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Executive Summary

The Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners (OPTEL) is a standardized observation protocol developed for use by teachers in evaluating a pupil’s English language proficiency to meet the requirements of California *Education Code* Section 313.3. California legislation outlines that the protocol shall be designed:

* to be used by teachers to evaluate a pupil’s use of English while engaging in academic content learning, including interactive language use with peers;
* to allow teachers to assess language practices across a range of proficiency levels in order to help teachers identify pupils’ performance along the continuum of progress toward proficiency in English;
* to be used for all English learner (EL) pupils, including students with disabilities who have individualized education programs (IEPs);
* to be used by content area teachers at all grade levels, English language development (ELD) teachers, bilingual teachers, and special education teachers; and
* for ease of use by educators.

Additionally, the protocol shall be aligned to the ELD standards and the performance levels for the ELD test described in Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 60810) of Part 33 of Division 4 of Title 2.[[1]](#footnote-1)

In alignment with these requirements, this OPTEL Final Validation Study Report documents the ways in which evidence from the field test of the OPTEL tool across California schools in 2023 supports the use of the OPTEL tool as designed. Table 1 outlines the ways in which findings from the field test provide evidence to support the use of the OPTEL tool in line with these requirements. This evidence is coupled with the design of the OPTEL tool to be in alignment with the ELD standards and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). While educators were encouraged to include students who took the Summative Alternate ELPAC (indicating that they are EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities) in the OPTEL field test, the OPTEL was designed prior to the development of the Alternate ELPAC. The OPTEL field test does not provide evidence on the validity of the OPTEL tool for use with EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

**Table 1. Legislative Requirements for the OPTEL Tool and Supporting Evidence**

| Requirement | Evidence to Support Validation |
| --- | --- |
| The OPTEL tool can be used by teachers to evaluate a pupil’s use of English while the pupil is engaging in academic content learning, including interactive language use with peers. | * OPTEL ratings are moderately consistent among pairs of educators who observed the same student, indicating that, with minimal training and differences in familiarity with students, educators still gave students the same rating more often than not (see Figures 9 and 10).
* OPTEL and Summative ELPAC scores are moderately aligned, indicating that they are measuring similar, yet not identical constructs (see Tables 11 and 12, as well as Figures 13 through 16).
* OPTEL ratings are well aligned with educators’ perceptions of students’ proximity to reclassification (see Tables 14 and 15).
* Qualitative feedback from educators supports the usability of the OPTEL tool (see Key Finding for Research Question 4 section).
 |
| The OPTEL tool can be used to enable teachers to assess language practices across a range of proficiency levels in order to help teachers identify pupils’ performance along the continuum of progress toward proficiency in English. | * Alignment of educators’ OPTEL ratings is moderate or higher across all ELPAC performance levels, indicating that, with minimal training and differences in familiarity with students, educators still gave students the same rating more often than not. Alignment was not lower than moderate for any ELP level (see Figures 11 and 12).
* Qualitative feedback from educators supports the usability of the OPTEL tool to help teachers identify pupils’ performance along the continuum of progress toward proficiency in English (see Key Finding for Research Question 4 section).
 |
| The OPTEL tool can be used for all EL pupils, including those who have IEPs. | * Among students with the same ELPAC performance level, OPTEL ratings did not differ significantly based on students’ home language, IEP or Section 504 Plan status, or gender (see Figures 19 through 22).

  |
| The OPTEL tool can be used by content area teachers at all grade levels, ELD teachers, bilingual teachers, and special education teachers and shall be designed for ease of use by educators. | * The OPTEL field test sample includes teachers from a diversity of grade levels and positions (see Figures 3 and 4, as well as Table 5).
* Among students with the same ELPAC performance level, OPTEL ratings did not differ based on whether teachers held endorsements specific to EL or bilingual instruction (see Figures 17 and 18).
* Qualitative feedback from educators from a diversity of positions supports ease of use (see Key Finding for Research Question 4 section).
 |

In addition to the requirements above, is the intent of the state legislature that the protocol also be useful to all of the following:

* Teachers, as a formative assessment tool for purposes of supporting pupils’ progress toward proficiency in English during the school year
* Teachers’ discussions with parents regarding pupils’ progress toward English language proficiency
* Institutions of higher education in the preparation of new teachers

This report does not address the validity of the OPTEL for these uses. Use of the OPTEL as a formative tool was an optional part of the field test, with feedback from those who did so.

To summarize the key report findings on the validity of the OPTEL tool, analysis of results from the OPTEL field test resulted in the following conclusions:

* Within pairs of educators who observed the same student, educators’ ratings of students’ English language proficiency expressive and receptive skills were aligned a majority of the time, for moderate alignment. When they were misaligned, they rarely differed by more than one level.
* Educators’ ratings of students’ English language proficiency skills were moderately aligned with students’ overall Summative ELPAC performance levels.
* Students’ OPTEL ratings did not consistently vary based on educator or student characteristics, although there were differences by whether a student had an IEP or Section 504 Plan in comparison with not, as well as student home language and grade level, for students at specific English language proficiency levels.
* Educators reported that the OPTEL tool is easy to use and feasible for use in the classroom.
* The WestEd team recommends thatstudents who receive OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings at Level 3 or Level 4 be considered for reclassification.

Introduction

The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 requires states to develop standardized criteria to determine when EL students no longer require services and can exit EL programs and be reclassified to fluent English proficient. The OPTEL tool, currently being developed to meet the requirements of California *Education Code* Section 313.3, will support that effort.

The OPTEL tool will consist of an instrument, accompanying guidance, and resources detailing a standardized implementation process to administer, score, and interpret results. The California Department of Education (CDE) has contracted with WestEd to design this observation protocol. As specified in state law, the OPTEL tool has been designed to be easy to use for all teachers to:

* provide evidence that contributes to reclassification decisions for all EL students who qualify to take the Summative ELPAC, including those with an IEP and/or a Section 504 Plan;
* evaluate student use of English while engaging in academic content learning, including interactive academic language use with peers; and
* assess language practices across a range of proficiency levels.

The OPTEL tool was designed iteratively and collaboratively by the CDE, WestEd, and educators and leaders from across the state of California. The tool is designed for educators’ use in determining and documenting a student’s proficiency with regard to English language expressive skills—speaking and writing—as well as in determining and documenting a student’s proficiency with regard to English language receptive skills—listening and reading. In addition to supporting reclassification decisions, the OPTEL tool is also designed to support educators as a formative assessment tool to support student progress toward English proficiency, as a tool to use in consultation with parents of EL students regarding their children’s progress toward English language proficiency, and as a tool to support the training of educators in teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education.

The OPTEL tool is designed to be in alignment with California ELD standards and the ELPAC performance levels. For both expressive and receptive skills, educators have the option to determine whether a student’s skills align with one of four performance levels. The proposed OPTEL performance levels are Level 1: Emerging; Level 2: Early-Mid Expanding; Level 3: Late Expanding–Early Bridging; and Level 4: Mid-Late Bridging. The levels are aligned with the three California ELD Standards proficiency levels (Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging) and the four ELPAC Performance Level Descriptors (Level 1: Beginning to Develop, Level 2: Somewhat Developed, Level 3: Moderately Developed, and Level 4: Well Developed). The alignment is summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. OPTEL Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| OPTEL Performance Level | ELD Standards Proficiency Level | ELPAC Performance Level Descriptors |
| Level 1: Emerging | Emerging | Level 1: Beginning to Develop |
| Level 2: Early-Mid Expanding | Expanding | Level 2: Somewhat Developed |
| Level 3: Late Expanding–Early Bridging | Expanding/Bridging | Level 3: Moderately Developed |
| Level 4: Mid-Late Bridging | Bridging | Level 4: Well Developed |

WestEd convened a group of experts from across the state of California as part of an OPTEL Advisory Committee (OAC) to provide input on the tool’s design three times throughout the development process. In 2019, WestEd conducted a pilot study of the OPTEL tool with educators from across the state. Data from the pilot study, reported to the CDE in fall 2019, provided initial evidence that OPTEL scores provide valid information about students’ English language use in the classroom. The pilot study results also suggested that the tool’s validity in supporting reclassification decisions would be improved with efforts to support teachers in familiarizing themselves with OPTEL tool’s rating scale and its connections with other CDE resources to support quality instruction for EL students.

In spring 2020, a field test was initiated to ensure that the OPTEL tool appropriately:

* assesses the intended target language constructs;
* demonstrates a meaningful relationship to the performance levels for the ELPAC;
* assesses classroom language use; and
* reflects student progress toward attaining targeted constructs.

The 2020 OPTEL field test was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The field test was restarted in January 2023 and was held through May 2023. The 2023 OPTEL field test was designed to have the same goals and overall structure as the cancelled 2020 OPTEL field test. This validation study report describes the OPTEL field test study design and methods and the results of the validation study research questions.

The research questions for the 2023 OPTEL field test were as follows:

1. How consistently do raters score EL students’ ability to use grade-level academic English language in the classroom setting using the OPTEL tool?
2. What is the relationship between OPTEL scores and performance on the Summative ELPAC?
3. How much do OPTEL scores vary based on educator and student characteristics?
4. To what extent do educators report that the OPTEL tool is feasible for use in the classroom?

Methodology

Field Test Design

The invitation to sign up for the OPTEL field test was disseminated across the state through multiple channels from both the CDE and WestEd from January 2023 through April 2023. Appendix B provides more detail on the recruitment process. Teachers who wished to participate in the field test were required to sign up in pairs. Each pair was asked to identify two EL students at each ELPAC level (using 2021–22 academic year achievement levels) to observe, for a total of eight students. After identifying their eight students, teacher pairs were instructed to work independently to observe each student and submit ratings without consultation with their partner. The purpose of this design was to maintain teachers’ independence as raters so that we could measure agreement across raters.

After signing up, educators accessed asynchronous training videos that described how to use the OPTEL tool and the OPTEL field test procedures. Educators then conducted observations, which could be done at different times and in different settings. After conducting the observations, teachers then submitted to the CDE for analysis their OPTEL ratings and brief surveys they completed, one about their professional background and another about their experience using the OPTEL tool. More detail about the study’s design is provided in Appendix A. The various surveys and instruments that teachers responded to are provided in Appendix C.

Field Test Validation Methods

There are four research questions that guide the OPTEL field test validation study. The methods used to answer these research questions are designed to provide information on the extent to which the OPTEL tool could be used to provide consistent, valid ratings of students’ English language proficiency. More detailed information on the methods is provided in Appendix A.

The first research question evaluates how consistently raters use the OPTEL tool to score EL students’ ability to use grade-level academic English language in the classroom setting. This research question is examined through generating descriptive alignment statistics, as well as interrater reliability statistics.

The second research question examines the relationship between student OPTEL ratings and achievement on the Summative ELPAC, as well as teacher reports of students’ proximity to reclassification. This research question is examined through descriptive statistics as well as correlations.

The third research question examines variation in student OPTEL scores by educator and student characteristics. This research question is examined through descriptive statistics that calculate the average OPTEL rating among students within a specific ELPAC performance level by educator and student characteristics of interest, as well as the use of multilevel models that partition variance by students, educators, and schools.

The fourth research question examines educators’ feedback on usability of the OPTEL tool. This research question is examined through descriptive statistics summarizing responses to Likert-type questions, as well as qualitative coding of open-ended feedback. Qualitative coding involves using codes defined *a priori* to categorize feedback into positive feedback on the OPTEL tool design, feedback on challenges with the OPTEL tool design, positive feedback on the OPTEL tool implementation process, feedback on challenges with the OPTEL tool implementation process, and other feedback, typically on the OPTEL field test or survey design. Categorized responses were then summarized.

Field Test Study Sample

This section provides summary information about the educators who participated in the OPTEL field test, as well as the students for whom those educators provided ratings.

Teacher Sample

Overall, 189 unique educators submitted OPTEL ratings in 75 pairs (some educators submitted ratings without a partner). Of the 189 educators who participated in the field test, 29 submitted only student ratings (meaning they did not submit background or feedback information), 14 submitted student ratings and only feedback about the OPTEL tool, 23 submitted student ratings and information about their background, and 123 submitted all three forms.

The 189 educators in the sample were from 45 unique districts across the state of California. As shown in Figure 1, a majority of the 189 respondents teach in the southern region of the state (109 of 189, 57.7%), followed by educators coming from the central (50, 26.5%) and northern (30, 15.9%) regions of the state. The proportion of educators from southern California is very close to the target set for the field test based on the statewide distribution of EL students—that 60 percent of educators be from southern California districts. The sample numbers for northern and central California were not as close to their targets, which were 27 percent of educators from northern California and 13 percent from central California. This means central California districts are slightly overrepresented, and northern California districts are slightly underrepresented.

**Figure 1. Location of Educators by State Region**

Figure Note: The figure shows data for the 189 educators who participated in the field test.

Of the 146 educators who submitted information on their background, 132 (90.4 percent) reported that they were classroom teachers only, eight (5.5%) reported that they were either school- or district-level administrators only, and six (4.1%) reported that they were both classroom teachers and school- or district-level administrators.

As shown in Table 3, educators had been working for an average of 16.1 years in the field of education, with an average of 13.4 years spent teaching. Responses ranged from one year to 35 years and zero years to 32 years, respectively.

