

Louisiana Believes

Measuring Progress to English Language Proficiency

Supervisor Collaborations - September 2018

Session Objectives

Participants will know:

1. the timeline and process for including English language proficiency in the accountability formula;
2. how English language proficiency progress will be measured; and
3. how English language proficiency will be included within the overall SPS calculation



ESSA and English Language Proficiency in Louisiana

English Language Proficiency in ESSA

Under Title III of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), districts were required to report progress (AMAO 1) and status (AMAO 2) on the state English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment.

Because ELP was part of Title III, consequences for not meeting AMAOs were not applicable to districts not receiving Title III funding and were not included in “SPS.”

ESSA changed this.

Under ESSA, “progress in achieving ELP” must be used as one of four mandatory indicators in school accountability systems.

English Language Proficiency Progress in 2018-2019 School Performance Scores

As required under ESSA, Louisiana will include a measure of progress to English language proficiency for English learners in the accountability formula. Every EL's improvement in English language proficiency will count in equal weight to all other assessments in the Assessment Index.

Throughout spring/summer 2018, the Department engaged a work group of experts in EL instruction and educators from the schools and school systems serving a majority of the state's EL students. Based on the recommendations of this work group, the Department will propose a specific methodology for measuring and rewarding ELP progress within the Assessment Index for BESE consideration in October.

For each ELPT tester, the recommended progress measure will consider:

1. Is the student on a trajectory to exit EL status within the expected time frame (based on his/her initial grade and proficiency)?
2. Did the student demonstrate improvement in English proficiency from the previous school year?

Because the state transitioned to a new ELP assessment in 2017-2018, the Department will recommend that 2018-2019 is a learning year, with ELP progress included in report cards for the first time in 2019-2010.

Recommended Timeline


Date	Action
Spring/Summer 2018	ELP work group meets to study and make recommendations for calculating student progress on the ELPT assessment
August 20, 2018	Accountability Commission endorsed the working group's recommendations with a commitment to review 2018-2019 results no later than August 2019
October 16-17, 2018	BESE will consider the ELP work group and Accountability Commission recommendations
2018-2019	Learning year: ELP measure is calculated and results provided to schools and school systems, but results do not impact overall SPS
Summer 2019	Review learning year results with ELP work group and Accountability Commission, recommend policy changes as needed
2019-2020	ELP included in SPS



English Learners in Louisiana

English Learners in Louisiana


Percentage of public school students who were English learners, by state:
School year 2014–15



Year	La. % EL
2014-15	2.6%
2015-16	3.0%
2016-17	3.1%
2017-18	3.4%


English Learners in Louisiana

Number of public school students who were English language learners, by state: School year 2014-15




Preliminary 2018 ELPT Results


Nearly 25,000 students participated in the 2018 ELPT assessment, and 20 percent of testers demonstrated English proficiency by scoring Level 4 or 5 across all four domains. Students scored highest on listening and struggled most with reading and writing.



Preliminary 2018 ELPT Results by Grade

The largest numbers ELPT testers in 2018 were in grades K-4. The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency is greatest in grade 4 and declines through middle school.





Proposed English Language Proficiency Progress Measure

Summary of ELP Recommendations

As recommended by the ELP work group and endorsed by the Louisiana Accountability Commission:

1. **An 'A' school is one where ELLs are on average on track to proficiency in the expected time frame.** Louisiana has set a goal that all students reach proficiency within seven years of first identification, though the trajectory will vary by grade and proficiency level at initial identification. Using a *clear and simple table* with an expected trajectory from an initial level, the accountability formula should reward meeting or exceeding the expected trajectory.
2. **All progress, even if not sufficient to exit in the expected time frame, should be recognized.** It is important that students progress towards overall proficiency, but year-over-year gains should also be rewarded in the accountability formula.
3. **Due to the transition to a new ELP assessment in 2017-2018, the 2018-2019 school year should be a learning year.** In 2018-2019, results should be calculated and shared with schools but not included on public report cards, with full implementation beginning no sooner than 2019-2020. Additionally, initial proficiency levels should be reset for all students beginning with administration of the ELPT assessment in the 2017-2018 school year.
4. The Accountability Commission will review learning year results no later than August 2019.

