	734 (19%)

Note. $\chi^2 = .379$, $df = 1$. Numbers in parenthesis indicate column percentages. * $p > .10$

Chi-square tests of independence conducted for the two of the IB high schools with EL representation, HS 17 and HS 19, in IB coursework did not demonstrate statistically significant results in the proportions of IB achievement. This lack of statistical significance in differences of achievement proportions in HS 17 and HS 19 indicated that EL achievement was proportionately similar to non-EL achievement on IB exams. The chi-square tests of independence for all five high schools are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Chi-Square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for International Baccalaureate Achievement in Five High Schools 2012-2014

High School	Chi-square Value	DF	<i>N</i>	<i>p</i>
HS 19	.097	1	1,327	.984
HS 17	.419	1	549	.810
HS 6	0	0	1,008	0
HS 18	0	0	764	0
HS 7	0	0	150	0

Note. HS 6, HS 18, and HS 7 did not have EL course enrollment records from 2012-2014

Descriptive analysis of EL ($n = 7$) and non-EL ($n = 3,791$) IB exam achievement frequencies were conducted for each of the five IB high schools and are reported in Table 52 (Appendix B, 190). HS 17 (0.7%) and HS 19 (0.1%) had the highest proportion of IB EL exam achievement in proportion to the overall number of IB exams taken at each high school by ELs and non-ELs. HS 17 and HS 19 are the only high schools with EL IB exam representation in their high schools' IB programs.

Further descriptive analysis of the data within the EL and non-EL subgroups revealed that EL exam achievement represented a higher proportion of passing scores on an IB exam of 4 or higher as shown in Table 22. HS 19 (100%) had the highest proportion of EL exam achievement, followed by HS 17 (67%). The remaining IB high schools did not have EL course enrollment in their IB courses from 2012-2014.

Table 22

Five High Schools' Disaggregate International Baccalaureate Exam Achievement:

Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2012-2014

Rank	High School	ELs Scoring 4 or Above (%)	ELs Scoring 3 or Below (%)	Non-ELs Scoring 4 or Above (%)	Non-ELs Scoring 3 or Below (%)
1	HS 19	100	0.0	91.0	9.0
2	HS 17	67.0	33.0	53.0	47.0
3	HS 18	0	0	91.0	9.0
4	HS 6	0	0	81.0	19.0
5	HS 7	0	0	29.0	71.0
	Total	71.4	28.6	80.6	19.4

Note. Proportions of achievement within EL ($n = 7$) and Non-EL ($n = 3,791$) subgroup for exams taken.

Final analysis of the IB data consisted of descriptive statistics to determine the mean and standard deviations of scores for Limited Former (LF) and non-ELs. The descriptive analysis points to a higher mean score for non-ELs ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 1.08$) than for LFs ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.49$). When analyzed by the two individual schools with LF exams in their IB achievement data, as shown in Table 53 (Appendix B, p. 191), the mean LF exam score was higher than that of non-ELs as is the case with HS 17. HS 19's LF mean exam score was lower than that of non-ELs. Scores for LFs were separated by less than one standard deviation, pointing a clustering of scores within the LF subgroup.

EL High School Advanced Coursework Achievement

Data collected from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) on advanced coursework achievement in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science spanned the school years 2009 to 2014.

The chi-square test of independence result $\chi^2(1, n = 349,163) = 158.16, p < .001$ for high school advanced coursework achievement demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of high school advanced coursework achievement for English learners (EL) and non-English learners for all 19 high schools in LUSD as shown in Table 23. The statistical difference in proportion of achievement indicated that non-EL achievement was proportionately higher than EL achievement.

Table 23

Chi-Square Results and Descriptive Statistics English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in High School Advanced Coursework 2009-2014

High School Advanced Coursework Achievement	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Grade A, B, or C	13,363 (85%)	295,088 (88%)
Grade D or F	2,323 (15%)	38,389 (12%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 158.16$, $df = 1$. Numbers in parenthesis indicate column percentages. *** $p < .001$

Chi-square tests of independence conducted for each of the 19 high schools demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of high school advanced coursework achievement in 13 of the 19 high schools as shown in Table 24. In these 13 high schools, the statistical differences in proportions of achievement indicated that non-EL achievement was proportionately higher than EL achievement with the exception of HS 17, which demonstrated proportionately higher EL achievement. However, in six of the 19 high schools, chi-square values did not demonstrate statistically significant differences in the proportions of achievement as shown in Table 24. In these six high schools, the lack of statistical differences in proportions of achievement indicated that EL and non-EL achievement were proportionately similar.

Table 24

Chi-Square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Coursework Achievement 2009-2014 in 19 High Schools

High School	Chi-square Value	DF	N	p
HS 12	.000	1	13,388	.984
HS 1	0.06	1	11,989	.810
HS 7	0.10	1	3,862	.753
HS 16	0.11	1	19,671	.742
HS 2	0.55	1	11,274	.457
HS 18	3.33	1	22,219	.068
HS 11	5.65	1	7,469	.017
HS 9	6.20	1	18,796	.014
HS 14	6.08	1	24,462	.014
HS 5	8.16	1	21,645	.004
HS 8	9.16	1	18,311	.003
HS 15	10.64	1	24,074	.001
HS 4	35.94	1	16,712	.000
HS 17	16.64	1	14,027	.000
HS 6	30.70	1	21,417	.000
HS 19	13.34	1	23,348	.000
HS 10	78.00	1	27,631	.000
HS 3	13.56	1	15,938	.000
HS 13	27.34	1	32,840	.000

Descriptive analysis of EL ($n = 15,686$) and non-ELs ($n = 333,477$) advanced coursework achievement were conducted for each of the 19 high schools. The aggregate analysis of advanced coursework achievement demonstrated that HS 11 (7.9%) had the highest proportion of final grade achievement of A, B, or C, followed by HS 18 (7.6%) and HS 2 (7.5%). HS 19 (1.3%) and HS 5 (1.2%) had the lowest proportion of EL final grade achievement of A, B, or C in advanced coursework as shown in Table 55

(Appendix C, p. 194). The remaining 15 high schools had EL advanced coursework achievement by final grade of A, B, or C that ranged from 7.5 percent to 1.5 percent.

Further descriptive analysis of the disaggregated achievement data within the EL and non-EL subgroups revealed that the proportions of achievement for ELs (85.2%) and non-ELs (88.5%) were similar in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science in achieving a final letter grade of A, B, or C as shown in Table 25. Differences in proportion of achievement ranged from 0.7 percent points in HS 2 to 9 percentage points in HS 4.

Table 25

*Nineteen High Schools' Disaggregate Advanced Course Achievement by Grades:**Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2009-2014*

High School	EL Grades A, B, or C (%)	EL Grades D or F (%)	Non-EL Grades A, B, or C (%)	Non-EL Grades D or F (%)
HS 2	92.4	7.6	93.1	6.9
HS 14	90.0	10.0	92.4	7.6
HS 12	90.0	10.0	90.0	10.0
HS 8	89.0	11.0	91.4	8.6
HS 5	88.5	11.5	92.8	7.2
HS 13	87.7	12.3	91.8	8.2
HS 19	87.4	12.6	92.6	7.4
HS 17	86.6	13.4	81.8	18.2
HS 18	85.3	14.7	86.7	13.3
HS 16	85.1	14.9	85.4	14.6
HS 15	84.5	15.5	88.2	11.8
HS 1	82.9	17.1	83.5	16.5
HS 3	81.5	18.5	87.4	12.6
HS 11	81.5	18.5	84.9	15.1
HS 6	80.7	19.3	87.6	12.4
HS 9	80.3	19.7	85.1	85.1
HS 10	79.1	20.9	88.1	11.9
HS 7	78.5	21.5	79.6	20.4
HS 4	73.5	26.5	82.8	17.2
Total	85.2	14.8	88.5	11.5

Note. EL ($n = 15,686$) and non-EL ($n = 333,477$) proportions of achievement by final letter grade are reported within each subgroup 2009-2014. Table is rank ordered by EL Grades A, B, or C.

EL Middle School Achievement

Data collected from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) on advanced coursework achievement in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science in middle school spanned the school years from 2009 through 2014.

The chi-square test of independence result $\chi^2(1, n = 262,505) = 715.62, p < .001$ for middle school achievement demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of middle school coursework achievement for ELs and non-ELs for all 38 middle schools in LUSD as shown in Table 26. The statistical difference in proportion of achievement indicated that non-EL achievement was proportionately higher than EL achievement.

Table 26

Chi-square Results and Descriptive Statistics for English Learner and Non-English Learner Achievement in Middle School Advanced Coursework 2009-2014

Middle School Advanced Coursework Achievement	English Learner Status	
	English Learner	Non-English Learner
Grade A, B, or C	16,582 (91%)	232,784 (95%)
Grade D or F	1,674 (9%)	11,465 (5%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 715.62, df = 1$. Numbers in parenthesis indicate column percentages. *** $p < .001$

Chi-square tests of independence conducted for each of the 38 middle schools demonstrated statistically significant proportions of middle school advanced coursework achievement in 22 of the 38 middle schools as shown in Table 57 (Appendix D, p. 197). In the 22 middle schools, the statistical differences in proportions of achievement indicated that non-EL achievement was proportionately higher than EL achievement. However, in 16 of the 38 middle schools, chi-square values did not demonstrate statistically significant differences in proportions of achievement as shown in Table 27. In these 16 middle schools, the lack of statistical differences in proportions of achievement indicated that EL and non-EL achievement were proportionately similar.

Table 27

Chi-square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Coursework Achievement in 16 Middle Schools 2009-2014

Middle School	Chi-square Value	DF	N	p
MS 11	0.03	1	4,054	.875
MS 30	0.14	1	3,507	.706
MS 33	0.14	1	4,429	.705
MS 36	0.19	1	4,569	.660
MS 10	0.28	1	1,992	.600
MS 25	0.51	1	2,266	.475
MS 12	0.53	1	3,064	.470
MS 37	0.94	1	4,294	.333
MS 24	1.20	1	10,109	.273
MS 3	1.60	1	8,087	.205
MS 27	2.08	1	2,156	.149
MS 7	2.46	1	11,017	.117
MS 13	2.48	1	6,878	.115
MS 35	3.44	1	3,940	.064
MS 6	3.44	1	3,638	.064
MS 38	3.55	1	6,332	.060

Descriptive analyses of EL ($n = 18,256$) and non-EL ($n = 262,505$) achievement were conducted for each of the 38 middle schools. The descriptive statistics represent the percentages for EL and non-EL final letter grade achievement in advanced coursework in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science. In Table 58 (Appendix D, p. 198), aggregate EL final letter grade achievement percentages in advanced coursework are reported for the LUSD's 38 middle schools. MS 35 (23.7%) had the highest proportion of final letter grade achievement of A, B, or C, followed by MS 6 (16.1%) and MS 18 (15.5%). MS 23 (1.3%) and MS 12 (0.9%) had the lowest proportion of EL final letter grade achievement of A, B, or C in advanced coursework. The remaining 33 middle schools had EL advanced coursework achievement that ranged from 13.9 percent to 2.0 percent as shown in Table 32.

Further descriptive analysis of the data within the EL and non-EL subgroups revealed that there was a slight difference (4.5%) in proportions of achievement between ELs (90.8%) and non-ELs (95.3%) earning a final letter grade achievement of A, B, or C as shown in Table 28. Although there was a difference, additional descriptive analysis of the data revealed that the proportion of EL final letter grade achievement of A, B, or C was above 90 percent in 28 of the 38 middle schools. Nine of the 38 middle schools had EL final letter grade achievement of A, B, or C above 80 percent. Only MS 14 had achievement that was below 80 percent. Differences in proportion of achievement ranged from 1.8 percent points in MS 12 to 7.9 percentage points in MS 14.

Table 28

*Thirty-Eight Middle Schools' Disaggregate Advanced Coursework Achievement by Grades:**Proportions for English Learners and Non-English Learners 2009-2014*

Middle School	EL Grades A, B, or C (%)	EL Grades D or F (%)	Non-EL Grades A, B, or C (%)	Non-EL Grades D or F (%)
MS 12	100.0	0	98.2	1.8
MS 10	98.4	1.6	99.1	0.9
MS 33	98.1	1.9	98.4	1.6
MS 7	97.3	2.7	98.3	1.7
MS 24	97.0	2.7	95.8	4.2
MS 26	96.8	3.2	98.3	1.7
MS 34	96.6	3.4	98.6	1.4
MS 6	96.1	3.9	97.4	2.6
MS 21	96.1	3.9	97.8	2.2
MS 15	95.9	4.1	98.3	1.7
MS 3	96.9	3.1	97.8	2.2
MS 11	95.7	4.3	95.4	4.6
MS 8	95.0	5.0	97.7	2.3
MS 5	94.7	5.3	96.2	3.8
MS 25	94.7	5.3	93.5	6.5
MS 29	94.4	5.6	97.5	2.5
MS 23	93.9	6.1	98.8	1.2
MS 35	93.8	6.2	95.3	4.7
MS 19	93.6	6.4	96.6	3.4
MS 2	93.5	6.5	97.3	2.7
MS 9	93.2	6.8	96.6	3.4
MS 31	92.9	7.1	95.5	4.5
MS 27	92.6	7.4	94.8	5.2
MS 1	92.4	7.6	98.0	2.0
MS 22	92.1	7.9	96.2	3.8
MS 36	91.3	8.7	91.8	8.2
MS 38	90.9	9.1	92.8	7.2
MS 30	90.9	9.1	91.8	8.2
MS 37	89.9	10.1	88.4	11.6
MS 28	89.6	10.4	97.4	2.6
MS 4	87.2	12.8	91.9	8.1
MS 13	86.3	13.7	89.7	10.3
MS 32	85.6	14.4	91.9	8.1
MS 17	85.2	14.8	94.1	5.9
MS 16	83.7	16.3	91.4	8.6
MS 18	81.4	18.6	89.7	10.3
MS 20	80.1	19.9	93.2	6.8
MS 14	79.9	20.1	87.8	12.2
Total	90.8	9.2	95.3	4.7

Note. EL ($n = 18,256$) and non-EL ($n = 262,505$) proportion of achievement by final letter grade are reported within each subgroup 2009-2014.

Research Question 3

What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for English learners in middle school and high school?

