



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

# CLDE Stakeholder Collaborative

October 17, 2016

welcome

wilamy mieläinen benvenuto benvido bem-vinda velkominn bienvenue szivesen lat chrosawa exspeclala privitani dobrodošao bun byenveni venit welkom bienvenida vitany taggapin hoşgeldiniz willkommen dobrodošli velkommen



# Agenda



- **Welcome and Introductions**
- **Stakeholder Updates**
  - **CABE, CoTESOL, HELDE**
- **Updates from Spoke Committees**
  - **CDE and Stakeholders**
- **2016 ACCESS for ELLs**
- **ESSA Title III requirements on State-wide Standardized EL entrance and exit procedures/criteria**
- **Closing and next steps**

# Meeting Objectives

- Clarify ESSA Title III requirements on EL entrance and exit procedures and criteria
- Examine proposed ESSA regulations on setting standardized entrance/exit criteria procedures and criteria
- Illustrate policy and options for standardizing EL entrance/exit procedures and criteria
- Generate ideas and discussion to identify needs, opportunities, and collect stakeholder feedback





# WiDA ACCESS for ELLs 2.0

- WIDA ACCESS assessment changed in 2016 to ACCESS 2.0. With this change, the assessment was available as either a paper or online assessment
- Paper results accounted for approximately 31% percent of the state's ACCESS results in grades 1-12 (Kindergarten was only offered in a paper format).
- While WiDA worked to put the two versions of the test on the same scale, the results still show a difference in performance that appears to be influenced by form choice (i.e., paper or online).

# 2016 Valid Score Counts by Form Choice

Grade	N	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Online		Paper	
				N	%	N	%
K	11,129	100	373	0	0.0%	11,092	100.0%
g1	12,018	145	365	8,341	69.4%	3,670	30.6%
g2	12,623	130	384	8,709	69.1%	3,901	30.9%
g3	12,299	224	412	8,444	68.7%	3,848	31.3%
g4	9,950	231	425	6,672	67.1%	3,278	32.9%
g5	7,766	233	423	5,361	69.0%	2,405	31.0%
g6	6,736	243	427	4,681	69.5%	2,053	30.5%
g7	6,753	248	432	4,730	70.1%	2,021	29.9%
g8	6,796	259	431	4,718	69.4%	2,077	30.6%
g9	6,693	263	461	4,263	63.8%	2,422	36.2%
g10	4,298	269	454	3,083	71.8%	1,211	28.2%
g11	3,011	272	458	2,243	74.5%	767	25.5%
g12	2,818	269	458	2,082	73.9%	734	26.1%

# Form Choice Effect

- The difference between test form is most pronounced in Speaking across all grade levels and overall at the high school grades
- Students with lower levels of English language proficiency (ACCESS Levels 1-3) showed more of a form choice impact. Students with higher levels of proficiency (ACCESS Levels 4-6) showed much smaller discrepancies between online and paper scores.
- Caution should be used when comparing student scores obtained via different test formats.



# Communication with WiDA

- When the issue was raised with WiDA, they indicated that they believed the differences were due, in part, to more accurate scoring and increased precision with the online form.
- While deciding not to address the issue with the 2016 scores, WiDA indicated that they would move forward with standard setting on the online assessment as planned and would then evaluate the need for additional psychometric procedures to increase comparability between the forms in 2017.



# Implications for Growth

- Given that redesignation decisions are currently made based on a body of evidence and the differences between paper and online administrations appear mostly at the lower end of the scale, the most significant issue becomes use of the 2016 scores in our normative-based growth calculations.



