The following manual was designed to help dig into performance of English Learners (ELs) at the local level. By gathering the data recommended in this document, districts can search for patterns and trends that would pinpoint some areas of success and areas of need. With some modifications, the tool can be used at the school level. The questions to consider are suggestions for a starting point. Once the suggested data has been pulled together, the trends and patterns identified should generate other questions and possibly other data to be considered.

You may obtain filterable data from CDE's Data Lab located at http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview (for example if you wish to disaggregate the data by grade). The Data Lab tool is located towards the middle of the page with a hyperlink called "Data Lab." The interactive data retrieval tool works best with Mozilla Firefox or Chrome.

| Data To Be Used | Terms |
|---|---|
| 1) Student Level Biographical or Demographic Data<br>2) District Level Data<br>a. EMH Level<br>b. Grade Level<br>3) School Level Data<br>4) State Assessments<br>a. PARCC[1]<br>i. English Language Arts<br>ii. Math<br>b. CMAS[2]<br>i. Science<br>ii. Social Studies<br>c. READ Act data<br>i. i-Ready<br>ii. PALS / PALS Español<br>iii. STAR<br>iv. NWEA CPAA<br>v. Pearson Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test<br>vi. TVIP<br>vii. VRMT-III<br>viii. DIBELS<br>ix. Woodcock-Munoz LS<br>d. Language Proficiency Assessments<br>i. CELA/Access<br>5) Colorado Growth Model Data (SGP, MGP, AGP)[3]<br>6) Local Assessments<br>7) Perception Data (Parent, Student, or Staff Surveys)<br>8) Classroom observations<br>9) Identification and Program Data (how long students have been identified as EL; which students receive EL programming or support; and type of programming EL students are receiving) | ACCESS = Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State<br>AGP = Adequate Growth Percentile<br>CELA = Colorado English Language Assessment<br>CMAS = Colorado Measure of Academic Success<br>ELD = English Language Development<br>EL = English Learner<br>EMH = Elementary, Middle, High<br>FEP = Fluent English Proficient<br>IEP = Individual Education Plan<br>LEP = Limited English Proficient<br>M1/2 = Monitor Year 1 or Monitor Year 2<br>MGP = Median Growth Percentile<br>N = Number<br>NEP = Not English Proficient<br>PARCC = Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers<br>SGP = Student Growth Percentile<br>TCAP = Transitional Colorado Assessment Program |

[1] Using PARCC ELA and math results are recommended as there are two years of data now.
[2] Using CMAS science and social studies results at the elementary and middle school levels are recommended as there are three years of data now.
[3] ACCESS growth data is available for analyses and recommended for analyzing student growth on language performance. However, at this time, content growth data is only available for earlier years (i.e., TCAP reading, writing, and math growth from 2014 and earlier).

**Questions to Consider**

1) On average, how long does it take students that come into the district (or school) at the **NEP** level to re-designate into monitoring status (M1)?
    a. Recommended disaggregation:
        i. By EMH level
        ii. By school and school feeder patterns
        iii. By entering grade / cohorts (for example, students that were NEP and entered the district in first grade compared to those who entered in kindergarten, etc.) [the recommendation is to track individual students across years]
2) Repeat for **LEP** students

3) How are ELs performing on state content assessments? Assess the mean scale scores of EL students on the CMAS PARCC English language arts (ELA) and mathematics assessments[4]. Breakdown by NEP, LEP, FEP Monitor 1 and 2, and FEP exited students. Review and consider participation rates when evaluating CMAS PARCC results. Use caution in interpreting any data based on less than 85% of students participating on a given assessment. [Repeat table to compare 2015 and 2016 CMAS PARCC results[5]]

    Note: Mean scale scores are derived by computing the average value of the student-level scale scores for all students within each group.

    i. Break down analyses by EMH level or by feeder patterns or schools to look for trends. Are some groups/schools performing higher than others? For example, are the LEP students in one school performing better than LEP students in other schools? If so, why? What lessons can be used to help the groups/schools not performing as well?

| Example: Mean Scale Scores on CMAS PARCC | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ELA | | Math | |
| | Percent Participation | Mean Scale Score | Percent Participation | Mean Scale Score |
| All English Language Learners (EL) | | | | |
| Not English Proficient (NEP) | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) | | | | |
| Fluent Eng. Proficient (FEP) – M1/M2 | | | | |
| FEP – Exited | | | | |

    a. What additional information do we have about EL students at each language proficiency level?
        i. For example, what are the demographics of the students in each cell in the tables above?
        ii. How many years have they been in program and at the current language proficiency level (based on CELA/ACCESS)?
        iii. Are groups with higher mean scale scores receiving supports or services that other students are not getting?
    b. What evidence is there that the EL programming is meeting individual student's needs? Based on the evidence used, are there any areas wherein student needs are not being met?
    c. What other supports, services, or programs are EL students receiving? Are services, programs, and supports aligned? How are funds being leveraged to best meet the needs of students?

