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## Project Description

**Part 1: The Context (5986 /6000)**

**Section A: Priority Identification**

**The Region 9 Literacy Project** (hereinafter “**Project 9”)** draws on consistently strong literacy research and practice outlined in the **California Comprehensive and Integrated Literacy Model (CILM)** and aligns with both **Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant priorities**: (1) Projects that include *evidence-based family literacy strategies;* and (2) Projects that increase *educational options for groups of students who have been traditionally underserved.*Project 9 proposal is for **Priority 3:** *TK–5 programs that build school capacity for effective literacy and comprehensive ELD for English learners (ELs), including opportunities to develop biliteracy and primary language instruction whenever possible.*

**Built on Success.** **Project 9** builds on the extensive expertise of the lead agency, **San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE),** and its official partners, the **Imperial County Office of Education (ICOE),** the **Orange County Department of Education (OCDE),** and the **California Reading and Leadership Project (CRLP).** The **Project 9 Grant Team (team)** developed and completed the **Regional Literacy Needs Assessment** **(RLNA),** which included both quantitative and qualitative data from the 20-21 school year, including the impact of Covid-19 on education in the region.The following findings emerged from the data analysis: 1) Region 9 borders Mexico and has the highest percentage of ELs in the state; 2) there is a wide range of ELs in the region, including unaccompanied minors, newcomers, progressing ELs, and long-term ELs; Region 9 has the highest number of American Indian (AI) communities in the state, with 18 tribal communities just in San Diego county; 3) literacy achievement gaps for all typologies of ELs and AI students have persisted in the region and have been widened due to the pandemic; 4) EL/AI populations have experienced disproportionate challenges as a result of the pandemic, including digital and linguistic access to instruction; and 5) EL/AI students persistently have disproportionately lower graduation rates and a-g completion rates. This analysis led the team to decide on the two populations for priority three that are historically underserved populations, English learners and dual language learners in traditional and dual language settings. A completed version of the RLNA is included in this application.

**Pilot LEAs.** SDCOE identified **Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District**, a rural district with a high population of AI and EL students, and **National School District**, an urban LEA with a high population of ELs. Both LEAs serve ELs in Structured English Immersion (SEI) and Dual Language (DL) settings. ICOE identified **Calexico Unified School District**, a semi-rural district with a high population of ELs and **San Pasqual Valley Unified School District,** a rural district with a high population of AI students**.** OCDE identified **Santa Ana Unified School District,** an urban district with a high population of ELs and students from low-income families.

**The Needs.** A detailed **Local Literacy Needs Assessment (LLNA)** with each of the five pilot LEAs is included in this application. The following themes emerged from an analysis of the *quantitative and qualitative data*: 1) the percentage of ELs who meet or exceed ELA standards on literacy assessment are consistently and significantly below other language proficiency groups;

2) speaking and listening ELPAC scores are consistently higher than reading and writing; 3) FEP and RFEP students consistently outperform English-only students and ELs; 4) the percentage of AI students who meet or exceed ELA standards on literacy assessments are consistently lower than white students; and 5) Literacy achievement gaps for EL/AI students in all settings widened during the pandemic. Based on these findings, the team identified the following needs to serve EL/AI students in traditional and DL contexts: 1) improve Tier 1 Instruction, including comprehensive ELD, assessment and data practices; 2) understand and implement culturally and linguistically responsive instructional resources; 3) improve LEAs’ capacity, including stakeholders from across the system, to implement asset-based literacy leadership and instructional practices (i.e., foster equity mindsets and exhibit high expectations); 4) improve LEAs’ capacity to implement evidence-based family literacy practices and strengthen family and student agency. A responsive, continuous improvement process, liberatory design, will be used with pilot LEAs throughout the scope of **Project 9** to further explore the strengths and needs in the system, implement project goal activities, develop, implement, and continue to improve the site/district literacy plan.

**Priority Integration and Project Goals.** The overarching goal of “**Project 9”** is to improve literacy outcomes for all students through the improvement of equity-centered literacy implementation in schools by engaging stakeholders at all levels. **Project 9** responds to the urgent need to design asset-based systems intentionally focused on the needs of historically underserved students, including EL/AI students in traditional and DL settings. The following goals are designed to fulfill the identified regional and local need:

* Goal 1: Improve literacy outcomes for TK-5 English learner and American Indian **students** in traditional and dual language settings.
* Goal 2: Increase **teacher** capacity (mindsets, knowledge, skills) to align and implement asset-based instructional practices.
* Goal 3: Increase educators’ capacity (mindsets, knowledge, and skills) to implement asset-based literacy **leadership** practices, including evidence-based family engagement and literacy programs.

**Additional Funding Needs.** Through empathy interviews, the team identified the need for additional funding to support professional learning (PL), coaching, planning/collaboration time, and opportunities to provide direct literacy support to EL/AI students and their families in traditional and DL settings.

**Section B:** The Process  *2700*(/6000)

**The Process.** The process used to select the focus of this proposal included a robust research phase conducted by SDCOE, the lead agency, prior to the RFA publication. Once the RFA was released, SDCOE‘s grant team reached out to the regional partners, OCDE, and ICOE, and our higher education partner, CRLP, to form a grant team. After conducting and analyzing the RLNA, Priority 3 was selected as the regional focus. (See Section A.)

During fall 2020, SDCOE participated in the California Comprehensive Statewide Literacy Needs Assessment, including representatives from Early Education, Migrant Education, Special Education, Innovation, Expanded Learning, and Juvenile Court and Community Schools. Based on the assessment, the following needs emerged: to improve outcomes for underserved students, increase family literacy engagement and practices, align instructional resources, increase capacity for quality instruction through PL and coaching.

In April 2021, the grant team began an extensive study of the Comprehensive State Literacy Plan. Literacy leaders from each partner COE and CRLP met 2-3 times a week to develop a shared understanding of these foundational state literacy documents and to identify promising practices. In May, the team developed a Regional Literacy Needs Assessment (RLNA) and through an analysis, the team identified Priority 3 as the focus. The team selected five LEAs to partner with for this pilot project based on the following criteria: significant populations of EL/AI students; commitment to preserve and honor native language and heritage language; commitment to strengthen foundational language and literacy skills; commitment to implementing an assets-based, culturally responsive approach; commitment to partnering with families and communities; and strong relationship between the LEAs and the COEs.

To understand the LEAs’ contexts and ensure alignment between the project activities and educational improvement plans, including Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs), the team accessed the 20-21 LCAP for each of the partner LEAs, and when possible the draft for the 21-22 school year; 2) analyzed the LCAP data by priority and goals and activities; 3) used the LCAP data to populate each LEAs LLNA and use the information to conduct empathy interviews with LEA leadership; 4) analyzed the LCAP data and LLNA data to determine Project 9 goals, objectives, and metrics; and 5) conducted intake empathy interviews with each LEA to assess their assets and needs; and 6) integrated data from the *SDCOE Equity Blueprint for Action* tool, which was co-designed with the San Diego county American Indian (AI) and Latinx communities.

In Year 1, LEAs will further explore their literacy needs using the Comprehensive State Literacy Needs Assessment (CDE, 2021). Information will help districts and pilot sites create their community-responsive literacy plans.