Recommended ELP Progress Accountability Framework

For each ELPT tester, the progress measure should consider:

- A. Is the student on a trajectory to exit EL status within the expected time frame (based on his/her initial grade and proficiency)?
- B. Did the student demonstrate improvement in English proficiency from the previous school year?

ELPT Progress Outcome	Assessment Index Points
Exceeds expected proficiency level (A)	150
Meets expected proficiency level (A)	100
Improvement of one or more English proficiency levels from prior year (B)	80
No improvement in overall English proficiency level	0

English Language Proficiency Levels

The new ELPT assessment measures and reports on students' English language proficiency overall, as well as in four domains: reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Each of the four domains are scored 1-5, where level 1 is beginning and level 5 is advanced.

The overall proficiency determination is based on the profile of domain scores. Students must score a combination of 4s and 5s across all domains in order to demonstrate proficiency.

Overall Proficiency Level	Domain Scores
Emerging (E)	All level 1s and 2s
Progressing 1 (P1)	At least one level 3 score in which the lowest score is a level 1
Progressing 2 (P2)	At least one level 3 score in which the lowest score is a level 2
Progressing 3 (P3)	At least one level 3 score in which the lowest score is a level 3
Transitioning/Proficient (T)	All level 4s and 5s

Examples of ELPT Score Profiles

Student	ELPT Domain Scores (Level 1-5)				Overall Proficiency Level
	Reading	Writing	Speaking	Listening	
A	◆ (1)	◆ (1)	◆◆ (2)	◆◆ (2)	Emerging (E)
B	◆ (1)	◆◆ (2)	◆◆◆ (3)	◆◆ (2)	Progressing 1 (P1)
C	◆◆ (2)	◆◆ (2)	◆◆◆◆ (4)	◆◆◆ (3)	Progressing 2 (P2)
D	◆◆◆ (3)	◆◆ (2)	◆◆◆◆◆ (5)	◆◆◆◆ (4)	Progressing 3 (P3)
E	◆◆◆◆ (4)	◆◆◆◆ (4)	◆◆◆◆◆ (5)	◆◆◆◆◆ (5)	Transitioning (T)

On Track to Proficiency: Expected Trajectory Tables


Students identified as ELLs in elementary school grades typically exit ELL status within 4-5 years, depending on their baseline proficiency level, while students who enter school in middle and high school grades typically need additional time.

Grades K-5 Initial Level	# of Years Identified as ELL			
	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
E	P1	P2	P3	T
P1	P2	P3	T	
P2	P3	T		
P3	T			

Grades 6-12 Initial Level	# of Years Identified as ELL					
	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
E	P1	P2	P2	P3	P3	T
P1	P2	P2	P3	P3	T	
P2	P2	P3	P3	T		
P3	P3	T				

Simulation: On Track to English Proficiency

Using a statistical method to translate the old ELP assessment to the new assessment scale, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the expected trajectory to English language proficiency is generally consistent regardless of the grade in which the student was first identified as ELL.



Simulation: Year-Over-Year Proficiency Level Progress


Approximately 43% of ELPT testers improved one or more proficiency levels from 2017 to 2018.

2017 Level (ELDA translated to ELPT scale)	2018 Level (ELPT)					% Improving 1+ Level
	E	P1	P2	P3	T	
E	53%	23%	16%	6%	1%	47%
P1	15%	31%	29%	19%	6%	54%
P2	3%	16%	32%	35%	14%	49%
P3	1%	6%	18%	47%	27%	27%

Simulation: ELP Progress Measure Distribution

In 2017-2018 simulations, 35% of ELPT results earned an 'A' (100+ points) in the Assessment Index. In comparison, just 13% of ELL students' LEAP 2025 tests scored Mastery or Advanced for an 'A' on the Assessment Index in 2018.

