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# California State Board of EducationMay 2019 AgendaItem #01

## Subject

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California: Approval of the Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Transition to Computer-Based Initial and Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California, the High-Level Test Design for the Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California, and the Proposed Revisions to the Computer-Based Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Blueprints; and an Update on Assessment Program Activities.

## Type of Action

Action, Information.

## Summary of the Issue(s)

This item requests approval of the proposed high-level test design (HLTD) for the transition of the Initial and Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) to computer-based tests, the proposed HLTD for the development of the computer-based Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC (Alternate ELPAC), and proposed revisions to the computer-based Summative ELPAC blueprints. (Further references in this document to ELPAC or Alternate ELPAC are inclusive of the Initial and Summative tests unless otherwise noted.)

This item also provides information on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) System, including updates on the California Science Test (CAST), the Broadband Infrastructure Improvement Grant (BIIG), and the Starting Smarter Project.

## Recommendations

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends that the California State Board of Education (SBE) approve the following proposed items:

* “Test Design Recommendations,” as described in Section 1.G. of the HLTD for the computer-based ELPAC (Attachment 2)
* “Test Design Recommendations,” as described in Section 1.F. of the HLTD for the Alternate ELPAC (Attachment 3)
* “General Performance Level Descriptors” (PLDs), as described in Section 2.D. of the HLTD for the Alternate ELPAC (Attachment 3)
* Revised Summative ELPAC blueprints (Attachment 4)

The CDE further recommends that the SBE authorize CDE staff to make technical edits, as necessary, to the documents listed above.

## Brief History of Key Issues

The CDE and testing contractor Educational Testing Service (ETS) have collaborated with nationally recognized experts in the development of the HLTDs.

For the computer-based ELPAC, the following national experts were consulted:

* Kenji Hakuta, Ph.D., Lee L. Jacks Professor emeritus at the Stanford University Graduate School of Education
* Diane August, Ph.D., managing researcher at the American Institutes for Research

For the Alternate ELPAC, the following national experts were consulted:

* Meghan Karvonen, Ph.D., director of Accessible Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Systems
* Lucrecia Santibanez, Ph.D., associate professor at Claremont Graduate University
* Edynn Sato, Ph.D., chief executive officer and chief research scientist of Sato Education Consulting LLC
* Martha Thurlow, Ph.D., director of the National Center on Educational Outcomes

In addition, during the development of the HLTD, the CDE and ETS consulted with measurement and linguistics experts on the ELPAC Technical Advisory Group (Attachment 5), as well as stakeholders from Californians Together, California Charter School Association, Small School Districts Association, Association of California School Administrators, California School Boards Association, Advisory Commission on Special Education, and the California Teachers Association.

The work for transitioning the ELPAC to a computer-based assessment began in June 2016, when the CDE authorized ETS to investigate theoretical and empirical literature about the advantages and potential challenges of computer-based assessments. The results were reported in *Considerations in the Transition of the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Paper-Pencil Tests to Computer-Based Assessments* (hereafter, *Computer-Based Report*), available at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/documents/elpaccbareporttagged.pdf>, and presented in an Information Memorandum to the SBE in June 2017. In addition, Attachment 1 of the June 2017 Memorandum included results of a survey of 762 respondents from several stakeholder groups that expressed support for the transition. The *Computer-Based Report* identified the enhanced efficiency of a standardized, computer-based administration; faster turnaround of scoring and reporting; centralized data management; and opportunities to better measure English language proficiency. The *Computer-Based Report* compiled findings and research from recent studies and current testing practices used by other computer-based English language proficiency assessment developers (i.e., World-class Instructional Design and Assessments and English Language Proficiency Assessments for the 21st Century). Information gathered from these early transition activities were applied to the development of the computer-based ELPAC and Alternate ELPAC HLTDs.

In addition, the *Computer-Based Report* stated that the task types on the paper-based ELPAC are appropriate for measuring the 2012 California English Language Development Standards (hereafter, 2012 ELD Standards) and could be delivered on a computer-based platform with relatively modest adaptations. This finding is further supported by feedback from classroom educators, via a post-test survey, that the existing ELPAC task types are effective in measuring student English language proficiency in a manner consistent with how the 2012 ELD Standards were being implemented in classrooms.

In collaboration with the national experts, both HLTDs were developed through the use of the following guiding principles:

1. The assessments must be designed to ensure that the test-taking population is able to demonstrate their English language proficiency.
2. The test design must be tailored to the specific needs of its intended population and offer an appropriate range of accessibility supports for students, including maximum accessibility for students with disabilities. It must also ensure linguistic and cultural fairness and sensitivity.
3. The test design must take into consideration the testing burden for students and test examiners.

### Proposed HLTD for the Transition to a Computer-Based ELPAC

The CDE is seeking SBE approval of the recommendations outlined in Section 1.G. “Test Design Recommendations” in the *Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Transition to Computer-Based English Language Proficiency Assessments for California* (Attachment 2). The CDE has approached the transition of the ELPAC to a computer-based administration with a high regard for designing an assessment that is fair and valid for all students. Familiarity with technology and students’ developmental characteristics have been ongoing key tenants in collaborative meetings with ETS and the experts. The CDE has proposed the addition of two accessibility resources to support individual students who require technological assistance both in navigation and keyboarding. In kindergarten and grade one, the computer-based ELPAC is proposed to be administered one-on-one, with a test examiner entering responses for the domains of Listening, Speaking, and Reading. In grade two, administration is proposed to occur in small groups of 10 or fewer students, which will allow test examiners to continue supporting individual student’s needs; LEAs may administer the assessment in smaller groups as necessary. In addition, it is proposed that students in kindergarten through grade two be administered the Writing domain in a paper-pencil format, which is age-appropriate. This proposed test design maintains current local scoring practices for the ELPAC.

A computer-based ELPAC will continue to successfully measure English language proficiency. The proposed test design plans to use the current paper-pencil task types in a computer-based platform without changing the construct of the task types. Accessibility resources can be embedded in the test items to provide access for all students. Furthermore, the computer-based ELPAC will be delivered on the same platform as the CAASPP assessments, which is already familiar to test examiners and students in grades three through twelve.

The proposed timeline below includes the development activities for the computer-based ELPAC and is consistent with the CAASPP/ELPAC contract that the SBE approved in November 2018.

#### **Computer-Based ELPAC Development Timeline**

| Date | Activity |
| --- | --- |
| **Fall 2018** | Conversion of usability pilot items from paper-based to computer-based format |
| Winter 2019 | Development of *Accessibility Framework* |
| April 2019 | Administration of usability pilot and cognitive lab study |
| May 2019 | California SBE action on the *Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Transition to Computer-Based English Language Proficiency Assessments for California* and proposed revisions to the Summative ELPAC blueprints |
| Spring 2019 | Conversion of entire paper-based item pool to computer-based format |
| Fall 2019 | Administration of field test  |
| Fall 2019 | Voluntary pilot and cognitive labs for accommodated form |
| Fall 2019 | Mode comparability study  |
| Winter 2019 | Threshold score review |
| February 2020 | Operational administration of computer-based Summative ELPAC  |
| July 2020 | Operational administration of computer-based Initial ELPAC  |

Once Section 1.G. “Test Design Recommendations” of Attachment 2 is approved by the SBE, it will be necessary to make revisions to the ELPAC regulations to include, but not necessarily be limited to, descriptions of eligible students and available accessibility resources.

### Proposed HLTD for the Development of the Alternate ELPAC

The CDE is seeking SBE approval of the recommendations outlined in Section 1.F. “Test Design Recommendations,” and Section 2.D. “General Performance Level Descriptors” of the *Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California* (Attachment 2) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

The Alternate ELPAC test design proposal provides flexibility while also ensuring that all students are measured on their English language proficiency. The national experts considered a wide range of conceptual approaches to the test design and evaluated each for its potential to satisfy the guiding principles. Once a conceptual approach to the test design was selected, discussions with the national experts addressed how to best measure the domains, given that students in the tested population use a variety of communication modes that may not fit neatly into the four categories of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. For example, a nonverbal student might use an augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) device to communicate a response to any test question, regardless of the domain(s) being assessed (e.g., Speaking and Writing). Consideration of this challenge resulted in the recommendation for an integrated approach to the design of test items, meaning that a single item may assess multiple domains (e.g., Listening integrated with Reading).

The CDE and ETS will continue meeting and working with stakeholders, including the national experts, in the design and development of the Alternate ELPAC blueprint and test items.

The proposed timeline on the following page includes the development activities for the Alternate ELPAC and is consistent with the CAASPP/ELPAC contract that the SBE approved in November 2018.

#### **Alternate ELPAC Development Timeline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Date |
| SBE action on the *Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California*, including general performance level descriptors  | May 2019 |
| Administration of the pilot test and cognitive labs | January 2020 |
| Development of proposed blueprint | February–March 2020 |
| SBE action on the proposed blueprint | May 2020 |
| Administration of a statewide operational field test for both Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC | January–February 2021 |
| Standard setting study for both Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC | Spring 2021 |
| SBE action on the proposed threshold scores | Spring 2021 |
| Administration of the Operational Initial Alternate ELPAC  | July 2021  |
| Administration of the Operational Summative Alternate ELPAC | February 2022 |

Once Section 1.F., “Test Design Recommendations” and Section 2.D., “General Performance Level Descriptors” of Attachment 3 are approved by the SBE, it will be necessary to make revisions to the ELPAC regulations for the Alternate ELPAC, including, but not limited to, descriptions of eligible students and available accessibility resources.

### Proposed Revisions to the Summative ELPAC Blueprints for the Transition to Computer-Based Delivery

A test blueprint details the number of items and points, by task type and content standard, for an assessment. Since 2015, the CDE has engaged with various stakeholder groups, including California educators and technical advisory groups, to develop and update ELPAC blueprints that reflect the depth, breadth, and rigor of the 2012 ELD Standards.

