

**CLDE Western Slope Stakeholders Feedback from October 21, 2016**

**What do you feel are potential opportunities with ESSA?**

* Utilizing WIDA resources such as: WIDA Performance Definitions and Rubrics
* Regional Hubs: Identifying pathways for support
* Expanding ownership responsibility across all teachers and Districts
* Needs vs numbers
* Question: Some things with WIDA we don’t know (2.0, Screener…)
* Site based vs District

**What are your concerns?**

* Having one data point
* New assessment WIDA screener: administration, training and exposure to technology
* WIDA materials: standardized use
* WIDA materials: Receptive Listening and Reading are not clear – exemplars by grade level and grade strands
* More than instructional strategies to make decisions
* Need both fiscal and HR time – both resources
* Site based vs District

****

**Summary of Discussion Feedback Table Groups**

**Stage 1 and 2 Discussion**

**1. Do current District/school language use survey questions (HLS) appropriately target key constructs? Are decisions and rules standardized and clear?**

* Our district MOSTLY uses the HLS survey appropriately (we need to perhaps add some guidance about the data that it gives us). Decisions are made using a standardized process, but process assumes a specific level of training of those making decisions. We have standardized HLS on registration form that triggers a more in depth survey. Additionally we have teacher checklist (for content teachers) for students that are questionable.
* Yes, we have revised our questions over the past 3-4 years to ensure that our questions gather the information that is most likely to be correct. We have also found a difference in the types of questions that need to be asked if registration is in paper format or if it is online.
* We do our HLS online in IC as part of the student registration process. We have problems because the information we receive is too limited.
* D51 asks many questions and at high school level we have added even more; therefore, we gather quite a bit to analyze and discuss whether or not to proceed with testing. I prefer more questions from the beginning since it really does inform decisions. The actual decisions are mostly standardized and ESL coaches help to make greater clarity and standardization. More questions are definitely better with some extra criteria to dig deeper and then designation for answers-- to clarify decision for more consistent identification.

**2. Should Colorado create a standardized Language Use Survey (LUS)? What questions should be asked?**

* NO-- It would be cumbersome because of different needs of different districts.... YES if it can be used as a 'standardized' data point
* No. There could be recommendations, but no set questions. What is needed is a consistent determination of when to assess. For example, in my district we teach our teachers to administer the screener if the responses indicate the child is or has recently been in the process of learning English. If parents would qualify the student as learning Spanish, the student isn't eligible for being tested. I don't know if other districts have the same rules about that.
* Yes, a standardized form would allow us to benefit from systems that are most effective.
* Yes. D51 has a K-12 2 page HLS and HS uses an additional page with ICAP type questions. We are willing to share.

**3. Should Colorado illustrate via flowchart/decision tree using initial ELP assessment results to classify students? If yes, how?**

* YES -- a differential type of flow chart would be helpful. A helper for teachers and district to fill our for each child. A rubric to consider parts of other data points.
* Sure, maybe just steps, rather than "if yes..." as it stands right now, identification with W-APT kinder seems really fluffy and 1-12 seems really rigid in how we classify. I'm not sure how this will change with the new screener, and it may be helpful to have steps of things to look at to help in the identification process. For kinder, we currently require our teachers to wait until the end of the 2 weeks or 30 days (at the beginning of the school year) before they work with classroom teachers to make a determination about identification.
* Yes-a flowchart would be useful to allow for consistency and standardization.
* Yes definitely. Flow chart with decision tree that goes deeper and a rubric to guide analytical decisions.

**4. What challenges does Colorado face in adopting a statewide policy and process for detecting, reporting, and correcting initial misclassifications? What solutions do you have to the proposed challenges?**

* Culture has a lot to do with language use and that is not uniform across state. We don't have uniform programming/ability for programming across state. We have local control in our state constitution.
* Be sure to ask lots of districts because we each have tried and refined for the past few years. We think we are in a good place, but other districts may have some better solutions that could help us.
* 1. CO is a local control state so this is contrary to that. Accommodations for PARCC/ CMAS should be addressed for language levels and the reporting of which accommodations to be within the content understanding: thus, language (by domains) and content information assessed and reported. Language acquisition should be taught to all teachers and then to all students to raise the academic levels of all our CO /USA students.

**5. Should Colorado consider WIDA’s proficiency cut point on the WIDA Screener as proficient in the initial classification stage?**

* Colorado should use their own data to establish Colorado cut scores (don't assume national scores)
* I don't know what WIDA's cut point is, but I would estimate that if they made the test, they set the cut points for a reason and the definition of who qualifies as an ELL should not be different state to state. That is unfair for school districts attempting to provide accurate services and unfair for families.
* We must have a body of evidence, in addition to screener cut point, to determine initial classification. Otherwise, we will misclassify and report inaccurate representation of newly classified ELs.
* Possibly, there should be an initial ID stage and then a confirmation of that ID within a longer period (30-120 days).