**Table 3. Educator Demographics – Number of Years in the Field and the Classroom**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean (Standard Deviation) |
| Years in the Field | 1 | 35 | 16.1 (8.4) |
| Years in the Classroom | 0 | 32 | 13.4 (7.7) |

Table Note: The statistics shown in this table are based on responses from 146 educators.

Table 4 shows that educators reported an average of 60 EL students on their rosters for the 2022–23 school year. Responses ranged from zero to 946 EL students, with a median of 22 EL students.

**Table 4. Educator Demographics – Number of EL Students on the 2022–23 School Year Roster**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum | Maximum | Median | Mean (Standard Deviation) |
| EL Students in 2022–23 Roster | 0 | 946 | 22 | 60 (133.7) |

Table Note: The statistics shown in this table are based on responses from 103 educators.

As shown in Figure 2, of the 140 educators who could be matched to a Statewide Educator Identifier (SEID) number in CALPADS (California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System), 117, or 83.6 percent, were identified as female, and 23, or 16.4 percent, were identified as male. The proportion of educators who were identified as female is higher in the field test than educators generally in California.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Figure 2. Educator Demographics – Educator Gender**

Figure Note: The figure above shows data for the 140 educators who could be matched to a SEID number.

Of the 140 educators who could be matched to a SEID number, 57 were identified as Hispanic (40.7%), 69 were White, non-Hispanic (49.3%), and 14 were from other racial backgrounds and non-Hispanic (10.0%).

The 138 educators who indicated that they were classroom teachers were asked to select all of the areas in which they hold certifications. As shown in Figure 3, the majority of respondents (66, 47.8%) reported holding certifications in Multiple Subject-Elementary. The next two commonly reported certifications were ELD certification (46, 33.3%) and English Language Arts (ELA), Reading, or Literacy (42, 30.4%).

**Figure 3. Teacher Certifications**

Figure Note: The responses represented in this figure are for 138 educators who indicated that they were classroom teachers. Percentages do not add up to 100 because educators could select multiple responses.

\*BCLAD is an acronym for Bilingual, Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development.

The survey also included a question about respondents’ class assignments for the 2022–23 school year. A majority of the 138 educators who reported that they were classroom teachers reported multiple course assignments, with ELD being the most common (84, 60.9%) followed by ELA (72, 52.2%) and mathematics (43, 31.2%) (see Figure 4).

**Figure 4. Teacher 2022–23 Teaching Assignments**

Figure Note: The responses represented in this figure are for 138 educators who indicated that they were classroom teachers.

\*STEM is an acronym for Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

The teacher background survey included three questions designed to gauge teachers’ expertise and familiarity with educating EL students. These questions were as follows:

* How familiar are you with the California ELD Standards?
* How familiar are you with the California English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework?
* Overall, how confident do you feel in your ability to design and deliver effective instruction for EL students?

Teachers’ responses to these questions are shown in Figures 5 through 7. In reviewing these responses, it is important to remember that they are self-reported and thus reflect teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about their own knowledge. Direct observation or assessment might produce different information about these individuals’ actual familiarity or expertise.

As shown in Figure 5, nearly all teachers reported being somewhat familiar or very familiar with the California ELD standards (140, 95.9%). Five respondents (3.4%) reported that they were “not so familiar” with the standards and only one (0.7%) reported that they were “not at all familiar” with the standards.

**Figure 5. Summary of Educators’ Perceptions of Their Familiarity with California’s ELD Standards**

Figure Note: The responses represented in this figure are from 146 educators who submitted information about their background. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 5)](#Figure_5E).

A slightly lower majority of teachers (93.2%) reported being somewhat familiar or very familiar with the CA ELA/ELD Framework. Nine respondents (6.2%) reported being “not so familiar” with the framework, and one respondent (0.7%) reported they were “not at all familiar” with the framework (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6. Summary of Educators’ Perceptions of Their Familiarity with California’s ELA/ELD Framework**

Figure Note: The responses represented in this figure are from 146 educators who submitted information about their background. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 6)](#Figure_6E).

Further, all teachers reported being somewhat or very confident in their ability to design and deliver effective instruction for EL students (see Figure 7).

**Figure 7. Summary of Educators’ Perceptions of Their Comfort Teaching EL Students**

Figure Note: The responses represented in this figure are from 146 educators who submitted information about their background. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 7)](#Figure_7E).

**Based on the information reported by participating educators, it appears that this educator sample was relatively experienced (as demonstrated by the average of 16 years in the profession), very familiar and confident with the state’s primary ELD resources (the CA ELD Standards and the CA ELA/ELD Framework), and very familiar with teaching EL students. It is likely that this sample may be more experienced and more proficient with instructing EL students than the California teacher population as a whole.** This means that findings and interpretations based on this sample should be interpreted through this lens. For example, if educators in this sample report that the OPTEL tool is easy to use, one might expect that this rating is higher than teachers who are less experienced or less confident in their ability to provide high-quality instruction for EL students.

Student Sample

Educators used the OPTEL tool to observe 754 unique students. Of these 754 students, 435 were observed by two educators (as was the field test design), and 319 were only observed by one. This section describes the sample of all students, regardless of whether they were observed by one or two educators.

The students in the OPTEL field test were from every grade, with an average of 58 students observed per grade. A larger number of students in the OPTEL field test sample were in secondary school than were in elementary school (see Table 5). Given that there are more EL students in elementary grades than secondary grades in California, this means that secondary grade EL students are overrepresented in the field test and that elementary grade EL students are underrepresented.

**Table 5. Student Grade Level**

| Grade  | Number | Percent | Statewide % of EL Students (2022–23 School Year) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Transitional Kindergarten/Kindergarten | <10 | <1% | 11.7% |
| 1 | ~45 | ~6% | 9.6% |
| 2 | ~50 | ~6.5% | 9.3% |
| 3 | ~70 | ~9% | 9.5% |
| 4 | ~75 | ~10% | 9.1% |
| 5 | ~60 | ~8% | 8.9% |
| 6 | ~75 | ~10% | 7.7% |
| 7 | ~110 | ~15% | 6.5% |
| 8 | ~55 | ~7% | 6.1% |
| 9 | ~45 | ~6% | 5.9% |
| 10 | ~90 | ~11% | 5.7% |
| 11 | ~35 | ~4.5% | 5.1% |
| 12 | ~40 | ~6% | 4.8% |

Table Note: Cells with fewer than 10 students are suppressed and accompanying cells rounded. Total *n=*754 students who were observed in the OPTEL field test. While educators’ assigned grade level is not available to summarize, student grade level will likely reflect the grade level for those who are classroom teachers.

Of the 754 students observed, 659 (87.4%) had ELPAC scores from the 2022–23 school year; the other 95 students (12.6%) were missing this information, partly due to educators providing identifiers for students that did not match their statewide student identifier. As shown in Table 6, across all grades for the 659 students with 2022–23 school year ELPAC scores, a larger proportion of the included students were at ELPAC Levels 3 and 2 (34.0% and 24.9%, respectively). The smallest group of students were those at ELPAC Level 1 (17.5%). The percentages are well aligned with the statewide distribution of EL students across ELPAC levels.

**Table 6. 2022–23 Overall ELPAC Scores of Students in the OPTEL Field Test**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022–23 Overall ELPAC Level | Number | Percent | Statewide % of EL Students(2021–22 School Year) |
| Level 1 | 115 | 17.5% | 18.5% |
| Level 2 | 164 | 24.9% | 30.7% |
| Level 3 | 224 | 34.0% | 35.2% |
| Level 4 | 156 | 23.7% | 15.6% |

Table Note: Total *n=*659 students who had 2022–23 ELPAC scores.

As shown in Table 7, a majority of the student sample (584 students, 84.6%) spoke Spanish as their home language. The next four most frequently reported languages were Vietnamese, Mandarin (Putonghua), Japanese, and Arabic.

**Table 7. Student Home Language**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Home Language | Number | Percent | Statewide % of EL Students (2022–23 School Year) |
| Spanish | 584 | 84.6% | 81.9% |
| Vietnamese | 22 | 3.2% | 1.9% |
| Mandarin (Putonghua) | 11 | 1.6% | 1.8% |
| Japanese | <10 | ~1.0% | 0.4% |
| Arabic | <10 | ~1.0% | 1.4% |
| Other Languages (24 languages) | ~60 | ~9% | 12.6% |

Table Note: Cells with fewer than 10 students are suppressed and accompanying cells rounded. Total *n=*690 students who had home language information.

As shown in Table 8, approximately 12.3 percent of students in the sample (81 students total) were identified as having an IEP, which is slightly lower than the statewide percentage. Although not included in the table, less than 1 percent of students observed had a Section 504 Plan, which is lower than the statewide proportion of EL students of 17.2 percent. It is important to ensure that the OPTEL tool is being used appropriately with this population of students given their unique experiences and needs. Educators were explicitly invited to include and observe students with IEPs and Section 504 Plans.

**Table 8. Students in the OPTEL Field Test Who Have an IEP**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Have an IEP | Number | Percent | Statewide % of EL Students (2022–23 School Year) |
| Yes | 81 | 12.3% | 17.2% |
| No | 578 | 87.7% | 82.8% |

Table Note: Total *n=*659 students who had information on whether the student has an IEP.

Less than 1 percent of students observed took the Summative Alternate ELPAC in the 2022–23 school year (Table 9). The Summative Alternate ELPAC is the summative English language proficiency assessment administered in California for EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The number of EL students who took the Summative Alternate ELPAC is too small for the analyses to confirm that the OPTEL is a valid tool for students who take the Summative Alternate ELPAC. Given the different performance levels on the Alternate ELPAC and the general ELPAC, these students are excluded from analyses that draw on OPTEL ratings and ELPAC performance levels but included for all others.

**Table 9. Students in the OPTEL Field Test Who Took the 2022–23 Summative Alternate ELPAC**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Took the 2022–23 Alternate Summative ELPAC | Number | Percent | Statewide % of EL Students (2022–23 School Year) |
| Yes | <10 | <1% | 1% |
| No | ~650 | ~99% | 99% |

Table Note: Cells with fewer than 10 students are suppressed and accompanying cells rounded. There were ~100 students who had missing information.

**Comparing percentages of the statewide EL student population who have the characteristics discussed in this section to the study proportions suggests that the OPTEL field test student population is fairly well aligned with the statewide population along dimensions of language and ELPAC level.** Among the students in the OPTEL field test, a larger proportion are in secondary grades than the statewide population of EL students as a whole, and a lower proportion are students with an IEP, with a 504 Plan, or who took the Summative Alternate ELPAC.

Summary of Findings

This section summarizes findings from the OPTEL field test. This section first describes general summary findings regarding student OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings, then describes results for each of the four research questions. More detailed information about how these results were calculated is provided in Appendix A.

General Summary of Student OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings

When submitting their OPTEL ratings, educators reported how many times they observed a student, the setting of each observation, and the types of interactions students engaged in while being observed. In producing both expressive and receptive ratings, educators reported observing each student a median of two times. The specific number of observations reported, however, ranged considerably, from a single observation to 100 reported observations.

For both expressive and receptive ratings, the most common observation setting was an ELA class (48.2% and 46.8% of observations, respectively), followed by an ELD class (24.9% and 26.0% of observations, respectively). Math was the third most common observation setting for both expressive and receptive ratings, at about 11 percent of ratings. Although educators did observe students in science, history/social science, and other class settings, such observations were less frequent (4% to 7% of total observations).

For expressive ratings, the most frequent types of interpersonal interactions on which educators reported they based their ratings were whole-group interactions (40.5% of observations), followed by small-group interactions (32.3%), pairs (19.3%), and then other (7.7%). Similarly, for receptive ratings, the most frequent types of interpersonal interactions on which educators reported they based their ratings were whole-group interactions (45.8% of observations), followed by small-group interactions (32.4%), pairs (14.0%), and then other (7.7%).

Figure 8 plots the number of OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings at each level across 1,189 unique ratings, representing 754 unique students. Overall, educators in the field test were more likely to rate students at OPTEL Levels 3 and 4 than Levels 1 and 2.

**Figure 8. Student OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings**

Figure Note. This figure displays 1,189 OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings, given to 754 students. Four hundred thirty-five students received two ratings from two distinct educators; 319 students received a single rating. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 8)](#Figure_8E).

Table 10 shows a cross-tabulation of students’ OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings when provided by the same educator. Numbers on the diagonal indicate that the student received the same two ratings (e.g., a student who received a rating of Level 3 on both the OPTEL receptive scale and the OPTEL expressive scale from the educator who observed them). Numbers off the diagonals indicate that a student earned a higher score on one scale than on the other. When observing a student, educators generally gave students similar ratings on the expressive and receptive scales. Overall, educators gave students the same rating on both scales 72.0 percent of the time. Students’ OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings were correlated at 0.86. When teachers rated students differently on the two OPTEL scales, they tended to rate students higher on the receptive scale.

**Table 10. Cross-Tabulations of Student OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings When Provided by the Same Educator**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Receptive Rating: 1 | Receptive Rating: 2 | Receptive Rating: 3 | Receptive Rating: 4 | Row Total |
| **Expressive Rating: 1** | 152 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 196 |
| **Expressive Rating: 2** | 17 | 199 | 88 | 7 | 311 |
| **Expressive Rating: 3** | 1 | 47 | 236 | 79 | 363 |
| **Expressive Rating: 4** | 1 | 1 | 48 | 269 | 319 |
| **Column Total** | 171 | 289 | 374 | 355 | 1,189 |

Table Note. This figure displays 1,189 OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings, given to 754 students. Four hundred thirty-five students received two ratings from two distinct educators; 319 students received a single rating.