To answer research question three, a qualitative approach was utilized. This approach consisted of document analyses of school district policy and guideline documents and middle school and high school curriculum guides using Glaser and Strauss's grounded research theory (2008). This researcher analyzed each of the Large Urban School District's (LUSD) policy documents and high school and middle school curriculum guides for elements that related to English learners' (EL) access to advanced coursework. During the analysis process, categories were created, reviewed, added, or eliminated based on the data gathered from the Large Urban School District's policy documents (Bowen, 2009). The analysis of the documents yielded four dominant elements throughout the documents related to ELs' access to advanced coursework: EL plan and placement, grade level and course placement, equal access to programs, and student progression.

EL Access Elements

The English Learner (EL) access elements identified by this researcher were consistent throughout the school district policy documents and middle school and high school curriculum guides. In each of the documents analyzed, the EL access elements appeared within each document under different elements contained in each document as shown in Table 29. EL plan and placement, grade level and course placement, equal

access to programs, and student progression were grounded in the Large Urban School District's EL District Plan and were related to elements contained in the Consent Decree of 1990. Specifically, the elements of equal access to appropriate programming, equal access to appropriate categorical and other programs for Limited English Proficiency students, and outcome measures (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). The EL access elements are described briefly here.

EL Plan and Placement Schools create EL plans using previous school records for grades completed, school transcripts, and other evidences of EL students' educational background. Schools must use the educational records of students to enroll students in courses that match students' prior enrollment and achievement in school. Additionally, schools must provide to parents information on the EL programs available within the Large Urban School District. As part of the EL plan and placement, parents are involved in selecting programs for EL students. Students who do not have educational records are placed in grades as determined by ELs' chronological age.

Grade Level and Course Placement To determine grade level and course placement, schools use *Evaluating Foreign Transcripts: The Guide to International School Systems* (School Board of Orange County, 2013), ELs' age, educational records available, the EL committee's recommendation, assessment of native language and English, and interviews of EL parents and students. In grades 6-12 ELs and their parents receive advice from the principal's designee, the ESOL compliance teacher at the school, and a school guidance counselor to determine EL students' grade level and course placement.

Equal Access to Programs ELs have equal access to programs provided under Title I, exceptional education, early childhood, voluntary pre-kindergarten, magnet schools, gifted, advanced placement courses, extracurricular activities, vocational and adult education, drop-out prevention, and other support services available. ELs cannot be denied access to programs based on limited English proficiency or meeting English competency requirements before receiving access to programs. It is the responsibility of directors of Multilingual Services to monitor the proportion of ELs participating in programs offered in the Large Urban District.

Student Progression The Large Urban School District does not have standards and procedures for the promotion, placement, and retention of EL students within its student progression plan. The EL committee makes educational decisions for ELs. ELs with less than two years since they entered the United States cannot be retained.

Table 29

English Learner Access Elements: School District Documents and Curriculum Guides

EL Access Elements	Consent Decree of 1990	School District Documents			Curriculum Guides
		ELL District Plan 2013-2014	School Visit Monitoring Tool for Program Effectiveness	Procedural Handbook	Middle and High School Curriculum Guides
EL Plan and Placement	Equal access to appropriate programming	El plan and placement	Registration, testing, and placement procedures	Initial placement based on testing and student ELL educational plan	EL English Language Arts Description
Grade Level and Course Placement	Equal access to appropriate programming	Grade level and course placement	Registration, testing, and placement procedures	ESOL program placement	EL classes included within course selection document
Equal Access to Programs	Equal access to appropriate categorical and other programming	Equal access to programs	Progress monitoring	ELL instructional program models	Access statements
Student Progression	Outcome measures	Student progression	Progress monitoring	ELL progress and review and ELL student progression	EL academic support structures

Note. EL= English learner; ELL= English language learner. EL Access Elements evidence in school district and school documents analyzed.

Large Urban School District Policy Documents

School district policy documents required by the state and created by the Large Urban School District (LUSD) were collected and analyzed to identify elements within each policy document that related to access to advanced coursework for English learners. Three school district documents were identified and utilized for this analysis: LUSD’s *ELL District Plan 2013-2014* (School Board of Orange County, 2014a), *Multilingual*

Student Education Services' *School Visit Monitoring Tool for Program Effectiveness* (School Board of Orange County, 2014b), and Multilingual Student Education Services' *Procedural Handbook* (School Board of Orange County, 2009). The findings for each document are discussed separately in the sections below.

Large Urban School District EL District Plan

English learner (EL) district plans are a requirement of the Florida State Department of Education as a monitoring tool for all school districts in the state to ensure that programmatic elements are in place, which meet the requirements of the Consent Decree of 1990 (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). The EL school district plan used in this study was in effect until June 2016. The school district plan is the base document for programmatic activities related to ELs in LUSD. The plan used for this analysis was submitted in June 2014 and approved by the Florida Department of Education through June 2016. LUSD and the LUSD's English Language Learner Parent Leadership Council developed the plan. Once approved by the Florida Department of Education, it became the guiding document for programmatic activities related to ELs (School Board of Orange County, 2014a).

The Large Urban School District's EL district plan contained 12 main elements as shown in Table 30. Each of the elements in the Large Urban School District EL district plan was accompanied by specific guidelines, which determined procedures related to the academic progression of Limited Yes (LY) and Limited Former (LF) students within each of the Large Urban School District's elementary and secondary schools. Of the 12 elements analyzed, the analysis of the Large Urban School District's EL plan yielded four

elements for ELs' access to advanced coursework. The elements of EL plan and placement, grade level and course placement, equal access to programs, and student progression were identified in the analysis of LUSD's English Learner District Plan (School Board of Orange County, 2014a).

Table 30

Large Urban School District 2013-2014 English Learner District Plan Elements and Guidelines

Element	Guidelines
Registration Procedures Assessment	School registration procedures are the same for ELs and non-ELs. Documentation is provided in home language when possible. English language proficiency is assessed using the IDEA Language Proficiency Test for students in grades 3-12.
EL Committee and EL Placement	Parents of ELs are included within the EL committee at schools to help decisions about their student's EL placement.
EL Plan and Placement	EL educational plan is developed utilizing previous grades, transcripts, and other evidences of schooling. EL students must be enrolled in courses that are equal to the level of achievement, regardless of level of English proficiency.
Grade Level and Course Placement	Course placement procedures for grades 6-12 are completed using foreign transcripts, ELs' age, prior schooling, EL committee recommendations, and assessment information.
Instruction for ELs	ELs are provided instruction that is equal to that of their non-EL peers. Principal of the school is responsible for ensuring comprehensible instruction for ELs through classroom observations and documentation of instruction.
Equal Access to Programs Student Progression	ELs have access to all programs, including magnet programs, gifted programs, and Advanced Placement programs. EL committee makes placement decisions for ELs, including promotion, course placement, and retention.
Statewide Assessment	ELs are required to take both the FCAT and CELLA examinations as part of the statewide assessment system. Appropriate testing accommodations must be given.
Exit from EL and Re-entry	ELs in grades 3-9 are exited from the EL program with a level 3 or above on FCAT and proficiency on the CELLA examination. ELs in grades 10-12 must meet FCAT graduation requirements and demonstrate proficiency on the CELLA examination. ELs' academic achievement in English, social studies, science, and mathematics is considered as part of the exit decision.
Monitoring of LFs	LFs are monitored for a period of two years through grades, assessments, and classroom performance. ELs are re-classified as Limited Yes, if ELs perform below grade level. EL committee must make this decision.
EL Parent Involvement	Parent leadership councils exist at the school- and school district-level to communicate school board policy and address parents' concerns to the school board.

School Visit Monitoring Tool for Program Effectiveness

The school visit monitoring tool for program effectiveness was acquired from the Multilingual Services Department. This tool was authored by the Large Urban School District's (LUSD) Multilingual Services Department to monitor implementation of the school district's English learner (EL) plan and requirements of the Consent Decree of 1990 (Florida Department of Education, 2014a). The school visiting monitoring tool created by the Large Urban School District's (LUSD) Multilingual Services contained elements that mirrored the twelve elements contained within the EL school district plan. The school visit monitoring tool identified documentation schools must have available to monitor for program effectiveness. The four elements of EL plan and placement, grade level and course placement, equal access to programs, and student progression identified for access to advanced coursework were contained within the school visit monitoring tool and documentation for each of those elements as shown in Table 31 (School Board of Orange County, 2014b). Within the EL plan and placement, the school monitoring tool identified testing procedures necessary for ELs. In terms of grade level and course placement, the school monitoring tool identified if a school is placing ELs based on the results of the IDEA Proficiency Test, a language proficiency assessment, and academic information available. For equal access to programs, the school visit monitoring tool identified monitoring mechanisms for Limited Former students. In terms of student progression, the monitoring tool identified EL committee involvement requirements.

Table 31

EL Access Elements: School Visit Monitoring Tool

EL Access Elements	School Visit Monitoring Tool Elements	School Visit Monitoring Tool Guidelines	School Monitoring Tool Documentation
EL Plan and Placement	Registration, Testing, and Placement Procedures	Placement of ELs within 30 days of school registration	Notification of Placement for Limited Yes Students and EL Committee Form
Grade Level and Course Placement	Registration, Testing, and Placement Procedures	Limited Yes status is activated and included in Limited Yes students' schedules; Limited Former status is activated and monitored for two years	Notification of Placement for Limited Yes students, Test Scores for Limited Yes and Limited Former students, and Notification of Exit
Equal Access to Programs	Progress Monitoring	Monitoring of Limited Formers' academic progress through reading state-standardized assessments, course grades, and other standardized testing	Monitoring Form for Limited Formers
Student Progression	Progress Monitoring	Conferring of meeting for Limited Yes and Limited Former students with academic or linguistic needs. Initiate multi-tiered systems of supports for identified students	Academic Needs Identification Meeting Notes, Limited English Proficiency Conference Notes, and Parent Invitation

Procedural Handbook

The procedural handbook utilized for this study was published during the 2009-2010 school year and made available online to schools via the Large Urban School District's website. It is a comprehensive handbook, containing all information and materials necessary for schools to be in compliance with the Consent Decree of 1990 (Florida Department of Education, 2014a; School Board of Orange County, 2009). The procedural handbook is 103 pages long. It was authored by the Multilingual Services Department and approved for use by schools by the Large Urban School District's (LUSD) school board. The procedural handbook's introductory material had a summary of the Consent Decree of 1990 (Florida Department of Education, 2014a), providing a brief summary on each of the elements contained within the decree.

Following the summary, procedural handbook contained discrete, detailed sections on LUSD's policy and guidelines that related directly to the requirements of the Consent Decree of 1990, including standardized assessment information for placement of English learners (EL), progress monitoring of ELs, funding information for ELs, and the role of the school district in supporting schools (School Board of Orange County, 2009). Additionally, the procedural handbook contained several communication templates for schools as necessary in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole. The procedural handbook was constructed so that it could serve as a reference tool for schools.

Within the procedural handbook, there were several sections that related to the EL access elements of EL plan and placement, grade level and course placement, equal access to programs, and student progression as shown in Table 32.

Table 32

EL Access Elements: Procedural Handbook

EL Access Element	Procedural Handbook Element	Guidelines
EL Plan and Placement	Initial Placement Based on Testing and Student ELL Educational Plan	Assessment procedures, cut score information for incoming EL students, and EL educational plan information
Grade Level and Course Placement	ESOL Program Placement	Items for placement in EL programs, grade level, and course placement, including subject areas other than English Language Arts
Equal Access to Programs	ELL Instructional Models	Overview of second language acquisition process, misconceptions of second language acquisition, instructional implications for classroom instruction, and explanation of EL language acquisition models
Student Progression	ELL Progress Review and ELL Student Progression	Exit procedures, extension of services for ELs, monitoring requirements for LFs, EL scheduling for credit completion in middle school and graduation in high school, and monitoring of ELs struggling with academic or linguistics

Note. Adapted from School Board of Orange County (2009, December 12). Multilingual Student Services procedural handbook. Unpublished internal handbook.

The procedural handbook sections on Initial Placement Based on Testing and English language learner education plan related to the EL access elements of EL plan and placement. In these two sections of the procedural handbook, LUSD provides guidelines on the assessment requirements for ELs, including cut scores for those assessments and implication of those scores on placement. For example, the policy guidelines are clear that if ELs score above the cut scores, then they may not be considered for EL program based on cut scores and the recommendations of the EL committee. Additionally, the

two sections are explicit in the information that should be documented in an EL's education plan. This is a legal document that must contain ELs' Limited Yes or Limited Former status, students' class schedules, and criteria for exit from the school's EL program, if applicable (School Board of Orange County, 2009).

The section of the procedural handbook dedicated to English for Speakers of Other Languages Program Placement related to the EL access element of grade level and course placement (School Board of Orange County, 2009). In this section, LUSD provides guidelines on the information that should be used to place students in grade levels and courses. Schools must use ELs' prior schooling information and assessment for placement in appropriate instructional programs. This includes placement outside of the EL program in other subject areas. The ESOL Program Placement guidelines also emphasize that an EL's performance in his or her native language should be a consideration for placement. Additionally, this section outlines the procedures to be used at elementary, middle, and high school levels. At the middle school level, the guidelines specified that schools could use teacher-created tests, tests in an EL's native language, interviews, or informal assessment to determine an EL's placement (School Board of Orange County, 2009). In high school, transcripts and assessments of academic skills could be used in determining ELs' course placement.

The procedural handbook's section on English Language Learner Instructional Models related to the EL access element of equal access to programs (School Board of Orange County, 2009). Within this section, the Large Urban School District provides information to schools on second language acquisition. First, the section explains the

process of language acquisitions. Secondly, it enumerates the advantages students have when they speak two languages, including the benefits students reap once they enter the workforce (School Board of Orange County, 2009). Thirdly, myths and misconceptions related to second language are listed and then followed by a fact that dispels the misconception. Next, the section discussed instruction program models for implementation, which spoke to comprehensible instruction for ELs. Specifically, the section emphasizes providing instruction, which allows ELs to stay apace with their monolingual counterparts during the second language acquisition process. Models for ELs' second language acquisition are presented accompanied with multiple citations from a variety of studies in the field. Information also is provided on levels of second language acquisition in the form of a table with linguistic descriptors at each level, such as language production and using grammatical structure (School Board of Orange County, 2009). Lastly, the section concludes with a detailed explanation instructional program models available to ELs in the Large Urban School District.

