



Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California

Prepared for the California Department of Education

by

Educational Testing Service

May 8, 2019

Table of Contents

Section 1: Overview	1
1.A. Background	1
1.B. Assessment Purposes	2
1.C. Test-Taking Population	2
1.C.1. Initial Alternate ELPAC	2
1.C.2. Summative Alternate ELPAC	2
1.D. Guiding Principles	2
1.E. Key Assumptions	3
1.F. Test Design Recommendations	3
1.G. Test Design Advisory Team	4
Section 2: Design and Development	5
2.A. Evidence-Centered Design Approach	5
2.A.1. ELD Connectors	5
2.A.2. High-Level Claim	6
2.B. Recommended Approach to Task Types and Test Development	6
2.B.1. Task Development	6
2.B.2. Development of a Linear Test	7
2.C. Blueprint Development	9
2.D. General Performance Level Descriptors	10
Section 3: Validity and Fairness	11
3.A. Background	11
3.B. Design Considerations	11
3.B.1. Test-taking Population	11
3.B.2. Universal Design	11
3.B.3. Online Test Administration	12
3.B.4. Accessibility	12
Section 4: Scoring and Reporting	14
4.A. Score Reporting Structure	14
Section 5: Planned Research Studies	15
5.A. Pilot Test and Cognitive Lab Study	15
5.B. Field Test Study	15
5.C. Standard Setting Study	15
5.D. Additional Studies	15
Appendix A High-Level Timeline	16
Appendix B Test Design Advisory Team Biographies	17
Appendix C References	19

List of Tables

Table 1. Alternate ELPAC PLDs	10
Table 2. Alternate ELPAC High-Level Timeline	16

Section 1: Overview

1.A. Background

In 2017–18 Educational Testing Service (ETS) with the California Department of Education (CDE) launched the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). The ELPAC is aligned with the *2012 California English Language Development Standards* (2012 ELD Standards) which were adopted by the California State Board of Education (SBE). The CDE and Educational Testing Service (ETS) are now embarking on the development of an alternate English language proficiency (ELP) assessment.

For the purpose of this high-level test design, the working definition of “pupils with the most significant cognitive disabilities” is, per *California Code of Regulations* 850(v), pupils with a disability or disabilities as defined under title 20 United States Code section 1401(3) that significantly impacts cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior and who require extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achievement measurement on academic standards, provided that:

- (1) The identification of a pupil as having a particular disability as defined in IDEA shall not determine whether or not a pupil is a pupil with the most significant cognitive disabilities; and
- (2) A pupil with the most significant cognitive disabilities must not be identified as such based solely on the pupil's previous low academic achievement or the pupil's previous need for accommodations to participate in general statewide or local assessments.
- (3) For purposes of this definition, “adaptive behavior” means behavior essential for someone to live independently and to function safely across three domains of daily life skills: conceptual (e.g., language, functional academics, self-direction, money management, and time concepts); social (e.g., interpersonal skills, responsibility, self-esteem, wariness/naivete, follow rules, etiquette, and social problem solving); and practical (e.g., activities of daily living, occupational skills, safety, healthcare, and travel).

English learners (ELs) with the most significant cognitive disabilities represent a diverse population of students in kindergarten through grade twelve, inclusive of students up to age 22 enrolled in grade twelve who continue to be eligible for special education and ELD services. A wide variety of language- and disability-related needs and alternate ways of communicating require careful thinking about how to measure the ELP needed to communicate in social and academic contexts. The CDE and ETS are committed to the design and development of a computer-based Alternate ELPAC that meets federal requirements and best supports ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities in their progress toward ELP. (Note that, hereafter, the use of the term “Alternate ELPAC” implies both initial and summative administration of the assessment.)

ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities must have access to instruction and assessment aligned with adapted grade-level academic standards. The Alternate ELPAC must carefully balance maximum accessibility while maintaining the intended construct(s) to be assessed as defined by the 2012 ELD Standards though reduced in depth, breadth

and complexity. As other alternate assessments administered in California schools are aligned with connectors for the appropriate content area, the Alternate ELPAC will align with the *California English Language Development Connectors for the Alternate ELPAC* (ELD Connectors) that are based on the 2012 ELD Standards. The Connectors offer a reduction in the depth, breadth, and complexity of the standards, as appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

1.B. Assessment Purposes

The Alternate ELPAC will provide, for the first time, consistent, standardized measurement of ELP across the state for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The purpose of the Alternate ELPAC is twofold:

1. The Initial Alternate ELPAC will provide information to determine a student's initial classification as an EL or as initial fluent English proficient (IFEP), for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
2. The Summative Alternate ELPAC will provide information on annual student progress toward ELP and support decisions on student reclassification as fluent English proficient (RFEP), for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

1.C. Test-Taking Population

1.C.1. Initial Alternate ELPAC

Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are determined by IEP teams to be eligible for an alternate assessment in kindergarten through grade twelve; and are enrolled in California schools for the first time who are potentially ELs based on a home language other than English, as indicated by the results of a home language survey.

Students meeting these criteria must be administered the Initial Alternate ELPAC within 30 days of their enrollment.

1.C.2. Summative Alternate ELPAC

Students who are English learners with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are determined by IEP teams to be eligible for an alternate ELP assessment in kindergarten through grade twelve.

1.D. Guiding Principles

The following principles guide decisions specific to the test design of the Alternate ELPAC. They are based on discussion with and feedback from various stakeholder groups and LEAs as well as nationally renowned experts in the field of English language development (see [subsection 1.G.](#)). The guiding principles are as follows:

1. The assessments must be designed to ensure that the intended test-taking population is able to demonstrate their ELP.
2. The test design must be tailored to the range of needs of the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, including maximum accessibility as well as ensuring linguistic and cultural fairness and sensitivity.

3. The test design must take into consideration the testing burden for students and test examiners.

1.E. Key Assumptions

The following assumptions will guide the planning and development of the Alternate ELPAC:

1. Participation criteria developed by the CDE will help guide IEP teams in determining whether the Alternate ELPAC is the most appropriate ELP assessment for an individual student. For any particular academic year, if an IEP team has designated the use of an alternate assessment on statewide summative assessments for a student, the student will be eligible for *all* alternate assessments available within that same year. If a student enrolls for the first time in a California public school, and has an individualized education plan, the IEP team may use the same criteria to determine eligibility.
2. The Alternate ELPAC will align with the 2012 ELD Standards via ELD Connectors. (Refer to [subsection 2.A.](#) for details.)
3. The Alternate ELPAC will assess four domains as required by federal legislation: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The assessment of these domains must take into account the accessibility resources identified and frequently needed by this test-taking population.
4. ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities will receive appropriate ELD instruction aligned with the 2012 ELD Standards, in addition to other required educational services (e.g., EL, special education, and related services).
5. Test items and other test materials for the Alternate ELPAC will be developed following the principles of universal design to maximize the accessibility of the assessment to students. (Refer to [subsection 3.B.](#) for details.)

1.F. Test Design Recommendations

The recommendations for the Alternate ELPAC test design, proposed for presentation to the SBE for review and approval, represent the best thinking from recognized experts in the field of assessment development for ELs and students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The proposed recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. Approve the proposed general performance level descriptors (PLDs) specifically tailored to the test-taking population in [subsection 2.D.](#); once approved by the SBE, the general PLDs will be used to develop reporting PLDs that describe levels of performance to educators and parents. These reporting PLDs will be used with in the standard setting process.
2. Organize grades and grade spans of the Alternate ELPAC test forms to be consistent with the Summative ELPAC: kindergarten, grade one, grade two, grades three through five, grades six through eight, grades nine and ten, and grades eleven and twelve.

Overview

3. Ensure task types that assess the four domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing in an integrated manner (i.e., a single task type may assess multiple domains). (Refer to [subsection 2.B.](#) for details.)
4. Provide accessibility resources, including universal tools, designated supports and accommodations, to be detailed in the ELPAC Accessibility Framework. (Refer to [subsection 3.B.4.](#) for details.)
5. Consistent with other alternate assessments in California, utilize a one-on-one administration model for all grades.
6. Develop an online, linear test (i.e., not adaptive). (Refer to [subsection 2.B.](#) for details.)
7. Develop a single test blueprint to be used for *both* the Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC for each grade or grade span. (Refer to [subsection 2.C.](#) for details.)
8. Locally score constructed-response items consistent with other alternate assessments in California that depend on test examiner knowledge of individual students. Local scoring will include a process, developed by ETS with input from national experts, for double-scoring a portion of student responses to check for scoring consistency.

