

Do Years of Experience and Hours of Training Really Matter? Investing in School Leaders' Efficacies and English Learners' Language Development

Pilar Moreno-Recio, EdD
 Director of Bilingual/ESL Education
 Goose Creek CISD
 Baytown, TX

Antonio Corrales, EdD
 Assistant Professor
 Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
 University of Houston, Clear Lake
 Clear Lake, TX

Amy Orange, EdD
 Assistant Professor
 Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
 University of Houston, Clear Lake
 Clear Lake, TX

Renee Lastrapes, PhD
 Assistant Professor
 Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
 University of Houston, Clear Lake
 Clear Lake, TX

Abstract

This study examined if there were differences between central office administrators', school administrators', and bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) teachers' efficacies when controlling for years of experience with bilingual/ESL classrooms and hours of training on the English language proficiency standards (ELPS). Data from a purposeful sample of 150 school leaders in an urban school district in Texas were examined. Face-to-face interviews captured school leaders' perceptions about the ELPS and the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) implementation in bilingual/ESL classrooms. Quantitative results indicated that school leaders' hours of ELPS training influenced leaders' efficacies. Leaders' perceptions revealed the benefits of the ELPS and TELPAS, but there was a need for differentiated instruction and school ELPS and TELPAS instructional advocacy. Recommendations included district strategic planning to meet the needs of all learners and leaders.

Key Words

English learners, leaders' efficacy, English language standards, language assessments, bilingual/ESL education, years of experience, professional development

Introduction

The United States (US) ranks as the number one country with the largest migrant population that includes 40 million foreign-born people. In addition, the US and Mexico have the biggest international migration in the world (Lee, Guadagno, Wagner, Cho, & Takehana, 2015; Vavrus, 2015). The percentage of English learners (ELs) in public school was 9.5% or an estimated 4.6 million students in school year 2014-2015, compared to the 9.3% or 4.5 million students in 2013-2014 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017).

The large and growing number of ELs born in the US calls for language assistance programs to ensure they attain English proficiency and mastery of all academic content and achievement standards that all students are expected to master. With the emergence of standard-based reform, school districts receive guidance on the type of English language instruction that ELs will receive. Improving English language proficiency, under Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, is a required indicator in every state's school accountability system, which will help make sure that the schools where these students are struggling get the right kind of support (United States Department of Education, 2016). Schools have to demonstrate that they are improving the English language proficiency of their English-language learners (United States Department of Education, 2016). Therefore, each US state, either within consortia or on their own, developed ELP standards to implement along with content standards within their school systems. Twenty-seven states use World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards along with the common core standards.

In Texas, every school district shall ensure linguistically accommodated instruction through the cross-curricular ELPS along with the Texas essential knowledge and skills (Texas Education Agency, 2007). Even though experience and professional development on the standards is important, the ELPS do not work alone, just as it happens with the content standards. Similarly, the expertise of both bilingual/ESL teachers and content teachers is necessary to help ELs achieve academically. Teachers, language standards (ELPS), and language assessment (TELPAS) are intrinsically connected as parts of the teaching-learning process. These language standards and assessments correlate to the content standards or the Texas essential knowledge and skills (TEKS) and the State of Texas Assessment for Academic Readiness (STAAR). The more language a student has, the more content he can understand (Quintanilla-Shelton, 2016). Providing linguistically accommodated instruction to students with different language proficiency levels while acquiring rigorous academic content is a challenge. This fact makes it hard for the students to master the English curriculum and succeed in the STAAR test.

The theoretical framework of the study of this article drew from the social cognitive theory of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982, 1986, 1993, 1997, 2001) and the social capital theory (Burt, 1992; Coleman, 1990). According to the social cognitive theory, self-efficacy allows leaders to apply what one learns to new situations and challenges (Seibert, Sargent, Kraimer, & Kiazad, 2017). In the same way, social capital theory refers to the leaders' social network of relationships that allows one to take

production action within a particular social context. Social capital (Coleman, 1990) consists of any social-structural resources or features that are useful to leaders for specific actions. Coleman stresses social capital as public good. These assets and features are available to all members of a particular group regardless of which members actually promote, or contribute to such resources. This research looks at district, school administrators' and bilingual/ESL teachers' years of experience with bilingual/ESL classrooms and hours of training received on the ELPS and TELPAS as additives to the leaders' self-efficacy and social capital. School leaders increased social capital on the areas of knowledge and experience eventually impact English learners as a group building capital or investing on the students as public good.

Schools with large proportions of ELs require strong leadership in order for students to succeed academically (Baecher, Knoll, & Patti, 2013; Becerra, 2012; Goldenberg, 2003; Slavin & Calder on, 2000; Theotaris & O'Toole, 2011). This investigation sheds more light into the specific perceptions educators have about their efficacy. Both self and means efficacy produce extra effort and engagement in activities, such as empowering others to succeed (Bandura, 1997; Eden, Ganzach, Granat-Flomin, & Zigman, 2010). Most of the findings in this study reside on the need to examine school leaders' efficacy, professional development, and years of experience with bilingual/ESL classrooms. Experience in this sense is on-the-job challenges that provide opportunities for learning (DeRue & Wellman, 2009; Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998; Dragoni, Oh, Vankatwyk, & Tesluk, 2011; Seibert et al., 2017). Individuals with high self-efficacy for development are more likely to engage in development activities than are individuals who have low self-efficacy for development (Maurer, Weiss, & Barbeitte, 2003; Reichard,

Walker, Puter, Middleton, & Johnson, 2017). Understanding that years of experience with bilingual/ESL classrooms and the amount of hours on the ELPS trainings may lead to higher efficacy and, therefore, more English language growth in ELs is critical.