Key Finding for Research Question 1: Within Educator Pairs, Educators’ Ratings of Students’ English Language Proficiency Skills Were Aligned a Majority of the Time

The WestEd team conducted quantitative analyses of OPTEL ratings to explore the extent to which educators who observed the same student provided consistent OPTEL ratings. The intent of these analyses was to provide evidence on whether students’ OPTEL ratings reflect differences in students’ English language skills, rather than differences attributable to the person who did the observation. The WestEd team looked at cross-tabulations, as well as at a statistical measure of interrater reliability.

Educators’ Ratings of Students’ Expressive English Language Proficiency Skills Were Generally Well Aligned

**Educators’ ratings of students’ expressive English language proficiency skills were aligned (i.e., they gave the same rating value) 66.2 percent of the time. Expressive ratings were adjacent (differed by one level) 28.7 percent of the time, differed by two levels 5.1 percent of the time, and never by three levels.** Figure 9 shows how often two teachers gave the same student the same rating on the OPTEL expressive scale. Specifically, the number of OPTEL receptive ratings is plotted at the intersection of the rating determined by the two educators in the pair. On the expressive scale, 53 students were given a rating of Level 1 by both educators, 79 students were given a rating of Level 2 by both educators, 76 students were given a rating of Level 3 by both educators, and 80 students were given a rating of Level 4 by both educators. The size of the circle at each intersection represents the relative frequency of students who received that combination of ratings. The more ratings that fall on the diagonal, the higher the rate of agreement among educator pairs. Figure 8 shows this to be the case.

**Figure 9. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs – Expressive**

Figure Note. This figure displays 870 ratings for 435 students who were rated by two educators in the OPTEL field test. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 9)](#Figure_9E).

As another measure of interrater reliability, the WestEd team calculated the kappa statistic. The kappa statistic assesses rater agreement while also correcting for the likelihood of chance agreement (i.e., that raters would randomly assign the same rating simply due to chance), which is possible in any scenario in which multiple raters are being asked to assign ratings. For OPTEL expressive ratings, the kappa value was 0.54, which is, as expected, lower than raw alignment values given the correction for random chance agreement. Research benchmarks would quantify this as moderate agreement.[[3]](#footnote-3) **This moderate agreement is evidence of the OPTEL tool’s reliability, given that educators had limited training and observation time and may have had different familiarity with the students they observed.**

Educators’ Ratings of Students’ Receptive English Language Proficiency Skills Were Generally Well Aligned

**Overall, educators’ ratings of students’ receptive English language proficiency skills were aligned 65.5 percent of the time. Receptive ratings differed by one level 31.0 percent of the time, by two levels 3.4 percent of the time, and never by three levels.**

Figure 10 shows how often two teachers gave the same student the same rating on the OPTEL receptive scales. As seen in Figure 10, on the receptive scale, 41 students were given a rating of Level 1 by both teachers, 71 students were given a rating of Level 2 by both teachers, 77 students were given a rating of Level 3 by both teachers, and 96 students were given a rating of Level 4 by both teachers.

**Figure 10. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs – Receptive**

Figure Note. This figure displays 870 ratings for 435 students who were rated by two educators in the OPTEL field test. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 10)](#Figure_10E).

To assess interrater reliability for receptive ratings, the WestEd team again calculated the kappa statistic. **For OPTEL receptive ratings, the kappa value was also 0.54, which indicates moderate agreement.[[4]](#footnote-4)**

Across Students at Various ELPAC Levels, the Percentage of Educators’ OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings That Were Aligned Was Moderate or Higher, but Alignment Was Highest for Students at ELPAC Levels 1 and 2

We calculated the percentage of aligned OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings within educator pairs separately for students at each ELPAC performance level, based on students’ 2022–23 ELPAC performance. In other words, for all students at each ELPAC level, we calculated the proportion who received the same rating from each educator who observed them. These percentages are displayed in Figure 11. For the 397 students who were rated by two educators and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing, educators’ OPTEL expressive ratings were aligned at a higher percentage when they were observing students at ELPAC Levels 1 and 2, both with alignment rates over 70 percent. Alignment rates of OPTEL expressive ratings within educator pairs were lower for students at ELPAC Levels 3 and 4, with alignment rates of 57.0 percent and 58.3 percent, respectively. However, across all levels, alignment remained moderate or higher and differences in alignment were almost always only different by one level.

**Figure 11. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs by ELPAC Performance Level – Expressive**

Figure Note. This figure displays alignment for 397 students who were rated by two educators and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 11)](#Figure_11E).

Educators’ OPTEL receptive ratings were also aligned at a higher percentage when they were observing students at ELPAC performance Levels 1 and 2, with alignment rates of 70.7 percent and 68.4 percent (see Figure 12). Alignment rates of OPTEL receptive ratings within educator pairs were lower for students at ELPAC Levels 3 and 4, with alignment rates of 54.9 percent and 65.6 percent, respectively.

**Figure 12. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs by ELPAC Performance Level – Receptive**

Figure Note. This figure displays alignment for 397 students who were rated by two educators and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 12)](#Figure_12E).

Overall, moderate agreement for both the expressive and receptive scales indicates that educators were aligned in many instances. However, there were also some instances of misalignment in students’ OPTEL ratings when observed by two different educators. In addition to statistical measures of raw alignment and agreement accounting for chance agreement, the conclusion of moderate alignment is also supported by the observation that, in the case of misalignment, the difference tended to be a single level, rather than multiple. A degree of misalignment is expected, given that educators conducted a median of just two observations, that there was minimal training and guidance, and that one educator may have been the student’s primary teacher whereas the other may not have been as familiar with the student. **The evidence suggests that the OPTEL tool can be used reliably across educators, but it also indicates a need for robust guidance and supports for educators to enable them to use the tool appropriately and consistently. Given that misalignment between educator ratings for the same student tended to be higher for students at ELPAC Levels 3 and 4, this guidance may be particularly important for students with more advanced English language proficiency to ensure reliable use at all ELPAC levels, especially when determining student readiness for reclassification.**

Key Finding for Research Question 2: Educators’ Ratings of Students’ English Language Proficiency Skills Were Moderately Aligned with Students’ Overall ELPAC Performance Levels

The WestEd team conducted quantitative analyses examining the relationship between students’ OPTEL ratings and students’ ELPAC overall performance levels from the 2022–23 school year to explore the extent to which the two different types of information on students’ English language proficiency skills aligned or diverged. For each OPTEL rating a student received (either a single rating or two ratings depending on if educators submitted in pairs), that rating was then analyzed for alignment with students’ overall ELPAC performance level. The main intent of these analyses was to provide evidence on whether the OPTEL tool’s construction supported valid measurement of students’ English language proficiency in the classroom. However, given that the OPTEL tool provides distinct ratings of students’ expressive and receptive skills in comparison with the overall ELPAC performance level, it is also expected that the correlation would not be strong. **If students’ scores on the two different instruments appear to be moderately or strongly correlated, that would provide evidence that the OPTEL tool is measuring a similar construct to the ELPAC—that of student English language proficiency. If the correlation was very strongly or perfectly correlated, however, that also might indicate that the OPTEL tool is not providing additional information on students’ English language proficiency.** As an additional exploration of construct validity, the same analyses were conducted examining the relationship between students’ OPTEL ratings and the response that teachers provided to the question “How close do you think the student is to reclassification?” This provides an additional measure of students’ English language proficiency to correlate with OPTEL ratings.

Students’ OPTEL Expressive Ratings Were Moderately Positively Correlated with Their ELPAC Scores

As shown in Table 11, of the 1,062 ratings included in the analysis (some ratings were not included because students did not have ELPAC scores), 511 of the student OPTEL expressive ratings aligned with their ELPAC performance level. That is an alignment rate of 48.1 percent. This means that the OPTEL expressive rating given to 551 students (51.9%) was either higher or lower than their overall ELPAC performance level. This degree of misalignment is somewhat expected, given that the ELPAC levels are overall performance levels, rather than a specific measure of expressive English language proficiency skills.

**Table 11. Cross-Tabulations of Student OPTEL Expressive Ratings and ELPAC Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 1 | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 2 | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 3 | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 4 | Row Total |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 1** | 112 | 51 | 15 | 3 | 181 |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 2** | 45 | 118 | 74 | 22 | 259 |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 3** | 19 | 107 | 153 | 89 | 368 |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 4** | 2 | 24 | 100 | 128 | 254 |
| **Column Total** | 178 | 300 | 342 | 242 | 1,062 |

Table Note. The responses in this table represent 1,062 ratings of 664 students who had at least one rating and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. Three hundred ninety-seven students have two ratings; 267 have only one due to their educator not submitting ratings with a partner.

For OPTEL expressive ratings that differed from overall ELPAC performance levels, the vast majority (84.6%) were only different by one level. Figure 13 plots the alignment of student OPTEL expressive ratings and ELPAC overall performance levels, with the size of the circle indicating the relative number of ratings at that intersection. As Figure 13 shows, the circles at the intersection of the same level on the OPTEL expressive scale and the overall ELPAC tend to be the largest, indicating alignment. Additionally, differences in alignment tend to be by one level, with very few instances where students’ ELPAC level and OPTEL rating differ by more than one level.

**Figure 13. Alignment of Student OPTEL Expressive Ratings and ELPAC Overall Performance Levels**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,062 ratings of 664 students who had at least one rating and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. Three hundred ninety-seven students have two ratings; 267 have only one due to their educator not submitting ratings with a partner. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 13)](#Figure_13E).

Figure 14 displays the percentage of ratings at each OPTEL expressive level by students’ overall ELPAC performance level. For students at ELPAC Level 1, the majority of OPTEL expressive ratings were also Level 1 (61.9%). Educators tended to give students at ELPAC Level 2 whose ratings were not aligned a higher OPTEL expressive rating than their ELPAC performance level, with 37.1 percent of students who were at ELPAC Level 2 receiving an OPTEL expressive rating of Level 3 or 4, in comparison with 17.4 percent who received an OPTEL expressive rating of Level 1. In contrast, educators tended to give students at ELPAC Level 3 whose ratings were not aligned a lower OPTEL expressive rating than their ELPAC performance level, rather than higher, with 34.3 percent of students at ELPAC performance Level 3 receiving an OPTEL expressive rating of Level 1 or 2, in comparison with 24.2 percent who received an OPTEL expressive rating of Level 4. Roughly half of students at ELPAC Level 4 received an OPTEL expressive rating of Level 4, while 39.4% received an OPTEL expressive rating of Level 3. This means that, for students at ELPAC Level 4 (who are eligible, by the state’s standards, to be considered for reclassification), a majority (50.4%) also received OPTEL expressive ratings of Level 4, and about 90% received OPTEL expressive ratings of either Level 3 or 4.

**Figure 14. Student OPTEL Expressive Ratings by ELPAC Performance Level**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,062 ratings of 664 students who had at least one rating and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. Three hundred ninety-seven students have two ratings; 267 have only one due to their educator not submitting ratings with a partner. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 14)](#Figure_14E).

As shown in Table 12, of the 1,062 OPTEL receptive ratings included in the analysis, 499 of the student OPTEL receptive ratings aligned with their ELPAC performance level, an alignment rate of 47 percent. This means that the OPTEL receptive rating for 563 students (53.0%) was higher or lower than their overall ELPAC performance level. Again, this degree of misalignment is somewhat expected, given that the ELPAC levels are overall performance levels, rather than a specific measure of receptive English language proficiency skills.

**Table 12. Cross-Tabulations of Student OPTEL Receptive Ratings and ELPAC Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 1 | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 2 | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 3 | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 4 | Row Total |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 1** | 103 | 55 | 19 | 4 | 181 |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 2** | 41 | 112 | 81 | 25 | 259 |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 3** | 14 | 94 | 150 | 110 | 368 |
| **ELPAC Overall Performance Level 4** | 1 | 15 | 104 | 134 | 254 |
| **Column Total** | 159 | 276 | 354 | 273 | 1,062 |

Table Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,062 ratings of 664 students who had at least one rating and whose ELPAC 2022–23 scores were not missing. Three hundred ninety-seven students have two ratings; 267 have only one due to their educator not submitting ratings with a partner.

Of OPTEL receptive ratings that differed from overall ELPAC performance levels, the vast majority (86.1%) differed by only one level. Figure 15 plots the alignment of students’ OPTEL receptive ratings and their ELPAC overall performance level, with the size of the circle indicating the number of ratings at that intersection. Again, the circles on the diagonal tend to be largest, indicating alignment, while circles at the intersection where alignment varies by one level are also sizable.

**Figure 15. Alignment of Student OPTEL Receptive Ratings and ELPAC Overall Performance Levels**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,062 ratings of 664 students who had at least one rating and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. Three hundred ninety-seven students have two ratings; 267 have only one due to their educator not submitting ratings with a partner. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 15)](#Figure_15E).

