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ABSTRACT

California’s foreign born population is estimated to increase by 5.5 million during the 1990 to 2020 time span. With this growth, it becomes essential that California’s public school English Learner programs are effective if English Learner students are to attain a high level of English language proficiency necessary to succeed in society. As such, starting with the 1998-1999 school year, the implementation of Proposition 227 mandated that California’s English Learner students would now be educated largely through English language instruction and not through bilingual instruction.

With this in mind, this investigation is aimed at answering this research question: Has Proposition 227’s implementation been effective for English Learner programs? Accordingly, superintendents from K-12 public school districts in San Bernardino County, California were asked to complete a survey concerning the status of their programs under Proposition 227. More specifically, the survey inquired about the efficacy of Proposition 227’s implementation through an evaluation of five efficacy domains. Each item comprising each domain contained a Likert-style scale and was determined to be either
effective or ineffective based on the position of the mean score on the scale ranging from 1 to 4.

Overall, the implementation of Proposition 227 was not found to be effective for English Learner programs.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- ABSTRACT ........................................... iii
- LIST OF TABLES ................................. viii
- LIST OF FIGURES ................................. x

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

- Nature of the Problem ....................... 1
- Purpose of the Study ....................... 5
- Significance of the Study .................. 6
- Description of the Study ................... 13
- Research Methodology ...................... 14
  - Research Questions ....................... 14
  - Hypotheses ................................. 15
  - Participants ............................... 15
  - Materials ................................ 16
  - Sampling ................................ 18
  - Definitions ............................... 19

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .......... 21

- Obscurity in Legislative Language .......... 23
- The Effects of Legislative Obscurity on School Administrators .......... 25
- Developing a Program Plan .................. 29
- The Dynamics of Program Implementation .......... 31
Recommendations .......................................................... 73

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE SURVEY COVER LETTER .................. 76

APPENDIX B: PROPOSITION 227 SUPERINTENDENT
SURVEY ........................................................................... 78

APPENDIX C: LIST OF INLAND EMPIRE SUPERINTENDENTS
WHO WERE SENT SURVEYS ........................................... 82

BIBLIOGRAPHY ................................................................. 84
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Total California English Learners from 1998-2002 ........................................ 2
Table 2. California English Learners by Grade Level ......................................................... 3
Table 3. Languages of California English Learners ............................................................... 4
Table 4. Achievement Percentage Ranks of California English Learners and All California Students ......................................................... 8
Table 5. Proposition 227’s Mandated English-Only Instructional Model ................................ 57
Table 6. Proposition 227's Structured English Immersion Time Period of One-Year ............... 58
Table 7. Proposition 227's Instructional Model as Compared with Other Approaches ............... 58
Table 8. How Teachers of English Learners were Perceived to View Proposition 227 ............ 59
Table 9. How Principals were Perceived to View Proposition 227 ........................................ 60
Table 10. How Parents of English Learners were Perceived to View Proposition 227 ............. 60
Table 11. The Impact of Proposition 227 on How English Learner Funds were Spent ............... 62
Table 12. Proposition 227 and Whether Funds were Spent on Effective Programs .................. 63
Table 13. Proposition 227 and What Should be Achieved in English Learner Programs ........................................ 64

Table 14. Proposition 227 and How English Learner Programs Should be Implemented ........................................ 64

Table 15. Proposition 227 and Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) Scores ......................................................... 65

Table 16. Proposition 227 and the Achievement Gap ................................................................................................. 66
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Percent of English Learners Redesignated as Fluent-English-Proficient as of Previous Year .......................... 10
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Passed on June 2, 1998, California State Proposition 227 eliminated bilingual education in California K-12 public schools. Now that Proposition 227 has been written into California's Education Code, English Learners are educated under a pedagogical model that dictates English-centric instruction in a one-year time frame to become English language proficient. The pedagogical model, known as structured English immersion, is defined as a process of English language acquisition, nearly all in English, with curriculum and presentation designed for English language learners (Torrez, 2001). However, prior to 1998, English Learners were taught under bilingual education and were instructed in varying combinations of their native language and the English language. An evaluation of Proposition 227’s implemented English Learner programs as measured by school district superintendents is the purpose of this study.

Nature of the Problem

Over the last ten years, the State of California has experienced a significant demographic change. This change
results from the immigrants who have made California their home. Accordingly, the California Department of Education (2002) notes for the 2001-2002 school year, California enrolled an aggregate 6,147,375 million students in its school districts as compared to an aggregate of 5,844,111 million students during the 1998-1999 school year. Further, of these students, 1,599,248 million or 25.4% of the total State student enrollment was designated English Learner in 2002 as compared to 1,406,166 million in 1998, an increase of 8% (CDE, 2002). Table 1 illustrates the increasing trend in California’s English language Learners.

Table 1. Total California English Learners from 1998-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Millions of English Learners</th>
<th>Percent of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,599,248</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,511,299</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,480,527</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,442,692</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,406,166</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Accordingly, population projections indicate that over the thirty year span from 1990 to 2020, California’s foreign-born population will increase by 5.5 million, or
83.8%, from 6.5 million to 12.0 million as the rapidly growing numbers of native-born children of immigrants will account for much of the overall population increase (Myers and Pitkin, 2001). Although these are only long-range projections, the aforementioned estimates illustrate that much of the future population growth in California will stem from the children of immigrants.

In light of this, as California’s immigrant population continues to rise, the need for effective English Learner programs for children of immigrants will increase as well. In fact, the majority of English Learners are located in the early elementary grade levels as more than one-third of California’s K-3 students were designated English Learner in the 2001-2002 school year (Education Data Partnership, 2003). Overall, Table 2 exhibits the number of English Learners in California as categorized by K-12 grade levels.

Table 2. California English Learners by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>K-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of English Learners</td>
<td>637,485</td>
<td>341,669</td>
<td>168,707</td>
<td>240,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is crucial that effective English Learner programs be in place to educate the apparently large number of young English Learners, the diversity of languages currently present in California public schools also illustrates the need for effective English language programs. Among the plethora of languages that make up the 25.4% of non-English speaking students, Spanish appears to be the most prevalent (EDP, 2003). Table 3 delineates the five most spoken languages of English Learners in California’s public schools.

Table 3. Languages of California English Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percent of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1,348,934</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>36,574</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>25,199</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>24,004</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino (Tagalog)</td>
<td>20,650</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>144,181</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As immigration rates continue to rise, the diversity of languages existing in California’s public schools will continue to present public educators with instructional problems in accommodating English Learners. For instance, educators will need to be increasingly knowledgeable about
these students’ languages and cultures for successful English instruction. In particular, knowledge of the Spanish language and culture will continue to be a requisite of teachers as Hispanic/Latino students are expected to be the majority student ethnic class by 2009-2010 (EDP, 2003).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain whether or not the implementation of Proposition 227 has been effective for advancing the English language acquisition needs of English Learners in the Inland Empire. The efficacy of the implementation of Proposition 227 will be determined by a survey to be completed by K-12 superintendents. The survey will measure the perceptions of Inland Empire superintendents regarding the effectiveness of Proposition 227’s implementation. This investigation will be beneficial to educational policy makers, administrators, and teachers in contributing to the evaluation of their own school district Proposition 227 programs. Additionally, this study will be of interest to anyone who is concerned with the current educational system of educating English Learners in California.
Significance of the Study

While an effective English language policy is needed for the current and increasing future numbers of children of immigrants, an effective English Learner policy is also needed to prevent the social and fiscal costs of having a citizenry that cannot read and write English. At the macro level, an inability to read and write English may lead to a decreased potential for personal income tax revenues and an increase in California’s unemployment rate as a result of an inability to compete in the work force. Also, an inability to learn English and thus compete in school may lead some students to drop out, in effect increasing the high school drop out rate. Furthermore, California’s public services may be increasingly burdened to provide financial and social assistance to those non-English speakers who cannot compete in the work force or who have dropped out of school. Moreover, the effectiveness of language support programs and policies will be all but decisive factors in the educational achievement of a rapidly growing segment of the population which will determine whether an entrenched underclass, defined by language, will develop causing severe social and economic consequences for us all (Ma, 2002).
An examination of Proposition 227's current impact on the state of school district English Learner programs will help gauge its impacts on the needs of English Learners and may offer indications of its long-term effects. Thus far, the effectiveness of Proposition 227 is still very much at question given its apparent insignificant effect on English Learners five years after its implementation starting in the 1998-1999 school year. First, an achievement gap still exists between English Learner students and all California students. Second, Proposition 227 has apparently had an insignificant impact on the redesignation rates to Fluent-English-Proficient status.