In September 2017, Summative ELPAC blueprints were approved by the SBE. In November 2018, the SBE approved plans to transition the paper-pencil ELPAC to computer-based.

As part of the transition work, the Summative ELPAC blueprints were reviewed to propose where minor adjustments could be made to increase the amount of information collected across the full range of English language proficiency while continuing to ensure that the assessment remains fair and valid for its intended purposes. The ELPAC Technical Advisory Group (TAG) members, as well as stakeholders from Californians Together, California Association of Bilingual Education, and the California Parent Teacher Association were presented with the revised blueprints for their review in March and April 2019.

The purpose of the recommended blueprint changes is not to impact the current expectations associated with each of the ELPAC performance levels. The results of this process led to the proposed minimal changes to the Summative ELPAC blueprints. Therefore, the proposed ELPAC blueprints (Attachment 4) provide an overview of the items and points on the Summative ELPAC, by domain and grade, and include proposed changes that appear throughout the ELPAC blueprints (i.e., proposed new item quantities and points are enclosed in parentheses and highlighted in yellow; proposed deletions are enclosed in brackets and highlighted in blue).

### CAST

In November 2017, the SBE approved the CAST general achievement level descriptors (ALDs) and blueprint. General ALDs articulate the goals and rigor at a high-level and are most often used by policymakers. The CAST ALDs and blueprint can be found on the SBE Current and Past Agendas web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07.doc> and at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item07a1.pdf>. In March 2019, ETS convened a meeting with California science educators to review and provide feedback on the grade-level range ALDs (i.e., grades five and eight and high school). The grade five ALDs are based on the Performance Expectations in grades three through five, the grade eight ALDs are based on the Performance Expectations in grades six through eight, and the high school ALDs are based on the Performance Expectations in grades nine through twelve. These ALDs delineate students’ science content knowledge at each of the four levels (i.e., Standard Exceeded, Standard Met, Standard Nearly Met, and Standard Not Met) and are developed to be consistent with the SBE approved CAST general ALDs. Based on educator feedback, these revised range ALDs will serve as a key document for CAST standard setting. The CAST threshold scores will be presented to the SBE for approval at the November 2019 State Board of Education meeting.

In May 2019, the CDE and ETS conducted an item review workshop with California science educators to receive feedback on items and prepare for the 2019−20 CAST administration.

A system performance test of the CAST was conducted by the K–12 High Speed Network (K12HSN), with the support of ETS and American Institutes for Research (AIR) in February 2019 to confirm that the network bandwidth required per student for administration of the operational CAST was within acceptable limits. The K12HSN manages the Broadband Infrastructure Improvement Grant (BIIG), which supports schools and districts to upgrade their internet bandwidth to support the administration of computer-based assessments. To ensure that the test was conducted as similarly as possible to normal testing conditions, the load test used the operational CAST with fully optimized assessment items, the recommended secure browser setup, and guidelines for test takers to ensure a realistic wait time between assessment items. The K12HSN found that the average bandwidth required per student was consistent with the bandwidth requirements for the Smarter Balanced assessments.

### Broadband Infrastructure Improvement Grant Update

The CDE continues to assist the K12HSN with the implementation of the BIIG programs. As of May 2019, 164 of the 165 BIIG 1.0 projects were completed, with approximately $895,000 of the grant award remaining. Of the 214 BIIG 2.0 projects, 176 are completed, with approximately $14.8 million of the grant award remaining. A fourth round of the BIIG 2.0 projects is in the bid process. Both BIIG 1.0 and BIIG 2.0 grant awards are meant to be spent by June 30, 2020.

### Starting Smarter Website Launch

In May 2019, the CDE, in collaboration with Smarter Balanced, HCM Strategies and ETS, launched the Starting Smarter website to provide resources to facilitate parents’/guardians’ understanding of the scores presented on their child’s score report and to assist them with having conversations with their child’s teacher. Feedback from stakeholders helped shape the development of the website. Website features include: score reports, sample test questions and no cost resources available to parents/guardians to support their child’s learning. The May 2019 release will include the CAASPP Smarter Balanced summative assessments for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, the California Alternate Assessments for ELA and mathematics, and the ELPAC assessments.

The Starting Smarter website is a multiyear project that will be developed over the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years. In fall 2019, the Starting Smarter website will be updated to include student score reports and resources for the CAST and CSA and in 2020–21 the ELPAC Alternate Assessment will be added. This website, which will be available in English and Spanish, also offers a guide for parent-teacher conferences, with worksheets to help guide a discussion about grade-level expectations, progress in the classroom, and how to provide support at home and at school. Learn more at <https://ca.startingsmarter.org/>.

**Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action**

In March 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System and ELPAC activities <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item03.docx>.

In February 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the ELPAC threshold score review study <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-feb19item01.docx>.

In January 2019, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System and ELPAC activities and requested approval of the 2019 LEA apportionment rates for CAASPP <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/jan19item08.docx>.

In December 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that gave an update on the 2017–18 public releases for the Initial California English Language Development Test, the Physical Fitness Test, and the preliminary indicators for the CAST field test and the CAA for Science, year two pilot <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-dec18item01.docx>.

In November 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on CAASPP System activities, requested approval of the proposed contract amendment for the CAASPP contract with ETS to include the integration of the ELPAC, and requested approval of the proposed contract amendment to the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) interagency agreement to provide an educator reporting system (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08.docx>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a1.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a2.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a3.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a4.xlsx>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a5.pdf>)

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item08a6.xlsx>).

In October 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that provided an update on the SSR for 2018–19 and beyond (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-oct18item01.docx>).

In September 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System, including a presentation on the electronic reporting pilot (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/sep18item03.docx>).

In August 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that provided an update on the development of both new science assessments, the CAST and the CAA for Science

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-aug18item01.docx>).

In July 2018, the SBE approved a request for authority to enter into negotiations to amend ETS’s CAASPP contract to include the integration of the ELPAC and enter into negotiations with UCSC for an interagency agreement to provide an educator reporting system (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item03.docx>).

In June 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with an Information Memorandum that included an update on the ELPAC and a review of the preliminary results of the Enhanced Assessment Grant for the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-jun18item02.docx>) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-jun18item02a01.pdf>).

In May 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/may18item03.docx>).

In March 2018, the CDE provided the SBE with updates on the CAASPP System (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item08.docx>).

In January 2018, the SBE approved the CAA for Science test blueprint, general ALDs, and score reporting structure (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item06.docx>).

In January 2018, the SBE approved LEA apportionment rates for the 2017–18 CAASPP administration and CDE-approved grade two diagnostic assessments

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item06.docx>).

In June 2017, the SBE received an ELPAC Information Memorandum with information regarding the transition to a computer-based assessment

(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-asb-adad-jun17item01.doc>).

## Fiscal Analysis

The 2018–19 Budget Act provides a total of $93,064,000 in multiple CAASPP System contract costs, which includes $82,754,000 in funding for the ETS CAASPP 2018–19 contract activities.

The proposed 2019–20 Budget Act provides a total of $87,537,000 in multiple CAASPP System contract costs, which includes $76,846,831 in funding for the ETS CAASPP contract activities.

The 2018–19 Budget Act also provides a total of $54,334,000 in multiple ELPAC contract costs, which includes $27,259,000 for the ETS ELPAC 2018–19 contract activities. There is a one-time funding amount of $27,075,000, to be utilized across four fiscal years, for the development and administration of a computer-based ELPAC and computer-based Alternate ELPAC, $8,567,586 of which will be used in 2018–19 for the ETS ELPAC contract activities.

The proposed 2019–20 Budget Act, along with supplemental funds from 2018–19 for ELPAC, provides a total of $36,793,235 in funding for ELPAC contract obligations, which includes $36,362,323 for the ETS ELPAC contract activities.

Funding for 2020–21 and beyond will be contingent on an annual appropriation being made available from the Legislature in future fiscal years.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: Outreach and Professional Development Activities (5 pages)
* Attachment 2: Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Transition to a Computer-Based Initial and Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (28 pages)
* Attachment 3: Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (24 pages)
* Attachment 4: Proposed Adjustments to the Test Blueprints for the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (19 pages)
* Attachment 5: California Department of Education English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) 2018–19 Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Members (1 page)

**Outreach and Professional Development Activities**

The California Department of Education (CDE), in coordination with California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) contractors, has provided a variety of outreach activities, including in-person workshops, focus group meetings, and presentations, throughout the state to prepare local educational agencies (LEAs) for the administration of the CAASPP System and ELPAC. In addition, the CDE continues to release information regarding assessment program updates, including weekly updates, on its website and through listserv email. The following tables provide descriptions of outreach and professional development activities during March and April 2019.

