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# California State Board of Education May 2018 Agenda Item #04

## Subject

English Language Proficiency Assessments for California: Approval of the Operational Initial Assessment Preliminary Threshold Scores and Composite Weights for the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue(s)

Approval of the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) recommended threshold scores and composite weights will allow the California Department of Education (CDE) to prepare for the operational administration of the Initial ELPAC starting in July 2018. Threshold scores determine the “entry” and/or “exit” points between the respective performance levels that describe three levels of performance on the ELPAC. Composite weights define the proportion of the overall score that consists of oral and written language skills. Reporting will occur only on the overall score. Assuming the State Board of Education (SBE) takes action on the proposed threshold scores, the scores should be considered preliminary threshold scores until after a review process that is scheduled to be completed by June 2019.

## Recommendation

The CDE recommends that the SBE approve the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s (SSPI’s) recommended preliminary threshold scores for the Initial ELPAC (Attachment 1). This item also presents for approval the recommended composite weights for the Initial ELPAC (Attachment 1).

## Brief History of Key Issues

In April 2018, the CDE provided an Information Memorandum to the SBE for a preliminary review of proposed Initial ELPAC threshold scores and composite weights based on a standard setting workshop that took place in February 2018. Links to the April and February Information Memoranda are provided in the Summary of Previous SBE Discussion and Action section of this item.

As described in the April 2018 Information Memorandum, the proposed composite weight calculations in Table 1 are examples of what was considered to determine a student’s overall scale score. Attachment 3 provides the field test impact data that was used for the SSPI’s recommended weight calculations. These data represent only a sampling of students and may not precisely represent the data that will result from the operational administration.

**Table 1. Proposed Composite Weight Calculation (by Percent) for the ELPAC**

| **Option/Grade** | **Oral Language Composite**  **(Listening and Speaking)** | **Written Language Composite**  **(Reading and Writing)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option 1: Kindergarten** | 90 | 10 |
| **Option 1: Grade 1** | 70 | 30 |
| **Option 1: Grades 2–12** | 50 | 50 |
| **Option 2: Kindergarten** | 70 | 30 |
| **Option 2: Grades 1–12** | 50 | 50 |

The CDE is recommending the option 1 proposed weightings in Table 1 to calculate the overall score for students in each grade and grade span (the options above are also provided in Attachment 1). The different weighting calculations in kindergarten, grade one, and grades two through twelve are based on the following rationale: (1) keeping the kindergarten weighting consistent with the current California English Language Development Test (CELDT); (2) putting more emphasis on grade one written language, as it is a separate test from kindergarten; and (3) keeping grades two through twelve consistent with the current CELDT, giving equal weighting to each domain.

“Educator Panels’ Proposed Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations” (Attachment 2) provides educator panels’ recommended threshold scores and composite weights across the six ELPAC grades/grade spans. Threshold scores determine the “entry” and/or “exit” points between respective performance levels of an assessment. “State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Proposed Initial ELPAC Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations” (Attachment 1) provides SSPI-recommended threshold scores and composite weights across the six assessed grade/grade spans. The SSPI recommendation reflects minor adjustments (one score point or less at the composite level) from the panel’s judgments to encourage adequate distribution across the possible score points. The recommendations were then reviewed by the ELPAC Technical Advisory Group. The CDE recommends that the SBE adopt the proposed threshold scores and composite weights in Attachment 1.

### Next Steps

In fall 2018, a threshold score review process will be conducted. More information on that process will be provided to the SBE in a future Information Memorandum.

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

In April 2018, an Information Memorandum was provided to the SBE for a preliminary review of the proposed Initial ELPAC threshold scores and composite weights (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/infomemoapr2018.asp>).

In March 2018, the SBE approved revisions to the Initial ELPAC blueprints (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/agenda201803.asp>).

In February 2018, an Information Memorandum was provided to the SBE to give an update on the Initial ELPAC standard setting process and provide a preliminary review of the revisions to the Initial ELPAC blueprints (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/infomemofeb2018.asp>).

In January 2018, the SBE approved general performance level descriptors (PLDs) for the Initial ELPAC (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/agenda201801.asp>).

In December 2017, an Information Memorandum was provided to the SBE, giving an update on the development of the ELPAC, including a detailed timeline (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-dec17item03.docx>).

In November 2017, the SBE approved the operational Summative ELPAC threshold scores, composite weights, and local educational agency apportionment rates (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/nov17item08.doc>).

In October 2017, an Information Memorandum was provided to the SBE on the standard setting and domain weighting process (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-adad-oct17item01.doc>).

In September 2017, the SBE approved revisions to the Summative ELPAC blueprints, the revised general PLDs, and the reporting hierarchy of the Summative and Initial ELPAC score reports (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item18.doc>).

## Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2017–18 Budget Act includes $13.8 million for Educational Testing Service contract activities, which includes standard setting.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Proposed Initial ELPAC Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations (1 page)
* Attachment 2: Educator Panels’ Proposed Initial ELPAC Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations (1 page)
* Attachment 3: Impact Data for the Composite Weight Recommendations (1 page)

# Attachment 1: State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Proposed Initial ELPAC Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations

**Overall Score Kindergarten through Grade Twelve**

Table 1. State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Recommendations for the Proposed Preliminary Thresholds for Performance Levels on the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California, Overall Score

| **Grade** | **Oral/Written**  **Weight** | **Level 1**  **% of Students [[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Level 1**  **% at or above [[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Level 2**  **% of Students** | **Level 2**  **Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score  [[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Level 2**  **% at or above** | **Level 3**  **% of Students** | **Level 3**  **Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** | **Level 3**  **% at or above** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K | 90/10 | 54.7 | 100 | 28.0 | 455 | 45.3 | 17.2 | 553 | 17.2 |
| 1 | 70/30 | 38.8 | 100 | 34.9 | 406 | 61.2 | 26.3 | 526 | 26.3 |
| 2 | 50/50 | 34.7 | 100 | 42.8 | 366 | 65.3 | 22.5 | 542 | 22.5 |
| 3–5 | 50/50 | 39.9 | 100 | 35.5 | 451 | 60.1 | 24.7 | 541 | 24.7 |
| 6–8 | 50/50 | 38.4 | 100 | 41.9 | 443 | 61.7 | 19.8 | 552 | 19.8 |
| 9–12 | 50/50 | 48.5 | 100 | 31.3 | 462 | 51.5 | 20.3 | 556 | 20.3 |

# Attachment 2: Educator Panels’ Proposed Initial ELPAC Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations

**Overall Score Kindergarten through Grade Twelve**

Table 1. Standard-Setting Panels’ Judgments for the Thresholds for the Performance Levels on the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), Overall Score

| **Grade** | **Oral/Written**  **Weight** | **Level 1**  **% of Students [[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Level 1**  **% at or above [[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level 2**  **% of Students** | **Level 2 Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score**  **[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Level 2**  **% at or above** | **Level 3**  **% of Students** | **Level 3 Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** | **Level 3**  **% at or above** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K | 90/10 | 54.7 | 100 | 27.3 | 455 | 45.3 | 18.0 | 551 | 18.0 |
| 1 | 70/30 | 38.8 | 100 | 34.9 | 406 | 61.2 | 26.3 | 526 | 26.3 |
| 2 | 50/50 | 34.7 | 100 | 37.2 | 366 | 65.3 | 28.1 | 517 | 28.1 |
| 3–5 | 50/50 | 39.9 | 100 | 35.5 | 451 | 60.1 | 24.7 | 541 | 24.7 |
| 6–8 | 50/50 | 38.4 | 100 | 41.9 | 443 | 61.7 | 19.8 | 552 | 19.8 |
| 9–12 | 50/50 | 48.5 | 100 | 31.3 | 462 | 51.5 | 20.3 | 556 | 20.3 |

# Attachment 3: Impact Data for the Composite Weight Recommendations

Table 1 provides initial assessment field test impact data for the two options recommended in this item.

Table 1. Field Test Impact Data for Kindergarten (K) and Grade 1 (Gr1) Weighting Options on the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California, based on the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Recommended Threshold Scores

| **Grade** | **Oral/ Written**  **Weight** | **Level 1**  **% of Students [[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Level 1**  **% at or above [[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Level 2**  **% of Students** | **Level 2**  **Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score [[9]](#footnote-9)** | **Level 2**  **% at or above** | **Level 3**  **% of Students** | **Level 3**  **Standard-Setting Scale Threshold Score** | **Level 3**  **% at or above** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option 1\*** K | 90/10 | 54.7 | 100 | 28.0 | 455 | 45.3 | 17.2 | 553 | 17.2 |
| **Option 1\*** Gr1 | 70/30 | 38.8 | 100 | 34.9 | 406 | 61.2 | 26.3 | 526 | 26.3 |
| **Option 2** K | 70/30 | 63.7 | 100 | 26.9 | 483 | 36.3 | 9.5 | 594 | 9.5 |
| **Option 2** Gr1 | 50/50 | 38.8 | 100 | 37.3 | 407 | 61.2 | 24.0 | 540 | 24.0 |

\*SSPI’s recommended option

1. Estimated percentage of students, statewide, who would be placed at this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Estimated percentage of students, statewide, who would be at or above this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Minimum standard-setting scale score needed to achieve this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. The standard-setting scale and threshold scores were generated solely for the standard-setting process. Reporting scales will be developed to report scores on the Student Score Report and public reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Estimated percentage of students, statewide, who would be placed at this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Estimated percentage of students, statewide, who would be at or above this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Minimum standard-setting scale score needed to achieve this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. The standard-setting scale and threshold scores were generated solely for the standard-setting process. Reporting scales will be developed to report scores on the Student Score Report and public reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Estimated percentage of students, statewide, who would be placed at this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Estimated percentage of students, statewide, who would be at or above this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Minimum standard-setting scale score needed to achieve this performance level on the basis of the results of the 2017–18 field test administration. The standard-setting scale and threshold scores were generated solely for the standard-setting process. Reporting scales will be developed to report scores on the Student Score Report and public reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)