



# Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report

Constraint 3 - Historically Marginalized Groups 3.2

**Board Meeting Date:** May 8, 2025

**Reporting Period:** May 8, 2025

## Constraint 3

*The superintendent shall not allow practices that lead to academic disparities within specific student populations (African American students, emergent bilingual students, students receiving special education services).*

## CPM 3.2 [Dual Language Instruction]

*The number of campuses scoring on track in the language of instruction domain of the locally developed Dual Language Data Collection Tool Rubric during walkthroughs will increase from BASELINE in June 2025 to Y% in June 2029.*

## District Initiatives Priority Alignment

District Initiative	Overview (Needs to be developed)	GPM Alignment
<b>AISD Stronger Together</b>	<i>Organizational Culture, Accountability, Communication, Outreach</i>	
<b>Early Learning</b>	<i>Enrollment, Academics, Outreach, Partnerships, Expansion</i>	
<b>Middle Years</b>	<i>Engagement, Staffing, Funding, Scheduling and Support</i>	
<b>Post Secondary Success</b>	<i>College-Readiness, Equity, Enrollment, CTE and Graduation</i>	
<b>Special Education</b>	<i>Inclusiveness, Compliance, Sustainability</i>	



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Background

Austin ISD's commitment to biliteracy stems from a deeply held belief that language is both a cultural and academic asset. Our Dual Language programs aim to graduate students who are bilingual, biliterate, and demonstrate cross-cultural competence through the implementation of Austin ISD's dual language model and language and content allocation plan.

Historically, Austin ISD's bilingual education efforts have centered on expanding access, laying the groundwork for the comprehensive dual language programs we have today. Building on that strong foundation, the district is now further investing in sustainability, instructional coherence, and long-term outcomes by aligning classroom environments with instruction. This progression reflects a continued commitment to meaningful outcomes for multilingual learners.

The Multilingual Education Team (MET) puts into action Austin ISD's belief that the linguistic and cultural richness of our students is a resource that should be recognized, valued, and sustained. The vision of the Multilingual Education Team is that Austin ISD schools will be inclusive communities that celebrate all languages and cultures, where exemplary multilingual instructional programs provide high-quality teaching and learning so that all students excel and graduate prepared for active engagement in a global, multicultural society.

The Elementary Dual Language Data Collection Tool was developed in collaboration with campus administrators focusing on essential environmental elements to support dual language instruction in the classroom. Partial implementation in 2023 of the newly developed tool indicated a need for training to understand the elements and to build on the role of the environment to facilitate content and language learning.

During the 2024-25 school year, campus administrators conducted the Fall 2024 Dual Language Walkthroughs in PreK4-5th grade classrooms, including ESL partner teachers' classrooms. Elementary Multilingual Education Specialists conducted the Spring 2025 Dual Language Walkthroughs for the same group of teachers observed in the Fall. Our District has 57 elementary campuses with dual language programming and 59 programs considering that two campuses are implementing two programs - Spanish Dual Language and Mandarin Dual Language.

The focus of CPM 3.2 is the element of 'Language of Instruction' which highlights the significance of maintaining the Language of Instruction aligned to the District's dual language model and Language Allocation Plan. The Language of Instruction is essential to developing academic language in the target and partner languages.

### Alignment with District Initiatives

This Constraint Progress Measure aligns with our draft district initiative, *Foundation First: Early Childhood*. This initiative positions Austin ISD as a leader in early childhood education by ensuring equitable, high-quality



learning experiences for children from birth to grade 2 to set students up for success throughout all grades in elementary and beyond.

These initiatives include several key projects, and those most closely associated with this constraint and this constraint progress measure are:

- **PK High-Quality Classrooms:** Providing enriched, multilingual curriculum that integrates purposeful, guided play with high quality content while exploring NAEYC accreditation for program consistency.
- **Early Childhood: K–2 Outcomes:** In multilingual settings, implementing robust foundational literacy and numeracy practices, strengthening Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and enhancing instructional alignment.

Milestones include the development of high-quality, developmentally appropriate learning experiences for students and families, the development of foundational curriculum, and the implementation of new K–2 instructional frameworks as part of a more considerable plan to adopt one coherent and aligned district-wide Instructional Framework. Our dual language program is a critical component of these district-wide efforts, and within that CPM 3.2 emphasizes the importance of maintaining the Language of Instruction in alignment with the District’s dual language model and Language Allocation Plan. This ensures the development of academic language in both the target and partner languages, directly supporting the goal of bilingualism and biliteracy for students. Specific milestones include efforts to align campus instructional schedules with the District’s Language Allocation Plan and providing targeted professional learning on effective strategies for maintaining the Language of Instruction.