The procedural handbook's sections that addressed English Language Learner Progress Review and ELL Student Progression related to the EL access element of student progression (School Board of Orange County, 2009). The ELL Progress Review detailed exit procedures for ELs, using standardized assessment cut scores, extension of services or re-entry into an EL program for students who were exited, and documents used to monitor LFs progress during the required two-year period. The section on ELL Student Progression emphasized ELs' equal access to programs, review of ELs' academic histories, and the role of the EL committee and placement of ELs. Additionally, this

section addressed EL class scheduling to meet graduation requirements in high school, retention requirements for ELs in secondary schools, and identification of interventions for ELs struggling academically or linguistically via the academic needs identification plan.

Middle School and High School Curriculum Guides

Curriculum guides from middle schools and high schools were collected and analyzed to identify items within the curriculum guides that were consistent with the four identified elements guiding access to advanced coursework from the Large Urban School District's EL school district plan of: English learner (EL) plan and placement, grade level and course placement, equal access to programs, and student progression. Curriculum guides analyzed for this study were collected from each school's website. The document analysis of the curriculum guide revealed four elements consistent throughout the middle school and high school curriculum guides related to access to advanced coursework as shown in Table 33.

Table 33

EL Access Elements: Curriculum Guides Elements

EL Access Elements	Curriculum Guide Elements
EL plan and placement	EL English Language Arts Course Description
Grade level and course placement, equal access to programs, and student progression	EL Classes Included in the Course Selection Document
Student progression	EL Academic Achievement Support Structures
Equal access to programs	Access Statements

Note. Curriculum guide elements created from middle school and high school guides themes

First, descriptions of EL English Language Arts aligned to the grade level and course placement and the EL plan and placement elements within the school district’s EL plan. Secondly, the inclusion of EL classes within the course selection document aligned with grade level and course placement, student progression, and equal access to programs as this piece of documentation highlighted the course offering at schools available to students. Thirdly, EL academic support structures aligned to student progression, as a method for schools to ensure ELs remained on course in their grade-level tracks. Lastly, access statements found within the curriculum guide aligned with equal access to programs as access statements made declarations of encouragement for all students within a school to engage in rigorous coursework.

Middle School Curriculum Guides

Middle school curriculum guides collected represented the school years of 2009 through 2015. Of the 38 middle schools included in the study, eight of them had curriculum guides available online. Each of the eight middle school curriculum guides underwent a content and thematic analysis (Bowen, 2009) to determine the presence of the elements of English Learner (EL) English Language Arts course description, EL classes included in the course selection document, EL academic support structures, and access statements as shown in Table 34. Elements present were coded as 1 and elements not present were coded as 0.

Of the eight middle school curriculum guides analyzed, the majority of them (88%) had a description of the EL English Language Arts course present in the curriculum guides. Five of the eight middle school curriculum guides contained a course selection document for students to select courses for the following school year. Over half of the course selection documents (60%) included the EL English Language Arts course as course selection option along with the standard-level and honors-level English Language Arts courses. Academic support structures presented in the middle school curriculum guide consisted of after school academic programs available to students who were in danger of failing a core content class. MS 16 was the only middle school that showed evidence of academic support for students not related to grade recovery mechanisms within the school. MS 16 offered academic tutoring after school through

teachers at the middle school. MS 16 also offered tutoring via community-based organizations.

Table 34

Middle School Curriculum Guide Focus on English Learners Coded Elements N = 8

	EL English Language Arts Course Description	EL Classes Included in Course Selection Document	EL Academic Support Structures	Access Statements	Total Elements Present
MS 16	1	-	1	1	3
MS 17	1	1	0	1	3
MS 32	1	1	0	0	2
MS 2	1	-	0	1	2
MS 37	1	0	-	1	2
MS 34	1	1	0	0	2
MS 4	1	-	0	1	2
MS 23	0	0	0	0	0

Note. EL= English learner. Coding: 1=Element Present; 0=Element Not Present; - = document missing.

Five of the eight middle school curriculum guides had access statements contained in the introductory material to the curriculum guide in the principal’s letter as shown in Table 35. MS 2 and MS 4’s access statements addressed middle school parents. MS 16, 17, and 37’s access statements addressed middle school students. MS 37’s statement addressed middle school parents and staff and made a statement of the

principal's statement of purpose. MS 37's principal states, "I have an obligation to do everything in my power..." to describe academic achievement for students.

In the access statements, principals used the words: academic, achieve, challenge, rigorous, success, and successful in relation to academic achievement. Each access statement contained one or more of the aforementioned words to describe academics in their middle schools. For example, MS 17 used both the words "challenge" and "rigorous" in its access statement. MS 2 used two forms of the word "success" in its access statement.

Table 35

Middle School Access Statements N=5

Middle School	Audience	Tone	Access Statement
MS 2	Parents	Positive	Make the conscious choice to be successful. Many times your child's level of success is dependent on their attitude. If they make the decision to be successful, they will be.
MS 4	Parents	Positive	Our motto, "Aiming for Excellence," exemplifies the school's commitment to providing the richest academic and social experience possible for your child.
MS 16	Students	Positive	At MS 16 we concentrate on rigorous instruction, 21 st century skills, and college and career readiness for all our Jets...
MS 17	Students	Positive	It is important that you challenge yourself academically by selecting the most rigorous courses in which you can succeed.
MS 37	Parents and Staff	Positive	I have an obligation to do everything in my power to help students create and achieve their dreams.

Note. Audience represents the intended recipient of the principals' access statement.

High School Curriculum Guides

High school curriculum guides collected for this analysis were from the 2014-2015 school year. Of the 19 high schools included in the present study 18 of them had curriculum guides available online. Each of the 18 high school curriculum guides underwent a content and thematic analysis (Bowen, 2009) analysis to determine the

presence of the elements of English learner (EL) English Language Arts course description, EL classes included within the course selection document, EL academic support structures, and access statements as shown in Table 36. Elements present were coded as 1 and elements not present were coded as 0.

At the close of the 2013-2014 school year, the Large Urban School District (LUSD) standardized the layout of the curriculum guide. The first 23 pages of each curriculum guide contained a message from the superintendent; information on academic and scholarship programs available to high school students; course progression information in the core content areas of language arts, science, and mathematics; and college entrance requirements and career planning. The course progression document included in the introductory material for language arts contained both the middle school and high school course progressions for students. In both the middle school and high school English Language Arts progression, the EL language arts course was absent. The introductory material available to students in the curriculum guides was drawn from the Florida Department of Education and LUSD's Guidance Services Department. Following the required introductory material comprised of 23 pages, each high school was permitted to insert its own material into the curriculum guides. It is from the school-created curriculum materials that this analysis was conducted.

Of the 18 high school curriculum guides analyzed all had a description of the EL language arts course present. Seventeen of the 18 curriculum guides contained a course selection document for students to select courses for the following school year. Of these, over half (64%) included the EL language arts course as an option within the course

selection documents along with the standard-level, honors-level ELA courses, and Advanced Placement English Language Arts courses. Only one high school curriculum guide, HS 2's, included an academic support structure in the form of tutoring for EL students.

Table 36

High School Curriculum Guide Focus on English Learners Coded Elements N = 19

High School	EL English Language Arts Course Description	EL Classes Included in Course Selection Document	EL Academic Support Structures	Access Statements	Total Elements Present
HS 2	1	1	1	1	4
HS 6	1	1	0	1	3
HS 12	1	1	0	1	3
HS 18	1	1	0	1	3
HS 17	1	1	0	1	3
HS 4	1	1	0	1	3
HS 11	1	0	0	1	2
HS 13	1	-	0	1	2
HS 1	1	0	0	1	2
HS 10	1	0	0	1	2
HS 5	1	0	0	1	2
HS 19	1	1	0	0	2
HS 3	1	1	0	0	2
HS 14	1	1	0	0	2
HS 15	1	1	0	0	2
HS 8	1	0	0	1	2
HS 16	1	1	0	0	2
HS 9	1	0	0	0	1
HS 7	N/A				

Note. EL= English learner. Coding: 1=Element Present; 0=Element Not Present

Twelve of the 18 high school curriculum guides had access statements contained in the introductory material to the curriculum guide in the principal's letter as shown in Table 37. The access statements contained within the principal's letter addressed high school students. In the access statements, principals used the words: capable, challenge,

encourage, high expectations, performance, potential, rigor, and rigorous in relation to academic achievement. Each access statement contained one or more of the aforementioned words to describe academics in their high schools. For example, HS 11 used both “challenge” and “rigorous” in the principal’s access statement. HS 4, HS 5, and HS 8 all mention AP courses in their access statements. Eleven of the 12 principal access statements analyzed established a positive tone in their statements. HS 8’s access statement differed from the others in that it established prerequisites students needed to participate in advanced coursework within its access statement. HS 8’s access statement was not contained within the principal’s letter.

Table 37

High School Access Statements N = 12

High School	Audience	Tone	Access Statement
HS 1	Students	Positive	HS 1 has high expectations for all students on campus.
HS 2	Students	Positive	Whether your plan is to go to college or enter the workforce upon graduation, you will find pathways within this guide that will support you in meeting your goals.
HS 4	Students	Positive	I encourage you to challenge yourself through Advanced Placement and Dual enrollment coursework...
HS 5	Students	Positive	We believe all students have the potential to complete college level [sic] courses, and we encourage you to challenge yourself with honors and advanced placement courses.
HS 6	Students	Positive	You are capable of completing college-level courses.
HS 8	Students	Negative	Honors and Advanced Placement is based on entirely on previous performance in courses taken and FCAT scores. If there are extenuating circumstances that prevented a student from earning the prerequisite, but the student clearly demonstrated the ability; [sic] the final decision will be made at the Principal's or Designee's discretion.
HS 10	Students	Positive	Challenge yourself. Take upper level [sic] classes. You'll be amazed at how much you can learn.
HS 11	Students	Positive	It is important that you challenge yourself academically by selecting the most rigorous courses in which you can succeed.
HS 12	Students	Positive	Challenge yourself—You are capable of completing college level [sic] courses
HS 13	Students	Positive	Keep “rigor” in mind and try to take the courses that will challenge you the most.
HS 17	Students	Positive	It is important that you challenge yourself academically by selecting the most rigorous courses in which you can be successful.
HS 18	Students	Positive	The learning environment is all-inclusive

Note. Audience represents the intended recipient of the principals' access statement.

Additional Analysis

The additional analysis of the course enrollment data and achievement consisted of an analysis of the courses with the highest proportion of ELs by the EL designation of Limited Former or Limited Yes course enrollment and their achievement in those courses. Advanced Placement, and high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework were included the course enrollment and achievement analysis. Tables 38 through 43 present additional data on course enrollment and achievement in each individual course by proportions of enrollment and achievement by exam grade or final letter grade are presented within the Limited Former and Limited Yes subgroups. Additionally, an analysis of schools' demographic variables for schools that had high EL enrollment and low EL achievement; high EL enrollment and high EL achievement; low EL enrollment and low EL achievement; and low EL enrollment and high EL achievement was completed.

Advanced Placement English Learner Course Enrollment and Achievement

Tables 38 through 39 depict the EL course enrollment and achievement information for Advanced Placement (AP) Spanish Culture and Language, Advanced Placement Spanish Culture and Literature, and Advanced Placement U.S. Government and Politics for Limited Former (LF) and Limited Yes (LY) course enrollment and achievement.

Limited Former Advanced Placement Course Enrollment and Achievement

The highest proportion of Limited Former (LF) enrollment (22.5%) and achievement ($M = 3.91$) was in AP Spanish Language and Culture as shown in Table 38. AP Psychology (9.6%) AP Human Geography (8.0%), AP Spanish and Literature (7.4%), and A.P. U.S. Government and Politics (6.1%) represented the other courses that had high LF enrollment. Although the proportion of enrollment for these courses was high in the Large Urban School District, only AP Spanish Language and Culture had high achievement for LFs, followed by AP Spanish Literature and Culture ($M = 3.34$). In AP U.S. Government and Politics, LFs demonstrated the lowest achievement ($M = 1.48$). AP Psychology and AP Human Geography ($M = 1.90$) both demonstrated slightly higher achievement for LFs.

Table 38

Advanced Placement Limited Former High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2011-2014 N=5

Rank	Advanced Placement Course Name	Advanced Placement Subject	Enrollment Percentage (%)	Enrollment Frequency (f)	Advanced Placement Exam Score <i>M</i>
1	AP Spanish Language and Culture	World Languages	22.5	249	3.91
2	AP Psychology	Social Studies	9.6	106	1.90
3	AP Human Geography	Social Studies	8.0	89	1.90
4	AP Spanish Literature and Culture	World Languages	7.4	82	3.34
5	AP U.S. Government and Politics	Social Studies	6.1	67	1.48

Note. Advanced Placement courses contained in the table represent the top five courses for enrollment and achievement in each for Limited Former students from 2011-2014 as represented by *N*. Percentages represent the proportion of Limited Former students enrolled in AP courses within the Limited Former subgroup.

Limited Yes Advanced Placement Course Enrollment and Achievement

The highest proportion of Limited Yes (LY) enrollment (55.6%) and achievement ($M = 3.83$) was in AP Spanish Language and Culture as shown in Table 39. AP Spanish and Literature (11.0%) AP French Language and Literature (5.8%), AP U.S. Government and Politics (2.7%), and A.P. U.S. History (2.4%) represented the other courses that had high LY enrollment. Although the proportion of enrollment for these courses was high in the Large Urban School District, only AP Spanish Language and Culture ($M = 3.83$) had

high achievement for LYs, followed by AP Spanish Literature and Culture ($M = 2.95$). In AP U.S. Government and Politics, LYs demonstrated the lowest achievement ($M = 1.00$). LYs achieved higher in AP French Language and Culture ($M = 2.79$) and AP U.S. History ($M = 1.31$).

