

**CLDE Stakeholders Feedback from October 17, 2016**

**What do you feel are potential opportunities with ESSA?**

* Uniform Process
* Common data across the state
* Easy, make things less complicated
* Simplifies the process
* Avoid over testing
* The same student would be identified and transitioned the same way in the entire state
* A lack of content achievement will not foreclose an El from exiting with language proficiency

**What are your concerns?**

* Could we use “Can do Descriptors” to inform as well?
* 31 WIDA States – what data pt for other states?
* One piece of evidence is not good for all students
* PARCC should trump ACCESS – If they do well on PARCC – Same Standards
* No alternative assessment for SPED students – dead end program
* Taking the human element out of the process
* Not using BOE to reclassify
* Not using BOE to qualify
* Re-testing students after they take W-APT a couple of weeks earlier in a different district
* Dual ID students – Non-Verbal
* One piece of evidence (ACCESS) is not a big or true representation of each student
* What about our SPED students?
* If PARCC is connected standards, why not part of BOE?
* One data point would be a huge challenge for MEP highly mobile
* Learning a language is not linear so what happens in those cases in which students regress in their learning?
* One point of data is not enough to make such an important decision.

****

**Summary of Discussion Feedback Table Groups**

**Stage 1 and 2 Discussion**

**1. Do current District/school language use survey questions (HLS) appropriately target key constructs? Are decisions and rules standardized and clear?**

* The questions do address key constructs, but it does come down to a parent's understanding of the questions and the way that they are written. Many parents misunderstand the wording which causes their student to appear to be a second language learner when they are not or vice versa. We believe that our decision rules aren't clear, because we often have to call parents and talk through the form in order to get the most accurate responses.
* The HLS survey questions are more general; however, if there is any question then a Home Language Screener is used to clarify language use. I would say that our decisions and rules are standardized and clear, but consistency of their use in each school could be a concern.
* Unsure, my impression is that it is inconsistent. At times students are placed in services for ELD when in fact they are dominant English but also speak another language at home. This is inherently flawed.

**2. Should Colorado create a standardized Language Use Survey (LUS)? What questions should be asked?**

* We would prefer to have a specific set of questions that must be answered, with the ability to edit and add more information if necessary.
* No. Why? The local control would be given up and the demographics for each area or cultural influences are varied statewide. The questions would have to address these cultural influences.
* Yes - outside of what other languages are spoken in the home, there needs to be a question about native like proficiency as well as dominant language used across domains. For example, at home they may mostly speak and hear native language due to parent’s language dominance but they may be only acquiring literacy and academic language in English.

**3. Should Colorado illustrate via flowchart/decision tree using initial ELP assessment results to classify students? If yes, how?**

* Yes; what is different than what we are already doing? Other than what is now required. Don't we already have a version of this in the guide book? We may need to change a few things in the guidebook as things change, but as it currently we do feel that it is sufficient.
* Yes. It would add another dimension to the decision process. However, could it be tweaked for local district use?
* yes

**4. What challenges does Colorado face in adopting a statewide policy and process for detecting, reporting, and correcting initial misclassifications? What solutions do you have to the proposed challenges?**

* Challenges: There aren't clear steps for exiting a student when they were mistakenly identified. We aren't clear on these procedures if there are any. There are a few districts that have different consent degrees (DOJ) needs to meet those needs as well. Solutions:
* Funding would be a challenge because it would change how much money each district gets. It would also effect staffing.
* If HLS reports a language other than English spoken in the home, students are automatically marked EL, however there are plenty of children whose dominant language is English in spite of parent’s home language. There need to be questions that unpack more about language dominance, parental preference

**5. Should Colorado consider WIDA’s proficiency cut point on the WIDA Screener as proficient in the initial classification stage?**

* Yes; but along with other pieces of evidence (HLS, etc.) We feel strongly that a body of evidence should be used to support this process.
* Kindergarten should be analyzed more because they are only tested on Speaking and Listening, and some score PHLOTE. However, in 1st grade they start to struggle so then we retest using the Full Kindergarten WAPT. They then score LEP.
* Yes

****

**Stage 3 Discussion**

**1. Should the "English proficient" performance standard on the state ELP test specify composite and domain scores?**

* Yes - this is where we can identify further need, and often one domain is an area of need for students even with high composite scores.
* Yes - composite and domain. It is important to look at the specific areas. It helps to focus the area of instruction.
* Yes. Especially in the area of writing and just literacy.
* Yes, the domain scores are very helpful in determining instructional supports needed.