**Section C: Educators’ Professional Learning Needs**

*Based on a recent needs assessment, the professional learning needs of the educators in the identified LEA(s) that will support our targeted population are as follows… (5895/6000)*

**Professional Learning Needs of Educators.** As evidenced by the Local Literacy Needs Assessments (LLNA), the PL needs of the educators in the identified LEAs that support EL/AI students in traditional and DL settings, include the following:

**For all LEAs**,there is a need to develop district and site community-responsive literacy plans aligned to the district/site strategic planning and fiscal plans such as the LCAP, the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA), and Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Plan, and the EL Master Plan. These literacy plans will meet the literacy needs of all students, with a focus on EL/AI students in pilot LEAs. There is also a need for defined roles for a variety of stakeholders to implement the community-responsive literacy plans. LEAs need to provide PL on the State Literacy Plan (SLP), including the CILM, MTSS, the ELA/ELD Framework, EL Roadmap, and Native Ways of Knowing. They need dynamic learning opportunities to engage them in a process to understand the systems they are leading and the literacy outcomes these systems are producing.

**Coaches, TOSAs, and Lead Teachers** need PL that supports them in building the capacity of educators to increase literacy outcomes for all students with a focus on underserved student populations, including how to: build teacher capacity for Tier 1 foundational skills and reading comprehension, including best first reading and writing instruction; build teacher capacity for effective literacy and comprehensive English language development for English learners, including opportunities to develop biliteracy and primary language instruction; and build teacher capacity to support students struggling with reading, including, but not limited to, students with disabilities and students with dyslexia.

The following questions are considerations for literacy leaders as they explore how to build educator capacity: (1) How do teachers transfer students' language and literacy skills from the primary language to L2 to help students develop English? (2) What does it look and sound like to use an appreciative lens and asset-based approach to analyze student assessment data, to observe and describe student learning, to determine areas of strength, growth, and next steps for teachers and for students, to address the specific literacy and language needs of all students including ELs and dually identified students, and to customize and personalize interventions flexibly and with precision? and (3) How do educators establish a trusting relationship with my peers who I lead and coach?

**Teachers** needPL that builds their capacity for high expectations and instruction that improves literacy outcomes for all students, with a focus on historically underserved students in their classrooms. The following areas can help build educator capacity: 1) How can teachers know their learners in order to meet their socio-emotional and academic needs. EL and AI learners are very diverse, with varying interests, attitudes, experiences, backgrounds, cultural contexts, academic strengths, and English proficiency levels; 2) Develop a formative assessment practice with an asset-based orientation. Evidence of learning includes: assessments, informal observations of student literacy behaviors and learning, and student work; 3) How to capitalize on the languages and cultures that students bring to their education. This includes: preservation/use of native language; 4) How to develop literacy, language, and content knowledge simultaneously through implementation of comprehensive ELD; 5) Integrate literacy instruction across the curriculum; 6) Communicate and engage students' families with cultural competency and identity affirmation; and 7) Lift student and family agency in supporting literacy goals and outcomes.

In creating coherence in literacy plans additional stakeholders in educational systems should include **librarians and classified library staff.**  Their needs include PL that builds their capacity to support literacy access and outcomes for all students, especially underserved populations such as EL, DL, and AI students. The following PL would support these efforts: 1) How to determine if materials are grade-appropriate and standards-aligned; 2) How to curate diverse library and school collections that affirm identities and are culturally sustaining. Students need mirrors, where they see themselves in the world of the text, and windows, where they can learn about the world and the lives of others; 3) How to curate libraries that support and celebrate multilingualism; 4) How to build libraries and curate resources that are grounded in the Native Ways of Knowing; 5) How to collaborate with teachers on designing literacy projects; 6) How to match children with books and digital resources that they want to read; 7) How to create library programs that support the school’s goals and help students see themselves as innovators, creators, problem solvers and thinkers; and engage families as their children’s literacy teachers and mentors at home.

The PL needs identified for each LEA are organized by the following themes:A) Coherence and Integration, B) Equity Leadership, and C) Developing Language, Literacy, and Content Knowledge Simultaneously; D) Assessment and Data Culture.The themes will be integrated into **Project 9 Professional Learning Plans** and aligned to the **Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS);** Data, Equity, Content and Pedagogy, Design and Structure, Alignment and Coherence, Collaboration and Shared Accountability, and Resources

**Part 2: Strategies and Interventions**

**Section A: Existing Local/Regional Literacy Work UPDATED VERSION**

**Section A.** Describe existing local and regional literacy work, how it is funded, and how this grant funding would supplement, not supplant, the existing work. **(5000 character max) 4910**

Add to references:

Haas, Goldman & Faltis (2018) *Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of Middle School English Learners: Building on What We Know Works Effectively*, The Educational Forum, 82:2, 208-226.

Our theory of action states that if we increase teachers' knowledge and skills in culturally-responsive, comprehensive literacy and language instruction, we will change teachers’ mindsets and their instructional practice, and we will improve EL and AI student learning in literacy. Project 9 will support our theory of action by aligning, redesigning, and expanding existing literacy work in each pilot LEA in service of the following project goals to: 1) improve literacy outcomes for TK-5 English learner and American Indian students in traditional and dual language settings; 2) increase teacher capacity (mindset. knowledge, skills) to implement asset-based instructional practices; and 3) increase educators’ capacity (mindsets, knowledge, and skills) to implement asset-based literacy leadership practices, including evidence-based family engagement and literacy programs.

Project 9 utilizes a comprehensive structure to leverage existing local and regional literacy work from regional county offices and higher education partner, CRLP. The regional team, composed of key COE and CRLP partners, will lead district and site teams in literacy plan development, provide coaching, design convenings and academies, and support action periods. Identified LEAs will participate in communities of practice (CoP) and participate in professional learning via Educator Academies. The literacy planning process will be designed to further surface specific professional learning needs. Based on local needs, the CoPs and academies will provide a menu of options that builds upon our region’s existing catalog of professional learning on equity-focused leadership and high-quality standards-based instruction and intervention for EL and Native American students.; Culturally and linguistically responsive literacy Instruction and intervention; Comprehensive ELA/ELD with literacy and language in tandem; Personalized Oral Language Literacy Strategies for TK; The English Learner Improvement Collaborative (ELIC); Supporting English Learners with Disabilities; Native Ways of Knowing; the Teacher Leadership Academy; Everyone A Reader; and the Equity Blueprint for Action.

Project 9 will build upon existing work that stems from two recent, completed grants: a California Equity Performance and Improvement (CEPIP) Grant and a U.S. Department of Education, Office of Indian Education (OIE) Indian Education Grant. Both projects were designed to improve academic outcomes for underserved students. The CEPIP project was developed to implement equity-based strategies and to monitor student outcomes,to address inequity between and within schools, as well as student opportunity gaps across school years. The OIE Indian Education Grant aimed to unite and leverage district and tribal education efforts to improve the educational opportunities for Native American youth in San Diego County. The promising equity-centered literacy practices applied in these two initiatives include evidence of success of culturally responsive literacy instruction.

