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# **MEMORANDUM**

DATE: December 13, 2019

TO: MEMBERS, State Board of Education

FROM: TONY THURMOND, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

SUBJECT: Update on the Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners

## Summary of Key Issues

This Memorandum provides an update on the development of the Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners (OPTEL). The OPTEL fulfills the requirement of California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 313.3, as added by Assembly Bill 1808, Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018. The OPTEL will be recommended to the State Board of Education (SBE) to be considered for approval as the statewide standardized protocol for criterion 2 (teacher evaluation of English learner students) and 3 (parent opinion and consultation) for the purpose of reclassification in fall of 2020. The OPTEL is designed to move California closer to statewide standardized exit criteria to meet Section 3111(b)(2)(A) of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

## Brief History of Key Issues

Both state and federal law require local educational agencies (LEAs) to ensure that English learners make progress toward English proficiency within a reasonable amount of time and remedy any academic deficits incurred while learning English. Pursuant to *EC* Section 313(b), the department, with approval of the state board, shall establish procedures for conducting the assessment required pursuant to subdivision (a) and for the reclassification of a pupil from English learner to English proficient.

*EC* Section 313(f) mandates the use of multiple criteria for determining whether to reclassify a pupil as proficient. These criteria include the following:

1. Assessment of language proficiency using the state test of English language proficiency;
2. Teacher evaluation including a review of the student’s curriculum mastery;
3. Parent opinion and consultation; and
4. Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the performance of English proficient students of the same age.

In December 2018, the California Department of Education (CDE) contracted with WestEd to co-develop, pilot, and validate an observation protocol to support teacher evaluation of English learner proficiency as it pertains to English learner reclassification. The contract includes the development of guidance and training materials for the OPTEL’s implementation.

In January 2019, based on the 2018–19 Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) revised threshold scores, the SBE approved use of ELPAC Overall Performance Level (PL) 4 as the statewide standardized English Language Proficiency (ELP) criterion for reclassification (criterion 1), beginning with the 2018–19 Summative ELPAC administration for Transitional Kindergarten through grade twelve. The revised threshold scores are available on the CDE Summative ELPAC web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/documents/selpacscalescores.pdf>. The remaining three criteria continue to be locally determined.

In February 2019, as required in *EC* Section 313.3(d)(1), the CDE and WestEd established the OPTEL Advisory Committee (OAC) to advise on the development and usefulness of the OPTEL. The OAC is comprised of 28 educators and experts from across California, some of whom previously participated in the ELPAC standard setting. As required in statute, the majority of the individuals with whom the CDE has consulted in the process of developing the OPTEL are credentialed teachers who regularly instruct English learner students. A list of the OAC members and a detailed OPTEL timeline can be found on the CDE OPTEL web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/optel.asp>.

## Purpose of the OPTEL

*EC* Section 313.3 states that the OPTEL is intended for use by teachers in evaluating both a pupil’s English language proficiency and use of English while engaging in academic content learning, including interactive academic language use with peers, as well as assessing language practices across a range of proficiency levels.

The OPTEL is designed to be used for all English learner students, including those with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). It is designed to be used with ease by content area teachers at all grade levels as it is aligned with the English language development (ELD) standards and the performance levels for the ELPAC. The legislation includes intent language identifying the following additional uses for the OPTEL: (1) use as a formative assessment tool to support student progress toward English proficiency; (2) use during consultation with parents of English learners regarding their progress toward proficiency; and (3) use by institutions of higher education in the preparation of new teachers. The CDE will conduct a validation process to ensure that the OPTEL appropriately assesses and reflects pupil progress towards the intended target language constructs, as well as demonstrates a meaningful relationship to the ELPAC performance levels, thus supporting reclassification decisions.

## Current Progress

In April 2019, the OAC members attended the first OPTEL meeting and 22 teachers participated in a prototyping study to provide initial feedback on the tool’s clarity and usability. Between April and August 2019, the CDE and WestEd collected additional comments and feedback from various stakeholder groups including: teacher focus groups, expert ELD coaches and trainers, the Title III County Office of Education Regional English Learner Specialists, State and Federal Programs Directors, the Migrant Education State Parent Advisory Council members, the Bilingual Coordinators Network, the Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee, representatives from the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), and the California Teachers Association (CTA). Attachment 1 highlights feedback from stakeholders that informed revisions to the prototype draft of the tool.