**Table 1. Trainings**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4/15 | Sacramento | 159 | Initial ELPAC 2019–20 Administration and Scoring Training Training to prepare LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 4/17 | Montebello | 180 | Initial ELPAC 2019–20 Administration and Scoring Training Training to prepare LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 4/18 | Montebello | 180 | Initial ELPAC 2019–20 Administration and Scoring Training Training to prepare LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 4/23 | San Jose | 115 | Initial ELPAC 2019–20 Administration and Scoring Training Training to prepare LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 4/24 | San Jose | 120 | Initial ELPAC 2019–20 Administration and Scoring Training Training to prepare LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 4/25 | Bakersfield | 100 | Initial ELPAC 2019–20 Administration and Scoring Training Training to prepare LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |
| 4/30 | Madera | 160 | Initial ELPAC 2019–20 Administration and Scoring Training Training to prepare LEAs for the Initial ELPAC administration. |

**Table 2. Advisory Panel/Review Committee Meetings**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2/28-3/1 | Rancho Cordova | 18 | CAST Alignment StudyCalifornia science educators participated in a Human Resources Research Organization alignment study to evaluate the CAST test items and their alignment to the California Next Generation Science Standards Performance Expectations. |
| 3/20 | Sacramento | 25 | Regional Assessment Network (RAN)A presentation was provided to RAN members on several topics, including CAASPP and ELPAC pretest workshops, electronic score reporting, the opening of the CAASPP and ELPAC administration windows. |
| 3/21 | WebEx | 14 | Statewide Assessment Stakeholders MeetingThe CDE provided CAASPP and ELPAC program updates as well as an update on the Starting Smarter website for parents and guardians. |
| 3/22 | Sacramento | 4 | ELPAC Technical Advisory Group (TAG) MeetingTAG members advised the CDE on topics related to the transition from paper-pencil ELPAC to computer-based and on the development of the Alternate ELPAC for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. |
| 3/26–27 | Sacramento | 18 | CAST Achievement Level Descriptors ReviewCalifornia science educators reviewed grade- specific achievement level descriptors to be used during the standard setting workshop scheduled for late July 2019. |
| 4/2–5 | Sacramento | 10 | California Alternate Assessment for Science (CAA for Science) Item/Task Review MeetingCalifornia educators participated in the review of the performance task items for the CAA for Science.  |
| 4/15 | WebEx | 25 | Smarter Balanced Performance and Practice CommitteeCommittee consisting of member representatives participated in the exchange of ideas regarding testing practices and Smarter Balanced enhancements. |
| 4/18 | WebEx | 14 | Statewide Assessment Stakeholders MeetingThe HLTD for the computer-based ELPAC and the HLTD for the Alternate ELPAC were presented for feedback. |

**Table 3. Presentations by CDE Staff**

| **Date(s)** | **Location** | **Estimated Number of Attendees** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3/1 | Oakland | 20 | Board of Admissions and Relations with SchoolsThe CDE presented information on the Smarter Balanced high school assessments |
| 3/11–14 | Sacramento | 17–45 | California Charter Schools Conference* Leveraging the Full Suite of Smarter Balanced Components
* An Update on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California
 |
| 3/20 | Sacramento | 25 | Regional Assessment Network MeetingCAASPP and ELPAC updates were provided. |
| 3/20–23 | Long Beach | 20–80 | California Association for Bilingual Education ConferenceThe following topics were presented:* Leveraging the Full Suite of Smarter Balanced Components
* Knowledge Is Power: Assessment Resources for Parents
* Saber es poder: Materiales disponibles para padres
* CSA: Innovating for the Future
* An Update on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California
* Accessibility Resources for State Assessments
 |
| 3/21 | Sacramento | 95 | Curriculum and Instruction Steering CommitteeThis presentation provided information on the new state assessments, the California Assessment Conference, the science contest, and the new electronic student score reporting system. |
| 3/24 | Garden Grove | 25 | California Teachers Association—Good Teaching ConferenceThis presentation provided key information on the development of the CAST. Participants learned how to read and use an item specification and to deconstruct a California Next Generation Science Standards performance expectation. |
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## Overview

### Background

In November 2012, the California State Board of Education (SBE) adopted new English language development (ELD) standards that correspond to the rigorous language demands of new academic content standards to prepare all students for college and careers. In response, the California Department of Education (CDE) worked with Educational Testing Service (ETS) to develop the paper-based English language proficiency (ELP) assessments known as the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). The ELPAC is aligned with the *California English Language Development Standards, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve* (2012 ELD Standards), and items in the ELPAC also correspond to the Common Core State Standards Mathematical Practices and the Science and Engineering Practices in the California Next Generation of Science Standards.

In 2016, the CDE authorized ETS to investigate theoretical and empirical literature about the advantages and potential challenges of computer-based assessments, as well as the suitability of the paper-based ELPAC task types for transition to computer-based assessment. The results were reported in *Considerations in the Transition of the ELPAC Paper-Pencil Tests to Computer-Based Assessments* (2017), which provided recommendations for consideration when transitioning to a computer-based ELPAC and confirmed the suitability of the paper-based ELPAC task types for transition to a computer-based platform.

The literature documents the advantages of computer-based assessments over paper-pencil tests (PPTs) to assess ELP (e.g., Alderson and Huhta, 2005; Bachman, 2000; Chalhoub-Deville, 2001; Fulcher, 2003; Hauck, Wolf, and Mislevy, 2016; Roever, 2001). Some of the major advantages are that computer-based assessments provide a more standardized administration, a faster turnaround of scoring and reporting, centralized data management, and opportunities to better measure students’ ELP.

The key benefits of transitioning the ELPAC to computer-based assessments are as follows:

* Faster turnaround of test results to educators​
* Opportunity for more engaging tests with authentic tasks​
* Supports students’ familiarity in interacting with technology in the classroom​
* Provides standardized entry and exit procedures
* Create consistency with other California assessments by utilizing the same online test delivery platform.
* Make adjustments to the delivery of the ELPAC task types to take advantage of the computer-based assessment platform.
* Increase the range of available accessibility resources.

This transition includes the development and administration of the computer-based ELPAC pilot test, field test, and operational tests for the school years 2018–19, 2019–20, 2020–21, and 2021–22. As part of the transition work, ETS will be responsible for developing items and test forms; hosting the test on a computer-based system; providing manuals, videos, training, and other resources to local educational agencies (LEAs); and conducting psychometric analyses.

### Key Assumptions

For planning and development purposes, the following assumptions will guide the transition of the Summative ELPAC and the Initial ELPAC PPTs to computer-based assessments:

1. The computer-based ELPAC will maintain the same test purposes as the PPT ELPAC.
2. The computer-based ELPAC will maintain the existing test blueprints to the greatest degree possible. If adjustments are needed, changes will be proposed to the CDE and the SBE.
3. The computer-based ELPAC will maintain the existing performance level descriptors (“general” and “range”).
4. The computer-based ELPAC will expand the availability of system-delivered accessibility resources, allowing for standardized administration to assess ELP.
5. The computer-based ELPAC will utilize the existing ELPAC item pool, which will be converted for use in a computer-based format.
6. The computer-based ELPAC will be provided in a linear format (i.e., not adaptive).
7. The computer-based ELPAC will utilize the same secure browser and online test delivery platform as the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and maintain a similar look and feel as the CAASPP program assessments.
8. The transition to the computer-based ELPAC will be conducted in a manner to support the successful submission of the federal peer review.

### Assessment Purposes

The purposes of the ELPAC were guided by California *Education Code* sections 313 and 60810 and Titles I and III of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).The ELPAC consists of the two separate ELP assessments: the initial assessment, for initial identification, and the annual summative assessment.

The two ELPAC tests are designed to serve the following purposes, respectively:

* The Initial ELPAC is designed to provide information to help determine student classification as an English learner (EL) or as initial fluent English proficient (IFEP).
* The Summative ELPAC is designed to monitor annual progress in developing ELP and to provide information to help determine whether a student should be reclassified as fluent English proficient (RFEP).

### Test-Taking Population

The test-taking population for the Initial ELPAC is identified as students whose primary language is not English, as indicated on their Home Language Survey, who have enrolled in a California school for the first time. These students must take the Initial ELPAC within 30 days of their enrollment. The majority of the test-taking population for the Initial ELPAC are students in kindergarten (inclusive of students in year one of a two year transitional kindergarten program). The Initial ELPAC test-taking population may enroll in a school at any time during the school year and may or may not have formal school experiences before enrollment in a California school.

The test-taking population for the Summative ELPAC includes students who have been formally identified as EL students in kindergarten through grade twelve.

In instances when the individualized education program (IEP) team has determined that the ELPAC is not accessible to a student, an Alternate ELP assessment may be determined to be more appropriate.

### Overview of Test Design

The Initial ELPAC is administered to the following grades and grade spans: kindergarten, grade one, grade two, grades three through five, grades six through eight, and grades nine through twelve.

The Summative ELPAC is administered to the following grades and grade spans: kindergarten, grade one, grade two, grades three through five, grades six through eight, grades nine and ten, and grades eleven and twelve.

Four domains are assessed in the ELPAC—Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing in English. Administration modes vary by grade or grade span and domain. Students in kindergarten and grade one are tested one-on-one for all four domains. Students in grade two are tested one-on-one in the Speaking and Writing domains and in small groups of 10 or fewer students in the Listening and Reading domains. Students in grades three through twelve are tested one-on-one in the Speaking domain and in a group administration of 20 or fewer students in the Listening, Reading, and Writing domains.

### Guiding Principles

The following principles guide decisions specific to the test design of the computer-based ELPAC. They are based on discussion with and feedback from various stakeholder groups and LEAs as well as nationally renowned experts in the field of English language development (see subsection 1.H). The principles also are consistent with the report *Considerations in the Transition of the ELPAC Paper-Pencil Tests to Computer-Based Assessments*, which compiled findings and research from recent studies, a review of current testing practices, and the experience of developing the paper-based ELPAC to inform recommendations for consideration when transitioning the ELPAC to computer delivery. The guiding principles are as follows:

* The assessments must be designed to ensure that the intended population of test takers is able to demonstrate their ELP.
* The test design must be tailored to the specific needs of its intended population and offer an appropriate range of accessibility supports, including maximum accessibility for students with disabilities. It must also ensure linguistic and cultural fairness and sensitivity.
* The test design must take into consideration the testing burden for students and test examiners.