****

**Stage 3 Discussion**

**1. Should the "English proficient" performance standard on the state ELP test specify composite and domain scores?**

* YES -- WRITING is the best indicator for success in the content classroom
* If we don't have PARCC, then we definitely need to include Writing as a piece. Currently, in most grade levels, we don't typically redesignate students who hit 5 and 5 the first time. Most of the time, teachers don't think students are ready.
* Yes, if we can't utilize a body of evidence to support reclassification, the use of domains as well as composite at least gives us a bit more comprehensive view of student performance.
* Standards of Language (by domain and age development) and CAS/Common Core/Content Standards should be cross walked to show what is needed and appropriate. Yes domain and composite scores are necessary to give a better understanding of what students know and need.

**2. Should Colorado set a performance standard beyond WIDA’s recommended level?**

* It depends on the level... the level that we had on the old ACCESS was good.
* Yes, we need additional pieces beyond just a single test.
* Performance standard would have to be higher than 5.0, at least 5.6 or higher.
* Yes, above WIDAs recommendations.

**3. Should Colorado request an extension in implementing the “standardized redesignation and exit criteria” when an additional year of PARCC and ACCESS for ELs is available that will yield more reliable and valid data to make decisions?**

* YES -- we have no idea what scores mean yet or new tools and standards to reflect them.
* We could wait until ACCESS 2.0 & PARCC is a little more consistent, but I think that if we just had some guidance on BOE, but not set in stone cut points. ALSO Some guidance on how to build a body of evidence for redesignation of ELLs with severe SPED needs. This is greatly needed.
* Yes
* Absolutely!

**4. What areas of content from PARCC and/or CMAS should be analyzed in setting the English proficient standard?**

* The sub area do not give us enough data (only uses arrows)
* Writing. I found that many kids listed as "approaching" or higher on PARCC ELA in my district could be rocking it in reading, and totally bomb the writing. For us was close to 1,000 students (district wide). We separated reading from writing. I tried to figure out a cut score that would not allow students to be "below" for more than one category, in other words, they would be near, meets or exceeds in most categories within each domain. Using whole district data, (not just ELLs) this is what I came to: Summative Reading Scale score of 43 or higher (indicated in alpine achievement as Rdg SS) Summative Writing Scale score of 33 or higher (indicated in alpine achievement as Wr SS). This is what we used as guidance. Sometimes teachers recommended students that fell a little bit lower, but not much.
* ELA
* One data point is absolutely inappropriate, much less, when ACCESS is not even a dependable data point as we progress to ACCESS 2.0. A body of evidence is much better and the WIDA Performance Definitions with quality rubrics could be used (with the exception of the receptive domains of L & R which need specific samples for grade spans and language levels to assess what a student actually knows and then where the student shows understanding on the Performance Definitions. There are some reading samples that are grade appropriate, but not leveled by language. I know of no listening samples, so please advise if they exist somewhere-- especially if they match the levels and features of the Performance Definitions.)

****

**Data Collection and Reporting**

**1. Should Colorado maintain a centralized language use survey database that can be accessible to all districts?**

* Yes
* No
* Yes, absolutely! We have students come to us with primary home language reported in Spanish in previous district and the parent reports language as English in this district. We have no way of knowing this and it causes a breakdown in our system.
* Yes, if it is more comprehensive and not short and limited. Otherwise, there needs to be exceptions for asking more pertinent information. I am unaware of the centralized data base.

**2. Should WIDA Screener results be made available to all Colorado district data users?**

* No
* No, interrater reliability would not be solid.
* Possibly the electronic WIDA WAPT score sheet.

**3. Should ACCESS for ELLs/Alternate ACCESS results be made available to all Colorado district data users?**

* Yes.
* Yes, it helps to inform decisions for our transient students.

**4. How does CDE improve streamlining current data collections to require data reporting under ESSA?**

* Need data if student moves districts!
* Share ACCESS scores among districts as a student transfers.

**5. Is CDE’s current exception process adequate to correct misclassification of ELs? Why or why not?**

* Needs better/easier process for K-2 and SPED students(sometimes it is school readiness/disability).
* Sure
* Yes

**6. Is CDE’s current exception process adequate to override criteria for redesignation? Why or why not?**

* Yes
* More information on how to do this need to be communicated. We are currently struggling with understanding this.
* Yes