Based on the feedback from these groups, as well as from many other stakeholders throughout the state, the most recent OPTEL draft (Attachment 2) takes the form of a holistic rating scale in which teachers rate students’ language use in two areas (expressive and receptive language) using a descriptive rubric.

In August and September 2019, 41 teachers throughout the state rated 88 English learner students using the OPTEL as part of a pilot study to support preliminary analyses of the tool’s usability, reliability, and validity. The participants overwhelmingly reported that the OPTEL was easy or very easy to use (83 percent of respondents) and that it was clear or very clear how to use it (93 percent of respondents). One hundred percent of the 41 teacher respondents also stated that the wording and meaning of the OPTEL performance descriptors was either clear or very clear. A more detailed summary of the pilot study can be found on the CDE OPTEL web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/optel.asp>.

A larger scale field test will be conducted in spring 2020 to collect evidence of the OPTEL’s usability, reliability, and validity to support reclassification decisions. The Field Test Plan can be found on the CDE OPTEL web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/optel.asp>.

On October 8, 2019, the OAC met in person in Sacramento to provide feedback on the most recent version of the OPTEL, review the results of the 2019 summer pilot, provide input on the Field Test Plan, and inform the development of guidance documents necessary for statewide implementation.

## Next Steps

During the 2020 ELPAC testing window, WestEd will conduct a field test to evaluate the OPTEL’s usability, reliability, and validity to ensure that the OPTEL appropriately assesses the intended target language constructs for students across a range of proficiency levels, demonstrates a meaningful relationship to the performance levels for the ELPAC, and informs the standard implementation of the OPTEL. The goal of the field test is to administer the OPTEL using ideal measurement conditions, as informed by WestEd’s analyses of the pilot study data, and to determine the strength of a validity case for the protocol’s use in reclassification determinations. The conditions in the field test will be based on findings from the pilot study.

Field test participants will receive instructions on how to use the OPTEL during the study window. In addition to providing ratings of student language use during academic instruction, field test participants will offer feedback on their experience using the tool. In order to facilitate the standardized implementation of the OPTEL, for the purposes outlined in *EC* Section 313.3, additional guidance and extensive professional development will need to be developed to ensure that teachers implement the OPTEL following an aligned protocol. WestEd will develop preliminary training materials and guides as part of the current development work. More extensive materials and resources will be needed to support statewide implementation. The CDE will continue to seek funding to develop additional tools and deliver extensive training to LEAs to support standardized implementation and use of the OPTEL. The CDE will also seek to develop additional materials and conduct additional studies to support and validate the intended additional uses for the OPTEL, including use as a formative assessment tool.

## Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: OPTEL Prototyping Feedback (29 pages)

Attachment 2: OPTEL Draft (2 pages)

# **OPTEL Prototyping Feedback**

## Acronyms Used in this Document

BCN: Bilingual Coordinators Network

BICS: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills

CA: California

CALPS: Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

CCSS: Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy

CDE: California Department of Education

DOK: Depth of Knowledge

EL: English Learner

ELA: English Language Arts

ELD: English Language Development

ELPAC: English Language Proficiency Assessments for California

EO: English only (students)

FPM: Federal Program Monitoring

HSD: High School District

IEP: Individualized Education Program

LEA: Local Educational Agency

LTEL: Long-term English Learner

OPTEL: Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners

PLC: Professional Learning Community

RFEP: Reclassified Fluent English Proficient

SBAC: Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SBCSS: San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