1.G. Test Design Advisory Team

The following team of four nationally recognized experts provided guidance in the development of the proposed high-level test design of the Alternate ELPAC:

- **Meagan Karvonen, Ph.D.**, director at Accessible Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Systems (ATLAS), has 20 years of experience in large-scale assessments for students with disabilities, and in particular, alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
- **Lucrecia Santibañez, Ph.D.**, associate professor at Claremont Graduate University, is an expert committed to issues of equity, access, and policy to improve teaching and learning for ELs and their teachers.
- **Edynn Sato, Ph.D.**, chief executive officer (CEO) and chief research scientist of Sato Education Consulting LLC, is a respected authority on student learning, instruction, and assessment, particularly of culturally and linguistically diverse learners (e.g., ELs) and students with disabilities.
- **Martha Thurlow, Ph.D.**, director of the National Center on Educational Outcomes, has conducted research for the past 45 years in a variety of areas, including assessment and decision making, learning disabilities, early childhood education, dropout prevention, effective classroom instruction, and integration of students with disabilities into general education settings.

[Appendix B](#) provides biographies for members of the Test Design Advisory Team members.

Section 2: Design and Development

2.A. Evidence-Centered Design Approach

The design and development of the Alternate ELPAC will follow the principles of evidence-centered design (ECD), which is a systematic set of procedures intended to “base important aspects of test design, test development, test scoring, and test use on sound evidentiary reasoning” (Zieky, 2014, p. 79). ECD accomplishes this by linking observations about what “students say, do, or make in particular task situations” to claims about “what they can know, do, or have accomplished” in the real world (Mislevy, 2011, p. 6). From this perspective, ECD provides a “principled framework” (Mislevy, Steinberg, & Almond, 2003, p. 1) for working to ensure that an assessment is based on a clear, documented chain of logic from what the test is intended to measure through the meaning of the scores that are reported.

For the purposes of the Alternate ELPAC high-level test design, key initial steps in the ECD process include defining the real-world knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that are to be included on the assessment, and specifying the claim(s) about student KSAs and levels of performance related to those claim(s) that will be measured. These steps are explained in the brief discussion of the ELD Connectors and high-level claim that follows.

It is worth noting that many students taking the Alternate ELPAC will be using individually preferred communication mode(s), some of which will be technology-based, to receive and express information during the test administration. This fact is considered both in the wording of the overall claim presented in [subsection 2.A.2.](#) and in the approach to task design described in [subsection 2.B.1.](#)

2.A.1. ELD Connectors

The key document defining the real-world KSAs to be measured on the Alternate ELPAC are the ELD Connectors, which are aligned with the 2012 ELD Standards.

For each of the 2012 ELD Standards at each grade or grade span assessed on the ELPAC, the ELD Connectors provide an aligned expectation of student ELP that has been reduced in depth, breadth, and complexity in order to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. This approach is consistent with other alternate assessments developed for California, in which connectors are used to define how content standards are to be interpreted for the assessment of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

In addition to the 2012 ELD Standards, the ELD Connectors were substantially informed by the ELP level descriptors in the *Council of Chief State School Officers ELP Standards for English Learners with Significant Cognitive Disabilities* (CCSSO, 2018).

The ELD Connectors—reviewed by experts, including California educators and the CDE—will be included in the test blueprint that will be brought to the SBE for approval in May 2020.

2.A.2. High-Level Claim

The next step of the ECD process is to formally define assessment claims, which are statements about what test takers are expected to know and be able to do with respect to the domain of the KSAs.

Claims can exist at various levels. High-level claims typically are supported by reported scores and therefore are connected to the assessment’s score reporting documentation. In the case of the Alternate ELPAC, key elements of the score reporting documentation include general PLDs, presented later in [subsection 2.D.](#), and the score reporting structure, presented in [section 4.](#)

Because the Alternate ELPAC will report a single overall score, a single overall claim is appropriate in the assessment design documentation. (The single overall score will be the most reliable score information that can be reported on the Alternate ELPAC. It may be supplemented by additional score information, as discussed in the next subsection.) ETS recommends the following overall claim:

Overall claim: Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are English learners, or potentially will be identified as English learners, are able to comprehend and communicate in English to access adapted grade-level content, using students’ individually preferred communication mode(s).

