Language Development Policies and Practices Impacting the College and Career Readiness of Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) in Secondary Schools

Cecilia Mendoza
California State University, Fresno

Abstract

Programs and policies related to the education of long-term English learners (LTELs) at the secondary level are often based on the belief that fluency in English is the primary, if not the sole, requirement for academic success and college and career readiness. This case study investigates whether LTEL students are accessing Linked Learning/California Partnership Academy pathways to achieve the goals of the Common Core State Standards of college and career readiness. Results indicate that conflicting language development policies at the district and site level impede access to programs that offer college and career readiness skills.

Keywords: long-term English language learners, English language proficiency policies, student engagement, college and career readiness, equity and access, Linked Learning/California Partnership Academy

Educational leaders' knowledge of their clients is the foundational starting point in making educational decisions that ensure equity and access for all students, especially for long-term English learners (LTELs) at the middle and high school level. Understanding who LTELs are, where they go to school, and whether they are accessing college preparation programs for college and career readiness is the focus of this research. The largest and fastest growing K-12 student population group in the United States is the Latino-origin student (McFarland et al., 2017). California reported the highest percentage of English language learners (ELLs) among its public school students, at 22.4% (McFarland et al., 2017; Sugarman & Lee, 2017). According to data collected by the California Department of Education for the 2015-2016 school year, Spanish was the most commonly spoken home language of ELLs, making up 85% of the state's ELL student population (California Department of Education, 2016). Additionally, California defines LTELs as those students who have been in school for six or more years and who are not progressing toward English proficiency. Of the 22% of the California student population who are ELLs, 63% are LTELs (Olsen, 2010; Sugarman & Lee, 2017) and are in grades 6-12 in secondary school.

LTELs in secondary schools have the added dimension of ethnic and lingual diversity, which presents challenges in accessing college and career academy programs due to language acquisition needs. The primary aim of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) is to ensure that all students are college and career ready by the end of secondary school. However, LTELs are not able to access programs that build upon the 21st-century skills of college and career readiness due to conflicting language policies and practices. This case study investigates whether LTELs are accessing Linked Learning/California Partnership Academy (LL/CPA) pathways to achieve the CCSS goals of being college and career ready students prepared to advance to a postsecondary college experience.

The initial stages of implementing the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) created a shift from the punitive accountability mandates of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to a devolution process that put states in charge of creating and managing the new federal accountability mandates. The ESSA represents a new paradigm shift from federal to local control, which provides flexibility in developing local accountability measures, thus resulting in the decentralization of accountability of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to the state and local levels with regard to educational decision-making. Political culture impacts how

programs are designed to meet the outcomes of the CCSS and the underlying foundation of the CCSS are the college and career readiness anchor standards, which align curriculum with college and career goals (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010). The college and career readiness anchor standards define the general, cross-disciplinary literacy expectations for students in preparation for college and the workforce. There is much discussion and deliberation among educators and research scholars concerning what constitutes college and/or career readiness and how it can be measured in order to monitor student progress toward meeting its goals. The stated aim of the CCSS is to define the knowledge and skills students should acquire in order to graduate from high school ready to succeed in entry-level, credit-bearing academic college courses that do not require remediation (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010; Conley, 2005, 2007, 2010) and in workforce training programs. However, career readiness pertains to the knowledge, skills, and learning strategies necessary to begin studies in a career pathway, which differs from work readiness and job training in the workplace (Lombardi, Conley, Seburn, & Downs, 2012).

The overarching inquiry of this study is to determine whether LTELs are accessing LL/CPA pathways to achieve the CCSS goals of being college and career ready. The purpose of this study was to examine the differences, if any, in student engagement, achievement, and access to college and career readiness standards between LTELs participating in an LL/CPA certified pathway and LTELs not participating in an LL/CPA certified pathway within the same high school. This study also measured factors of student achievement and engagement in the academies, as these are foundational components that make up the structure of a career academy. Measuring student engagement is the key to improving student achievement, especially for those classified as at-risk, meaning at high risk for dropping out of school (Appleton, Christenson, Kim, & Reschly, 2006).

