



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

## ESSA Accountability Work Group: EL Growth Indicator Decision Point

November 21, 2016

The ESSA Accountability Work Group is made up of a diverse group of stakeholder perspectives, coming together to think through the decision points for Colorado's ESSA state plan, specific to school accountability. This presentation will share information around the decision point pertaining to the EL Progress indicator.

## Decision Point

- How will Colorado incorporate progress in acquiring English language proficiency for ELs in our state accountability system?

2



The specific decision point is around how Colorado will incorporate progress in acquiring English language proficiency for ELs into our state accountability system.

## Requirements: Federal Statute

- **§1111(c)(4)(A)(ii):** Report for accountability "for English Learners, increases in the percentage of **students making progress in achieving English language proficiency** within a State-determined timeline"

3



According to ESSA statute §1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), States are required to report for accountability purposes "for English Learners, increases in the percentage of students making progress in achieving English language proficiency within a State-determined timeline"

## Requirements: Proposed Federal Regulations

- **§200.14(b)(4):** Include "For all schools, a Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator, based on English learner **performance on the annual English language proficiency assessment...** in each of grades 3 through 8 and in grades for which English learners are otherwise assessed... that—
  - i) **Takes into account students' English language proficiency level** and, at a State's discretion, one or more student characteristics in the same manner in which the State determines its long-term goals for English learners...
  - (ii) Uses **objective and valid measures of progress** such as student growth percentiles...
  - (iii) Is aligned with the **State-determined timeline for attaining English language proficiency...**
  - (iv) May also include a measure of proficiency (e.g., an increase in percentage of English learners scoring proficient on the English language proficiency assessment...compared to the prior year)."

4



More specific language in the proposed regulations requires state to include "For all schools, a Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator, based on English learner **performance on the annual English language proficiency assessment...** in each of grades 3 through 8 and in grades for which English learners are otherwise assessed... that—

- i) **Takes into account students' English language proficiency level** and, at a State's discretion, one or more student characteristics in the same manner in which the State determines its long-term goals for English learners...
- (ii) Uses **objective and valid measures of progress** such as student growth percentiles...
- (iii) Is aligned with the **State-determined timeline for attaining English language proficiency...**
- (iv) May also include a measure of proficiency (e.g., an increase in percentage of English learners scoring proficient on the English language proficiency assessment...compared to the prior year)."

## Requirements: Proposed Federal Regulations

- New ESSA statute and regulations also require a state-determined timeline for ELs to achieve proficiency (be redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (FEP) Monitor Year 1).
- **§200.13(c)(2):** For goals and measurements of interim progress, the State "(i) Must set expectations that each English learner will—
  - (A) Make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency; and
  - (B) **Attain English language proficiency within a period of time after the student's identification as an English learner**, except that an English learner that does not attain English language proficiency within such time must not be exited from English learner services or status”

5



Proposed regulations also require a state-determined timeline for ELs to achieve proficiency (be redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (FEP) Monitor Year 1).

§200.13(c)(2): For goals and measurements of interim progress, the State "(i) Must set expectations that each English learner will—

(A) Make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency; and

(B) **Attain English language proficiency within a period of time after the student's identification as an English learner**, except that an English learner that does not attain English language proficiency within such time must not be exited from English learner services or status”

## Requirements: Proposed Federal Regulations (cont.)

- **§200.13(c)(2): goals and measurements of interim progress,**

“(ii) Must be determined using a State-developed uniform procedure applied consistently to all English learners in the State that takes into consideration, at the time of a student's identification as an English learner, the student's English language proficiency level, and may take into consideration, at a State's discretion, one or more of the following student characteristics: **(A) Time in language instruction educational programs. (B) Grade level. (C) Age. (D) Native language proficiency level. (E) Limited or interrupted formal education, if any.**”

6



Additionally under the proposed regulation §200 .13(c)(2), goals and measurements of interim progress

“(ii) Must be determined using a State-developed uniform procedure applied consistently to all English learners in the State that takes into consideration, at the time of a student's identification as an English learner, the student's English language proficiency level, and may take into consideration, at a State's discretion, one or more of the following student characteristics: (A) Time in language instruction educational programs. (B) Grade level. (C) Age. (D) Native language proficiency level. (E) Limited or interrupted formal education, if any.”