The intention of this claim is to state what it means if a student gets a high overall score on the Alternate ELPAC: Such a score means that the student has sufficient ELP to use English to learn grade-level content in the same manner as non-ELs who have the most significant cognitive disabilities.

As work on the Alternate ELPAC test design continues through the pilot and field test, it is possible that the Alternate ELPAC may report additional score information on areas such as “oral language” and “written language”—analogous to information currently reported on the ELPAC—or “receptive language” and “expressive language.” Work is currently underway to document the relationship of individually preferred communication modes to the potential combinations of language domains that could be reported.

The question of what information will be appropriate to report will be further explored through the task design and blueprint development process, which will be confirmed as part of the analysis of the January 2020 pilot. If additional score information is to be reported, aligned claims for each type of score information, derived from the approach and wording of the overall claim shown previously, will be developed and then brought to the SBE for review and approval at the same time as the test blueprint. (Refer to [subsection 2.C.](#) for details on the development of the test blueprint.)

2.B. Recommended Approach to Task Types and Test Development

2.B.1. Task Development

Developing test items that gather appropriate evidence of student proficiency in relation to the overall claim is an essential part of the Alternate ELPAC development process. Before test items can be developed, it is necessary to identify appropriate task types, or models for

the development of items, that will capture appropriate evidence of student language proficiency in relation to the ELD Connectors and the overall claim. As part of this process, ETS will review the task types currently being used on the computer-based ELPAC. Those task types will be adapted and expanded upon as appropriate for use on the Alternate ELPAC (e.g., adapting task types to integrate two or more domains).

The task design process will also follow the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to maximize accessibility of the tasks to all members of the diverse population of students who will take the Alternate ELPAC. For example, as mentioned in [subsection 3.B.](#), many Alternate ELPAC test takers will use individually preferred communication mode(s), some of which will be technology-based. This will be considered in the task design process in that tasks will not require students to use a particular language mode (i.e., Listening, Speaking, Reading, or Writing) to receive information or to express information. Instead, the Alternate ELPAC will offer flexibility so students can receive or express information via their individually preferred communication mode(s).

In consultation with the Test Design Advisory Team, ETS evaluated a range of test design options against the guiding principles outlined in [subsection 1.D.](#) The resulting test design recommendation for the Alternate ELPAC is a standardized assessment including task types that integrate combinations of the Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing domains, while allowing students to use their individually preferred communication mode(s) as they choose. Such “integrated tasks” reflect a best practice in item development because they allow students to interact with tasks that involve more than one domain of language use, which reflects the organization of the 2012 ELD Standards as well as what students do while learning in the content areas. This approach will help to ensure that test scores will be valid for the intended purposes, meet the needs of the test-taking population, minimize additional testing burden for students as well as for test examiners, and meet state and federal legal requirements and standards for technical quality.

The specific approach to be used in implementing task types that integrate multiple domains will be determined during the task type development phase, including input from California educators in the item writing and item review processes. At a minimum, task types integrating at least two language domains will be included.

During the task type development phase, both existing ELPAC task types and new task types will be considered for inclusion on the Alternate ELPAC, as-is or with adaptations as appropriate. Task types may be revised later on the basis of information obtained from pilot testing in January 2020.

2.B.2. Development of a Linear Test

The Alternate ELPAC will be an online, linear assessment delivered under untimed testing conditions. Delivery online will make the Alternate ELPAC consistent with the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs). It is important to note that the student will not be expected to interact directly with the computer; the one-on-one administration model will allow for the test examiner to interact with the computer on behalf of the student, as appropriate to the student’s individual needs and abilities.

Design and Development

A linear, rather than adaptive, approach is preferred for the Alternate ELPAC for several reasons. The linear approach will simplify administration for students and test examiners. In addition, it will avoid challenges in developing a pre-equated item pool of sufficient size, to support adaptive testing for a small test-taking population. Finally, the need for the Alternate ELPAC to measure ELP across the domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing, as well as the expectation that many task types will be set-based, limits the potential advantages of adaptive testing.