ELP Progress Index Simulated Distribution of Results by Current Grade Level (2018)




The background of the slide features a world map rendered in a light blue, watercolor-like style. The map is centered and occupies most of the frame. Overlaid on the map are horizontal, light blue lines, similar to those on a piece of lined paper, which run across the entire width of the image. The overall aesthetic is clean and professional, with a focus on the title text.

English Language Proficiency in Accountability Scores


School Performance Score Formulae

Elementary Schools




- State Assessment Performance
- Student Progress

Elementary/Middle Schools (with Grade 8)



- State Assessment Performance
- Student Progress
- Credit Accumulation

High Schools



- State Assessment Performance and Progress
- ACT/WorkKeys
- Strength of Diploma
- Graduation Rate

ELP in Accountability

Louisiana will measure school success with English language learners in two ways:

1. Progress towards English language proficiency, as measured by the English language proficiency exam, will be included within the Assessment Index. This ensures all student scores are included regardless of the number of English language learners in a school, and that all such scores are weighted equally with the assessment results of all students in the school.
2. Both the English language proficiency results and English learner subgroup results on all other SPS indicators will be publicly reported on school report cards.

Louisiana is committed to:

- a) measuring the progress to English language proficiency for ALL students who are English learners, and
- b) ensuring that indicator is weighted proportionally within the overall calculation.

The policies surrounding accountability of schools for English proficiency reflect these values.

Just one-third of schools in Louisiana meet the minimum n-size (10) for English learners, and 10% of English learners attend a school that enrolls fewer than 10 ELs.

# of English Learners	% of Schools	% of All ELs Enrolled	% EL in School
0	26%	0%	NA
1-9	40%	10%	0.1% - 5.5%
10 or more	34%	90%	0.6% - 54%

Assessment Index Calculation

Each student's ELP results are weighted equal to the academic assessments within the Assessment Index.

In the K-8 Assessment Index calculation, this means ELP is weighted six times, equal to the six academic assessment units. For the High School Assessment Index, ELP is weighted equal to the number of English learners with English I, English II, Algebra I, Geometry, U.S. History, and Biology assessment units.

Assessment	K-8 AI Weight
English Language Arts	2
Math	2
Science	1
Social Studies	1
English Language Proficiency measure	6

K-8 Assessment Index Example

Example School has 100 students enrolled in grades 3-5, and 50 students are ELLs.

Level	ELA (x2)	Math (x2)	Science (x1)	Social Studies (x1)	ELP (x6)	Total
Advanced/Exceeds Target (150 pts)	10	5	5	5	5	
Mastery/Meets Target (100 pts)	30	30	25	30	20	
Basic/Improves 1+ Levels (80 pts)	35	40	35	35	15	
Below Basic/No Gain (0 pts)	25	25	35	30	10	
Count of Tests	100	100	100	100	50	450
Total Test Units with Weights						
Points Earned						
Total Points with Weights						
Index (Total Points / Total Test Units)						

K-8 Assessment Index Example

Example School has 100 students enrolled in grades 3-5, and 50 students are ELLs.

Level	ELA (x2)	Math (x2)	Science (x1)	Social Studies (x1)	ELP (x6)	Total
Advanced/Exceeds Target (150 pts)	10	5	5	5	5	
Mastery/Meets Target (100 pts)	30	30	25	30	20	
Basic/Improves 1+ Levels (80 pts)	35	40	35	35	15	
Below Basic/No Gain (0 pts)	25	25	35	30	10	
Count of Tests	100	100	100	100	50	450
Total Test Units with Weights	200	200	100	100	300	900
Points Earned						
Total Points with Weights						
Index (Total Points / Total Test Units)						

K-8 Assessment Index Example

Example School has 100 students enrolled in grades 3-5, and 50 students are ELLs.

Level	ELA (x2)	Math (x2)	Science (x1)	Social Studies (x1)	ELP (x6)	Total
Advanced/Exceeds Target (150 pts)	10	5	5	5	5	
Mastery/Meets Target (100 pts)	30	30	25	30	20	
Basic/Improves 1+ Levels (80 pts)	35	40	35	35	15	
Below Basic/No Gain (0 pts)	25	25	35	30	10	
Count of Tests	100	100	100	100	50	450
Total Test Units with Weights	200	200	100	100	300	900
Points Earned	7300	6950	6050	6550	3950	30800
Total Points with Weights						
Index (Total Points / Total Test Units)						

K-8 Assessment Index Example

Example School has 100 students enrolled in grades 3-5, and 50 students are ELLs.