To measure student progress, California State Senate Bill 376 authorized the achievement testing of all students, except certain special education students, beginning with the 1997-1998 school year. The Stanford Achievement Test (Stanford-9) assesses students in grades 2 through 11 in various subjects such as reading and math and allows comparisons to be made to a national sample of students (CDE, 2002). Table 4 illustrates a comparison of the percentage of California English Learner students and all California students that scored at or above the 50th

Table 4. Achievement Percentage Ranks of California English Learners and All California Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year/Subjects Tested</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
<th>All California Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 demonstrates that English Learners have scored percentile ranks that are roughly half of the percentile ranks of all California students in math and nearly a third of the percentile ranks of all California students in reading. These percentile ranks illustrate achievement scores beginning for the 1999-2000 school year that is one year after the implementation of Proposition 227 in the 1998-1999 school year. Moreover, assuming that Proposition 227 has been somewhat effective in facilitating English Learners in gaining English proficiency, English Learners
should have scored better than only a half and a third of the percentile ranks of all California students in math and reading. Also, while the English Learner percentile ranks have slightly increased sequentially in math and reading over the three school years, so have the ranks for all California students. As such, no significant gains have been made in the achievement scores of English Learners under Proposition 227 as their scores have steadily increased in concert with the percentile ranks of all California students.

Similarly, while there appears to be no change under Proposition 227 in the achievement gap between English Learners and students who are English proficient, Proposition 227 has also not appeared to be significant in the redesignation of English Learners to Fluent-English-Proficient. In general, English Learners shall be reclassified as Fluent-English-Proficient when they are able to comprehend, speak, read, and write English well enough to receive instruction in the regular program and make academic progress at a level substantially equivalent to that of students of the same age or grade whose primary language is English (EC 52164.6). Criteria for determining Fluent-English-Proficient status are usually established by
individual school districts, so the criteria can vary, but they usually involve results from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and an evaluation of the student’s English competency through teacher evaluation (CDE, 2003). Figure 1 highlights the percentage of English Learners who were redesignated as Fluent-English-Proficient in California’s public schools from the 1981-1982 school year through the 2001-2002 school year.

![Bar graph showing the percentage of English Learners redesignated as Fluent-English-Proficient from 1981-1982 to 2001-2002]

Figure 1. Percent of English Learners Redesignated as Fluent-English-Proficient as of Previous Year

This data indicates that Proposition 227 has not made a significant difference in increasing the percentage of redesignations to Fluent-English-Proficient after its first year of implementation starting in the 1998-1999 school year. In fact, there has been very little change in the percentage of redesignations from 1998-2000. Only during the 2000-2001 school year does there seem to be a discernible increase in the percent of redesignations. However, with the subsequent 2001-2002 year, the percent redesignated actually declined to the 1999-2000 school year level.

In contrast, as bilingual instructional models were the primary method of educating English Learners before Proposition 227, it appears that redesignation rates under bilingual education actually exceeded redesignation rates under Proposition 227. More specifically, redesignation rates from the 1981-1982 school year through the 1987-1988 year exceeded the highest Proposition 227 redesignation rate at 9% during the 2000-2001 school year. Further, while redesignation levels from the 1988-1989 school year through the 1997-1998 year were either similar to or less than redesignation rates under Proposition 227, an upward trend in redesignation rates began during the 1992-1993
year. This increasing trend was successive including the first implementation year of Proposition 227 and ending during the 2000-2001 school year. Accordingly, it can be inferred that the brief sequential increase in redesignation rates from 1998-2001 was not an effect of Proposition 227, but rather was the conclusion of an upward trend in redesignation rates that originally began during the 1992-1993 school year. In short, it seems there has not been a significant difference in the percentage of English Learners being redesignated Fluent-English-Proficient under Proposition 227 as compared with rates under bilingual instruction.

The narrower focus of my investigation is to evaluate the effectiveness of Proposition 227’s implementation on English Learner programs as appraised by K-12 public school superintendents. As assessment of Proposition 227’s efficacy is especially important as the mandate has apparently not thus far mitigated California’s English Learner achievement gap, nor does it appear to have had a meaningful impact on increasing the redesignation rates to Fluent-English-Proficient status of California’s English Learners.
Description of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one presents an introduction to the nature of the problem, the purpose and significance of the study and how it relates to public administration, and an overview of the research methodology utilized in the study. Chapter two presents a review of relevant literature highlighting legislative obscurity, the effects of legislative obscurity on school administrators, the development of a program plan, the mediating factors present in program implementation, management approaches, and methods of program evaluation. Chapter three evaluates the achievement of English Learners and the status of the one year instructional time frame after the implementation of Proposition 227. Chapter four presents an analysis of the English Learner survey. Chapter five presents a discussion concerning a review of the study results, the significance of the results, limitations of the study, and recommendations for the enhancement of current and future policies and programs that are intent on educating California’s English Learners.
Research Methodology

Research Questions

The purpose of this investigation was to evaluate the effectiveness of Proposition 227's implementation in progressing the English language acquisition needs of English Learners in the Inland Empire. Therefore, the following central research question was posited for the study: Has the implementation of Proposition 227 been effective for English Learner programs in the Inland Empire? The independent variable for this study was the implementation of Proposition 227 and the dependent variable was a measurement of the effectiveness of Proposition 227's implementation in public school district English Learner programs. The specific research questions that were proposed for the study were as follows:

1. Has Proposition 227's predominantly English-only instructional model been effective?
2. Have public school personnel and parents of English Learners felt Proposition 227 has been effective?
3. Has Proposition 227 positively affected the budgets of English Learner instructional programs?
4. Has Proposition 227 guided its implementation in school districts by clearly describing what it was intent on achieving and how it was intent on achieving it?

5. Has Proposition 227 improved the achievement of English Learners?

**Hypotheses**

1. Proposition 227’s English-centric instructional model has not been effective.

2. Public school personnel and parents of English Learners have not felt that the implementation of Proposition 227 has been effective.

3. Proposition 227 has not positively affected the budgets of English Learner instructional programs.

4. Proposition 227 has not clearly described what it was intent on achieving and how it was intent on achieving it.

5. Proposition 227 has not improved the achievement of English Learners.

**Participants**

Employing a cross-sectional design without a control group, twenty-seven elementary, high school, and unified public school district superintendents from San Bernardino County, California (see Appendix C) were asked to participate in the investigation. Once superintendent from
the San Bernardino County Office of Education and one superintendent from the California Youth Authority were excluded from the study because they do not manage some aspect of a traditional K-12 public school district. Overall, the rationale for surveying public school district superintendents stems from the fact that the superintendent job role embodies that of primary policy maker and administrator for their school district.

**Materials**

The superintendents completed a survey (see Appendix B) which was comprised of twelve closed-ended and two open-ended items with closed-ended items appearing first, followed by open-ended items. For the closed-ended items, a Four-point Likert Scale measured the following four intensities: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. As such, the level of “effectiveness” for each item was coded according to the following: Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Agree=3, and Strongly Agree=4. Each item was assigned a score ranging from 1-4 denoting the level of effectiveness for each item. More specifically, item scores between 1.00 and 2.49 yielded an ineffective score, while scores between 2.51 and 4.00 yielded an effective score. Because 2.50 is the median of
the scale, a mean score of 2.50 yielded neither an effective or an ineffective rating.

