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Session Goals

- Clarify ESSA Title III requirements on EL entrance and exit procedures
- Examine proposed ESSA regs on setting uniform entrance/exit criteria
- Illustrate policy and technical options for standardizing EL entrance/exit
- Stimulate discussion, generate ideas, identify needs
Every Student Succeeds Act

States will “establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with local educational agencies representing the geographic diversity of the State, **standardized, statewide [EL] entrance and exit procedures.**”

*(ESSA §3111, §3113)*
§299.19(c)(3) [3113(b)(2)] Regulations clarify:

1. Standardized statewide EL entrance and exit procedures must include uniform criteria applied statewide.

2. Prohibits a “‘local option,’ which cannot be standardized and under which LEAs could have widely varying criteria.”

3. Exit procedures must include objective, valid, and reliable criteria, including a score of proficient on the State’s annual ELP assessment.
§ 299.19(c)(3) [3113(b)(2)] Regulations clarify:

4. Scores on content assessments cannot be included as exit criteria (not valid and reliable measures of ELP, may result in prolonged EL status, civil rights violations)

5. Exit criteria must be applied to both Title I EL subgroup and Title III services (exit EL status for both Title I and Title III purposes)
Current Reality

“Standardized, statewide [EL] entrance and exit procedures”

• **EL Entrance:**
  » 23 states use multiple initial ELP screeners
  » 40 states allow LEAs to define process

• **EL Exit:**
  » 29 states plus DC use state ELP test only
  » 17 states use academic achievement test results
  » 15 states use teacher input/evaluation
Quick-Talk (2 mins)

Discuss with team member or elbow partner:

- 2 key concerns
- 1 potential opportunity related to this new provision in law and proposed regulations –

Be specific on:

- *entrance into* EL category
- *exit from* EL category
4-Stage framework: Overview & guidance on each stage

http://ccsso.org/Documents/Moving%20Toward%20a%20More%20Common%20Definition%20of%20English%20Learner-Final(0).pdf

(Linquanti, Cook, Bailey, & MacDonald, 2016)
Policy Space

1. Identify potential English learners
   • Home language surveys (HLS)

2. Establish initial EL classification
   • EL classification instruments & process

3. Define “English proficient”
   • ELP assessment performance standard

4. Reclassify English learners
   • Exit criteria & process

(Linquanti & Cook, 2013; Linquanti, Cook, Bailey, & MacDonald, 2016)
Framework to Move Toward More Common EL Definition

1. Identify Potential EL
   - Administer Home Language Survey (HLS) at entry
   - Do HLS criteria indicate a potential EL?
     - YES
       - Administer initial ELP screener/assessment
     - NO
       - ELP not tested (False Negative?)

2. Classify as EL
   - English Learner
     - NO
       - Determine placement & appropriate instr. svc
     - YES
       - Meet initial English proficient criterion?
         - YES
           - Meet EL exit criteria (ELP perf.std, other criteria & evidence)
         - NO
           - Initial fluent English proficient (No LIEP provided)

3. Define ELP Performance Standard
   - Assess/monitor each reclassification at least annually
   - YES
     - Exited & reclassified fluent English proficient
   - NO
     - Monitor academic progress for two (2) years to ensure no further specialized services are needed

4. Reclassify
   - YES
     - Meet EL exit criteria (ELP perf.std, other criteria & evidence)
Every Student Succeeds Act

- requirement that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

- Each LEA, not later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year, shall inform parents of an English learner identified for participation or participating in such a program.

- For those children who have not been identified as English learners prior to the beginning of the school year but are identified as English learners during such school year, the LEA shall notify the children’s parents during the first 2 weeks of the child being placed in a language instruction educational program.

(ESSA § 1111, 3111)
### HLS relation to ELP “Screener”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HLS Result (Stage 1)</th>
<th>Initial ELP Assessment Result (Stage 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential EL</td>
<td>Proficient I-FEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Potential EL</td>
<td>Not Proficient “Discovered” EL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I-FEP = Initially fluent English proficient
- EO = English Only
Where Misclassifications Can Occur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HLS Result (Stage 1)</th>
<th>Potential EL</th>
<th>Not Potential EL</th>
<th>Initial ELP Assessment Result (Stage 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-FEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Discovered”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[“EO”]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cook & Linquanti, 2015)
## How Students Can Be Classified/Misclassified

### Table 2. Permutations of language classification and special education status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Classification</th>
<th>Not Special Ed-identified</th>
<th>Special Ed-identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EL linguistic-minority (Initially English fluent / native bilingual)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual English (&quot;English Only&quot;)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cook & Linquanti, 2015)
Home Language Survey Guidance

- Explicitly state purposes & uses
- Clarify the construct (current English use and exposure)
- Develop questions – e.g.,
  - Which language(s) does your child currently understand and speak?
  - Which language(s) does your child most often use at home, in school, outside school?
  - Which language does your child most often hear at home, in school, outside school?