Key Data Findings

- The 2024-2025 baseline data indicates that the dual language element of Language of Instruction is at a 2.0 - Developing level district-wide.
- After averaging the Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 scores, the number and percentage of elementary dual language programs scoring at each level are:

	Emerging	Developing	On Track
Number	3	49	7
Percentage	5%	83.1%	11.9%

The above table reflects the total 59 dual language programs at 57 elementary campuses. Joslin and Reilly have a Mandarin dual language program and a Spanish dual language program.



## DATA ANALYSIS

**District-Level:** The number of campuses scoring on track in the language of instruction domain of the locally developed Dual Language Data Collection Tool Rubric during walkthroughs will increase from BASELINE in June 2025 to Y% in June 2029.

### Language of Instruction

			Yearly Targets			
Group	2024-25	2024-25 ACTUAL	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
Language of Instruction Target Percent Score	BASELINE	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Language of Instruction Number 'On Track'	BASELINE	7				
Language of Instruction Percentage 'On Track'	BASELINE	11.9%				

*There are a total of 59 dual language programs at 57 elementary campuses in the 2024-25 school year. Joslin and Reilly have two dual language programs: Mandarin and Spanish.*



## Key Takeaways

- The 2024-2025 baseline data reveals that the dual language element of ‘Language of Instruction’ is at a ‘Developing’ level at the large majority of campuses, indicating that some, but not all, elements of language of instruction are in place at most campuses (see Appendix 3 for a detailed table regarding the elements observed and in place at each campus).
- After averaging the Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 scores, the number (and percentage) of elementary dual language campuses at each level are:
  - Emerging - 3 (5%)
  - Developing - 49 (83.1%)
  - On Track - 7 (11.9%)
- Discrepancies exist between scores observed by campus administrators in the Fall of 2024 and the scores observed by Multilingual Education Team department members in the Spring of 2025, with campus administrators trending higher in their scoring than MET members (see data collection table in Appendix 2 for a comparison of scoring).

## The Root Cause

- There is a need for campus administrators and teachers to continue to strengthen their understanding of the District’s Dual Language Model including the program goals of bilingualism/biliteracy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural proficiency, as well as the District’s Language and Content Allocation Plan that is aimed at developing language within content.
- Campus administrators and teachers continue to strengthen their understanding and implementation of the Elementary Dual Language Data Collection Tool. However, the variances that exist between the Fall Dual Language Walkthroughs conducted by campus administrators and the Spring Dual Language Walkthroughs conducted by the Multilingual Education Team indicate that calibration on walkthrough content is needed. The district has noted a similar pattern in Early Learning Walkthroughs in which campus observation scores trend high.
- Staffing shortages in bilingual education classrooms continue to affect the consistency and quality of dual language instruction, with Austin ISD experiencing an increasing number of bilingual exceptions being filed for the last several years that allow permission for bilingual education classrooms to be staffed with non-bilingual certified teachers.

## Outliers

Although most campuses are in the Developing stage of adhering to Language of Instruction, there are several campuses that are already ‘On Track’. Campuses that are already ‘On Track’ for Language of Instruction are:

Band 1 - Govalle

Band 2 - Guerrero Thompson, Palm

Band 3 - Doss, Joslin, Reilly, Summit



There are three distinct indicators within the dual language element of ‘Language of Instruction’ - (1)*Teacher maintains language of instruction according to schedule*; (2)*Teacher utilizes visual marker to identify the language of instruction*; and (3)*Each language is represented in print within its content and each is marked by its respective color*. These seven campuses who were ‘On Track’ had more than 50% of teachers demonstrating all three indicators.

Overall during observations, several characteristics were noted for the ‘On Track’ campuses. For instance, teachers at Govalle Elementary consistently use a language marker such as clothespins in red or blue, beaded necklaces in red and blue, and a lamp that turns red when plugged in. At Palm Elementary, student work is displayed in both languages which reflects the language of instruction. Additionally, students use their journals to write in both languages. At Doss Elementary, a teacher maintains language of instruction as she instructs students to use choral responses in unison. At Joslin Elementary, a teacher maintains the language of instruction according to the schedule in Mandarin without translation. Both Mandarin and English are represented in the content area.

Other dual language elements support ‘Language of Instruction’. For instance, Guerrero Thompson had 75% of their teachers ‘On Track’ on the dual language elements of ‘Daily Schedule’ and ‘Linguistic Spaces’. Additionally, Govalle had 100% of their teachers ‘On Track’ on the dual language element of ‘Linguistic Spaces’. Campuses ‘On Track’ for ‘Language of Instruction’ and other dual language elements indicate that campus leaders and teachers have a stronger understanding of the elements that support dual language implementation.