The authors of the leadership efficacy questionnaire (LEQ) used in this study created the instrument with the intent of supporting and increasing leader efficacy (Hannah & Avolio, 2012). The LEQ measures three areas of efficacy: (a) leader action efficacy or ability to mentor, motivate or empower stakeholders; (b) leader means efficacy or reliance on others, resource or policies; and (c) leader self-regulation efficacy or ability to empathize with others and problem-solve. Participants rated their efficacies using a 1-100% rating scale to measure level of confidence. The larger the score, the higher the levels of leaders' efficacies.

Research implementing the LEQ demonstrated that leaders and self-efficacy can be developed through mentoring programs and other specific leader development programs (Hannah & Avolio, 2012). Current research supports the notion that the capacity of the leaders regarding preparation and experience versus the leadership effectiveness to produce results goes hand in hand (Coleman & LaRoque 1988; Corrales, 2016; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Mintrop & Trujillo 2005; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

Recent studies have analyzed in depth the impact of the English language proficiency standards on student achievement; the implementation and leadership of language standards at school district level; the relationship between language acquisition tests and standardized assessments; and the perceptions of TELPAS by school teachers

(Badgett, Harrell, Carman, & Lyles, 2012; Boals, Kenyon, Blair, Cranley, Wilmes, & Wright, 2015; Echevarria, Vogst, & Short 2017; Morita-Mullaney, 2017; Téllez & Mosqueda, 2015; Quintanilla-Shelton, 2016; Moreno-Hewitt, 2015).

However, this study looks to contribute within the field on different levels of school leaders' efficacies: central office, teachers, and school administrators based on their years of experience with bilingual/ESL programs, as well as professional development hours on ELPS and TELPAS. In addition, the study presents educators' perceptions about both the ELPS and TELPAS implementation to support ELs.

Methods

Participants

A sample of school leaders (central office and school administrators and teachers) was drawn from a large school district in Texas. For the quantitative portion of the study, a purposeful sample of 150 pre-kindergarten through twelve central office administrators (n=27), school administrators (n=40), and bilingual/ESL teachers (n= 83) participated in the study. A previous purposeful sample of 40 bilingual/ESL teachers took the LEQ to pilot and help refine the survey and focus of this study.

The qualitative part of the study included face-to-face interviews with a purposeful sample of 24 participants based upon having at least three years of administrative and or teaching experience with bilingual/ESL classrooms and implementation of the ELPS. The sample included seven central office administrators, seven school administrators, and nine teachers. A previous purposeful sample of nine bilingual/ESL teachers helped polished questions in this research study article.

Data Collection and Analysis

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) tests helped determine if there were differences in district administrators', school administrators', and teachers' overall efficacy controlling for years of experience with bilingual/ESL classrooms and hours of training on the ELPS. Further analysis with multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) tests helped determine if there were differences in district administrators', school administrators', and teachers' action, self-regulation, and means efficacies controlling for years of experience with bilingual/ESL classrooms and hours of training on the ELPS. The researcher calculated the effect size using partial eta squared and statistical significance of 0.5.

The qualitative part of the study included a generic approach to coding (Lichtman, 2013) to analyze the face-to-face transcribed interviews from the purposeful sample of 23 leaders. The questions asked participants to name the ELPS and TELPAS trainings attended, hours they received, how those trainings helped them understand, and they provided their perceptions about the quality of implementation in their schools. The qualitative data obtained from the interviews were analyzed using the three Cs of analysis: from coding to categorizing to concepts (Lichtman, 2013). Axial coding strategies and open coding were also employed "to make connections between category and its subcategories" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 97) to further explain and categorize the data for the emerging themes.

Results

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with leader's years of experience as the covariate and the district assignment as the fixed factor, indicated that there were not significant differences among the overall efficacy for any of these leaders' groups: central office, school

administrators, and bilingual/ESL teachers when controlling for years of experience $F(1, 146) = 2.4, p > .05$

A multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), with the subscales (action, means, and self-regulation efficacies) as the dependent variables, the years of experience as the covariate, and leaders' district assignment as the fixed factor, indicated that there were significant differences among leaders' efficacies on the three efficacy subscales when controlling for years of experience in bilingual/ESL classrooms $F(3, 144) = 1.4, p > .05$; *Wilks' $\Lambda = .97$* .

Results from an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with leader's amount of hours on ELPS training as the covariate and the district assignment as the fixed factor, indicated that leaders' hours of ELPS training did significantly predict their overall efficacy, but not by district assignment. Results indicated that there were not significant differences on the three efficacy subscales tested separately as

dependent variables for any of these groups: central office, school administrators, and bilingual/ESL teachers, $F(3, 144) = 1.4, p > .05$; *Wilks' $\Lambda = .97$* .