### Test Design Recommendations

The following proposed list summarizes the computer-based ELPAC test design recommendations contained in this document for presentation to the SBE for review and approval. These proposed recommendations are based on current best practices, the latest research findings, and best thinking from renowned experts in the field of ELD and assessment development for EL students. It is recommended that the computer-based ELPAC be designed to accomplish the following:

1. Maintain the one-on-one test administration model in kindergarten and grade one and small-group administration in grade two.
	* This ensures that young ELPAC test takers have active, personal support in navigating the computer interface as well as all other aspects of the test.
2. Allow test takers in kindergarten through grade two to respond to Writing tasks using pencil on printed answer books.
	* This reflects the writing skills expected by California’s *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework* for students in these grades.
3. Increase accessibility resources for students, including students with disabilities, with the transition to computer delivery.
	* Offer, for example, American Sign Language videos, closed captioning, text-to-speech, and navigation assistance.
4. Make targeted adjustments to the distribution of task types on the Summative ELPAC test blueprint in order to improve the measurement of student proficiency across the full range of English language proficiency, without impacting the current expectations associated with each of the ELPAC performance levels.

### Test Design Advisors

The transition to computer-based ELPAC is being advised by two nationally recognized experts:

* **Kenji Hakuta**, Ph.D.—Lee L. Jacks Professor emeritus at Stanford University Graduate School of Education; expert on language development, bilingual education, research methods, and statistics
* **Diane August**, Ph.D.—Managing researcher at the Center for English Language Learners, American Institutes for Research; expert on policy, research, and technical assistance related to the education of preschool and school-age second-language learners.

Appendix B provides biographies of Design Team advisors.

### Document Purpose

The purpose of this document is to present the high-level test design of the computer-based ELPAC as it transitions from a paper-based format. Section 1 provides an overview of the ELPAC, the guiding principles and recommendations for the transition to computer-based delivery. Section 2 presents the background of the design and development of the paper-based ELPAC. Section 3 describes key considerations for the validity and fairness of the assessment. Section 4 presents key considerations for the design and development of the computer-based ELPAC. Finally, Section 5 provides an overview of ELPAC scoring and section 6, ELPAC reporting.

## Design and Development of the ELPAC Paper-Pencil Tests

### Standards and Claims

In addition to the ELPAC’s alignment with the SBE-adopted 2012 ELD Standards, ELPAC items correspond to the Common Core State Standards Mathematical Practices and the Science and Engineering Practices in the California Next Generation of Science Standards.

While the 2012 ELD Standards are organized according to three modes of communication (collaborative, interpretive, and productive communication), federal Title I requirements emphasize the importance of assessing the four language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. To create a clear link between the 2012 ELD Standards and the domain-based reporting categories, high-level assessment claims were written for the ELPAC, breaking down the 2012 ELD Standards into statements about student performance within each of the four domains. These high-level claims describe the performance of students who obtain the highest performance level on the ELPAC:

* **Listening**. An EL student can comprehend spoken English (conversations, discussions, and oral presentations) in a range of social and academic contexts.
* **Reading**. An EL student can read, analyze, and interpret a variety of grade-appropriate literary and informational texts.
* **Speaking**. An EL student can express information, express ideas, and participate in grade-level conversations and group and class discussions.
* **Writing**. An EL student can write literary and informational texts to present, describe, and explain ideas and information.

These statements allow for student performance on assessment tasks that are aligned with the 2012 ELD Standards to be linked to performance in the domain-based reporting categories. In addition to high-level claims, there are multiple claims within each of the four domains, each detailing how the individual standards apply to the specific domain. The language of claims comes verbatim from the 2012 ELD Standards or the proficiency level descriptors (PLDs) (available at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/elpacgpld.asp>) when possible.

### Task Types

Twenty-seven task types are contained in the ELPAC: five for Listening, six for Speaking, nine for Reading, and seven for Writing. The entire list of task types, with descriptions, is available on the CDE website at [https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/‌ep/documents/elpactasktypes.pdf](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/%E2%80%8Cep/documents/elpactasktypes.pdf). Feedback from classroom educators, obtained through a post-test survey, found that these task types are effective in measuring student ELP in a manner consistent with how the 2012 ELD Standards are being implemented in classrooms. The computer-based ELPAC will maintain the same task types, with modest enhancements appropriate to the computer-based platform (see section 4 for details).

### Test Blueprints

The *Test Blueprints for the Initial ELPAC* and the *Test Blueprints for the Summative ELPAC* are publicly released documents that describe the task types administered in each grade or grade span, the alignment of the task types with the 2012 ELD Standards, and the point value of each task type. Task types and standards may have different degrees of alignment. The ELPAC test blueprints use the terms “primary” and “secondary” to describe two levels of alignment. Primary alignment indicates that there is a close or strong match in terms of the language knowledge, skills, and abilities covered by both the task type and the standard. Secondary alignment indicates that there is a moderate or partial match between the standard and the item in terms of language knowledge, skills, and abilities.

### Item and Form Development

Item development creates a robust pool of items suitable for the development of test forms that conform to the test blueprints. California educators contribute to all ELPAC new item development through participation in Item Writing Workshops, Content Review Panel (CRP) meetings, and Bias and Sensitivity Review Panel (BSRP) meetings. During the process, ETS assessment specialists serve as item writer trainers and item reviewers. The ETS assessment specialists’ main tasks are to develop item writer training materials, lead item writer training sessions, review items, facilitate review meetings with California educators, and apply feedback from the CRP and BSRP meetings to enhance the quality of the item pool.

ELPAC practice tests are publicly accessible documents that are available online at <https://www.elpac.org/resources/practicetests/>. They give students, parents/guardians and other family members, teachers, administrators, and anyone else an opportunity to become familiar with the types of test questions on the ELPAC. The ELPAC practice tests include examples of all of the types of test questions that may appear on the actual Summative Assessment in each grade or grade span.

## Validity and Fairness for the Computer-Based ELPAC

### Background

To support appropriate inferences about students’ ELP based on the computer-based ELPAC scores, it is vital to develop the computer-based ELPAC on the basis of best practices and testing standards that take the target testing population into account. In particular, attending to the enhancement of accessibility for all students, including EL students and EL students with disabilities, is a key consideration in establishing the validity and fairness of the computer-based ELPAC. In the following sections, the overall approach to ensuring validity and fairness in the transition to the computer-based ELPAC is described, including specific considerations.

#### **Best Practices**

The transition to the computer-based ELPAC is guided by considerations from numerous documents. *The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, and NMCE, 2014; henceforth, *The Standards*) describes a number of considerations that are applicable to transitioning the PPT ELPAC to an online delivery. Attention to details about fairness at the early stages of the ELPAC’s transition will help to promote valid interpretations and use of students’ test scores. Taking into account the range of characteristics of the target test-taking population also can help to promote a fair and equitable testing experience for all of the computer-based ELPAC test takers by enhancing the access of the test content for all students. The compilation *How ETS Works to Improve Accessibility* (ETS, 2010) outlines key considerations in creating content that is accessible for the target testing population while still minding the construct of the assessment and how tests can be made more accessible to minimize the need for adaptations in future development. The *ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness* *(ETS, 2015)* outlines standards to guide practices for validity and fairness, such as considering the types of validity evidence that may need to be collected to support the test development process and eventual test claims. For fairness considerations, the *Standards for Quality and Fairness* recommends that the diversity of the student population be deliberately considered in addition to design considerations, accessibility, and score reporting. Together, these documents outline guiding parameters to consider when developing a test and, in the case of the ELPAC, transitioning the test to an online mode of delivery.

### Design Considerations

In ensuring that the computer-based ELPAC is a fair and valid assessment, the following areas are the major considerations in the development process.

#### **Test-taking Population Characteristics**

During the transition process, it is critical to carefully consider the cultural and linguistic diversity of the students who will be taking the computer-based ELPAC. Eligible students will vary in the home languages and cultural experiences that complement their formal educational experiences (Klingner et al., 2005). Specifically, characteristics of the target population are reviewed in the subsections that follow. In the classroom, educators will encounter students who could possess one of these characteristics, or all of these characteristics, or any combination thereof—which makes attention to these details imperative in order to enhance the validity and fairness of the computer-based ELPAC.

##### **Computer Familiarity**

Technology is a ubiquitous component of education in the twenty-first century; however, EL students with diverse backgrounds may have differing degrees of experience and familiarity with it. During the transition to a computer-based ELPAC, technology should not introduce construct-irrelevant variance for the ELP construct. In other words, the computer-based ELPAC scores should remain a valid indication of students’ language skills, not a reflection of students’ ability to interact with the computer. Computer familiarity may be impacted by a range of considerations, such as device, required functionality, and usability. Further, these considerations may interact with any student-level characteristics, such as young students (Wolf, Guzman-Orth, and Wain, 2015). To mitigate these challenges, EL students taking the computer-based ELPAC need the opportunity to interact with the assessment in a variety of ways, such as requesting assistance from a test examiner to help navigate the test or through more structured help, such as having a test examiner assist with the typing of written responses because of the student’s limited computer familiarity (ELPA21, 2015).

##### **Young Test Takers**

Students can begin taking the ELPAC as early as kindergarten, including transitional kindergarten, all the way through grade twelve. Very young test takers (e.g., transitional kindergarten, kindergarten, first grade, and second grade students) are part of the target students taking the ELPAC. The ELPAC will not require students to interact directly with the computer interface if they are not able to do so effectively. When assessing very young test takers, it is paramount to consider the assistance they will reasonably need to interact with the assessment and how that may interact with the design considerations for the test (Bailey, 2008; Wolf and Butler, 2017). For example, young test takers may need additional support to understand the test expectations and interact with technology (Guzman-Orth et al., 2016; Wolf et al., 2016). Test examiners may need additional support and training to learn how to best meet the needs of these young test takers (Espinosa and Garcia, 2012). For an example of how the characteristics of young test takers were taken into consideration for the conversion to computer delivery, refer to subsection 4.B.