## Progress of Initiatives

The key projects of the draft initiative *Foundation First: Early Childhood* that most closely relate to CPM 3.2 are PreK High Quality Classrooms and K–2 Academic Outcomes. Work specific to these projects has already begun in the 2024-25 school year. Substantial, district-wide work includes:

- The purchase of Tier II and Tier III early literacy Spanish resources, related professional learning, and adding a ‘cross-linguistics’ look-for on the MTSS walkthrough form.
- The Multilingual Education Team (MET) has partnered with elementary STEM and Humanities to provide a Language and Content Allocation Plan and robust dual language curricula in the foundational years through 5th grade that are intentionally designed to build language proficiency in both Spanish and English, utilizing cross-linguistic connections and content-based language instruction as key tenets of dual language curricula.
- The MET provided training on the District’s Language and Content Allocation Plan denoting the designated language per content. For example, Spanish is the designated language for teaching Science in grades PreK through 5th grades. Please see the Austin ISD Elementary Language and Content Allocation Plan in Appendix 6.
- In this baseline year, the Multilingual Education Team has worked to inform campuses of the expectations by providing professional learning regarding the Elementary Dual Language Elements, including examples.



- Initial cross-training of MET, Humanities, and STEM team members on Content Based Language Instruction to aid in the development and improvement of curricula and professional learning, and to collaboratively plan for expanded professional learning sessions in the coming years.
- Collaborative planning with Elementary School Leadership regarding specificity of classroom schedules with defined content blocks and language of instruction, which will begin with required training of campus administrators at Leadership Institute 2025.
- In order to support the staffing of bilingual certified teachers and to reduce the number of teachers on Bilingual Exceptions, the Multilingual Education Team has provided regularly scheduled professional learning sessions including specific bilingual certification sessions. The Multilingual Education Team is currently partnering to design and implement a robust 4-day Bilingual Academy focusing on specific elements connected with the 164 and 190 Bilingual Exams including coaching and practice tests for currently certified teachers who are candidates to add the Bilingual Certification. The inaugural cohort will begin in May 2025 with a second cohort scheduled in July 2025 prior to the beginning of the 2025-26 school year.

## The Plan Forward

- We will continue to provide an annual training session to introduce the 'Elements of Dual Language' (formerly known as the 'Dual Language Data Collection' session for newly hired teachers and administrators, or to serve as a refresher, throughout the school year
- We will calibrate the Dual Language Data Collection Rubric with campus administrators to minimize the variances that emerged between the Fall Dual Language Walkthroughs conducted by campus administrators and the Spring Dual Language Walkthroughs conducted by the Multilingual Education Team.
- We will continue to provide professional learning around the District's Language and Content Allocation Plan and the purpose of dual language programming towards the goals of bilingualism/biliteracy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural proficiency.
- We will develop and launch professional learning focusing on Content-Based Language Instruction (CBLI) that will support teachers with maintaining the language of instruction, which will roll out this summer for the 2025-2026 school year.
- Elementary campuses will begin a district-wide focus on detailed classroom schedules that denote specific instructional blocks, resources that support those blocks, and denoting targeted language of instruction with an initial rollout at Leadership Institute and continued professional learning and monitoring of implementation.
- The MET will continue to collaborate with Talent Strategy and across departments on the provision and implementation of a robust plan to address staffing shortages in bilingual education classrooms, which may be contributing to the consistency and quality of dual language instruction.
- We will focus professional learning on Band 1 campuses in accordance with Austin ISD's Support and Resource Index to align with our values of serving our underserved students and families.
- The Austin ISD Bilingual Academy inaugural cohort focused on certification exams will begin in May 2025 with a second cohort scheduled in July 2025 prior to the beginning of the 2025-2026 school year.



## Key Progress Indicators (KPIs)

- Track inventory of dual language instructional materials and resources, with a sustainable plan for replenishment of materials over time.
- Evidence of multilingual curricular supports with a continued plan for annual evaluation and identification of areas for improvement.
- Track participation of provided professional learning for teachers and observed implementation using the Dual Language Data Collection Tool in classrooms aimed at the following:
  - Strengthening the understanding of teachers pertaining to the District's Dual Language Model including the program goals of bilingualism/biliteracy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural proficiency, as well as the District's Language and Content Allocation Plan.
  - Strengthening the understanding of teachers regarding the implementation of the Elementary Dual Language Elements.
- Track participation in calibration sessions for the Elementary Dual Language Data Collection Tool with campus administrators aimed at the following:
  - Strengthening the understanding of campus administrators in the content of the Data Collection Tool and what the delivery of that content looks like in high quality dual language settings.
  - Creating alignment across the district for observational scoring.
- Track key areas of implementation of the district plan to address staffing shortages and bilingual exceptions, including:
  - Numbers of exceptions approved for bilingual certifications.
  - Staff participation in the AISD Bilingual Academy and corresponding testing and successful certification rates of participants.