Results from a MANCOVA test with the subscales (action, means, and self-regulation efficacies) as the dependent variables and the hours of ELPS training as the covariate and district assignment as the fixed factor, indicated that there were significant differences among leaders' efficacies on the three efficacy subscales when controlling for hours of ELPS training $F(3, 144) = 3.3, p = .02$; *Wilks' $\Lambda = .94$* ; *partial $\eta^2 = .07$* . In addition, there were significant differences among leaders' district assignment and their efficacies $F(6, 288) = 2.2, p = .04$; *Wilks' $\Lambda = .91$* ; *partial $\eta^2 = .04$* on the omnibus test. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs showed that only hours of ELPS training were statistically significant for action efficacy $t(2) = 2.3, p = .02$, *partial $\eta^2 = .04$* ; and self-regulation efficacy $t(2) = 2.9, p = .01$, *partial $\eta^2 = .06$* , but not for means efficacy (See table 1)

Table 1

Hours of ELPS Training and the Impact on Action and Self-regulation Efficacies

Dependent Variable	Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Partial Eta Squared
Action Efficacy	Intercept	8.753	.197	44.445	.000	8.364	9.142	.931
	Hours ELPS	.005	.002	2.311	.022	.001	.009	.035
	[District Assignment=1]	.232	.323	.718	.474	-.406	.870	.004
	[District Assignment=2]	-.483	.278	-1.742	.084	-1.032	.065	.020
	[District Assignment=3]	0 ^a
Means-Efficacy	Intercept	8.468	.220	38.492	.000	8.033	8.903	.910
	Hours ELPS	.002	.002	.934	.352	-.003	.007	.006
	[District Assignment=1]	.202	.361	.560	.576	-.511	.914	.002
	[District Assignment=2]	-.166	.310	-.535	.594	-.779	.447	.002
	[District Assignment=3]	0 ^a
Self-Regulation Efficacy	Intercept	9.103	.164	55.519	.000	8.779	9.427	.955
	Hours ELPS	.005	.002	2.980	.003	.002	.009	.057
	[District Assignment=1]	.582	.269	2.165	.032	.051	1.113	.031
	[District Assignment=2]	.008	.231	.034	.973	-.449	.464	.000
	[District Assignment=3]	0 ^a

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

ELPS and TELPAS training as support for school administrators, teachers, and ELs

All leaders found the ELPS and TELPAS trainings useful when they were asked how the training has helped them understand. One principal shared: “The ELPS training helped me gain a better understanding on the ELPS, language objectives and the content

objectives.” Another principal indicated: We made a 21% [growth] gain in our second language acquisition [state report]. So, we did see quite an impact on how understanding the proficiency level descriptors of [TELPAS] impact our scores.” For instance, a central office leader indicated: “TELPAS gives us an opportunity to demonstrate students’ progress,

their proficiency as they move towards their educational journey. It helps us set goals. It also clarifies the question: “Are we providing the opportunities for our students to demonstrate language?”

One of the administrators shared that TELPAS training worked best when “breaking down the training over time and understanding what a beginner, intermediate...students looks like and putting real students’ [writing] examples made a difference.” This principal saw a 21% TELPAS composite growth in her scores from 2016 to 2017. She attributed the TELPAS composite growth to how the training was sequenced and built over time during her campus PLC meetings.

ELPS rationale, training format, and professional learning communities

All administrators agreed that understanding of the ELPS had to do with how the training was presented to the staff. On-going training and discussion on the ELPS through professional learning communities (PLCs) seemed to have helped teachers and principals because of the knowledge gained and growth in their TELPAS composite scores. One of the teachers shared: “If I had not attended our district bilingual PLCs and get together as ESL teachers and ask lots of questions, [I would not have reached the level of understanding I have today]. The discussions during the PLC meetings were most useful.”

Teachers’ lack of understanding about the ELPS and need to differentiate instruction

Overall, all leaders reported that the ELPS were not easy to implement for teachers. One central office administrator shared: “Teachers have a good understanding about the ELPS, but where there is room for growth is how to implement. Not just know what the ELPS are, but how to use them to linguistically accommodate the instruction for ELs.” A teacher with more than

twenty years of experience shared: “It is not easy to implement the ELPS because you have to look at every individual student, but it is possible. You just have to know where your students are and offer the support.”

Need for ELPS instructional leadership at the school level

Participants perceived that the responsibility of the implementation of the ELPS fell on the school administrators, more specifically on the principal. The expectations for ELPS implementation “needed to start at the central office level, but making ELPS a priority in schools, in every classroom, and setting the tone of implementation were the principals’ responsibilities” as expressed by one of the teachers. One supervisor of school principals reported:

The implementation of the ELPS just depends on the school leadership. You can have two campuses, one right by each other, and you have one principal who does not see it as a priority, they do not see the concerted effort, and then you go to another campus where the principal feels that this is important and it is going to help not only ELs, but all students and it’s monitored and gets implemented more.