##### **First-Time Test Takers**

Students who are new arrivals have diverse cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences. These students may also have had interruptions in their formal schooling opportunities or standardized assessment experience, which could pose a challenge for some of these students taking the computer-based ELPAC. The computer-based ELPAC must remain free from bias and promote cultural appropriateness (Padilla, 2001; Santos, 2004). To facilitate these goals, opportunities for students to clarify expectations, ask questions, and take breaks may be necessary to ensure that the testing experience is appropriate and that students’ backgrounds do not impact their ability to show what they know and are able to do.

##### **EL Students with Disabilities**

EL students with disabilities—excluding EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities—also will be part of the target population taking the computer-based ELPAC. As noted in section 1.D, ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be eligible to take the Alternate ELPAC (per IEP). EL students with disabilities who take the computer-based ELPAC are a diverse group and may experience a range of cognitive, sensory, or motor challenges that could impact how they individually interact with the computer-based ELPAC to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Christensen, Albus, Liu, Thurlow, and Kincaid, 2013; Guzman-Orth et al., 2016). Other details, such as the type of disability (or disabilities, as students may have more than one disability), the presentation characteristics, the age of identification or onset, and the compensatory strategies used will all intersect within individual students. The transition to the computer-based ELPAC provides an opportunity to better establish and maintain a balance between the needs of individual students, the need to maintain a standardized assessment administration, and the need to ensure that the test feasibly can be administered by the LEAs. The computer-based ELPAC also will attend to the unique needs of students who may not be able to take a computer-based assessment, despite assistance. In these instances, LEAs may also request paper test forms, such as a braille or large-print paper test form, to meet the needs of their students.

#### **Computer-Based ELPAC Accessibility Considerations**

Universal design also can enhance the development of the allowable accessibility resources for the computer-based ELPAC; that is, accessibility resources for the ELPAC are designed in such a way that they promote multiple pathways for access by students with diverse needs. These accessible pathways promote a fairer and more equitable testing experience for diverse students (CAST, 2018; Liu and Anderson, 2008).

Transitioning to a computer-based administration affords similarities in style, use, and functionality with the existing CAASPP content assessment accessibility resources that also could support the measurement of the ELP construct. These accessibility resources are organized in a multitiered model that supports access for all students, including students with disabilities. These tiers are represented through universal tools (resources available for all students), designated supports (resources available for some students with parent/guardian or teacher input), and accommodations (resources available for students with disabilities, as specified through their IEP or Section 504 plan). Across these tiers, the resources also are categorized by what will be available external to the system (non-embedded) or internal (embedded). This structure promotes flexibility for the LEAs to select and administer the appropriate resources to assist their students in taking the computer-based ELPAC and producing valid and reliable scores to demonstrate their English language skills.

The *ELPAC Accessibility Framework* (forthcoming), developed by ETS in collaboration with national experts, includes detailed recommendations for accessibility resources, both non-embedded and embedded, that students may use as they take the ELPAC. The recommendations for resources were the result of a detailed synthesis of allowable resources in the field, across existing CAASPP assessments, such as Smarter Balanced English language arts and mathematics, as well as World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment, and ELPA21 language proficiency assessments. For example, recommendations for resources include test examiner assistance with test navigation (universal tool) and translated test directions (designated support).

The goal of the range of resources recommended for the ELPAC is to ensure that students have multiple means of access to the test to demonstrate their language skills and to ensure that their performance is a measure of their language skills and not a result of their technology skills or disability status. The *ELPAC Accessibility Framework* is a separate document supporting the conversion of the computer-based ELPAC. The resources described in this framework will be presented to the SBE for approval through the regulatory guidelines.

## Design and Development of the Computer-Based ELPAC

### Conceptual Approach to Development of the Computer-Based ELPAC

The CDE has been considering the transition of the paper-pencil ELPAC to computer-based assessments for some time and has shown its commitment to making this transition in an intentional, thoughtful manner. The initial development of the paper-based ELPAC called for task types to be developed in a manner that would support their eventual transition to computer delivery. Even as the paper-based ELPAC was being developed, the CDE commissioned ETS to [develop](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cybyun%5CDesktop%5Cdevelop) the *Computer-Based Report,* as described in section 1.

While the change from a paper-based platform to a computer-based platform is significant, the transition to computer-based assessment does not call for radical change to the manner in which the ELPAC measures student language proficiency. The test’s purposes, the standards being assessed, and the assessment claims will not change as the ELPAC transitions from a PPT to a computer-based platform.

The key goals to be achieved in the transition to a computer-based assessment are as follows:

* Make accessibility resources available in a more comprehensive manner to ELPAC test takers (as previously detailed in section 3).
* Reduce the turnaround time for SSRs due to the elimination of returning of paper tests to contractor for grades three through twelve.
* Make the ELPAC more consistent with other California assessments. Transitioning to a computer-based ELPAC will allow students and educators to interact with a single platform and ensure technological parity between the ELPAC and the other California tests.
* Support increasing familiarity and comfort of ELs in interacting with technology in the classroom.
* Make modest adjustments to the delivery of the ELPAC task types to take advantage of the computer-based platform (e.g., allow a more integrated presentation of recorded audio; allow student responses to writing tasks to be entered using a keyboard in grades three through twelve).

The following assumptions will guide the transition to the computer-based ELPAC:

* Use digital voice capture in the Speaking domain to back score a percentage of spoken responses and thereby verify the consistency of local scoring to inform training.
* During the transition, include a usability pilot in spring 2019, a field test in fall 2019, and a threshold score review.

### Considerations for Conversion of the Item Pool to Online Test Delivery

As noted previously, the test’s purposes, standards being assessed, and assessment claims for the computer-based ELPAC are the same as for those of the ELPAC PPT. The *Computer-Based Report* found that the task types on the paper-based ELPAC are appropriate for measuring the 2012 ELD Standards and could be used on a computer-based platform with relatively modest adaptations to take advantage of the computer platform. This finding is supported by feedback from classroom educators that the existing ELPAC task types do an effective job of measuring student ELP consistent with how 2012 ELD Standards are being implemented in classrooms. Similarly, the model for administration for the computer-based ELPAC follows what was used for the ELPAC PPT (refer to subsection 1.E), including one-on-one assessment of students in kindergarten and grade one for all domains and one-on-one administration of the Speaking domain in all grades. A careful analysis of the best way to convert each ELPAC task type to computer-based delivery, on the basis of the findings of the *Computer-Based Report*, was conducted and documented in the *Specifications for Conversion of ELPAC Task Types for Computer-Based Assessment*, which details the process followed to prepare ELPAC paper-based items for computer-based delivery. This section summarizes key aspects of the planned computer-based ELPAC presentation of task types for each domain, all of which maintains the important consistency with the *ELA/ELD Framework*.

#### **Listening Domain**

For the computer-based ELPAC for kindergarten and grade one (K–1) students, a test examiner will sit one-on-one with the student to provide guidance and to operate the computer tools. This approach is consistent with a number of studies previously conducted by ETS to examine the interactions of EL students in kindergarten through grade two (K–2) with computer-based features when taking ELP assessments on the computer (Lopez, Wolf, and Evanini, 2013a, 2013b; Lopez, Wolf, Evanini, Wang, and Everson, 2013; Wolf, Lopez, Oh, and Tsutagawa, 2017). One of the findings indicated that K–1 students needed one-on-one support while the grade two sample students were able to navigate computer-based assessments independently in small-group administration settings.

#### **Speaking Domain**

In the Speaking domain, test examiners will continue to administer the items one-on-one to the students, maintaining the interview style that was used in the ELPAC PPT. On the computer-based ELPAC, however, students will view images that accompany items on a computer screen rather than in a printed test book. Test examiners will continue to assign scores to student responses in the moment; on the computer-based ELPAC, however, there will be two interfaces: in addition to the computer screen that students use to view stimuli and record their spoken responses, test examiners will have another interface on a separate electronic device that they will use to enter scores.

The computer-based ELPAC also will utilize voice capture technology to capture student responses in order to support the review of examiner-assigned scores.

#### **Reading Domain**

For the Reading domain, passages and items will be presented on the computer-based ELPAC much as they appear on the paper-based ELPAC. Current plans for presenting directions on the computer-based ELPAC are as follows: The directions for K–1 will be read aloud by the test examiner from printed directions for administration. For grades two through twelve, directions for the Reading domain will be presented only as on-screen text, not via recordings. Item-level directions will appear on the same screen on which the Reading stimulus appears.

#### **Writing Domain**

For the Writing domain, K–2 students will write their responses in pencil in scannable answer books. The student experience will remain paper-based to allow for the administration of items that align with the 2012 ELD Standards and conform to best practices for literacy instruction in K–2. The scannable answer books will be returned to ETS in preparation for scoring.

For grades three through twelve, the Writing test will be taken solely on the computer. Students will work through the Writing test independently and will keyboard their responses on the computer. The directions will be audio recorded in addition to being presented as text on the screen. Students will be able to replay the directions and item audio as often as needed before moving on to the next item.

### Blueprint Development

The process used to develop the test blueprints for the ELPAC PPT is described in
subsection 2.C. The transition to the computer-based ELPAC involves a small-scale usability pilot in spring 2019 and a field test in fall 2019, leading up to the first operational administration in spring 2020.

The transition to a computer-based platform also provided an opportunity to review the test blueprint and make any adjustments that could improve the validity and reliability of reported scores. During the review of the Summative ELPAC test blueprints, an opportunity was found to make minor adjustments to the distribution of task types in order to increase the amount of information collected across the full range of ELP, particularly in grades one and grade two and for the Speaking domain in all grades. These proposed adjustments will not impact the current expectations associated with each of the ELPAC performance levels; they will enable the computer-based ELPAC to provide improved measurement of student progress toward language proficiency. The review of test blueprints did not lead to any recommended changes to the Initial ELPAC test blueprints.