The concept of "effectiveness" for Proposition 227's implementation was operationally defined and measured in the survey according to the following five efficacy domains:

1. Whether Proposition 227's predominantly English-only instructional model has been effective.
2. How public school personnel and parents of English Learners perceived Proposition 227's implementation.
3. Whether Proposition 227's implementation has positively affected the budgets of English Learner instructional programs.
4. Whether Proposition 227 has clearly described what it was intent on achieving and how it was intent on achieving it.
5. Whether Proposition 227's implementation has improved the achievement of English Learners.

Accordingly, the twelve close-ended survey items were indicators that corresponded to one of the aforementioned five efficacy domains. The two open-ended survey items provided a glimpse into the appraisals of superintendents as they pertain to how Proposition 227 has affected how
funds were spent for English Learner programs and how the implementation of Proposition 227 could be improved.

In addition, the survey was a self-report, therefore district superintendents completed the survey without outside help. Demographic items and items that could have disclosed the personal identity of a respondent were not included in the survey.

**Sampling**

This study was intent on being representative of the K-12 public school district superintendent population in the Inland Empire region of Southern California. Therefore due to the small superintendent population size, no probability sampling method was employed as a superintendent from each of the twenty-seven K-12 public school districts in San Bernardino County were sent surveys.

In particular, surveys were mailed to the twenty-seven K-12 public school superintendents in San Bernardino County with a cover letter (see Appendix A) requesting that they complete the survey. The cover letter addressed the purpose of the survey and assured anonymity and confidentiality for the responses provided. Surveys were also sent with a self-addressed stamped envelope. Twenty-
seven surveys were initially sent to the superintendents on July 28, 2003, and by August 25, 2003, twenty surveys had been returned. The response rate was 74%, therefore the likelihood of any sample bias has been mitigated. For reporting and analysis, a 50% response rate is acceptable, a 60% response rate is better, and a 70% response rate is optimal.

Definitions

English Learner: a classification given to students whose primary language is identified as other than that of the English language on the California State-approved “Home Language Survey” and who, on the basis of the State-approved oral language assessment, have been determined to lack the clearly defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed a school district’s regular instructional programs.

Fluent-English-Proficient: a classification given to students whose primary language is identified as other than that of the English language and who have met their school district’s criteria for determining proficiency in the English language.
K-12: refers to the Kindergarten instructional level through the 12th grade instructional level

Achievement Gap: refers to the disparity in achievement scores as measured by the Stanford 9th Edition Achievement Test (Stanford-9) between English Learners and students who are proficient in the English language.
Although Proposition 227 has established a greater awareness of the needs of English Learners among school administrators (Fields, 1999), the concept of “sheltered English immersion” may not have been properly operationally defined in the Law. Furthermore, while sheltered English immersion did allow for supplemental native language supports depending on an individual English Learner’s English language capacity, the Law only allowed for one year of native language supports which may be grossly inadequate for students to sufficiently acquire English language competency. Exacerbating the uncertainty of being capable of developing effective programs due to vague legislative language and an unrealistic English language competency timeline, school administrators have been confronted with the risk of legal liability for willingful noncompliance with Proposition 227. Moreover, school administrators have experienced confusion regarding the appropriate design and implementation of English Learner programs in accordance with Proposition 227’s sheltered English immersion model.
In an attempt to quell some of the bewilderment among school district administrators, the California Board of Education issued new regulations early in the 1999-1999 school year with the adoption of “structured English immersion” as to describe the pedagogical approach that focuses on the primary use of English language for instructional purposes (Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, Garcia, Asato, Gutierrez, Stritikus, and Curry, 2000). However, the Board’s newly issued regulations were still poorly defined and failed to specify the appropriate amount of native language that should be utilized in structured English immersion programs developed by school districts. As a whole, while the creation of Proposition 227 was clear as it was intended to bolster the English competency of California’s English Learners, the legislative language of the Law did not offer school administrators clear guidelines for the formulation of English Learner programs. Therefore, it is uncertain whether English Learner programs in practice today are effective given that school administrators developed their programs based on the ambiguous legislative language of Proposition 227.
Obscurity in Legislative Language

While the vague language outlined in Proposition 227 may have allowed for substantial discretion in the development of English Learner programs, the ambiguous language of the Law has also created confusion for school administrators. Because legislative language is so often vague, interpreting legislative intent can present pitfalls for an agency and without clear guidance, an agency may be left to fend for itself in the political arena (Milakovich and Gordon, 2001). As such, the lack of operational definitions and guidelines delineated in Proposition 227 left school administrators with the uncertainty of whether or not their program development efforts were effective and or were in compliance with the legislative intent of Proposition 227.

Moreover, a lack of clarity or obscurity in legislative language can encumber the abilities of school administrators to sufficiently implement the legislative intent of a law. If laws are to be implemented properly, implementation directives must be clear and if they are not, implementors will be confused about what they should do (Edwards, 1980). The linguistic obscurity that is sometimes present in the language of legislation can be
characterized by indeterminate words and unclear priorities. Indeterminate words involve ambiguity and vagueness in the meaning of words or a group of words, while unclear priorities refers to the implication that two or more goals are provided within legislation but without any indication of what the priority among them ought to be (Vedung, 1997).

With this in mind, the concept of indeterminate words is illustrated in the follow section from Proposition 227 that encompasses perhaps the most consequential provisions of the Law:

... all children in California public schools shall be taught English by being taught in English. In particular, this shall require that all children be placed in English language classrooms. Children who are English learners shall be educated through sheltered (structured) English immersion during a temporary transition period not normally intended to exceed one year. (Rossell, 2002)

While it is understood that Proposition 227’s structured English immersion is the mechanism by which English Learners will be educated to learn the English
language, it is unclear what structured English immersion actually means. As such, Proposition 227 does not operationally define structured English immersion by its components, nor does it attempt to describe how such components would interact as structured English immersion is put into practice. Furthermore, while the structured English immersion model is supposed to incorporate an appropriate amount of native language supports, the Law does not specify allowable amounts of native language supports for inclusion.

The Effects of Legislative Obscurity on School Administrators

As a result of the obscure nature of Proposition 227's legislative language, school administrators have struggled to effectively implement the Law in their own districts. In fact, in some districts, changes were made site by site in response to particular administrators resulting in arbitrary policy implementation across districts which demoralized bilingual teachers (Torrez, 2001). Also, in conversations with principals, Rossell (2002) discovered that principals felt satisfied with the English Learner programs they were implementing so long as they were
comprised of a significant amount of English language instruction. Rossell (2002) also noted that other important factors such as the organization of the school or the composition of the classroom were not significant factors in the formulation of Proposition 227 English Learner programs. In order to assure compliance with Proposition 227, school administrators may have simply designed their programs based on the provisions they interpreted, however at the expense of effectively designing programs with an adequate amount of native language supports. The apparent necessity for some school administrators to hastily implement the most compliance worthy provisions of Proposition 227 without the consideration of more effective program development is illustrated by the following teacher:

What I sensed was the people...were like a little bit afraid. The people that were responsible for the program wanted to follow things the way they were set up in 227. And, I...they didn’t say it, but I sensed like they were afraid maybe if they would try something else, they would get in trouble, lose their job, things like that. I was discouraged though. Because I thought those were
the people who could do so much. (Gandara et al., 2000)

In short, school administrators were faced with the daunting task of trying to devise English Learner programs in response to Proposition 227's obscurely defined instructional model of structured English immersion. This problem is summarized by the following comments of one school administrator in a large school district:

In a Structured English Immersion setting, notice I didn’t use the word program or project because I’m not sure such a thing exists. There’s no program called Structured English Immersion. Even the state is calling it the Structured English Immersion Process. 'Cause we’re not sure what that is. But one thing we do know is that it has to be overwhelmingly or almost in English. (Gandara et al., 2000)

In any event though, while many school administrators struggled to create district English Learner policies that emulated the intent of Proposition 227, many school districts actually developed programs that were based on their instructional preferences before passage of Proposition 227. More specifically, Gandara et al. (2000)
discovered that a school district’s level of commitment toward a specific type of English Learner model prior to Proposition 227 dictated the type of programs implemented after passage of Proposition 227. Accordingly, five districts that had a strong English-only stance before Proposition 227 employed seventeen native language programs before Proposition 227 and only two native language programs after Proposition 227. Also, six districts that had a strong native language orientation before Proposition 227 operated thirty-three native language programs before 227 and continued to operate thirty-one native language programs after 227.