Figure 16 displays the percentage of ratings at each OPTEL receptive level by students’ overall ELPAC performance level. For students at ELPAC Level 1, the majority of OPTEL receptive ratings were also Level 1 (56.9%). As with expressive ratings, educators tended to give students at ELPAC Level 2 whose ratings were not aligned a higher OPTEL receptive rating (41%), rather than lower (15.8%). However, in a pattern that differs from expressive ratings, for students at ELPAC Level 3 educators gave students either higher or lower receptive ratings at almost identical percentages of about 30 percent. Over half of the OPTEL receptive ratings given to students at ELPAC Level 4 were also Level 4, with very few being Level 1 or 2. This means that, for students at ELPAC Level 4 (who are eligible, by the state’s standards, to be considered for reclassification), a majority (52.8%) also received OPTEL receptive ratings of Level 4, and over 95% received OPTEL receptive ratings of either Level 3 or 4.

**Figure 16. Student OPTEL Receptive Ratings by ELPAC Performance Level**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,062 ratings of 664 students who had at least one rating and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. Three hundred ninety-seven students have two ratings; 267 have only one due to their educator not submitting ratings with a partner. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 16)](#Figure_16E).

**The correlation between students’ expressive ratings from the OPTEL field test and their overall ELPAC performance level was 0.61, and the correlation between students’ receptive ratings from the OPTEL field test and their overall ELPAC performance level was also 0.61. This is a moderate, positive correlation between OPTEL ratings and overall ELPAC performance levels.[[5]](#footnote-5)** This moderate level of alignment is expected, given that the ELPAC and the OPTEL are measuring different things (overall English language proficiency in contrast with domain-specific English language proficiency skills), and also somewhat desirable, as they confirm that they OPTEL is not entirely redundant with the information provided by the ELPAC.

Students’ OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings Were Well Aligned with Educator Perceptions of Student Proximity to Reclassification for Students at the Highest and Lowest OPTEL Rating Levels

To analyze the alignment between students’ OPTEL ratings and educator perceptions of student proximity to reclassification, alignment was first analyzed between educator perceptions of student proximity to reclassification and student ELPAC performance levels, to see the extent to which educators’ perceptions are in line with, or diverge from, conclusions that would be made from students’ ELPAC results regarding reclassification.

Table 13 summarizes how close to reclassification educators felt the student was and the ELPAC performance level they received. As seen in Table 13, for students at ELPAC Level 1, educators overwhelmingly tended to perceive them as not close to reclassification (*n=*153, 84.5%). For students at ELPAC Level 2, 46.3 percent of educators felt they were not close to reclassification (*n*=120), while 41.7 percent felt that they were somewhat close (*n*=108). For students at ELPAC Level 3, educators tended to perceive them as either somewhat close to reclassification (*n*=152, 41.3%) or very close to reclassification (*n*=148, 40.2%). Finally, for students at ELPAC Level 4, the majority felt that they were very close to reclassification (*n*=173, 68.1%), while 29.1 percent felt they were somewhat close (*n*=74). Table 13 provides evidence that educators’ perceptions of student proximity to reclassification tend to be aligned with the conclusions that would be drawn from their ELPAC performance level, although there were sizable proportions that may have diverged. For example, while the majority of educators felt students at ELPAC Level 4 were very close to reclassification, there were still almost 30% who felt they were somewhat, rather than very, close to reclassification. These results provide context for examining the alignment between students’ OPTEL expressive ratings and educator perceptions of student proximity to reclassification, lending both credibility that the perceptions tend to align with other measures of English language proficiency, and providing evidence that the two different measures may capture different elements of students’ English language proficiency and readiness for reclassification given the imperfect alignment.

**Table 13. Cross-Tabulations of Educator Perceptions of Student Proximity to Reclassification and ELPAC Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Educator Perception of Student Proximity to Reclassification  | ELPAC Performance Level 1 | ELPAC Performance Level 2 | ELPAC Performance Level 3 | ELPAC Performance Level 4 | Row Total |
| **Not Close** | 153 | 120 | 68 | 7 | 348 |
| **Somewhat Close** | 24 | 108 | 152 | 74 | 358 |
| **Very Close** | 4 | 31 | 148 | 173 | 356 |
| **Column Total** | 181 | 259 | 368 | 254 | 1,062 |

Table Note. The responses in this table represent 1,062 ratings of 664 students who had at least one rating and whose 2022–23 ELPAC scores were not missing. Three hundred ninety-seven students have two ratings; 267 have only one due to their educator not submitting ratings with a partner.

Table 14 provides evidence on the extent to which students’ OPTEL expressive ratings are aligned with educator perceptions of student proximity to reclassification. Of the students who received OPTEL expressive ratings of Level 1, 93.3 percent were also reported to be not close to reclassification by the educator who observed. For Level 2, about half were reported to be not close to reclassification (*n*=156), whereas just fewer than half were reported to be somewhat close to reclassification (*n*=141). For Level 3, a little over half were reported to be somewhat close to reclassification (*n*=203), with an additional 37.4 percent reported to be very close (*n*=136). Of the students who received OPTEL expressive ratings of Level 4, 89.3 percent were reported as being very close to reclassification (*n*=285). **These results suggest that, for students at the highest and lowest OPTEL expressive rating levels, the OPTEL ratings align well with educators’ perceptions of students’ readiness for reclassification. For students at the middle OPTEL rating levels, there is greater heterogeneity in educator perceptions regarding students’ readiness for reclassification.**

**Table 14. Cross-Tabulations of Student OPTEL Expressive Ratings and Educator Perceptions of Student Proximity to Reclassification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Educator Perception of Student Proximity to Reclassification  | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 1 | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 2 | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 3 | OPTEL Expressive Rating: Level 4 | Row Total |
| **Not Close** | 183 | 156 | 24 | 6 | 369 |
| **Somewhat Close** | 10 | 141 | 203 | 28 | 382 |
| **Very Close** | 3 | 14 | 136 | 285 | 438 |
| **Column Total** | 196 | 311 | 363 | 319 | 1,189 |

Table Note. This figure displays 1,189 OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings, given to 754 students. Four hundred thirty-five students received two ratings from two distinct educators; 319 students received a single rating.

Table 15 summarizes how close to reclassification educators felt the student was and the OPTEL receptive ratings they received. Of the students who received OPTEL receptive ratings of Level 1, 95.9% were also reported to be not close to reclassification by the educator who observed (*n*=164). For Level 2, over half were reported to be not close to reclassification (*n*=165), and about 40 percent were reported to be somewhat close to reclassification (*n*=116). For Level 3, 61.8 percent were reported to be somewhat close to reclassification (*n*=231), with an additional 29.7 percent reported to be very close (*n*=111). Similarly, for students who received OPTEL receptive ratings of Level 4, 89.0 percent were reported as being very close to reclassification (*n*=316). **As with expressive ratings, these results suggest that, for students at the highest and lowest OPTEL expressive rating levels, the OPTEL ratings tend to align with educators’ perceptions of students’ readiness for reclassification. For students at the middle OPTEL rating levels, educator perceptions regarding students’ readiness for reclassification are more divergent.**

**Table 15. Cross-Tabulations of Student OPTEL Receptive Ratings and Educator Perceptions of Student Proximity to Reclassification**

| Educator Perception of Student Proximity to Reclassification  | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 1 | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 2 | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 3 | OPTEL Receptive Rating: Level 4 | Row Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Not Close** | 164 | 165 | 32 | 8 | 369 |
| **Somewhat Close** | 4 | 116 | 231 | 31 | 382 |
| **Very Close** | 3 | 8 | 111 | 316 | 438 |
| **Column Total** | 171 | 289 | 374 | 355 | 1,189 |

Table Note. This figure displays 1,189 OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings, given to 754 students. Four hundred thirty-five students received two ratings from two distinct educators; 319 students received a single rating.

Overall, the moderate agreement between OPTEL and ELPAC performance indicates that the OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings are measuring moderately similar constructs to the overall ELPAC performance level, but that they are not measuring highly or completely similar constructs. This evidence is coupled with alignment between educator perceptions of student proximity to reclassification and student OPTEL ratings, which provides evidence that the OPTEL tool is capturing relevant information on educators’ judgment of students’ English language proficiency skills in the context of reclassification. **Together, these pieces of evidence provide support for the construct validity of the OPTEL tool and again also support the need to provide guidance and supports for educators to implement the OPTEL tool in a way that ensures it is being used consistently.**

Key Finding for Research Question 3: Students’ OPTEL Ratings Did Not Consistently Vary Based on Educator or Student Characteristics, Although There Were Some Differences by Student Characteristics at Certain English Language Proficiency Levels

The WestEd team also conducted quantitative analyses to examine the extent to which variation in OPTEL ratings may be due to educator or student characteristics. The purpose behind these analyses was to provide evidence on the extent to which OPTEL ratings reflect actual differences in students’ English language proficiency skills, as opposed to factors that should not be related to their English language proficiency, such as whether the educator has relatively little awareness of the ELD standards or whether the student has an IEP or a Section 504 Plan. More information on the methods is provided in Appendix A.

Students’ OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings Did Not Significantly Vary by Whether Educators’ Held an ELD or a BCLAD Certification

The WestEd team descriptively examined the extent of variability in OPTEL expressive ratings based on certain educator characteristics. The analysis was restricted to comparisons among students with similar English language proficiency levels, as measured by their 2022–23 ELPAC scores.

Figure 17 plots average OPTEL expressive ratings by two variables—students’ 2022–23 ELPAC levels and whether or not the educator assigning the rating held an ELD or a BCLAD certification. The bars represent the average rating given to students either by teachers who did hold an ELD or a BCLAD certification or by teachers who did not hold such a certification. As the figure shows, across the groups of students at each ELPAC level, educators without an ELD or a BCLAD certification tended to give students slightly higher ratings. These differences were very small for students across ELPAC levels, with the largest difference observed for students at ELPAC Level 2. However, on average, there were no significant rating differences between teachers who did or did not hold an ELD or a BCLAD certification.

**Figure 17. Average OPTEL Expressive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether or Not the Rating Educator Held an ELD or a BCLAD Certification**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 939 ratings of 617 students who had at least one rating, whose ELPAC 2022–23 scores were not missing, and whose rating educator reported whether or not they held an ELD or a BCLAD certification. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 17)](#Figure_17E).

Similarly, Figure 18 plots average OPTEL receptive ratings by students’ ELPAC levels and whether or not the educator assigning the rating for the students at that ELPAC level held an ELD or a BCLAD certification. The patterns observed were similar to those observed in the expressive ratings, with no significant differences based on whether or not teachers held an ELD or a BCLAD certification.

**Figure 18. Average OPTEL Receptive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether or Not the Rating Educator Held an ELD or a BCLAD Certification**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 939 ratings of 617 students who had at least one rating, whose ELPAC 2022–23 scores were not missing, and whose rating educator reported whether or not they held an ELD or a BCLAD certification. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 18)](#Figure_18E).

Students’ OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings Did Not Consistently Vary by Student Characteristics, But Did Vary in Some Instances for Students at Certain ELPAC Levels

The WestEd team descriptively examined the extent of variability in OPTEL expressive ratings based on student characteristics. Figure 19 plots average OPTEL expressive ratings by two variables—students’ 2022–23 ELPAC levels and whether the student’s home language was Spanish or another language. As the figure shows, there were some differences. For students whose ELPAC levels were Levels 1 and 2, average OPTEL expressive ratings were lower for students whose home language was not Spanish, whereas for students at ELPAC Levels 3 and 4, the reverse was true. However, the only statistically significant differences were for students at ELPAC Levels 1 and 2, where students whose home language was Spanish were given, on average, higher OPTEL expressive ratings.

**Figure 19. Average OPTEL Expressive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students’ Home Language Was Spanish**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,034 ratings of 644 students who had at least one rating and whose home language data and ELPAC 2022–23 scores were not missing. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 19)](#Figure_19E).

Figure 20 plots a similar pattern in students’ average OPTEL receptive ratings by students’ ELPAC levels and whether the student’s home language was Spanish or another language. As with expressive ratings, for students at ELPAC Levels 1 and 2, students whose home language was Spanish were given, on average, significantly higher OPTEL expressive ratings.

**Figure 20. Average OPTEL Receptive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students’ Home Language Was Spanish**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,034 ratings of 644 students who had at least one rating and whose home language data and ELPAC 2022–23 scores were not missing. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 20)](#Figure_20E).

Figure 21 plots average OPTEL expressive ratings by two variables—students’ 2022–23 ELPAC levels and whether the student was reported as having an IEP or a Section 504 Plan. As the figure shows, among students with the same ELPAC level, students without an IEP or a Section 504 Plan had, on average, higher expressive ratings than students with an IEP or a Section 504 Plan, with the exception of students at ELPAC Level 1. The difference was only statistically significant for students at ELPAC Level 3—the observed differences at ELPAC Levels 2 and 4 were not precise enough to reject the hypothesis that the difference is zero. This is evidence that, for students with ELPAC scores at Level 3, educators’ ratings may be slightly downwardly biased for students with an IEP or a Section 504 Plan, although the same pattern was not observed for students at higher and lower ELPAC performance levels.

**Figure 21. Average OPTEL Expressive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students Have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,034 ratings of 644 students who had at least one rating, whose IEP and Section 504 Plan status and ELPAC 2022–23 scores were available. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 21)](#Figure_21E).