## What We've Heard

- CDE's Listening tour did not specifically address the challenges and opportunities related to English learners.
- Within each of the spoke committees, EL stakeholders were included as members and provided expertise relevant to regulation decisions and recommendations.
- Additional committee and regional meetings have been held to solicit stakeholder input on ESSA as it relates to ELs.
- The Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education (CLDE) Stakeholder collaborative members provided feedback at their November meeting.

[http://www.cde.state.co.us/cde\\_english/CLDEmeetings](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cde_english/CLDEmeetings)

7



As part of creating the ESSA state plan, CDE has engaged with numerous stakeholder groups to collect feedback around the options for an EL progress indicator.

CDE's Listening tour did not specifically address the challenges and opportunities related to English learners.

Within each of the spoke committees, EL stakeholders were included as members and provided expertise relevant to regulation decisions and recommendations.

Additional committee and regional meetings have been held to solicit stakeholder input on ESSA as it relates to ELs.

The Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education (CLDE) Stakeholder collaborative members were briefed at their October and November meetings and provided substantive feedback.

CLDE represent higher educators in linguistically diverse education, district representatives (small/large, urban/rural), advocacy groups (CABE, COTESOL, CO-NAME). More information can be found at the link below.

## Recommendation #1

- Continue using the existing sub-indicator for ELP growth - **median student growth percentile (MGP) on WIDA ACCESS**
- MGP metric provides information on how much progress students with two+ consecutive years of WIDA ACCESS scores have made in acquiring English proficiency in comparison to their English proficiency peers.
- For accountability reporting, 4-rating categories are applied (Does Not Meet, Approaching, Meets, Exceeds) that roughly correspond to the 15<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, and 85<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the school growth distribution

8



Based on federal requirements and Colorado stakeholder input, the Accountability Working Group recommends continuing to use the existing sub-indicator for ELP growth - median student growth percentile (or MGP) on WIDA ACCESS.

This MGP metric provides information on how much progress students with two+ consecutive years of WIDA ACCESS scores have made in acquiring English proficiency in comparison to their English proficiency peers.

For accountability reporting, 4-rating categories are applied (Does Not Meet, Approaching, Meets, Exceeds) that roughly correspond to the 15<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, and 85<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the school growth distribution



## Recommendation #2

- **Add a sub-indicator for ELP accountability measuring growth-to-a-standard on WIDA ACCESS.**
- **Proposing to use CDE’s current 6-year stepping-stone timeline with potential modifications (depending on transition to ACCESS 2.0 and revised standard setting results) to determine students progress towards achieving English proficiency.**
- **Students coming in at Level 1 would be given 6 years to achieve redesignation.**
  - Students entering at any point further along in the proficiency continuum would be expected to achieve redesignation within the remaining time allowed by the stepping-stone trajectory.

9



The Accountability Working Group has an additional recommendation for adding a sub-indicator for English language proficiency (ELP) accountability measuring growth-to-a-standard on WIDA ACCESS.

The proposal is to use CDE’s current 6-year stepping-stone timeline with potential modifications (depending on transition to ACCESS 2.0 and revised standard setting results) to determine students progress towards achieving English proficiency.

Students coming in at Level 1 would be given 6 years to achieve redesignation. Students entering at any point further along in the proficiency continuum would be expected to achieve redesignation within the remaining time allowed by the stepping-stone trajectory.

## Recommendation #2

- If at any point a student did not make the progress expected on the stepping-stone trajectory (1-1-1-2-1) based on their prior year proficiency level, they would be considered off-track.
- Recommending a series of next steps to determine an expected trajectory to English proficiency (redesignation) that reflects the needs and opportunities of Colorado EL students.
- In determining this trajectory, keep in mind that ESSA will require the State to report the number of students who do not achieve proficiency within a 5-year timeframe.

10



If at any point a student did not make the progress expected on the stepping-stone trajectory (1-1-1-2-1) based on their prior year proficiency level, they would be considered off-track.

As part of this recommendation, the Accountability Working Group has also laid out a series of next steps for determining the expected trajectory to English proficiency (redesignation) that reflects the needs and opportunities of Colorado EL students.

In determining this trajectory, decision-makers will need to keep in mind that ESSA will require the State to report the number of students who do not achieve proficiency within a 5-year timeframe. Whether the state trajectory will align with this federal requirement is still to be determined.