2.C. Blueprint Development

The Alternate ELPAC test blueprint will provide guidance for the development of all Alternate ELPAC test forms, ensuring that they appropriately sample the knowledge, skills, and abilities defined by the ELD Connectors aligned with the 2012 ELD Standards to be measured; provide enough score points to support reliable score reporting; and support a test form that is of appropriate length for the Alternate ELPAC testing population.

The Alternate ELPAC test blueprint will be similar in format to the ELPAC test blueprint and will contain the following information:

- Task type and domains assessed by each; with the inclusion of integrated tasks, a given task type will assess multiple domains
- Task format (i.e., discrete or set-based)
- Aligned ELD Connector
- Number of items (by task type)
- Number of score points (by task type)
- Total number of items

ETS recommends that the same test blueprint be used for both the Initial Alternate ELPAC and the Summative Alternate ELPAC. The reason for this recommendation is that the general PLDs ([subsection 2.D.](#)) and score reporting structure ([subsection 4.A.](#)) are the same for the initial and summative assessments. As a result, the Initial Alternate ELPAC and the Summative Alternate ELPAC test form and length should be the same. (This recommendation marks a difference between the Alternate ELPAC and the ELPAC. On the ELPAC, there are different score reporting structures for the initial and summative uses, which makes it appropriate to have different test blueprints [and different test forms] for those two uses.)

ETS is confident that, for the identified test purposes of the Alternate ELPAC, using a single test form (and a single test blueprint) is an appropriate means of assessing the ELP of the Alternate ELPAC student population.

The Alternate ELPAC test design will also account for test-takers that provide non-observable responses to test items. Through the test design process, the potential for establishing exit criteria will be explored, if necessary, to provide clear guidance to test examiners to end test administration.

ETS also recommends that a single blueprint of the Alternate ELPAC be used for both initial and summative purposes in each testing year. Development of the Alternate ELPAC test blueprints will be iterative, proceeding through the following stages:

1. A preliminary draft of the test blueprints will be created to inform item development for the pilot test. This preliminary draft will contain information about which task types are being administered during the pilot test. It will not describe test forms in the level of detail needed to produce test forms suitable for reporting student scores.

Design and Development

2. As part of the analysis of the pilot test, decisions will be made regarding which task types are suitable for use on the operational forms and how many items of each task type are needed to appropriately sample the ELD Connectors, support reliable score reporting, and provide a test form that is of appropriate length.
3. Based on these pilot analyses, an operational test blueprint containing all of the information necessary to develop the operational Alternate ELPAC will be finalized for SBE consideration.

2.D. General Performance Level Descriptors

The Alternate ELPAC general PLDs are short policy descriptors that convey the degree of student proficiency in English. Taken together with reporting PLDs and threshold scores, the general PLDs convey to educators, parents, students, and the public the meaning of assessment results.

With input from experts and stakeholders, the CDE determined that the descriptions should include three levels of performance. Three performance levels are appropriate for a test of this length and are consistent with the CAAs. Table 1 provides a description of the three general PLDs reflecting the highest to the lowest level of performance.

Table 1. Alternate ELPAC PLDs

Level	Description
Fluent English Proficient	Students at this level have sufficient English language proficiency. They may need occasional linguistic support to enable them to access adapted grade-level content in English.
Intermediate EL	Students at this level have moderate English language proficiency. They may need frequent linguistic support to enable them to access adapted grade-level content in English.
Novice EL	Students at this level have minimal English language proficiency. They need substantial linguistic support to enable them to access adapted grade-level content in English.

Section 3: Validity and Fairness

3.A. Background

Ensuring tests provide valid and reliable measurement of students' knowledge, skills, and abilities, as well as attention to minimizing bias and increasing fairness, is an especially important task for developing assessments for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The assessment will be designed and developed with adherence to the technical quality guidelines in *The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], & National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME], 2014) and considerations for validity and fairness in the Every Student Succeeds Act, under the Code of Federal Regulations [34 CFR§ 200.6(h)(5)]².

3.B. Design Considerations

The need to minimize bias and increase fairness is a requirement for valid and meaningful interpretations to ensure that eligible students' performance on the assessment is reflective of their English language proficiency and English-based communication strategies rather than their disability status. These considerations for validity and fairness are especially critical for the development of the Alternate ELPAC as they relate to access needs for domains, test administration considerations, and accessibility resources.