Project 9 supplements existing work**.** Project 9 funding will support our project goals by aligning, and expanding existing literacy work in pilot LEAs. Project 9 leverages the literacy coaches in each pilot LEA providing 60 days per year for these LEA leads to actively co-design and co-facilitate COPs and Academies. This approach will help build the internal capacity of each pilot LEA. Funds will support COP teams from each site to engage in COP convenings, action periods, and academies. Additionally, Project 9 funding will provide supplemental books and other multimedia materials to support culturally responsive literacy instruction. Funds support library staff to diversify collections and collaborate with teachers on their use. Further, funding will host student activities and community literacy events where libraries serve as a hub for school-family-community engagement. Funds are allocated to CLSD support Family Literacy programs such as Everyone a Readers and culturally responsive family literacy programs.

Project 9 provides district and site literacy plans and practice profiles. Currently, SDCOE, OCDE, ICOE, and CRLP integrate MTSS with Comprehensive ELD and the EL Roadmap Principles and offer PL on instruction that is aligned to the CILM and strongly supports the ELA/ELD Circles of Implementation. Funding will provide time to align and expand this work through the co-design and implementation of literacy plans and practice profiles, for teachers, administrators, parents, librarians, counselors, paraeducators across the system serving EL and AI students in traditional and DL settings. These project deliverables follow California’s Local Literacy Planning Toolkit and are adapted specifically for EL and AI student contexts. Project deliverables will be available for widespread application and replication through website publication.

**Section B.** Describe the specific evidenced-based practices that will be implemented to address the identified needs outlined in Part 1, and the specific strategies that will be used. **(4912/5000 character max)**

**Evidence-based Practices.** Specific evidenced-based practices and strategies will be implemented to address the identified LEA needs outlined in Part 1 are organized by theme.

**Coherence, Integration, and Equity Leadership**

**Project 9** hinges on distributed leadership, reciprocal accountability and builds capacity in leaders throughout the system. **Educators** will have clarity on their respective roles in implementing district Literacy Plans as they use Liberatory Design (National Equity Project, 2020), an equity-centered, continuous improvement process in developing, implementing, and sustaining their plans. Implementation Science (NIRN, 2020) is used to develop Practice Profiles to identify the core components or essential functions of the literacy program as well as expected practice variations for various stakeholders. Administrators will use 1) Roadmap Principles (2017), the Roadmap Toolkit For Administrators (2021), and California MTSS Resources (n.d) to build upon the school’s MTSS; and 2) use the QPLS (2014) and West Ed’s QPLS System Review (n.d.) to ensure that PL delivered by both the GTs and LEAs is supportive of district and school goals. Family engagement strategies will help administrators reimagine existing family and community engagement structures and infuse new strategies to strengthen ties to literacy (CDE, 2017). **Teacher Leaders (TLs), including coaches, TOSAs and lead teachers** will use partnership principles to develop a stance of equality, voice, choice, dialogue, reflection, praxis, and reciprocity as they work alongside their colleagues (Aguilar, 2013; Knight,2010). TLs will follow an instructional coaching model that sets targets for students rooted in the standards and framework (Sweeney, 2011). Capacity to lead from an equity stance is further developed in TLs as they grow liberatory mindsets in themselves and others and the Coaching for Equity Framework (NEP, 2020).

**Developing Language, Literacy, and Content Knowledge**

**TLs** develop practices in coaching and facilitating collaborative teams by growing their own knowledge of comprehensive ELD as explained in the Framework and ELD standards. TLs grow expertise in literacy intervention using targeted individual and small group instruction, comprehension focus groups, and dyslexia interventions (Dorn and Soffos, 2011; CDE, 2017a; CDE, 2019). **TLs and teachers** will use translanguaging strategies, provide multiple modalities for instruction, varied opportunities to demonstrate learning, provide curriculum and language support materials in each language that are of equal high quality, and follow an intentional, systematic plan for supporting the development of each language (Beeman and Urow, 2012; CDE, 2020). **All teachers of emerging bilinguals TK-5** will develop approaches to balanced bilingualism (CDE, 2020; Espinoza, n.d.). **Teachers** will build confidence and capacity in their application of the Standards and Framework and Liberatory Design Mindsets as they continue to improve the quality of assets-based literacy instruction. To develop restorative and culturally sustaining literacy lessons that better connect with students, households and communities, teachers will use culturally and historically responsive teaching instructional and lesson design strategies that build collaborative classroom communities strongly featuring student agency and voice and are more responsive to students’ social, emotional, and health needs (Hammond, 2014; Muhammad, 2020; CDE, 2019). **Library Staff (LS) including teacher librarians and classified library staff,** will use the Model School Library Standards (2010), the ASA National School Library Standards (2016), the Framework’s “Guiding Principles,” and “Three Part Text Complexity Model” to provide broad literacy support throughout the district and at individual sites. LS will learn strategies for: supporting teachers and leaders with curriculum, instruction, and assessment materials and resources; celebrating diversity by curating the school library collection and providing input on classroom libraries and family literacy programs; and supporting the physical, mental, and emotional needs of students and families through collections, programs, and services. Equity-focussed family engagement strategies will link LS virtual and in person events to literacy learning (CDE, 2014, CDE 2017b).

**Assessment and Data Culture**

**Administrators** will organize their assessment system into short, medium and long cycles (CDE, 2014). They will capture and act upon ELPAC progress data using the MEGA Dashboard, an SDCOE-developed data tool. **TLs and teachers** will assess children in both their home language and English to understand their full range of skills (CDE, 2020).Teachers, including special education teachers, will learn formative assessment strategies (CDE, 2014). **All educators** will learn strategies for data collection, analysis and reflection and participate in empathy interviews (The Holdsworth Center, 2020) , student shadowing (Soto, 2012), and Learning Walks (SDCOE, n.d).

**Section C**. Describe the evidence used to support the selected strategies. **(4826/5000 character max)**

**Research base**. Emerging from the PL needs, the section below lists the scientifically-based research references as identified above in section B. Project 9 strategies are based primarily on California guidance documents referenced in an Appendix and included with this application. Additional evidence to support selected strategies includes:

**Liberatory Design and Continuous Improvement**

The National Equity Project’s Liberatory Design Framework (2020) helps leaders investigate their district and each site’s context in ways that will help them better understand the complexity of the needs of traditionally underserved students.

SISEP & NIRN Active Implementation Hub (n.d.) is an online learning environment to increase knowledge and improve the performance of persons engaged in actively implementing any program or practice.

**Leadership and Coaching**

Aguilar’s *The Art of Coaching: Effective Strategies for School Transformation’s*  (2013) Chapter 5, “Beginning A Coaching Relationship” begins with the axiom, “without trust there can be no coaching” (35). Aguilar offers ten practical steps to beginning a coaching relationship with supporting vignettes, sample questions, and tools.

Knight’s *Unmistakable Impact: A Partnership Approach for Dramatically Improving Instruction* (2010) “Partnership Principles” - equality, choice, voice, reflection, dialog, praxis, and reciprocity - provide the theoretical foundation for leadership and are applicable for administrators, coaches, and teacher leaders.

Sotto’s (2012) *ELL Shadowing as a Catalyst for Change* helps teachers experience the classroom from the student’s point of view by increasing teacher sensitivity to ELLs’ school experiences leading to a heightened sense of urgency to support ELLs in literacy learning.

Sweeney’s *Student-Centered Coaching* (2011) illustrates how coaches work collaboratively with teachers to set specific targets for students that are rooted in the standards and curriculum and ensure that the targets are met by measuring “our impact based on student learning.”