# Options for Calculating Growth

- **CDE investigated the following possibilities for calculating growth given the differences in test mode.**
  - Ignore test mode and calculate growth regardless
  - Run growth calculations separately for the paper tests and the online tests
  - Adjust the scale scores to ensure that comparable levels of language proficiency result in comparable scores, similar to the methodology used on the CMAS PARCC assessments (there are a few different methods CDE tried to do this)



# Options for Calculating Growth

- **Each of the options has drawbacks.**
  - The first leads to an artificial depression of schools and districts using the online forms.
  - The second creates dual systems that are independently normed with no way to ensure comparability of the growth outcomes.
  - The district with the largest English learner population in Colorado gave all paper assessments which skews the norming group for the paper results.
  - Finally, since a new standard setting process is being conducted on ACCESS 2.0 and additional psychometric procedures may be applied consortium-wide next year, any adjustment made by CDE this year may be a single year solution that may only make it more difficult to interpret the data in the long term.



# Inclusion for Accountability

- As a result, CDE will not be using any of the potential growth calculations for 2016 accountability determinations.
- Instead, the 2015 WiDA ACCESS growth results are included for points in the 2016 school and district performance frameworks.
- Due to last year's accountability hold, the 2015 English Language Proficiency (ELP) growth results have not previously contributed to plan type determinations.
- However, if there are concerns about the inclusion of the 2015 ELP growth results for 2016, districts and schools may request to remove those results through the request to reconsider process.



# Release of 2016 ACCESS Growth Results

- CDE has decided to release results from the separate paper and online growth runs for local use.
- These results allow for comparisons within schools and districts taking the same test form (online or paper) but should not be used for cross form or state-level comparisons.
- We will share these calculations with districts for informational purposes, but will not use them for accountability determinations.
- Results will hopefully be available by the end of October.



# Moving Forward with ESSA

- Given the concerns with the 2015-16 ACCESS data and the proposed (but not currently finalized) federal regulations, CDE may prefer to hold off on setting new exit criteria until 2018-19.
- CDE is considering proposing this option to USDE, but recognizes it may not be allowable.
- If CDE is required to set new exit criteria for 2017-18, the targets will be reviewed and revised as necessary once additional years of ACCESS 2.0 data are available.



# ESSA EL Definition

- ESSA defines an “English learner” as an individual who, among other things, has difficulties in *speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language* that may be sufficient to deny him or her the *ability to meet challenging state academic standards*.





# Every Student Succeeds Act

States will “establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with local educational agencies representing the geographic diversity of the State, **standardized, statewide [EL] entrance and exit procedures.**” (*ESSA §3111, §3113*)



# Draft ESSA Regulations on Accountability and State Plans

§299.19(c)(3) [3113(b)(2)] Regulations clarify:

1. Standardized statewide EL entrance and exit procedures must include uniform criteria applied statewide
2. Prohibits a “‘local option,’ which cannot be standardized and under which LEAs could have widely varying criteria”
3. Exit procedures must include objective, valid, and reliable criteria, including a score of proficient on the State’s annual ELP assessment



# Draft ESSA Regulations on Accountability and State Plans Cont.

§299.19(c)(3) [3113(b)(2)] Regulations clarify:

4. Scores on ***content assessments cannot be included as exit criteria*** (not valid and reliable measures of ELP, may result in prolonged EL status, civil rights violations)

5. Exit criteria must be applied to both Title I EL subgroup and Title III services (exit EL status for both Title I and Title III purposes)



# Quick Talk



**Discuss with team member or elbow partner:**

- 2 key concerns
- 1 potential opportunity

related to this new provision in law and proposed regulations –

**Be specific on:**

- *entrance into* EL category
- *exit from* EL category

# Standardized Entrance Procedures and Criteria



# 4 Stage Framework

1. Identify potential English learners
  - Home language surveys (HLS)/Language Use Survey
2. Establish initial EL classification
  - EL classification instruments & process
3. Define “English proficient”
  - ELP assessment performance standard
4. Reclassify English learners
  - Exit criteria & process

(Linguanti & Cook, 2013; Linguanti, Cook, Bailey, & MacDonald, 2016)

# Stage 1: Identify Potential ELs

- ...requirement that all students who may be English learners are **assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.**
- Each LEA, **not later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year**, shall inform parents of an English learner identified for participation or participating in such a program
- For those children who have not been identified as English learners prior to the beginning of the school year but are identified as English learners during such school year, the LEA shall notify the children's parents **during the first 2 weeks** of the child being placed in a language instruction educational program.
- (ESSA §1111, 3111)



