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Session Goals

✓ Highlight considerations, current research evidence on effectively supporting EL success
✓ Note recent/coming changes in CA EL policy and practice
✓ Explore local EL assessment and accountability strategies that foster equity, deeper learning
So Who are English Learners?

- Protected class (policy construct)
- “Difficulties” with English that may deny equitable access
- Entry + (multiple) exit criteria, vary
- Temporary status, instructionally dependent
- Diverse + dynamic: Higher performers exit, lower performers stay, newly-arrived ELs enter
- Former ELs may need support after exit


Evidence Point 1: ELs’ ELP Progress and Status Vary by (a) Initial ELP Level and (b) Time in System

(Courtesy: Karen Thompson, Oregon State University; See also Hopkins et al., 2013; Thompson, 2015)
**Evidence Point 2:** ELs’ ELP Progress Can Vary by Current ELP Level and Grade Level

Rates of Growth in ELP Scale Score, Grades 3, 4, 5, by ELP Level in Base Year

Exhibit reads: An EL in grade 3, 4, or 5 beginning at ELP level 4 in the initial year of the analysis is estimated on average to grow from an ELP scale score of 361 to 389 over a three-year period.

*(Cook & Zhao, 2011; Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012)*

**Evidence Point 3:** ELs’ English language Proficiency Level Affects Their Assessed Academic Performance (in English)

Language and content learning intertwine

*CST performance by CELDT level*

*(Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012)*
Evidence Point 4: ELs’ ELP and academic attainment timeframes can vary by language instructional education program

Figure 7. Adjusted cumulative percentage of students meeting all reclassification criteria simultaneously, by grade and initial linguistic instructional program.
(Umansky & Reardon, 2014)

Evidence Point 5: Full accountability includes “ever ELs”

(Data from CDE Dataquest, 2017; ever-EL analysis based on Hopkins, Thompson, Linquanti, Hakuta, & August, 2013)

Ever EL: 2.38M = 56% Current (1.33M) + 44% Former (1.05M)
Why are ELs a leading indicator of deeper learning?

Education for Life and Work: Developing Transferable Knowledge and Skills in the 21st Century (NRC, 2012)

**SCIENCE**
- ask questions
- construct explanations
- argue from evidence
- obtain, evaluate, communicate information

**MATH**
- explain, conjecture, and justify in making sense of problems and solving them
- construct viable arguments

**ELA**
- write to inform, argue, and analyze
- engage with complex texts
- clarify one’s own ideas and build on those of others
What does 21st C. teaching for EL success look like?

- Plans & fosters ELs’ interactions with peers to make meaning with disciplinary ideas
- Scaffolds ELs’ conceptual, analytical, and linguistic development simultaneously
- Designs lesson plans/units of study that support ELs to link ideas, engage in deeper learning and language use
- Engages in planned and contingent formative assessment practices

(Heritage, Walqui, & Linquanti, 2015)

How are districts advancing science learning for ELs?

- Providing professional learning to build science content knowledge and integrate science and ELD pedagogies
- Partnering with science institutions
- Systematically increasing science instructional time in early grades for ELs
- Encouraging multilingual strategies to advance EL science learning
- Using LCAP to dedicate funding

(Feldman & Flores-Malagon, 2017; Lagunoff et al., 2015)
Selected Findings

- ELP development takes 5 to 7 years for those entering with emerging English, benefits from coherent and aligned instruction, and can take place as an integrated process simultaneous with academic content learning in addition to designated ELD and development of bilingualism/biliteracy.
- Bilingualism provides benefits from capacity to communicate in more than one language and may enhance cognitive skills, improve academic outcomes.
- The diversity of EL population (newcomers, LTEls, SIFE, SWD, GATE, continuous exiting of ELs) necessitates differentiated and responsive pedagogy and educational supports.
- Establishing proper and consistent procedures and criteria for identifying, monitoring, and exiting ELs using appropriate assessment procedures is key lever for system improvement.

Selected Practices

- ELs are recognized as capable of learning whatever society expects all children to learn in school rather than as incapable of handling the school’s curriculum until they master English.
- Language-rich classroom and school environments are promoted – communication and self-expression are encouraged.
- Administrative leadership (district, school) takes responsibility for initiating and sustaining instructional programs and practices supporting academic development of all students, including ELs.
- Teachers are encouraged [and supported] to work collaboratively to improve instruction. Cross-disciplinary planning and integrating of instruction [are] critical in supporting language and literacy development across curriculum.