Teachers perceived the same discrepancy regarding ELPS instructional leadership. One teacher shared: “TELPAS data were discussed at the end of the year. They will be having action goals on the area of the ELPS. The action goal will include not only posting the ELPS, but making sure students understand the ELPS.” In contrast, one of her colleagues commented: “One big issue is that our administrators are not aware of how important bilingual education is. For this

teacher it was key that her administrators spent more time in her class.” She shared: “a 15-minute walk-through, a 45-minute observation is never good enough.” She wanted her administrators “to be there more, be longer time, and be able to see, and then, go to the next teacher.”

TELPAS isolation versus integration

According to teachers, during training, TELPAS was presented as a separate test they had to administer as opposed to an assignment embedded during daily instruction. The TELPAS test made students anxious and their performance got compromised. Teachers shared that TELPAS “is extra on the teacher, the extra writing assignment.” She felt her students “performed better on a regular paper than the one I set aside for their TELPAS”. These teachers viewed TELPAS as an additional task as they had to require students to write for TELPAS as a specific assessment instead of integrating it during daily instruction. In turn, the way TELPAS was presented to their students may compromise students’ performance.

TELPAS and STAAR prestige

Overall leaders perceived STAAR as having more prestige than TELPAS. The STAAR test had more accountability weight than TELPAS making TELPAS occupy a lower level of importance in school instruction. One of the principals commented:

Some of my classrooms [teachers] may not understand, especially my new teachers, they do not understand how all [TELPAS and ELPS] tie together and the importance of it. It [ELPS] is going to be more of a push based upon the STAAR scores we received based upon

the writing scores and reading for 4th and 3rd grade, so we got to do a better job with that.

Despite TELPAS being a state assessment, this test was not regarded with the same level of importance as STAAR. One of the central office leaders shared:

Because TELPAS is not a critical part of our evaluation system, I do not think the sense of urgency is not the same as for STAAR or an End of Course exam. It is not accessible to our community. They do not speak that language. They speak: *Am I an improvement required campus?* Which has nothing to do with TELPAS. *Am I meeting standard? Am I an A-F campus?* So its focus is more on STAAR results.

Despite the importance of TELPAS data, TELPAS data were not used to the same degree as STAAR data were. One principals’ comment included:

I think that TELPAS is important. I do not think it is given enough attention in comparison to STAAR and the data from TELPAS seems to me to be more authentic because is a case study on the child’s language ability.

One of the teachers’ pointed out that the TELPAS-STAAR prestige perception was a state issue:

I think that TELPAS can be a powerful tool, but it is not well

respected, and I think it is not well respected because it is not as important as STAAR ... This is just not a thing that happens in our district, it is across the state.

District system and collaboration with campuses on ELPS and TELPAS

Central office leaders elaborated on the support they provided to campuses to share the importance of the ELPS and TELPAS. One of central office administrators indicated:

Our bilingual director has provided rosters of students. What powerful information to have conversations with teachers and why do we have children regressing, why are they not progressing, why do they plateau? I think we demonstrate that we see the value within the [TELPAS] data. I believe we are demonstrating that.

As an example, one of the principals reaped the benefits of working in very close collaboration with the bilingual/ESL director and specialists to train and collaborate directly with her teachers on the understanding of the ELPS, TELPAS, and PLDs. This principal commented:

We were unacceptable in TELPAS according to our campus score card [last year]. So, we did see quite an impact on how understanding the PLDs impacted our scores. I feel we will keep on going with that next year. I foresee us being recognized for TELPAS next year because we have a much better understanding about the TELPAS process, what it should look like for every student.

Another teacher shared that analyzing students' writing samples during the campus PLC meetings in collaboration with central office staff "was very useful."

School leaders' perceptions on subjectivity in rating

All participant groups shared concerns about the subjective nature of the TELPAS. The holistic rating of these students' language domains relied on teachers' subjectivity and level of expertise with the ELPS, TELPAS and proficiency level descriptors (PLDs), creating validity issues. For instance, one of the principals indicated that the only reliable instrument in TELPAS "was the reading test for grades 2-12" and that students took on the computer.

Teachers' and students' fear of/and stress with TELPAS

Teachers reported feelings of fear or anxiety when (a) teachers had to take the online TELPAS rating test to calibrate students' writing samples and (b) when they had to rate the students in the areas of writing. One of the school principals expressed: "I think it is all in how we present it [TELPAS] ... I think the teachers are still scared." One of the teachers commented that TELPAS "can be stressful." She worked very hard "just trying to integrate it."

Teachers were not the only ones fearing the TELPAS writing calibration tests, 45% of the teachers perceived that students also were afraid of TELPAS. One of the teachers shared: "the kiddos they feel uncomfortable because of their spelling, their handwriting, so I feel that they have a lot of... their affective filter affects them." For students, the feelings of stress and anxiety came when TELPAS was another writing test they have to do.

Online Testing of Listening and Speaking Domains as a Positive and as a Concern

All central administrators felt that the online TELPAS testing would bring consistency of rating. One central office administrator indicated: “TELPAS is going to bring consistency. There is no question because there is going to be a core of individuals that are trained that are going to evaluate at the same level [with consistency].”

All leaders felt that they needed to think about embedding practice time and support during instruction to ensure the students were successful with the new test format. On the other hand, sixty seven percent of the teachers worried about listening and speaking going online as they “did not know how the computer is going to judge accurately how to be able to listen an EL speak.”