## APPENDIX

### Appendix 1: Campus-Level Data

**Table Name. Campus Level Data, Disaggregated by Groups, Ordered by SRI Band**

Campus	SRI Band	# of Dual Language Students	# Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Non Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Teachers Observed	Language of Instruction Score (Average score of Fall 2024 & Spring 2025 Data Collection)	Language of Instruction Tracking
Andrews ES	1	230	226	4	11	2.1	Developing
Barrington ES	1	298	292	6	13	2.4	Developing
Brown ES	1	347	340	7	14	2.2	Developing
Cook ES	1	327	318	9	16	1.9	Developing
Dawson ES	1	63	47	16	5	1.6	Developing
Galindo ES	1	241	234	7	10	2.1	Developing
Govalle ES	1	132	98	34	7	3.0	On Track
Harris ES	1	206	188	18	13	2.1	Developing
Hart ES	1	407	396	11	18	2.1	Developing
Houston ES	1	302	296	6	14	2.1	Developing
Jordan ES	1	280	274	6	6	2.1	Developing
Langford ES	1	253	252	1	11	1.6	Developing
Linder ES	1	395	384	11	17	1.7	Developing



Campus	SRI Band	# of Dual Language Students	# Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Non Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Teachers Observed	Language of Instruction Score (Average score of Fall 2024 & Spring 2025 Data Collection)	Language of Instruction Tracking
Norman-Sims ES	1	81	80	1	4	2.3	Developing
Ortega ES	1	101	85	16	7	1.5	Developing
Overton ES	1	283	267	16	14	1.6	Developing
Padron ES	1	516	512	4	23	2.2	Developing
Pecan Springs ES	1	119	110	9	6	1.7	Developing
Perez ES	1	339	312	27	15	1.9	Developing
Pickle ES	1	324	316	8	15	2.0	Developing
Rodriguez ES	1	160	158	2	10	2.4	Developing
Sanchez ES	1	288	38	326	17	2	Developing
Walnut Creek ES	1	337	332	5	16	2.1	Developing
Widen ES	1	196	192	4	11	1.7	Developing
Winn Montessori	1	203	155	48	9	1.5	Developing
Wooldridge ES	1	343	341	2	18	1.9	Developing
Wooten ES	1	197	190	7	10	1.5	Developing
Allison ES	2	131	128	3	7	2.1	Developing
Guerrero-Thompson ES	2	435	435	0	16	2.5	On Track
Graham ES	2	238	233	5	12	1.6	Developing



Campus	SRI Band	# of Dual Language Students	# Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Non Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Teachers Observed	Language of Instruction Score (Average score of Fall 2024 & Spring 2025 Data Collection)	Language of Instruction Tracking
McBee ES	2	256	250	6	14	1.7	Developing
Odom ES	2	121	117	4	11	2.2	Developing
Palm ES	2	146	138	8	8	2.5	On Track
Pillow ES	2	159	155	4	6	1.5	Developing
Pleasant Hill ES	2	165	163	2	7	1.8	Developing
St Elmo ES	2	149	144	5	8	2.1	Developing
Zavala ES	2	64	31	33	3	2.2	Developing
Blanton ES	3	491	163	328	25	2.3	Developing
Blazier ES	3	350	292	58	16	1.8	Developing
Casey ES	3	148	83	65	7	2.1	Developing
Cunningham ES	3	54	49	5	4	1.0	Emerging
Doss ES	3	147	12	135	8	2.0	On Track
Joslin ES (Mand)	3	70	7	63	3	1.6	On Track
Joslin ES (Spa)	3	139	46	93	8	2.3	Developing
Kocurek ES	3	92	87	5	6	2.1	Developing
Menchaca ES	3	196	142	54	11	2	Developing
Oak Hill EL	3	256	225	31	12	2.2	Developing



Campus	SRI Band	# of Dual Language Students	# Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Non Emergent Bilingual DL Students	# of Teachers Observed	Language of Instruction Score (Average score of Fall 2024 & Spring 2025 Data Collection)	Language of Instruction Tracking
Reilly ES (Mand)	3	112	29	83	7	1.9	On Track
Reilly ES (Spa)	3	285	126	159	9	2.2	Developing
Summitt ES	3	250	166	84	13	1.8	On Track
Sunset Valley ES	3	424	119	305	16	2.2	Developing
Travis Heights ES	3	183	76	107	13	2.2	Developing
Uphaus ECC	3	144	137	7	5	2.1	Developing
Williams ES	3	110	103	7	7	2.2	Developing
Bear Creek ES	4	43	11	32	3	2.0	Developing
Becker ES	4	496	99	397	23	2.2	Developing
Maplewood ES	4	118	23	95	6	1.3	Emerging
Ridgetop ES	4	387	55	332	19	2.3	Developing
Zilker ES	4	133	8	125	10	1.1	Emerging
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>NA</b>						