SPED: Special Education

TOT: Training of Trainers

| **Comment Number** | **Section** | **Commenter** | **Comment/ Recommendation/Question** | **Agency Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | A process will need to be created for secondary students to be observed by all teachers. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 2 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | What is the timeframe or duration specified by the observation window?  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 3 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | How will this happen: “Elementary students will be observed by multiple teachers.” Are there guidelines? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 4 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Will there be training and calibration? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 5 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | The form should be more aligned to the standards. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 6 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Will this be in electronic format? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 7 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Is there a separate primary and secondary form? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 8 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Will there be training? Training would have to be significant. | This information will be clarified in the development of the support material. |
| 9 | **Scoring** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | How will it be scored? | This will be clarified in the support material.  |
| 10 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | At the secondary level, which teacher would be responsible for the OPTEL? | This information will be clarified in the support material. |
| 11 | **Teacher Burden**  | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Overwhelming for (content) teachers to do more than once: will not happen. | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 12 | **Teacher Burden** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Will it be one form per teacher? Labor intensive. | This information will be clarified in the support material. |
| 13 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Engaging in Collaborative Oral Discussion (A.1, A.2, A.3, and A.4) are all good objectives. | Thank you for the feedback. |
| 14 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | What does the observation refer to, since the date is already there? How many observations will there be? | This information will be clarified in the support material. |
| 15 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | The question in the observation box is too broad to be done individually for each student. Possibly additional instructions or an example? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 16 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Can you check more than one interaction type? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 17 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Where is the Integrated or Designated ELD addressed on this form? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 18 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Dependent on all teachers across content areas knowing the CA ELD standards. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 19 | **Teacher Burden** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Furthermore, this requirement may encourage teachers’ attempts to avoid having EL students in their class. | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 20 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Will this impact EL reclassification? | This information will be clarified in the support material.  |
| 21 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Is this form for K−12? | This information will be clarified in the support material. |
| 22 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | It has clear constructs. | Thank you for the comment. |
| 23 | **Teacher Burden** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | The tool does a thorough job of addressing the CA ELD Standards. However, the demand it places on the teacher sets them up for failure. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 24 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | How long would it take to complete? | This information will be clarified in the support material. |
| 25 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | How would this be communicated to parents? | This information will be clarified in the support material. |
| 26 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Ensure the teacher follows the instructions and understands its purpose. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 27 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Engaging Oral Discussions: Provide indicators for rubric (specify). | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 28 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | How do we differentiate between levels? Seems subjective since all evaluation descriptors do not apply to all students in all settings. | This information will be clarified in the support material.  |
| 29 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Does not work for all grade levels – needs two separate versions: a primary and secondary version of the tool.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 30 | **Teacher Burden** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Long form may cause a teacher to feel overwhelmed. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 31 | **English Learners with IEPs** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | How are IEP goals taken into consideration? | This information will be clarified in the support material.  |
| 32 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Delivery of Oral Presentations: Define grade appropriate (DOK). | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 33 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Engaging in Writing: Define appropriate technology.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 34 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Individual or group papers? | This information will be clarified in the support material. |
| 35 | **Undetermined** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | SBAC & ELPAC Assess (individual) | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 36 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Observation window needs to be clearly defined. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 37 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | More user friendly for general ed teachers. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 38 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Attach CA ELD Standards in full form. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 39 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Do we need to attach work samples? | This information will be clarified in the support material.  |