Similarly, Figure 22 plots average OPTEL receptive ratings by two variables—students’ 2022–23 ELPAC levels and whether the student was reported as having an IEP or a Section 504 Plan. The same pattern was observed as that for expressive ratings, with educators giving students at ELPAC Level 3 who do not have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan significantly higher ratings, on average, than students at ELPAC Level 3 who do have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan.For students with ELPAC scores at Level 3, educators’ ratings may be slightly downwardly biased for students with an IEP or a Section 504 Plan, although this pattern was not observed for students at higher and lower ELPAC performance levels.

**Figure 22. Average OPTEL Receptive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students Have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan**

Figure Note. The responses in this figure represent 1,034 ratings of 644 students who had at least one rating, whose IEP and Section 504 Plan status and ELPAC 2022–23 scores were available. This figure is fully described in [Appendix D (Figure 22)](#Figure_22E).

Other student characteristics examined, but not presented graphically, were gender and student grade level. For gender, there were no observed significant differences in the average OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings. When looking at variation in OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings by student grade level among students at the same ELPAC performance level, there were some significant differences observed. Specifically, there were significant differences in average expressive ratings by grade level among students whose ELPAC scores were at Levels 2, 3, and 4 and in average receptive ratings among students whose ELPAC scores were at Levels 2 and 3. Sample sizes, however, were quite small among many of the groups of students by ELPAC level and grade, making these comparisons potentially unreliable.

Results from additional multilevel model analyses suggest that variation in student ratings is not substantially driven by educators.

The goal of these analyses was to examine the extent to which, among students with similar English language proficiency levels, OPTEL ratings appear to differ based on educator or student characteristics. Overall, results suggest that differences in OPTEL ratings are not primarily or overtly driven by differences in educators’ use of the OPTEL tool in response to their ELD or BCLAD certification training. However, the results provide evidence that one source of variability identified through these descriptive analyses was whether the educator was assigning different ratings for students with a home language other than Spanish, although only among students with lower overall ELPAC performance levels. Additionally, another source of variability identified through these descriptive analyses was whether the educator was assigning different ratings for students who have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan, with students at ELPAC Level 3 being rated significantly lower on OPTEL expressive and receptive if they had an IEP. Finally, there were some observed differences by student grade level among students at the same ELPAC level. While these differences may suggest that teachers assign ratings differentially in response to certain student characteristics, there is also the possibility that the OPTEL tool results are reflecting additional true variation in students’ skills—we are unable to determine which is true.

**However, these findings provide evidence that OPTEL rating reliability may be strengthened with additional training and resources to ensure that educators’ ratings of students are not impacted by their perceptions of or experience working with students from home language backgrounds other than Spanish or students with an IEP or a Section 504 Plan. Additionally, this provides evidence that OPTEL rating reliability may be strengthened with additional training and resources to ensure that educators’ ratings of students are not impacted by challenges in identifying grade-level English language proficiency skills for students across grade levels.**

Key Finding for Research Question 4: Educators Reported That the OPTEL Tool Is Easy to Use and Feasible for Use in the Classroom

The WestEd team analyzed educator responses to the four Likert-type questions that were designed to get educators’ feedback on both the OPTEL tool and the OPTEL field test process. The team also analyzed open-ended feedback responses. The intent behind these analyses was to use educators’ responses to provide evidence showing the extent to which educators who used the OPTEL tool felt that as designed, the tool was feasible for use in the classroom, as well as to provide evidence showing the feasibility of widespread implementation and use.

The four Likert-type questions to which educators were asked to respond were as follows:

* In general, how easy was it for you to use the OPTEL tool to rate students' language uses in the classroom?
* In general, how clear was the wording and meaning of the OPTEL performance descriptors?
* In general, how clear was the OPTEL tool in terms of how it should it be filled out and used?
* How helpful was the training webinar/video in helping you understand how to fill out the OPTEL tool?

Of the 196 educators who provided student ratings, 137 provided feedback about the clarity and usability of the OPTEL tool. More information on the survey questions is provided in Appendix C, and more information on how responses were analyzed is provided in Appendix A.

Overall, the feedback was positive. The vast majority of educators said that the OPTEL tool was easy or very easy to use (see Figure 23). Of the 137 educators who responded, 46 reported that the OPTEL tool was very easy to use, and 73 reported that it was easy to use. Combined, that translates into 86.9 percent of participating educators who reported the tool to be easy or very easy to use, in comparison with just 13.1 percent who found it difficult or very difficult to use.

**Figure 23. Teacher Feedback on the OPTEL Tool’s Ease of Use**

Figure Note. The responses represented in this figure are for 137 educators who provided feedback on the OPTEL tool.

As shown in Figure 24, 121 educators (88.3%) responded that the OPTEL tool was clear or very clear in how it should be filled out and used. Only 14 educators said the tool’s use was unclear, and only two teachers thought it was “very unclear,” for a total of 11.7 percent of the respondents.

**Figure 24. Teacher Feedback on the OPTEL Tool’s Clarity of Use**

Figure Note. The responses represented in this figure are for 137 educators who provided feedback on the OPTEL tool.

As shown in Figure 25, 123 educators (89.8%) responded that they found the OPTEL performance descriptors to be clear or very clear. Eleven teachers reported the performance descriptors to be “unclear,” and three reported them to be “very unclear” (10.2% in total).

**Figure 25. Teacher Feedback on the Clarity of OPTEL Performance Descriptors**

Figure Note. The responses represented in this figure are for 137 educators who provided feedback on the OPTEL tool.

Educators Reported That Training Videos Were Helpful

In addition to the central questions about the OPTEL tool itself, participating teachers had an opportunity to respond to questions about the training they received on how to use the OPTEL tool in the context of the study. As shown in Figure 26, a vast majority of teachers who viewed the training videos (131 of 137 respondents) found them to be somewhat helpful or very helpful (95.6%). Only three teachers (2.2%) reported that they did not view the videos. Another three respondents (2.2%) found the training videos to be “unhelpful.”

**Figure 26. Teacher Feedback on the Helpfulness of OPTEL Training Videos**

Figure Note. The responses represented in this figure are for 137 educators who provided feedback on the OPTEL tool.

Educators’ Open-Ended Feedback Highlighted Ways in Which the OPTEL Design Was Easy to Use While Also Noting Potential Improvements, Opportunities for Implementation Support, and Considerations to Support Ease of Use

In addition to the selected-response survey items summarized in previous sections, teachers were given the opportunity to provide open-ended feedback about their experience using the OPTEL tool, as follows:

* Please share any other comments you have about the OPTEL tool’s clarity or usability. Please be as specific as possible when referring to the tool's language or layout (e.g., if you found some language confusing, please let us know exactly what the language was).

A total of 137 educators provided some kind of open-ended feedback in response to this prompt, although three provided either “No comment” or “N/A” as their feedback. A brief summary of themes from those responses follows.

Forty-four respondents (32.1% of those who offered open-ended feedback) provided positive feedback about the OPTEL tool design. Twenty-one respondents either used the words “clear” or “simple” when describing the tool layout or performance descriptors, and twenty-two respondents described the use of the tool as “easy” or “straightforward.” As one example of positive feedback on the OPTEL tool design, one educator shared, “The wording and descriptions of the language levels/indicators are well written and clear,” and another educator provided the feedback that “the layout of the testing tool was very simple as well and easy to use/navigate.”

Eleven educators provided feedback on some of the challenges they encountered with the OPTEL tool’s design. Four respondents found the tool to be too wordy, dense, or overwhelming, and another four felt that the performance descriptors were vague or the categories broad. One educator shared that “the tool contained too much wording. The layout was overwhelming to the eyes.” Another educator shared their thoughts on how the forms and language were too vague and expressed that “the forms utilized are very vague and don’t offer enough descriptors to indicate an accurate observation of student progress/performance.” As one example of feedback on the tool’s design that focused on how some of the language was vague and could be clearer, one educator shared, “[For] linguistic supports—teachers may have differing opinions on what constitutes a support and what constitutes ‘substantial,’ ‘moderate,’ etc.”

Educators (39 in total) also provided constructive feedback on the tool’s design. One suggestion that was repeated across five respondents was editing the text to be less wordy or dense. For example, one educator suggested, “I think keeping the wording to a minimum is also helpful.” A related suggestion echoed across 12 respondents was to simplify the format to be more usable, with suggested changes including to add bullet points, add a word bank, change to a matrix format, and add a checklist or checkboxes.

Additional constructive feedback on the tool’s design focused on strengthening or clarifying the performance descriptors. Suggestions from 11 respondents included ways of doing so that included adding more in-depth performance descriptors, adding exemplars to accompany the performance descriptors, and clarifying the meaning of terms such as *sometimes, rarely, substantial,* and so on within the context of the OPTEL tool. For example, one educator shared, “I feel something that would be helpful for teachers to refer to as they are observing students include samples of evidence of what expressive and receptive language looks like and sounds like at each of the levels,” and another shared, “It was challenging to use a general and vague rubric that does not have clearly defined grade level expectations. I needed to spend time calibrating what ‘grade level peers’ referred to for every lesson I observed.”

Finally, 11 respondents suggested that expressive and receptive be broken down into the four domains of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. One educator shared, “I thought it was difficult to distinguish between the two domains in each category. For example, some students are proficient in speaking, but not in writing … I think it would be more helpful to have the four domains separated.”

Across these responses, clear takeaways emerged. These takeaways included an interest from educators who participated in the field test in further simplifying the OPTEL tool design, despite a great deal of positive feedback highlighting that the OPTEL tool was simple, clear, and straightforward to use. Additionally, there is interest from educators in having guidance that further clarifies the performance descriptors used in the tool to help educators be clear in what they are looking for and fully understand the scale being used.

Fifteen total educators provided positive feedback about the implementation process. Of these 15, eight shared that using the OPTEL tool in the classroom helped them get a better sense of their student’s English proficiency in the classroom. For example, one educator shared, “I think this is a great tool to help teachers identify the specific skills we should be looking for in terms of reclassification.” Another educator shared, “I believe the tool will help classroom teachers attain a better assessment of how students are progressing in language acquisition and demonstrating their abilities.” Another educator noted that the tool was also helpful for guiding instruction, noting that “the descriptors for each level really helped me to ‘see’ what kind of instruction, instructional supports, and activities should be considered and implemented to promote both expressive and receptive (comprehension) English language development as well as content learning.”

Thirty-two educators shared feedback highlighting challenges they encountered in using the OPTEL tool. Of these, 14 educators shared that the observation process, as conducted during the field test, was time-consuming and could be seen as a burden for teachers. For example, one educator expressed the concern that implementing the OPTEL tool “is too big a burden on already overwhelmed classroom teachers,” and another shared, “Realistically, I’m unsure when a classroom teacher can take the time to observe and complete this tool for each student who is reclassifying if they have an entire class of English language learners.”

Additionally, 13 educators shared that it was difficult to observe the necessary behaviors to generate ratings for students in the observations they had conducted. As an example, one educator noted, “[I]t was difficult to gather data because much of the instruction was direct, teacher to whole group. Students did not have many opportunities to demonstrate language proficiency,” and another shared, “Some students were not using language during my observations. That was a challenge.”

Further challenges included not always knowing what it meant for a student to be “at grade level,” which made it difficult for some educators: (1) to provide ratings, (2) to give an overall expressive or receptive rating if a student’s skills differed within the overall domain, (3) to use the tool in a bilingual setting where instruction was not delivered in English, and (4) to ensure that students with disabilities were observed appropriately and accurately.

Twelve participants provided constructive feedback focused on the OPTEL tool implementation process. Six educators shared that it would be helpful if there were more training videos or other resources developed to support teachers’ professional learning with the OPTEL tool, with specific suggestions that training focus on how teachers can support the instructional environment to support students’ demonstration of the skills, as well as an echoed call for more examples. Additionally, six educators felt that more guidance around how many observations should be conducted, as well as which teacher should conduct the observation, would be helpful.

Of the 137 educators who provided feedback, 24 reported that they used the OPTEL tool as a formative assessment tool to give feedback to students and/or as guide instruction focused on supporting development of academic language and of students’ English language proficiency. This was an optional part of the field test. Those 24 educators were asked to respond to four additional questions focused on use of the OPTEL tool to support documentation of formative evidence collected through: (a) techniques for determining progress toward learning targets, (b) techniques for using classroom-level criteria to assess academic achievement, (c) techniques for assessing engagement of all students, and (d) techniques for monitoring progress through peer reflection and self-assessment.

Key feedback on use of the OPTEL tool to support formative assessment practices tended to focus on the ways in which the tool could be used to adjust instruction or scaffolding for students, to discuss opportunities for growth with students, to track data on student progress, and to inform the students’ overall OPTEL rating. Some constructive feedback noted that the tool was sometimes seen as too dense or vague to be easily used in a formative way.

There were also key takeaways across the feedback on the OPTEL implementation process. One key takeaway is that the tool was seen as useful for deepening educators’ understanding of their students’ English language proficiency skills in the classroom. Another key takeaway is that with the limited training provided, educators encountered some challenges in using the OPTEL tool that can be targeted by strong guidance. Specific ways that guidance may support educators in their use of the OPTEL tool include providing more examples, providing guidance that further breaks down what educators are looking for, and providing information on how instruction can facilitate opportunities for students to demonstrate their skills. Additionally, the opportunity exists to provide guidance that can support educators who work with students with disabilities and those who work with students in bilingual settings, as those settings may require additional considerations for use of the OPTEL tool. Another takeaway is an interest from participants in guidance that helps to aggregate domain-specific skills into expressive and receptive overall ratings.