In light of this, it appears school districts that maintained a history of committing to English-only or Proposition 227 type programs substantially decreased their number of native language programs, while districts that affirmed a history of native language commitment virtually left their number of native language programs unchanged. Moreover, even though Proposition 227 has mandated every California school district to switch to an English-centric instructional model for English Learners, school districts that were historically committed to English-only instruction chose not to fully divest themselves of native
language instruction. This may be a reflection of the uncertainty felt by school administrators concerning whether or not they interpreted and implemented Proposition 227's structured English immersion model correctly.

Developing a Program Plan

Once a school administrator has developed a thorough understanding of the school context in which an English Learner program will be designed, administrators can then develop a program plan. Without the construction of a program plan, the effectiveness of a school's programs, such as school's Proposition 227's programs would certainly be undermined as its design would be flawed. As such, a program plan enables a school administrator to create and clarify the design of a program, gain approval and resources for its later implementation, and to manage the implementation process effectively (Koteen, 1989). Given the discriminating needs of English Learners as the need for instruction to include some level of native language supports within a reasonable time frame, it is imperative that administrators develop a comprehensive plan in the construction of their Proposition 227 programs.
In light of this, Koteen (1989) has suggested certain elements that are essential to an effective program plan. First, an illustration of what the program is ultimately expected to achieve or a definition of its purpose should be present. The purpose of a program should clearly aim to ameliorate an existing problem while highlighting the target audience of the program and a definitive time frame for the purpose to be realized. Unfortunately, while the purpose statement does illuminate those persons for whom a program is designed to help within an expected time frame, these statements do not offer a description of the specific processes or methods that will be utilized to achieve the purpose of the program. Additionally, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and their corresponding targets should be described. Integral to the evaluation of a program’s performance, a program plan should include explicit and verifiable indicators of outcomes and anticipated progress. For California’s English Learners, the performance measures and targets may revolve around expected outcomes on the Stanford-9 Achievement Test. Also, a calculation of the needed inputs that are essential to achieve specified program outcomes should be illustrated. For school programs, these may be existing
line personnel such as teachers or other school staff that need to be hired, material resources such as technology and textbooks, and a sustainable amount of financial resources enduring the duration of the program.

The Dynamics of Program Implementation

While many program designers maintain the assumption that a program will be gracefully implemented as it was designed subsequent to its adoption (Chapman and Carrier, 1990), implementing school administrators may have a rude awakening if they fail to discern the interplay between the existing characteristics of a program. Through an understanding of the imposing factors encompassing a program’s implementation, administrators will be capable of proactively inhibiting those variables that may hinder effective implementation, and empower those variables that may facilitate effective implementation. With this in mind, systems theory provides a foundation from which administrators can develop an understanding of the variables that interact before and during program implementation.

More specifically, systems theory purports that the parts of any system are interdependent as the overall
performance of the system is dictated by the quality of interaction between its parts. Applied to the execution of an English Learner program, the quality of interaction between the characteristics of a school’s staff and English Learner student population, the material and financial resources of a school, and other factors may contribute to the quality of implementation. Put into a framework, the attributes of a program, the implementing administrator, and the surrounding contextual factors determine the level of implementation (Chapman and Carrier, 1990). Concerning program attributes, these may take the form of an organization’s available financial and material resources, quality of program planning, and intended program outcomes. In any event though, how funds are allocated, the quality of program plans, and other factors are largely determined by the nature of the implementing administrators.

In light of this, the attributes of implementing school administrators may be the integral component to effective program implementation. Vedung (1997) suggests that an implementing administrator may determine the quality of program implementation. In particular, Vedung (1997) contends that an administrator’s comprehension, capability, and willingness to implement a program impacts
the quality of execution. Fundamental to the design of clear program goals and objectives, school administrators need to possess an understanding of the law or policy from which they must design a program. Because the legislative language of Proposition 227 is somewhat vague, administrators may be incapable of devising program goals that adhere to the intent of the Law. If the program goals and objectives are flawed from inception, the direction of program implementation may become askew, and the goals initially established may have to be readjusted at a later point. In effect, administrators will then have wasted time and resources carrying out the program in a direction that is not consistent with the goals and objectives of the program. Also, while it is essential that a school administrator possess the capability to carry out a program, the capability of the administrator is not solely a function of the administrator, but also a function of an organization's personnel and resources. Thus, a school administrator must be able to persuade and rally others behind the program in order to gain the needed personal and financial support required for effective implementation. Furthermore, school administrators must possess a fundamental willingness to successfully carry out the
program. After all, it is unlikely that a program will be implemented if a principal opposes or halfheartedly supports it, success requires the principal to be an advocate for and act on behalf of the program (Hope, 2002).

Additionally, the contextual surroundings, such as community support for a program, may impact program implementation. Because Proposition 227 was written into California’s Education Code, schools were mandated to devise and implement English-centric programs regardless of community sentiment. As such, while a community’s political beliefs can not preclude schools from offering English Learner programs that accentuate English language instruction, a community’s beliefs may dictate to some degree the amounts of native language supports utilized within structured English immersion and thus, impact implementation. For instance, for a community where the parents of English Learners are not amenable to the design of a school’s program and believe greater native language instruction should be included, school administrators may have to offer more native language instruction within the allowable parameters of Proposition 227’s structured English immersion model. As a result, the implementation of that school’s program will have to be altered to
accommodate the potential need for more bilingual teachers and more native language material resources.

With an understanding of the various factors that may affect program implementation within the school context, school administrators may be able to develop an understanding of how the various factors encompassing a program will interact with a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis. Though traditionally used in the private sector, a SWOT analysis can assist public school administrators in the assessment and modifying of existing internal and external program characteristics, particularly threats and deficiencies, before implementation. In short, by outlining the strategic fit between the external opportunities and internal strengths of a program and the external threats and internal weaknesses of a program (Hunger and Wheelen, 1997), the likelihood for effective implementation may be increased. As such, administrators may be able to identify external program competencies such as a positive community stance and internal program competencies such as an adequate supply of financial, personnel, and material resources that a district or school can provide for their program. Conversely, a SWOT analysis may also reveal to
school administrators any external program threats such as a negative community outlook toward a program and any internal deficiencies that may confront a program such as an inability for a school or district to provide sufficient amounts of financial, personnel, and material resources. Overall, the utility of a SWOT analysis is dependent on school administrators continuously refining the data in each of the four components to be as clear and specific as possible.

Management Processes in Program Implementation

Today, school administrators are continually inundated with new policies to implement and as such, are confronted with the many obstacles of implementation including lack of resources, insufficient time for implementation, and disagreement about how to achieve results (Hope, 2002). As such, effectively carrying out the goals and objectives delineated in a program’s plan necessitates that school administrators are capable of successfully reconciling the various adverse factors that may hinder the program implementation process. Moreover, school administrators may be more likely to address and thus mitigate these
encumbering factors if they approach implementation in a structured manner.

Specifically, the Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) enables school administrators to account for estimates of essential resources and time frames and the specification of activities to be completed by sequentially mapping out the necessary steps in a program's implementation (Milakovich and Gordon, 2001). However, while the PERT method fosters efficiency by providing administrators with a structured guide of the sequential progression and utilization of time, resources, and activities to be accomplished, this management approach may be too simple in meeting the complex demands of implementing effectively.

While this strategy does attempt to clarify the coordination of personnel, it appears to not attribute significance to the disposition of implementors. Consideration should be given to the willingness, motivation, and leadership abilities of implementors as dispositional factors may interact with other program characteristics to determine the quality of implementation. Also, it does not appear that the PERT approach guides implementation according to the goals and objectives.
established in a program plan. Without implementing pursuant to a program’s goals and objectives, the direction of program implementation may be uncertain. Furthermore, the PERT approach is flawed in its sequential implementation. Because it implies that a preceding activity must be achieved before the successive activity can be initiated, the PERT method purports that nothing of utility can be accomplished in a subsequent activity until the anterior activity is fully complete. This assumption may be in contradiction to the dynamic nature of program implementation where activities should be started as soon as possible, given the needed resources enabling the initiation of an activity are present.