Background

Drawing from the opportunity to learn (OTL) theory, Callahan (2005) found that ELL students were "tracked" (p. 5) into lower academic classes based on linguistic abilities. ELLs enter U.S. schools with two tasks to complete: learn English and learn academic subject content. When ELL students at the secondary level have limited opportunities and are placed

in low-track courses, this frequently results in exposure to less rigorous content and fewer learning opportunities. Olsen (2010) indicated that LTELs who are "stuck" in the English Language Development (ELD) ghetto have less opportunity to be engaged in school and their academic progression is significantly reduced (p.18). Stanton-Salazar (1997) inferred a connection between social capital theory, student engagement, and peer connectedness, which enables ELL students to establish social networks that in turn foster the growth of human capital.

As educational institutions seek programs that meet the threshold of providing college and career readiness for all students, programs like LL/CPA have been touted as meeting and even exceeding these aims (California Center for College and Career Readiness, 2012a). Secondary programs of study need more opportunities for students to match what they are learning to their aspirations, interests, and ambitions. This aim, as Olsen (2010) and later Conley (2014) state, is particularly important for high school LTELs who need to acquire college and career readiness skills in a program of study in which their interests, aspirations, and engagement are integrated into their learning. Career academies are designed to integrate core content courses with career/technical courses centered on a particular industry sector. This integration of core and career/technical-themed courses provides students with opportunities to refine their career readiness skills as they participate in work-based learning.

U.S. educational policy with respect to ELL students has become more rigid, viewing these children solely from a deficit perspective and increasingly demanding that English alone be used in their education (Garcia, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). Title III of the ESEA holds state educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools accountable for increases in English proficiency and core academic content knowledge of Limited English Proficient (LEP) children by requiring that they demonstrate improvements in the English proficiency of LEP children each fiscal year and adequate yearly progress for LEP children, including immigrant children and youth (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

All ELL students are administered the reclassification assessment, and the results are assessed to determine if the ELL student has met the reclassification criteria to be considered a Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) student. However, LTELs that have not met the reclassification criteria are placed into ELD courses to learn English language skills. For these courses, ELL students are pulled out of regular classrooms and given one-on-one or small group designated instruction in

English, which is usually unrelated to the content area instruction they receive while in their mainstream classrooms. School districts use various approaches when implementing Title III at the secondary level, one of which is blocking or doubling up on ELD courses. In such a setting, ELL students take up to two ELD classes in lieu of one English class. This emphasizes the paradox of practice for LTELs who are placed in intervention classes due to underperformance on state benchmarks.

A study by Thomas and Collier (1997) found that English as a second language (ESL) taught via content-area instruction (social studies, math, science, etc.) is associated with higher long-term educational attainment than ESL pull-out programs. However, the prevailing method of providing ELD courses is predominately using the pull-out strategy rather than programs that teach English via content-area instruction (Thomas & Collier, 1997, p. 32). The result is, as researchers such as Menken and Kleyn (2010) and Umansky and Reardon (2014) have shown, that many ELL students remain in ESL programs on a semi-permanent basis—as LTELs.

Mendoza (2016) argues that ELL students are not accessing core academic courses or electives such as LL/CPA pathways due to the competing language development policies and related program compliance mandates. At the same time, English language acquisition itself is treated as a "gatekeeping process for access to college preparatory content" (Rodriguez & Cruz, 2009, p. 2392), so that if students are not reclassified, their access to rigorous curricula is restricted (Kanno & Gromley, 2015). Due to the competing mandate of implementing Title III policies, LTELs are not accessing core academic courses or electives that provide engaging and relevant preparation for college and career readiness.

It is noteworthy to highlight the programmatic conflicts of implementing a mandated program like the Title III policies based on a restrictive strategy of offering pull-out ELD courses to ELL students that have not been reclassified as English proficient. However, for LTELs at the middle and high school level, the lack of access to courses that provide college and career readiness is a significant barrier in meeting graduation requirements and college admission criteria. As I engage readers in the forthcoming discussion, I stress that the often-unintended outcome of only recognizing one avenue for language development is the further stratification of an already marginalized adolescent population. In 2011, the California Department of Education (CDE) released *A Blueprint for*

Great Schools, which describes the need for increased personalization of instruction and engagement of students through career-themed LL/CPA pathways. State Superintendent Tom Torlakson announced at the Annual Educating for Careers Conference on March 3, 2014, that the Common Core would include the new Smarter Balanced Assessments. These include standards for career-ready practice, which align with college and career readiness for postsecondary education and career training, i.e., workforce training that goes beyond academic skills in order to address California's longstanding goal of preparing college and career ready students capable of competing in a global economy.