Discussions

The findings of the study indicate that the amount of hours in ELPS training not only created significant differences on the overall efficacy for any of the leaders’ groups: central office, school administrators, and bilingual/ESL teachers, but the hours in ELPS training also revealed significant differences on these leaders’ action, self-regulation, and means efficacy.

These findings are congruent with previous research on self-efficacy for development as a predictor of an individual’s attitude toward employee development programs (Maurer, Mitchell, & Barbeite, 2002; Maurer & Tarulli, 1994; Reichard et al., 2017), learning motivation during training (Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000), participation in development activities outside of work (Maurer et al., 2000). Individuals with high self-efficacy for development are more likely to

engage in development activities than are individuals who have low self-efficacy for development (Maurer et al., 2003, Reichard et al., 2017).

Some teachers and principals indicated that ELPS were best practice they implemented in the classrooms. Some teachers felt ELPS contributed to enriching their teaching toolkit along with strategies they implemented and trainings they had attended such as sheltered instruction or SIOP training (Echevarria et al., 2017). These perceptions aligned with research on linguistically accommodated instruction (Knight & Wiseman 2006; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Téllez & Mosqueda, 2015).

Face-to-face and on-going trainings and professional learning community meetings rather than online versions of training seemed to produce more understanding and positive perceptions on teachers and administrators. These findings align with previous literature indicating that effective professional development must include follow-up support, coaching, and inclusion within professional learning communities (Calderon & Slakk, 2016; Joyce & Showers, 1996, 2002; DuFour, 2004).

During the district PLC meetings, teachers collaborated, discussed, and revisited the ELPS or TELPAS data, which allowed deepening their understanding (DuFour, 2004). These remarks align with previous research indicating that preparation prior to a test is important to create more confidence and success for both teacher and student (Portolese, Krause & Bonner, 2016; Cizek, 2010).

In addition, these findings reinforce previous research emphasizing that teacher collaboration and professional development opportunities on the area of assessments

resulted in more confident teachers and deeper understanding of their assessment practices (Télez & Mosqueda, 2015).

The school leaders in this study shared the importance of supporting students during the year to expose them to the online test format and expectations before the real spring test administration (Moreno-Hewitt, 2015; Portolese et al., 2016). Teachers of ELs, especially new teachers should receive professional development focused on understanding language development that differentiate between ELs' capacities for the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing (Campbell & Evans, 2000; Knight & Wiseman, 2006; Maclellan, 2004; Télez & Mosqueda, 2015). Teachers of ELs are unprepared to work with linguistically diverse students and fail to acquire needed expertise to meet the needs of ELs (Télez & Mosqueda, 2015). Specialized assessment knowledge is critical for teachers of bilingual and dual language programs (Heritage, 2010; Plake, Impara, & Fager, 1993; Maclellan, 2004; Télez & Mosqueda, 2015; Zepeda, Castro, & Cronin, 2011).

If individual plans were not created and formative assessments were not used to meet the needs of the different proficiency levels in the classroom, some damage happened (Cizek, 2010; Télez & Mosqueda, 2015). The situation may have worsened for ELs when school administrators did not sustain the same level of expectations for the implementation of the ELPS and TELPAS as they did for the TEKS or the STAAR test (Williams, Hakuta, Haertel et al., 2007; Harper, de Jong, & Platt, 2008; Moreno-Hewitt, 2015; Morita-Mullaney, 2017).

The lack of ELPS and TELPAS school leadership perceived by central office and teachers corroborate previous research findings

highlighting that follow up systems are critical to succeed academically (Williams et al., 2007; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Morita-Mullaney, 2017). In addition, this finding reinforces the notion that the principal stands out as the individual who influences the most the long-term success of the EL programs (Reyes, 2006; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011).

Equitative access to technology is key to prevent academic gaps (Leu, Forzani, Rhoads, Cheryl, Kennedy, & Timbrell, 2014). Previous research indicated that students do not perform better with online test and the access to technology (Leu et al., 2014; Yonker 2011). Test knowledge and preparation tend to impact the academic success of the students (Heritage, 2010; Plake et al., 1993; Maclellan, 2004; Télez & Mosqueda, 2015; Moreno-Hewitt, 2015; Portolesse et al., 2016).

Implications

Strategic professional development plan for all and by all

Hours of training and not years of experience predict leaders' efficacy. Investing on individuals' preparation programs rather than rewarding years of experience could yield to higher results for school districts. The creation of long-range strategic plan could include a continuous tiered professional development, support for campus administrators, and teachers (Allison & Kaye, 2005).

The goal of evidence-based professional development should be to improve academic achievement in students (Calderon & Slakk, 2016; Darling-Hammond, 2009). Effective professional development must include follow-up coaching and inclusion in professional learning communities (Calderon & Slakk, 2016; Joyce & Showers, 1996, 2002; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011; DuFour, 2004). Investing in on-going professional development on assessment practices may result in teachers

who are more confident to improve their assessment practices (Mertler 2009; Téllez & Mosqueda, 2015).