- Set administrative procedures, interpretation rules

(Linquanti & Bailey, 2014)
Guidance on Initial Classification Policy & Procedures

- Set common policies and practices for initial EL classification
- Implement process appropriately, consistently
- Consider a *provisional classification* period to correct any initial misclassifications
- Differentiate procedures for initially classifying early elementary students; monitor and validate

(Cook & Linquanti, 2015)
Initial EL Classification Model

Stage 2.

“Pre-classification Period”
Identify potential ELs

Student identified as a “Potential English Learner”

Classification Instrument & Procedure

How Long?

Provisional Classification Period

Initially classified as English Learner

ELP Support Program & Content Classes

Classify EL

Struggling with Academic English

Clearly Misclassified

Successfully managing Academic English

Not English Proficient

How Long?

Annual ELP Summative Assessment

Clearly English Proficient / Reclassify

2-year Monitoring

No ELP Support Services Provided

Stage 1

Stage 2

Stages 3 & 4

National Working Session Idea

(Cook & Linquanti, 2015)
Stage 1 & 2 Discussion Questions

• Do our HLS questions appropriately target key constructs? Are our decisions rules standardized and clear?
• What can we learn and leverage from consortia and other states’ efforts?
• How might our state illustrate via flowchart/decision tree using HLS and initial ELP assessment results to classify students?
• What challenges do we face in adopting a statewide policy and process for detecting, reporting, and correcting initial misclassifications?
Guidelines (3 of 9)

States...

3. **Establish the "English proficient" performance standard on the state ELP assessment using methods that take account of EL students' academic proficiency on content assessments.**
   
   - Do not require minimum academic performance on content test to reclassify
   - Anticipate & mitigate risks
   - Domain score weights affect ELP test relationship to content test results

(Linquanti & Cook, 2015)
Establishing an English-Proficient Performance Criterion

(Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012; pp.7-26)

http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/implementation-supplemental-report.html
What Does English Proficient Mean?

Goal – Determine English language proficiency level range that reflects “English proficient”

Relate ELP to content assessment performance *without requiring a minimum content test performance*

**Key Assumptions**

- A meaningful relationship exists between ELP and content assessment performance
- ELP level becomes less related to content achievement as students approach English language proficiency

(Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012)
Multiple Methods to Identify English-Proficient “Sweet Spot”

**Decision Consistency** – ELP Level & content achievement categorizations

**Logistic Regression** – Likelihood that ELs at given ELP level will score proficient on content assessment

**Descriptive Box Plots** – Graphically represents ELP and content assessment relationships

**Equivalent Distribution** – Identifies ELP score/level where content test item performances of ELs and non-ELs are equivalent

(Linquanti & Cook, 2013; Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012)
Grade 4, 2008 ELA Logistic Plot

Estimated Probability

Level 1
Level 2
Level 3
Level 4
Level ≥5
English Only

(See Linquanti & Cook, 2013; Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012)
Stage 3 Discussion Questions

• Will the "English proficient" performance standard on state ELP test specify composite and domain scores?
• Will we set a performance standard beyond our ELP assessment consortium’s recommended level?
• What is our capacity to analyze annual ELP assessment results in relation to EL academic content assessment results:
  • Who has matched-score ELP and content assessment data?
  • Who undertakes these analyses?
• Will we need to share de-identified, matched-score student ELP and academic content assessment data?
Stage 3 (English proficient) to Stage 4 (Exit)

Reclassification criteria based on Federal definition:
English Learner no longer denied...

ESSA § 8002(5)

1. ability to meet challenging State academic standards
   - Empirical Analysis of ELP & Content Assessment results
     → Determine English Language Proficient Criterion

2. ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English
   - Evidence of receptive & productive language uses to accomplish tasks appropriate to grade level, content areas
     → Assessment tools supporting and standardizing local criteria & evidence

3. opportunity to participate fully in society in English
   - Evidence of receptive & productive language uses to accomplish social and occupational goals within & beyond school
     → Assessment tools supporting and standardizing local criteria & evidence

Consensus: ✔ ✔ ✗
Guidelines (4 of 9)

States and districts...