| 40 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Missing comprehension skills. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 41 | **Teacher Burden** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Too long. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 42 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Tool does not lend itself to accumulative/multiple evaluations.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 43 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Parent Conference date? | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 44 | **Undetermined** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Instant access for new students? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 45 | **Undetermined** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Other assessments able to add? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 46 | **Implementation Guidance** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | On Dashboard? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 47 | **Content & Format** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Electronic? | This comment will inform revision of the tool.  |
| 48 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | SBCSS EL Leadership Network | Is it K−12 inclusive? (Accountability FPM) | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 49 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think that it is overall a clear design in its intention. I do feel that the content is very compacted, and teachers really need to know what everything stands for. But overall, I do think it works for those who know about the CA ELD Standards. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 50 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I feel the tool is very clear and each section is clearly defined. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 51 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The content is clear however the amount of information is very busy. Some of my peers shared it was overwhelming and very busy They thought it was too long. I feel I could use it as a teacher by highlighting the sections I would be focusing on. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 52 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The design is fairly clear but the sections on "Target Language Use" and "OPTEL Performance Level" may require descriptors to ensure the user knows what these sections are asking.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 53 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | Samples of each criteria/level would be helpful in determining the levels. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 54 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | At a glance, it looks like a lot of text. But once I was walked through the document, it seems very clear and logical. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 55 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | With regards to each student level 1−4, what defines some of the terms from level to level is not clear. For example, what is defined as small-some-variety in A.3 is not clear, and it can be seen as different from teacher to teacher. | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 56 | **English Learners with IEPs** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I am pleased to see the structure of OPTEL. In my work leading special education, the assessors have tremendous difficulty ascertaining oral language proficiency of ELL students and the clarity of OPTEL will allow them to better understand the student's oral language. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 57 | **Teacher Burden**  | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The clarity is still cumbersome, and the design has too many language tasks for one sitting. It seems unreasonable for a teacher to complete such a tool for all her English learners.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 58 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The tool was easy to understand once I watch the training. I would recommend to train teachers on how to use the tool.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 59 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The format is easy to use and understand. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 60 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | At first glance the OPTEL is overwhelming in design. There are a lot of rows and columns. Once I started to use the form it became less cumbersome. A.2 makes the assumption that students have been taught to use the routine of turn taking, the building on of peer ideas, and finally the critiquing of peer ideas. If this routine has not been taught, A.2 is impossible to score accurately. I do not think it would be fair that a student would earn a low score based on a routine vs. their language capabilities. Scoring A.2 also requires that a student have engaged peers to score a level 3 or level 4. The OPTEL lacks the clarity in how to score individual student if an engaged group dynamic is not occurring. When reviewing the form, it is unclear whether or not an evaluator could use writing to justify a score. For example, A.3 and A.4 might be able to be demonstrated in writing, if not always in speaking. But is this allowed? Section B Feedback: Delivering Oral Presentations is an easier section to score an individual student's performance, as this section seems to rely less on the functionality of a group. B.1: This section is not aligned well to the CA ELA Standards in the secondary level. All students should be providing oral presentations with details, evidence and reasoning. This section should be revised to show that to what extent all three of these things occur would be language level. B.2 is not aligned to the Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy, as such this would be unfair to score a student on something they probably don't have practice engaging in.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 61 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I would like to see other ways to approach writing considered. Even though the paper copy is getting longer, keeping each section on a separate page is helpful. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 62 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I like how the different language levels are included in the OPTEL. I think it is a good progress monitoring tool as well and will give the teachers good information on the student's language skills and progress. | Thank you for the feedback. |