**2. Should Colorado set a performance standard beyond WIDA’s recommended level?**

* We would like to see all domains at or above 5 - EXCEPT for students on an IEP or 504. WE NEED a pathway for these students. Many districts would be willing to share their processes.
* We are not there yet, we are not sure if we can respond to this.
* At this point a 5 Overall correctly identifies our students. We do use a 5 in literacy in most cases. Literacy performance standards could be played with based on what our native English speaking students are scoring on PARCC by comparing the two tests.
* No. I think the rigor of WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards crosses the domains.
* Unsure, need more information on current criteria

**3. Should Colorado request an extension in implementing the “standardized redesignation and exit criteria” when an additional year of PARCC and ACCESS for ELs is available that will yield more reliable and valid data to make decisions?**

* Yes - consensus. We do not yet have reliable and valid data.
* ABSOLUTELY! Let us figure it out and let the "Feds" take a lead from us.
* Yes; it would be nice to not change the following year.
* Yes. Especially since we have a difference in those who took the paper/pencil and the online assessment.
* Yes

**4. What areas of content from PARCC and/or CMAS should be analyzed in setting the English proficient standard?**

* All content areas should be an option in setting the English proficient standard. If a student is able to score at a level 4 or 5 (or at a level comparable to English proficient peers) in any content included on PARCC or CMAS, they have proven English proficiency.
* ELA should be the first area to be analyzed, as we begin to learn to read then reading to learn; however, we shouldn't discount math, science and social studies as it contains content specific language that can be very relevant to other areas of study in being college and career ready.
* PARCC ELA, CMAS Science and Social Studies might be considered, but they are only given at certain grade levels.
* ELA, Math, Social Studies and Science because of the learning and application of academic vocabulary and processes used in these content areas.
* Reading, writing, communicating, speaking across content areas.

****

**Data Collection and Reporting**

**1. Should Colorado maintain a centralized language use survey database that can be accessible to all districts?**

* YES!!!
* Yes, as long as they meet the FERPA guidelines
* No, the HLS can change from year to year
* Yes. It would cut down lag time of receiving the cumulative file from the previous school so we can know our students' background. We would also not have to retest on the WAPT.
* Yes, this would help with coherence when students are mobile and examine overall numbers/trends across districts for allocating resources.

**2. Should WIDA Screener results be made available to all Colorado district data users?**

* YES!
* Yes, as long as they meet the FERPA guidelines
* Yes. This could be another piece of evidence that districts use
* Yes. Please see above.
* Yes

**3. Should ACCESS for ELLs/Alternate ACCESS results be made available to all Colorado district data users?**

* YESSS!!!!!
* Yes, as long as they meet the FERPA guidelines
* Yes. Again this is another piece of evidence that districts can use.
* Yes. Please see above.
* Yes

**4. How does CDE improve streamlining current data collections to require data reporting under ESSA?**

* Work with IC to correct their coding system to support the effort. Pull from PowerSchool and Enrich too. These programs don't talk
* We do not know enough about his process to answer this question
* Who will track (recode students) moving to FELL? What data will be used?
* Not sure on this.
* Unsure

**5. Is CDE’s current exception process adequate to correct misclassification of ELs? Why or why not?**

* Once you know it, it is ok. But we aren't working form the data end and have to rely on others
* We do not know enough about his process to answer this question
* The exception process may not be clear to ALL of us. Can it be reviewed with EL people?
* The process has to be clarified with the ELL Admin.
* Unsure

**6. Is CDE’s current exception process adequate to override criteria for redesignation? Why or why not?**

* Yes. Lots of paperwork and hoops to jump through....
* We do not know enough about his process to answer this question
* This is not adequate- we would like state-wide guidance. It is a violation of student rights, if we do not clear to exit guidance.
* The process has to be clarified with the ELL Admin.
* Unsure