# Stage 1

## Language Use Survey Guidance

- Explicitly state purposes & uses
- Clarify the construct (current English use and exposure)
- Develop questions –e.g.,
  - *What language(s) did your child learn first?*
  - *Which language(s) does your child currently understand and speak?*
  - *Which language(s) does your child most often use at home, in school, outside school?*
  - *Other – What other information about your child’s language use would you like to share?*
- Set administrative procedures, interpretation rules

(Linguanti & Bailey, 2014)





# Guidance on Initial Classification Policy & Procedures

## Stage 2

- Set common policies and practices for initial EL classification
- Implement process appropriately, consistently
- Consider a *provisional classification* period to correct any initial misclassifications
- Differentiate procedures for initially classifying early elementary students; monitor and validate



# Stage 1 and 2 Discussion

- Do current District/school language use survey questions (HLS) appropriately target key constructs? Are decisions and rules standardized and clear?
- Should Colorado create a standardized Language Use Survey (LUS)? What questions should be asked?
- Should Colorado illustrate via flowchart/decision tree using initial ELP assessment results to classify students? If yes, how?
- 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?
- Should Colorado consider WIDA's proficiency cut point on the WIDA Screener as proficient in the initial classification stage?



# Stage 3: Define English Proficient

## What Does English Proficient Mean?

- Goal –Determine English language proficiency level range that reflects “English proficient”
- **Relate ELP to content assessment performance *without requiring a minimum content test performance***

## Key Assumptions

- A meaningful relationship exists between ELP and content assessment performance
- ELP level becomes less related to content achievement as students approach English language proficiency

(Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012)



# Stage 3: Define English Proficient

***Establish the "English proficient" performance standard on the state ELP assessment using methods that take account of EL students' academic proficiency on content assessments.***

- Do not require minimum academic performance on content test to reclassify
- Anticipate & mitigate risks
- Domain score weights affect ELP test relationship to content test results

(Linguanti & Cook, 2015)



# Stage 3: Define English Proficient

- “when ELs’ English proficiency no longer inhibits their meaningful participation on state assessments or in the classroom using English, they may be classified as fully English proficient. Note that the federal definition does *not* require that ELs be academically proficient in order to be classified as fully English proficient. Clearly, many native-English-speaking students are also not proficient on state content assessments. These students’ lack of academic proficiency may not be related at all to their English-language skills. ELs, therefore, must have sufficient ability in academic English to meaningfully participate in the classroom and on content assessments.”

(Cook, Linquanti, Chinen & Jung, 2012)



# Stage 3: Define English Proficient

- CDE plans to combine empirical data with policy judgment to determine what score on the ELP assessment should be used for redesignating students as Fluent English Proficient.
- Several analytic models will be used to examine the balance between WiDA ACCESS proficiency and CMAS PARCC content area achievement, trying to identify the ideal exit point for Colorado students.
- CDE is currently investigating this question using the 2015-16 assessment data, but due to the previously raised concerns around ACCESS 2.0 and issues with CMAS PARCC participation at high school, all results will need to be carefully reviewed when additional years of data become available.



# Relationship between Proficiency and Content Performance

			2016 CMAS PARCC Achievement Level- English Language Arts									
			Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
			Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Grade 3	2016 ACCESS Proficiency Level	Level 1	93	96.9%	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Level 2	426	95.5%	18	4.0%	0	0.0%	2	.4%	0	0.0%
		Level 3	1082	87.4%	137	11.1%	18	1.5%	1	.1%	0	0.0%
		Level 4	1516	58.9%	840	32.6%	192	7.5%	26	1.0%	0	0.0%
		Level 5	951	23.3%	1560	38.3%	1222	30.0%	341	8.4%	1	.0%
		Level 6	39	1.8%	279	13.1%	768	36.2%	987	46.5%	50	2.4%
	Never Identified as ELL between 2012-13 and 2015-16	7700	15.0%	9233	18.0%	12801	25.0%	19440	38.0%	2006	3.9%	

- CDE will investigate the relationship between ACCESS and CMAS PARCC achievement and bring results back for future discussion.