Career academies have existed for more than 30 years and have been implemented in more than 1,500 high schools across the country. Students are placed in cohorts that participate in the same grade level and career-themed course of study. Teachers in these programs support the development of student peer-to-peer networks and teacher–student relationships that enhance student learning. Career academies provide an integrated instructional approach by combining core content academic courses with an occupation-related career emphasis.

The Linked Learning initiative aims to give all students access to the experiences and conditions they need to grow as learners and to be prepared for college, career, and civic life. To achieve this goal, the Linked Learning initiative brings together rigorous academics, a challenging theme-based or career-based curriculum (e.g., health professions, technology, and global studies), and opportunities to apply learning through real-world experiences. The Linked Learning approach blurs the distinction between Career Technical Education (CTE) and college preparation by creating a pathway toward a single goal: preparation to succeed in college and careers (California Center for College and Career Readiness, 2012b, 2012c; Saunders, 2013). According to the James Irvine Foundation, Linked Learning is a high school reform effort that includes cross-disciplinary instruction, career-themed experiences and content, and opportunities for solving real-life problems as strategies to increase student motivation, engagement, and learning. Linked Learning strategies transform the traditional high school experience by bringing together strong academics, a demanding technical education, and real-world experiences to help students gain an advantage in high school, postsecondary education, and careers (Gonzalez, 2017).

Linked Learning is delivered through a wide variety of structures or programs known as pathways. These pathways may be shaped by

existing CPA school structures and local partnerships, which support the skills and backgrounds of instructional staff. Pathways vary in their themes or career focus; their organization of coursework; how much time students spend on and off campus; their relationships with two- and four-year colleges; and their partnerships with community organizations, businesses, and industries. Pathways align with careers or majors and may be delivered in academies, magnet schools, occupational training centers, small themed high schools, or small learning communities within large high schools (Saunders, 2013).

Methods

The Researcher's Positionality

I was involved with the Linked Learning College and Career Pathway program as a district manager overseeing the development and implementation of the Linked Learning initiative. This role allowed me to gain insights on how to assist site teams with the implementation of the Linked Learning approach. As part of the continuous improvement cycle, pathway programs were evaluated against criteria established by the Scientific Research Institute (SRI) to determine the effectiveness of the programs (Guha et al., 2014). This SRI evaluation confirmed that ELL students were not enrolled in pathway programs at the same rate as other subgroups.

This collective case study focused on four sub-cases comprised of three lead teachers, two counselors, six LTELs in LL/CPA pathways, and five LTELs not participating in LL/CPA pathways. The participants for this study met the criteria for participation, which included being identified as the lead teachers of the pathways, counselors assigned to the pathways, and students in one of the three Linked Learning pathways. The student sample consisted of LTELs that were identified in the student information system (Power School) as enrolled in the Engineering, Multimedia, and Law Academies. However, another sample of LTELs was also tagged as being enrolled in the academies but not taking any CTE courses associated with the pathways. This study used a control and experimental group to compare research results. The 11 students participating in this study provided a sample large enough to analyze whether LTELs were accessing LL/CPA pathways. All students were offered the option of being interviewed in English or Spanish.

The research methodology applied to this study was a case study using mixed methods of qualitative and quantitative measures to conduct an in-depth inquiry of the Linked Learning approach and identify factors that either enhance or impede LTELs in accessing college and career readiness programs to prepare them for post-secondary education. The mixed-method quantitative portion was used to describe trends in the data or the relationship between variables (Creswell, 2009).

The variables used in the study were the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) pass rates; grade point averages; California English Language Development Test (CELDT) rates; credits earned toward graduation within the Engineering, Multimedia, and Law Academy; and the non-academy LTELs group. Table 1 illustrates the data indicators for the two sub-cases of students that participated in the study. At the same time, the inquiry of whether college and career academies provide ELL students access to college and career readiness programs was explored using qualitative interviews with LTELs in the Engineering, Multimedia, and Law Academies and non-academy LTELs at the same high school. Quantitative and qualitative data were combined to better understand this research problem and identify the issues ELL students encounter in achieving the CCSS goals of being college and career ready.