In contrast, school administrators may find more usefulness in implementing English Learner programs according to the Management By Objectives (MBO) approach. The MBO strategy guides administration through a program’s goals, objectives, and expected outcomes. Essentially, the MBO approach provides supervisors and subordinates with a clear definition of common goals and objectives established by top managers, jointly identifies every implementor’s major area of responsibility in terms of results expected, and uses these measures as guides for operating the program.
(Koteen, 1989). Unlike the PERT method, this approach bolsters flexibility whereby school administrators can initiate different program stages sequentially or if resources permit, in an overlapping fashion. Overall, the establishment of program and individual objectives will keep personnel in the collective yearning for communal program goals while mitigating the potential for internal dissension over how to implement. For instance, any disagreement between teachers and principals may eventually be resolved by the refocusing on urgent program objectives. The MBO management strategy also fosters collusion between administrators and subordinate personnel. Through participative management, subordinate employees can participate in the determination of program objectives which in turn, fosters employee commitment to these objectives (Milakovich and Gordon, 2001). As such, school administrators do not merely impose their plans for implementation on their teachers, but rather incorporate the ideas and suggestions of teachers into the implementation process.

However, even with the incorporation of subordinate input into the implementation process, the weighty reliance on goals and objectives as a guide for program execution
may encumber a program's outcome. Osborne and Gaebler (1992) propose the MBO approach leads to ineffective program implementation, because it does not ensure that objectives relate to a program's results, it sets program objectives low so that employees can meet them, and it focuses too much on objectives. Not linking program objectives with expected results, or its performance measures and targets undermines the purpose of devising objectives in the first place. Arbitrarily constructing goals and objectives without any consideration to expected outcomes results in a program that is being blindly managed. Perhaps, instead of employing a top-down approach where goals and objectives are created, then followed by performance measures and targets, school administrators should employ a bottom-up approach. While establishing targets for new programs may be problematic, school administrators could utilize benchmarks for similar English Learner programs in other school districts in the formulation of performance measures. Then, once crude performance measures are established, administrators could then aggregate related measures into domains or objectives. Over time of course, as baseline program data becomes available, performance measures could be tailored to the
program and targets could be created. Moreover though, program effectiveness can only be measured with goals, objectives, and performance measures being linked.

Similarly, relying on objectives as a guide for implementation may undermine program outcomes. By setting expectations (goals, objectives, performance measures, targets) too low and by focusing exclusively on objectives, employees may accomplish their required tasks, but at the expense of instructional quality for English Learners. For instance, if principals were to establish easily attainable instructional levels for teachers, teachers may lose some of their motivation to go out of their way for their students, in the form of after or before school tutoring for example, to assure students learn the English language. Also, relying on objectives may cause principals and teachers to focus too narrowly on objectives at the expense of instructional quality. If objectives were to emphasize one aspect of the English Learner curriculum more so than other aspects of the curriculum, teachers may spend more of their time assuring students learn the emphasized curriculum while students receive inadequate instruction in the de-emphasized curriculum.
Although the MBO management approach, in part, advocates participation from lower level employees in decisions over implementation, Total Quality Management (TQM) may be a stronger approach. More specifically, not only does TQM attempt to include the participation of subordinates in the decision-making process, but specifically addresses how subordinates participate in this process. TQM maintains that employees work in teams proactively to attack problems before they occur and asserts that employees be capable of measuring the various variables that impact a program's operations (Hunger and Wheelen, 1997). However, while continuous program evaluation is integral TQM, many public institutions choose to only employ certain aspects of TQM and fail to employ other aspects such as tracking program outcomes and defining exactly what constitutes quality performance (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). In light of this, because teachers are the line personnel primarily responsible for implementing English Learner programs, teachers may be in a position to remove program deficiencies as they continuously evaluate their programs. Essentially, through TQM, programs are carried out in such a way that the people for whom the program targets are the most important,
followed by those who directly serve the target population, followed by management who serve those who directly serve the target population (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). As such, it is the responsibility of school administrators to ensure that students receive the highest quality instruction by facilitating teachers' job functions through various forms of support. Accordingly, principals can provide staff development for their teachers which furnishes them with the tools and skills to perform tasks associated with effective implementation (Hope, 2002).

Overall, it appears that school administrators may increase the potential for effective program implementation by synthesizing the aforementioned management approaches, rather than concentrating on the utilization of only one approach alone.

Evaluating the Efficacy of Implemented Programs

Once an educational program has been implemented, it is imperative that school administrators continuously evaluate its operation and effects to ascertain its effectiveness. More specifically, it is essential that educational programs are evaluated to determine the extent
to which the program is being implemented and to document the outcomes of implementation to determine whether the program is achieving its objectives (Hope, 2002). Essentially, program evaluation is the application of systematic research methods to the retroactive assessment of program design, implementation, and effectiveness of public programs (Vedung, 1997).

With this in mind, Vedung (1997) suggests the effectiveness of public programs can be measured through evaluation models that assess the goals, results, and the comprehensive nature of a program in its design, implementation, and outcomes. As such, the purpose of the goals-attainment evaluation is to determine whether pre-established program goals have been achieved and to ascertain to what degree has the program contributed to goal achievement (Vedung, 1997). Essentially, this model measures program effectiveness according to the congruence between program outcomes and program goals. However, because this model narrowly concentrates on the achievement of pre-instituted goals, it does not allow for the anticipation of unexpected program outcomes outside the parameters of goals initially set. By not allowing for unintended outcomes, it may be difficult for school
administrators to discern negative program effects until they have inadvertently manifested themselves. Also, relying entirely on pre-established goals assumes the pre-established goals are the best representation of the intentions of the proposed program and are devoid of partisan personnel objectives and inferior goals that are easily attainable. Moreover, this evaluation approach may be limited in its ability to assess program effectiveness, because effectiveness is only defined by the relationship between program goals and outcomes and neglects to incorporate the dynamics of program implementation.

On the other hand, assessing program efficacy through a goals-free evaluation discounts the significance of pre-established program goals. This model evaluates efficacy solely by observing the intended or unintended result of a program without a comparison to pre-established goals (Vedung, 1997). In doing so, it is possible to acquire a valid representation of program impacts, because the only focus of this approach is observe program effects, and because pre-constituted goals do not guide or define the outcomes expected. For instance, at a specific point after the implementation of a new English Learner program, it may be intelligent to simply observe all of the program effects
and then, ascertain program efficacy from the baseline results observed. Moreover, the goals-free model of evaluation enables school administrators to first observe aggregate outcomes, then to prioritize outcome observations after negative results have been excluded.

Overall though, school administrators may be able to obtain the most valid measure of program effectiveness through a comprehensive evaluation. While an examination of the goals and impacts of a program are integral aspects to the aforementioned program evaluation models, neither model has been inclusive of the dynamics of implementation. Accordingly, the comprehensive model evaluates programs by describing the intents and observations of a program and the judgment processes and the criteria used to make judgments before, during, and immediately following the implementation of a program (Vedung, 1997). By examining the implementation phase of a program, it may be possible to discern cumbersome aspects associated with implementation such as inept employees that may give explanation to adverse program outcomes. Also, assessing the implementation phase enables school administrators to observe how the implementation of a program may deviate from its program plan as the eventual constraints of
implementation may necessitate a change in how resources are utilized. Nonetheless, it may be difficult to comprehensively evaluate educational programs as it may prove to be troublesome to operationally define program activities, judgment processes, and other program factors, and it may be overall too time consuming to examine a program in such detail. In sum, while the comprehensive approach appears to be complex, this approach may provide for a more valid evaluation of efficacy, because it compares a program’s implementation with its inputs and outcomes.
CHAPTER THREE
EVALUATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF
ENGLISH LEARNERS AND THE
ONE-YEAR INSTRUCTIONAL
TIME FRAME POST-
PROPOSITION 227

English Learner Achievement

It appears that the Stanford-9 test scores of English Learners has increased since the implementation of Proposition 227. However, while it may appear that the achievement of English Learners has increased, there may be mitigating factors that give partial explanation to the rise in test scores.