(National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine, 2017: https://www.nap.edu/download/24677)
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California’s New Policy Context for English Learners

Major EL Policy Developments

ESSA / LCFF / SBE
- EL Progress Indicator: ELD progress; LTEL, RFEP wghts
- Acad. Indicator EL subgroup: ELs + RFEP 4yrs.
- Standardized EL entrance/exit procedures/criteria
- Data analytics (Dashboard, Dataquest)
- CA EL Roadmap

CA Legislative Action
- CA EdGE initiative (Prop. 58)
- SB 463 reclassification (in process)
### California’s LCFF/ESSA Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Indicator</th>
<th>Composition of English Learner Student Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate</td>
<td>Students designated as EL at any time during the academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner Progress</td>
<td>Students who take the annual CELDT in the current year or students who were reclassified fluent English proficient (RFEP) in the prior year (i.e., July 1 to June 30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Students designated as EL at any time during the four-year cohort timespan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Indicator</td>
<td>Students designated as EL during the academic year, including students who were reclassified (RFEP) within the past four years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CA LCFF/ESSA EL Progress Indicator (to be revisited under ELPAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Overall Level</th>
<th>Current Overall Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beginning</td>
<td>Early Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Early Intermediate</td>
<td>Low Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low Intermediate</td>
<td>High Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High Intermediate</td>
<td>Early Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Early Advanced or Adv Not Proficient</td>
<td>Early Advanced or Adv Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Early Advanced or Adv Proficient</td>
<td>Early Advanced or Adv Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students who reclassify from prior to current year (e.g., July 1 to June 30)
### ELPI Calculation

**Formula:** Current EL annual CELDT test takers (grades 1-12) + students reclassified in the prior year

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percent of annual CELDT test takers who advanced at least one performance level on the 2016 overall CELDT compared to the 2015 overall CELDT</td>
<td>210/250 = 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of ELs who were reclassified in prior year (2014–15)</td>
<td>20 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add reclassified students to Step 1 and calculate the rate.</td>
<td>230/270 = 85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SBE-Approved Formula for 2017–18

**Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at least 1 CELDT Level**

**Plus**

**Annual CELDT Test Takers Who Maintained Early Advanced/Advanced English Proficient on the CELDT**

**Plus**

**ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year**

**Plus**

**LTEL CELDT Test Takers Who Increased at Least 1 CELDT Level**

**Divided by**

Total Number of Annual CELDT Test Takers in the Current Year** Plus**

**ELs Who Were Reclassified in the Prior Year**
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 Title III provisions, § 3111, § 3113)

Establish the "English proficient" performance standard on the state ELP assessment using methods that take account of EL students' academic proficiency on content assessments.

- Use only ELP assessment evidence since it measures focal (ELP) constructs
- Examine relationship of ELP test “exit” level to content test performance
- Do not require minimum academic performance on content test to reclassify

Make EL reclassification decisions using more than annual ELP assessment result; also examine ELs' classroom language uses as additional reclassification criterion.

- Provide complementary (not duplicative) evidence
- Examine collaborative, interactive language uses
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Emerging → Expanding → Bridging

ELPAC Design and Reporting

Overall Scale Score
Four Performance Levels

Oral Language Scale Score
Four Performance Levels

Written Language Scale Score
Four Performance Levels

Listening Three Performance Levels
Speaking Three Performance Levels
Reading Three Performance Levels
Writing Three Performance Levels

Emerging → Expanding → Bridging

ELPAC Reclassification Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Low-to-Mid Expanding]</th>
<th>[Upper Expanding to Lower Bridging]</th>
<th>[Upper Bridging]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Bridging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4

Borderline Level 2 Student
Borderline Level 3 Student
Borderline Level 4 Student

(CDE, 9/2017) WestEd.org
ELPAC Reclassification Criterion Informed by Impact Data

Emerging | Low-to-Mid Expanding | Upper Expanding to Lower Bridging | Upper Bridging

(Adapted from Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012)

Some Opportunities regarding SB 463

1. Standardize reclassification criteria statewide
2. Promote a standardized teacher evaluation of ELs’ classroom language use
3. Set ELPAC exit threshold at “sweetspot” addressing contribution of ELP to academic performance on CAASPP-ELA without requiring a minimum content test performance for exit

*Researcher letter available at ELLPolicy.org
Key Questions to Answer for
Local Accountability and Continuous Improvement

• What must our students learn?
• How do we continually improve our instructional practices?
• How do we effectively assess and assist their learning?
• How can we leverage local accountability to build systems of EL instructional leadership and support?