This article begins by presenting a framework for analyzing ELL student access to the Linked Learning college and career pathways and what impediments ELL students face in fully participating in these pathways. The data was collected at a high school in the East Bay in California, one of six comprehensive high schools in the school district serving a low-income and racially diverse student body that is reflective of the larger community. The high school community of 1,581students is richly diverse. Student enrollment includes 11% receiving special education, 47% qualifying for English learner support, and 92.2% qualifying for free or reduced-priced meals (California Department of Education, 2014). At the time of this study, the student population was approximately 82.8% Latino. Some of the Latino students at this high school are immigrants, mostly from Mexico and Central and South America. The majority of the Latino students are second- and third-generation immigrants.

The interview questions developed were adapted from Appleton and Christenson's (2004) Student Engagement Instrument (SEI), which measures students' beliefs of cognitive and psychological engagement from the perspective of the student. For this study, 10 interview questions

were developed to address students' level of cognitive engagement (perceived relevance to school) and psychological engagement (perceived connection to others and school).

Table 1
ELD 1-4 and ELD 5-RFEP Participants

	CAHSEE ELA/ CAHSEE MATH	GPA 9-12 weight	CELDT score/level	Credits earn toward graduation
ELD 1-4 Student Data Indicators				
Student A	Not passed/Passed	3.2	1-Beginner	217/225
Student B	Not passed/Not passed	2.4	1-Beginner	205/225
Student C	Not passed/Passed	2.1	1-Beginner	195/225
Student D	Not passed/Not Passed	1.8	4-Early Advanced	200/225
Student C	Not passed/Passed	3.3	1-Beginner	190/225
ELD 5- Reclassified Student Data Indicators				
Student A	Not passed/Not passed	1.6	RFEP	180/225
Student B	Not passed/Not passed	1.08	3-Intermediate	177/225
Student C	Not passed/Not passed	2.6	4-Early Advanced	235/225

Student D	Passed/Passed	3.6	RFEP	210/225
Student E	Passed/Passed	3.1	RFEP	217/225
Student F	Passed/Passed	1.8	5-Advanced	220/225

For the purposes of this study, HyperRESEARCH (Researchware, Inc., 2012) was used to perform the following tasks: (a) coding of text paragraphs, in which segments of text were assigned multiple codes, and (b) retrieval of coded materials (text, graphics, audio, and video segments), which enabled me, as the sole researcher, to organize all similarly coded material together. Fundamental to the data analysis was Boeije's (2002) constant comparative method (CCM). The HyperRESEARCH software program allows for various reports to be constructed. One such report is the frequency report that can be filtered by cases, names, and codes. The report builder module in HyperRESEARCH was used to generate the frequency responses of the sub-case members against the same groups of codes selected in corroboration to answer each interview question. The various report builders were organized by case, code, frequency, and sources in order to gather data to address the research questions concerning what factors affect LTELs' access to LL/CPA pathways, as illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2
Frequency Table of Significant Codes from Each Sub-Case

Codes	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Teachers/counselors				
College-going culture	2.4	.84	0.00	5.00
College and career readiness	1.6	.59	1.00	2.00
Networking	1.6	2.07	0.00	5.00
Differentiate support	1.2	.84	0.00	2.00

Student engagement	1.2	1.09	0.00	3.00
Intervention support	1.2	1.10	0.00	2.00
RFEP students				
College and career ready	3.0	1.11	1.00	4.00
Academy teachers support	2.0	0.64	1.00	3.00
College-going culture	1.8	1.17	1.00	4.00
Student engagement	1.2	.75	0.00	2.00
ELD 1-4 students				
Barriers to pathways	3.0	4.3	0.00	6.00
Barriers to passing CAHSEE	3.0	3.6	0.00	5.00
Lack of college admissions	2.0	2.9	0.00	4.00
Peer support	1.5	2.1	0.00	3.00

Using the framework of CCM, the triangulation of all the data sources of the sub-case interview questions based on the student engagement instrument (SEI), student and adult responses aligned to the codes, and quantitative variable data supported the trustworthiness of the analysis, thus providing a balanced and authentic representation of the data. This study used the mixed-methods sequential exploratory strategy for this research design with strong qualitative data collection and analysis that was guided by the following research questions:

(1) What factors affect LTELs in accessing college and career readiness programs?;
(2) How does a Linked Learning pathway provide access to college and career readiness for ELL students?; and

(3) Do Linked Learning pathways provide engagement, support, and a sense of belonging for ELL students, and if so, in what ways?