As such, in an evaluation of reading, math, and language Stanford-9 test scores, Amselle and Allison (2000) discovered that structured English immersion not only did not hinder English Learners as was purported by many native language advocates, but English Learners actually experienced gains across all three subjects. In particular, students in grades two through six sequentially increased their national percentile ranks for three years, with school districts implementing the most rigid
interpretation of structured English immersion experiencing
the greatest increases. Oceanside Unified, Santa Barbara
Elementary, Ceres Unified, and Alameda Unified School
Districts experienced the most significant percentile
gains, while school districts that continued native
language instruction such as San Jose Unified, Santa Ana
Unified, Vista Unified, and the Los Angeles Unified School
districts experienced static results. Amselle and Allison
(2000) concluded that the observed percentile increases,
especially in districts that fully carried out Proposition
227, were indicative of 227 being efficacious for English
Learners. In any event though, the validity of the
Stanford-9 test as a measure of English Learner achievement
may be uncertain given the test was originally designed to
measure the academic achievement of native English
speakers, not English Learners (Ma, 2002).

Nevertheless, while the Stanford-9 test scores of
English Learners have apparently increased subsequent to
the implementation of Proposition 227, the increase in
scores may not be attributed to strict adherence to
Proposition 227, but rather to other factors. In general,
with the advent of a new testing program, the first several
years show increases as the system becomes familiar to the
test (Butler, Orr, Bousquet, and Hakuta, 2001). Similarly, Krashen (2000) notes that inflation in Stanford-9 scores was responsible for either all or half of the increased reading scores in grades two through seven. Additionally, increases in Stanford-9 scores may be related to the increased focus on English language development that has taken place in California in recent years as reflected by the passage of Proposition 227 (Butler et al., 2001).

Moreover, an assessment of Proposition 227’s impact on English Learner achievement can only be determined through an evaluation of achievement results within the relative context of all students. As such, if it is to be assumed that Proposition 227 has led to increased achievement scores among English Learners, then score increases should be observed among districts that fully implemented Proposition 227 and not among districts that continued native language programs. However, Hakuta (2000) discovered that while achievement gains were evident in structured English immersion school districts, increases were also evident in districts that continued with native language instruction, and in districts that never implemented native language programs. Likewise, Butler et al. (2001) also found across-the-board increases in
Stanford-9 scores between school districts that utilized structured English immersion, districts that continued to employ native language instruction, and districts that never had English Learner instruction. In short, because increases were observed in relation to both structured English immersion and native language instruction, increases were not a result of structured English immersion. Perhaps score gains were caused by the inherent phenomenon for new tests to yield increased scores or by other factors related to the test itself or by other external occurrences not directly related to the test. In any case, what is particularly interesting is the rise in scores among fluent English speaking students. In sum, the consistency in score increases across various types of English Learner instructional models reaffirms the unlikelihood that Proposition 227 caused the score increases. It also further supports the probability that circumstances surrounding the testing process or characteristics of the test itself caused the observed score increases.
The One-Year Instructional Time Frame

It is estimated that English Learners need anywhere from four to eight years to become proficient enough to read or communicate abstract ideas at grade level (Feinberg, 2002). As such, in an examination of two San Francisco school districts that were considered to be the most successful in redesignating English Learners to Fluent-English-Proficient, Hakuta, Butler, and Witt (2000) discovered that academic English proficiency or proficiency necessary to perform successfully in school takes from four to seven years to develop. Also, in a study of English Learners who participated in an English immersion program for one year, participants did not score well enough to perform in regular classrooms (Mitchell, Destino, and Karan, 1997). In sum, a more sensible policy would be one that assumes the entire spectrum of elementary grades as the realistic time range within which English acquisition is accomplished (Hakuta et al., 2000)

Accordingly, school districts that have rigidly applied Proposition 227 have not experienced meaningful gains in English language fluency after one year. In the Oceanside School District, 88% of the non-English speaking
students were still classified as English Learner after a year or more in the District’s English immersion programs (Krashen, 2001). Surprisingly, even with the District’s stringent application of Proposition 227 to its programs, the District still allows up to five years of structured English immersion participation. Allowing up to five years for English immersion conveys Oceanside’s possible belief that the one-year time limit is not sufficient. Likewise, in the Orange Unified School District, even though 84% of the English Learners studies had begun the 1998-1999 school year with some English language proficiency, 47% had attained a proficiency level by the end of the year that still necessitated modified English language instruction (Clark, 1999)

Overall, school administrators may be able to reduce the length of time needed for English Learners to acquire English proficiency if they remain cognizant of the factors that may impact the rate at which English Learners acquire proficiency. Researchers agree that the amount of time necessary to attain English language proficiency may be dependent on a student’s age, level and quality of prior schooling, type and quality of English language instruction provided, parents’ education level, the student’s exposure
to the English language in their community, and the quality of teachers providing instruction (Ma, 2002). Also, lower socioeconomic status and constrained time periods furnished for English language instruction during formal school hours may dictate longer time frames to acquire English language proficiency (Hakuta et al., 2000). As such, school administrators need to consider the aforementioned factors in order to ensure English Learners are placed in the individually beneficial programs for their language acquisition needs.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

In order to ascertain whether or not the implementation of Proposition 227 has been effective in meeting the needs of English Learners, I asked public school district superintendents in San Bernardino County, California were asked to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix B) that measured their perceptions of Proposition 227’s implementation in their school districts. As such, superintendents appraised the efficacy of Proposition 227’s implementation through my survey that measured five efficacy domains that were comprised of twelve closed-ended questions.

More specifically, the twelve close-ended questions were indicative of the following five efficacy domains: 1. Whether Proposition 227’s predominantly English-only instructional model has been effective; 2. How school district personnel and English Learner parents were perceived by superintendents to view the implementation of Proposition 227; 3. Whether the implementation of Proposition 227 has positively impacted the budgets of school district English Learner programs; 4. Whether
Proposition 227 has guided its implementation in school districts by describing what it was intent on achieving and how it was intent on achieving it; and 5. Whether the implementation of Proposition 227 has improved the achievement of English Learners. Two open-ended questions aimed to inquire about the nature of Proposition 227's impact on how funds were expended for school district English Learner programs and to request recommendations that may ameliorate the efficacy of implementing Proposition 227.

In the tables below, the frequency, percentage of total responses, and mean of total coded responses are presented for each closed-ended question. Questions are presented under the effectiveness domains they represent. Also, while the data below are based on surveys from twenty superintendents, the total number of responses varies between items as respondents frequently omitted answering certain question.

Moreover, for each closed-ended question, an evaluation of the mean coded score of total responses on a scale between 1.00 and 4.00 led to a determination of Proposition 227's implementation being either effective or ineffective. More specifically, because each response was
coded so that strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, agree=3, and strongly agree=4, a score between 1.00 and 2.49 yielded a rating of ineffective, while a score between 2.51 and 4.00 yielded a rating of effective. Because 2.50 is the median of the scale, a mean score of 2.50 yielded neither an effective or an ineffective rating.

Whether Proposition 227's Predominantly English-Only Instructional Model has been Effective

Table 5. Proposition 227's Mandated English-Only Instructional Model

Proposition 227's mandated English-only instructional model has been more effective than other English Learner instructional approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16 100 m=1.94
Table 6. Proposition 227's Structured English
Immersion Time Period of One-Year

Proposition 227's mandated structured English immersion time period, not to exceed one year, is effective in educating the English Learners in my district in the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=19 100 m=2.1

Table 7. Proposition 227's Instructional Model
as Compared with Other Approaches

Proposition 227's mandated English-only instructional model has been more effective than other English Learner instructional approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16 100 m=1.94

It was hypothesized that Proposition 227's mandated English-only instructional model would not be effective in meeting the language acquisition needs of English Learners in the Inland Empire. Accordingly, with the exception of
Table #5, the findings of Domain 1 appear to confirm this expectation. Tables #6 and #7 display means that are within the range of an ineffective rating. In fact, Table #7 yields a score below 2.00, suggesting that superintendents may view Proposition 227’s instructional model as only similarly or equally effective or even less effective than previously implemented instructional models such as bilingual education.