| 63 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | This was the first time I used this tool so it will take time before I can completely feel comfortable with the application. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 64 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I was quite surprised by the clarity. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 65 | **Teacher Burden** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | It is not feasible, as when I showed it to multiple teachers, they felt that there were such subtle differences between the levels that it would be almost impossible to discern the different. In addition, they said that their English only students would have difficulty getting a 3 or higher. It also is not feasible, and they felt that the ELPAC is a better way to determine oral language proficiency than this tool would give. Our special, education teachers expressed the most concern as they see this as a barrier to reclassification and not SPED friendly.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 66 | **Teacher Burden** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The tool was easier to use than I anticipated. But, I do wonder the difficulty of doing it with a large number of students. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 67 | **Teacher Burden** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | As for the use of this tool, it will not be easy at first as there are teachers who are not familiar with the CA ELD Standards and they will feel that it is too much to do.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 68 | **(Duplicate)** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | This was the first time I used this tool so it will take time before I can completely feel comfortable with the application. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 69 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The tool is not difficult to use. The information is well organized and easy to understand.  | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 70 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think many teachers in my district will struggle with this tool because they lack familiarity with the CA ELD Standards and the proficiency descriptors. However, I think the tool will help in bringing the importance of knowing these things to the forefront.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 71 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I do not see how this entire form could be completed in one observation. In one 20-minute observation, I was able to find evidence for five sections out of the nine sections outlined. There is also very little given as far as examples go, so it was hard for me to make the judgement. It felt a bit like I was trying to score a student based on the exact example given vs. the overall topic of the section. Example: A.1 Student contributes relevant grade-appropriate content-area ideas by... vs. the specific examples given for level 1: ... asking and answering basic questions, and level 2: ...asking and answering on topic questions and adding relevant information. I was confused if I could use other examples of contribution to record and determine or a score or if I was tied to the exact example given on the form.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 72 | **Implementation Guidance** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | Best to focus on one or two students at a time; difficult to observe more than that at once and still collect relevant data. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 73 | **Implementation Guidance** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | Being around the CA ELD Standards and students all day, still did not help fill this form out with enough clarity as to what it is looking for. In doing so, for me (given our current course of study), it still took me a week to look at for the individual student I focused on. Depending on the teacher, with basic knowledge of the CA ELD Standards, I see this form taking a lot longer if done correctly. However, due to its length and ambiguity in terminology, I can see teachers just looking at the form and simply checking boxes just to finish it. Or they may ask the person giving the form, "Okay, what do you want me to put?" | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 74 | **Teacher Burden** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think it would be rather intimidating to need to use this tool for a whole class of ELD. I think it is manageable for a small subset of EL students within a content area class. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 75 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I strongly feel this tool would yield very subjective results. The results would vary greatly as each teacher has varying degrees of understanding of what constitutes a student's production of 'with greater detail’...also the level of training that would be required is unreasonable for all teachers to master. Even if we provided more training on the CA ELD Standards, the tool is subjective in nature. Teachers looked at the tool, and I got lots of reservations on using it. They said it is overwhelming. Again, special education teachers felt it was extremely unreasonable to have them complete as the dual-identified English learners would have a very difficult time independently engaging in tasks that could be evaluated in such a manner.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 76 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think it gives you a better picture of a student and would be great to share with parents as well as a tool for data to use in school sites' PLCs. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 77 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think that as it is polished more and more, the clarity of its use will become apparent.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 78 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | During the last meeting, we mentioned that the tool does not assess any reading skills. In order for students to reclassify, they have to demonstrate proficiency in all domains (Reading, Listening, Writing, and Speaking). I still suggest to add another section that can evaluate reading skills.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 79 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think it will be a very useful tool but it will take a lot of work to develop enough language expertise in teachers for them to use the tool effectively and accurately.  | Thank you for the feedback. |
| 80 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | After observing a student and calculating the student’s average score on the OPTEL, it was determined that the student scored at a level 2. When I showed the teacher his score, she disagreed with the score and felt that the form did not capture accurately his language capabilities. This form seemed to be very limiting in how it captured a student’s language abilities, and at times a bit random in topics. They do not seem to represent clearly the CA ELD Standards or the CCSS for ELA/Literacy for Speaking. So, is the OPTEL really measuring anything very well?  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 81 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | The last half, of course, is extremely vague. However, I know it is a work in progress. But the usefulness of Writing and Listening can be expanded on. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 82 | **Content & Format** | Prototyping Survey Feedback | Undoubtedly it would be useful to capture this kind of information. I see a secondary usefulness in driving practice towards the CA ELD Standards. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 83 | **Implementation Guidance** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | B. Activities were impossible to observe because the lesson I observed did not have presentation as a learning target.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 84 | **Content & Format** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | C.1 was extremely difficult to observe as this is not a typical activity that students engage. Along the same line of thinking, C.2 was also difficult to observe as this is not a typical activity that teachers ask to students to engage. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 85 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | The highlighted areas above (B1, C1, C2) are so dependent on a teacher providing the time, the modeling, and the explicit teaching of those skills, that I feel they are not areas that can be scored without a level of bias. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 86 | **Content & Format** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | B.1 - I believe that most students can provide a level of detail, evidence, and reasoning in their presentations. High school students are all expected to provide details, evidence, and reasoning; the extent that they can do that differentiates.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 87 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | B.2: I had a hard time deciphering the difference between level 3 and level 4.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 88 | **Content & Format** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | C.1: "text type" was added to level 4. I am unclear what that would look like and how I might see that with peers writing together. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 89 | **Content & Format** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I like that the same language from the standards is used. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 90 | **Content & Format** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | In general, students are only engaged in one type of "interaction type" during an observation. Because of this, the form implies that I will need to observe the same student multiple times in different lessons.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 91 | **Content & Format** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | Also, it is rare to observe a student in a whole group setting, talking and interacting with enough quantity to be able to score them accurately. There just isn't enough opportunity to talk in a whole group setting. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 92 | **Content & Format** | Natasha Moore, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I can hear a student use language more frequently and accurately in a pair situation than in a group setting. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 93 | **Content & Format** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | Overall, the target language was clear. As for the term collegial discussion it seems that a more appropriate term would be group discussion because that is what teachers do in a class setting and it would make more teacher-friendly. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 94 | **Teacher Burden** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | No, I found that if time was allowed, I would have been able to observe more, especially the one with formal oral presentation. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 95 | **Content & Format** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | No, the target language is specific in what it asks teachers to look for in student performance. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 96 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I believe that the performance descriptor is specific to each level performance and were clear.  | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 97 | **Implementation Guidance** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think that this (A1) was difficult because at the time that I observed my students, I felt that she had given me a level 1 but other days she was more at a level 2. I think that we need to let teachers know that students will have off days and that they cannot just go based on one observation for that particular target language use. Overall, it was easy to use, but I just wanted to make a note of that experience. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 98 | **Content & Format** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | This section (observation types) was very clear and very useful. I really liked this section because it helped in giving you information of how you acquired this observation. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 99 | **Content & Format** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I really liked this section (observation notes) as well because it provided me with information that I would need in order to assess performance. I like the space to write in and the prompt allowed me to think on a clear instance where I observe this. Although I like to write and felt that it did not have a great deal of space, the page with the additional notes section gave me that space that I needed to continue writing. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 100 | **Content & Format** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think that overall, the design of the OPTEL is very clear; its structure is well thought out. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 101 | **Teacher Burden** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think that this tool will be very easy to use for teachers. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 102 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | Carmen Esterman, Prototyping Survey Feedback | I think that this is a very useful tool for teachers to gather information about their students’ progress. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 103 | **Content & Format** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | This portion (Part A) of the OPTEL assesses oral BICS. Because of what is being asked, the observer must do multiple observations to be able to assess parts A1−A4.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 104 | **Content & Format** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | This portion (Part B) of the OPTEL assess oral CALPS.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 105 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | Based on the rubric, it (Part B) appears to be only applicable for elementary and maybe only those elementary grades learning to read as opposed to those reading to learn.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 106 | **Implementation Guidance** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | The only way this portion of the OPTEL (Part B) can be meaningful in a secondary setting is to have an ELA, social science, science, and math teacher complete it, multiple times.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 107 | **Content & Format** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | What is the definition of formal presentation? Student share-out?  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 108 | **Implementation Guidance** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | After querying several core content teachers, we anecdotally found that most oral presentations at the core level are summative in nature and thus only happen once or twice per semester.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 109 | **Content & Format** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | Part C1−2 is not looking at a student’s independent writing product, but that which is created in collaboration. The only way to assess that is to sit with the student as they draft. If Google Docs are being used, you could look at the revision history. It seems quite cumbersome.