Table 39

Advanced Placement Limited Yes High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2011-2014

$N=5$

Rank	Advanced Placement Course Name	Advanced Placement Subject	Enrollment Percentage (%)	Enrollment Frequency (f)	Advanced Placement Exam Score M
1	AP Spanish Language and Culture	World Languages	55.6	328	3.83
2	AP Spanish Literature and Culture	World Languages	11.0	65	2.95
3	AP French Language and Culture	World Languages	5.8	34	2.79
4	AP U.S. Government and Politics	Social Studies	2.7	16	1.00
5	AP U.S. History	Social Studies	2.4	13	1.31

Note. Advanced Placement courses contained in the table represent the top five courses for enrollment and achievement in each for Limited Yes students from 2011-2014 as represented by N . Percentages represent the proportion of Limited Yes students enrolled in AP courses within the Limited Yes subgroup.

High School English Learner Advanced Coursework Course Enrollment and Achievement

Tables 40 and 41 depict the English learner course enrollment and achievement information for Algebra II Honors, Biology I Honors, World History Honors, and U.S. History Honors for Limited Former and Limited Yes course enrollment and achievement as measured by final letter grade of A, B, or C.

Limited Former High School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement

The highest proportion of Limited Former (LF) enrollment (7.9%) was in Algebra II Honors and Biology I Honors (7.9%) as shown in Table 40. The highest level of achievement was in U.S. History Honors (89.6%) as measured by final letter grade of A, B, or C. English I Honors (7.3%), World History Honors (7.2%), and U.S. History Honors (6.7%) represented the other courses that had high LF enrollment. Although the proportion of enrollment for these courses was high in the Large Urban School District, U.S. History had high achievement for LFs, followed by Biology I Honors (88.8%). In Algebra II Honors, LFs demonstrated the lowest achievement (77.0%). World History Honors (86.5%) and English I Honors (85.9%) both demonstrated higher achievement for LFs.

Table 40

High School Advanced Courses Limited Former High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2009-2014 N=5

Rank	Advanced Course Name	Advanced Course Subject Area	Enrollment Percentage (%)	Enrollment Frequency (f)	Grade A, B, or C (%)
1	Algebra II Honors	Mathematics	7.9	835	77.0
2	Biology I Honors	Science	7.9	833	88.8
3	English I Honors	Language Arts	7.3	765	85.9
4	World History Honors	Social Studies	7.2	753	86.5
5	U.S. History Honors	Social Studies	6.7	710	89.6

Note. High school advanced courses contained in the table represent the top five courses for enrollment and achievement in each for Limited Former students from 2009-2014 as represented by *N*. Percentages represent the proportion of Limited Former students enrolled in high school advanced courses within the Limited Former subgroup.

Limited Yes High School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement

The highest proportion of Limited Yes (LY) enrollment was in World History Honors (10.2%). The highest level of achievement as measured by final letter grade of A, B, or C was in U.S. History Honors (85.3%) as shown in Table 41. Biology I Honors (10.1%), Geometry Honors (10.0%), Algebra II Honors (9.9%) and U.S. History Honors (8.0) represented the other courses that had high LY enrollment. Although the proportion of enrollment for these courses was high in the Large Urban School District, U.S. History Honors represented the highest proportion of achievement, followed by World History Honors (82.3%). In Geometry Honors, LYs demonstrated the lowest achievement

(80.9%). LYs achieved more highly in Algebra II Honors (81.3%) and Biology I Honors (81.1%). In each of these courses LY achievement was above 80 percent.

Table 41

High School Advanced Courses Limited Yes High Enrollment Courses 2009-2014 N=5

Rank	Advanced Course Name	Advanced Course Subject Area	Enrollment Percentage (%)	Enrollment Frequency (f)	Grade A, B, or C (%)
1	World History Honors	Social Studies	10.2	526	82.3
2	Biology I Honors	Science	10.1	524	81.1
3	Geometry Honors	Mathematics	10.0	518	80.9
4	Algebra II Honors	Mathematics	9.9	512	81.3
5	U.S. History Honors	Social Studies	8.0	415	85.3

Note. High school advanced courses contained in the table represent the top five courses for enrollment and achievement in each for Limited Yes students from 2009-2014 as represented by *N*. Percentages represent the proportion of Limited Yes students enrolled in high school advanced courses within the Limited Yes subgroup.

Middle School English Learner Advanced Coursework Course Enrollment and Achievement

Tables 42 and 43 depict the English learner course enrollment and achievement information for Grade 6 Mathematics Advanced, Grade 7 Mathematics Advanced, and Life Science Advanced, for Limited Former and Limited Yes course enrollment and achievement as measured by final letter grade of A, B, or C.

Limited Former Middle School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement

The highest proportion of Limited Former (LF) enrollment (13.7%) was in Grade 6 Mathematics Advanced as shown in Table 42. The highest level of achievement was in Language Arts 2, Advanced (94.1%) as measured by final letter grade of A, B, or C. Language Arts 1, Advanced (13.4%), Life Science Advanced (10.3%), Grade 7 Mathematics Advanced (9.0%) and Language Arts 2, Advanced (8.8%) represented the other courses that had high LF enrollment. Although the proportion of enrollment for these courses was high in the Large Urban School District, Language Arts 2, Advanced had high achievement for LFs, followed by Grade 6 Mathematics Advanced (93.3%). In Life Science Advanced (92.2%) and Grade 7 Mathematics Advanced (92.2%), LFs demonstrated the lowest achievement. In Language Arts 1, Advanced, LFs demonstrated higher achievement (92.8%).

Table 42

*Middle School Limited Former High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2009-2014**N* = 5

Rank	Advanced Course Name	Advanced Course Subject Area	Enrollment Percentage (%)	Enrollment Frequency (<i>f</i>)	Grade A, B, or C
1	Grade 6 Mathematics Advanced	Mathematics	13.7	2,007	93.3
2	Language Arts 1, Advanced	Language Arts	13.4	1,960	92.8
3	Life Science Advanced	Science	10.3	1,502	92.2
4	Grade 7 Mathematics Advanced	Mathematics	9.0	1,315	92.2
5	Language Arts 2, Advanced	Language Arts	8.8	1,283	94.1

Note. Middle school advanced courses contained in the table represent the top five courses for enrollment and achievement in each for Limited Former students from 2009-2014 as represented by *N*. Percentages represent the proportion of Limited Former students enrolled in middle school advanced courses within the Limited Former subgroup.

Limited Yes Middle School Advanced Coursework Enrollment and Achievement

The highest proportion of Limited Yes (LY) enrollment was in Grade 6 Mathematics Advanced (12.7%). The highest level of achievement as measured by final letter grade of A, B, or C was in Grade 7 Mathematics Advanced (90.6%) as shown in Table 4. U.S. History Advanced (11.1%), Grade 7 Mathematics Advanced (9.7%), Life Science Advanced (9.3%) and Pre-Algebra Advanced (7.9%) represented the other courses that had high LY enrollment. Although the proportion of enrollment for these

courses was high in the Large Urban School District, Grade 7 Mathematics represented the highest proportion of achievement, followed by Grade 6 Mathematics Advanced (85.8%). In U.S. History Advanced, LYs demonstrated the lowest achievement (77.6%). LYs achieved more highly in Life Science Advanced (85.3%) and Pre-Algebra Advanced (81.1%).

Table 43

Middle School Limited Yes High Enrollment Courses and Achievement 2009-2014 N=5

Rank	Advanced Course Name	Advanced Course Subject Area	Enrollment Percentage (%)	Enrollment Frequency (f)	Grade A, B, or C
1	Grade 6 Mathematics Advanced	Mathematics	12.7	444	85.8
2	U.S History Advanced	Social Studies	11.1	389	77.6
3	Grade 7 Mathematics Advanced	Mathematics	9.7	341	90.6
4	Life Science Advanced	Science	9.3	327	85.3
5	Pre-Algebra Advanced	Mathematics	7.9	275	81.1

Note. Middle school advanced courses contained in the table represent the top five courses for enrollment and achievement in each for Limited Former students from 2009-2014 as represented by *N*. Percentages represent the proportion of Limited Yes students enrolled in middle school advanced courses within the Limited Yes subgroup.

Enrollment and Achievement: School Demographic Variables

Analysis of school demographic variables consisted of the percentages of gender, ethnicity, and poverty, as measured by free and reduced lunch status, at high schools and middle schools that had high enrollment and low achievement, high enrollment and high

achievement, low enrollment and low achievement, and low enrollment and high achievement. Schools selected for this analysis met the characteristics mentioned and represented schools in the upper and lower ranges of English learner (EL) enrollment and achievement.

High Enrollment and Low Achievement

Demographic variables for HS 18 and MS 16 are presented in Table 44. Both these schools had high EL enrollment and low EL achievement in advanced coursework. HS 18 had high Advanced Placement (AP) enrollment (5.0%) and a high proportion of AP exam scores of 2 or below (49.5%). In terms of high school advanced coursework in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies, HS 18 had high enrollment (8.9%) and slightly higher proportion of ELs receiving a grade of D or F (14.7%). MS 16 had higher enrollment (7.4%) and a higher proportion of ELs receiving a D or F (45.6%). Analysis of demographic variables revealed that in terms of gender and free and reduced lunch status, HS 18 and MS 16 were similar. However, there were differences in proportions of ethnicities in the schools, most prevalent in the proportion of Hispanic students in HS 18 (60%) and MS 16 (48.8%) and white students in HS 18 (13.1%) and MS 16 (24.6%).

Table 44

High Enrollment and Low Achievement Demographic Variables: High School 18 and Middle School 16 2013-2014

		High School 18 (%) <i>n</i> = 3,063	Middle School 16 (%) <i>n</i> = 893
Gender	Female	48.6	48.8
	Male	51.4	51.2
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0.7	0
	Asian	9.8	5.4
	Black	13.6	18.7
	Hispanic	60.6	48.8
	Multiracial	1.9	2.1
	White	13.1	24.6
Free and Reduced Lunch Status	Yes	71.4	68.4
	No	28.6	31.6

Note. Adapted from “School Public Accountability Reports 2013-2014,” by Florida Department of Education, 2014d, Retrieved from http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/year1314/schl1314.cfm?dist_number=48

High Enrollment and High Achievement

Demographic variables for HS 8 and MS 35 are presented in Table 45. Both these schools had high EL enrollment and high EL achievement in advanced coursework. HS 8 had high EL Advanced Placement AP enrollment (7.0%) and high proportion of EL AP exam scores of 3 or above (50.1%). In terms of high school advanced coursework in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies, HS 8 had high enrollment (7.8%) and slightly higher proportion of ELs receiving a grade of A, B, or C (89.0%). MS 35 had higher enrollment (25.3%) and a higher proportion of ELs receiving a grade A, B, or

C (93.8%). Analysis of demographic variables revealed that in terms of gender, HS 8 and MS 35 were similar. However, there were differences in proportions of ethnicities and free and reduced lunch status in the schools. MS 35 had a high free and reduced lunch status (100%) and HS 8 had a lower rate (55.7%). In terms of ethnicities, the HS 8 had a larger white student population (26.0%) than MS 35 (2.9%).

Table 45

English Learner High Enrollment and High Achievement School Demographic

Variables: High School 8 and Middle School 35 2013-2014

		High School 8 (%) <i>n</i> = 3,231	Middle School 35 (%) <i>n</i> = 1,227
Gender	Female	48.2	50.0
	Male	51.8	50.0
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4	0
	Asian	7.3	2.1
	Black	14.1	52.3
	Hispanic	49.3	41.5
	Multiracial	2.7	1.1
	White	26.0	2.9
Free and Reduced Lunch States	Yes	55.7	100
	No	44.3	0

Note. Adapted from “School Public Accountability Reports 2013-2014,” by Florida Department of Education, 2014d, Retrieved from http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/year1314/schl1314.cfm?dist_number=48

Low Enrollment and Low Achievement

Demographic variables for HS 7 and MS 13 are presented in Table 46. Both these schools had low EL enrollment and low EL achievement in advanced coursework. HS 7 had low EL AP enrollment (2.6%) and a high proportion of EL AP achievement exam scores of 2 or below (92.3%). In terms of high school advanced coursework in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies, HS 7 had low enrollment (3.6%) and slightly higher proportion of ELs receiving a grade of D or F (21.5%). MS 13 had low enrollment (3.1%) and a higher proportion of ELs receiving a grade D or F (13.7%). Analysis of demographic variables revealed that in terms of gender and free and reduced lunch status, HS 7 and MS 13 were similar. However, there were differences in proportions of ethnicities. HS 7 had a high black enrollment (91.5%) and no white enrollment (0%). MS 13 presented higher Hispanic enrollment (11.5%).

Table 46

*English Learner Low Enrollment and Low Achievement School Demographic Variables:
High School 7 and Middle School 13 2013-2014*

		High School 7 (%) <i>n</i> = 768	Middle School 13 (%) <i>n</i> = 964
Gender	Female	51.0	49.7
	Male	49.0	50.3
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0
	Asian	0	1.5
	Black	91.5	60.3
	Hispanic	5.6	11.5
	Multiracial	1.3	1.9
	White	0	24.6
Free and Reduced Lunch States	Yes	80.3	78.7
	No	19.7	21.3

Note. Adapted from “School Public Accountability Reports 2013-2014,” by Florida Department of Education, 2014d, Retrieved from http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/year1314/schl1314.cfm?dist_number=48

Low Enrollment and High Achievement

Demographic variables for HS 19 and MS 12 are presented in Table 47. Both these school had low EL enrollment and high EL achievement in advanced coursework. HS 19 had low EL AP enrollment (1.1%) and a high proportion of EL AP achievement exam scores of 3 or above (68.0%). In terms of high school advanced coursework in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies, HS 19 had low enrollment (1.5%) and slightly higher proportion of ELs receiving a grade of A, B, or C (87.4%). MS 12 had low enrollment (0.9%) and a higher proportion of ELs receiving a grade A, B, or C (100%). MS 12 is a K-8 school. Analysis of demographic variables revealed that in terms of gender and free and reduced lunch status, HS 19 and MS 12 were similar with differences of less than one percent. However, there were differences in proportions of ethnicities with HS 19 having a higher Hispanic population (22.8%) and MS 12 having a lower Hispanic population (15.6%).