A locally viable and well-designed curriculum could help meeting the needs of ELs as they progress through grade levels (Genesse, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian 2006; Lucas et al., 2004). Districts and schools should ensure these language standards are embedded in the curriculum, as well as monitored implementation.

Social justice, heroic and instructional leadership for English learners

Social justice for ELs may be obtained as principals are able to create inclusive services for ELs such as prioritizing students' language learning including their families and cultures in the school community, assuming language as a right and asset (Theotaris & O'Toole, 2011; Reyes, 2006).

Considering the benefits of bilingual education, the district strategic plan could include the implementation of a two-way bilingual education model to keep the language development as one of the main focus within the organization. This dynamic could contribute better preparing all students with the twenty-first century language skills, in order to succeed and better compete in the global economy (Umanski, Valentino, & Reardon, 2015;).

ELs' access to technology

School districts and schools may try to ensure the new online testing is supported through planning and budgeting within the school district strategic plan, in order to ensure access to resources and successful online testing for all students. Practice and exposure may be essential to succeed academically (Moreno-Hewitt, 2015; Portollesse et al., 2016).

Shared learning targets, criteria for success, goal setting and feedback

Students need to know what and why they are learning through intentional shared learning targets. Shared learning targets should indicate the what, the how deep students will learn and how they will demonstrate they got the learning (Moss & Bookhart, 2012; Moss, Brookhart, & Long, 2011). The rubric for success in this case could include examples of the English language proficiency level descriptors (PLDs) for the different proficiency levels of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. English learners could visualize the success rubric and set their language goals. Students' portfolio-based assessments for the language domains can be used to set goals and confer with the students individually through EL talks process. The EL talks or student led conferences could happen continuously as checkpoints along the year to assist students monitoring their goals and growth. Feedback offered to students should be corrective, timely, and specific to the level of skill or knowledge (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001; Trammel, Schloss, & Alper, 1994).

Instructional rounds as a tool for district and school collaboration

Leaders should keep learning as the main focus (Elfers & Stritikus, 2013; Marzano & Waters, 2009). Creating and implementing school collaborative approaches to reform factors such as learning goals may be critical to achieve academic success (Coburn & Russell, 2008; Hopkins, Spillane, Jakopovic, & Heaton, 2013; Liou, 2016). Both district and campus staff could engage in ongoing instructional rounds where the ELPS are intentionally addressed (City, Elmore, Friarman, & Teitel, 2009). Instructional rounds could help developing individual and collective efficacy by involving the entire educational community within the data collection process and instructional practices.

Conclusions

The findings of this study indicate that hours of ELPS training are statistically significant to develop leaders' overall efficacy. More efforts should be invested in hiring effective administrative leadership and developing personnel based on professional development hours, in order to ensure successful implementation of the ELPS, TELPAS, and academic achievement in general. School districts may be able to develop leaders' efficacies through targeted professional development on the areas of ELPS and TELPAS as part of their strategic plan. A viable curriculum that includes the ELPS and linguistic accommodated instruction guidance may help teachers. Additionally, shared learning goals may allow students to own their

learning. Students monitoring their own learning goals tend to be aware of the expectations and are able to receive immediate feedback. Instructional Rounds may provide all levels of educators in the educational community: central office, school administrators, and teachers, with an opportunity to work together (City et al., 2009).

This process may be viewed as a catalyst to improve not only individual but collective efficacy, and ultimately overall student achievement (Hattie, 2017; Leithwood & Jentzi, 2008). Different levels of educators within the educational community may need to work together helping students to increase their capacity, by allowing them to effectively acquire more language and academic content simultaneously.

Author Biographies

Pilar Moreno-Recio is the director of bilingual/ESL education in Goose Creek CISD in Baytown, Texas. She has first-hand experience as a learner of languages and teaching language learners in several countries. She has served in instructional leadership positions at the school level as well as in district level executive and administrative positions. She has worked with federal and state programs serving bilingual/ESL/Migrant populations across Texas. Her research focuses on school leadership and impact of standards and assessment on leaders' efficacy and English learners' language growth. E-mail: pilar.morenorecio@gccisd.net

Antonio Corrales is an assistant professor in educational leadership at the University of Houston in Clear Lake, TX. He has several years of experience in providing managerial leadership and administrative support to various departments in a variety of school districts and organizations. He has also served in executive and administrative positions at the district and campus level, as well as management of multimillion-dollar projects for multinational companies. His research focuses on school turnaround and multicultural issues in education. Email: corrales@uhcl.edu

Amy Orange is an assistant professor at the University of Houston at Clear Lake's Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis where she teaches courses in qualitative research methods and research design. Prior to her appointment at UHCL, she taught in California public schools. She has published articles on early childhood education, workplace bullying in schools, high-stakes testing and accountability in K-12 education, and qualitative methodology. She is a senior editor for *The Qualitative Report*, a peer-reviewed journal, and has also served as a peer reviewer for conference proposals and journal manuscripts. E-mail: Orange@UHCL.edu

