INTRODUCTIONS & SESSION TOPICS

PRESENTERS:
- Mike Middleton - Governing Board Chair-Elect for ELPA21@UCLA
  Director, Select Assessments & Business Enterprises, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, WA
- Margaret Ho - Manager, Member Support & Outreach for ELPA21@UCLA

TODAY’S TOPICS:
- English Language Proficiency Standards
- Assessment system to measure the new ELP Standards
- State accountability under ESSA, new directions
The English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) is a member-supported program housed at the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) at the University of California, Los Angeles.

ELPA21 was started in 2013 through a federal Enhanced Assessment Grant to develop an assessment system that incorporates the latest understanding of language development to support students and educators.

This assessment system was developed by states for states – and this dynamic will continue as it ensures state guidance for educators and provides members with a secure place to network, problem-solve, and learn from one another.
ELPA21 is a group of states designing and developing an assessment system for English language learners. The system is based on the new English Language Proficiency Standards and addresses the language demands needed to reach college and career readiness.

Get the Right Information, Relevant to You

For Educators
For Administrators
For Parents and Guardians
For Students
NEW COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

- Signal an upward shift in knowledge, skills, and abilities that students must develop
- Increase language demands across content areas
- Identify specific language and analytical practices students need to perform
ELP Standards

1. construct meaning from oral presentations and literary and informational text through grade-appropriate listening, reading, and viewing
2. participate in grade-appropriate oral and written exchanges of information, ideas, and analyses, responding to peer, audience, or reader comments and questions
3. speak and write about grade-appropriate complex literary and informational texts and topics
4. construct grade-appropriate oral and written claims and support them with reasoning and evidence
5. conduct research and evaluate and communicate findings to answer questions or solve problems
6. analyze and critique the arguments of others orally and in writing
7. adapt language choices to purpose, task, and audience when speaking and writing
8. determine the meaning of words and phrases in oral presentations and literary and informational text
9. create clear and coherent grade-appropriate speech and text
10. make accurate use of standard English to communicate in grade-appropriate speech and writing
OLD PARADIGM

Content

Language

Mostly vocabulary, grammar
NEW PARADIGM

- Discourse
- Text (complex text)
- Explanation
- Argumentation
- Purpose
- Typical structure of text
- Sentence structures
- ΔVocabulary practices

Content

Language
Relationships and Convergences

Found in:
1. CCSS for Mathematics (practices)
2a. CCSS for ELA & Literacy (student capacity)
2b. ELPD Framework (ELP “practices”)
3. NGSS (science and engineering practices)

Notes:
1. MP1–MP8 represent CCSS Mathematical Practices (p. 6–8).
2. SP1–SP8 represent NGSS Science and Engineering Practices.
4. EP7* represents CCSS for ELA student “capacity” (p. 7).

Stanford Center for Education

Understanding Language

In Spring 2013, the CCSSO (Council of Chief State School Officers) commissioned the standards work to be done by WestEd and the ELPA21 Consortium.
**ELP Standards: Developing Language to Communicate Content**

**Old standards**

- Simplified texts and activities
- Language development focused on accuracy, vocabulary, and correct grammar
- ELP Standards as “junior,” or a precursor, to ELA/literacy standards

**ELP Standards**

- Intellectually challenging activities that promote access to grade-level texts with language scaffolds for deeper learning
- Language development focused on comprehension, production, and interaction
- ELP Standards that correspond with college- and career-ready standards to support ELLs’ academic language development and participation in content-area activities

*The old ELP standards of some states*
GOALS FOR THE NEW ELP STANDARDS

Create fewer, clearer standards with **strategic correspondences** to:
- CCSS ELA & Literacy
- CCSS for Mathematics
- NGSS

Specify key language functions that students must be able to carry out in discipline-appropriate ways

Express target language uses in clear and meaningful **progressions**

Enable collaborative use by both ELD/ESL and content-area teachers

Influenced by the Understanding Language video of Aída Walqui: Language and the Common Core State Standards: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T3YJx8ujoto](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T3YJx8ujoto)
Turn to a shoulder partner and discuss how the shift in the new ELP Standards will impact the work you are doing with English Learners in your local context.
THE ELPA21 ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
The ELPA21 Assessment System has instruments for six (6) grades/spans: K, 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

Both the summative and screener instruments are designed to be delivered electronically.

Paper/pencil forms, including large print, are available for students who cannot test online.

Blind/low vision forms are also available for students K through 12.

The screener and summative assessments measure the same standards, follow similar blueprints and use innovative item types.
VIEW INNOVATIVE ITEM TYPES:
http://elpa21.org/assessment-system/sample-items
ELPA21 STANDARD SETTING DESIGN

Educator input:
- Contrasting Group Study – performance ratings by teachers of their ELs
- EL Expert Advisory Team – state representatives evaluating all data/information for SS
- In-Person Panel – 52 EL teachers/educators making up 6 teams of raters

In-Person Panel charged with:
- Deriving cut-score recommendations for sub-tests (domains) at two performance levels:
  - L4 – level defined with comparable language skills to non-EL peers
  - L3 – level with significant portion of students not yet proficient
- Derive recommendations for six “grades” – K, 1, 3, 5, 7, & HS
  - HS skills not viewed as different across grades 9 through 12

Consortium calculated remaining two levels (L2 and L5), and interpolated other grade levels (2, 4, 6, & 8)
HOW TO EMPLOY ELPA21?

