

California Practitioners Advisory Committee

Jonathan Isler
**Analysis, Measurement, and
Accountability Reporting Division**

April 13, 2017



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Agenda

- Purpose of the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Workgroup
- Summary of the Group's Work
- Group Discussion Activity

Purpose of the ELPI Workgroup

In June 2016, the State Board of Education (SBE) recommended that the California Department of Education (CDE) convene a workgroup of experts to:

- Explore the use of the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), Long Term English Learners (LTELs), and Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) criteria to capture a fuller picture of student performance; and to
- Advise on the development of the ELPI to include in the new accountability system.

Workgroup Recommendations

The CDE consulted with the workgroup on the following items:

- Whether or not LTELs should be incorporated into the ELPI;
- Whether or not RFEP students should be included in the English Learner (EL) student group for the Academic Indicator. (*Note: action was taken on this recommendation by the SBE during their January, 2017 meeting); and
- Adding further EL reports in DataQuest and the California School Dashboard.

SBE Updates on the ELPI Workgroup

- June 2016: SBE Memo including the purpose for convening the ELPI workgroup:
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-jun16item02.doc>
- October 2016: SBE Memo including an update on the ELPI workgroup:
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-oct16item02.doc>
- The CDE also provided updates on the ELPI workgroup during the following SBE meetings: September 2016, November 2016, January 2017, and March 2017.

Summary of the Group's Work

The ELPI workgroup's first met by phone in October 2016 and convened three subsequent times in person.

October 2016:

- ELPI workgroup asked for simulations to be run using both the *Education Code 313.1* LTEL definition and students identified as EL for 6+ years in school.

October 2016 Meeting Requests

- The Workgroup members requested that CDE use the California *Education Code (EC)* Section 313.1 definition for LTELs (see slide 8) to run simulations.
- However, some members indicated that it is also important to run simulations based on the number of years a student is identified as an EL as the only criterion.
- Therefore, simulations were ran using the following LTEL definitions:
 - California *EC* Section 313.1
 - Students identified as EL for six or more years.

Education Code Section 313.1

Long-Term English Learner: An English learner student to which all of the following apply:

(1) is enrolled on Census Day (the first Wednesday in October) in grades 6 to 12, inclusive; and

(2) has been enrolled in a U.S. school for six or more years; and

(3) has remained at the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive prior years, or has regressed to a lower English language proficiency level, as determined by the CELDT; and

(4) for students in grades 6 to 9, inclusive, has scored at the “Standard Not Met” level on the prior year administration of the CAASPP-ELA. In addition, please note the following:

- (1) students for whom one or more of the required testing criteria are not available are categorically determined to be an LTEL; and
- (2) the assessment component of LTEL determination for students in grades 10 – 12, inclusive, is based solely on the CELDT criteria outlined above.

Summary of the Group's Work (cont.)

December 2016:

- Provided feedback on presenting information on the EL subgroup for the Academic Indicator, detailed in the January 2017 SBE Item #2.
- Reviewed whether LTEL data could appropriately and viably be incorporated into the current ELPI.

Summary of the Group's Work (cont.)

January 2017:

- Reviewed and provided feedback on draft LTEL reports for posting on the CDE's DataQuest site that further disaggregates the LTEL student population.
- Reviewed the LTEL data simulations and agreed not to include the data into the existing ELPI formula for status and change due to:
 - difficultly in interpreting the results; and
 - data unfairly penalizes middle and high schools.

January 2017: LTEL Data Simulations

Summary of LTEL Results Based on *EC* Section 313.1 Definition

School Summary:

- Less than 1% of elementary schools would be identified as Red or Orange.
- Approximately 86% of middle schools would be identified as Red or Orange.
- Approximately 93% of high schools would be identified as Red or Orange.

District Summary:

- Zero districts would be identified as Red.
- The distribution of districts in the Orange performance level varies by type:
 - High = 79%
 - Unified = 0.6%
 - Elementary = 0.6%

January 2017: LTEL Data Simulations (cont.)

Summary of LTEL Results Based on 6+ years EL Definition

School Summary:

- The results for the percent of schools by school type identified as Red or Orange using the six years only definition are:
 - Approximately 1% elementary schools
 - Approximately 97% middle schools
 - Approximately 95% of high schools

District Summary:

- The six years definition does identify some districts in the Red performance level
- The performance level distributions for Red and Orange vary by district type
 - High = 95%
 - Unified = 11%
 - Elementary = 2%

Summary of the Group's Work (cont.)

March 2017 (cont.):

- The workgroup recommended a method to provide “extra credit” for LTELs in the ELPI who advance at least one level on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).
- The workgroup supported providing additional EL and LTEL data reports in DataQuest and the California School Dashboard.

Proposal to Include LTELs in the ELPI Formula

Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at least 1 CELDT Level

Plus

Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Maintained Early Advanced/
Advanced English Proficient on the CELDT

Plus

ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year

Plus

LTEL CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at Least 1 CELDT Level

Divided by

Total Number of Annual CELDT Test Takers in the Current Year *plus*

ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year

Adding Full Weight for LTELs Who Increased 1+ CELDT Level

Results of adding an additional full weight to all LTEL students who increased at least one performance level on the CEDLT, using the ELPI data released in the Spring 2017 Dashboard.

Schools with an ELPI Color	Schools with LTEL Students	Schools with at least one LTEL Student that Increased a Performance Level	Schools with an Improved Status Adding Full Weight	Schools with a Change in Color Adding Full Weight
6,437	4,902	853	89	63

(Note: The information presented here is just a simulation and will not change the spring 2017 Dashboard report.)

Group Activity

Break into small groups to discuss the topics listed below (Note: the proposed criteria are provided at each table).

- **Topic 1**: Pros of providing extra weight for LTELs who increased 1+ CELDT level/s into the ELPI
- **Topic 2**: Cons of providing extra weight for LTELs who increased 1+ CELDT level/s into the ELPI
- **Topic 3**: Positive unintended consequences of providing extra weight for LTELs who increased 1+ CELDT level/s into the ELPI
- **Topic 4**: Negative unintended consequences of providing extra weight for LTELs who increased 1+ CELDT level/s into the ELPI