The Holdsworth Center’s (2020) Empathy Interview resources lead you through the process of planning and executing empathy interviews with students. These interviews are meant to help teachers and administrators glean insights that will help to solve specific challenges or get candid feedback on whether changes are working.

SDCOE (n.d.) Learning Walks are a proven process where site teams collect descriptive evidence from classroom observations and analyze data according to the school’s instructional focus.

**Teaching and Learning**

American Association of School Librarians National School Library Standards (2016) Three sets of standards (Learner, School Librarian, and School Library) make up an integrated Framework. Six shared foundations - inquire, include, collaborate, curate, explore, and engage - highlight core educational concepts.

Beeman and Urow’s *Teaching for Biliteracy: Strengthening Bridges between Languages* (2012) helps educators understand simultaneous bilingual development and appreciate the value of translanguaging as an “independent systematic, and rule-governed language variety that bilingual and/or bidialectal people choose to use, based on the context in which they find themselves.”

Dorn and Soffos’ *Interventions that Work: A Comprehensive Intervention Model for Preventing Reading Failure in Grades K-3 (2011)* presents the authors’ Comprehensive Intervention Model, a portfolio of small group interventions for meeting the diverse needs of struggling readers with research-based activities, scaffolding techniques, and assessment tools that guide teachers in promoting strategic learners.

Espinoza and Hayslip’s *Dual Language Learners POLL- Personalized Oral Language Learning* (n.d.) supports language skills in both English and the home language by providing support for “balanced bilingualism” even when teachers don’t know most of the languages spoken in the classroom themselves. POLL is composed of three complementary supports for DLLs: Instructional Supports, Family Languages and Interests, and Environmental Supports.

Hammond’s *Culturally Responsive Teaching and The Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor Among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students* (2014) elucidates why culture is the fundamental imperative for learning by translating neuroscience into a framework that enables teachers to create the relationships and apply strategies that foster culturally responsive teaching.

Muhammad’s *Cultivating Genius: An Equity Framework for Culturally and Historically Responsive Literacy* (2020) argues for a Historically Responsive Literacy Framework offering a practical model based on culturally relevant and responsive theories of education. The HRL centers identity, skills, intellect and criticality as literacy learning goals.

**Section D.** D. Describe how PL will align with the Quality PL Standards, and describe the content curriculum, and teaching and learning that will impact educator knowledge and skills related to the strategies identified include description of how an assets based approach and culturally sustaining pedagogies will be incorporated throughout the project. (5000 character max) 4843/5000

**Professional Learning**. Because Project 9 PL stems from the CILM and Roadmap Principles, an assets based approach is carried throughout Project 9. Liberatory Design builds empathy and relational trust in service of improving student outcomes. Equity and culturally sustaining pedagogies are incorporated with a relentless focus on identity, growth, mindset and cultural competency.

**Project 9** delivers PL through 1) Communities of Practice (CoP) for district and site leadership teams with action periods or PDSA cycles in between; and 2) Additional PL opportunities outside of CoPs. PL content is selected as district and school literacy plans develop and specific needs emerge.

The PL content described below is organized by the themes that emerged from on-going needs assessments. QPLS standards are indicated first by Standard (initials) then Element (letter) and Indicator (number) where applicable.

**Coherence, Integration and Equity Leadership**

**District and site leadership teams** identify equity challenges within their context that meet high-leverage needs as a focus for the LP. Practice Profiles for administrators, TLs, LS, and teachers will be developed to provide clarity on roles in LP implementation, and they will be used starting in year 2 as a basis for PL and to collect fidelity assessment data.

CSA.A Supports a collaborative culture through: shared meaning-making of the CILM, reflection, communication, and action.

E. Addresses opportunity gaps and equity challenges. PL helps educators develop inclusive policies and aligns evidenced-based leadership, instructional and assessment practices to the CILM.

**Developing Language, Literacy, and Content Knowledge Simultaneously**

PL builds capacity and confidence in **TLs** to: co-teach, model interventions, coach, support action periods, and lead teams in analyzing student data and lesson planning. Similarly, **administrators** learn how to lead learning walks with site teams to collect descriptive evidence and evaluate stages of implementation of site LPs.

CSA.A.5: Supports educators in making practice more transparent through peer observation, and experimentation with feedback through coaching and collaborative planning at every level of the system.

CP.B PL Expands instructional and assessment skills, practices, and adult behaviors so that all students meet content and performance expectations, become broadly literate, and make progress towards readiness for college, careers, and civic life.

**Assets-Based Culturally Sustaining Instruction & Assessment and Data Culture**

PL structures such as student shadowing and empathy interviews create urgency and understanding of how EL and AI students experience literacy and language learning. Educators analyze empathy data and reflect on implications for their instructional design. Liberatory Design Mindsets provide an equity-focussed frame for educators. Customized PL leverages key content from the SLP especially on family and community engagement, the Framework’s *Guiding Principles* and *Circles of Implementation*, and valuing home language and culture as assets.

E.C Application of Roadmap and Framework principles creates affirming learning contexts. PL emphasizes why knowledge of the cultural, intellectual, social, emotional, and physical needs of each learner is critical for success.

CP With a shared understanding of the CILM, responsive, evidenced-based strategies are identified relative to students’ diverse backgrounds and equity needs.

D.A.3, 4. Household and community members are regarded as equal partners. Data collection includes perceptions data from staff, community, family, and students to inform decisions.

**Assets-Based Culturally Sustaining Instruction & Assessment and Data Culture**

PL structures such as student shadowing and empathy interviews create urgency and understanding of how traditionally underserved students experience literacy and language learning. Educators analyze empathy data and reflect on implications for their instructional design. Liberatory Design Mindsets provide an equity-focussed frame for educators. Customized PL leverages key content from the CILM especially on family and community engagement, the Framework’s *Guiding Principles*, *Circles of Implementation*, and *Values For Educating ELs*.

E.C By applying Roadmap and Framework principles, identity affirming learning becomes a shared goal. PL emphasizes why knowledge of the cultural, intellectual, social, emotional, and physical needs of each learner is critical for success.

CP With opportunities for all stakeholders to create a shared understanding of the CILM, evidenced-based strategies that are responsive to student’s diverse backgrounds and equity needs are identified.

D.A.3, 4. Household and community members are regarded as equal partners. Data collection includes perceptions data from staff, community, family, and students to inform decisions.

**Section E.** Describe how the project increases educational options for groups of students who have traditionally been underserved. **(5000 character max)**

**Project 9** increases options for groups of students who have been traditionally underserved with a relentless focus on aspiring to all EL Roadmap Principles.

[**Principle One**](https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/principleone.asp)**: Assets-Oriented and Needs Responsive Schools.** Our deliverables support educators in knowing who their ELs and AIs are, understanding diverse typologies, creating safe and affirming school climates, and building strong family-school-community partnerships to improve literacy outcomes (Olsen Admin Toolkit, 2021). Liberatory Design enables leaders to attend to the human elements in their system when establishing goals for and monitoring implementation of LPs. In order to disrupt the status quo, PL enables leaders to clarify their moral imperative for leading change centering equity and lifting outcomes for all students.