## Recommendation #2- Plan of Action

- Review available literature on definitions of and timelines for acquiring English proficiency (generally recommend 5-7 years).
- Review historical CDE data (ELP and content area assessments) to determine patterns of EL progress over time and in comparison to native English-speaking peers in Colorado.
- Analyze outcomes for students after redesignation to determine whether previous cuts were appropriate.
- Once information from WIDA's ACCESS 2.0 standard setting is published, review performance descriptors, consortium recommended cuts (if available) and student outcomes for alignment with Colorado values.

11



The plan of action recommended by the Accountability Working Group involves the following short and long term steps:

Review available literature on definitions of and timelines for acquiring English proficiency (generally recommend 5-7 years).

Review historical CDE data (ELP and content area assessments) to determine patterns of EL progress over time and in comparison to native English-speaking peers in Colorado.

Analyze outcomes for students after redesignation to determine whether previous cuts were appropriate.

Once information from WIDA's ACCESS 2.0 standard setting is published, review performance descriptors, consortium recommended cuts (if available) and student outcomes for alignment with Colorado values.

## Recommendation #2- Plan of Action

- Investigate impact of revised cuts on prior results and determine the degree of alignment with Colorado expectations.
- Analyze relationship of new proficiency designations with CMAS PARCC outcomes.
- Convene panel of experts who will use all the above information to determine the ELP assessment score (or scores if using multiple domains) that Colorado feels are appropriate for redesignation.
- Panel will also determine the **overall timeline** for achieving English proficiency and **yearly benchmarks** that will ensure proficiency within the given timeline.

12



Investigate impact of revised cuts on prior results and determine the degree of alignment with Colorado expectations.

Analyze relationship of new proficiency designations with CMAS PARCC outcomes.

Convene panel of experts who will use all the above information to determine the ELP assessment score (or scores if using multiple domains) that Colorado feels are appropriate for redesignation.

Panel will also determine the overall timeline for achieving English proficiency and yearly benchmarks that will ensure proficiency within the given timeline.

Note that in practice the annual benchmarks will be specific to a student's prior year proficiency level, with a set timeline allotted for moving up to the next level of proficiency.

## Recommendation #2- Plan of Action

- Yearly benchmarks will be used to determine whether or not students are **on-track to proficiency**.
- School level (elementary, middle and high school) aggregations of on-track status will be reported as an additional accountability indicator with 4-rating categories applied (Does Not Meet, Approaching, Meets, Exceeds) that roughly correspond to the 15<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, and 85<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the school on-track status distribution.
- As additional years of data become available, review results to ensure continued appropriateness of exit criteria.

13



Yearly benchmarks will be used to determine whether or nor students are on-track to proficiency.

School level (elementary, middle and high school) aggregations of on-track status will be reported as an additional accountability indicator with 4-rating categories applied (Does Not Meet, Approaching, Meets, Exceeds) that roughly correspond to the 15<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, and 85<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the school on-track status distribution.

As additional years of data become available, review results to ensure continued appropriateness of exit criteria.

## Options Not Recommended

- Previous CDE methodology for calculating adequate student growth percentiles, did not meet ESSA requirement for a finite timeline to achieve English proficiency.
- Other considered methodologies did not align with Colorado's definition of student growth or allow for meaningful differentiation among schools based upon student progress.

14



Technical and practical considerations limited the usability of existing or alternative methodologies for reporting EL progress as an accountability indicator.

The previous CDE methodology for calculating adequate student growth percentiles, did not meet ESSA requirement for a finite timeline to achieve English proficiency.

Other considered methodologies did not align with Colorado's definition of student growth or allow for meaningful differentiation among schools based upon student progress.

## Input Needed

- Please use this link to respond to the following questions:  
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JJVJ6PH>
- Who are you?
  - Parent
  - Educator
  - Public
  - Hub member
- Do you support including both a median student growth percentile and a growth-to-standard measure as part of the English language progress indicator? (1=do not support, 5=strongly support)
- Are there any additional factors that the spoke committee should consider or investigate?

15



Through this presentation and the accompanying survey, CDE seeks an even wider audience of stakeholders to provide input on the proposed recommendation. The following questions will be included on the survey and open for comment:

Who are you?

- Parent
- Educator
- Public
- Hub member

Do you support including both a median student growth percentile and a growth-to-standard measure as part of the English language progress indicator? (On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being do not support and 5 being strongly support)

Are there any additional factors that the spoke committee should consider or investigate?

We greatly appreciate the time you have taken to understand this issue and provide your feedback. It will be a tremendous help as we further develop the ESSA state plan. Thank you.