English Language Proficiency Indicator

IL Accountability TAC, April 2, 2018
ESSA Requirements

Annually measure….for all public schools in the State, progress in achieving English language proficiency, as defined by the State and measured by the [state’s ELP assessment] within a State-determined timeline for all English learners—

• in each of the grades 3 through 8; and

• in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed… during the grade 9 through grade 12 period
Primary Considerations

- Under ESSA, the ELP indicator may take individual student characteristics into account.
- Two important characteristics that influence whether a student is reclassified:
  - Student’s initial level of English proficiency,
  - Time in the system as an EL

- Growth considerations
  - Growth trajectories are rarely linear
    - Faster growth early; slows down over time
    - Growth is often consistent across grades among initial levels
    - Students entering in the later grades tend to score similarly and display similar growth trajectories to students with the same ELD level who have been in the school system longer

IL State Plan

• Illinois proposes a targeted maximum timeline of five years for English Learners to achieve ELP
• Proficiency has been established as a composite proficiency level score of 4.8 or above
• ELs must make annual progress towards the composite score of 4.8 or above on ACCESS 2.0 within five years. Students measure toward proficiency is individually based on entry level performance. A student is making progress provided that they score at or above their calculated interim target
The interim target is calculated by interpolating between the student’s entry level ACCESS 2.0 score and the minimum exit score of 4.8.

All students are provided 5 years to exit regardless of their composite proficiency level in year 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sample Target A</th>
<th>Sample Target B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thoughts from the December meeting

• Need additional information to help evaluate the reasonableness of this model and propose additional options for consideration:
  – Technical characteristics of the ACCESS 2.0
  – Summary of what other WIDA states are doing/planning
  – Characteristics of the population of ELL test takers in IL
  – Potential impact of proposed ELP indicator for different types of schools in IL
WIDA States

Graphic from www.wida.us
Purpose: meet state and federal requirements for the annual assessment of English learners to …

- Identify the appropriate language instruction educational program (LIEP) placement
- Determine if students are making acceptable progress in English language proficiency
- Determine if students have attained sufficient English language proficiency to be reclassified
- Support the evaluation of LIEP programs

Taken from WIDA Interpretive Guide
Language Domains

- **Listening**: Process, understand, interpret and evaluate spoken language in a variety of situations.

- **Speaking**: Engage in oral communication in a variety of situations for a variety of purposes and audiences.

- **Reading**: Process, understand, interpret and evaluate written language, symbols and text with understanding and fluency.

- **Writing**: Engage in written communication in a variety of situations for a variety of purposes and audiences.

Slide developed by WIDA Consortium
Assessed Grades

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0
Paper Grade Clusters
1 2 3 4-5 6-8 9-12

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0
Online Grade Clusters
1 2-3 4-5 6-8 9-12

Online - Staged Adaptive Design

Listening Test → Reading Test → Speaking Test Writing Test (in either order)

Slide developed by WIDA Consortium
### Online Test vs Paper Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online Test</th>
<th>Paper Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The grade-level clusters are 1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, and 9–12.</td>
<td>The grade level clusters are 1, 2, 3, 4–5, 6–8, and 9–12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adaptive Listening and Reading tests are administered first, and the student’s performance determines his or her tier placement for Speaking and Writing.</td>
<td>Teachers must select which tier of the test to give to each of their students prior to the start of the test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing tests are scored centrally; keyboarded responses are sent automatically to be scored, and handwritten responses need to be mailed.</td>
<td>Handwritten responses are mailed in and the Writing responses are scored centrally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the Speaking test, students speak into a headset to record their answers, which are centrally scored.</td>
<td>The paper-based Speaking test is administered and scored locally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain Scores

• Scale Scores: Within each domain scores are reported on a vertical scale that ranges from 100-600.
  – appropriate for making comparisons across grades within a domain
  – confidence intervals based on CSEMs.

• Proficiency level scores – grade specific interpretations of student performance in a content domain based upon the PLs in the ELD Standards.
  – Proficiency level scores are presented as whole numbers followed by a decimal. The whole number indicates the student’s language proficiency level (from 1-6) based on the WIDA ELD Standards. The decimal indicates the proportion within the proficiency level range that the student’s scale score represents, rounded to the nearest tenth. (See Appendix D in the Interpretive Guide)
  – The same scaled score is associated with a different proficiency level across grades. “A Reading scale score of 355 for a fifth grade student is interpreted as Level 4.0. The same scale score for a fourth grader results in Level 4.6, and for a third grade student that scale score results in Level 5.2.”
  – Appropriate for comparisons across domains within a grade.
Proficiency Levels

• Level 1: Entering
• Level 2: Beginning
• Level 3: Developing
• Level 4: Expanding
• Level 5: Bridging
• Level 6: Reaching