OPTEL Advisory Committee Role

The OPTEL Advisory Committee (OAC) is a group of educators and education experts from across the state of California who were convened three times over the course of the OPTEL tool’s development to review evidence on the OPTEL tool and provide feedback and recommendations to inform the OPTEL tool’s development. California Education Code Section 313.3 requires that a majority of the OAC be composed of classroom educators.

At the first OAC meeting, in spring 2019, OAC members reviewed a draft version of the tool and provided feedback on elements such as the overall usability of the tool for a variety of teachers across grade levels and content areas, the ability of the tool to identify EL student English language proficiency across a range of performance levels, and the alignment of the tool with California ELD standards and ELPAC levels. In response to the first OAC meeting, the WestEd team and the CDE team collaboratively implemented a set of recommended changes in advance of pilot testing the OPTEL tool.

At the second OAC meeting, in fall 2019, OAC members reviewed results from the OPTEL pilot study and provided feedback on recommended changes in response to evidence from the pilot study, as well as feedback on how to conduct the OPTEL field test. Much of the feedback focused on the organization of the tool and some of the language, with suggestions to recruit widely for the field test to allow for multiple observations and to give longer observation windows for educators. Additionally, there was feedback to link a future user guide to existing California resources.

At the third OAC meeting, in spring 2023, OAC members reviewed initial results from the OPTEL field test and provided feedback on recommended changes in response to evidence from the field test. Feedback focused on creating a more parent-friendly section in the tool, simplifying the tool’s design, and ensuring that strong guidance and supports are made available for educators at all levels.

Recommendations

Recommended Revisions to the OPTEL Tool

Based on the OPTEL field test findings, as well as input from the OAC, the WestEd team has proposed the following revisions to the OPTEL tool:

1. **Reformat the layout from landscape to portrait view** so that the width of the text is narrower (i.e., spans 8 and not 11.5 inches) and therefore may be easier to read and less overwhelming in appearance.
2. Use bullet points or checkboxes for the text of each descriptor so that users can more easily and quickly discern each performance level’s characteristics. Given the tool is intended to be usable in real time during a classroom observation, breaking up the text will help users more easily identify what to look for at each performance level.
3. Add a box for educators to note whether any specific accommodations were in use for students with IEPs or Section 504 Plans, and whether they feel the student’s disability impacted the rating they received.
4. **Expand the parent consultation section and move it to a separate page.** The parent consultation section represents an important aspect of the tool’s use. Moving it to its own page will permit its expansion, which we recommend include the addition of subsections to guide in-depth conversations between teacher and parent and of an expanded section for recording the parent’s input and comments. This page could record discussions with parents at points throughout the school year, as well as at the time of making a reclassification decision. This section intended for parent use should avoid jargon and employ language non-educators would understand.

Recommendation for How to Use the OPTEL to Inform Reclassification Decisions

In response to the results from the field test and the OAC’s input, the WestEd team recommends that**students who receive expressive and receptive OPTEL ratings at Level 3 or Level 4 be considered for reclassification.** The evidence from the OPTEL field test supports OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings of Level 3 or higher as evidence that a student is ready for reclassification. Specifically, when educators reported that they felt students were very close to reclassification, they overwhelmingly rated their expressive and receptive OPTEL skills at Level 3 or 4 (see Tables 13 and 14) . Very rarely did a student receive an OPTEL expressive or receptive rating below 3 if their teacher felt they were very close to reclassification. Additionally, for both expressive and receptive ratings, about 90 to 95 percent of students who received an ELPAC performance level of 4 received OPTEL Level 3 and 4 ratings (see Figures 13, 14, 15 and 16). Analyses that look at differences in OPTEL ratings by student characteristics at ELPAC Level 4 find that students’ average OPTEL ratings were between Level 3 and 4, providing further evidence for Level 3 or higher (see Figures 17 through 22).

Recommendations for Future OPTEL Guidance

In response to both the results from the field test and the OAC’s input, the WestEd team proposes the following recommendations for future OPTEL guidance:

1. Develop a user guide and additional training materials for the OPTEL that provide clear, at-a-glance examples of student performance at each score point. Based both on qualitative feedback, as well as quantitative assessments of how ratings may vary by grade level among students with similar English language proficiency, users will need user guides or supplementary guidance documents that illustrate differences in student performance across proficiency levels, as well as across grade levels within proficiency levels. Users will need anchors that exemplify range by proficiency level, for example, exemplifying the differences between students’ use of language in particular ways as “rarely,” “sometimes,” “often,” or “consistently.”
2. Develop a user guide and additional training materials that provide examples of classroom instruction that lend themselves to evidence collection. There were multiple feedback responses that suggested it was difficult to conduct the OPTEL observation when instruction was not facilitating students’ demonstration of these skills. It should not be assumed that users will know which types of classroom activities are necessary (or appropriate) for OPTEL observation, and guidance can support educators in their approach to designing instruction to facilitate students’ expressive and receptive use of the English language.
3. Develop a user guide and additional training materials to support users in understanding how to appropriately and accurately integrate observations of students’ reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills into overall expressive and receptive ratings. Some users reported struggling to make an overall rating determination in instances when certain skill areas within the overarching category may not have aligned. Guidance can be designed to help educators understand how to evaluate speaking and writing separately, and then how to integrate those observations into a single rating (expressive), with the same for reading and listening (receptive).
4. Develop presentation materials specifically designed to be accessible to family members to describe for them the OPTEL tool’s purposes, results, and intentional use, which is to explain to parents their children’s progress in the English language skills measured by the OPTEL tool. The presentation should include clear communication about the purpose of the tool and how it can be used to inform parents of their child’s progress toward English language proficiency. This presentation should employ parent-friendly language that avoids jargon. Additionally, develop guidance to support educators in using the OPTEL tool in conversations with families about their children’s English language proficiency development, including providing translation support, especially for key phrases, for better communications with parent.
5. **Ground guidance in the message that the OPTEL tool is not meant to be an additional burden to educators’ work with EL students.** Multiple users expressed concern about the time and additional burden a new tool may place on already overtaxed educators. Guidance should make clear that the OPTEL tool is intended to standardize what schools are already doing to make reclassification decisions regarding teachers’ evaluation (criterion #2). This is to mitigate any potentially negative response to the tool as placing new, additional burdens on educators and instead highlighting its benefit as an improvement to schools’ already-existing practices. This aspect of messaging during rollout is critical. Educators’ first encounter with the OPTEL tool should be grounded in reflection on the work they are already doing, for example, engaging them in self-reflection questions such as “What are you currently doing to capture teacher evaluation for reclassification purposes?” The tool can then be presented as a beneficial innovation, standardizing what schools are already doing, not adding new burdens.
6. **Provide guidance for local educational agencies on how to determine all other requirements for implementation.** Although some respondents felt there should be a minimum number of observations or requirements around who should conduct the observations, local education agencies may be well positioned to make these determinations, given both the lack of consensus and concerns about time and other demands on personnel.
7. Include specific guidance and support for using the OPTEL tool to observe EL students with disabilities who have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan. Initial quantitative evidence suggests that educators may provide different ratings to students with disabilities compared with students who do not have disabilities, even when students are assumed to be at similar English language proficiency levels. Although this conclusion is tentative, coupled with qualitative concerns about how educators will be supported to use the OPTEL tool with this student population, it justifies specific guidance for how the tool can be used to observe EL students with disabilities or with a Section 504 Plan. This guidance should be in alignment with the California Practitioners’ Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities and address opportunities for observers to consult with the IEP team or Education Specialist. Additionally, the OPTEL field test was only able to provide validation results for students who did not take the Alternate ELPAC. Future guidance and support should also consider next steps to support the use of standardized observation tools to observe students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take the Alternate ELPAC.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the OPTEL development process, including a pilot study, multiple rounds of consultation and revision with OAC experts, and the OPTEL field test, has resulted in an OPTEL tool that meets legislative requirements and can be used across the state of California by educators to evaluate a student’s use of English while the student is engaging in academic content learning, to inform reclassification decisions. The OPTEL tool will also be useful for consultation with parents and engaging in formative assessment practices. Results from the OPTEL field test, as well as consultation with OAC experts, also supports the development of robust guidance materials to support the implementation of the OPTEL as a statewide tool.

Appendices

Appendix A: Methods and Analysis

This section provides more detail about the design, methods, and analysis plan for the OPTEL field test.

Study Design

The goal for the field test was to have 150 pairs of teachers observe eight students (two at each ELPAC performance level) in each grade from kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12) and collect two OPTEL ratings for each student, then to use the two ratings to compare alignment and to explore the extent to which ratings varied by educator and student characteristics.

Research Question 1 – Methods and Analysis: How consistently do Raters Score EL students’ ability to use grade-level academic English language in the classroom setting using the OPTEL tool?

One threat to the validity of proposed uses of the tool is if most of the variability in ratings is due to the raters, not to the students’ true language proficiency. To investigate the hypothesis that ratings are due in large part to differences in how two raters judge the same student, WestEd used interrater reliability methods. Interrater reliability estimates are designed to quantify the level of agreement between two (or more) raters.

The WestEd team began by cross-tabulating OPTEL performance levels assigned to students by their two raters. In crosstabs, seeing the vast majority of ratings given by the two educators align might suggest that both measures are consistently measuring facets of the student’s language proficiency.

We then used a more formal measure of interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. The kappa statistic is similar to a correlation, but accounts for the rate at which chance agreement would be expected to happen.

Kappa is calculated as follows:

where Pr(*a*) represents the actual observed agreement and Pr(*e*) represents chance agreement. In the case of two raters,

where represents column 1 marginal, represents column 2 marginal, represents row 1 marginal, represents row 2 marginal, and represents the number of observations (not the number of raters).

The kappa can range from −1 to +1, with +1 indicating perfect agreement among raters, and –1 indicating perfect disagreement. Common interpretation is that values ≤0 indicate no agreement, 0.01–0.20 no to slight agreement, 0.21–0.40 fair agreement, 0.41–0.60 moderate agreement, 0.61–0.80 substantial agreement, and 0.81–0.99 almost perfect agreement.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Research Question 2 – Methods and Analysis: What is the relationship between OPTEL scores and performance on the Summative ELPAC?

This question was examined in multiple ways. First, for students who participated in the ELPAC during the 2022–23 school year, the WestEd team correlated students’ 2022–23 overall Summative ELPAC performance level with their respective OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings. High correlations might suggest that both measures are consistently measuring facets of the student’s language proficiency. At the same time, a perfect correlation would mean that the OPTEL is not capturing any information that is unique beyond the ELPAC. ELPAC scores also will represent student proficiency from roughly one year prior to their observation with the OPTEL, so we would expect students to have made some progress in their language development between receiving the ELPAC score and the OPTEL rating. Thus, moderate to high correlations would constitute a piece of evidence validating use of the OPTEL tool for reclassification considerations.

As a second check, the WestEd team conducted a descriptive analysis of students’ OPTEL scores in relation to teachers’ judgments of whether students were very close, somewhat close, or not close to reclassifying. WestEd examined alignment between teacher judgments and their OPTEL ratings to see whether there was evidence that they were well aligned. If they did, this constitutes additional evidence that the OPTEL ratings reflect students’ language abilities and align with other measures.

Research Question 3 – Methods and Analysis: How much do OPTEL scores vary based on educator and student characteristics?

To answer this question, the WestEd team first examined the extent to which, among students with the same ELPAC level, there were significant differences in the ratings assigned to students based on different educator characteristics and based on different student characteristics. This was done graphically, as well as by running t-tests or analysis of variance analyses to test for significant differences, as a *p*<.05 level.

Additionally, the WestEd team fit a multilevel model nesting observations within students within educators within schools, separately for OPTEL expressive and receptive ratings. These models then produce an intra-class correlation coefficient, which approximates the amount of variation in the outcome attributable to the different levels. Relative intra-class correlation coefficient values were examined to see the extent to which educators were explaining relatively substantial or insubstantial variation in the outcome.

Research Question 4 – Methods and Analysis: To what extent do educators report that the OPTEL tool is feasible for use in the classroom?

This research question was examined through descriptive statistics summarizing responses to Likert-type questions about the OPTEL tool’s feasibility of use, as well as through qualitative coding of open-ended feedback. To answer this question, the WestEd team first analyzed the Likert-type questions that captured teacher feedback on the usability and feasibility of the OPTEL tool by generating descriptive statistics.

The Likert-type questions were as follows:

* In general, how easy was it for you to use the OPTEL tool to rate students’ language uses in the classroom?
* In general, how clear was the wording and meaning of the OPTEL performance descriptors?
* In general, how clear was the OPTEL tool in terms of how it should it be filled out and used?
* How helpful was the training webinar/video in helping you understand how to fill out the OPTEL tool?

The WestEd team also analyzed the open-ended qualitative responses to this prompt: “Please share any other comments you have about the OPTEL tool’s clarity or usability. Please be as specific as possible when referring to the tool’s language or layout (e.g., if you found some language confusing, please let us know exactly what the language was).”