Table 47

*English Learner Low Enrollment and High Achievement School Demographic Variables:
High School 19 and Middle School 12 2013-2014*

		High School 19 (%) <i>n</i> = 3,147	Middle School 12 (%) <i>n</i> = 975
Gender	Female	49.5	49.2
	Male	50.5	50.8
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0
	Asian	5.8	3.2
	Black	12.8	14.3
	Hispanic	22.8	15.6
	Multiracial	2.6	3.5
	White	55.6	63.3
Free and Reduced Lunch States	Yes	33.4	35.0
	No	66.6	65.0

Note. Adapted from “School Public Accountability Reports 2013-2014,” by Florida Department of Education, 2014d, Retrieved from http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/year1314/schl1314.cfm?dist_number=48

Summary

This chapter started with the purpose of the study, the research questions in the study, and a description of how the study was completed. This was followed by a description of the population of study and demographic variables on the student course enrollment sample included within the study.

The following section of the chapter described the three questions guiding the study and the data analysis conducted for the quantitative portions of the study. First, course enrollment proportions for English learners (EL) and non-English learners in

Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework were described. The chi-square results for course enrollment in advanced coursework for AP, IB, high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework revealed statistically significant differences in the proportions of EL and non-EL course enrollment in each of the identified areas of advanced coursework. The statistically significant results of the chi-square tests demonstrated proportionately higher advanced coursework enrollment for non-ELs and proportionately lower advanced coursework enrollment for ELs. The results of the chi-square tests for course enrollment were followed by descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and proportions for each of the 57 schools included in the study for AP, IB, high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework.

Secondly, achievement by exam grade or final letter grade for AP, IB, high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework were analyzed and reported to answer research question 2. The results of the chi-square tests for achievement demonstrated a statistically significant difference in the proportions of achievement between ELs and non-ELs in AP, high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework; statistically significant differences in proportions of EL and non-EL achievement were not present for IB. The statistical differences in proportions of achievement indicated higher proportions of EL achievement in AP and higher proportions of achievement for non-ELs in high school and middle school

advanced coursework. The lack of statistical significance for IB indicated similar proportions of achievement for ELs and non-ELs.

Additional chi-square tests were presented for each of the 19 high schools and 38 middle schools in the study for AP, IB, high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework achievement. Results of chi-square tests for each school revealed that statistically significant differences did not exist for 11 high schools in AP achievement, five high schools in high school advanced coursework achievement, and 16 middle schools in middle school advanced coursework achievement. In the schools that did not demonstrate statistical significance based on the results of the chi-square tests, the proportions of achievement for ELs and non-ELs were similar. For the eight high schools that demonstrated statistically significant differences in proportions of achievement for AP, only one had a higher proportion of non-EL AP achievement; the remaining seven had higher proportions EL AP achievement. For high school advanced coursework, only one of the statistically significant high schools, HS 17, had higher EL achievement. The remaining four high schools had higher proportions of non-EL achievement. In middle school, each of the schools that demonstrated a statistically significant difference in proportions of achievement, non-EL achievement was proportionately higher.

The discussion of the quantitative data analyses was followed by a description of the document analyses completed for the third research question. The qualitative analysis included a document analysis of school-district policy and guideline documents as well as school-level curriculum guides for middle school and high school. The document

analysis of the district EL plan (School Board of Orange County, 2014a) revealed four dominant EL access elements: EL plan and placement, grade level and course placement, equal access to programs, and student progression. The EL access elements identified mirrored provisions of the Consent Decree of 1990. The four EL access elements identified via the district EL plan guided the analysis of school-district level policy and guideline documents and 26 school-level curriculum guides.

Within the curriculum guides, the EL access elements were: EL language arts description (EL plan and placement), EL classes included within the course selection document (grade level and course placement), access statements (equal access to programs), and EL academic support structures (student progression). Through the document analysis it was revealed that five of the eight middle school curriculum guides contained at least two of the EL access elements. At the high school level, 11 of 18 had at least two of the EL access elements. One middle school and one high school curriculum guide demonstrated evidence of EL academic support structures.

The qualitative analysis also included an analysis of access statements made by principals via the introductory material contained in the curriculum guides. The analysis of the statements revealed the verbiage principals used to describe academics in their high schools and middle schools. The words used most frequently by principals were: challenge, rigorous, and success. Of the access statements analyzed, the majority established a positive tone. Only one principal access statement, HS 8's, established prerequisites for access to advanced coursework.

In Chapter 5, the data analyses presented in this chapter will be discussed. This chapter will include the implications for EL enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework in grades 6-12 for the Large Urban School District and other school districts to consider in promoting access to advanced coursework. Recommendations for future research in EL enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework also will be proposed.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the presentation and analysis of data were reported. Chapter five consists of a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, implications for practice, recommendations for further research, and conclusions. First, a summary of the study will be presented. This will be followed by a discussion of the findings for each research question and the conclusions drawn from those findings. Implications for practice for school districts will be discussed as they relate to English learner enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework in grades 6-12. The chapter will close with recommendations for practice and conclusions. The purpose of chapter 5 is to integrate the findings from the data collected with the policy, guidelines, and practices of school districts as they relate to English learners' enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship of school district policy, guidelines, and practices related to the enrollment and achievement of English learners (EL) in advanced coursework in middle school and high school. The study contributed to the body of knowledge on the impact of educational policy, guidelines, and recommended practices on student acceleration, specifically the academic acceleration of ELs through advanced coursework in middle school and high school. The findings of

this study on the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school and district-level and school-level policies and guidelines could be used by school districts to analyze current policies, guidelines, and practices to determine the impact they have on ELs' enrollment and achievement in Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and middle school and high school advanced courses.

The purpose of this study was achieved by examining the proportion of enrollment of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school, the proportion of achievement of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school, and analyzing school district policy and guideline documents and middle school and high school curriculum guides. Historical data for the school years between 2009 and 2014 were used to answer research questions 1 and 2. The document analysis of policy and guideline documents answered research question 3.

The research questions listed below guided this research on the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework in middle school and high school.

1. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and ELs enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?
2. What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and EL student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?

3. What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for ELs in middle school and high school?

Statement of the Problem

There is a dearth of research on the effect school district-level policies, guidelines, and practices have on the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced courses in middle school and high school. Existing research on ELs provides information on this group's academic achievement on national and state measurements of achievement (Walqui & Pease-Alvarez, 2012), such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress and the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. However, there is an absence of research concerning this group's achievement in advanced courses at the middle school and high school levels. Moreover, there is an absence of research on this group's achievement on college-level examinations (e.g., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Advanced International Certificate of Education).

Methodology

This study employed the use of a mixed-methods approach to analyze the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced middle school and high school coursework and to examine the school district policies and guidelines for access to advanced courses in middle school and high school. The purpose of the mixed-methods approach was to add the component of explanatory design in a qualitative approach to provide additional information for the quantitative dimension of the study (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). The enrollment and achievement of ELs in Advanced Placement

(AP), International Baccalaureate (IB) and advanced middle school and high school coursework were analyzed quantitatively to determine if there was a difference in this group's proportion of enrollment and achievement in comparison to the overall student population's enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework.

To complete the quantitative analysis, proportions of enrollment and achievement were tested using the chi-square test for goodness of fit and the chi-square test of independence respectively to determine if there were statistical differences in proportions of enrollment and achievement. Moreover, frequencies and percentages of enrollment were analyzed and reported. In terms of achievement, proportions of achievement for ELs and non-ELs also were reported. For AP and IB, additional analysis of means and standard deviations of exam scores were completed and reported. The qualitative portion of the research study consisted of analyses school-district level policy and guideline documents and middle school and high school curriculum guides.

Population

The population of study for this analysis was ELs at the middle school and high school levels. To conduct the analysis, participants were selected based on enrollment in advanced courses from 2009-2014 in grades 6-12 in the Large Urban School District to analyze ELs' enrollment and achievement in advanced middle school and high school courses.

Instrumentation

This analysis utilized both quantitative and qualitative instrumentation to collect all relevant data for this study. Quantitative data were collected via enrollment and the academic test scores for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate and the final letter grade assigned for high school and middle advanced courses from 2009 to 2014. Qualitative data were collected through document analysis of policy and guideline documents at the school-district level and school-level.

Data Collection

The data for this analysis were collected via document analysis of policy and guideline documents during the fall of 2015. Historical data for the school years between 2009 and 2014 were collected during the same time period.

Discussion of the Findings

The following sections will discuss the findings for each of the three research questions in the study.

Research Question 1

What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall students enrolled in advanced courses and ELs enrolled in advanced courses in middle school and high school?

The data obtained from the Large Urban School District (LUSD) on the enrollment of English learners (EL) in advanced coursework revealed statistically significant differences in the proportion of EL and non-EL course enrollment in Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and high school advanced coursework and middle school advanced coursework from 2009-2014. Advanced International Certificate of Education course enrollment was not present in the data received from LUSD. Descriptive analysis revealed a low proportion of EL enrollment (5.1%) in the four identified advanced coursework areas of AP, IB, and high school and middle school advanced coursework for this study. The analysis of the proportions of enrollment in the four identified areas revealed statistically significant differences in proportions of enrollment for all with a higher proportion of non-ELs enrolled in AP, IB, and high school and middle school advanced coursework. Descriptive analysis of individual school demonstrated a similar trend.

Enrollment of ELs in advanced coursework in grades 6 through 12 demonstrated the performance/empowerment model of school district theory of action (McAdams & Katzir, 2013). Within this context, schools in a school district are responsible for changes within a school with regards to resource allocation and instructional decisions. Using this paradigm, the differences in enrollment of ELs in advanced coursework are dependent upon decisions made by individual school instructional leaders. Although LUSD maintained an open access approach to advanced coursework, the proportion of EL high school advanced course enrollment (4.5%) was small. This finding is consistent with other research (Trujillo, 2012; Kanno & Kangas, 2014), which found that ELs were

underrepresented in advanced coursework. However, at the middle school level, the paradigm was different with a larger proportion of ELs (7%) participating in advanced coursework. The higher proportion of enrollment in middle school advanced coursework could be indicative of a stronger curricular alignment process occurring between instructional leaders and teachers in an effort to prepare students for rigorous coursework in high school, which would be consistent with the literature (Flores & Gomez, 2011). This paradigm also was reflected in the middle school feeder patterns to the high schools. The high schools that had a higher proportion of EL advanced course enrollment were within the feeder pattern of the middle schools that demonstrated a higher proportion of EL advanced course enrollment. The middle school feeder pattern of the high schools had an impact on EL advanced coursework enrollment.

In terms of ELs enrolled in AP and IB courses in the Large Urban School District, high schools had a higher proportion of EL advanced course enrollment in AP (3%) than in IB (0.2%). This is likely reflective of LUSD's open access approach to AP coursework using the College Board's AP Potential Tool to identify students likely to succeed in AP coursework (The College Board, 2012). Adoption of this tool as a method of open access helped to identify students who were not necessarily in the top echelon of their high schools and is consistent with the literature (Flores & Gomez, 2011). However, although strides were made via the open-access approach, at 13 of the 19 high schools, AP EL course enrollment was under 4 percent, a finding that reinforces findings in the literature (Kanno & Kangas, 2014), reflecting an underrepresentation of ELs in AP coursework in these 13 high schools.

IB is an area of concern for LUSD as EL representation in the IB program is very low (0.2%). Although open access has been used to increase enrollment in AP courses, IB functions as a magnet program within the Large Urban School District, limiting accessibility to the IB advanced program. To be in IB, students must apply through LUSD's magnet program before being accepted into the IB program. As a magnet program, it has not been utilized as a vehicle for the acceleration of ELs, although the IB program has been shown to be effective as an acceleration mechanism and as a method of closing the achievement gap for ELs by other school districts as found in the literature (Mayer, 2012; Turner, 2015).

Additional analysis completed on proportions of enrollment in types of courses revealed that ELs were likely to be enrolled in advanced mathematics, science, and social studies in LUSD high schools, which was a different finding from the literature (Callahan, 2005; Callahan et al., 2010). This is perhaps due to the findings in the literature being representative of the results of a national study, while this study analyzed enrollment in only one urban school district. Additionally, ELs categorized as Limited Former (LF) also were enrolled in advanced language arts courses at the high school level. The additional analysis also demonstrated a similar dynamic at the middle school level with EL representation in advanced mathematics, science, and language arts, if the EL was designated as LF.

Research Question 2

What is the relationship, if any, between the proportion of overall student achievement in advanced courses and EL student achievement in advanced courses in middle school and high school?

The data obtained from the Large Urban School District on the achievement of English learners (EL) in advanced coursework revealed statistically significant differences in proportions of EL and non-EL achievement as measured by exam grade in Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) and final letter grade in high school advanced coursework and middle school advanced coursework in the aggregate. This finding indicated a higher proportion of non-EL achievement in high school and middle school advanced courses across the school district. For AP, however, the statistical difference in proportions of achievement revealed proportionately higher achievement for ELs. In terms of IB, statistically significant differences in proportions of EL and non-EL achievement were not present. This result indicated similar proportions of achievement for ELs and non-ELs. Individual analysis of proportions of EL and non-EL achievement by school site for advanced coursework work in mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies revealed that significant and non-significant differences in proportions of achievement varied by school. In AP statistically significant differences in proportions of achievement found in individual schools pointed to higher EL achievement with one exception. Conversely, in high school and middle school advanced courses, statistically significant differences in proportions of achievement pointed to

higher non-EL achievement with only one exception in high school where EL achievement was higher.

In analyzing AP scores for ELs, Limited Former (LF) students and Limited Yes (LY) outperformed non-ELs with LYs earning a higher mean score ($M = 3.14$) on AP exams taken. When enrolled in AP coursework, differences in proportions of EL and non-EL exam achievement were not statistically significant at 11 of the 19 high schools. In seven of the eight remaining high schools, however, statistical differences highlighted higher EL achievement. It should be noted that the majority of ELs were enrolled in AP Spanish and AP French language and literature courses, which were delivered in either ELs' heritage language or a language closely related to ELs' heritage language. The higher proportion of AP achievement demonstrated the ability of ELs to achieve highly in AP coursework.

Unlike AP, IB proportions of EL and non-EL exam achievement were not statistically significant at the two LUSD IB high schools that had EL IB course enrollment. Proportions of achievement for ELs and non-ELs were similar. This finding suggests the ability of IB to act as an acceleration mechanism for ELs as found in the literature (Turner, 2015; Mayer, 2012).