3.B.1. Test-taking Population

Development work for the Alternate ELPAC must take into account the cultural and linguistic diversity of the test-taking population. Similar to their peers taking the ELPAC, eligible students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will vary in the home languages and cultural experiences that complement their formal educational experiences (Klingner et al., 2005). Additionally, eligible students will demonstrate a range of receptive and expressive communication skills, varied abilities of cognition, processing and memory, and variable modes of communication, including oral and written, as well as potential use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC), sign language, and braille. Incorporating deliberate attention to these characteristics will help promote a fair and valid assessment opportunity to measure students' language skills and not their disability.

3.B.2. Universal Design

An examination of the characteristics of the target population should help guide decisions for elements such as mode of delivery, item types, and allowable accommodations to support the construct definition and intended assessment purpose (Winter et al., 2018). Attending to these needs through the principles of universal design helps ensure that information is presented in the most accessible formats across domains (CAST, 2018). It will also allow students to demonstrate their English language skills across the test domains in manners most appropriate for each individual student using any accommodations, such as assistive technology, AAC, or other manual communication systems.

3.B.3. Online Test Administration

The Alternate ELPAC will be an online assessment. However, it will not require students to interact directly with the computer interface if they are not able to do so effectively. The one-on-one administration model for Alternate ELPAC, and the directions for administration that will be developed and provided to test examiners, will ensure that the test examiner provides individualized support as needed for each student. This includes navigating and entering responses into the computer interface for the student, as appropriate.

For those students who will be able to interact directly with the computer interface, it is worth noting that with the exception of students who are newcomers, defined by the United States Department of Education as any foreign-born student and their families who have recently arrived in the United States, and in the first 12 months of enrollment in California schools, test takers in grades three through eight and grade eleven may be familiar with the test platform used on the CAAs. It is important to consider that very young test takers and newcomers alike may need additional support understanding the test expectations and interacting with technology (Guzman-Orth et al., 2016; Wolf et al., 2015). This support will be provided via the one-on-one administration mode.

Test administration guidelines should recommend that each test examiner be familiar with the individual students tested. Test examiners may need additional support and training to learn how to best meet the needs of young test takers (Epstein, Schweinhart, DeBruin-Parecki, & Robin, 2004; Espinosa & Garcia, 2012). Administration considerations should include procedures that familiarize students with test content and administration flow, such as providing meaningful practice and training test opportunities.

3.B.4. Accessibility

Accessibility is a critical component of the test development process that ensures the testing experience results in valid and meaningful interpretations of a student's ELP. *The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], & National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME], 2014) recommend that accessibility and universal design considerations are essentially intermeshed in the efforts to create accessible assessments (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014).

To promote consistency for students and test examiners, the Alternate ELPAC will adopt the multitiered accessibility resources model used in the CAASPP System of assessments; students will have access to embedded and non-embedded resources that are appropriate for the Alternate ELPAC construct. The accessibility resources will fall into one of the following categories:

- Universal tools, which are available for all eligible students
- Designated supports, which are available for some eligible students with teacher or parental judgment
- Accommodations, which are available to eligible students with appropriate documentation such as an IEP.

Because of the construct of the Alternate ELPAC, certain resources may be domain-specific, while others may be allowed across all tested domains. This information will be further detailed in the ELPAC Accessibility Framework, a separate document detailing the range of accessibility considerations and resources allowed on the computer-based ELPAC and the Alternate ELPAC.

Together, these efforts mirror the necessary validity and fairness considerations to support the design and development for the Alternate ELPAC. Accessibility is viewed as a set of comprehensive approaches to improve access for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities so students have the opportunity to demonstrate their language skills through fair, valid, and equitable testing opportunities.

Section 4: Scoring and Reporting

4.A. Score Reporting Structure

The Alternate ELPAC student score reporting structure consists of an overall scale score with three performance levels. The four domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing will each contribute to the overall score through the proposed design approach, including the use of integrated tasks described in [section 2](#).

Data from the field test administration will be used to evaluate the reliability of the score reporting structure and to recommend what additional score information, if any, may be useful. The CDE and ETS will continue to explore other reliable reporting structures for the SBE's consideration.