The qualitative coding process involved one researcher conducting an initial coding review of all open-ended responses, coding excerpts using codes defined *a priori* to categorize feedback into: (a) positive feedback on the OPTEL tool design, (b) feedback on challenges with the OPTEL tool design, (c) positive feedback on the OPTEL tool implementation process, (d) feedback on challenges with the OPTEL tool implementation process, and (e) other feedback not relevant to the overall research question. After the initial coding review, a researcher used those codes to organize excerpts into separate columns for each overarching code theme, including the unique identifier for the respondent. Another researcher then reviewed the organized excerpts, generated descriptive counts for certain responses by unique respondents (e.g., how many provided feedback that the tool was too wordy), and pulled out overarching themes.

Missing, Incomplete, or Redundant Data

An educator was included in the data set if they provided at least one OPTEL rating, regardless of whether they provided background information or responses via the feedback form. For questions that drew on background information, if a respondent was missing background information, they were dropped from that question. If CALPADS data was used to obtain educators’ demographic information, then educators who could not be matched to their SEID number were dropped from that question, but retained for other analyses that did not rely on that information. Although all student ratings had complete rating data, many students could not be matched to their statewide CALPADS data due to incorrect student identifiers reported by educators. When a question relied on CALPADS data, such as looking at variation by home language or correlating OPTEL ratings and ELPAC levels, students whose CALPADS data was missing were dropped from the analysis. Some educators submitted more than one rating for a given student or more than one background form. In these cases, the more complete response was kept, and the less complete response was dropped. If both were equally complete, the most recent response was kept, and the earlier response was dropped. If both were submitted on the same day, the more conservative response was kept (e.g., a lower OPTEL rating, a lower rating of student proximity to reclassification).

Appendix B: Description of Recruitment and Participation Process

Recruitment Plan

Recruitment was done through a partnership between the CDE and WestEd. Any educator who had previously expressed interest in the cancelled 2020 field test was emailed an invitation to sign up on an interest list. Additionally, the CDE emailed the same invitation to multiple list-serv groups, posted a flyer on its webpage, and presented at multiple meetings and conference presentations (e.g., Bilingual Coordinators Network, Regional English Learner Specialists). The WestEd team also reached out to direct contacts to solicit interest and encourage participation. Once on the interest list, educators could access more information about the field test and then had the option to officially sign up for it.

The CDE and WestEd teams met weekly to review target sign-up goals, with an overall goal of 150 pairs of educators, including goals specific to region and content area. After three months of recruitment, the goal of 150 pairs of educators was met for sign-up. However, despite extending the field test deadline multiple times, many educators or educator pairs did not end up completing the OPTEL field test. Many reached out to express that the time demand was too substantial given other testing demands. Others pointed out that the end of the field test window coincided with spring break as well as with extreme weather events in California, which made timely completion difficult.

Those who did complete the field test participated in an asynchronous online training, conducted ratings, then submitted ratings, background information, feedback, and consent forms to the CDE. The CDE and WestEd then entered into a data-sharing agreement, and the CDE shared the OPTEL field test results with WestEd for analysis.

Teacher Consent

Teachers who agreed to participate in the OPTEL field test received a consent form. Teachers then completed the consent form and submitted it to the CDE. A copy of the consent form is provided in Appendix C.

Training

Teachers who agreed to participate in the OPTEL field test received access to three training videos. The first video primarily went over the field test goals and procedures and provided context for the OPTEL tool’s development. The second video explained the content of the OPTEL tool in depth. The third tool provided an example observation of a student.

Appendix C: Survey Questions and Forms

This section provides the questions from each of the four forms that educators were asked to fill out for the field test.

Teacher Consent Form

Multilingual Support Division

Thank you for signing up for the OPTEL field test. This is a consent form that you will need to fill out to consent to participate in the field test.

**Note:** For questions, please contact the OPTEL team by email at optel@wested.org.

OPTEL Field Test Information

In response to state legislation (California Education Code Section 313.3), the California Department of Education (CDE) is developing an observation protocol for teachers of English learners (OPTEL) to support teachers' documentation of students' English language proficiency use in the classroom.

The OPTEL will provide evidence that:

* supports reclassification decisions;
* contributes to determinations regarding English learner (EL) student progress;
* informs immediate instructional decisions that advance student learning (formative assessment activities);
* supports communication with parents;
* informs institutions of higher education with teacher preparation programs.

To validate the reliability of the protocol, a field test of the OPTEL tool will be conducted in volunteer schools across the state January 9–March 31, 2023. During the field test, teachers and other educators will use the OPTEL to observe and rate students’ academic use of the English language in the classroom.

The CDE is partnering with WestEd to analyze data from the field test. The CDE will share anonymized field test data with WestEd so that WestEd can support the CDE to:

* establish the tool’s reliability and validity for the uses noted above;
* determine the best implementation configuration for the final tool (e.g., how many teachers should observe the same student, how many times teachers should observe each student, when during the school year teachers should observe students, etc.);
* refine the tool’s design and content; and
* collect information on the tool’s usability to inform the creation of guidance documents and training for teachers.

Field Test Procedures

Participants will be asked to:

* view two to three short training videos about this study and the OPTEL;
* use the OPTEL to collect observational data on two EL students at each of the four English Language Proficiency Assessments of California performance levels (eight students total);
* coordinate with another teacher or coach from same site so each student is independently observed by two individuals; and
* submit completed observation ratings and participate in a brief online survey.

Time Required

We estimate that participation in this field test, including training, will require four to six hours of your time.

Benefits

The results of the field test will validate the reliability of the OPTEL as a protocol for teachers. Once finalized, use of the OPTEL will improve and promote standardization of the reclassification process for EL students while increasing knowledge and capacity to align instruction with the California English Language Development (ELD) standards.

Confidentiality

All information collected will be kept secure and confidential. Names will not be used during data analysis or in the field test report, which will provide aggregated results or anonymized open-ended comments. Identifying information will only be shared with the CDE and used in the context of the field test.

The information to be collected for the study is listed below:

Your professional background

* Years of experience
* Teaching certifications
* Teaching assignments during 2022–23 school year
* Content areas you are teaching (including ELD and special education)

Your experience and confidence in teaching EL students

* Number of EL students on your roster
* Familiarity with the CA ELD standards
* Familiarity with the CA English Language Arts (ELA)/ELD Framework
* Level of confidence with EL students

Participation and Withdrawal

Your participation is entirely voluntary. Should you choose to participate, you may withdraw from the field test at any time without consequences. To withdraw from the field test, email the OPTEL team at optel@wested.org.

Consent

**I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about this field test. I have read this consent form and I understand what is being requested of me as a participant in this field test. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age. By typing my name in the box below, I am consenting to participate in this field test. My participation is entirely voluntary. Should I choose to participate, I may withdraw from the field test at any time. To withdraw from the field test, I can email the OPTEL team at** **optel@wested.org****.**

Participant Background Survey

Multilingual Support Division

Thank you for using the Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners (OPTEL) to support the determination of student performance ratings. We appreciate your time and effort in participating in this field test. Answers are required for all questions, except where otherwise indicated.

**Note:** For questions, please contact the OPTEL team by email at optel@wested.org.

OPTEL User Information

**Participant Information**

*(Enter your name the same way for all forms you complete for the OPTEL project.)*

Participant First Name:

Participant Last Name:

Participant E-mail:

District:

**Which of the following best describes your current position?** *(Select all that apply.)*

* + Classroom teacher
	+ School-level administrator
	+ County-level administrator
	+ District-level administrator

Professional Background

Tell us some basic information about your professional background and experience.

**How many years have you been in the field of education** *(e.g., as a teacher, coach, principal, coordinator, etc.)*?

**How many of those years have been as a classroom teacher?**

**Which of the following teaching certifications do you have?** *(Select all that apply.)*

* K–12 Multiple Subject
* Multiple Subject Elementary
* General Education
* English language arts, reading, or literacy
* Mathematics
* Science
* History/Social Studies
* English language development (ELD)
* (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (BCLAD)
* World language instruction
* Special education
* Other

**Which of the following courses are you teaching in the 2022/2023 school year?** *(Select all that apply.)*

* English language arts (ELA) or literacy
* Mathematics
* Science or STEM courses
* English language development
* Bilingual or multilingual program
* World language courses (e.g., Spanish language; AP French, etc.)
* Self-contained special education classrooms
* NA/Not a classroom teacher

Your Experience and Confidence in Teaching English Learner Students

**Do you know how many English learner students are on your official roster for the 2022–23 school year?**

* Yes
* No
* I don’t know
* I do not have an official roster

How many English learner students are on your official roster for the 2022–23 school year? (Only participants who select “Yes” to the question above will be asked this question.)

**How familiar are you with the California ELD Standards?** (Available here: [California English Language Development Standards [PDF](https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf)])

* Very familiar
* Somewhat familiar
* Not so familiar
* Not at all familiar

**How familiar are you with the California ELA/ELD Framework?** (Available here: [ELA/ELD Framework](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/))

* Very familiar
* Somewhat familiar
* Not so familiar
* Not at all familiar

**Overall, how confident do you feel in your ability to design and deliver effective instruction for English learner students?**

* Very confident
* Somewhat confident
* Not so confident
* Not at all confident

Submission

By selecting the **Print** response button below, you will be redirected to a new browser window where you can print the form. You must return to the previous browser window and select **Submit** to send this form to the CDE.

Use the **Submit** button below to send your responses to the Multilingual Support Division and then you will be redirected to the OPTEL web page on the department’s website.

Field Test Student Ratings Form

Multilingual Support Division

Thank you for using the Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners (OPTEL) to support the determination of student performance ratings. We appreciate your time and effort in participating in this field test. We are now asking you to input the student’s OPTEL ratings. Answers are required for all questions, except where otherwise indicated.

**Note:** For questions, please contact the OPTEL team by email at optel@wested.org.

OPTEL User Information

**Participant Information**

*(Enter your name the same way for all forms you complete for the OPTEL project.)*

Participant First Name:

Participant Last Name:

Participant E-mail:

District:

Student Information

**Statewide Student Identified (SSID)**

*(Please provide the SSID of the student whose ratings you are entering.)*

**Not Opted Out**

By checking this box, you confirm that you sent home a form to this student’s parent with information about how they may opt out of the study, AND the family has not yet responded to indicate that they wish to opt out.

*Please note: If at any time you hear back from this student’s family that they wish to opt out of this study, please notify the OPTEL team immediately at optel@cde.ca.gov and do not provide any further ratings for this student.*

* Yes
* No

**Proximity to Reclassification**

How close do you think the student is to reclassification?

* Very Close
* Somewhat Close
* Not Close

**Grade Level**

In what grade is this student?

* TK/K
* 1
* 2
* 3
* 4
* 5
* 6
* 7
* 8
* 9
* 10
* 11
* 12

Receptive Skills: Listening and Reading Comprehension

**Receptive Rating**

* 1 – Emerging: Substantial linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning
* 2 – Early-Mid Expanding: Moderate linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning
* 3 – Late Expanding–Early Bridging: Light linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning
* 4 – Mid-Late Bridging: Minimal linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning

**Observation Notes** *(Receptive)*

What did you consider in selecting this level?

**Instructional Setting** *(Receptive)*

In what kind of instruction did you observe the student demonstrating this level of language use?

* English language arts (ELA)/Literacy
* Science
* Mathematics
* History/Social Science
* English language development (ELD)
* Other

**Interaction Type** *(Receptive)*

* Whole group (one-to-many)
* Small group (one-to-group)
* Pairs (one-to-one)
* Other

**Number of Observations** *(Receptive)*

How many times did you observe this student before deciding on your rating for this language use?

**Receptive Observation Date** *(MM/DD/YYYY)*

Please enter the date on which you observed the language uses described above. If you observed the student more than once, please enter the most recent date on which you observed them.

Expressive Skills: Speaking and Writing

**Expressive Rating**

* 1 – Emerging: Substantial linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning
* 2 – Early-Mid Expanding: Moderate linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning
* 3 – Late Expanding–Early Bridging: Light linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning
* 4 – Mid-Late Bridging: Minimal linguistic support needed to engage in grade-level learning

**Observation Notes** *(Expressive)*

What did you consider in selecting this level?

**Instructional Setting** *(Expressive)*

In what kind of instruction did you observe the student demonstrating this level of language use?

* English language arts (ELA)/Literacy
* Science
* Mathematics
* History/Social Science
* English language development (ELD)
* Other

**Interaction Type** *(Expressive)*

* Whole group (one-to-many)
* Small group (one-to-group)
* Pairs (one-to-one)
* Other

**Number of Observations** *(Expressive)*

How many times did you observe this student before deciding on your rating for this language use?

**Expressive Observation Date** *(MM/DD/YYYY)*

Please enter the date on which you observed the language uses described above. If you observed the student more than once, please enter the most recent date on which you observed them.

Submission

By selecting the **Print** response button below, you will be redirected to a new browser window where you can print the form. You must return to the previous browser window and select **Submit** to send this form to the CDE.

Use the **Submit** button below to send your responses to the Multilingual Support Division and then you will be redirected to the OPTEL web page on the department’s website.

Participant Feedback Survey

Thank you for using the Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners (OPTEL) to support the determination of student performance ratings. We appreciate your time and effort in participating in this field test. As a final step, we would like to ask you for some feedback on your experience using the OPTEL. Answering the questions in this survey will help make the OPTEL a clear, useful, and user-friendly protocol. Answers are required for all questions, except where otherwise indicated.