EL achievement in advanced coursework in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science also revealed that some schools did not have significant differences in proportions of achievement. Of the 57 middle schools and high schools included in the study, 16 middle schools and six high schools did not have significant differences in proportions of achievement, indicating similar proportions of achievement for ELs and

non-ELs. These results point to ELs' ability to engage in the same rigorous coursework as non-ELs when enrolled in advanced coursework. This finding for ELs' achievement in advanced coursework adds to the existing literature that has focused on ELs' performance in remedial coursework and standardized assessments (Gwynne et al., 2012; Gándara et al., 2003).

Additional analysis by course demonstrated that in advanced mathematics, language arts, science, and science at the high school level, ELs' achievement was above 70 percent. In middle school, EL achievement was above 80 percent in mathematics, language arts, and science and 70 percent in social studies. The proportions of achievement between LY and LF ELs were similar, which was a different finding from the literature, which found that long-term ELs tended to earn lower grades than new ELs as measured by grade point average (Gwynne et al., 2012). This researcher's study, however, did not include an analysis of grade point average.

Research Question 3

What are the school district policies and guidelines that govern access to advanced courses for ELs in middle school and high school?

The document analyses of the school district policy and guideline document and middle school and high school curriculum guides yielded four dominant elements that were represented in each of the documents analyzed: (1) English learner (EL) plan and placement, (2) grade level and course placement, (3) equal access to programs, and (4) student progression. The analysis of the middle school and high school curriculum

guides, revealed that the EL access elements were contained in the curriculum guide sections and correlated to the following elements found in the curriculum guides: (1) English Language Arts Course description, (2) inclusion of EL classes within the course selection document, (3) EL academic achievement support structures, and (4) access statements contained in the principals' address to students.

The Large Urban School District's (LUSD) EL policy and guideline documents made available to schools provided guidance primarily on issues of compliance to ensure that school procedures related to ELs are within the parameters of applicable state and federal laws, such as the Consent Decree of 1990, the Equal Education Opportunities Act, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and Race to the Top Fund (Consent Decree of 1990; US Education Law, 2015; No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; United States Department of Education, 2010). In issuing the policy and guideline documents and providing oversight via the Large Urban School District's *School Visit Monitoring Tool*, the school district employed a managed instruction model (McAdams & Katzir, 2013) with regards to ELs' academic progress in its schools.

The EL access elements grounded in the school district's EL district plan and evident throughout its policy and guideline documents ensured that all ELs had access to all academic programs within schools. However, like the provisions in the Consent Decree of 1990, the school district policy and guideline documents did not make specific references to ELs in advanced coursework with the exception of the EL district plan that made one reference to Advanced Placement coursework. Although advanced coursework is not specifically mentioned, the school district policy and guideline documents did

make specific references to having schools ensure that students are placed in classes that are commensurate with prior schooling. Additionally, the school district's documents also ascertained that ELs received academic support as necessary to ensure their academic success and college and career readiness as required by state and federal mandates (Consent Decree of 1990; No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; Race to the Top Fund, 2009). The LUSD school district documents, like other school district documents (Turner, 2015), LUSD relied on state and federal mandates to ensure ELs' academic support, but not explicitly the acceleration of ELs through advanced coursework.

At the school level, the curriculum guides were indicative of a performance/empowerment model of accountability and autonomy for schools and the ELs they served in that the curriculum guides were tailored to the needs of individual schools (McAdams & Katzir, 2013). The EL access elements contained within the curriculum guides were evidence of this as only one curriculum guide demonstrated evidence of all four EL access elements. Within the curriculum guides, evidence of the EL English Language Arts description and its inclusion in the course selection document pointed to ELs' equal access to programs at the school site. Access statements made by principals went a step further, encouraging students to engage in advanced coursework at their schools, demonstrating an equity orientation from the school's instructional leader, similar to the findings in the literature of the necessity of instructional leaders to promote social justice within their schools (Reihl, 2009; Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). However, not all curriculum guides contained principal access statements.

Within the curriculum guides at both the middle school and high school levels, only one curriculum guide demonstrated evidence of explicit EL support structures, suggesting that the instructional leader of this particular high school was better prepared to address the needs of ELs, which supports the literature on administrator preparation to address ELs' needs (Baecher et al., 2013; Tredway et al., 2012; Trujillo & Cooper, 2014).

Implications for Practice

The academic advancement of ELs began with the landmark cases at the federal level (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974) and state level (*LULAC et al. v. State Board of Education Consent Decree*, 1990), which determined the academic trajectories of ELs in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade education. The passage of federal educational policy, such as the Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974 and the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1964 and its reauthorizations through the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and Race to the Top Fund (United States Department of Education, 2010) played a major role in the crafting of educational policy for ELs across the United States. In particular, both No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top Fund included provisions for accelerated mechanisms, such as Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate, to increase the achievement of disadvantaged groups in the United States (United States Department of Education, 2010). In turn, the crafting of federal educational policies and the concomitant state cases influenced the educational policies adopted at the state level and manifested in school-district level policies, guidelines, and procedures.

The findings of this study have many implications for the acceleration mechanisms articulated by school districts and implemented by middle schools and high schools to ensure the college and career readiness of ELs through advanced coursework. Instructional leaders at the school-district and school-level intent on increasing access for ELs to advanced coursework may take an interest in the findings this study with the purpose of augmenting ELs' future educational opportunities.

For instructional leaders at the school-district level, the findings of this study may suggest the need for a social justice orientation (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Reihl, 2009; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011; Tredway et al., 2012; Trujillo & Cooper, 2014) at the school-district level to ensure that ELs have equal access to advanced coursework in middle school and high school. The findings for research question one suggest the need to establish specific mechanisms at the school-district level that ascertain that ELs will be enrolled in advanced coursework. Statistically significant differences were found in the proportion of EL course enrollment in advanced coursework in grades 6-12. Moreover, the findings from research question three found that the current managed instruction model (McAdams & Katzir, 2013) implemented by the LUSD with regards to EL compliance issues contained within the Consent Decree provides a framework from which the school district can ensure a social justice orientation. Federal and state law and policy mandates provide the language school districts may consider using to increase EL enrollment in advanced coursework (Turner, 2015) when creating school-district level policy and guideline documents.

This study also provides implications related to EL achievement in advanced coursework in grades 6-12 as shown by findings from research question two. As with EL course enrollment, there were statistically significant differences in proportions of achievement for ELs in Advanced Placement (AP), high school advanced coursework, and middle school advanced coursework. In AP, these statistical differences in proportions of achievement pointed to a higher proportion of achievement for ELs in AP courses. The findings from this study suggest that ELs achieve highly in AP courses. School districts may wish to consider increasing EL enrollment in AP courses from current levels of AP enrollment (Kanno & Kangas, 2014), particularly in AP world language and literature courses.

Statistically significant differences in proportions of achievement were not found for ELs in LUSD's IB programs. This finding supports the use of IB programs to accelerate the achievement of ELs in school districts (Turner, 2015; Mayer, 2012). School districts may want to consider increasing EL enrollment in IB. The findings from research question two suggest a need to for school districts to provide a framework and monitoring of support for ELs within advanced classes. Research question three revealed a progress monitoring component embedded within LUSD's school visit monitoring tool (School Board of Orange County, 2014b), which school districts could consider augmenting to include progress monitoring of ELs' achievement in advanced coursework and college-level exams as well as support mechanisms for ELs' achievement in those courses.

For instructional leaders at the school-level, the findings from this study pose new avenues to ensure ELs' college and career readiness in grades 6-12. Findings for individual schools in research question one as related to ELs' advanced coursework course enrollment will be useful in analyzing an individual school's differences in proportions of EL and non-EL course enrollment and addressing inequities through school-level mechanisms using the performance/empowerment model (McAdams & Katzir, 2013). Moreover, analysis of the middle school and high school feeder patterns on EL course enrollment in advanced coursework will be beneficial for school districts when determining the vertical alignment and articulation of ELs into advanced coursework at the high school level.

Findings from research question three suggest that schools have latitude in employing strategies at the school level to ensure access to advanced coursework for all students. Additionally, the findings from research question three suggested an emerging commitment to an open access approach on the part of instructional leaders to engage in inclusive practices to support the needs of diverse learners (Tredway et al., 2012; Trujillo & Cooper, 2014). Findings from research question two suggest that ELs' achievement in advanced coursework was not disproportionately less at all schools. In several instances, particularly in AP, IB, and at middle school level, ELs' proportion of achievement was not statistically significant different from that of non-ELs, indicating that EL achievement was proportionate to non-EL achievement. In AP where there were statistical differences in proportions of achievement, EL achievement was higher.

Given this context and the findings from the additional analysis, schools may consider encouraging ELs to enroll in advanced coursework in specific content areas. In advanced mathematics, science, and social studies, for example, schools may consider an increase in the number of LYs and LFs enrolled. In advanced language arts, schools may consider an increase in LF enrollment in advanced coursework. Increases in the advanced coursework enrollment in mathematics, science, and social studies would ameliorate the current underrepresentation of ELs in these courses (Callahan, 2005; Callahan et al., 2010).

Based on the findings of this study, this researcher suggests the following additions that LUSD and other school districts may choose to consider incorporating into school-district level policy and guideline documents provided to schools and recommendations for school-level practices:

1. EL school district plans submitted to a state department of education may mention specifically all of the academic acceleration mechanisms available within the school district to ELs and methods to progress monitor the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework.
2. School visit monitoring tools may have an added component that collects information on the number of ELs enrolled in advanced coursework per school site.
3. School visit monitoring tools may monitor the academic support structures available to ELs in advanced coursework to ensure ELs' academic achievement.
4. School districts' guideline and policy documents on EL program placement may include a subsection dedicated specifically to the enrollment of ELs in advanced

- coursework in grades 6-12 and recommendations for content areas for EL advanced coursework enrollment.
5. School districts' policy and guideline documents on EL instructional program models may include a subsection on EL support structures in advanced classes.
 6. School districts' policy and guideline documents on EL progress and review and EL student progression should provide advice to schools in the form of course progressions to ensure that ELs are enrolled in advanced coursework.
 7. School-level instructional leaders may consider monitoring the number of ELs enrolled in advanced coursework and provide for access at their school sites.
 8. School-level instructional leaders may consider increasing the number of ELs enrolled in Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate coursework.
 9. School-level instructional leaders may consider monitoring the achievement of ELs in advanced coursework and ensuring that appropriate academic support structures are in place to support ELs in advanced classes.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study generated suggestions for future research regarding the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework and the effect of school-district level policies and guidelines and school-based practices.

1. Future research could determine what differences, if any, there are in the proportion of EL enrollment and achievement in advanced courses in other large urban school districts.
2. Future research could determine the school-based practices implemented by instructional leaders, including principals, assistant principals, and school-based instructional coaches, that impact ELs' enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework.
3. Future research could determine the school-based practices related to the counseling of ELs to determine the impact, if any, on ELs' enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework.
4. Future research could determine the classroom practices of advanced classes that contribute to ELs' achievement in advanced coursework.
5. Future research could determine the factors that promote or inhibit ELs' access to Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate coursework in school districts.
6. Future could determine the relationship, if any, between EL advanced coursework enrollment in middle school and EL course enrollment in middle school and high school feeder patterns.

7. Future research could determine the academic tracks of ELs enrolled in advanced coursework at the middle school level through the completion of high school to determine persistence in advanced coursework.
8. Future research could determine the impact, if any, of standardized testing on ELs' access to advanced coursework.

Conclusion

The academic achievement of ELs was influenced by the passage of landmark court cases both at the national and state level (Lau v. Nichols, 1974; LULAC v State Board of Education Consent Decree, 1990). Additionally, this group's academic opportunities have been tied to educational national, state, and local policy, which exhorted school districts to ensure that ELs had equal access to academic programs available in schools. However, there has been little emphasis at the state and local level on the enrollment and achievement of ELs in advanced coursework. Existing research on EL achievement has focused primarily on the remediation of ELs based on the results of standardized testing (Wang & Goldschmidt, 2003; Gándara et al., 2003; Callahan et al., 2010). There is, however, emergent research on the enrollment of ELs in advanced coursework (Callahan, 2005; Flores & Gomez, 2011; Kanno & Kangas, 2014).

LUSD's EL course enrollment demonstrated an underrepresentation of this group in advanced coursework across the 57 secondary schools in this study. EL achievement within advanced coursework also demonstrated differences in achievement levels with

non-ELs demonstrating higher achievement levels in high school advanced coursework and middle school advanced coursework. In Advanced Placement coursework, however, ELs demonstrated higher achievement levels than non-ELs at the aggregate level. In International Baccalaureate EL and non-EL achievement was proportionate. Further analysis of individual school sites demonstrated that in some cases, EL achievement in advanced coursework was proportionate to that of non-ELs. These sites provide valuable information on effective mechanisms to increase the incidence of this phenomenon to other urban secondary schools.

The additional analysis of enrollment and achievement by course in middle school and high school demonstrated high levels of achievement for ELs in the courses where there was high EL representation. Analysis of school-level demographic variables for schools with high enrollment and low achievement, high enrollment and high achievement, low enrollment and low achievement, and low enrollment and high achievement demonstrated that high school and middle schools who met this criteria were, in most cases, similar in gender and ethnicity composition and poverty rate. However, in some instances, the high schools and middle schools differed in ethnicity composition, representing higher Hispanic, black, or white enrollment, and differed in poverty rates.

This research study was completed to shed light on the current state of ELs' enrollment and achievement in advanced coursework to provide an impetus for school districts to determine their current state. By doing so, school districts will be able to craft policies and guidelines that will influence the school-based practices that govern ELs'

access to advanced coursework. This will shift the paradigm for ELs from remediation to acceleration of academic achievement for this group.

