**Information on CELApro Growth**

**What is CELApro?**

CELApro is a part of Colorado’s state mandated assessment system for K-12 public school students. CELApro is administered every year to all students identified by Local Educational Agencies as non-English proficient (NEP) or limited English proficient (LEP). CELAPro measures English Learners’ English language proficiency in the four language domains of reading, writing, speaking and listening, and these scores plus the overall score can help determine the kinds of English language support services students may need in school.

**Why calculate growth in English proficiency?**

The Colorado Department of Education has for the first time applied the Colorado Growth Model method to CELApro data in order to describe student progress in attaining English proficiency. In calculating a growth model, we are trying to answer two questions:

How much growth is each student making?

Is that enough growth to get him or her to proficiency in a reasonable amount of time?

These are the same questions we already ask when we calculate growth on the state’s assessments in reading, writing and mathematics. In the case of CELApro data, the answers tell us about progress toward English language proficiency, rather than toward proficiency in academic content. However, the same Colorado Growth Model can be used for both of these purposes because it can handle many different kinds of data.

The first question is answered directly by the output of the Colorado Growth Model. The second question requires the additional calculation of Adequate Growth, explained in another question within this set of FAQs.

**Where are the CELApro growth results available?**

Registered school and district users can log into the CEDAR data reporting system at CDE and download their student-level CELApro growth results. In CEDAR, the data are available as “flat files” (Excel spreadsheets with every student’s results on every CELApro subtest as well as for the composite score). The files also include student growth percentile calculations for the 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 administrations of CELApro.

Access to student-level data is limited to educators who have a need for such data. For permission to access to the student-level data for your school or district, please contact your local school district’s Local Access Manager (LAM) and request access to CDE’s CEDAR system. CDE does not grant access to this system to either district- or school-level users directly – districts must add, administer, and remove users themselves.

Summary data in the form of median growth percentiles by school and district, as well as interpretation guidelines, will be published on the [CDE website](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/index_assess.html) in the fall of 2011.

**Are Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGP) calculated for English proficiency?**

No, AGPs at the student level are not currently reported by CDE. CELApro Growth describes how a student is progressing toward English language proficiency compared to his/her peers – students that had similar score histories in the same grades. Adequate Growth reflects the percentile at which a student needs to perform each year in order to attain proficiency within a specified time horizon. Comparisons between the two show if a student’s growth is enough to get him or her to a particular level of proficiency in time. In other words, was the growth that a student demonstrated enough to get him/her to the target level of proficiency? Performing this calculation requires some additional information beyond just the amount of growth; it also requires knowing what the target level of proficiency is, as well as how much time is allotted to reach it.

The necessary growth to meet the different CELApro proficiency levels in one, two, three, or more years has been estimated at the individual student level, and is reported in the student-level files available on CEDAR. These data are not available to the general public. Specifically, the policy around the appropriate timeline for reaching the destination proficiency level has not been developed, so Adequate Growth is not shown in flat files. Some data related to this calculation are included, and can be explored by users.

Along these lines, the data suggest that it takes more than three years for the great majority of early English learners to get to Level 5, the state-designated proficient level of scoring on the CELApro. In short, how much time to allot students for achieving proficiency in English is not a simple matter of creating a proficiency target and expecting students to get there – it requires a careful examination of the data, state and national norms, and research on English language acquisition to set a policy that is an ambitious but attainable goal for all students.

With the release of the individual student level data, the Department looks forward to conversations with districts that will inform the establishment of reasonable timeline and destination goals. These conversations and analyses will help determine the policy so that CDE can calculate an AGP for each student and a median AGP for schools or districts in the future.

**Do low median growth percentiles necessarily mean that the school or district is not doing its job?**

No. Median growth percentiles need to be interpreted with substantial knowledge of the local context. For example, some schools may have had a large number of EL students for a very short time, so even though the schools have these students’ growth numbers attributed to them, they may not have had enough input to make a real difference in their learning. In contrast to growth in academic content areas, the state does not currently have a set of inclusion/exclusion rules based on how long a student was in a school or district in place for a more official assignment of responsibility.

Additionally, the numbers represent the relative growth of students in Colorado. Low median growth percentiles mean that schools are generally making less growth than other schools in the state. High median growth percentiles mean that schools are generally showing more growth than other schools in the state. Right now, without an AGP measure, we cannot say whether low or high median growth percentiles are “enough.”

At this point, the CELApro growth numbers are not included in any accountability calculations. They are provided for information and for local planning efforts.