Findings

This researcher used a combination of predetermined and emerging codes that were derived from the interview questions to provide data to answer the research questions. The data codes were organized by the sub-case groups' responses to the interview questions that illustrated general statements in response to the research question. Finally, after narrowing down the codes and responses to each question, sub-case themes emerged from the responses. Using HyperRESEARCH software, five key themes emerged from the data analysis: (a) student recruitment, (b) student engagement, (c) college and career readiness, (d) support services, and (e) student network development. These five key themes were triangulated to determine the perceptions, actions, beliefs, and behaviors of the participants in the sub-cases. The perceptions, actions, and beliefs behind the students' behavior focused on their perception of being college and career ready. In Table 3, a summary of the differences between the ELL student sub-cases illustrates the disparity in language-minority students' access to programs that provide college and career readiness relative to other students.

The English Language Development Level 5 (advanced) and Reclassified Fluency English Proficient (ELD5-RFEP) students provided various codes that emerged from each interview question. The following codes were created from the interview questions that assisted in establishing themes, which emerged from the participants' responses to the interview questions, as illustrated in Table 2, the frequency table of codes for the three sub-cases: (a) college-going culture; (b) college and career readiness; (c) teacher support; and (d) student engagement. Similar codes emerged from both the teachers and RFEP students. However, the ELD 1-4 students did not match codes with either the teachers or the RFEP students; instead, their predominant codes reflected the barriers they encountered. The codes that related to college and career readiness were (a) barriers to the pathways; (b) barriers to passing the CAHSEE; and (c) lack of college admission information. During the interviews with the ELL 1-4 students, the following statements were shared:

- feelings of being marginalized and disenfranchised at high school
- lack of access to the pathway due to conflicts with ELD classes and not having enough room in their schedule to participate in academies
- difficulty passing the CAHSEE
- lack of awareness of the graduation requirements for "a-g" admissions within the University of California/California State University system.

The findings summarized in Table 3 below pertain to the following research questions: (a) What factors affect LTELs in accessing college and career readiness programs?; (b) How do Linked Learning pathways provide access to college and career readiness for ELL students; and (c) Do Linked Learning pathways provide engagement, support, and a sense of belonging for ELL students, and if so, in what ways?

Table 3
Summary of Differences for Pathway and Non-Pathway LTEL Students

Key Indicators	ELD 5 and Reclassified	ELD 1-4
Student recruitment	✓ Eligible to be recruited into the academy programs ✓ Aware of the Linked Learning academies ✓ Students were seen as ambassadors of the academies and participated in promotion activities to recruit rising students into the academies	✓ Not recruited to participate in the academies due to language barriers and schedule conflicts with ELD classes ✓ Rarely take academy classes, as the academic language is "too hard" ✓ Had no knowledge about Linked Learning academies

Student Engagement	✓ Students that participated in the CPA academies indicated that they felt supported and engaged as participants in the academies	✓ They were prohibited from participation because they were not recruited
College and Career Readiness	✓ Academy lead teachers designed activities and projects that provided college and career readiness opportunities for students. Examples of these activities consisted of college tours to expose students to college campuses and campus life. ✓ The sense of being "ready" was corroborated by the teachers, who sought to teach the students how to self-regulate and be proactive in pursuing college and career readiness opportunities ✓ Career Academy students are taught to evaluate their transcripts with the expectation they will go to college	✓ ELL counselor makes arbitrary decisions concerning how college and career readiness is provided. He cites conflicts with student class schedules due to the required ELD language acquisition classes that ELL students need to take ✓ The ELL counselor advocates for ELL students to get their certificate of completion, which counts for community college ✓ Provided minimal exposure to college and career readiness ✓ Students shared that they were not aware of what college and career readiness meant nor had exposure to colleges ✓ Students did not know how to evaluate their high school transcripts for high school graduation progress nor had any knowledge of what "a-g" admission requirements were.