APPENDIX A
ADVANCED PLACEMENT COURSE ENROLLMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT
TABLES

Table 48

*Limited Yes and Limited Former Advanced Placement (AP) Course Enrollment in 19**High Schools 2011-2014*

Rank	High School	EL AP Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Yes AP Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Yes AP Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Former AP Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Former AP Course Enrollment (%)
1	HS 11	16.7	60	10.1	39	6.6
2	HS 16	7.2	66	3.3	80	4.0
3	HS 8	7.0	133	2.3	272	4.7
4	HS 2	6.8	69	2.5	121	4.3
5	HS 17	5.0	15	1.6	34	3.4
6	HS 18	4.4	19	0.9	76	3.6
7	HS 4	2.7	21	1.1	29	1.5
8	HS 13	2.7	18	0.3	127	2.3
9	HS 7	2.6	14	1.4	12	1.2
10	HS 10	2.2	47	1.1	51	1.1
11	HS 3	2.0	18	1.0	18	1.0
12	HS 6	1.8	17	0.5	50	1.4
13	HS 12	1.8	12	0.8	14	1.0
14	HS 5	1.5	13	0.4	31	1.0
15	HS 14	1.5	25	0.5	44	0.9
16	HS 15	1.4	20	0.4	45	1.0
17	HS 19	1.1	11	0.3	38	0.9
18	HS 9	0.8	8	0.3	12	0.5
19	HS 1	0.8	4	0.6	13	0.6
	Total	3.0	590	1.0	1,106	2.0

Note. AP = Advanced Placement. Table is rank ordered by EL AP course enrollment percentage.

Table 49

Nineteen High Schools' Aggregate Advanced Placement Exam Achievement: English Learners and Non-English Learners 2011-2014

Rank	High School	EL Scores 3 or Higher (%)	EL Scores 2 or Lower (%)	Non-EL Scores 3 or Higher (%)	Non-EL 2 or Lower (%)	Total 3 or Higher (%)
1	HS 11	10.8	5.9	25.2	58.1	36.0
2	HS 16	4.5	2.8	20.1	72.6	24.6
3	HS 2	4.1	2.6	43.2	50.1	47.3
4	HS 8	3.5	3.5	38.4	54.6	41.9
5	HS 18	2.2	2.2	40.9	54.6	43.2
6	HS 13	1.5	1.0	50.6	46.8	52.1
7	HS 10	1.3	0.9	42.0	55.8	43.2
8	HS 5	1.2	0.3	59.1	39.4	60.3
9	HS 14	1.2	0.3	66.6	31.9	67.8
10	HS 12	1.0	0.8	40.7	57.6	41.7
11	HS 4	1.0	1.7	30.0	67.4	30.9
12	HS 3	1.0	1.0	35.8	62.2	37.1
13	HS 19	0.8	0.4	66.0	32.9	66.8
14	HS 6	0.7	1.1	30.5	67.7	31.2
15	HS 15	0.5	0.9	57.3	41.3	57.8
16	HS 9	0.4	0.4	46.3	52.9	46.7
17	HS 7	0.2	2.4	7.2	90.2	7.4
18	HS 1	0.1	0.6	38.9	60.4	39.0
19	HS 17	0.0	5.0	6.0	89.0	6.0
	Total	1.3	1.4	45.1	51.8	46.4

Note. Proportion of achievement for each group is proportionate to all exams completed by EL and non-EL subgroups.

Table 50

Advanced Placement Exam Mean Scores and Standard Deviations: Limited Former, Limited Yes, and Non-English Learners in 19 High Schools 2011-2014

High School	Limited Former Score		Limited Yes Score		Non-EL Score	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
HS 15	3.35	1.52	4.08	0.95	2.87	1.24
HS 18	3.23	1.29	3.68	0.80	3.09	1.18
HS 12	3.08	1.38	4.09	0.94	3.04	1.16
HS 5	2.85	1.53	3.15	1.22	2.01	1.16
HS 4	2.74	1.55	3.65	1.30	1.84	1.03
HS 6	2.69	1.36	3.06	1.31	2.62	1.21
HS 10	2.63	1.44	3.09	1.33	2.37	1.23
HS 17	2.63	1.40	3.65	1.22	2.48	1.19
HS 11	2.50	1.48	3.32	1.34	2.39	1.21
HS 9	2.50	1.30	2.67	1.14	2.22	1.17
HS 13	2.43	1.70	3.42	1.44	2.39	1.27
HS 2	2.42	1.44	3.63	1.51	2.49	1.19
HS 8	2.36	1.26	2.25	1.45	2.83	1.23
HS 14	2.28	1.22	2.05	1.16	2.08	1.14
HS 16	2.24	1.45	3.12	1.41	2.36	1.15
HS 3	1.94	1.28	3.24	1.52	2.04	1.11
HS 7	1.77	0.73	2.00	0.82	2.30	1.15
HS 1	1.15	0.36	1.00	0.00	1.27	0.66
HS 19	1.08	0.29	1.36	0.93	1.35	0.69
Total	2.53	1.44	3.14	1.40	2.49	1.24

Note. Table is organized by Limited Former mean scores.

APPENDIX B
INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE COURSE ENROLLMENT AND
ACHIEVEMENT TABLES

Table 51

*International Baccalaureate (IB) Limited Yes and Limited Former Course Enrollment**2012-2014 in Five High Schools*

Rank	High School	IB EL Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Yes IB Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Yes IB Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Former IB Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Former IB Course Enrollment (%)
1	HS 17	1.1	0	0	6	1.1
2	HS 19	0.1	0	0	1	0.1
3	HS 6	0	0	0	0	0
4	HS 18	0	0	0	0	0
5	HS 7	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	7	0	0	7	0.2

Table 52

*Five High Schools' Aggregate International Baccalaureate (IB) Exam Achievement**2012-2014*

High School	EL Scores 4 or Higher (%)	EL Scores 3 or Lower (%)	Non-EL Scores 4 or Higher (%)	Non-EL 3 or Lower (%)	Total 4 or Higher (%)
HS 17	0.7	0.4	52.8	46.1	53.6
HS 19	0.1	0.0	91.1	8.8	91.2
HS 18	0	0	91.0	9.0	91.0
HS 6	0	0	81.0	19.0	81.0
HS 7	0	0	29.0	71.0	29.0
Total	0.1	0.05	80.4	19.3	80.6

Note. Proportions of achievement for each group proportionate to all exams taken by EL and non-EL subgroups. Table is in rank order by EL Scores 4 or Higher.

Table 53

International Baccalaureate Exam Mean Scores and Standard Deviations: Limited Former and Non-English Learners in Five High Schools 2012-2014

High School	Limited Former Score		Non-English Learner Score	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
HS 19	4.00	.00	4.68	.90
HS 17	3.67	.52	3.61	1.11
HS 18	0	0	4.74	.93
HS 6	0	0	4.39	1.04
HS 7	0	0	3.01	1.02

Note. Table is organized by Limited Former mean score.

APPENDIX C
HIGH SCHOOL ADVANCED COURSEWORK ENROLLMENT AND
ACHIEVEMENT

Table 54

Limited Yes and Limited Formers Advanced Course Enrollment in 19 High Schools 2009-2014

Rank	High School	EL Advanced Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Yes Advanced Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Yes Advanced Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Former Advanced Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Former Advanced Course Enrollment (%)
1	HS 11	9.7	274	3.7	452	6.0
2	HS 18	8.9	474	2.1	1,510	6.8
3	HS 16	8.8	704	3.6	1,022	5.2
4	HS 17	8.2	543	3.9	602	4.3
5	HS 2	8.1	394	3.5	517	4.6
6	HS 8	7.8	525	2.9	900	4.9
7	HS 13	3.9	285	0.9	998	3.0
8	HS 10	3.9	438	1.6	633	2.3
9	HS 12	3.9	168	1.3	351	2.6
10	HS 7	3.9	60	1.6	89	2.3
11	HS 4	3.7	211	1.3	409	2.4
12	HS 15	3.6	303	1.3	564	2.3
13	HS 6	3.5	207	1.0	534	2.5
14	HS 14	3.4	138	0.6	696	2.8
15	HS 3	2.9	176	1.1	279	1.8
16	HS 1	2.0	79	0.7	155	1.3
17	HS 9	1.9	76	0.4	275	1.5
18	HS 19	1.5	79	0.3	271	1.2
19	HS 5	1.4	41	0.2	263	1.2
	Total	4.5	5,175	1.5	10,520	3.0

Note. EL = English learner. Table is in rank order by EL Advanced Course Enrollment.

Table 55

Nineteen High Schools' Aggregate Advanced Course Achievement by Grades 2009-2014

High School	EL Grades A, B, or C (%)	EL Grades D or F (%)	Non-EL Grades A, B, or C (%)	Non-EL Grades D or F (%)	Total Grades A, B, or C (%)
HS 11	7.9	1.8	76.6	13.7	84.5
HS 18	7.6	1.3	79.0	12.1	86.6
HS 2	7.5	0.6	85.6	6.4	93.0
HS 16	7.5	1.3	77.9	13.3	85.4
HS 17	7.1	1.1	75.1	16.7	82.2
HS 8	6.9	0.9	84.3	7.9	91.2
HS 12	3.5	0.4	86.5	9.6	90.0
HS 13	3.4	0.5	88.2	7.9	91.6
HS 14	3.1	0.3	89.2	7.4	92.3
HS 10	3.1	0.8	84.7	11.4	87.7
HS 15	3.0	0.6	85.0	11.4	88.1
HS 7	3.0	0.8	76.5	19.6	79.5
HS 6	2.8	0.7	84.5	12.0	87.3
HS 4	2.7	1.0	79.8	16.5	82.5
HS 3	2.3	0.5	84.9	12.3	87.2
HS 1	1.6	0.3	81.9	16.2	83.5
HS 9	1.5	0.4	83.5	14.6	85.0
HS 19	1.3	0.2	91.2	7.3	92.5
HS 5	1.2	0.2	91.5	7.1	92.7
Total	3.8	0.7	84.5	11	88.3

Note. EL = English learner. EL final letter grade achievement is reported in relation to overall EL and non-EL final letter grade achievement per school in advanced coursework from 2009-2014. Table is rank ordered by EL Grades A, B, or C.

APPENDIX D
MIDDLE SCHOOL ADVANCED COURSEWORK ENROLLMENT AND
ACHIEVEMENT

Table 56

Limited Yes & Limited Former Advanced Course Enrollment in 38 Middle Schools 2009-2014

Rank	Middle School	EL Advanced Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Yes Advanced Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Yes Advanced Course Enrollment (%)	Limited Former Advanced Course Enrollment (f)	Limited Former Advanced Course Enrollment (%)
1	MS 35	25.3	116	2.9	882	22.3
2	MS 18	19.0	559	5.3	1,465	13.8
3	MS 6	16.8	84	2.3	526	14.5
4	MS 5	14.7	288	3.7	846	11.0
5	MS 31	14.6	104	2.2	586	12.4
6	MS 38	12.9	124	2.0	690	10.9
7	MS 36	12.8	141	3.1	444	9.7
8	MS 27	12.0	27	1.3	231	10.7
9	MS 4	11.5	220	2.7	711	8.8
10	MS 37	10.8	55	1.3	410	9.5
11	MS 25	10.8	37	1.6	208	9.2
12	MS 21	10.1	90	1.4	557	8.7
13	MS 19	7.7	106	1.1	642	6.6
14	MS 16	7.4	108	1.6	383	5.8
15	MS 29	7.2	65	0.7	599	6.5
16	MS 33	7.1	23	0.5	291	6.6
17	MS 26	6.6	32	0.4	464	6.2
18	MS 20	6.5	426	2.7	601	3.8
19	MS 34	5.7	111	1.0	504	4.7
20	MS 3	5.6	47	0.6	403	5.0
21	MS 2	4.7	24	0.4	268	4.3
22	MS 32	4.4	25	0.4	254	4.0
23	MS 8	4.4	27	0.4	254	4.0
24	MS 30	4.1	11	0.3	132	3.8
25	MS 9	4.0	98	1.0	282	3.0
26	MS 7	3.7	62	0.6	341	3.1
27	MS 24	3.6	119	1.2	247	2.4
28	MS 22	3.5	74	0.8	257	2.7
29	MS 10	3.2	14	0.7	50	2.5
30	MS 14	3.1	22	0.3	198	2.8
31	MS 13	3.1	61	0.9	151	2.2
32	MS 11	2.9	15	0.4	102	2.5
33	MS 17	2.9	108	0.8	258	2.0
34	MS 1	2.5	45	0.5	165	2.0
35	MS 15	2.2	44	0.4	226	1.8
36	MS 28	2.2	9	0.3	58	1.9
37	MS 23	1.3	4	0.2	45	1.2
38	MS 12	0.9	7	0.2	22	0.7
	Total	7.0	3,532	1.4	14,753	5.6

Table 57

Chi-square Values for English Learners and Non-English Learners for Advanced Coursework Achievement in 38 Middle Schools 2009-2014

Middle School	Chi-square Value	DF	N	p
MS 11	0.03	1	4,054	.875
MS 30	0.14	1	3,507	.706
MS 33	0.14	1	4,429	.705
MS 36	0.19	1	4,569	.660
MS 10	0.28	1	1,992	.600
MS 25	0.51	1	2,266	.475
MS 12	0.53	1	3,064	.470
MS 37	0.94	1	4,294	.333
MS 24	1.20	1	10,109	.273
MS 3	1.60	1	8,087	.205
MS 27	2.08	1	2,156	.149
MS 7	2.46	1	11,017	.117
MS 13	2.48	1	6,878	.115
MS 35	3.44	1	3,940	.064
MS 6	3.44	1	3,638	.064
MS 38	3.55	1	6,332	.060
MS 5	5.73	1	7,704	.017
MS 26	6.28	1	7,489	.012
MS 21	6.59	1	6,408	.010
MS 8	7.91	1	6,416	.005
MS 15	8.83	1	12,386	.003
MS 31	8.84	1	4,739	.003
MS 23	9.17	1	3,660	.002
MS 14	12.33	1	6,997	.000
MS 16	32.42	1	6,604	.000
MS 2	14.14	1	6,169	.000
MS 29	21.65	1	9,251	.000
MS 20	234.61	1	15,701	.000
MS 17	48.73	1	12,721	.000
MS 4	23.77	1	8,056	.000
MS 19	17.61	1	9,721	.000
MS 18	108.72	1	10,553	.000
MS 9	12.51	1	9,460	.000
MS 32	13.67	1	6,348	.000
MS 1	30.98	1	8,380	.000
MS 22	14.06	1	9,583	.000
MS 28	15.08	1	3,006	.000
MS 34	15.76	1	10,823	.000

Table 58

Thirty-Eight Middle Schools' Aggregate Advanced Course Achievement by Grades 2009-2014