### Items and Form Development

Two sources of test items exist for the computer-based ELPAC. The majority of the computer-based ELPAC items through the time of the first operational launch will come from the existing pool of paper-based ELPAC items, which will be converted for use on the computer-based ELPAC following the principles outlined in subsection 3.B. In addition, the annual development of new items will continue throughout the transition to computer delivery. A sufficient number of new items will be developed to support the contracted annual refresh of the content of Summative ELPAC forms.

Two tryouts of items will take place in 2019 to support the transition to computer delivery: (1) a usability pilot using a cognitive lab methodology; and (2) a field test (with an associated voluntary pilot of an accommodated form). Each of these two events is described briefly in the following subsection.

#### **Usability Pilot: Spring 2019**

This event will be a small-scale “dry run” of the planned process for converting and administering ELPAC items and forms for computer delivery, and will involve the administration of approximately 150 items (drawn from publicly available paper-based practice items) to a small sample of students. A cognitive labs methodology will be used to evaluate the converted items, as well as ancillary materials, such as the *Directions for Administration* (*DFAs*) and support materials for local educator scoring of speaking responses, according to the following criteria:

* Students are able to understand directions and items and respond appropriately for all domains.
* Test Examiners are able to administer the computer-based test effectively (including in-the-moment scoring of Speaking responses).
* Students are able to make appropriate use of embedded universal tools for accessibility.

Results of the usability pilot will be used to confirm or adjust the plans for conversion of the remaining items in the ELPAC item pool, as well as ancillary materials, such as the *DFAs* and support materials for test examiner scoring of speaking responses, in preparation for field testing and operational use. Results also will yield validity evidence to address critical elements for peer review.

#### **Field Test and Voluntary Pilot of Accommodated Form: Fall 2019**

A voluntary field test will be held in fall 2019 to conduct all empirical studies necessary for the operational launch of the Initial ELPAC and the Summative ELPAC on the computer-based platform (refer to section 4.E for details).

At the same time as the fall 2019 field test, a small-scale voluntary pilot of an accommodated test form will be administered to provide an opportunity for students to have access to the ELPAC content on the computer while using their allowed accommodations. ETS will conduct a small-scale cognitive lab during the voluntary pilot to learn more about how students with low-incidence disabilities, specifically students who have visual impairments or who have deafness or are hard of hearing, not with the most significant cognitive disabilities, are interacting with the computer-based ELPAC content and their allowed accommodations.

### Additional Studies

The main purpose of the psychometric activities discussed in this section is to support a smooth transition from the ELPAC PPT to the computer-based ELPAC and to ensure that the ELPAC scores remain valid and reliable. In order to support the transition to the computer-based ELPAC, two additional studies are planned for the fall of 2019: the ELPAC field test and the ELPAC mode comparability study. The scope for these studies is similar to the stand-alone ELPAC PPT field test in spring of 2017 in establishing the summative reporting scales.

The purposes of the fall 2019 ELPAC field test are as follows:

* Support the development of a preequated Summative ELPAC spring 2019–20 administration and a preequated Initial ELPAC 2020–21 administration.
* Evaluate the Summative ELPAC PPT vertical (common) scales with computer-based ELPAC data to maintain comparability.

The purposes of the mode comparability study are as follows:

* Estimate the magnitude of test mode effect between the paper-based ELPAC and the computer-based ELPAC for each grade or grade span.
* Place the computer-based ELPAC on the established paper-based ELPAC scale to ensure continuity for score reporting and utilize the linkage to develop a crosswalk.

The stand-alone field test and the comparability study will inform future development of test forms.

## Scoring

### Background

Item-level scoring for the computer-based ELPAC will be performed using two approaches to scoring. The Listening and Reading domains contain selected-response items, which are scored by machine. The Speaking and Writing domains contain constructed-response (CR) items, which are scored by human raters. Machine-scored results and human-scored results are merged to develop scaled scores for score reporting. All rating will be completed following the approved guidelines already in place for the ELPAC PPT for certifying and supervising rater quality, accuracy, and validity.

### Scoring the ELPAC

For the computer-based Initial ELPAC, all Speaking and Writing CR items will be scored locally. The current Rotating Score Validation Process (RSVP), which provides backscoring by ETS raters for a predetermined set of LEAs, will continue for the computer-based Initial ELPAC.

For the computer-based Summative ELPAC, Speaking CR items will be scored locally. Voice capture in the Speaking domain will be used to back score a percentage of spoken responses. All Writing CRs will be scored by ETS.

All scoring rules currently in place for the ELPAC PPT will be revisited and revised to allow for changes needed as a result of the transition to the computer-based ELPAC.

All machine-scored and human rater-scored results will be merged for final scoring, analysis, and score reporting.

## Reporting

### Reporting Scores

Score reporting for the computer-based ELPAC will be consistent with what was reported for the ELPAC PPT.

Figure 1, below, displays the score reporting hierarchy for the Summative ELPAC, approved in September 2017 by the SBE, which requires four performance levels to be reported for three composite scores, Oral Language, Written Language, and an Overall Score. In addition, three performance levels will be reported for each domain.



Figure 1. Summative ELPAC Score Reporting Hierarchy

Figure 2, on the following page, displays the score reporting hierarchy for the Initial ELPAC, approved in January 2018 by the SBE, which requires three performance levels to be reported for three composite scores, Oral Language, Written Language, and an Overall Score. Compared to the Summative ELPAC, the Initial ELPAC has fewer items in each domain; therefore, domain scores are not reported.



Figure 2. Initial ELPAC Score Reporting Hierarchy

Similar to the ELPAC PPT, score reports will be provided electronically for the computer-based Summative ELPAC as well as locally for the computer-based Initial ELPAC. All score reporting specifications will be reviewed, revised, and updated in accordance with any changes required by the transition to computer delivery as a result of the threshold score review.

### Threshold Score Review

As part of the transition to computer delivery, an evaluation of the impact on threshold scores is an important check on the validity of the computer-based ELPAC scores. The standards, alignment of the assessment with the standards, score reporting hierarchy, and PLDs, have not changed in this transition.

A threshold score review study will be conducted after the mode comparability studies are complete. Approved ELPAC general PLDs and range PLDs will be used as part of the threshold score review. Educators will be selected from the pool of educators who participated in the two ELPAC standard setting workshops conducted for the PPT ELPAC in November 2018 (Summative) and February 2019 (Initial).

The purposes of the threshold score review panel are to review the process of development of the PPT threshold scores approved in November 2018; and to share the process of comparing the computer-based ELPAC scores and the process to align the threshold scores between the two assessment modes. The goals of the threshold score review study are to ensure transparency of the process and to collect confirmation from the educators who were in the original ELPAC standard setting that subsequent processes are reasonable to provide threshold scores for the computer-based ELPAC.

## Appendix A: High-Level Transition Timeline

| Date | Activity |
| --- | --- |
| Fall 2018 | Conversion of usability pilot items from paper-based to computer-based format |
| Winter 2019 | Development of *Accessibility Framework* |
| April 2019 | Administration of usability pilot and cognitive lab study |
| May 2019 | California State Board of Education action on the *Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Transition to Computer-Based English Language Proficiency Assessments for California* and proposed revisions to the Summative ELPAC test blueprints |
| Spring 2019 | Conversion of entire paper-based item pool to computer-based format |
| Fall 2019 | Administration of field test  |
| Fall 2019 | Voluntary pilot and cognitive labs for accommodated form |
| Fall 2019 | Mode comparability study  |
| Winter 2019 | Threshold score review |
| February 2020 | Operational administration of computer-based Summative ELPAC  |
| July 2020 | Operational administration of computer-based Initial ELPAC  |

**Appendix B: Biographical Summaries: ELPAC Test Design Advisors**

**Kenji Hakuta, Ph.D.** is the Lee L. Jacks Professor emeritus at the Stanford University Graduate School of Education. He received his Ph.D. in experimental psychology from Harvard University in 1979; has held faculty positions at Yale University and the University of California, Santa Cruz; and served as the founding dean of the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts at the University of California, Merced. He has been elected to the National Academy of Education, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the American Educational Research Association. Dr. Hakuta has published research in the areas of psycholinguistics, bilingualism, language shift, and the acquisition of English by immigrant students. He is the author and editor of many articles and books, including *Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism* (1986) and *In Other Words: The Science and Psychology of Second Language Acquisition* (1994). In addition to his conducting of research, Dr. Hakuta is professionally active in the areas of language policy, education of language-minority students, affirmative action in higher education, and improvement of quality in educational research. He has served on the boards of the Spencer Foundation and the Educational Testing Service, and he chaired the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board of the US Department of Education. In California, he served on the Department of Education’s committee to develop the state English Language Development Standards, and he was the author (and co-chair) of the California English Learner Roadmap policy. Dr. Hakuta has been actively involved in supporting the work of school districts and states throughout the country to improve education for English learners. He currently advises the Council of Chief State Schools Officers in supporting state collaborative efforts regarding EL students.