Further, because Table #5 yields a mean score of 2.50, a consensus regarding the effectiveness of Proposition 227’s English-centric instructional model was not found.

How School Personnel and English Learner Parents were Perceived by Superintendents to have Appraised Proposition 227

Table 8. How Teachers of English Learners were Perceived to View Proposition 227

The teachers of English Learners in my district believe Proposition 227 is an effective educational policy in educating their students in the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=17 100  m=2.29
Table 9. How Principals were Perceived to View Proposition 227

The principals in my district believe Proposition 227 is an effective educational policy in educating their students in the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16 100 m=2.44

Table 10. How Parents of English Learners were Perceived to View Proposition 227

The parents of English Learners in my district believe Proposition 227 is an effective educational policy in educating their children in the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16 100 m=2.5

It was hypothesized that school district personnel and English Learner parents perceived Proposition 227 to be ineffective in educating their students. With the exception of Table #8, the results for Domain 2 do not
support this hypothesis. The mean score for Table #10 is at the scale median. However, how the parents of English Learners may have perceived Proposition 227 was not determined.

In contrast, Table #8 illustrates a mean score that is within the ineffective range. In any event, it is surprising to note that only teachers were perceived by their superintendents to find Proposition 227 ineffective. However, an explanation to this result may involve the fact that teachers directly interact with students in implementing Proposition 227 programs. Thus, they could possess a better understanding of the encumbrances that may exist with the daily operations of Proposition 227 programs and are more likely to communicate their concerns to their school district.

Surprisingly, the superintendents felt their principals perceived Proposition 227 to be an effective policy and thus, Table #9 represents a mean score within the effective range. With this in mind, it is not understandable why principals were appraised to find Proposition 227 effective, while teachers were not, given they are both involved with the daily implementation of English Learner programs. Perhaps teachers have
communicated more adverse concerns to their superintendents, because they are directly involved with teaching English Learners, where school principals usually do not have direct contact with students. In any event though, 59% of the superintendents believed their principals perceived Proposition 227 to be effective.

Whether Implementing Proposition 227 has Positively Impacted the Budgets of English Learner Programs

Table 11. The Impact of Proposition 227 on How English Learner Funds were Spent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=19 100 m=2.26
Table 12. Proposition 227 and Whether Funds were Spent on Effective Programs

Proposition 227 has ensured that funding for English Learner instructional programs in my districts have been spent on programs that have been proven to be the most effective for English Learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16  100  m=2.06

It was hypothesized that Proposition 227 has not positively influenced the budgets of English Learner instructional programs. As such, it appears this expectation was confirmed. The mean scores for the items in Domain 3 demonstrate an ineffective rating.
Whether Proposition 227 has Adequately Guided its own Implementation

Table 13. Proposition 227 and What Should be Achieved in English Learner Programs

Proposition 227 has guided school administrators and teachers on what should be achieved in the formulation of English Learner instructional programs through definitive goals and measurable objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=19 100 m=1.79

Table 14. Proposition 227 and How English Learner Programs Should be Implemented

Proposition 227 has guided school administrators and teachers on how English Learner instructional programs should be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=19 100 m=2.34

It was hypothesized that Proposition 227 has not offered sufficient guidance to school administrators in its
implementation and thus, the results appear to confirm this hypothesis. For the Tables in Domain 4, the means are within the range of an ineffective rating. In particular, the superintendents especially felt that Proposition 227 has not provided adequate instruction to administrators and teachers for the formulation of policies for district Proposition 227 programs. In fact, the percentage of superintendents who believed Proposition 227 has not furnished adequate guidance is 90%, while only 10% of respondents felt the Law has provided sufficient guidance in the formulation and implementation of Proposition 227 programs.

Whether Implementing Proposition 227 has Improved the Achievement of English Learners

Table 15. Proposition 227 and Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) Scores

Proposition 227 has been effective in increasing the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) scores of English Learners in my district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m=2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Proposition 227 and the Achievement Gap

Proposition 227 has been effective in reducing the achievement gap (as measured by SAT-9 scores) between English Learners and students who are English proficient in my district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18  100  m=1.94

It was hypothesized that the implementation of Proposition 227 has not improved the achievement of English Learners in the Inland Empire. Accordingly, the findings in Domain 5 appear to support this expectation. The mean scores for Tables #15 and #16 are within the range for an ineffective rating. In fact, 72% of the respondents were adamant that implementing Proposition 227 has not reduced the achievement rift between English Learners and students who are English proficient.

In addition, superintendents frequently chose to omit responding to the two open-ended questions. In fact, only nine out of twenty superintendents responded to the following open-ended question: How has Proposition 227 impacted the way in which funds are spent on English Learner instructional programs in your district? In all, the respondents noted that the amounts of funding for
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English Learners did not increase or decrease with Proposition 227, but rather funds for English Learners were allocated differently to accommodate the implementation of Proposition 227’s mandated English-only programs such as the costs of more paperwork. Similarly, instead of school districts purchasing textbooks that were once dictated by the primary languages of English Learners, districts now purchased only textbooks in the English language.

Also, only five out of twenty superintendents responded to the following question: What recommendations would you make to improve the effectiveness of Proposition 227? Their responses were as follows: 1. Allow for a reasonable timeline to transition from Bilingual to English-only instruction; 2. The Law should be more reflective of research on second language acquisition; 3. Existing teachers should be trained in structured English immersion strategies; 4. The Law should utilize dual immersion, which is a form of bilingual education; and 5. The Law should be repealed.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Review of Findings

With the exception of two items that were at the scale median and one item that had an effective rating, the overall findings suggest the implementation of Proposition 227 has not been effective in meeting the language acquisition needs of English Learners in the Inland Empire. Moreover, the findings of this investigation are significant because they address the possible limitations to Proposition 227's design that may undermine its capability to provide efficacious service to English Learners. More specifically, the findings suggest that Proposition 227's instructional time line is inadequate. Also, it is suggested that Proposition 227 has not been sufficient in guiding school personnel in the formulation and implementation of Proposition 227 programs.

Similarly, the results are significant because they address the possible effects of Proposition 227's implementation. Accordingly, the results intimate that Proposition 227 has not been effective in increasing the achievement of English Learners or decreasing the
achievement gap between English Learners and students who are English language proficient. Further, Proposition 227 has not positively impacted the budgets of English Learner programs or ensured that funding would only be used for demonstrated effective English Learner programs. In addition, Proposition 227 has seemingly only affected program budgets as to influence a change in how existing English Learner funds are allocated within programs, rather than affecting the amounts of funding allotted to English Learner programs in the first place. For instance, existing English Learner funds have been reallocated differently from bilingual instructional programs to accommodate the needed English language textbooks and heightened paperwork that are necessary for Proposition 227 programs.

Significance of Findings

In short, these findings are significant because they suggest that the touted effectiveness of Proposition 227 may not be so rosy as proponents of the Law have promised and thus, it may not be reasonable for public school administrators to assume that Proposition 227 is attaining its desired outcomes. As increasing numbers of English
Learners enter California’s school districts each year, it is imperative that the instructional approaches devised to educate these students are effective. If the current deficiencies I discovered from the Inland Empire superintendents that seemingly undermine Proposition 227’s efficacy are not improved, a greater likelihood of adverse effects for English Learners may result. These effects could include dropping out of school or being incapable of competing in California’s tight job market. In turn, these occurrences could lead to a decrease in personal income tax revenues or an increase in California’s unemployment rate. Therefore, it is of paramount significance to not only the English Learners themselves, but also to California’s elected officials, public school administrators, and citizenry in general that English Learners be educated through an effective instructional approach.