Level Definitions established in consideration of:

– Linguistic Complexity: Extent of functional language (text or discourse)
– Vocabulary Usage: Comprehension and use of the technical vocabulary of the content areas
– Language Control: Comprehension and use of phonological, syntactic, and semantic structure & rules

From WIDA Interpretive Guide
Composite Score Categories

Overall composite

- **Listening**: 15%
- **Speaking**: 15%
- **Reading**: 35%
- **Writing**: 35%

Oral language composite

- **Listening**: 50%
- **Speaking**: 50%

Literacy composite

- **Reading**: 50%
- **Writing**: 50%

Comprehension composite

- **Reading**: 70%
- **Listening**: 30%

Slide developed by WIDA Consortium
Composite Scores & Proficiency Levels

• Composite Scale Scores: Weighted sum across domain scaled scores (compensatory)
  – Confidence intervals based on classical test theory SEMs

• Composite Proficiency Level Scores: derived from the domain scaled scores, not the domain proficiency levels (i.e., based upon the composite scaled score).

• Cautions from WIDA:
  – The Overall Score is helpful as a summary of other scores and because sometimes you may need a single number for reference. However, it’s important to always remember that it is compensatory; a particularly high score in one domain may effectively raise a low score in another. Similar overall scores can mask very different performances on the test.
  – No single score or language proficiency level, including the Overall Score (Composite), should be used as the sole determiner for making decisions regarding a student’s English language proficiency.
Factors to Consider in Defining ELP Indicator
(Reviewed 12 approved plans for WIDA states)

• How is English Language Proficiency Defined on the ACCESS 2.0?
  – 5.0 PL - 9 states;
  – 4.6- 1 state; 4.5 – 1 state; 4.8 – IL

• What is the maximum number of years a student has to achieve proficiency?
  – 5 year: 4 states
  – 6 years: 8 states

• What factors influence the number of years a student has to reach proficiency?
  – Baseline proficiency level (11 states)
  – Baseline grade level (3)

• How is annual progress evaluated?
  – Compare gain in PL score to that deemed necessary to achieve proficiency in a “fixed” number of years: 8 states
  – Evaluate whether observed SGP is on track with that needed to be proficient in a defined number of years (adequate growth percentile): 3 states
  – Compare gain in PL score against a common fixed criterion for all students - 1 state (HI) requires 1.0 PL gain per year
Factors to Consider in Defining EL Indicator

• Are targets for performance reset each year?
  – Yes: redistribute the gap necessary to achieve proficiency in the defined amount of time each year (3 states)
  – Yes: through annual recalculation of AGPs (3 states)
  – No: must achieve targets established in baseline year 1 to make adequate progress (6 states)

• How is school performance quantified within the ELP indicator?
  – Percentage of students achieving/exceeding the annual targets toward proficiency in the school (i.e., score or AGP): 8 states
    • MA also considers the percentage of students that achieved proficiency on the ACCESS 2.0
  – Assign points to each student based on degree to which progress target is met using a value table approach: 4 states
    • Establish a weighted rate of target attainment: 2 states (DE, PA)
    • Create an index score for the school based on sum of points earned by each student: 1 state (SD)
  – Consider aggregate residual difference between observed PL score and target PL score over students and assign a grade (A-F) to this residual for reporting: (NM)
### Student Interim Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 Baseline</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6 or higher‡</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 – 4.5</td>
<td>((a^{\dagger} - b^{\dagger}) / 2)+b</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 3.9</td>
<td>((a^{\dagger} - b^{\dagger}) / 3)+b</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 – 2.9</td>
<td>((a^{\dagger} - b^{\dagger}) / 4)+b</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.9</td>
<td>((a^{\dagger} - b^{\dagger}) / 5)+b</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
<td>End Year (4.6 or higher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Column 1 scores and the score in the “End year” cells are performance level scores and the scores in the formulas are scale scores.

*Composite performance level score of 4.6 is exit criteria for EL services.
† The scale score needed during the “End Year” to be deemed English Proficient (i.e., to earn a performance level score of 4.6) is represented by “a”.
‡ The prior year scale score is represented by “b”.