Level	ELA (x2)	Math (x2)	Science (x1)	Social Studies (x1)	ELP (x6)	Total
Advanced/Exceeds Target (150 pts)	10	5	5	5	5	
Mastery/Meets Target (100 pts)	30	30	25	30	20	
Basic/Improves 1+ Levels (80 pts)	35	40	35	35	15	
Below Basic/No Gain (0 pts)	25	25	35	30	10	
Count of Tests	100	100	100	100	50	450
Total Test Units with Weights	200	200	100	100	300	900
Points Earned	7300	6950	6050	6550	3950	30800
Total Points with Weights	14600	13900	6050	6550	23700	64800
Index (Total Points / Total Test Units)						

K-8 Assessment Index Example

Example School has 100 students enrolled in grades 3-5, and 50 students are ELLs.

Level	ELA (x2)	Math (x2)	Science (x1)	Social Studies (x1)	ELP (x6)	Total
Advanced/Exceeds Target (150 pts)	10	5	5	5	5	
Mastery/Meets Target (100 pts)	30	30	25	30	20	
Basic/Improves 1+ Levels (80 pts)	35	40	35	35	15	
Below Basic/No Gain (0 pts)	25	25	35	30	10	
Count of Tests	100	100	100	100	50	450
Total Test Units with Weights	200	200	100	100	300	900
Points Earned	7300	6950	6050	6550	3950	30800
Total Points with Weights	14600	13900	6050	6550	23700	64800
Index (Total Points / Total Test Units)	73	69.5	60.5	65.5	79	72

K-8 Assessment Index Example

How does Example School perform on the Assessment Index without the ELP measure?

Level	ELA (x2)	Math (x2)	Science (x1)	Social Studies (x1)	ELP (x6)	Total
Advanced/Exceeds Target (150 pts)	10	5	5	5		
Mastery/Meets Target (100 pts)	30	30	25	30		
Basic/Improves 1+ Levels (80 pts)	35	40	35	35		
Below Basic/No Gain (0 pts)	25	25	35	30		
Count of Tests	100	100	100	100		
Total Test Units with Weights	200	200	100	100		
Points Earned	7300	6950	6050	6550		
Total Points with Weights	14600	13900	6050	6550		
Index (Total Points / Total Test Units)	73	69.5	60.5	65.5		

K-8 Assessment Index Example

How does Example School perform on the Assessment Index without the ELP measure?

Level	ELA (x2)	Math (x2)	Science (x1)	Social Studies (x1)	ELP (x6)	Total
Advanced/Exceeds Target (150 pts)	10	5	5	5		
Mastery/Meets Target (100 pts)	30	30	25	30		
Basic/Improves 1+ Levels (80 pts)	35	40	35	35		
Below Basic/No Gain (0 pts)	25	25	35	30		
Count of Tests	100	100	100	100		400
Total Test Units with Weights	200	200	100	100		600
Points Earned	7300	6950	6050	6550		26850
Total Points with Weights	14600	13900	6050	6550		41100
Index (Total Points / Total Test Units)	73	69.5	60.5	65.5		68.5

Next Steps

Recommended Timeline

Date	Action
Spring/Summer 2018	ELP work group meets to study and make recommendations for calculating student progress on the ELPT assessment
August 20, 2018	Accountability Commission endorsed the working group's recommendations with a commitment to review 2018-2019 results no later than August 2019
October 16-17, 2018	BESE will consider the ELP work group and Accountability Commission recommendations
2018-2019	Learning year: ELP measure is calculated and results provided to schools and school systems, but results do not impact overall SPS
Summer 2019	Review learning year results with ELP work group and Accountability Commission, recommend policy changes as needed
2019-2020	ELP included in SPS

Questions?

Jill.Zimmerman@la.gov

Beverly.Diaz@la.gov