Middle School	EL Grades A, B, or C (%)	EL Grades D or F (%)	Non-EL A, B, or C (%)	Non-EL D or F (%)	Total Pass (%)
MS 35	23.7	1.6	71.2	3.5	94.9
MS 6	16.1	0.7	81.1	2.1	97.2
MS 18	15.5	3.6	72.6	8.3	88.1
MS 5	13.9	0.8	82.1	3.2	96.0
MS 31	13.5	1.0	81.6	3.8	95.1
MS 36	11.7	1.1	80.1	7.1	91.7
MS 38	11.7	1.2	80.8	6.3	92.5
MS 27	11.0	1.0	83.4	4.6	94.4
MS 25	10.2	0.6	83.4	5.8	93.6
MS 4	10.0	1.5	81.4	7.1	91.4
MS 37	9.7	1.1	78.8	10.4	88.5
MS 21	9.7	0.4	87.8	2.0	97.5
MS 19	7.2	0.5	89.1	3.2	96.3
MS 33	7.0	0.1	91.4	1.5	98.4
MS 29	6.8	0.4	90.5	2.3	97.3
MS 26	6.4	0.2	91.8	1.6	98.2
MS 16	6.2	1.2	84.6	8.0	90.8
MS 34	5.5	0.2	93.0	1.3	98.5
MS 3	5.4	0.2	92.4	2.1	97.7
MS 20	5.2	1.3	87.1	6.3	92.4
MS 2	4.4	0.3	92.7	2.6	97.1
MS 8	4.2	0.2	93.4	2.2	97.6
MS 9	3.7	0.3	92.7	3.3	96.4
MS 32	3.7	0.6	87.9	7.8	91.6
MS 30	3.7	0.4	88.1	7.9	91.8
MS 7	3.5	0.1	94.7	1.6	98.3
MS 24	3.5	0.1	92.4	4.0	95.9
MS 22	3.1	0.3	92.9	3.7	96.1
MS 10	3.1	0.1	95.9	4.1	99.1
MS 11	2.7	0.1	92.6	4.5	95.4
MS 13	2.7	0.4	86.9	10.0	89.6
MS 14	2.5	0.6	85.1	11.8	87.6
MS 17	2.4	0.4	9.4	5.7	93.8
MS 1	2.3	0.2	95.5	1.9	97.9
MS 15	2.1	0.1	96.2	1.7	98.3
MS 28	2.0	0.2	95.2	2.5	97.2
MS 23	1.3	0.1	97.5	1.2	98.7
MS 12	0.9	0.0	97.3	1.8	98.2
Total	6.3	0.9	88.4	4.4	89.3

Note. EL = English learner. Table is rank ordered by EL Grades A, B, or C.

APPENDIX E
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**
To: **Marjorie Ceballos**
Date: **June 24, 2015**

Dear Researcher:

On 06/24/2015, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: AN ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT-LEVEL POLICY AND GUIDELINES RELATED TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS' ENROLLMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT IN ADVANCED COURSES
Investigator: Marjorie Ceballos
IRB Number: SBE-15-11359
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#)

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 06/24/2015 09:19:18 AM EDT

IRB manager

APPENDIX F
ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS APPROVAL



Orange County Public Schools

445 West Amale Street • Orlando, FL 32801-1729 • Phone: 407.317.3200 • www.ocps.net

Notice of Approval

Approval Date: 9/18/15 Approval Number: **0019**
 Project Title: **An Analysis of School District-Level Policy and Guidelines Related to English Language Learners' Enrollment and Achievement in Advanced Courses**
 Requester: **Marjorie Caballos**
 Project Director/Advisor: **Rosemarie Taylor**
 Sponsor Agency/Institutional Affiliation: **University of Central Florida**

Thank you for your request to conduct research in Orange County Public Schools. We have reviewed and approved your application. This Notice of Approval expires one year after issue, 9/17/16.

If you are interacting with OCPS staff or students, you should have submitted a Principal Notification Form with your application. You may now email the principals who have indicated interest in participating, including this Notice as an attachment. After initial contact with principals, you may then email any necessary staff. This notice does not obligate administrators, teachers, students, or families of students to participate in your study; participation is entirely voluntary.

OCPS badges are required to enter any OCPS campus or building (see the [Security Clearance Flow Chart](#)).

You are responsible for submitting a [Change Request Form](#) to this office prior to implementing any changes to the currently approved protocol. If any problems or unexpected adverse reactions occur as a result of this study, you must notify this office immediately by emailing a completed [Adverse Event Report Form](#). On or before 8/18/16, you must complete a [Request for Renewal or Extension of a Study Submission](#). Email all forms to caseci@ocps.net. All forms may be found at www.ocps.net/es/harvins/accountability/Pages/Research.aspx.

Should you have questions or need assistance, please contact Mary Ann White at (407) 317-3201 or maryannwhite@ocps.net.

Best wishes for continued success.

Tavy Chen, Ed.D.
tavy.chen@ocps.net
Director of Accountability, Research and Evaluation
Orange County Public Schools

Cc: Brandon McKelvey, Senior Director, brandon.mckelvey@ocps.net

"The Orange County School Board is an equal opportunity agency."

REFERENCES

- Articulated Acceleration Mechanisms, F.S. 1007.27 (2014).
- Baecher, L., Knoll, M., & Patti, J. (2013). Addressing English learners in the school leadership curriculum: Mapping the terrain. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 8, 280-303. doi: 10.1177/1942775/113498377
- Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document analysis as a quantitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9, 27-40. doi: 10.33161QRJ0902027
- Cambridge International Examination (2015). Cambridge AICE Diploma. Retrieved from <http://www.cie.org.uk/programmes-and-qualifications/cambridge-advanced/cambridge-aice-diploma/>
- Callahan, R.M. (2005). Tracking and high school English learners: Limiting opportunities to learn. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(2), 305-328.
- Callahan, R., Wilkinson, L., & Muller, C. (2010). Academic achievement and course taking among language minority youth in U.S. schools: Effects of ESL placement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 32, 84-117. doi: 10.3102/0162373709359805
- Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M.M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Education Policy*, 19, 201-222. doi: 10.177/0895904804271609.
- Canole, M., & Young, M. (2013). Standards for educational leaders: An analysis. Retrieved from the Council of Chief State School Officers website: [http://www.ccsso.org/documents/Analysis%20of%20Leadership%20Standards - Final-070913-RGB.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/documents/Analysis%20of%20Leadership%20Standards-Final-070913-RGB.pdf)

Council of Chief State School Officers (2015). ISLLC 2015: Model policy standards for educational leaders. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2015/RevisedDraftISLLCStandards2015.pdf>

Center for Applied Linguistics (2015). Mission and values. Retrieved from: <http://www.cal.org/who-we-are/mission-values>

Epline, C. (2014 May 21). Re: Proposal to state board through rule [Electronic mailing list message]. Retrieved from <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/learning-the-language/FloridaWIDAletter.JPG>

English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficiency Students, F.S. 1003.56 (2014).

Florida Department of Education (2007). Florida information note: English language learners. Retrieved from: <http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7584/urlt/0086410-ell0607.pdf>

Florida Department of Education (2014a). Consent Decree. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/academics/eng-language-learners/consent-decree.shtml>

Florida Department of Education (2014b). 2014-2015 course directory. Retrieved from <http://http://www.fldoe.org/policy/articulation/ccd/2014-2015-course-directory.shtml>

Florida Department of Education (2014c). PK-12 public school data publications and reports. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/data-sys/edu-info-accountability-services/pk-12-public-school-data-pubs-reports/students.shtml>

- Florida Department of Education (2014d). School Public Accountability Reports 2013-2014. Retrieved from http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/year1314/cfm?dist_number=48
- Florida Department of Education (2015). Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/teaching/professional-dev/the-fl-principal-leadership-starts>
- Florida Department of State (2010). Educator standards, preparation, and performance. Retrieved from <https://www.flrules.org/gateway/RuleNo.asp?ID=6A-5.080>
- Florida House of Representatives (2011). Student Grading Scales for Grades 6-12. Retrieved from http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/FileStores/Web/HouseContent/Approved/Web%20Site/education_fact_sheets/2011/documents/2010-11%20Student%20Grading%20Scale%20for%20Grades%206-12.3.pdf
- Flores, S., & Gomez, M.O. (2011). Strategies for increasing advanced placement for under-represented students: Barriers, practices, and positive outcomes. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1), 65-79. doi: 10.1177/0192636511406529
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H.H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gándara, P., Rumberger, R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). English learners in California schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(36), 1-54.

- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (2008). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Aldine Transation.
- Gwynne, J., Stitzel Pareja, A., Ehrlich, S.B., & Allensworth, E. (2012). What matters for staying on-track and graduating in Chicago Public Schools: A focus on English language learners. Retrieved from The University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research website: https://ccsr.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/ELL%20Report_0.pdf
- Hoerr, T.R. (2007). The principal connection: What is instructional leadership? *Informative Assessment*, 65 (4), 84-85. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/dec07/vol65/num04/What-Is-Instructional-Leadership.aspx>
- Howe, K.R. (2012). Mixed methods, triangulation and causal explanation. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6, 89-96. doi: 10.177/1558689812437187
- International Baccalaureate Programme (2014). Middle Years Programme. Retrieved from <http://www.ibo.org/en/programmes/middle-years-programme/>
- Kanno, Y., & Kangas, S.E. (2014). I'm not going to be, like, for AP: English language learners limited access to advanced college-preparatory courses in high school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(5), 848-878. doi: 10.3102/0002831214544716
- Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).
- League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) et al. v. State Board of Education Consent Decree (S.D. Fla. 1990).

- Lee, O., Quinn, H., & Valdes, G. (2013). Science and language for English language learners in relation to Next Generation Science Standards and with implications for Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics. *Educational Researcher*, 42, 223-233. doi: 10.3102/0013189X13480532
- Li, G. (2012). Literacy through online and offline communities outside school: English language learners' development as readers and writers. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 312-318. doi: 10.1080/00405841.2012.726061
- Mayer, A.P. (2012). Paving the way to college: An analysis of an International Baccalaureate Diploma Program serving immigrant students in California. In Y. Kanno & L. Harklau, L. (Eds.) *Linguistic minority students go to college: preparation, access, and persistence* (pp. 55-73). New York, NY: Routledge.
- McAdams, D.R., & Katzir, D. (2013). *The redesign of urban school systems: Case studies in district governance*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Education Press.
- Metro Orlando Economic Development Commission (2014). Demographics. Retrieved from <http://www.Orlandoedc.com/Data-Center/demographics.shtml>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2015). The condition of education 2015. Retrieved from: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015144.pdf>
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).

- Reihl, C.J. (2009). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational Administration. *Journal of Education*, 189, 183-197.
- The College Board (2012). AP Potential. Retrieved from <https://appotential.collegeboard.orgapp/welcome.do>
- The College Board (2013). 10th Annual AP report to the nation: Florida State supplement. Retrieved from <https://apreport.collegeboard.org>
- The School Board of Broward County (2012). State Database Guidelines for English Language learners (ELLs). Retrieved from <http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/esol/Eng/ESOLPDF/Handbook/2011-12%20State%20Database%20Guidelines%20for%20ELLs%20Handbook%20.pdf>
- The School Board of Orange County (2009, December 12). Multilingual Student Services procedural handbook. Unpublished internal document.
- The School Board of Orange County (2013). Evaluating foreign transcripts: The guide to international school systems. Retrieved from <https://www.ocps.net/cs/multilingual/teachers/Documents/Foreign%20Transcripts%20Guide.pdf>
- The School Board of Orange County (2014a, July 12). Multilingual Student Education Services district English learner plan. Retrieved from <https://www.ocps.net/cs/multilingual/Documents/Orange%20ELL%20Plan%202014-2016.pdf>

- The School Board of Orange County (2014b). Multilingual Student Education Services school visit monitoring tool. Unpublished internal document.
- Steinberg, W.J. (2011). *Statistics Alive!*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sugarman, S.D., & Widess, E.G. (1974). Equal protection for non-English speaking school children: Lau v. Nichols. *California Law Review*, 67, 157-182. Retrieved from <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2562&context=californialawreview>
- Taylor, R., Watson, R., & Nutta, J. (2014). *Leading, teaching, and learning the Common Core State Standards: Rigorous expectations for all students*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading inclusive ELL: Social justice leadership for English language learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46, 646-688. doi:10.1177/0013161X11401616
- Tredway, L., Stephens, D., Leader-Picone, L., & Hernandez, J. (2012). *Leadership connection rubric: supporting equity in schools we need*. Berkeley, California: Leadership Connection. Retrieved from https://principals.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/docs/pli/LCRubric%20Second%20Edition_Web.pdf
- Torrance, H. (2012). Triangulation, respondent validation, and democratic participation in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6, 111-123. doi:10.1177/1558689812437185

- Trujillo, T.M. (2012). The politics of district instructional policy formation: compromising equity and rigor. *Educational Policy*, 27, 531-559. doi: 10.1177/0895904812454000
- Trujillo, T., & Cooper, R. (2014). Framing social justice leadership in a university-based preparation program: The University of California's principal leadership Institute. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 9, 142-167. doi: 10.1777/1942775114525046
- Turner, E.O. (2015). Districts' responses to demographic change: Making sense of race, class, and immigration in political and organizational context. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52, 4-39. doi: 10.3102/002831214561469
- Turner, J.D., & Dandridge, J.C. (2014). Accelerating the college and career readiness of diverse K-5 literacy learners. *Theory into Practice*, 53, 212-219. Doi: 10.1080/00405841.2014.916963
- United States Census Bureau (2013). Race. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html>
- US Education Law (2015). Equal Education Opportunities Act. Retrieved from <http://usedulaw.com/279-equal-educational-opportunity-act.html>
- United States Department of Education (2010). A Blueprint for Reform: The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Retrieved from: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/publication.html#part1>

- Walqui, A., & Pease-Alvarez, L. (2012). Teacher learning for instruction of second language learners. In K.S. Gallagher, R. Goodyear, D.J. Brewer, & Rueda, R. (Eds.), *Urban Education* (pp. 295-310). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wang, J., & Goldschmidt, P. (2003). Importance of middle school mathematics on high school students' mathematics achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 97*(1), 3-19.
- World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (2014a). Mission and the WIDA Story. Retrieved from <https://www.wida.us/aboutus/mission.aspx>
- World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (2014b). The WIDA standards framework and its theoretical foundations. Retrieved from <https://www.wida.us/get.aspx?id=731>