---

**Center for Assessment**
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Delaware/Pennsylvania Approach

- Growth is based on the vertical scale of ACCESS 2.0
- Students have between 3-6 years to exit (composite 5.0 or higher) depending on initial access level
- The state produces an index that measures “percent of annual target achieved” and allows a bonus of up to 10% if the target is exceeded
  - E.g. if the target growth is 20 points and the student earns 15 points the student receives .75
- Students who do not exit in the designated attainment year are eligible for partial points when they exit
  - .75, .5, or .25 for each of 1, 2, or 3+ years of “late exit”
- Total school index score is the average of each student’s score (essentially a weighted attainment index)
## EL ACCESS Growth Targets - Annual Calculation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 Baseline ACCESS PL</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.0 or Higher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 - 4.9</td>
<td>Year 1 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 2</td>
<td>SS for 5.0 two grades out (AT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.9</td>
<td>Year 1 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 3</td>
<td>Year 2 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 2</td>
<td>SS for 5.0 three grades out (AT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.9</td>
<td>Year 1 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 4</td>
<td>Year 2 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 3</td>
<td>Year 3 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 2</td>
<td>SS for 5.0 four grades out (AT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.9</td>
<td>Year 1 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 5</td>
<td>Year 2 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 4</td>
<td>Year 3 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 3</td>
<td>Year 4 SS plus SS progress to reach to AT divided by 2</td>
<td>SS for 5.0 five grades out (AT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DE Growth Index

### Chart 1

**Student-Level ELP Growth Index Score by Student Outcome**  
(Rules for years up to and including the designated attainment year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Outcome</th>
<th>Progress toward target but grade-level attainment target not met</th>
<th>Grade-level attainment target met or exceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-participant</td>
<td>No progress toward target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Before designated attainment year | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 - 1.10*  
CY SS - PY SS  
/(IT SS - PY SS) | 1.10 |
| In designated attainment year     | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 - 0.99  
CY SS - PY SS  
/(AT SS - PY SS) | 1.00 - 1.10*  
CY SS - PY SS  
/(AT SS - PY SS) |

*PY SS - Previous Year Scale Score  
CY SS - Current Year Scale Score  
IT SS - Interim Target Scale Score  
AT SS - Grade-level Attainment Target Scale Score*

### Chart 2

**Student-Level ELP Growth Index Score by Student Outcome**  
(Rules for years after the designated attainment year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Outcome</th>
<th>Grade-level attainment target not met</th>
<th>Grade-level attainment target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year late</td>
<td>Non-participant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years late</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ years late</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A student is expected to make 20% progress toward proficiency each year.
Michigan – Adequate Growth Percentiles

Each student’s attainment growth target is the scale score (SS) at a PL 4.5 at the grade level for the year that they are expected to reach attainment.

Each student’s interim growth targets are calculated annually using the adequate growth percentile (AGP). An AGP is a quantitative description of the growth necessary to be consistently achieved to reach proficiency in a set number of years.

The annual reset allows for a variable growth trajectory depending on each student’s progress over time while still requiring that the AT be reached within the required number of years. This yearly reset recognizes the nonlinear growth that students at varying proficiency levels make within a year’s time.

### English Learner ACCESS Growth Targets – Annual Calculation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 Baseline ACCESS Composite Point</th>
<th>Year 2 Growth Targets</th>
<th>Year 3 Growth Targets</th>
<th>Year 4 Growth Targets</th>
<th>Year 5 Growth Targets</th>
<th>Year 6 Growth Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5 or higher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.4</td>
<td>SS at year two on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS for PL 4.5 two grades out (AT)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9</td>
<td>SS at year two on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS at year three on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS for PL 4.5 three grades out (AT)</td>
<td>SS for PL 4.5 four grades out (AT)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.9</td>
<td>SS at year two on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS at year three on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS at year four on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS for PL 4.5 four grades out (AT)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.9</td>
<td>SS at year two on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS at year three on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS at year four on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS at year four on the student’s AGP curve</td>
<td>SS for PL 4.5 five grades out (AT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• All EL student’s ELP scores are compared to their personalized annual targets. The residuals are accumulated for all ELP students in the school. A positive value indicates that students are, on average, exceeding targets and a negative value indicates that they are not meeting targets.

• Schools earn a grade on the indicator based on the residual score obtained. (Cut-scores have not yet been determined).
Data Analyses
Descriptive Summary

• Approximately 188K EL students in IL
• Overall, about 80% of examinees are level 3 and below
• About 22K EL in HS grades
  – 11% Level 1
  – 23% Level 2
  – 47% Level 3
  – 17% Level 4
  – About 2% Level 5+
• About 17K Students served 3+ years in HS
  – 7% Level 1
  – 23% Level 2
  – 51% Level 3
  – 17% Level 4
  – About 1% Level 5+
• Growth is highest for lower performing students in earlier grades

• Students in grades 9-12 demonstrate the lowest growth (often negative) regardless of starting level and regardless of whether they have been receiving services for less than 3 year or 3+ years

• For students in the lower grades below level 5 average growth is often sufficient to reach level 5 in 3 or fewer years; this is not the case for students in middle and especially high school grades
Discussion

• What guidance does the TAC have to implement a fair and technically defensible approach for measuring English language progress?

• How can we ensure the method balances the importance of progress to exit in a reasonable timeframe and setting expectations that are obtainable?

• What additional information/ analyses are highest priority to inform these decisions?