**Diane August, Ph.D**. is a Managing Researcher at the American Institutes for Research (AIR). At AIR, she is responsible for directing the English learner work for the Center on English Learners. Her area of expertise is policy, research, and technical assistance related to the education of preschool and school age second-language learners. Dr. August brings to this work 40 years of experience in the many aspects of educating language-minority children. Before her position at AIR, she was a senior research scientist at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), where she directed federally funded studies related to the development of literacy in English learners. At CAL she also has served as coprincipal investigator of the National Research and Development Center on English Language Learners, where she developed, implemented, and evaluated innovative STEM programs for second-language learners in secondary school. Dr. August also has served as a senior program officer at the National Academy of Sciences, where she was study director for the Committee on Developing a Research Agenda on the Education of Limited English Proficient and Bilingual Students. In addition, she has worked as a teacher, school administrator, legislative assistant, grants officer for the Carnegie Corporation, and director of education for the Children's Defense Fund. In 1981, Dr. August received a Ph.D. in education from Stanford University, and in 1982 completed a postdoctoral fellowship in psychology, also at Stanford. She has published widely in journals and books.
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## Overview

### Background

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

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

(1) The identification of a pupil as having a particular disability as defined in IDEA shall not determine whether or not a pupil is a pupil with the most significant cognitive disabilities; and

(2) A pupil with the most significant cognitive disabilities must not be identified as such based solely on the pupil's previous low academic achievement or the pupil's previous need for accommodations to participate in general statewide or local assessments.

(3) For purposes of this definition, “adaptive behavior” means behavior essential for someone to live independently and to function safely across three domains of daily life skills: conceptual (e.g., language, functional academics, self-direction, money management, and time concepts); social (e.g., interpersonal skills, responsibility, self-esteem, wariness/naivete, follow rules, etiquette, and social problem solving); and practical (e.g., activities of daily living, occupational skills, safety, healthcare, and travel).

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

ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities must have access to instruction and assessment aligned with adapted grade-level academic standards. The Alternate ELPAC must carefully balance maximum accessibility while maintaining the intended construct(s) to be assessed as defined by the 2012 ELD Standards though reduced in depth, breadth and complexity. As other alternate assessments administered in California schools are aligned with connectors for the appropriate content area, the Alternate ELPAC will align with the *California English Language Development Connectors for the Alternate ELPAC* (ELD Connectors) that are based on the 2012 ELD Standards. The Connectors offer a reduction in the depth, breadth, and complexity of the standards, as appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

### Assessment Purposes

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

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

### Test-Taking Population

#### **Initial Alternate ELPAC**

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

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

#### **Summative Alternate ELPAC**

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

### Guiding Principles

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

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

### Key Assumptions

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

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

### Test Design Recommendations

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

1. Approve the proposed general performance level descriptors (PLDs) specifically tailored to the test-taking population in subsection 2.D.; once approved by the SBE, the general PLDs will be used to develop reporting PLDs that describe levels of performance to educators and parents. These reporting PLDs will be used with in the standard setting process.
2. Organize grades and grade spans of the Alternate ELPAC test forms to be consistent with the Summative ELPAC: kindergarten, grade one, grade two, grades three through five, grades six through eight, grades nine and ten, and grades eleven and twelve.
3. Ensure task types that assess the four domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing in an integrated manner (i.e., a single task type may assess multiple domains). (Refer to subsection 2.B. for details.)
4. Provide accessibility resources, including universal tools, designated supports and accommodations, to be detailed in the ELPAC Accessibility Framework. (Refer to subsection 3.B.4. for details.)
5. Consistent with other alternate assessments in California, utilize a one-on-one administration model for all grades.
6. Develop an online, linear test (i.e., not adaptive). (Refer to subsection 2.B. for details.)
7. Develop a single test blueprint to be used for *both* the Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC for each grade or grade span. (Refer to subsection 2.C. for details.)
8. Locally score constructed-response items consistent with other alternate assessments in California that depend on test examiner knowledge of individual students. Local scoring will include a process, developed by ETS with input from national experts, for double-scoring a portion of student responses to check for scoring consistency.

### Test Design Advisory Team

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

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

Appendix B provides biographies for members of the Test Design Advisory Team.

## Design and Development

### Evidence-Centered Design Approach

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

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

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

#### **ELD Connectors**

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

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

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

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

#### **High-Level Claim**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Recommended Approach to Task Types **and** Test Development

#### **Task Development**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Development of a Linear Test**

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

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

### Blueprint Development

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. A preliminary draft of the test blueprints will be created to inform item development for the pilot test. This preliminary draft will contain information about which task types are being administered during the pilot test. It will not describe test forms in the level of detail needed to produce test forms suitable for reporting student scores.
2. As part of the analysis of the pilot test, decisions will be made regarding which task types are suitable for use on the operational forms and how many items of each task type are needed to appropriately sample the ELD Connectors, support reliable score reporting, and provide a test form that is of appropriate length.
3. Based on these pilot analyses, an operational test blueprint containing all of the information necessary to develop the operational Alternate ELPAC will be finalized for SBE consideration.

### General Performance Level Descriptors

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

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

Table 1. Alternate ELPAC PLDs

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

## Validity and Fairness

### Background

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

### Design Considerations

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

#### **Test-taking Population**

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

#### **Universal Design**

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

#### **Online Test Administration**

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

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

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

#### **Accessibility**

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

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

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

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

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

## Scoring and Reporting

### Score Reporting Structure

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

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

## Planned Research Studies

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

### Pilot Test and Cognitive Lab Study

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

### Field Test Study

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

### Standard Setting Study

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

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

### Additional Studies

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

**Appendix A High-Level Timeline**

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

**Table 2. Alternate ELPAC High-Level Timeline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Date |
| SBE action on the *Proposed High-Level Test Design for the Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessments for California*, including general performance level descriptors  | May 2019 |
| Administration of the pilot test and cognitive labs | January 2020 |
| Development of proposed blueprint | February–March 2020 |
| SBE action on the proposed blueprint | May 2020 |
| Administration of a statewide operational field test for both Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC | January–February 2021 |
| Standard setting study for both Initial and Summative Alternate ELPAC | Spring 2021 |
| SBE action on the proposed threshold scores | Spring 2021 |
| Administration of the Operational Initial Alternate ELPAC  | July 2021  |
| Administration of the Operational Summative Alternate ELPAC | February 2022 |

**Appendix B Test Design Advisory Team Biographies**

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

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

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

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

The English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) is an English language development (ELD) test for students in kindergarten through grade twelve (K–‍12). The ELPAC must comply with California *Education Code (EC)* sections 60810 et seq. by which the Legislature required the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education (SBE) to select or develop a test that assesses the English language proficiency (ELP) of students whose primary language is a language other than English. Beginning with the 2000–01 school year, the new law required the assessment of ELP to be done upon initial enrollment and annually thereafter until the local educational agency reclassified the student. State law required the state test of ELP to be aligned to the state-adopted ELD Standards (California *EC* Section 60810[c][7]). *EC* Section 60811 (as amended by Assembly Bill 899 in 2013) requires the 2012 California *English Language Development Standards, Kindergarten Through Grade 12* (2012 ELD Standards) to be linked with academic content standards for mathematics and science in order to meet state law and federal accountability requirements.

The ELPAC consists of two separate assessments: the Initial ELPAC for initial identification and the annual Summative ELPAC. The Summative ELPAC is administered to seven grades and grade spans: kindergarten, one, two, three through five, six through eight, nine and ten, and eleven and twelve. The Initial ELPAC is administered to six grades and grade spans: kindergarten, one, two, three through five, six through eight, nine through twelve. The ELPAC is aligned with the 2012 ELD Standards adopted by the SBE in November 2012. Items also correspond to the Common Core State Standards Mathematical Practices and the Science and Engineering Practices in the California Next Generation of Science Standards.

In November 2015, the SBE approved the Proposed Test Blueprints for the ELPAC. After that, the first pilot of ELPAC items and the stand-alone sample field test of the summative assessment were administered. Analysis of the pilot and the stand-alone sample field test results led to modifications of the ELPAC test blueprints. The names of some of the task types were changed, and some of the task types were removed from the test blueprints. In addition, the ELPAC test blueprints for the Initial ELPAC were separated from the test blueprints for the Summative ELPAC. The SBE approved the Summative ELPAC test blueprints in September 2017.

In November 2018, the SBE approved plans to transition the ELPAC from a paper-based assessment to a computer-based assessment (CBA). The transition to the ELPAC CBA involves a small-scale pilot in spring 2019 and a field test in fall 2019, leading up to the first operational administration in spring 2020. As part of the transition work, the Summative ELPAC test blueprints were reviewed to see where minor adjustments could be made to appropriately utilize CBA delivery and increase the amount of information collected across the full range of English language proficiency, while continuing to ensure the assessment remains fair and valid for its intended purposes.

The results of this process are the attached proposed adjustments to the test blueprints for the Summative ELPAC, which appear in Table 3 through Table 6. Table 7 provides an overview of items and points on the Summative ELPAC by domain and grade.

## Final Changes Prior to Publication

This document contains proposed new item quantities and points enclosed in parentheses and highlighted in yellow and proposed deletions enclosed in brackets and highlighted in blue. If this document is approved by the SBE, the following changes will be made to this document:

* The old information that is in brackets and highlighted in blue will be removed.
* Parentheses and yellow highlighting will be removed from the new information.
* The title will be changed to Test Blueprints for the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.
* The phrase “Proposed Adjustments to” will be removed from the titles of Table 1 through Table 4. For example, Table 1 will be renamed “Table 1. Listening: Number of Items and Points by Task Type and Grade.”
* This section, Final Changes Prior to Publication, will be deleted.

These changes and any other needed changes related to the appearance or accessibility of the document will be made before the document is posted to the California Department of Education website.

In the Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s) column in Table 3, multiple primary standards are listed for those task types with items that align with different standards. These vary by grade. Additional secondary standards may apply to select stem types.