Support Services	✓ Academy teachers intervened quickly when academy students showed signs of struggle. They formed teams that involved other guidance counselors, a college and career counselor, and sometimes parents to design a plan to address the student's needs ✓ Scaffolding academic language strategy used often by the academy teachers	✓ The ELL counselors concurred that the language barriers of ELD 1-4 students that do not speak English and teachers that do not speak Spanish are a constant barrier for ELD 1-4 students in accessing academies ✓ Another obstacle is the need to take some bilingual classes, which are not offered in the academy

The findings highlight how educational inconsistency within a sample of ELL students within the same high school impacts LTELs in becoming college and career ready. Overall, the ELD5-RFEP students did receive support and access to all components of college-going culture in the three academies to become college and career ready. However, the ELD 1-4 students were denied access to the Linked Learning/CPA pathways and, therefore, did not have access to programs to help them become college and career ready.

Discussion

This study measured the perceptions, beliefs, knowledge, and skills of two sets of LTELs with regard to college and career readiness. What became apparent was that the ELL students were sub-divided into classifications that determined their eligibility for participation based on their limited English language. Since ELD 5-RFEP students were in the pathways, they received services and gained valuable skills related to college and career readiness due to the college-going culture of the pathway programs. When institutional decisions or policies exclude students from participating in programs based on the students' language skills, the results are devastating

to students and discriminatory in practice. Educational programs are designed to close the academic achievement gap, and special consideration needs to be extended to marginalized ESL student populations that are often overlooked or not considered for participation.

In this case study, there is substantial evidence that arbitrary decisions about how language policies are implemented at the district and site levels impact the ability of ELD 1-4 students to participate in pathways. Based on teacher interviews, they perceived that ELD level 1, 2, and 3 students rarely took academy classes because the academic language was too hard. However, these same students took CTE elective classes that were offered in the academy to graduate but did not participate in the pathway program. This distinction was made by the career counselor who stated that all students take CTE classes to meet the graduation requirements for elective credits. Due to this exclusion, ELD 1-4 students shared that they felt disenfranchised by the school and did not have the knowledge and skills to pursue post-secondary options.

ELD 5-RFEP students perceived that they were college and career ready because of the constant reinforcement by academy teachers and the college and career counselor that the students were college ready. Academy students were able to demonstrate their analytical skills in self-evaluating their high school transcripts to assess their graduation progress. However, the paradox for these students is that their perception of being college and career ready is not totally realistic. As an example, the findings illustrate that 73% of the student samples would not graduate if the CAHSEE were still required for graduation. Another example is the academy student who stated he was college ready because he was already taking a course at a community college. However, the course was a remediation course needed for high school graduation.

For the ELD 1-4 students, the CAHSEE poses a significant barrier, as 100% of the students would not be eligible to graduate from high school if the exam were to be reinstated. Another constant barrier for ELL students is the mandate of Title III that requires school districts to offer language development classes until the student has met the various criteria for reclassification and has become English proficient.

This study identified conflicting practices for LTELs who are scheduled to take multiple ELD courses to develop their English proficiency and lack access to LL/CPA pathways (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005). Further research is needed to explore how learning institutions can provide LTEL students at the secondary level

the academic rigor and relevant skills necessary for college and career readiness while also meeting the criteria for English language reclassification. In addition, conducting a Title III policy audit of the school site and district is recommended to ensure that the practices being implemented provide access to programs of study that offer college and career readiness to secondary LTELs.

Educational leaders have an opportunity and the responsibility to make educational decisions that positively impact all students, regardless of English language abilities. Decisions can involve ELD 1-4 students in pre-academy models that enhance participation and engagement in pathways while developing English language skills. LTEL involvement in pathways will help provide them with access to college and career readiness.

It is recommended that LL/CPA courses explore the development of contextualized instruction in the core content and technical courses. Contextualized or interactive instruction emphasizes learning that is mediated through interaction with other ELL learners who are more competent readers and writers. The goals of interactive approaches include specific literacy skills and English language development strategies found in career pathways, as well as other literacy-related outcomes such as engagement in reading and writing and building social capital from peers (Genesee et al., 2005). Students should be permitted to integrate language acquisition skills and strategies in developing their English language competency in LL/CPA pathways regardless of ELD classification.