A Proficiency Profile Determination based on the pattern of domain scores

Specifically = “Emerging”, “Progressing”, “Proficient”

(For example, "Proficient"/"Nearly Proficient"/"Not Proficient"
OVERALL PROFICIENCY DETERMINATION

- Individual domain scores reported by level (Levels 1 to 5)

- Proficiency Profile Determination is a measure of proficiency across all domains by level (not domain score)
  - Proficiency Profile Determination reported in 3 categories
    - Emerging ➔ Progressing ➔ Proficient

- ELPA21 to use rule-based model for combinations of domain levels as result in a proficiency determination
Establishing the domain score combinations that identify a student as: Proficient, Progressing, or Emerging

- **Proficient** = all four domains ≥4
- **Emerging** = all four domains ≤2
- **Progressing** = all other domain combinations
Currently, the second operational administration of the summative (annual) ELPA is concluding

Includes two embedded trials:

1) Block adaptive testing in two grade bands; and

2) Adaptation of administration protocols for the significantly cognitively impaired
The screener is being implemented in two phases across the next 18 months:

- Washington will begin using screener results operationally in May 2017 – full form administration; paper-pencil.
- Arkansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Oregon, and West Virginia will join Washington August, 2017 – full form administration, online.
- Ohio will transition to the ELPA21 screener for SY2018-19.

During state implementation, ELPA21 is gathering information on administration protocols for consideration of:

- Adopting early stopping rules for program service determinations;
- Adjustments to student interface and engagement processes
PLANNED SCREENER DESIGN – SY2018 - 2019

(Local) Home Language Survey

- English Only

Not Eligible for Services

- Proceed if student remains potential ELL

Step 1: Practice/demo; determine whether self-administered or administrator-assisted

Step 2: Administer primarily machine-scored tasks from Levels 1-3

Step 3: Administer machine- and hand-scored tasks from Levels 3-5

Identify as English Language Learner Eligible for Services

Parent Notification

NOTE: allows for possibility of stopping after step 2 (if sufficiently clear that student is not proficient)
SUMMATIVE TEST

- Domain scale scores are provided, as are two composite scores, Comprehension and Overall
- Proficiency profiles show if a student is Proficient, Progressing, or Emerging
- Screener: Design is to provide the same level of reporting as for the summative
INCLUDING ENGLISH LEARNERS IN STATE PLANS

NINE ISSUES STATES ARE ADDRESSING:
- Plan to model progress to proficiency on the ELP indicator
- Factors to consider: e.g., initial proficiency level, time in the system, student age
- Minimum n-size
- Accounting for schools with below n-size counts, e.g., aggregating at district or county level
- Inclusion of former EL students in the academic indicator subgroup (2 years, 4 years, not at all?)
- Approach for recently-arrived English learners (RAELs) into accountability system
- Weighting the ELP indicator for the overall accountability index
- Communication of new plan for ELs with stakeholders
- New/productive consultations across offices in a state about ELP indicator as part of Title I accountability
Accountability

Academic Indicators
- Proficiency
- Growth
- English Learner Progress

School Quality or Student Success
- Chronic Absenteeism

Elementary
- Proficiency
- Growth
- English Learner Progress

Middle School
- Proficiency
- Growth
- English Learner Progress

High School
- Proficiency
- Graduation Rate
- English Learner Progress
- Chronic Absenteeism
- 9th Graders on Track
- Advanced Course-Taking (dual credit)
WEIGHTING: EXAMPLES

Proficiency

Growth

Graduation

English Learner

School Quality and Student Success

Score A

Score B

Score C

Score D

Score E

Wt1

Wt2

Wt3

Wt4

Wt5

Sum Score
INCLUDING ENGLISH LEARNERS IN STATE PLANS

- Plan to model progress to proficiency on the ELP indicator
- Factors to consider: e.g., initial proficiency level, time in the system, student age
- Minimum $n$-size
- Accounting for schools with below $n$-size counts, e.g., aggregating at district or county level
- Inclusion of former EL students in the academic indicator subgroup (2 yrs., 4 years, not at all?)
- Approach for recently-arrived English learners (RAELs) into accountability system
- Weighting the ELP indicator for the overall accountability index
- Communication of new plan for ELs with stakeholders
- New/productive consultations across offices in a state about ELP indicator as part of Title I accountability
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) TASKS

- English learner progress measure
- Weighting of indicators
- Inclusion of targeted subgroups
THANK YOU!

For additional information about ELPA21@UCLA, please visit www.elpa21.org