[**Principle Two**](https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/principletwo.asp)**: Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access**. Students benefit when educators know: what high-quality standards and framework-aligned literacy instruction looks and sounds like; how to “engage in dialogue about instructional practices” that develop the *Capacities of Literate Individuals* and how to “examine various forms of ensuring meaningful access for ELs” and other under-represented groups (Olsen, 2021). As set forth by the ELD Standards *Theoretical Foundations* (2012), educators across the system will have clarity and support in how to use the ELD standards to design learning that is: A) interactive and engaging, meaningful and relevant, and intellectually rich and challenging B) appropriately scaffolded in order to provide strategic support that moves learners toward independence C) values and builds on home language and culture and other forms of prior knowledge and D) builds both academic English and content knowledge.

[**Principle Three**](https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/principlethree.asp)**: System Conditions that Support Effectiveness**. By the end of the 3 year pilot, educators at all levels will have built the will, knowledge and skill they need to grow as leaders of change. They will have become more knowledgeable about the strengths and needs of emerging bilinguals, AIs, students and their communities. They will have acquired new tools and approaches to be more responsive to those needs. Districts and schools will be in possession of robust data systems built upon culturally and linguistically valid assessments. Continuous improvement processes and equity mindsets will have become integral. New district-wide initiatives will be able to trace their origins to safe-to-fail experiments born out of praxis and a willingness to try something new. Both educators and students will feel that their goals are genuinely connected to district and school goals. Practice profiles and LP will continue to be refined. Finally, trust, empathy, collaboration and mentorship will have become inseparable within the district’s DNA.

[**Principle Four**](https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/principlefour.asp)**: Alignment and Articulation Within and Across Systems**. Our deliverables improve alignment between: A) classroom, site, district and state literacy plans B) all literacy programs including: EL, core academic, early learning, dual language, world language, library media services and expanded learning C) curriculum, instruction, and assessment and D) PL, continuous improvement and LP implementation. By the pilot’s end, administrators will have learned how to lead stakeholder teams to develop, support implementation, and monitor LPs. TLs will have learned how to support site LPs through facilitation, coaching, and co/leading PL. Library staff will have learned how to support standards-aligned materials selection, build culturally sustaining collections that inspire a love of reading, and lead family and community engagement efforts outside of the classroom and at home. Families will learn how to leverage home and culture to support literacy goals, and they are regarded by the school as trusted partners and the child’s first teachers at home. Community members and organizations will be sought out to lend their expertise. Teachers will have the resources to design learning experiences that manifest a mosaic of language, curiosity, knowledge, culture, identity, agency, and voice. Most importantly, students will graduate from their elementary education not only socially, emotionally and academically ready for middle school, but with expanded opportunities for their secondary education.

**Section F. Describe the project’s focus on family and community engagement.** **(5000 character max)**

**Focus on Family and Community Engagement.** This project focuses on best practices in family and community engagement through an equity-centered continuous improvement lens. In the broadest sense, family literacy acknowledges and supports parents as the first teachers of their children. Specifically, family literacy refers to home-school engagement programs that address the intergenerational nature of literacy. According to the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Title II of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, family literacy programs integrate (1) interactive literacy activities between parent and child; (2) training in parenting activities; (3) literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency; (4) age-appropriate education to prepare children for success in school and life experiences.

This project will take a **partnership orientation approach** to family literacy, which is rooted in a funds of knowledge framework, which draws upon the assets and experiences of all stakeholders, including students, their families, and the educators who serve them. This approach also draws on recent research, including the 2017 California Department of Education’s Family Engagement Toolkit, as well a growing body of research that highlights that families involved in their child’s literacy correlates to increased literacy growth across demographics (Brotman, et al., 2011). Recent longitudinal studies describe the clear, positive impacts of family literacy practices, including an increase in parents’ understanding of how to advocate for their children at school (London, 2016; Guerra & Perry, 2012). Notably, findings from these studies also indicate the need for capacity-building initiatives for parents and school staff, including a focus on the cultural and linguistic differences between the school and district staff and families (London, 2016; Quick, et al., 2011).

These studies support approaches that value and provide rich literacy development and experiences throughout the elementary grades (and beyond) in multiple languages. (Guerra, L., & Perry, M., 2012). Specifically, studies also underscore the need to leverage literacy practices in families’ home languages and provide families with examples of genre-specific (describing, comparing/contrasting, cause/effect) layered questions to pose to their children (in their home languages) while engaging in daily literacy activities, including reading, watching television, reading labels while shopping, riding in a car (Capotosto & Kim, 2016; Capotosto et al., 2017)

This partnership orientation approach to family literacy aims to cultivate a welcoming school environment and nurture two-way communication between families and school staff. This approach involves both building the capacity of the educators and families to work together as partners. To support this aim, the project goals will use an asset-based approach to understanding families and provide professional learning to build the capacity of educators and staff to provide meaningful literacy experiences for children through culturally responsive family interaction.

Furthermore, this approach draws on recent interviews and insights with more that 40 school and district parent liaisons across San Diego County who support communities with high populations of EL and AI students. During World Café sessions, led by the SDCOE Equity Dept., held between 20-21, the parent liaisons identified three actions to improve family engagement initiatives, including family literacy programs: (1) prioritize the program. For example, include family literacy in the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), and school sites’ School Plans for Student Achievement (SPSA), and classroom unit/lesson plans and resources; (2) provide full-service family engagement and welcome centers in every school; and (3) share the responsibility for family literacy initiatives. Parent liaisons reported the need to address parents key concerns: not feeling comfortable with communicating with the teacher and school staff and not feeling confident in supporting their child and children to improve literacy.

Further, the site and district parent liaisons have recently reported an increased need to assist parents more intensively in their home languages and with a deep understanding of their cultures through remote virtual meetings. Many liaisons have recounted positive anecdotes from parents who feel empowered to now connect virtually and access email communication. The liaisons stress the urgent need to build on this opportunity and leverage technology to improve home-school communication and family literacy initiatives. This project’s partnership orientation approach will directly address these concerns and opportunities through the project goals.

**Section G.** Describe the project’s focus on accelerating literacy learning post-pandemic. **(5000 character max)**

**Accelerating literacy.** The pandemic had disproportionately negative effects on English learner and American Indian populations. AI and EL families suffered disproportionate loss of life and trauma through the pandemic. Furthermore, access to educational services emerged as one of the greatest challenges for these populations. Research conducted by SDCOE in partnership with the California Indian Culture and Sovereignty Center identified that 1 in 4 AI students in the region did not have connectivity seven months into the pandemic. Furthermore, research conducted by SDCOE’s Transnational Student Task Force identified that 40,000 students that normally attended schools in California, Region 9, resided in Baja California through the pandemic. The majority of these students struggled to connect to a new education system, including distance learning in Spanish. Empathy interviews and student panels conducted by SDCOE’s Equity Department, revealed that EL families in the county struggled disproportionately with distance learning. With disproportionate access to educational services during the pandemic for EL and AI students, the gap for literacy achievement further widened for these populations.