4. **Make EL reclassification decisions using more than annual summative ELP assessment result; also examine EL students' classroom language uses as an additional reclassification criterion.**

- Complementary (not duplicative) evidence
- Examine collaborative, interactive language uses
- Student focused, assets-based (*can do*)
- Formative / summative tensions

(Linquanti & Cook, 2015)
**Standard 12.10:** In educational settings, a decision or characterization that will have major impact on the student should take into consideration *not just scores from a single test but other relevant information* (p. 198).

**Standard 12.13:** When test scores are intended to be used as part of the process for making decisions about... *provision of services for English language learners*, then empirical evidence documenting the relationship among particular test scores, the instructional programs, and desired student outcomes should be provided. When adequate empirical evidence is not available, *users should be cautioned to weigh the test results accordingly in light of other relevant information about the students* (p. 199).
Guidelines (5 of 9)

States and districts...

5. **Ensure local educators have training, tools, and ongoing support to effectively and consistently apply classroom language-use criterion for reclassification decisions.**

- Collaborative R&D
- Video & audio samples for calibration
- Leverage complementary initiatives & resources
  
  » Language observation protocols (UL @ Stanford)
  » Online tools and approaches (WIDA, TX)

*(Linquanti & Cook, 2015)*
New Guidance on Gathering and Using Local Evidence of ELs' Classroom Language Uses for Exit Decisions

Supplemental Guidance

• Guidelines for developing standardized methods to gather and interpret evidence of ELs’ classroom language uses

• Strategies to target interactive, discipline-specific uses complementary to state annual ELP test, and use appropriately in exit decisions

• Sample tools (observation protocol, evaluation rubrics) states and local educators can consider

(Molle, Linquanti, MacDonald, & Cook, 2016)
Guidelines (6 of 9)

States and districts...

6. **Collaborate to establish common reclass criteria and processes within states, to strengthen validity of inferences from local educator input & accuracy of decisions based on multiple sources of evidence.**

- Local/state balance
- Standardized, standards-based, complementary
- Combining multiple sources of evidence
- ELA proficient test score as “corrective criterion”

(Linquanti & Cook, 2015)
Figure 3. Sample reclassification decision matrix combining multiple sources of ELP evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELP Test Result</th>
<th>“English-Proficient” within CSEM</th>
<th>“English-Proficient”</th>
<th>Borderline “English-Proficient”</th>
<th>Not “English-Proficient”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“English-Proficient”</td>
<td>R-FEP</td>
<td>R-FEP</td>
<td>R-FEP*</td>
<td>EL*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“English-Proficient” within CSEM</td>
<td>R-FEP</td>
<td>R-FEP*</td>
<td>EL*</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates ambiguous ELP results where proficient ELA test result might be utilized as a “corrective criterion.”

(Linquanti & Cook, 2015)
8. Examine application of reclassification criteria & processes for primary-grade ELs, and ELs with disabilities, to maximize validity, reliability, and fairness.

- Grades K, 1, and 2: ELP test literacy weights
- Study post-reclassification ELA performance, relationship of listening, speaking to ELA
- SWD: Detect misclassifications early
- Alternate English-proficient composites, criteria addressing specific nature of disability

(Linquanti & Cook, 2015)
9. Carefully examine subsequent academic performance of reclassified ELs for as long as these students remain in the district or state.

- Ensure consequential validity of reclassification criteria and processes
- Longer-term outcome measures
  - Advanced Placement, other college-ready coursework
  - Graduation rates
  - Seal of Biliteracy attainment
  - College/career application, acceptance, completion rates.

(Linquanti & Cook, 2015)
Stage 4 Discussion Questions

• Who has authority to change state reclassification criteria?
• How will we select and engage representative LEAs?
• How might we approach issues of exiting primary-grade ELs and ELs with disabilities?
• How long do we identify former ELs? Report the academic performance results of former ELs?
• Do we report longer-term academic outcomes of former ELs?
Moving Forward

What are our key issues?

- Home language survey
- Initial ELP assessment & procedures
- English-proficient standard
- Reclassification criteria & procedures

What are our next steps?

- Policy development
- Process & timeline
- Stakeholder selection & engagement
- Data analysis
- Training and support