[4] With the transition to CMAS PARCC, the mean scale scores allow for more nuanced interpretation of results across the state. Additionally, mean scale scores allow for greater data privacy in reporting at the disaggregated group level. For more information, please visit http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/impact-of-assessment-transition-on-school-and-district-accountability.

[5] Comparisons across difference assessments is not recommended. For example, it is not appropriate to compare 2014 TCAP percent proficient and advanced to CMAS PARCC mean scale scores.

4) How are EL students performing on local assessments and how does that performance align with their performance on state assessments? Assess how EL students performed on local assessments (e.g., Acuity, Galileo, NWEA MAP, DIBELS 6 or NEXT, STAR). Breakdown the NEP, LEP, FEP Monitor 1 and 2, and FEP exited students within each level. What trends are noted using local assessments?

5) How do EL Students who are also receiving other supports, services, or programs (e.g., Gifted/Talented, Title I funded interventions, students with IEPs) perform on state assessments? How does each groups' performance compare to the same group in the state tables?

**Elementary** [Repeat for Middle and High School]

| | ELA | | Math | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Participation | Mean Scale Score | Percent Participation | Mean Scale Score |
| All English Language Learners (EL) | | | | |
| EL & Gifted/Talented | | | | |
| EL & Students with IEPs | | | | |
| EL & Title I | | | | |
| Not English Proficient (NEP) | | | | |
| NEP & Gifted/Talented | | | | |
| NEP & Students with IEP | | | | |
| NEP & Title I | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) | | | | |
| LEP & Gifted/Talented | | | | |
| LEP & Students with IEP | | | | |
| LEP & Title I | | | | |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) **– M1 and M2** | | | | |
| FEP & Gifted/Talented | | | | |
| FEP & Students with IEP | | | | |
| FEP & Title I | | | | |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) **– Exited** | | | | |
| FEP & Gifted/Talented | | | | |
| FEP & Students with IEP | | | | |
| FEP & Title I | | | | |

a. What additional information do we have about EL students at each language proficiency level?
   i. For example, what are the demographics of the students in each cell in the tables above?
   ii. How many years have they been in program and at the current language proficiency level (based on CELA/ACCESS)?
   iii. Are groups with higher mean scale scores receiving supports or services that other students are not getting?
b. What evidence is there that the EL programming is meeting individual student's needs? Based on the evidence used, are there any areas wherein student needs are not being met?
c. What other supports, services, or programs are EL students receiving? Are services, programs, and supports aligned? How are funds being leveraged to best meet the needs of students?

6) How well are ELs growing on language and content assessments? For years wherein growth data is available, what are the CMAS PARCC and CELA/ACCESS MGPs of the EL students (by NEP, LEP, and FEP) for each content area? [Repeat for Elementary, Middle, and High School levels as appropriate or to answer

other questions such as is the growth (MGP) of students in one school higher than other schools? If so, why?]

| MGP of EL Students | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Language Proficiency | ELA | | | Math | | | ELD | | |
| | N | MGP | AGP | N | MGP | AGP | N | MGP | AGP |
| All ELs | | | | | | | | | |
| NEP | | | | | | | | | |
| LEP | | | | | | | | | |
| FEP – M1/M2 | | | | | | | | | |
| FEP - Exited | | | | | | | | | |

7) After reviewing the data, what additional questions need to be asked to gain a deeper understanding of the performance of ELs?

8) What additional data is needed to evaluate the English Language Proficiency (ELP) program? What other data can help triangulate the findings from the analyses? At the school level? At the district level? What would be the most appropriate source for the needed data? What is the plan for analyzing, interpreting, and using that data?
   a. Examples:
      i. Graduation rate
      ii. Courses taken/completed
      iii. Dropout rate
      iv. Discipline data

## Contact Information

Questions regarding serving ELs:

Morgan Cox at cox_m@cde.state.co.us

Questions regarding data or using this manual:

Nazanin (Nazie) Mohajeri-Nelson at mohajeri-nelson_n@cde.state.co.us