**Project 9** supports the acceleration of literacy learning post-pandemic by building educator capacity to accelerate learning by integrating high-leverage comprehensive literacy learning practices that are culturally responsive and trauma informed. During site and district literacy plan development, empathy interviews and student shadowing will enable leaders to gain insight into what students and parents report as being positive aspects that LEAs can build from the pandemic experience. In addition, LEAs will gain insights of needs -learning, social, and emotional- ~~needs~~ of students, staff, and the community. Practice Profiles and the Educator Academies will support culturally- responsive and trauma informed practices at every level: high-quality first best instructional, formative assessment, and intervention practices for teachers that are based on the Circles of Implementation; responsive high-quality literacy and language support for paraprofessionals; equity-focussed leadership practices for administrators, coaches and TOSA; systematic and data-driven counseling program development and practices for counselors where parents and families feel regarded as partners; and practices for library staff to support literacy school-wide and diversify classroom resources and library collections. Leaders will also adopt Liberatory Design, a human-centered continuous improvement approach as they shed light on post-pandemic needs and shift mindsets and practices to improve literacy and language outcomes for traditionally underserved students.

Furthermore, **family literacy program development involves** family and students as equal partners in accelerating literacy outcomes for students. On-going, assets-based literacy and language assessments will identify Can - Do statements and goals for students. Families and students will understand these data points, as well as literacy practices they can support to accelerate outcomes for students. This approach will foster a growth mindset and lift family and student agency in support of literacy and educational achievement for students.

**Section H**. A table titled **Scope of Work** that illustrates the three-year sequence of events and activities of the project that includes the person or organization responsible for each activity, the expected goal of the activity, and how the effectiveness of the activity will be measured for both teacher practice and student achievement is included in this application. The Scope of work will be contextualized for each participating LEA.

**Part 3: Project Leadership**.

**Section B.** Describe the partner districts and schools, the demographics of students served, and the number and demographics of teachers who will be supported. Include signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) from each partner district. *\*See page 11 of the RFA for information about an opportunity to participate in the American Institutes for Research (AIR) Impact Study for K–5.* **(6000 character max)3600**

**Regional Partnership and Leadership. Project 9** builds upon the high level of expertise and collaboration of the three regional COEs, SDCOE, ICOE, and OCDE, and its regional IHE partner, the CRLP. These organizations serve as official partners to lead this project, and have a long history of strong, effective collaboration that is built on a foundation of trust. **Letters of commitment and assurances** from each official partner organization are included in this application. Project 9 has identified Priority 3 as its focus, and specifically addresses the needs of English learners, dual language learners, and American Indian students. The official partners have deep expertise in serving these populations, and will also draw upon the specific expertise of the following supportive organizations to best serve the identified populations: 1) Californian’s Together, 2) the California Association for Bilingual Education, 3) the California Indian Culture and Sovereignty Center, 4) the California Museum and Culture Center, and 5) the National Equity Project.

**LEA Leadership and Participation**. Each COE has identified specific LEAs to serve as pilot(s) LEAs in the region. The LEAs selected fit the criteria identified by the Project 9 Grant Team, and have a successful history of collaboration with its COE. Each LEA will identify two pilot schools to participate beginning in Year 1 of the grant. **Letters of commitment or MOUs** for each participating LEA are included in this application. Project 9 also builds upon the leadership of each LEA. Each pilot school will establish a Project 9 Leadership Team, which will include a district administrator, a district literacy coach or TOSA, a site administrator, and five lead teachers, and the site librarian. The educators selected to participate will draw on the diversity and experiences of the site educators, to establish a well-rounded site leadership team. As a whole Project 9 will minimally serve: 1) five district leaders, five district TOSAS or literacy coaches, 5 site administrators, and 25 classroom teachers.

**Pilot LEA Demographic Data**. SDCOE has identified the National School District as a pilot district. The National School District the following is National School District Demographic Information:

District Enrollment for 20-21 = 5,152

* Hisp/Latino = 4,315
* African American = 58
* American Indian = 2
* Asian = 86
* Filipino = 447
* Pacific Islander - 21
* White = 110
* Two or More Races = 91
* EL = 2,421
* SED = 4, 714
* SWD = 727
* Foster = 29
* Homeless = 424

SDCOE has also identified Valley Center - Pauma Unified School District. The following is

Valley Center- Pauma’s demographic information:

District Enrollment for 20-21 = 3,865

* Hisp/Latino = 2, 298
* American Indian - 341
* White - 941
* Asian - 35
* African American - 20
* Two or more races - 177
* EL = 1,054
* SED = 2,495
* SWD = 682
* Migrant = 128
* Foster = 25

l

ICOE has identified the Calexico Unified School District. The following is Calexico’s demographic data:

* District Enrollment for 20-21 = 8,721
* Hisp/Latino = 8,646
* African American = 6
* Asian = 18
* White = 31
* EL = 5,145
* SED = 7,674
* SWD = 697
* Migrant = 610
* Foster = 34
* Homeless = 697

ICOE has also identified the San Pasqual Valley Union School District. The following is San Pasqual Valley Demographic Data:

* San Pasqual Valley District Enrollment for 20-21 = 609
* Hisp/Latino - 262
* American Indian - 304
* African American - 4
* White - 11
* EL - 170
* SED - 572
* SWD - 91
* Migrant - 25
* Foster - 4
* Homeless - 73

OCDE has identified Santa Ana Unified School District.

District Enrollment for 20-21 = 48,953

* Hisp/Latino = 44,673
* American Indian = 131
* African American - 101
* Asian = 916
* Pacific Islander = 73
* White = 400
* Two or more races = 160
* EL = 18,084
* SED = 43,449
* SWD = 6,805
* Migrant = 445
* Foster = 366
* Homeless = 6,516

**Section C**.Describe the overall management structure of the project and the roles of each partner in the project’s management including how each will enhance, improve, or expand current, local, and regional efforts to address the needs of the targeted population(s). **(6000 character max)**

**Management Structure**. SDCOE will serve as the lead agency for the project and take responsibility for the primary implementation of all grant requirements and activities. The management structure of Project 9 includes the following roles and responsibilities. As the lead agency, SDCOE will take responsibility for the **Principal Investigator** role. The Principal Investigator will (1) lead the dissemination of activities for the project (oversee the data collection and documentation); (2) serve as technical advisor/lead fiscal agent for project development and implementation activities; (3) direct field practice and district partner collaboration; and (4) coordinate all project activities with the Project Coordinator and ensure all data are reported to the CDE, and to the Project Evaluator.

As lead agency, SDCOE will take responsibility for the **Project Coordinator** role. The Project Coordinator will 1) assist the Principal Investigator with implementation of Project 9 and dissemination of project activities; 2) direct Project facilitators and LEA Leads, monitor the quality of literacy plans and PL, and ensure all data and information are collected and reported towards project goals and objectives; 3) meet weekly, or as needed, with the Principal Investigator to implement and monitor all project activities; and 4) meet monthly with the Regional Leadership team and support partner COEs and LEAs as needed.

The **Project Facilitators** will 1) oversee the implementation of Project 9 components for their county office or their organization and the roles and responsibilities they have been assigned; 2) help organize and facilitate project convenings, meetings, and activities; 3) manage the establishment and development of their Community of Practice (CoP); 4) guide the data-collection and dissemination of project activities with each of its identified LEAs.

The **Project Evaluator** will 1) oversee the program evaluation components; 2) work with *Principal Investigator/Project Coordinator* and the *Project Facilitators* to monitor project activities and evaluate program effectiveness; 3) Complete all evaluation analysis and reporting documents.

The **Project LEA Leads** will participate in regional planning, meetings, communities of practice convenings, Practice Profile development, and Educator Academies. They will be responsible for coordinating meetings, coaching, and action period activities at the site level. They will ensure all measures and assessments are conducted and data are collected.