Section 5: Planned Research Studies

Research studies are planned to establish validity and fairness evidence for the Alternate ELPAC. These studies are designed to support the principles and considerations laid out in [section 3](#).

5.A. Pilot Test and Cognitive Lab Study

Pilot testing will be conducted in January 2020 to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of task types being considered for use on the Alternate ELPAC. Sample selection criteria for participants will include the diversity of cultures and languages as well as geographical diversity in California. Concurrent with pilot testing, cognitive labs will be conducted to gain additional insights into test examiner and student interactions with the test. Using the cognitive lab research methodology, richly detailed validity evidence will be obtained through structured interview and observation techniques that can be used to inform the next steps of Alternate ELPAC development.

5.B. Field Test Study

The Alternate ELPAC will be developed and field tested based on results from the pilot test and cognitive labs. This statewide operational field test, to be administered to all eligible students in January and February 2021, will be designed to allow the launch of the first Initial Alternate ELPAC in July 2021 and reporting of the Summative Alternate ELPAC field test results in fall 2021. The field test will provide information on item performance, test administration procedures, and is a valuable part of the test development process. Measurement models and field test study designs for the Alternate ELPAC will take into account the relatively small target student population in California, to ensure the approaches are suitable for small sample sizes and the item statistics remain robust.

5.C. Standard Setting Study

Following the field test in January and February 2021, a standard setting study will be conducted to allow the reporting of three performance levels for each of the Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC. Expectations of student performance will be considered separately for students taking the Summative Alternate ELPAC at the end of a grade level and for students taking the Initial Alternate ELPAC at the beginning of the grade level.

ETS will work with the CDE and the ELPAC Technical Advisory Group in developing the psychometric design for Alternate ELPAC, with the goal of providing valid and reliable test results.

5.D. Additional Studies

Additional studies may be needed and will be identified following key stages in the development of the Alternate ELPAC, including observation of the diversity of test examiners in California.

Appendix A High-Level Timeline

The development and launch of the Alternate ELPAC will follow a timeline that allows for the opportunity to evaluate approaches and task types in a pilot test before finalizing a test blueprint and conducting a statewide operational field test.

Table 2. Alternate ELPAC High-Level Timeline

Activity	Date
SBE action on the <i>Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California</i> , including general performance level descriptors	May 2019
Administration of the pilot test and cognitive labs	January 2020
Development of proposed blueprint	February–March 2020
SBE action on the proposed blueprint	May 2020
Administration of a statewide operational field test for both Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC	January–February 2021
Standard setting study for both Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC	Spring 2021
SBE action on the proposed threshold scores	Spring 2021
Administration of the Operational Initial Alternate ELPAC	July 2021

Appendix B Test Design Advisory Team Biographies

Dr. Meagan Karvonen is director of Accessible Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Systems (ATLAS), a center at the University of Kansas (KU). In this role, she also directs the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Consortium and is principal investigator (PI) of the Institute of Education Sciences Project, 5E-Model Professional Development in Science Education for Special Educators, and the Enhanced Assessment Grant, Innovations in Science Maps, Assessment, and Reporting Technologies; and is co-PI on the Office of Special Education Programs–funded Shared Writing Instructional Model for students with intellectual disability. In 2018, she served as a consultant on Evidence-Centered Design for the Alternate English Language Learner Assessment (ALTELLA) Enhanced Assessment Grant. Dr. Karvonen has nearly 20 years of experience in large-scale assessments for students with disabilities and, in particular, alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Prior to joining KU, Dr. Karvonen was a tenured faculty member in educational research and measurement. Dr. Karvonen has coauthored more than 200 publications and presentations for a range of audiences.

Dr. Lucrecia Santibañez is an associate professor of teaching, learning, and culture in the School of Educational Studies at Claremont Graduate University. Previously, she was an education economist at the RAND Corporation. Her academic research has been published by *Economics of Education Review*, *Teachers College Record*, *Review of Educational Research*, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, and the *International Journal of Educational Development*. She publishes in both English-speaking and Spanish-speaking journals. Dr. Santibañez’s research focuses on understanding how to improve teaching and learning for low-income children and how to increase education quality and access of opportunity to low-income populations in the U.S. and abroad. Her research focuses on school-based management, parent engagement, school leadership, and teacher labor markets. She is currently developing a new line of research to study how to improve teaching and schooling for English language learners in mainstream and dual-language immersion programs.