Renée E. Lastrapes is an assistant professor of educational research and assessment at the University of Houston in Clear Lake, TX where she teaches graduate courses in measurement, research design, and statistics, and supervises graduate student research for doctoral dissertations. She has been a classroom special education teacher in California and Louisiana with sixteen years of experience working with students with various disability categories from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Her research interests include formative assessment in the content areas and evidence-based behavioral interventions for students with behavioral disorders. E-mail: Lastrapes@UHCL.edu

References

- Allison, M. and Kaye, J. (2005). *Strategic planning for nonprofit organizations*. 2nd ed. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Badgett, K., Harrell, S., Carman, A. C., & Lyles, L. (2012). Examining the relationship between TELPAS reading and TAKS reading for students with limited English proficiency. *Education and Urban Society*, 44(6) 688-706.
- Baecher, L., Knoll, M., & Patti, J. (2013). Addressing English language learners in the school leadership curriculum: Mapping the terrain. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 8(3), 280-303.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy and mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social-cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1986.4.3.359>
- Becerra, D. (2012). Perceptions of educational barriers affecting the academic achievement of Latino K-12 Students. *National Association of Social Workers*. 34(3), 167-177.
- Boals, T, Kenyon, M. D., Blair, A., Cranley, E. M, Wilmes, C., Wright, L. J. (2015). Transformation in K-12 English language proficiency assessment: Changing contexts, changing constructs. *Review of Research in Education*, 39, 122-164.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Calderon, M. E., & Slakk, S. (2016). *Promises fulfilled: A leaders' guide for supporting English learners*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Campbell, C., & Evans, J. A. (2000). Investigation of preservice teachers' classrooms assessment practices during student teaching. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93, 350-355.

- Cizek G. J. (2010). An introduction to formative assessment: History, characteristics, and challenges. In Andrade H., Cizek G. (Eds.). *Handbook of formative assessment* (pp. 3–18). New York, NY: Routledge.
- City, E. A., Elmore, R.F. Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Coburn, C. E., & Russell, J. L. (2008). District policy and teachers' social networks. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 3, 203-235.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Coleman, P., & LaRoque, L. (1998). Reaching out: Instructional Leadership in School Districts. *Peabody Journal of Education* 65(4) 60-89.
- Colquit, J., Lepine, J., & Noe. R. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: meta-analytic path of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 678-707.
- Corrales, A. (2016). *The relationship between school funding and graduation rates of Hispanic students*. (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Houston, Clear Lake. Retrieved from <http://library.uh.edu/record=b5849629~S9>.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). *Thoughts on teacher preparations*. San Rafael, CA: Edutopia, The George Lucas Education Foundation.
- DeRue, D.S., & Wellman, N. (2009). Developing leaders via experience: The role of developmental challenge, learning orientation, and feedback availability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 854-875.
- Dragoni, L., Oh, I., Vankatwyk, P., & Tesluk, P. E. (2011). Developing executive leaders: The relative contribution of cognitive ability, personality, and the accumulation of work experience in predicting strategic thinking competency. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 829-864.
- DuFour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6-11.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2017). *Making content comprehensible for English learners, the SIOP model*. New York, NJ: Pearson.
- Eden, D., Ganzach, Y., Granat-Flomin, R., & Zigman, T. (2010). Augmenting means efficacy to improve performance: Two fields experiments. *Journal of Management*, 36, 687-713.

- Elfers, A. M., Stritikus, T. (2014). How school and district leaders support classroom teachers' work with English language learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(2) 305-344.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W.M., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldenberg, C. (2003). Setting for school improvement. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 50(1), 7-16.
- Hannah, S., & Avolio, B.J. (2012). *The leadership efficacy questionnaire*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden Inc. Retrieved from www.mindgarden.com.
- Harper C. A., de Jong, E. J., & Platt, E. J. (2008). Marginalizing English as a second language teacher expertise: The exclusionary consequence of No Child Left Behind. *Language Policy*, 7, 267–284.
- Hattie, J. A. (2017). Visible learning plus: 250+ influences on student achievement. Retrieved from <http://visiblelearningplus.com/sites/default/files/A0169%20250%20Influences%200010%20DEC%202017.pdf>
- Heritage M. (2010). *Formative assessment and next-generation assessment systems: Are we losing an opportunity?* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Hopkins, M., Spillane, J. P., Jakopovic, P., & Heaton, R. M. (2013). Infrastructure redesign and instructional reform in mathematics. *Elementary School Journal*, 114, 200-224.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1996). Professional development as a comprehensive service organization. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17(1), 2-6.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through professional development* (3rd edit.) Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Knight S. L., Wiseman D. L. (2006). Lessons learned from a research synthesis on the effects of teachers' professional development on culturally diverse students. In Téllez K., Waxman H. C. (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policy, and practice* (pp. 71–98. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lee, J.H.H., Guadagno, L, Wagner, A.C., Cho, S., & Takehana, Y. (2015). *World migration report 2010*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Migration. Retrieved from http://publications.iom.int/system/files/wmr2015_en.pdf

- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. W. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.pdf>
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 496-528.
- Leu, D. J., Forzani, E., Rhoads, C., Maykel, C., Clint, K., & Timbrell, N. (2014). The new literacies of online research and comprehension: Rethinking the reading achievement gap. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 50(1), 37-59.
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Liou, Y.H. (2016). Tied to the common core: Exploring the characteristics of reform advice relationships of educational leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(5) 793-840.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361-373.
- Maclellan, E. (2004). Initial knowledge states about assessment: Novice teachers' conceptualizations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 523-535.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Maurer, T. J., Mitchell, D., & Barbeite, F. (2002). Predictors of attitudes toward a 360 degree feedback management development activity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 3-14.
- Maurer, T. J., & Tarulli, B. A. (1994). Investigation of perceived environment, perceived outcome, and person variables in relationship to voluntary development activity by employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 3-14.
- Maurer, T. J., Weiss, E. M., & Barbeite, F. G. (2003). A model of involvement in work-related learning and development activity: The effects of individual, situational, motivational, and age variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 707-724.
- Mertler C. A. (2009). Teachers' assessment knowledge and their perceptions of the impact of classroom assessment professional development. *Improving Schools*, 12, 101-113.

- Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2005). Corrective action in low-performing schools: Lessons from NCLB implementation from state and district strategies in first-generation accountability systems. *Educational Analysis and Policies Archives*, 13(48) 1-30.
- Moreno-Hewitt, A. (2015). *An exploration of English language learners reading proficiency assessment, the Texas English language proficiency assessment system, as perceived by teachers* (Doctoral Dissertation) Dissertation and Thesis Global. (Order No. 10110318).
- Morita-Mullaney, T. (2017). Borrowing legitimacy as English learner (EL) leaders: Indiana's 14-year history with English language proficiency standards. *Language Testing*, 34(2), 241-270.
- Moss, C.M., & Bookhart, S.M. (2012). *Learning targets: Helping students aim for understanding in today's lessons*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Moss, C.M., Bookhart, S.M. & Long, B.A. (2011). Knowing your learning targets. *Educational Leadership*, 68(6),66-69.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *English language learners in public schools*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp
- Plake B. S., Impara J. C., Fager J. J. (1993). Assessment competencies of teachers: A national survey. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 12(4), 10–12.
- Portolese, L., Krause, J., & Bonner, J. (2016). Timed online tests: Do students perform better with more time? *American Journal of Distance Education* 30(4), 264-271.
- Quintanilla-Shelton, J. (2016). *The relationship between the Texas English language proficiency assessment system and the state reading assessment among fifth grade English learners* (Doctoral Dissertation). Dissertation and Thesis Global (Order No. 10253426).
- Reichard, R. J., Walker, D. O, Putter, S. E., Middleton, E., & Johnson, S. K. (2017). Believing is becoming: The role of leader developmental efficacy in leader self-development, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 24(2) 137-156.
- Reyes, A. (2006). Reculturing principals as leaders for cultural and linguistic diversity. In K. Téllez & H. C. Waxman (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policies, and practices* (pp. 145-165). Mahwah, MJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Seibert, S. E., Sargent, L. D., Kraimer, M. L., & Kiazad, K. (2017). Linking developmental experiences to leader effectiveness and promotability: The mediating role of leadership self-efficacy and mentor network. *Personnel Psychology*, 70, 357-397.

- Slavin, R. E., & Calder on, M. (2000). *Effective Programs for Latino Students*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.
- Steele, J. L, Bacon, M., Slater, R., Li, J., Miller, T., Zamarro, G., & Burkhauser, S. (2016). *Effects of dual-language immersion programs in Portland public schools* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from http://www.ncele.us/files/uploads/2016/Michael_Bacon_and_Jennifer_Steele_Dual_Language_Education_Programs.pdf
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- T llez, K., & Mosqueda, E. (2015). Developing teachers' knowledge and skills at the intersection of English language learners and language development. *Review of Research in Education*, 39, 87-121. doi: 10.3102/0091732X14554552.
- Tesluk, PE., & Jacobs, R. R. (1998). Toward an integrated model of work experience. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 321-355.
- Texas Education Agency. (2007). *Required Curriculum, Chapter  74, Curriculum Requirements, Part A Required Curriculum*. Retrieved from <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter074/ch074a.html>.
- Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading inclusive ELL: Social justice leadership for English language learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(4) 646-688.
- Trammel, D. L., Schloss, P.J., & Alper, S. (1994). Using self-recording and graphing to increase completion of homework assignments. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 27(2), 75-81.
- Umanski, I. M., Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2015). *The promise of bilingual and dual immersion education*. Retrieved from Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis <http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp15-11>
- United States Department of Education. (2016). *Non-regulatory guidance: English learners and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by Every Student Succeed Act (ESSA)*. Washington, DC: Department of Education.
- Vavrus, M. (2015). *Diversity and education: A critical multicultural approach*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effects of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved from:

<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED481972.pdf>

- Williams, T., Hakuta, K., Haertel, E., et al. (2007). *Similar English learner students, different results: Why do some schools do better: A follow up analysis, based upon a large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income and EL students*. Mountain View, CA: Edsource.
- Yonker, J. E. (2011). The relationship of deep and surface study approaches of factual and applied test-bank multiple-choice question performance. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(6), 673-686.
- Zepeda M., Castro D. C., & Cronin S. (2011). Preparing early childhood teachers to work with young dual language learners. *Child Development Perspectives*, 5, 10–14.