The **Professional Development Team** will develop Practice Profiles, and provide professional learning at the Educator Academies, and CoP Convenings. They will provide coaching as needed during project action periods.

The partners in Project 9 will work collaboratively and draw on their extensive experiences in transforming educational experiences and outcomes for underserved populations. SDCOE, OCDE, ICOE, and CRLP serve as statewide leaders in English learner instruction. Furthermore SDCOE, and ICOE have extensive experience with American Indian education, and serve as statewide leaders in this area.

Each Project 9 partner will enhance, improve, or expand current, local, and regional efforts to address the needs of the targeted population(s) in the following ways: Each partner will expand upon their efforts on ELD instruction, literacy instruction, developing language and literacy in tandem. Furthermore, SDCOE will draw upon their extensive efforts with the WRITE and ELIC projects, TK and Early Ed, comprehensive literacy Instruction, the MEGA Dashboard, California Indian Education for ALL, Spanish Language Arts/SLD, and Liberatory Design. OCDE will draw upon its efforts with Project GLAD, CA MTSS, aand Coaching for Literacy. ICOE will draw upon its efforts with dually identified students, and MTSS for underserved populations.

**Organizational Chart.** An organizational chart that clearly illustrates the organizational structure, lists names, titles, role and responsibilities has been included in this application. Furthermore, Form C: CLSD ProgramStatement of Assurances have been completed by the lead applicant and signed by an appropriate designated official with the authority to submit proposals in this competition.

### Part 4: Project Staff

**Section A.** Describe the key project personnel from each of the partner organizations, their roles and responsibilities in the project, their qualifications for these roles and responsibilities, and their time commitment base to the project. Explain why these personnel are essential to the successful management, functioning, and completion of the intended outcomes of the project. **(3000 character max) 4913**

**Project Staff**. The staff for this project represent the partners involved in Project 9. SDCOE will serve as the lead agency, in partnership with ICOE, OCDE, and CRLP. According to longstanding policies of all partners, as well as those of the Region 9 pilot districts, all project personnel are selected without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, and age or handicapping condition. There is equal opportunity to participate in this project, which encourages bilingualism, diversity, and multiculturalism. Staff selected for this project have expertise in literacy and supporting the needs of underserved populations. All have expertise working directly with teachers and administrators to improve literacy outcomes for underserved populations. They have strong relationships and connections at the local, regional, and state levels.

Senior Leaders from the SDCOE Multilingual Education and Global Achievement (MEGA) Department will provide supervisory oversight, guidance, and ensure alignment to statewide initiatives to meet desired outcomes. Dr. Olympia Kyriakidis (.05 FTE) and Jorge Cuevas Antillon (.15 FTE) have experience in leading systemic change for historically underserved student populations throughout San Diego County’s 42 school districts, supporting 500,000 students. Kyriakidis and Antillon possess expertise in Improvement Science (Carnegie), Liberatory Design (National Equity Project, Stanford), and Implementation Science (NIRN) and have provided leadership for federal and state grants.

**SDCOE Project Coordinator (1.0 FTE), To Be Determined,** The Project Coordinator position will be a new hire for this project. A team representing all partners will work together to hire a candidate with the expertise to serve in this important role. The job description for the role will include: Responsibility for reporting to the CDE, ensuring project compliance, organizing meetings, convenings, and training, and distributing information to members of the partnership.

**SDCOE Project Facilitator (.20 FTE),** Jennifer Upham**,** MEGA Literacy Coordinator:

has expertise leading district-wide change resulting in improved literacy outcomes for English learners, building capacity in teacher leaders and coaches, facilitating professional learning on high-quality and standard-based literacy instruction that integrated comprehensive ELD, oracy, and Liberatory Design..

**ICOE Project Facilitator (.20 FTE),** Queana Givens-Jarvis, ELA/ELD Coordinator K-12 and Regional CRLP Co-Director, designs and delivers high-quality professional development experiences including training, demonstration lessons, guided lesson planning, learning walks and lesson studies based on her expertise in the EL Roadmap, ELD instruction, and Culturally Responsive instruction.

**OCDE Project Facilitator (.20 FTE),** Audra Mesa, Literacy and Language Coordinator, designs and facilitates professional development on reading foundational skills, ELD instruction, literacy assessments, UDL for culturally & linguistically relevant ELA lessons, and diversifying texts, as well as, curriculum planning and designing instruction that integrates the CA MTSS and UDL guidelines.

**CRLP Project Facilitator (.20 FTE),** Sarah Peterson, Regional Director, California Reading and Literature Project (CRLP) at UC San Diego: has over 15 years in education serving primarily as a biliteracy classroom teacher in historically marginalized communities. and has advanced technical expertise in adult learning theory [transformational coaching], improvement science, K-12 English language arts, ELD, and biliteracy instruction/instrucn onal models (Spanish-English).

**Project LEA Leads (.30 FTE), TBD.** Each of the five pilot LEAs will identify oneProject LEA Lead.Project LEA Leads will draw from each LEAs district Literacy Coaches or TOSAs responsible for leading all project activities at the site level.

**Region 9 Literacy Project, Professional Learning Team,** draws upon the broad experiences and expertise of the Project 9 partners staff. Staff from SDCOE, ICOE, OCDE, and CRLP have a broad range of expertise including literacy instruction and interventions, library and media services, early education, American Indian education, English learner services, comprehensive ELD, and dual language instruction.

**SDCOEProject Evaluator, (.10 FTE),** Dr. Shannon Coulter, Director, Assessment, Accountability, and Evaluation, SDCOE, has ten years of experience evaluating the effectiveness of school programs through WASC visits, research studies, and numerous state and federal grants, with extensive background in assessment and evaluation by creating performance assessments, guiding teachers through the process of developing common assessments, analyzing school data, and program evaluation.

**Curriculum Vitae**. Curriculum vitae (CV) for each of the key project personnel listed on the organizational chart are included in the application.

### Part 5: Project Participants (Partner Local Educational Agencies)

Proposals must describe how the project will ensure enthusiastic, engaged, and sustained participation by all participants in every phase.

**Section A**. Describe how school and district culture will be transformed so the grant work will be sustained using local resources after grant funds are expended. **(3000 character max)**

**Project Participant Engagement.**  The project will ensure enthusiastic, engaged, and sustained participation through the Liberatory Design process. Liberatory Design is an approach to addressing equity challenges and change efforts in complex systems. In the context of Project 9, it serves as a process and practice to:

* Design literacy plans that help interrupt inequity and increase opportunity for those most impacted in our systems,
* Transform powerby shifting the relationships between those who hold power to design and those impacted by these designs,
* Generate critical learning and increased agency for those involved in designing and implementing literacy plans.
* Engage in a continuous improvement process that supports the implementation, on-going improvement and sustainability of LEA literacy plans

Liberatory Design is both a **flexible, continuous improvement process** that builds on Stanford’s Design Thinking and can be used by teams and a **set of equity leadership habits** that can be practiced daily. It can be used in a variety of ways and by a variety of actors, including innovation efforts, strategic planning, community-driven design, and collaborative teams. At the core of Liberatory Design are a set of beliefs and mindsets that all students can achieve at the highest levels.