Number of Dual Language Students, Emergent Bilingual DL Students, and Non-Emergent Bilingual Students is as of 4/10/25. The 'Language of Instruction Score is an average score of Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 Data Collection Walkthroughs. Data is organized by Support Resource Index ([SRI](#)) bands.



KEY Spanish		KEY Mandarin & Vietnamese/English	
0.0 - 0.4	Not Observed	0.0 - 0.4	Not Observed
0.5 - 1.4	Emerging	0.5 - 0.9	Emerging
1.5 - 2.4	Developing	1.0 - 1.4	Developing
2.5 - 3.0	On Track	1.5 - 2.0	On Track

#### Summary Table by Band

	Band 1 Campuses*	Band 2 Campuses*	Band 3 Campuses*	Band 4 Campuses*
Emerging Level			1	2
Developing Level	26	8	12	3
On Track Level	1	2	4	

*\*Includes 57 Dual Language campuses and 59 Dual language programs -  
Joslin and Reilly have Mandarin Dual Language and Spanish Dual Language programs*



## Appendix 2: Campus Level LOI Walkthrough Comparisons and Averages

The following table compares the Fall 2024 LOI-focused walkthrough conducted by campus administrators with the Spring 2025 LOI-focused walkthroughs conducted by the Multilingual Education Team and then averages the scores for this CPM board report.

	FALL 2024			SPRING 2025			AVERAGE OF FALL & SPRING		
CAMPUS	LOI Score Spanish Program Scale	LOI Score Mandarin & Vietnamese Programs Scale	LOI Rank	LOI Score Spanish Program Scale	LOI Score Mandarin & Vietnamese Programs Scale	LOI Rank	LOI Score Spanish Program Scale	LOI Score Mandarin & Vietnamese Programs Scale	LOI Rank
Allison	2.6		On Track	1.6		Developing	2.1		Developing
Andrews	1.8		Developing	2.3		Developing	2.1		Developing
Barrington	2.3		Developing	2.5		On Track	2.4		Developing
Bear Creek	2.3		Developing	1.7		Developing	2.0		Developing
Becker	2.6		On Track	1.7		Developing	2.2		Developing
Blanton	2.5		On Track	2.0		Developing	2.3		Developing
Blazier	2.3		Developing	1.3		Emerging	1.8		Developing
Casey	1.8		Developing	2.3		Developing	2.1		Developing
Cook	1.9		Developing	1.9		Developing	1.9		Developing
Cunningham	0.6		Emerging	1.3		Emerging	1.0		Emerging
Dawson	1.8		Developing	1.4		Emerging	1.6		Developing
Doss (Mandarin)	3.0	2.0	On Track	3.0	2.0	On Track	3.0	2	On Track
Galindo	2.5		On Track	1.7		Developing	2.1		Developing
Govalle	2.9		On Track	3.0		On Track	3.0		On Track
Graham	1.9		Developing	1.2		Emerging	1.6		Developing
Guerrero Thompson	2.9		On Track	2.0		Developing	2.5		On Track
Harris	2.7		On Track	1.5		Developing	2.1		Developing
Hart	2.3		Developing	1.9		Developing	2.1		Developing
Houston	2.3		Developing	1.9		Developing	2.1		Developing
Jordan	2.9		On Track	1.8		Developing	2.4		Developing
Joslin Spanish	3.0		On Track	1.5		Developing	2.3		Developing
Joslin (Mandarin)	1.8	1.2	Developing	3.0	2.0	On Track	2.4	1.6	On Track
Kocurek	2.3		Developing	1.8		Developing	2.1		Developing
Langford	1.4		Emerging	1.8		Developing	1.6		Developing