**Note:** For questions, please contact the OPTEL team by email at optel@wested.org.

OPTEL User Information

**Participant Information**

*(Enter your name the same way for all forms you complete for the OPTEL project.)*

Participant First Name:

Participant Last Name:

Participant E-mail:

District:

**Ease of Use and Performance Descriptors**

In general, how easy was it for you to use the OPTEL to rate students’ language uses in the classroom?

* Very Easy
* Easy
* Difficult
* Very Difficult

In general, how clear was the wording and meaning of the OPTEL performance descriptors?

* Very Easy
* Easy
* Difficult
* Very Difficult

**Clarity**

In general, how clear was the OPTEL in terms of how it should be filled out and used?

* Very Clear
* Clear
* Unclear
* Very Unclear

**Training**

How helpful were the training videos in developing your understanding of how to fill out the OPTEL tool?

* Very Helpful
* Somewhat helpful
* Unhelpful
* I did not view

**Observation Window Feedback**

Did the number of days you had for the field test feel like enough time to develop a reasonable judgment about the student’s language use?

* About right
* Not enough time
* Too much time

Formative Assessments

**Share any comments you have about the OPTEL’s design, content, clarity, or usability:**

*(Be as specific as possible when referring to the tool’s language or layout [e.g., if language was confusing, please describe exactly what the language was].)*

**Feedback on Formative Use of the OPTEL Tool**

Did you use the OPTEL as a formative assessment tool to give feedback to students and/or guide instruction focused on supporting development of academic language and of students’ English language proficiency, which was an optional part of the field test?

* Yes *(Participants who chose this response would also be asked to answer the four questions in the following section, “Aspects of OPTEL.”)*
	+ No

Aspects of OPTEL

**Learning Targets:** For the following question, please consider how well-defined learning targets assist teachers in adjusting their instruction and help students take more control of their learning because they define the anticipated outcomes of lessons.

Possible Formative Evidence Collection Resources: Teacher-led Learning Target Discussion, Student-Designed Test Items, Completed Graphic Organizers, Writing Frames

How did use of the OPTEL tool support documentation of formative evidence collected through techniques for determining progress toward learning targets *(what students are expected to learn or understand)*?

**Academic Achievement:** Student- and/or teacher-developed criteria are necessary to guide students to a clearer understanding of successful and unsuccessful work as well as assist teachers in communicating characteristics of high quality and lesser quality work.

Possible Formative Evidence Collection Resources: Models of Student Work, Student/Teacher-Developed Rubrics with Teacher, Diagnostic Questions, Text Discussions, Exit Passes, Think/Pair/Share, Jigsaw, Homework Help Boards

How did use of the OPTEL tool support documentation of formative evidence collected through techniques for using classroom-level criteria to assess academic achievement *(what a student can do if they meet learning targets)?*

**Engagement of All Students:** There are different ways (single-student and whole-class response systems) to elicit responses to questions and engage all students in thinking and learning tasks.

Possible Formative Evidence Collection Resources: No Raised Hands, ABCD Cards, Mini Whiteboards, Random Selection, Bouncing Questions

How did use of the OPTEL tool support documentation of formative evidence collected through techniques for assessing engagement of all students?

**Monitoring Progress (Peer Reflection and Self-Assessment):** Student reflection on what they know, what they don’t know, and how their learning is progressing is important, whether student-initiated or teacher-prompted at specific points during the lesson.

Possible Formative Evidence Collection Resources: Peer = Two Stars and a Wish, Rubric Evaluation, C3B4ME (see three before me); Self = Question Strips, Pre-Flight Checklist, Traffic Light Signals, Learning Logs/Portfolios

How did use of the OPTEL tool support documentation of formative evidence collected through techniques for monitoring progress through peer reflection and self-assessment?

Submission

By selecting the **Print** response button below, you will be redirected to a new browser window where you can print the form. You must return to the previous browser window and select **Submit** to send this form to the CDE.

Use the **Submit** button below to send your responses to the Multilingual Support Division and then you will be redirected to the OPTEL web page on the Department's website.

**Appendix D: Descriptions of Complex Figures**

**Figure 5. Summary of Educators’ Perceptions of Their Familiarity with California’s ELD Standards**

A color coded, stacked bar chart shows survey data for the question “How familiar are you with the CA ELD Standards?”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very familiar** | 54.8% |
| **Somewhat familiar** | 41.1% |
| **Not so familiar** | 3.4% |
| **Not at all familiar** | 0.7% |

(See [Figure 5](#Figure_5))

**Figure 6. Summary of Educators’ Perceptions of Their Familiarity with California’s ELA/ELD Framework**

A color coded, stacked bar chart shows survey data for the question “How familiar are you with the CA ELA/ELD Framework?”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very familiar** | 50.7% |
| **Somewhat familiar** | 42.5% |
| **Not so familiar** | 6.2% |
| **Not at all familiar** | 0.7% |

(See [Figure 6](#Figure_6))

**Figure 7. Summary of Educators’ Perceptions of Their Comfort Teaching EL Students**

A color coded, stacked bar chart shows survey data for the question “Overall, how confident do you feel in your ability to design and deliver effective instruction for EL students?”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Very confident** | 63.7% |
| **Somewhat confident** | 36.3% |
| **Not so confident** | 0% |
| **Not at all confident** | 0% |

(See [Figure 7](#Figure_7))

**Figure 8. Student OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings**

A color coded bar chart shows data for OPTEL Expressive and Receptive Ratings by Level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| **Number of Expressive Ratings** | 196 | 311 | 363 | 319 |
| **Number of Receptive Ratings** | 171 | 289 | 374 | 355 |

(See [Figure 8](#Figure_8))

**Figure 9. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs – Expressive**

A bubble chart plots the alignment of students’ OPTEL expressive ratings within educator pairs. The X axis represents the OPTEL expressive rating for educator 1. The Y axis represents the OPTEL expressive rating for educator 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Educator 1 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 1 | Educator 1 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 2 | Educator 1 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 3 | Educator 1 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 4 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 1** | 53 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 2** | 8 | 79 | 21 | 14 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 3** | 2 | 27 | 76 | 27 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Expressive Rating: 4** | 0 | 5 | 30 | 80 |

(See [Figure 9](#Figure_9))

**Figure 10. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs – Receptive**

A bubble chart plots the alignment of students’ OPTEL receptive ratings within educator pairs. The X axis represents the OPTEL receptive rating for educator 1. The Y axis represents the OPTEL receptive rating for educator 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Educator 1 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 1 | Educator 1 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 2 | Educator 1 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 3 | Educator 1 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 4 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 1** | 41 | 11 | 4 | 0 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 2** | 11 | 71 | 29 | 7 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 3** | 2 | 24 | 77 | 32 |
| **Educator 2 OPTEL Receptive Rating: 4** | 0 | 2 | 28 | 96 |

(See [Figure 10](#Figure_10))

**Figure 11. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs by ELPAC Performance Level– Expressive**

A color coded, stacked bar chart shows the percent of OPTEL Expressive Ratings by ELPAC Level 2022–23.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| **Aligned** | 76.9% | 73.7% | 57.0% | 58.3% |
| **Difference of One Level** | 23.1% | 24.2% | 34.5% | 33.3% |
| **Difference of Two Levels** | 0.0% | 21.1% | 8.5% | 8.3% |

(See [Figure 11](#Figure_11))

**Figure 12. Alignment of Students’ OPTEL Ratings within Educator Pairs by ELPAC Performance Level– Receptive**

A color coded, stacked bar chart shows the percent of OPTEL Receptive Ratings by ELPAC Level 2022–23.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| **Aligned** | 70.7% | 68.4% | 54.9% | 65.6% |
| **Difference of One Level** | 29.2% | 25.3% | 41.5% | 30.2% |
| **Difference of Two Levels** | 0.0% | 6.3% | 3.5% | 4.2% |

(See [Figure 12](#Figure_12))

**Figure 13. Alignment of Student OPTEL Expressive Ratings and ELPAC Overall Performance Levels**

A bubble chart plots the alignment of student OPTEL expressive ratings and ELPAC overall performance levels. The X axis represents the ELPAC Level 2022–23. The Y axis represents the OPTEL expressive rating.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **OPTEL Expressive Rating: 1** | 112 | 45 | 19 | 2 |
| **OPTEL Expressive Rating: 2** | 51 | 118 | 107 | 24 |
| **OPTEL Expressive Rating: 3** | 15 | 74 | 153 | 100 |
| **OPTEL Expressive Rating: 4** | 3 | 22 | 89 | 128 |

(See [Figure 13](#Figure_13))

**Figure 14. Student OPTEL Expressive Ratings by ELPAC Performance Level**

A color coded, stacked bar chart shows the percentages of student OPTEL expressive ratings by ELPAC performance level (2022–23).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **OPTEL Level 1** | 61.9% | 17.4% | 5.2% | 0.8% |
| **OPTEL Level 2** | 28.2% | 45.6% | 29.2% | 9.4% |
| **OPTEL Level 3** | 8.3% | 28.6% | 41.6% | 39.4% |
| **OPTEL Level 4** | 1.7% | 8.5% | 24.2% | 50.4% |

(See [Figure 14](#Figure_14))

**Figure 15. Alignment of Student OPTEL Receptive Ratings and ELPAC Overall Performance Levels**

A bubble chart plots the alignment of student OPTEL receptive ratings and ELPAC overall performance levels. The X axis represents the ELPAC Level 2022–23. The Y axis represents the OPTEL expressive ratings.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **OPTEL Receptive Rating: 1** | 103 | 41 | 14 | 1 |
| **OPTEL Receptive Rating: 2** | 55 | 112 | 94 | 15 |
| **OPTEL Receptive Rating: 3** | 19 | 81 | 150 | 104 |
| **OPTEL Receptive Rating: 4** | 4 | 25 | 110 | 134 |

(See [Figure 15](#Figure_15))

**Figure 16. Student OPTEL Receptive Ratings by ELPAC Performance Level**

A color coded, stacked bar chart shows the percentages of student OPTEL receptive ratings by ELPAC performance level (2022–23).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **OPTEL Level 1** | 56.9% | 15.8% | 3.8% | 0.4% |
| **OPTEL Level 2** | 30.4% | 43.2% | 25.5% | 5.9% |
| **OPTEL Level 3** | 10.5% | 31.3% | 40.8% | 40.9% |
| **OPTEL Level 4** | 2.2% | 9.7% | 29.9% | 52.8% |

(See [Figure 16](#Figure_16))

**Figure 17. Average OPTEL Expressive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether or Not the Rating Educator Held an ELD or a BCLAD Certification**

A color coded bar chart shows average OPTEL expressive ratings for students at each ELPAC level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **Average Expressive: ELD/BCLAD** | 1.48 | 2.19 | 2.80 | 3.38 |
| **Average Expressive: No ELD/BCLAD** | 1.52 | 2.34 | 2.85 | 3.43 |

(See [Figure 17](#Figure_17))

**Figure 18. Average OPTEL Receptive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether or Not the Rating Educator Held an ELD or a BCLAD Certification**

A color coded bar chart shows average OPTEL receptive ratings for students at each ELPAC level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **Average Receptive: ELD/BCLAD** | 1.54 | 2.33 | 2.94 | 3.51 |
| **Average Receptive: No ELD/BCLAD** | 1.61 | 2.34 | 2.98 | 3.47 |

(See [Figure 18](#Figure_18))

**Figure 19. Average OPTEL Expressive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students’ Home Language Was Spanish**

A color coded bar chart shows average OPTEL expressive ratings for students at each ELPAC level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **Average Expressive: Spanish** | 1.60 | 2.33 | 2.83 | 3.35 |
| **Average Expressive: Not Spanish** | 1.22 | 2.03 | 3.00 | 3.55 |

(See [Figure 19](#Figure_19))

**Figure 20. Average OPTEL Receptive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students’ Home Language Was Spanish**

A color coded bar chart shows average OPTEL receptive ratings for students at each ELPAC level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **Average Receptive: Spanish** | 1.67 | 2.40 | 2.96 | 3.45 |
| **Average Receptive: Not Spanish** | 1.22 | 2.08 | 3.05 | 3.51 |

(See [Figure 20](#Figure_20))

**Figure 21. Average OPTEL Expressive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students Have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan**

A color coded bar chart shows average OPTEL expressive ratings for students at each ELPAC level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ELPAC Level 1 | ELPAC Level 2 | ELPAC Level 3 | ELPAC Level 4 |
| **Average Expressive: No IEP or Section 504 Plan** | 1.54 | 2.33 | 2.90 | 3.40 |
| **Average Expressive: IEP or Section 504 Plan** | 1.54 | 2.12 | 2.35 | 3.27 |

(See [Figure 21](#Figure_21))

**Figure 22. Average OPTEL Receptive Ratings for Students at Each ELPAC Level by Whether Students Have an IEP or a Section 504 Plan**

A color coded bar chart shows average OPTEL receptive ratings for students at each ELPAC level.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ELPAC Level 1** | **ELPAC Level 2** | **ELPAC Level 3** | **ELPAC Level 4** |
| **Average Receptive: No IEP or Section 504 Plan** | 1.58 | 2.40 | 3.01 | 3.47 |
| **Average Receptive: IEP or Section 504 Plan** | 1.65 | 2.14 | 2.48 | 3.36 |

(See [Figure 22](#Figure_22))
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