**Transformational Change.** The Liberatory Design process creates transformational change by disrupting inequities in educational systems. Pilot LEAs and sites will be led in this process by the Principal Investigator, Dr. Olympia Kyriakidis, an expert in Liberatory Design, and systemic change. In the first stage of the process, local leadership teams will learn the liberatory design phases in Communities of Practice Convenings, and engage in the stages of the improvement process during the corresponding action periods. Liberatory Design phases include See the System, Empathize, Define, Ideate, Prototype, and Test. In the See the System phase teams will engage in qualitative and quantitative data as defined in the Needs Assessments. In the Empathy Stage teams will seek to understand the experiences of students and their families through activities such as student shadowing and empathy interviews. In the define stage, teams will explore foundational frameworks and the CILM, as well as the information learned though the earlier stages to define their Theory of Action for culturally responsive - sustaining literacy. In the ideation stage the team would discuss the possibilities for developing content of their plan, including furthering the literacy assets in their system, and further addressing literacy gaps in their system. The following stages are opportunities for teams to prototype, and test ideas in their system as they implement their plans. Stakeholder roles in implementing the plans will be developed by participating stakeholders (i.e. principals, classroom teachers, parents, librarians) and communicated through Literacy Plan Practice Profiles. The Literacy Plans and corresponding Practice Profiles support sustaining, spreading, and scaling the work across the LEA.

Liberatory Design methodology is also carried through Educator Academies that are organized by role: teachers, administrators, counselors, paraprofessionals, and library staff. Educators will choose a focus for an action research project that is aligned to the site’s literacy plan and is responsive to needs of the students they personally serve. After engaging in professional learning to deepen a particular CILM-aligned practice, educators will conduct PDSA cycles, collect and reflect on teacher and student implementation data, and report findings in a Showcase of Learning.

### Part 6: Evaluation Plan

### Describe how the analysis of the data collected from the project activities, resulting in a final evaluation, will be exploratory in nature, and aid in better understanding of the characteristics and needs of the targeted student population(s) and how the COE, or consortia of COEs, can effectively and efficiently meet their needs. (3000 character max)

The SDCOE internal evaluators will use an exploratory approach to analyze and investigate data collected prior to and after the implementation of the program. Their analyses will summarize and visualize the main characteristics of the data in order to answer specific questions and provide guidance and next steps to frontline staff.

The final analysis will compare program expectations to actual program outcomes to determine the extent to which the program produced the desired change in literacy and language development.For this final evaluation, we will compile data from several sources including (a) parent registration forms, (b) surveys, (c) program records, and (d) student assessments. All families complete a registration form before their student begins school. This form includes basic demographic information we will use to understand who the grant served. Additionally, prior to the beginning of the program and at the end, teachers and administrators will complete a short asset-based mindset survey, which examines their perceptions of language development. We will capture the data using a secure survey tool: Qualtrics. We will also gather information from parents about their involvement with their child’s learning, homework, and other ways they support their child’s literacy and language development. Additionally, we will collect information from program records to capture evidence about literacy plans and practice profile development, stages of implementation of these plans and profiles, and alignment between plans and LCAPs, SPSAs, and EL Master plans. Furthermore, we will use program records in the form of observational ratings of the professional learning events, using WestEd’s companion tool for the Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS), to assess the quality of the learning events. Finally, we will capture standardized assessment data from each district’s data system both prior to the intervention and directly after to investigate changes in reading, writing, and oracy development.

The evaluation will allow us to understand the characteristics and needs of the targeted student population in several ways. First, our analyses allow us to monitor the development of students’ language and literacy development over time and make adjustments to our strategies based on student performance. Additionally, our theory of action moves from teacher mindsets to practice to outcomes. We believe by changing teachers’ mindsets and practices we will observe changes in student learning, and these formative data will allow us to further understand the needs of our students better. Finally, we will embed our data into each school’s community of practice, which will allow frontline staff to better understand students’ literacy and language development along with any additional needs that we must address.

Our evaluative efforts and theory of action will demonstrate how a COE can effectively meet the needs of students. Our theory of action focuses on the district as the lever of change. While learning occurs primarily at the classroom level, schools are not often in complete control of all the factors influencing student learning. By developing a comprehensive literacy plan at the district level that builds the capacity of frontline staff along with tools and processes for monitoring the outcomes of the plan, we will be able to demonstrate how a COE can improve students’ literacy and language development.

B. Explain how the evaluation results will be used to sustain the project beyond the life of the grant so others may benefit from the project. **(3000 character max**

**Project Sustainability.** We will sustain project strategies beyond the funding of the grant in several ways. First, we have embedded the comprehensive literacy plans into an interactive cycle where school districts examine the effectiveness of their literacy programs both formatively and summatively. Summative cycles involve annual evaluations of program effectiveness and plans are re-examined every three years. This iterative cycle ensures that a key element of this grant, comprehensive literacy planning, remains sustainable after the funding expires.

Secondly, the measures for this project are locally sourced from the school districts in the grant or from other on-going projects. Schools continuously gather *demographic information* on students including race/ethnicity, language acquisition status, socioeconomic status, and others. All school districts have access to the Practice Profiles that were developed in year one and used to deepen implementation starting in the second year of the pilot. LEAs will also have access to the *Assets-based Mindset Survey* which asks teachers about their perceptions of student linguistic and academic achievement (Hanover, 2020). All districts have access to the *QPLS Companion Tool* developed by WestEd, which captures information on the extent to which professional learning events meet the criteria for high quality professional learning. Furthermore, this project uses local *literacy and language development data* so there is no need for districts to purchase additional assessments. We will provide case study descriptions for how schools use this data to make informed decisions regarding literacy and language development. Finally, the *Parent Engagement and Literacy Practices Survey*, which captures both quantitative and qualitative data on parent engagement practices around their child’s literacy and language development, is a locally developed tool that all districts can access on the COE’s companion website for this project. We will archive all project tools, sample plans, practice profiles, and other related project deliverables on the companion website so other districts can use these deliverables and learn from them.

Finally, this initiative’s professional learning, in-class strategies, and family engagement activities developed for this grant including:

(a) developing, aligning, and monitoring district and site literacy plans,

(b) building staff skill in literacy instruction, comprehensive ELD, dual language literacy,

(c) building diverse libraries,

(d) instructional coaching, and

(e) on-going equity professional learning

are all fully sustainable by integrating them into on-going professional development for teachers and into district strategic planning documents such as the LCAP. School districts can continue to prioritize Title I and II funding to provide high quality professional learning opportunities for teachers and ensure every child has access to high quality programs that effectively develop their literacy and language skills.

Part 7: Budget and Cost Effectiveness

The applicant must provide a thorough and detailed justification for each identified cost associated with implementing the proposed initiatives and goals, including why the costs are reasonable and necessary to support the proposal’s initiatives and goals. A projected budget is required for the application. The three-year budget will be reviewed and scored. The following are instructions for completing Part 7:

1. Complete the 2021 CLSD Proposed Project Budget Summary (Form D) for the project’s performance period from September 1, 2021, through September 30, 2024.
2. Provide a detailed budget narrative (description) for each line-item included in the three-year performance period on Form E that aligns with Form D. The narrative should include how the proposed costs to implement the proposed project are necessary and reasonable in terms of project activities, benefits to participants, and project outcomes.

The portal will require the upload of these documents at the end.