Dr. Edynn Sato has over 25 years of experience in education research and consultation, and currently is the CEO and chief research scientist of a small, woman-owned business, Sato Education Consulting LLC. She is a respected authority on student learning, instruction, and assessment, particularly of culturally and linguistically diverse learners (e.g., English language learners) and students with disabilities. Her practical, research-supported approaches to developing and putting into practice various learning, instructional, and assessment products and services has helped educators and students across numerous states in the U.S. as well as internationally. Dr. Sato’s work includes a substantive contribution to the development of California’s English Language Development Standards (adopted in 2012). She served as a chair of the Diversity Issues in Testing Committee for the National Council on Measurement in Education, is a Peer Reviewer of State Assessments for the U.S. Department of Education, and has provided a briefing to White House, Senate, and House of Representative staff on English language learner research and policy implications.

Appendix B Test Design Advisory Team Biographies

Dr. Martha Thurlow is the director of the National Center on Educational Outcomes. In this position, she addresses the implications of contemporary U.S. policy and practice for students with disabilities and English learners, including national and statewide assessment policies and practices, standard-setting efforts, and graduation requirements. Dr. Thurlow has conducted research for the past 45 years in a variety of areas, including assessment and decision making, learning disabilities, early childhood education, dropout prevention, effective classroom instruction, and integration of students with disabilities in general education settings. Dr. Thurlow has published extensively on all of these topics, authoring numerous books and book chapters, and publishing more than 200 articles and reports. From 1995 to 2003, she completed her eight-year term as co-Editor of *Exceptional Children*, the research journal of the Council for Exceptional Children, and is currently associate editor for numerous journals.

Appendix C References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- CAST (2018). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2*. Retrieved from http://udlguidelines.cast.org/binaries/content/assets/udlguidelines/udlg-v2-2/udlg_graphicorganizer_v2-2_numbers-yes.pdf
- Christensen, L. L., Gholson, M. L., & Shyyan, V. V. (2018, April). Establishing a definition of English learners with significant cognitive disabilities (ALTELLA Brief No. 1). Retrieved from University of Wisconsin–Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Alternate English Language Learning Assessment project: <http://altella.wceruw.org/resources.html>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2019). English language proficiency standards for English learners with significant cognitive disabilities. Washington, DC: Author.
- Epstein, A. S., Schweinhart, L. J., DeBruin-Parecki, A., & Robin, K. B. (2004). *Preschool assessment. A guide to developing a balanced approach*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- Espinosa, L. M., & Garcia, E. (2012). Working Paper #1: Developmental assessment of young dual language learners with a focus on kindergarten entry assessment: Implications for state policies. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, Center for Early Care and Education Research – Dual Language Learners.
- Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95 § 114 Stat. 1177 (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>
- Guzman-Orth, D., Laitusis, C., Thurlow, M. and Christensen, L. (2016). *Conceptualizing accessibility for English language proficiency assessments*. ETS Research Report Series, 2016: 1-12. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ets2.12093>
- Klingner, J. K., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., . . . & Riley, D. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Education policy analysis archives*, 13, 38.
- Mislevy, R. J. (2011). *Evidence-Centered Design for simulation-based assessment. CRESST Report 800*. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Mislevy, R.J., Steinberg, L.S., and Almond, R.A. (2003). On the structure of educational assessments. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 1, 3–67.
- Thurlow, M. L., Liu, K. K., Goldstone, L., Albus, D., & Rogers, C. (2018). Alt-ELPA21 Participation Guidelines. Los Angeles: Regents of the University of California.

Appendix C References

- Wolf, M., Guzman-Orth, D., & Wain, J. (2015). *Investigating the usability of technology-enhanced assessment items during the ELPA21 development process*. ELPA1 Cognitive lab study report. Final Deliverable to ELPA21.
- Winter, P. C., Karvonen, M., & Christensen, L. L. (2018, August). *Developing item templates for alternate assessments of English language proficiency*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin–Madison, Alternate English Language Learning Assessment (ALTELLA). Retrieved from University of Wisconsin–Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research: <http://altella.wceruw.org/resources.html>
- Zieky, M. (2014). An introduction to the use of evidence-centered design in test development. *Psicologia Educativa*. (20)2, 79–87.