Linder	1.9		Developing	1.5		Developing	1.7		Developing
Maplewood	1.3		Emerging	1.3		Emerging	1.3		Emerging
McBee	1.6		Developing	1.7		Developing	1.7		Developing
Menchaca	2.1		Developing	1.8		Developing	2.0		Developing
Norman Sims	2.6		On Track	2.0		Developing	2.3		Developing
Oak Hill	2.2		Developing	2.1		Developing	2.2		Developing
Odom	2.4		Developing	2.0		Developing	2.2		Developing
Ortega	1.6		Developing	1.3		Emerging	1.5		Developing
Overton	1.7		Developing	1.5		Developing	1.6		Developing
Padron	2.3		Developing	2.0		Developing	2.2		Developing
Palm	2.9		On Track	2.1		Developing	2.5		On Track
Pecan Springs	1.6		Developing	1.8		Developing	1.7		Developing
Perez	1.8		Developing	1.9		Developing	1.9		Developing
Pickle	2.0		Developing	2.0		Developing	2.0		Developing
Pillow	2.2		Developing	0.8		Emerging	1.5		Developing
Pleasant Hill	2.0		Developing	1.6		Developing	1.8		Developing
Reilly (Spanish)	2.5		On Track	1.9		Developing	2.2		Developing
Reilly (Mandarin)	3.0	2.0	On Track	2.9	1.8	On Track	2.9	1.9	On Track
Ridgetop	2.7		On Track	1.9		Developing	2.3		Developing
Rodriguez	2.7		On Track	2.1		Developing	2.4		Developing
Sanchez	2.0		Developing	1.9		Developing	2.0		Developing
St. Elmo	1.9		Developing	2.3		Developing	2.1		Developing
Summit (Vietnamese)	2.4	1.6	On Track	3.0	2.0	On Track	2.9	1.8	On Track
Sunset Valley	2.2		Developing	2.1		Developing	2.2		Developing
TA Brown	2.2		Developing	2.2		Developing	2.2		Developing
Travis Heights	2.5		On Track	1.8		Developing	2.2		Developing
Uphaus	1.8		Developing	2.4		Developing	2.1		Developing
Walnut Creek	2.3		Developing	1.8		Developing	2.1		Developing
Widen	1.9		Developing	1.4		Emerging	1.7		Developing
Williams	2.4		Developing	2.0		Developing	2.2		Developing
Winn	1.7		Developing	1.3		Emerging	1.5		Developing
Wooldridge	2.0		Developing	1.7		Developing	1.9		Developing



Wooten	1.5		Developing	1.4		Emerging	1.5		Developing
Zavala	2.3		Developing	2.0		Developing	2.2		Developing
Zilker	0.6		Emerging	1.5		Developing	1.1		Emerging

## Appendix 3: Language of Instruction by Criteria

The following table indicates the percentage of implementation observed for each criteria within the Language of Instruction element of the dual language data collection tool.

Language of Instruction by Criteria							
		Criteria 1 Teacher maintains language of instruction according to schedule		Criteria 2 Teacher utilizes visual marker to identify the language of instruction*		Criteria 3 Each language is represented in print within its content and each is marked by its respective color**	
Campus	Total # Teachers	# Teachers LOI Criteria 1 Observed	% LOI Criteria 1 Observed	# Teachers LOI Criteria 2 Observed	% LOI Criteria 2 Observed	# Teachers LOI Criteria 3 Observed	% LOI Criteria 3 Observed
Andrews ES	11	11	100%	4	36%	10	91%
Barrington ES	13	12	92%	3	23%	13	100%
Brown ES	13	12	92%	5	38%	11	85%
Cook ES	15	11	73%	2	13%	15	100%
Dawson ES	5	5	100%	0	0%	2	40%
Galindo ES	10	7	70%	2	20%	8	80%
Govalle ES	7	7	100%	7	100%	7	100%
Harris ES	13	9	69%	1	8%	10	77%
Hart ES	18	17	94%	3	17%	14	78%
Houston ES	14	13	93%	2	14%	10	71%
Jordan ES	6	6	100%	6	100%	5	83%
Langford ES	11	10	91%	4	36%	6	55%
Linder ES	17	13	76%	0	0%	12	71%
Norman-Sims ES	4	4	100%	1	25%	3	75%
Ortega ES	7	5	71%	0	0%	4	57%