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 110 | **Teacher Burden** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | Part C3 “...does not count towards a student’s OPTEL score.” After the laborious task of doing Parts A−C2, I’m not sure anyone will engage in section.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 111 | **Content & Format** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | Based on the OPTEL Tool (DRAFT April 1, 2019) we used, this tool heavily assesses the Oral Collaborative mode of Parts I & II of the standards. It does not assess part III of the standards - Foundational Literacy Skills.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 112 | **Content & Format** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | Historically our LTELs have been able to “fool” themselves and teachers into thinking that they “spoke English” because their oral skills were highly developed. This tool only perpetuates that myth.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 113 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | The OPTEL highly prioritizes oral language, which is only one of the domains tested on the ELPAC, and by far is the domain that is the fastest to acquire, as seen by our LEA data, county data, and state data for the spring 2018 ELPAC.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 114 | **Content & Format** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | No individually drafted writing is assessed on the OPTEL.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 115 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | B2 asks for multiple text types to be presented in oral fashion, but narrative is not a text type secondary uses for presentations. About 70 percent of our standards ask for expository or explanatory texts. Additionally, I believe that on the 7−12 ELPAC, narrative writing is not even assessed.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 116 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | Part C3 appears to be the most significant variable to student success at the secondary level. Can a student produce writing, in a variety of contexts and genres, at the same rate as their English-only peers?  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 117 | **Implementation Guidance** | Michele Estill & Joann Phillips, Grossmont Union HSD, Prototyping Feedback (not via survey) | Teachers have to be very well versed in the CA ELD Standards to understand what is being asked, thus this assessment can only be done by the student’s teacher. In secondary that represents a minimum of 4: ELA, science, social science, and math. This tool seems to be created for elementary settings and does not take into account the secondary setting with multiple teachers who are experts in one discipline/content area.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 118 | **Implementation Guidance** | Antonio Mora/Kim Collier, Prototyping feedback submitted via email | Teachers will need to plan experiences so that the listed standards can be measured. During the day, I didn't observe any planned collaborative discussions (could observe some by chance discussion), formal oral presentations, or academic writing during the time I was there.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 119 | **Implementation Guidance** | Antonio Mora/Kim Collier, Prototyping feedback submitted via email | I could see a tool like this guiding teachers to make sure they plan those experiences. In my opinion, it would be more user friendly for the designated ELD teacher (even though all teachers should know what their English learners can do with the standards). I just think at the secondary level, starting this in designated ELD seems more realistic. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 120 | **Implementation Guidance** | Antonio Mora/Nadia Clayton, Prototyping feedback submitted via email | It is not something that you can just walk into a class and administer in a class period. It really is best if the teacher who works with the student fills it out over a week or longer period of time, to be able to observe the student in all of the areas.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 121 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | Antonio Mora/Nadia Clayton, Prototyping feedback submitted via email | It gives good information and will certainly focus instruction on the CA ELD Standards, but it will take training to administer and calibration may be an issue. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 122 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | Antonio Mora/Nadia Clayton, Prototyping feedback submitted via email | There are many English-dominant students who would not be level 4s on this. It also appears to be written for secondary students. With both of these considerations in mind, I think it will greatly reduce the number of students who reclassify, especially at the elementary level.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 123 | **English Learners with IEPs** | Margaret Cota, Prototyping feedback submitted via email | It is important to inform if a student who reclassifies has an IEP. This can be easily put on the same form in a box to be checked if student has an IEP. Then the teacher can look in files for eligibility and accommodations needed. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 124 | **Teacher Burden** | Prototyping feedback submitted via email (author unknown) | According to this informational sheet, this protocol asks that the teacher pace student observations to 3 or 4 different students on a regular basis. This enables the teacher to look through the given list of what to observe and take notes. This program seems to follow the same concept as in early literacy habits on observations. It concentrates on a few (3−4) students a day or weekly rather that all at once for guided reading and phonics. This makes this protocol very familiar for most teachers to do the same habit in ELD. What I liked most about this procedure for the English learner is the quick check-off skills that is needed for the EL expectancy. It has their expectations for grade-appropriate language learning in writing and reading. Since it is a pre-planned protocol, it is easier to plan in other areas of curriculum, so English language learning can be interchangeable in academic domains such as history, social studies, and science. The notetaking for the teacher is very friendly and to the point.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 125 | **Elementary vs. Secondary** | Prototyping feedback submitted via email (author unknown) | One suggestion I have is while teachers are in training, cross grade-level articulation is necessary to establish what grade-level appropriate skills will be necessary for grades that are before and/or after the student’s current level. It is important to express grade-level appropriate language since many teachers change grade levels yearly and the new grade level being taught may be unfamiliar. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 126 | **English Learners with IEPs** | Elena Fajardo, submitted via track changes on Revised OPTEL tool | Change wording at top from “on an IEP” to “has an IEP”. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 127 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | Elena Fajardo, submitted via track changes on Revised OPTEL tool | Add blank for parent signature (see Word doc for recommended wording). | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 128 | **Content & Format** | Marcela Rodriguez, submitted via track changes on Revised OPTEL tool | Place table from first page (about how language domains are assessed) in a support document outside of actual tool. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 129 | **Content & Format** | Sandra Covarrubias, submitted via track changes on Revised OPTEL tool | Place front matter in a document outside of the OPTEL tool. Clarify purpose of chart at the beginning of tool (about how language domains are assessed).  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 130 | **Scoring** | Sandra Covarrubias, submitted via track changes on Revised OPTEL tool | Remove comment about teachers not consulting with each other to complete form (in front matter). | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. It was specific to the pilot study. |
| 131 | **Content & Format** | BCN | If it can be considered a monitoring tool, are you considering adding more observation entries? | This information will be clarified in the support material.  |
| 132 | **Content & Format** | BCN | Regarding interaction types – a student might perform differently. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 133 | **Implementation Guidance** | BCN | Include ideas for systematic sharing of information within grade levels – across content areas about specific students or patterns noted from groups. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 134 | **Content & Format** | BCN | This template will elevate the conversation for all teachers and admin (regarding how to meet the needs of EL students). | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 135 | **Implementation Guidance** | BCN | Please be more specific about how many observations need to happen within each category; instructions say student will be observed by multiple teachers. What does that mean? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 136 | **Content & Format** | BCN | We question the need for A.3 vocabulary and A.2; a student being considered for reclassification should already be skilled at these categories. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 137 | **Scoring** | BCN | Since it’s a subjective tool, if a student scores a 4 on ELPAC, will this tool be needed even if the teacher marks the student lower on this too? What will you accept? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 138 | **Content & Format** | BCN | The form has a lot – it seems overwhelming.  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 139 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | BCN | If this is truly going to be standardized, additional guidance will be needed around the observation occurrences/instances (e.g., how much observation time is sufficient to gather evidence needed for judgements in each area).  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 140 | **Scoring** | BCN | What about assuring inter-rater reliability? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 141 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | BCN | State-level TOT for county offices of education/districts? Then (eventually) all teachers with ELs in CA receive training? | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 142 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | BCN | Follow through four-year RFEP monitoring?  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 143 | **Future Validity Work** | BCN | What about validation studies to confirm that this form of teacher evaluation is a better measure of a student’s readiness to reclassify?  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 144 | **Content & Format** | BCN | I hope additional language domains/areas of focus are not included in future versions. The three areas included in this version make great sense as a complementary measure to ELPAC. An observation tool should be used to gather EL proficiency evidence that is not easy or really possible to collect in a standardized, larger scale assessment. | Thank you for the feedback.  |
| 145 | **English Learners with IEPs** | BCN | Have you considered an “alternate” OPTEL that is aligned with both the CA ELD Standards and students with disabilities’ goals? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 146 | **English Learners with IEPs** | BCN | We need some way to progress monitor our English learners with IEPs. | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 147 | **Content & Format** | BCN | This should be on an app (or Google Form). | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 148 | **Future Validity Work** | BCN | Create student language version so students can self-assess. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 149 | **Teacher Burden** | BCN | Union issues (challenge?) if teachers think it is something else on their plate. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 150 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | BCN | Training: What will the rollout look like? It will be a huge undertaking to train all teachers in the state.  | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 151 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | BCN | Will a student not be able to reclassify if they score a 4 on the ELPAC, but one content teacher scores them low on the OPTEL? | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 152 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | BCN | While the tool can be used with all English learners, the only mandated group that teachers should have to use it with is the group of students that scored a 4 on the ELPAC (since the purpose is for reclassification). Teachers are overwhelmed with the amount of monitoring they currently have to do – RFEP (for 4 years), LTEL, and sometimes EL report cards...consider if this could take the place of LTEL/EL report cards monitoring. | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 153 | **Implementation Guidance** | BCN | Introduction, second paragraph, last sentence: Unclear; needs specifics, clarity, where it says “observed by multiple teachers...” | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 154 | **Reclassification & Other Uses** | BCN | A.2: ...following turn-taking rules: Is this necessary to be reclassified turn taking? | This comment informed the revision of the tool. |
| 155 | **Training, Exemplars, & Calibration** | BCN | A.3: ...a small number (too vague. Need numbers). “...a variety of... (lends itself to be too subjective). | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 156 | **Undetermined** | BCN | B.1: appropriate information and ideas, apply understanding of text structure by..., apply understanding of cohesion by... | This information will be considered in the development of the support material. |
| 157 | **Content & Format** | BCN | C. Writing can be assessed. Need to really consider including the Listening. How were the CA ELD Standards considered?  | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |
| 158 | **Content & Format** | BCN | C.3: Can this be assessed a different way? | This comment informed the revision of the tool.  |