Mining EL Data in Dashboard (1 of 4)
### Mining EL Data in Dashboard (3 of 4)

**Additional English Learner Assessment Data**

The English learner student group definition for this indicator includes students who are currently English learners and students who were reclassified within the past four years. Data for both the English Learners and reclassified students are provided below for informational purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL - EL Only</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>Very Low: 45.6 points below level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL - Reclassified Only</td>
<td>2138</td>
<td>High: 58.2 points above level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Levels:** Blue (green): Very Low; Yellow: Low; Orange: Very High; Red (low): Low.

An asterisk (*) shows that the student group has fewer than 15 students and is not reported for privacy reasons. The performance level (scale) is not included when there are fewer than 30 students in any year used to calculate status and change. N/A means that data is not currently available.
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Mining EL Data in Dashboard (4 of 4)

Mining Dashboard School-level EL Data (1 of 2)

CERA Annual Conference Plenary Session 11/29/2017 Anaheim, CA
### Mining Dashboard School-level EL Data (2 of 2)

San Gregorio Unified (Santa Rita County)

### Mining Dashboard Results for EL Subgroup:
**District and Focal Schools***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>ELA Indicator for EL Subgroup</th>
<th>Math Indicator for EL Subgroup</th>
<th>ELPI Indicator for EL Subgroup</th>
<th>Grad Rate</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Gregorio USD</td>
<td>Low (-40.8 pts) Incr. (12.6 pts)</td>
<td>Low (-45.7 pts) Mnt'd 8 (4.4 pts)</td>
<td>Low (-65.7 pts) Incr. (2.0 pts)</td>
<td>Low (-84.3 pts) Sig Incr. (5.4 pts)</td>
<td>High (4.8%) Incr. (0.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignacio</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High EL-enrolling and underperforming relative to District.
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---

**SGUSD “Ever EL” by Grade (Years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
<th>RFEP</th>
<th>Total (Ever-EL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KN</td>
<td>100.0% 0.0% 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0% 0.0% 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>76.0% 6.5% 0.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>40.2% 31.4% 0.0%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>3.8% 64.8% 1.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>4.3% 50.0% 13.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>4.4% 1.0% 46.5%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>3.2% 1.2% 37.8%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>3.3% 0.8% 32.4%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>3.2% 0.7% 28.5%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1% 0.6% 23.0%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>1,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4% 0.8% 25.2%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4% 1.2% 21.8%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**San Gregorio USD**

- 23.5% 12.1% 19.0% 45.4% 12,794

**Santa Rita County**

- 29.0% 9.3% 13.9% 47.8% 118,580

**State**

- 28.7% 10.7% 16.6% 44.0% 2,379,072


---

(Data from CDE Dataquest, 2017; ever-EL analysis based on Hopkins, Thompson, Linquanti, Hakuta, & August, 2013)
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SGUSD CAASPP ELA 2017: EL (N = 2,826)

SGUSD CAASPP ELA 2017: RFEP (N = 3,503)

SGUSD CAASPP ELA 2017: Ever-EL (N = 6,329)

SGUSD CAASPP ELA 2017: EO (N = 8,446)
Enacting Systemic Improvement of EL Teaching and Learning: Case in Point

Theory of Action Built on Strategic Objectives that Respond to Key Findings

Source: Clark County School District, Master Plan for ELL Success, 2016.
Instructional implications for teachers and administrators

1. All teachers responsible for teaching ELs; all leaders responsible for supporting improved instruction
2. All teachers support student engagement in academic discourse; all leaders recognize and support such language uses
3. Learning content and language simultaneously requires all teachers to help students engage in learning, self-assess, and move to autonomy; all leaders actively promote these practices

Source: Clark County School District, Master Plan for ELL Success, 2016.
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Source: Clark County School District, Master Plan for ELL Success, 2016.

Academic Language & Content Achievement Model
- All students, in all classrooms
- Strengthens grade-level, standards-based instruction (Tier I)

Newcomer Model
- For students with less than 2 years of schooling in the U.S.
- Personalized learning plan and extensive instructional support.

Strategic Academic Language & Literacy Model
- Intentional and intensive supports to develop academic discourse and literacy.
- Typically, students classified as ELLs for more than 5 years.

Dual Language Model
- For ELL and non-ELL students who aspire to become bilingual and biliterate.

Source: Clark County School District, Master Plan for ELL Success, 2016.
How will you help your district build a culture of learning?

Thanks for listening!
rlinqu@wested.org