Table 3. Proposed Adjustments to Listening: Number of Items and Points by Task Type and Grade

| **Listening Task Type** | **Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s)** | **Discrete/‌Set, Point Value** | **K Items** | **K Points** | **Grade 1 Items** | **Grade 1 Points** | **Grade 2 Items** | **Grade 2 Points** | **Grades 3–5 Items** | **Grades 3–5 Points** | **Grades 6–8 Items** | **Grades 6–8 Points** | **Grades 9–10 Items** | **Grades 9–10 Points** | **Grades 11–12 Items** | **Grades 11–12 Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Listen to a Short Exchange | Part (P)I.A.1, PI.B.5, PII.A.2 | Discrete, 1 point | 5 | 5 | [4](2) | [4](2) | [4](2) | [4](2) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Listen to a Classroom Conversation  | PI.A.1, PI.A.3, PI.B.5 | Set of (2–)3 items, (2–)3 points per set | 0 | 0 | [0](2) | [0](2) | [0](2) | [0](2) | [6](3) | [6](3) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Listen to a Story | PI.B.5, PII.A.1 | Set of 3 items, 3 points per set | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Listen to an Oral Presentation | Grades K–12 PI.B.5Grades 6–12 PI.B.7, PI.B.8, PII.A.1 | Set of 3–4 items, 3–4 points per set | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | [7](10) | [7](10) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Listen to a Speaker Support an Opinion | PI.A.3, PI.B.5, PI.B.7, PI.B.8, PII.A.1 | Set of 4 items, 4 points per set | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| NA | NA | Totals | 20 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |

In the Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s) column in Table 4, multiple primary standards are listed for those task types with items that align with different standards. These vary by grade.

In the Aligned Secondary ELD Standard(s) column, secondary standards vary based on the stem types. These secondary standards are used in service of the PI Standards and are implicitly accounted for in the constructed-response rubrics.

Table 4. Proposed Adjustments to Speaking: Number of Items and Points by Task Type and Grade

| Speaking Task Type | Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s) | Aligned Secondary ELD Standard(s) | Discrete/Set, Point Value | K Items | K Points | Grade 1 Items | Grade 1 Points | Grade 2 Items | Grade 2 Points | Grades 3–5 Items | Grades 3–5 Points | Grades 6–8 Items | Grades 6–8 Points | Grades 9–10 Items | Grades 9–10 Points | Grades 11–12 Items | Grades 11–12 Points |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Talk About a Scene | Part (P)I.A.1 | PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5 | [Set of 6 items, 9 points per set](Set of 4 items, 6 points per set) | [6](4) | [9](6) | [6](4) | [9](6) | [6](4) | [9](6) | [6](4) | [9](6) | [6](4) | [9](6) | [6](4) | [9](6) | [6](4) | [9](6) |
| Speech Functions | PI.A.4 | PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5 | Discrete, 2 points | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Support an Opinion | Grades K–5 PI.C.11Grades 6–12PI.A.3  | PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6 | Discrete, Grades K–2: 2 points Grades 3–12:3 points | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| Retell a Narrative (Speaking with Listening) | PI.C.9 | PI.B.5, PI.C.12, PII.A.1, PII.A.2, PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6 | Discrete, 4 points | [1](2) | [4](8) | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Present and Discuss Information (Speaking with Reading) | PI.C.9, PI.A.3 | PI.B.6, PII.A.2, PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6 | Set of 2 items, 6 points per set | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| Summarize an Academic Presentation (Speaking with Listening) | PI.C.9 | PI.B.5, PII.A.2, PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6, PII.C.7 | Discrete, 4 points | 1 | 4 | [1](2) | [4](8) | [1](2) | [4](8) | [1](2) | [4](8) | [1](2) | [4](8) | [1](2) | [4](8) | [1](2) | [4](8) |
| NA | NA | NA | Totals | [10](9) | [21](22) | [10](9) | [21](22) | [13](12) | [27](28) | [13](12) | [29](30) | [13](12) | [29](30) | [13](12) | [29](30) | [13](12) | [29](30) |

In the Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s) column in Table 5, multiple primary standards are listed for those task types with items that align with different standards. These vary by grade. Additional secondary standards may apply to select stem types.

Table 5. Proposed Adjustments to Reading: Number of Items and Points by Task Type and Grade

| Reading Task Type | Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s) | Discrete/Set, Point Value | K Items | K Points | Grade 1 Items | Grade 1 Points | Grade 2 Items | Grade 2 Points | Grades 3–5 Items | Grades 3–5 Points | Grades 6–8 Items | Grades 6–8 Points | Grades 9–10 Items | Grades 9–10 Points | Grades 11–12 Items | Grades 11–12 Points |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Read-Along Word with Scaffolding | Part (P)III[[1]](#footnote-2), PI.B.6 | Set of 2 items, 3 points per set | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Read-Along Story with Scaffolding | PIII1, PI.B.6  | Set of 4 items, 5 points per set | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Read-Along Information | PI.B.6 | Set of 3 items, 3 points per set | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Read and Choose a Word | PI.B.6 | Discrete, 1 point | 0 | 0 | [3](2) | [3](2) | [2](0) | [2](0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Read and Choose a Sentence | PI.B.6 | Discrete, 1 point | 0 | 0 | [5](4) | [5](4) | [6](4) | [6](4) | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Read a Short Informational Passage | Grades 1–12 PI.B.6Grades 3–12 PI.B.7, PI.B.8, PII.A.1, PII.A.2 | Set of 2–3 items, 1 point per item | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Read a Student Essay | PI.B.6, PI.B.7, PI.B.8, PII.A.1, PII.A.2, PII.C.6, PII.C.7 | Grades 3–‍5: Set of 6 itemsGrades 6–‍12: Set of 8 items, 1 point per item | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Read a Literary Passage | PI.B.6, PI.B.7, PI.B.8, PII.A.1, PII.A.2 | Grades 1, 2: Set of 3(–4) itemsGrades 3–12: Set of 6 items, 1 point per item | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | [6](8) | [6](8) | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Read an Informational Passage | PI.B.6, PI.B.7, PI.B.8, PII.A.1, PII.A.2 | Grades 1, 2: Set of 3(–4) itemsGrades 3–12: Set of 5–6 items, 1 point per item | 0 | 0 | [3](6) | [3](6) | [6](8) | [6](8) | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| NA | NA | Totals | 14 | 17 | [20](21) | [20](21) | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 |

In the Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s) column in Table 6, multiple primary standards are listed for those task types with items that align with different standards. These vary by grade.

In the Aligned Secondary ELD Standard(s) column, secondary standards vary based on the stem types. These secondary standards are used in service of the PI Standards and are implicitly accounted for in the constructed-response rubrics.

Table 6. Proposed Adjustments to Writing: Number of Items and Points by Task Type and Grade

| Writing Task Type | Aligned Primary ELD Standard(s) | Aligned Secondary ELD Standard(s) | Discrete/Set, Point Value | K Items | K Points | Grade 1 Items | Grade 1 Points | Grade 2 Items | Grade 2 Points | Grades 3–5 Items | Grades 3–5 Points | Grades 6–8 Items | Grades 6–8 Points | Grades 9–10 Items | Grades 9–10 Points | Grades 11–12 Items | Grades 11–12 Points |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Label a Picture—Word, with Scaffolding | PI.C.10 | NA | Set of 4 items, 6 points per set | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Write a Story Together with Scaffolding | Grades K–2 PI.A.2Grades 1–2 PI.C.10 | NA | K: Set of 4 items, 6 points per setGrade[s] 1[, 2]: Set of [4](3) items, [7](6) points per set(Grade 2: Set of 2 items, 5 points per set) | 4 | 6 | [4](3) | [7](6) | [4](2) | [7](5) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Write an Informational Text Together | PI.A.2, PI.C.10 | PI.C.12, PII.A.1, PII.A.2, PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6 | Set of 2 items, 5 points per set | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Describe a Picture (Writing with Reading) | Grades 1–2 PI.C.10Grades 3–12 PI.A.2, [PII.C.6](PII.C.7) | PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, [PII.C.7](PII.C.6) | Grades 1–2: Discrete, 3 pointsGrades 3–12: Set of 2 items, 4 points per set | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Write About an Experience | (Grades 1–2 PI.C.12)(Grades 3–12)PI.C.10 | (Grades 1–2 PI.C.10)(Grades 1–12)PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6 | (Grade 1: Discrete, 3 pointsGrades 2–12) Discrete, 4 points | 0 | 0 | [0](1) | [0](3) | [0](1) | [0](4) | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Write About Academic Information (Writing with Reading) | Grades 3–12 PI.C.10Grades 6–12 PI.C.11 | PI.B.6, PI.C.12, PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6, PII.C.7 | Set of 2 items, 5 points per set | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| Justify an Opinion | PI.C.11 | PI.C.12, PII.A.1, PII.B.3, PII.B.4, PII.B.5, PII.C.6 | Discrete, 4 points | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| NA | NA | NA | Totals | 8 | 12 | 7 | [15](17) | [7](6) | [15](17) | 6 | 17 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 17 |

Table 7. Overview of Items and Points by Domain and Grade

| **Domain** | **K Items** | **K Points** | **Grade 1 Items** | **Grade 1 Points** | **Grade 2 Items** | **Grade 2 Points** | **Grades 3–5 Items** | **Grades 3–5 Points** | **Grades 6–8 Items** | **Grades 6–8 Points** | **Grades 9–10 Items** | **Grades 9–10 Points** | **Grades 11–12 Items** | **Grades 11–12 Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Listening | 20 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Speaking | [10](9) | [21](22) | [10](9) | [21](22) | [13](12) | [27](28) | [13](12) | [29](30) | [13](12) | [29](30) | [13](12) | [29](30) | [13](12) | [29](30) |
| Reading | 14 | 17 | [20](21) | [20](21) | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 |
| Writing | 8 | 12 | 7 | [15](17) | [7](6) | [15](17) | 6 | 17 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 17 |
| Totals | [52](51) | [70](71) | [59](59) | [78](82) | [68](66) | [90](93) | [67](66) | [94](95) | [67](66) | [94](95) | [67](66) | [94](95) | [67](66) | [94](95) |
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1. PIII foundational literacy skills may not be expressly considered standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)