Overton ES	14	11	79%	1	7%	9	64%
Padron ES	23	21	91%	7	30%	18	78%
Pecan Springs ES	6	6	100%	1	17%	4	67%
Perez ES	15	12	80%	2	13%	11	73%
Pickle ES	15	15	100%	1	7%	14	93%
Rodriguez ES	9	9	100%	3	33%	7	78%
Sanchez ES	17	15	88%	3	18%	15	88%
Walnut Creek ES	16	12	75%	4	25%	12	75%
Widen ES	11	9	82%	1	9%	5	45%
Winn Montessori	9	9	100%	0	0%	3	33%
Wooldridge ES	17	16	94%	5	29%	8	47%
Wooten ES	10	8	80%	0	0%	6	60%
Allison ES	7	5	71%	1	14%	5	71%
Graham ES	12	7	58%	1	8%	6	50%
Guerrero-Thompson ES	16	16	100%	2	13%	14	88%
McBee ES	13	10	77%	3	23%	9	69%
Odom ES	11	10	91%	2	18%	10	91%
Palm ES	8	8	100%	2	25%	7	88%
Pillow ES	6	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%
Pleasant Hill ES	7	6	86%	1	14%	4	57%
St Elmo ES	8	7	88%	3	38%	8	100%
Zavala ES	3	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Blanton ES	25	24	96%	8	32%	19	76%
Blazier ES	16	13	81%	0	0%	8	50%
Casey ES	7	7	100%	4	57%	5	71%
Cunningham	4	4	100%	0	0%	1	25%
Doss ES (Mandarin)	8	8	100%	NA	NA	8	100%
Joslin EL (Mandarin)	3	3	100%	NA	NA	3	100%
Joslin ES (Spanish)	8	6	75%	1	13%	5	63%
Kocurek ES	6	4	67%	1	17%	6	100%
Menchaca ES	11	8	73%	2	18%	9	82%
Oak Hill EL	12	12	100%	3	25%	10	83%



Reilly ES (Mandarin)	6	6	100%	NA	NA	5	83%
Reilly ES (Spanish)	8	7	88%	1	13%	7	88%
Williams ES	7	7	100%	1	14%	6	86%
Summitt ES (Vietnamese)	13	13	100%	NA	NA	13	100%
Sunset Valley ES	16	15	94%	6	38%	13	81%
Travis Heights ES	13	10	77%	4	31%	9	69%
Becker ES	23	22	96%	3	13%	13	57%
Maplewood ES	6	5	83%	0	0%	2	33%
Ridgetop ES	19	17	89%	7	37%	12	63%
Zilker ES	10	10	100%	0	0%	5	50%

\*This criteria does not apply to Mandarin nor Vietnamese programs

\*\* This criteria is modified for Mandarin & Vietnamese programs to read: Each language is represented in print within its content

## Appendix 4: Defining the Progress Measure

There are three distinct indicators within the dual language element of ‘Language of Instruction’ - There are three distinct indicators within the dual language element of ‘Language of Instruction’ - (1) *Teacher maintains language of instruction according to schedule*; (2) *Teacher utilizes visual marker to identify the language of instruction*; and (3) *Each language is represented in print within its content and each is marked by its respective color*. Campuses with a majority of teachers demonstrating all three indicators are On Track.

The Elementary Dual Language Data Collection Tool was developed in collaboration with campus administrators focusing on essential environmental elements to support dual language instruction in the classroom. During the 2024-2025 school year, campus administrators conducted the Fall 2024 Dual Language Walkthroughs in PreK4-5th grade classrooms, including ESL partner teachers. Elementary Multilingual Education Specialists conducted the Spring 2025 Dual Language Walkthroughs for the same group of teachers observed in the Fall.

For the Spanish Dual Language Walkthrough, each of the seven elements consists of three indicators. For the Mandarin Dual Language Walkthrough and the Vietnamese Dual Language Walkthrough, each element consists of two indicators. Therefore, the range for each element of the Spanish DL Walkthrough is 0-3 and the range for each element of the Mandarin DL and Vietnamese DL Walkthrough is 0-2.

The focus of CPM 3.2 is the element of ‘Language of Instruction’ which highlights the significance of maintaining the Language of Instruction aligned to the District’s dual language model and Language Allocation Plan. The Language of Instruction is essential to developing academic language in the target and partner languages.



## Appendix 5: Root Cause and Theory of Change

The Root Cause indicates a continued need for deepening understanding and consistent implementation of the District's Dual Language Model, including program goals, the Language and Content Allocation Plan, and the Elementary Dual Language Data Collection Tool. It also highlights calibration gaps and staffing challenges that impact program fidelity.

### Clarifying and Reinforcing Foundational Knowledge

- To support both new and returning educators, efforts include annual training on the 'Elements of Dual Language', formerly known as the Dual Language Data Collection session. This ensures that all staff, especially newly hired teachers and administrators, develop a strong foundational understanding of the District's Dual Language Model, its goals (bilingualism/biliteracy, academic achievement, and cross-cultural proficiency), and the tools used to monitor implementation. Regular refreshers also help ensure knowledge retention and consistent messaging system wide.

### Improving Calibration and Monitoring Practices

- Recognizing that variances in walkthrough data between campus-led and MET-led observations are often due to calibration gaps, efforts include intentional calibration sessions using the Dual Language Data Collection Rubric with campus administrators. This action ensures aligned understanding and consistent application of the tool's indicators, improving the reliability of data used to support instructional decisions.

