IELLAAC Meeting Notes
10-29-2013 IRC, Arlington Heights
10am to 3pm

**Introductions**
Meeting notes from the meeting in December of 2012 were read and approved as amended.

**Updates**
Regarding joint meetings with IACBE about program types, they have been overshadowed by meetings focused on the new proficiency criteria. There was a joint meeting regarding PARCC, but nothing for program types.

The new ACCESS Listening Test format has been announced a few times. There are preparations that school districts need to make. Is there anything that the state should be doing to help this along? Suggestions were to make an announcement at the state conference, and to include something in communications about ACCESS ordering. It was noted that the listening test is still a small group assessment, although no maximum size has ever been defined by the state.

Regarding a Spanish translation of the PARCC mathematics assessment, although the PARCC Board approved that it could be translated, plans have not been made, nor resources committed for it.

**Old Business**
Tier C Recommendation – With the change in the state English proficiency criteria, reclassifications will be restricted to Tiers B & C. The state does not seem to want to make any further restriction at this time.

Program Typology – the joint subcommittee effort with IACBE & DELL has been inactive, mostly because of the focus on adopting new reclassification criteria. Also, because there is not a clear idea of what it should be.

Members discussed some of the problems of the current system. We could try to revive the joint subcommittee. Perhaps progress can be made working online using Google Docs to collaborate on definitions. We should be aware, at the outset, whether some of the types have definitions in statute somewhere. The program type data is likely used for federal reporting in some way. In the past, it was used in the Annual Evaluation Report. Members discussed a possible process for moving forward.

New ISAT Cut Scores – The effect on ELs for 2013 was as expected. The gap between ELs and non-ELs has grown. The data also show that ELs who would have achieved proficiency at the coming (2014) standard met and exceeded standards on ISAT and PSAE at a higher rate than those who achieved proficiency at the current criteria.

It was noted that the new ELP criteria will make it more difficult for ELs to show positive results for AMAOs 1 & 2.
WIDA’s growth charts – The charts confirm a decreasing rate of growth as students become more proficient. We don’t get the charts until late in the calendar year. We might be able to get Illinois data earlier. Future reports may show a growth average over 3 years.

WIDA has made available, through MetriTech, district level growth charts. These charts are an outgrowth of the LADER project. District level charts cost $200/district and $0.15/student. It would valuable information to present in the IIRC, and for making comparisons across districts or across languages.

The group discussed reasons why higher proficiency students show low growth or even regression. Perhaps students have lost motivation after testing several times. Some students plateau way before they should, almost like they are satisfied where they are. However, it happens at grade 1.

Additional Updates

CCSSO Meeting – A two-day meeting among the six assessment consortia was held in early October to discuss a common EL definition and the Home Language Survey. No consensus was reached at that meeting, but there was considerable progress. More meetings are to come.

PARCC Leader Cadre – A map was shared of the Illinois, PARCC Leader Cadre showing who is serving and where they are from in the state. They are a voice for Illinois in the development of the PARCC assessment.

KIDS – KIDS is a tool for measuring school readiness in kindergarten. It was developed in California with WestEd and UC Berkeley. The version on hand is a beginning version that will surely evolve. It has 30 observational measures. There are additional measures that ISBE wants to include that could make a list of 59 measures. Not all of them would be used every year. ISBE would like the committee’s input regarding KIDS. Today’s discussion is merely introductory. The districts of a few members are participating in the pilot. The training for it lasts two days. Observations are to be made by all teachers that work with kindergarten students, not just the home room teacher. It’s intended to be fully operational in 2015-16.

The first 4 observations target ELs, but they seem to have value beyond just English. For other measures, it would valuable to note the language in which they are stronger and/or weaker. The guidance given to one pilot district was that the language for the observation of any measure does not have to made via English.

Committee members have several questions. How would it inform instruction, or be otherwise used? How much instructional time would be lost? How rigidly tied will be to accountability? If too much, it will lose its value. Will it replace something or be an addition to existing demands?

There was concern about adding KIDS and PODER at kindergarten along with ACCESS and an instructional test. It’s too much testing. It was pointed out that KIDS is observational tool, not a sit-down test.

The committee would like more information about how it will be rolled out before making a recommendation. Perhaps a guest expert could attend a future meeting to share more about it.
New Business

PERA/PEAC – There was a presentation by Vince Camille of ISBE about the Performance Evaluation Reform Act and the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council. There were occasional questions from the committee. Concerns were expressed about the timing of the evaluation and the availability of student data.

There were concerns about the validity of assessments to be used for teacher evaluation. One question asked was whether PEAC has a licensure subcommittee? Yes, it does. There was talk of surveying the EL community. It would be worth doing if it would have some impact. The committee would like more information from PEAC about it. There were some additional questions about the terminology used in the presentation.

The committee thought that the evaluation process is potentially valuable for teaching and learning, but there should be more guidance available for preparing them. Members noted that, for full-time TBE, an assessment may need to be in the student’s home language.

Members had a number of questions. What about differential growth standards? How will special education be handled? How could we use state test data since it would not be available in time for the evaluation? What about those content areas that do not have a Type I assessment?

There needs to be additional guidance looking at TBE full-time vs. part-time.

CPS has already implemented evaluations, but teachers are being evaluated on the building’s test results for TBE, and are, reportedly, not happy about it. Their assessments are not yet consistent with the language of instruction.

PEAC has not started talking about special education and English learners yet. It may begin doing so in December. Having recommendations at the beginning of the process increases the likelihood of their impact, especially if they solve problems instead of simply raising concerns.

Some members discussed the possibility of meeting again prior to the December IELLAAC meeting to do some pre-work on recommendations to discuss.

PARCC Accommodations for ELs – PARCC has taken a somewhat different approach than Illinois to EL accommodations. Members discussed the differences between what Illinois currently does and what PARCC has announced. Members felt that the PARCC accommodations are insufficient support for ELs. The CCSSO group that met in DC was, reportedly, rather critical of PARCC’s proposed accommodations.

Members discussed what might be done to encourage PARCC to create a trans-adapted math test? It was suggested that letters from school districts to the state Superintendent might have an impact.

The committee approved the following recommendation.

The IELLAAC respectfully requests that IACBE join with IELLAAC in recommending that the Illinois state superintendent continue to communicate Illinois’ strong insistence that PARCC develop assessments in other languages in addition to English, beginning most immediately with the adaptation of the mathematics test into Spanish. Furthermore, we recommend that Illinois collaborate with other PARCC consortium states that have communicated their need for trans-adapted tests as well (CO, MA, NM, NJ, NY, OH, &
RI). We find this of the utmost importance and urgency due to the time line for field testing in 2014 and census testing in 2015.

The meeting adjourned.
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