CECILIA MENDOZA is an assistant professor in educational leadership in the Kremen School of Education and Human Development at California State University, Fresno, 5005 N. Maple Ave., Fresno, CA 93740. Email: cecilia.mendoza@fresnostate.edu

References

Appleton, J. J., & Christenson, S. L. (2004). *Scale description and references for the student engagement instrument*. Unpublished manuscript.

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 427–444.

Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quarterly and Quantity*, *36*(4), 391–409.

California Center for College and Career Readiness. (2012a, April 12). *College and career readiness: What do we mean*. Berkeley, CA: California Center for College and Career Readiness. Retrieved from http://www.ConnectEdCalifornia.org

California Center for College and Career Readiness. (2012b). *Criteria for linked learning pathways quality review and continuous improvement*. Berkeley, CA: California Center for College and Career Readiness. Retrieved from http://ConnectEdcalifornia.org

California Center for College and Career Readiness. (2012c). *Leading high school transformation for college and career success: A guide for developing a system of linked learning pathways*. Berkeley, CA: California Center for College and Career Readiness.

California Department of Education. (2014). *DataQuest school graduation numbers.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education. Retrieved from http://dq.cde.ca .gov

California Department of Education. (2016). *Facts about English learners in California*. Retrieved from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/cefelfacts.asp

Callahan, R. M. (2005). Tracking and high school English learners: Limiting opportunity to learn. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*(2), 305–328.

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *Common core state standards for English language arts & literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Common Core State Standards Initiative. Retrieved from

http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf
Conley, D. T. (2005). *College knowledge: What it really takes for students to succeed and what can we do to get them ready*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Conley, D. T. (2007). *Redefining college readiness*. Eugene, OR: Educational Policy Improvement Center.
Conley, D. T. (2010). *College and career ready: Helping all students succeed beyond high school*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Conley, D. T. (2014). *Getting ready for college, careers, and the common core: What every educator needs to know*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
Garcia, O., Kleifgen, J., & Falchi, L. (2008). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals*. New York City, NY: Columbia University, A Research Initiative for the Campaign for Educational Equity.
Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students at Risk*, *10*(4), 363–385.
Gonzalez, E. (2017, December 1). Progress and promise: The expanding Linked Learning field [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://www.irvine.org/blog/progress-and-promise-the-expanding-linked-learning-field
Guha, R., Caspary, K., Stites, R., Padilla, C., Arshan, N., Park, C., … Adelman, N. (2014). *Taking stock of the California Linked Learning District Initiative: Fifth-year evaluation report*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Retrieved from http://www.sri.com
Kanno, Y., & Gromley, J. G. (2015). English language learners' pathways to four-year colleges. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(12), 1–44.
Lombardi, A. R., Conley, D. T., Seburn, M. A., & Downs, A. M. (2012). College and career readiness assessment: Validation of the key cognitive strategies framework. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, *38*(3), 163–171. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508412448668

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., De Brey, C., Snydes, T., Wang, X., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., … Gebrekristos, S. (2017). *The condition of education 2017* (NCES 2017-144). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education

Mendoza, C. (2016). *Denial of access: The impact of Linked Learning/California Partnership Academies in preparing English Language Learners to become college and career ready for post-secondary opportunities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English Language Learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(4), 399–417.

Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long-term English learners*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.

Researchware, Inc. (2012). *HyperRESEARCH.* Randolph, MA: Researchware, Inc. Retrieved from http://researchware.com

Rodriguez, G. M., & Cruz, L. (2009). The transition to college of English learner and undocumented immigrant students: Resource and policy implications. *Teacher College Record*, *111*(10), 2385–2418.

Saunders, M. (2013). *LinkLearning: A guide to making high school work*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles Institute for Democracy Education and Access (IDEA).

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (1997). A social capital framework for understanding the socializaiton of racial minority children and youth. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(1), 1–41.

Sugarman, J., & Lee, K. (2017). *Facts about English learners and the NCLA/ESSA transition in California*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Thomas, M., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Students, George Washington University, Center for the Study of Language and Education.

Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Education Research Journal*, *51*(5), 879–912.

U.S. Department of Education. (2014, September 15). *Part A — English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg40.html