# Considerations for Analysis

- Since the majority of native English-speaking students are not currently Meeting Expectations on the new CMAS PARCC assessments, expecting EL students to perform at this level may not be the appropriate gauge for exiting EL programs.
- What then would be an appropriate target for content assessment performance?
- Similar results to native English-speaking peers?
- How do we define this peer group?
  - All Colorado students who opted to take the content assessment?
  - Native English-speakers from comparable socio-economic backgrounds?





# Stage 3 and 4 Discussion Questions

- Should the "English proficient" performance standard on the state ELP test specify composite and domain scores?
- Should Colorado set a performance standard below or above WIDA's recommended level? (based on new ACCESS 2.0 standard setting results)
- What areas of content from PARCC and/or CMAS should be analysed in setting the English proficient standard?
- 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?



# Moving Forward

## What are our key issues?

- Home language survey
- Initial ELP assessment & procedures
- English-proficient standard (WIDA Screener)
- Reclassification criteria & procedures
- ***Students assessed on COALT and Alternate ACCESS***

## What are our next steps?

- Policy development
- Process & timeline
- Stakeholder selection & engagement
- Reporting and data analysis
- Training and support
- ***Develop Alternate procedure and criteria, if USED allows***



# USED Data Collection Associated Requirements

*ESSA requires each LEA receiving Title III funds to submit:*

- The number and percentage of ELs in the programs and activities who are:
  - making progress toward English language proficiency\*,
  - **attaining English language proficiency by the end of each school year,**
  - **exiting the LIEP/ELD based on their attainment of English language proficiency,**
  - meeting the challenging State academic standards for each of the **4 years after the student is no longer receiving services\***, and
  - not attaining English language proficiency **within 5 years of initial classification** as an EL and first enrollment in the LEA.

*\*Must be reported in the aggregate and disaggregated, at a minimum, by English learners with a disability.*



# Discussion: Data Collection and Reporting

- 1. Should Colorado maintain a centralized language use survey database that can be accessible to all districts?**
- 2. Should WIDA Screener results be made available to all Colorado district data users?**
- 3. Should ACCESS for ELLs/Alternate ACCESS results be made available to all Colorado district data users?**
- 4. How does CDE improve streamlining current data collections to required data reporting under ESSA? (i.e. after 4 years FEP, recode as FELL)**
- 5. Is CDE's current exception process adequate to correct misclassification of ELs? Why or why not?**
- 6. Is CDE's current exception process adequate to override criteria for redesignation? Why or why not?**



# Next Steps

## Guiding Questions

- How do your ELs at each ACCESS for ELLs proficiency level (3 -6) perform on PARCC levels (1 -5) vs NEVER EL performance on PARCC (1 -5) ELA and Mathematics?
- Specific language domains : What is the correlation between performance on the reading and writing domains of ACCESS for ELLs and PARCC English language arts?

Cross-tab PARCC and ACCESS		PARCC Performance levels				
		1	2	3	4	5
ACCESSs for ELLs Levels	3	N	N	N	N	N
	4	N	N	N	N	N
	5	N	N	N	N	N
Never EL		N	N	N	N	N

**N = number of students that performed at each level**

**Repeat the table for the ACCESS reading and writing domains (the Never EL line would stay the same)**

# ESSA... Continuing the Conversation

- **ESSA in Colorado Blog**

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/ESSABlog>

- **ESSA Mailbox**

[essaquestions@cde.state.co.us](mailto:essaquestions@cde.state.co.us)

- **ESSA Webpage**

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa>

- **ESSA Committees**

[essaquestions@cde.state.co.us](mailto:essaquestions@cde.state.co.us)