**Was growth calculated on the Language Domains separately, or on the overall scores from CELApro?**

The calculations were run both ways, on overall scores and on each language domain separately. The results of the overall scores were determined to be the most stable, while some grade and language domain combinations produced unstable results. Therefore, CDE will release only overall score results to the public, but districts can see individual students’ results by language domain as well, so please consult the table below to see where this might be the case.

**How do we interpret growth on CELApro?**

Although the tests have very distinct purposes, growth for CELApro is interpreted in a similar way as growth for CSAP reading, writing and math. There is already a lot of interpretation information available for CSAP growth. [This page](http://www.schoolview.org/ColoradoGrowthModel2.asp) provides some help in interpreting growth percentiles, particularly through the private student growth FAQs and the video entitled Introducing Colorado's Growth Model.

**Is CELApro growth used in calculating AMAOs?**

No, it is not.

**Is CELApro growth used in the state Performance Frameworks?**

No, these data are not included in the state accountability system.

**Will CELApro growth appear in the bubble plots on Schoolview?**

No, the way that scores and proficiency levels work in CELApro is so different that putting them in bubble plots would not really make sense. There will likely be some visual display of the data at a future time.

**What will happen when the assessment used for English Language proficiency changes?**

The Colorado Growth Model can easily handle data from different assessments, as long as the assessments measure the same thing. When Colorado switches to a new English proficiency instrument, research will be conducted to determine if it is appropriate to calculate growth between the old and new administrations. If the contents of the two tests proved to be quite different, then it would be necessary to wait for two years of data on the same instrument to accumulate until growth calculations could again be used, so there would be a one-year gap in growth data.

**Comparison Between CSAP and CELApro, and Their Growth Measures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CSAP**  | **CELApro**  |
| Construct  | Academic content knowledge  | English language development  |
| Contents Areas / Language Domains  | Reading, Writing, Math  | Overall, Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing  |
| Time of Testing | February-April | December-January |
| Grades Tested  | 3-10  | K-12  |
| Test structure  | By grade  | By grade span: K-1, 2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12  |
| Students Tested  | All students  | NEP and LEP only  |
| Student Did Not Test Codes | 1-9, A, and B for each content area separately | 1-9, A and B for each language domain, but Overall is Invalid if any individual domain is invalid |
| Vertically scaled?  | Yes  | Yes  |
| Proficiency Levels  | 1= Unsatisfactory2= Partially Proficient3= Proficient4= Advanced | 1= CELA Level 12= CELA Level 23= CELA Level 34= CELA Level 45= CELA Level 5 |
| Grade-specific cut-scores?  | Yes | Yes  |
| What is the proficiency standard?  | Proficient  | CELA Level 5 |
| How long to reach this proficiency level?  | 3 years or by 10th grade  | To be determined. More research is needed before a policy is set. |

**CELApro 2011 Growth Results Availability by Language Domain**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade  | Overall  | Listening  | Reading  | Speaking  | Writing |
| 1 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔\* |
| 2 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔\* |
| 3 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔\* |
| 4 | ✔ | - | ✔ | ✔ | ✔\* |
| 5 | ✔ | - | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| 6 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| 7 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| 8 | ✔ | ✔\* | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| 9 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| 10 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| 11 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| 12 | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | - |

- results are not stable due to lack of data

\* restriction of number of prior scores used in calculation was necessary

**CELApro Overall Scale Scores and Proficiency Cut-Points**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Level 1  | Level 2  | Level 3  | Level 4  | Level 5  |
| KG | 260–381  | 382–425  | 426–450  | 451–514  | 515–585  |
| 1 | 260–410  | 411–434  | 435–468  | 469–521  | 522–590  |
| 2 | 260–430  | 431–464  | 465–490  | 491–545  | 546–592  |
| 3 | 297–444  | 445–477  | 478–508  | 509–561  | 562–651  |
| 4 | 297–457  | 458–489  | 490–525  | 526–577  | 578–651  |
| 5 | 297–459  | 460–492  | 493–532  | 533–583  | 584–651  |
| 6 | 341–462  | 463–495  | 496–538  | 539–589  | 590–666  |
| 7 | 341–464  | 465–498  | 499–545  | 546–595  | 596–666  |
| 8 | 341–468  | 469–502  | 503–548  | 549–597  | 598–666  |
| 9 | 350–472  | 473–506  | 507–550  | 551–599  | 600–675  |
| 10 | 350–476  | 477–509  | 510–552  | 553–602  | 603–675  |
| 11 | 350–480  | 481–513  | 514–555  | 556–604  | 605–675  |
| 12 | 350–484  | 485–517  | 518–558  | 559–606  | 607–675  |