### Deepening Understanding of the Language and Content Allocation Plan:

- Continued professional learning focused on the District's Language and Content Allocation Plan will reinforce expectations around the designated language of instruction per content area. This supports campus staff in implementing dual language instruction with greater fidelity and clarity, directly responding to the root cause of inconsistent understanding across campuses.

### Building Instructional Capacity Through CBLI

- To address challenges with maintaining the language of instruction and promoting meaningful language development within content, professional learning on Content-Based Language Instruction (CBLI) will be launching at scale in summer 2025. This training will equip teachers with practical strategies to develop students' language skills through content learning, directly aligning with the dual language model's focus on language development through academic instruction.

### Prioritizing Support Where It's Needed Most

- Acknowledging that staffing shortages and implementation challenges may be more pronounced in some schools, Band 1 campuses are identified as a focal point for professional learning and support. This targeted approach ensures that schools with the highest needs receive the most intensive guidance, thereby improving consistency and equity in dual language instruction across the district.

Through these strategic actions, efforts are in reinforcing foundational knowledge, improving calibration and data integrity, deepening instructional practices, and prioritizing differentiated support. Together, these efforts



will strengthen the overall quality and consistency of the district's dual language programming and increase the number of Elementary Dual Language campuses 'On Track' for Language of Instruction.

## Appendix 6: Supporting Implementation Data / Research

In regards to maintaining the **Language of Instruction** in a Dual Language model, here are a few salient points from the research:

According to LaForett, et.al (2023), "The importance of language of instruction in dual language education (DLE) programs is emphasized throughout the research by LaForett et al. (2023). The authors state that "use of the partner language at least 50% of the time has been defined as a central tenet among DLE programs (Lindholm-Leary, 2001), as students need opportunities to produce language to build their language skills (Saunders & O'Brien, 2006)". They argue that "adherence to the language of instruction is a key aspect of delivering DLE programs with fidelity". Furthermore, the authors highlight that "for DLE programs, the heart of fidelity lies in the need for congruence between a DLE program's theoretical model for dual language instruction and actual classroom practice (Mora et al., 2001), including teachers' actual language use in the classroom". In fact, "the Center for Applied Linguistics' (CAL) Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (Howard et al., 2018, p. 57) Instruction strand Principle 1A specifies the standard that "The program model and corresponding curriculum are implemented with fidelity". Ultimately, "adhering to the designated language of instruction, regardless of the language of instruction model, is critical to promoting students' bilingualism, biliteracy, and academic success in English and in the partner language".

During an interview with Dr. Sonia Soltero in 2019, the following question was posed: "Many dual language education programs maintain separation of the two languages, why is that?"

Dr. Soltero's response included, "In dual language programs there needs to be a sort of accountability of how much of each language is being used for instruction and learning, that is why the program models are called for example 80-20 (meaning starting with 80% of the time in the language other than English, and 20% in English) or 50-50 when the instructional time is split evenly between the two languages. When both languages are constantly used simultaneously there is no way of knowing if the model language allocation is being implemented."

"All that said, language boundaries in dual language programs do not preclude teachers from engaging students in building metalingual awareness, exploring cross-linguistic connections, and using both their linguistic repertoires. Students should definitely be allowed and encouraged to use whatever language they choose or are stronger in to communicate and process their learning. However, one thing that needs to be clear is that the language boundaries apply to teachers so that they are not translating or flip-flopping between the two."



## References

Colón, I. T. (2019, November 25). *Interview: Dr. Sonia Soltero on the importance of cross-linguistic connections and metabilingual awareness*. New America.

<https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/interview-dr-sonia-soltero-importance-cross-linguistic-connections-and-metabilingual-awareness/>

LaForett, D. R., Franco-Jenkins, X., Winsler, A., Eron, M. T., Mumma, K., & Nguyen, M. V. H. (2023). Adherence to language of instruction in Spanish-English dual language early elementary classrooms. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 13(3–4), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26390043.2023.2280612>

## Appendix 6: Glossary

- Dual Language Elements/Data Collection Tool
  - [Elementary Mandarin/Vietnamese Dual Language Elements/Data Collection Tool](#)
  - [Elementary Spanish Dual Language Elements/Data Collection Tool](#)
- Austin ISD Elementary Language and Content Allocation Plan
  - [Mandarin Dual Language](#)
  - [Spanish Dual Language](#)
  - [Vietnamese Dual Language](#)
- Austin ISD Elementary Dual Language Data Collection Walkthrough Rubric
  - [Mandarin/Vietnamese DL Rubric](#)
  - [Spanish DL Rubric](#)