Limitations of Study Design

However, while this investigation does suggest areas where the implementation of Proposition 227 has not been effective, it is very limited in its present scope to be a comprehensive tool for a state-wide evaluation of Proposition 227’s implementation. As such, this study has
relied on the perceptions of school district superintendents in one geographical region to measure effectiveness. Nevertheless, a much more valid measure of the performance of the variables that constitute Proposition 227’s efficacy would be to gauge each variable directly and among a large survey sample. For example, in measuring the achievement of English Learners, a more valid measure would involve the longitudinal assessment of Stanford-9 test scores for each individual school district subsequent to the passage of Proposition 227. Also, rather than examining the potential attitudes of school personnel and even parents towards Proposition 227 through the inquisition of superintendents, a much more valid measure would result in asking teachers, principals, and parents what they thought directly.

In addition, this study was limited in its evaluation of Proposition 227’s effectiveness by not being inclusive of the many variables that, taken together or separately, may aid in determining program efficacy. Although Proposition 227’s implementation can be evaluated for effectiveness by examining the outcome or achievement of English Learners, efficacy could also be ascertained by assessing the personal attributes, such as motivation and
leadership style, of the individual implementers. Also, effectiveness could be determined by examining how the organizational structure of an individual school district may relate to a program's implementation. Furthermore, efficacy could be determined by evaluating a program's established goals and the degree of congruency between its goals and outcomes. Additionally, the amount of inputs or the amount of time, funding, personnel, and material resources a school district uses to implement a program could help determine effectiveness.

In light of this, future efforts to evaluate the efficacy of Proposition 227's implementation or the implementation of analogous policies should aim to determine effectiveness from data that is directly linked to the variable under study, rather than from perceptions of those who are knowledgeable about the subject. While data from those who are knowledgeable about a subject may certainly yield valid results on the subject, directly linked data may present more validity. In addition, future research on this subject should attempt to be inclusive in incorporating the wide array of variables that may contribute to an aggregate representation of how the implementation of a policy such as Proposition 227 has
performed. Furthermore, while cross-sectional studies such as this project do provide a glimpse into the performance of a policy's implementation, longitudinal investigations provide a more valid and reliable understanding of how a program is performing. Also, if possible, control groups and pre-test and post-test designs should be utilized. My current study is only suggestive.

Recommendations

Moreover, while Proposition 227 is mandated for all English Learners in the State of California, future attempts by lawmakers to improve English Learners' language proficiency in California should take into consideration and thus, resolve those areas that have potentially undermined the efficacy of current educational approaches for English Learners. With this in mind, the following recommendations should be considered and possibly applied to existing and future English Learner policies and programs:

1. Allow for adequate transitional time periods to prepare English Learners for mainstream English language classes that are longer than one year and are both reflective of second language acquisition research and are predicated on
the English language proficiencies of individual English Learner students.

2. Because teachers are on the frontlines of implementing and are thus cognizant of the smallest operational aspects of any English Learner program, their input can prove to be invaluable in highlighting any deficiencies in the program that may be overlooked by school administrators and therefore, teachers of English Learners should be given prominent positions in the design and evaluation of English Learner programs.

3. English Learner programs and policies should attempt to provide additional funds or guidelines concerning the allocation of existing funds for English Learner programs in order to accommodate the needs of newly developed programs.

4. English Learner programs and policies should attempt to link the expending of English Learner funds only to the strategies, practices, and programs that have been proven to be effective for the needs of English Learners.

5. English Learner policies should attempt to provide clear guidelines concerning the formulation and implementation of English Learner programs.
6. English Learner programs and policies should attempt to describe and clarify its goals, objectives, expectations, and measures of student achievement.

7. At its core foundation, English Learner programs and policies should be formulated according to objective, sound educational research.

8. English Learner programs should be routinely evaluated to expose any program deficiencies that may be undermining the effectiveness of its implementation.

9. English Learner programs should provide mandatory training to educational personnel in the strategies, practices, and processes that are distinctive and essential to the effective execution of one's job functions within a specific program context.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE SURVEY COVER LETTER
Dear Superintendent Chris Van Zee,

Hello, my name is Wesley Musson, and I am a graduate student in the Master of Public Administration at Cal State San Bernardino. For my culminating MPA project, I am investigating the effectiveness of Proposition 227's implementation. Moreover, I am extremely interested in documenting a valid representation of how Proposition 227 has impacted English Learner programs in San Bernardino County five years after its implementation in 1998.

As such, I have enclosed a self-addressed stamped envelope and a short 15 question survey for your completion. I would greatly appreciate it if you could complete the survey, and return it in the enclosed envelope by August 20, 2003. No names or any other demographic information is requested.

Again, no names or other demographic information is requested, and survey responses will remain anonymous and confidential. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to email me at Nossum701@yahoo.com. I will promptly respond to your inquiries.

Thank you very much for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Wesley Musson
APPENDIX B

PROPOSITION 227 SUPERINTENDENT SURVEY
Survey on the Effectiveness of Proposition 227

Please answer the following 15 questions to the best of your knowledge. Place a check in the box next to either Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, or Strongly Agree for each item. There are two open-ended items, therefore please respond as succinctly as possible. If you need more room to respond, please feel free to write on the back of the survey. Answer as many or as few items as you would like. All responses will remain confidential and anonymous. Again, thank you very much for taking the time to participate in this investigation; your responses are greatly appreciated.

1. Proposition 227’s mandated English-only instructional model with occasional native language supports has been effective in educating English Learners in my district in the English language.

2. Proposition 227’s mandated structured English immersion time period, not to exceed one year, has been effective in educating the English Learners in my district in the English language.

3. Proposition 227 has been effective in increasing the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) scores of English Learners in my district.

4. The teachers of English Learners in my district believe Proposition 227 has been an effective educational policy in educating their students in the English language.

5. Proposition 227 has been effective in reducing the achievement gap (as measured by SAT-9 scores) between English Learners and students who are English proficient in my district.
6. The principals in my district believe Proposition 227 has been an effective educational policy in educating their students in the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. The parents of English Learners in my district believe Proposition 227 has been an effective educational policy in educating their children in the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Proposition 227 has had a positive impact on how funds for English Learner instructional programs are spent in my district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Proposition 227 has guided school administrators and teachers on how English Learner instructional programs should be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Proposition 227's mandated English-only instructional model has been more effective than other English Learner instructional approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Proposition 227 has guided school administrators and teachers on what should be achieved in English Learner instructional programs through definitive goals and measurable objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Proposition 227 has ensured that funding for English Learner instructional programs in my district are spent on programs that have been proven to be the most effective for English Learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
13. How has Proposition 227 impacted the way in which funds are spent on English Learner instructional programs in your district?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

14. What recommendations would you make to improve the effectiveness of Proposition 227?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C

LIST OF INLAND EMPIRE SUPERINTENDENTS
WHO WERE SENT SURVEYS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents Surveyed</th>
<th>San Bernardino County School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chris Van Zee</td>
<td>Adelanto School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Janet Morey</td>
<td>Alta Loma School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ellen Garretson</td>
<td>Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ron Peavy</td>
<td>Bear Valley Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dr. Patricia A. Mark</td>
<td>Victor Valley Union High School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dennis Byas</td>
<td>Colton Joint Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Claudia Maidenberg</td>
<td>Cucamonga School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shawn Judson</td>
<td>Etiwanda School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mark A. Sumpter</td>
<td>Helendale School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. James Majchizak</td>
<td>Morongo Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dr. Robert Cosgrove</td>
<td>Mountain View School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Phillip Tenpenny</td>
<td>Mt. Baldy Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dave Renquist</td>
<td>Needles Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dr. Sharon McGehee</td>
<td>Ontario-Montclair School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dr. Clint Harwick</td>
<td>Rim of the World Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Gary Thomas</td>
<td>Silver Valley Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Pete Watson</td>
<td>Upland Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Dr. Art Golden</td>
<td>Snowline Joint Unified School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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