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# **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** April 5, 2018

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Operational Initial Assessment Threshold Scores and Composite Weights for the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.

## Summary of Key Issues

In May 2018, the California Department of Education (CDE) will bring proposed threshold scores and composite weights for the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) to the State Board of Education (SBE) for adoption. 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.

### Proposed Initial ELPAC Threshold Scores

In February 2018, an SBE Information Memorandum explained the process that Educational Testing Service (ETS) would use to convene standard-setting panels for recommending Initial ELPAC threshold scores (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/infomemofeb2018.asp>).

During the standard-setting process, 62 California educators participated from across the state who are familiar with the 2012 California English Language Development Standards, and who work with students classified as English learners (ELs). Six panels were formed, one panel for each of the six grades/grade spans of the Initial ELPAC. First, the educators reviewed the performance level descriptors and took the test in all domains. Then, they defined the expectations of the students who would be at the border of each level and made recommendations about the oral language and written language expectations of students who would be classified as either Novice ELs, Intermediate ELs, or Initial Fluent English Proficient. Using a booklet of items ordered by difficulty based on test-taker performance, educators on each panel recommended a threshold score for oral language and written language. Next, they made threshold score recommendations for the overall scale score using an integrated judgments process, which integrates all of the language domains. The educators considered the contribution of students’ oral language and written language proficiency to the overall score. After setting the thresholds for the overall scores, panel members were shown their grade-level impact data and were allowed to make changes based on their professional judgement.

In the afternoon of the last day of the standard-setting process, a subset of 10 educators representing all six grades/grade spans worked together on a cross-grade articulation panel to consider the recommendations across all six tests. For all ELPAC grades/grade spans, the educators reviewed the student threshold definitions, impact data across the grades, and historical data from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). After discussing all of the above, the panel of 10 educators agreed that there was no need to make changes to the threshold scores made by the grade and grade span panels.

A review of the panel recommendations was conducted by psychometricians from the CDE. The data were reviewed for continuity from grade to grade, and small changes were made which resulted in the proposed threshold scores. Additionally, the data were presented to the ELPAC Technical Advisory Group members on March 22, 2018, where they confirmed their support of the proposed threshold scores.

The “Educator Panels’ Proposed Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations” (Attachment 2) provides the educator panels’ recommended threshold scores across the six grades/grade spans. Actual reporting scales will be developed later based on the standard-setting scale, for the purpose of reporting scores on the Student Score Report and to the public. The reporting scale will be a three-digit common scale that will not overlap with the scale used for the Summative ELPAC. “State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Proposed Threshold and Composite Weight Recommendations” (Attachment 1) provides State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI)-recommended threshold scores and composite weights across the six grades/grade spans. The document in Attachment 1 will be presented to the SBE for adoption in May 2018. If the SBE approves, the threshold scores will be used in the 2018–19 school year.

### Proposed Initial ELPAC Composite Weights

As the Initial ELPAC becomes operational in July 2018, composite weights are needed to provide overall scores. As a point of reference, there are two different weight calculations for the overall CELDT score, as described below. These weights were applied to both the initial and annual CELDT:

* For kindergarten and grade one, the calculation is 45 percent Listening, 45 percent Speaking, 5 percent Reading, and 5 percent Writing.
* For grades two through twelve, the four domains are weighted equally at 25 percent each.

To arrive at the weight recommendations for the Initial ELPAC, Table 1 shows proposed composite calculations to determine a student’s overall scale score. All impact data presented at the standard-setting workshop were based on these proposed calculations. These data represent only a sampling of students and may not precisely represent the data that will result from the operational administration. Where the CELDT calculated the overall score by domain weight percentages, the ELPAC will calculate the overall score by oral language and written language composites. This is aligned with the score reporting hierarchy approved by the SBE in September 2017, which will allow performance levels to be reported for each student for oral language and written language in addition to scale scores and performance levels for overall English language proficiency.

The proposed composite weight calculations in Table 1 are examples of what was considered to determine a student’s overall scale score. During the Integrated Judgments Method of the standard-setting workshop, the educator panels reviewed field test impact data based on the overall score, which integrated the panel-recommended oral language and written language threshold scores. The educators confirmed that the Option 1 weights proposed for the Initial ELPAC were appropriate for reporting the overall scores for each grade and grade span. The educators on the cross-grade articulation panel reviewed the impact data across all grade and grade-span tests. They discussed the desirability of having two separate tests for students entering kindergarten and grade one, and concluded that the proposed weights for all grades for the Initial ELPAC were appropriate. Attachment 3 demonstrates the impact data that was used for the SSPI’s recommended composite 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 Calculations (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 will recommend Option 1 to calculate the overall score for students in each grade and grade span for adoption at the May SBE meeting (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 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.

### Next Steps

In fall 2018, a threshold score review process will be conducted after the first operational Initial ELPAC to verify the appropriateness of the threshold scores. If there are adjustments to the threshold scores, the CDE plans to bring the changes to the SBE for approval in May 2019, with subsequent implementation July 1, 2019. More information on this process will be provided to the SBE in a future Information Memorandum.

## 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 Thresholds for Performance Levels on the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), 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 (SSPI’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)