

## Draft questions about EL accountability for the ESSA EL Work Group to consider for making recommendations to the ESSA Accountability Work Group:

---

### Questions to Consider

The following questions are intended for the ESSA English Learner (EL) Work Group to consider, discuss and provide responses that can be given as expert recommendations for the ESSA Accountability Work Group to consider in its deliberations and recommendations. *Please review the additional documentation on pp. 2-9)*

1. **What comments/input do you have regarding the measure of English Learner progress on the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) being developed with the intent to be included in Nevada’s accountability system?** (see pages 2-3)
2. **What categories of disaggregated EL student *reporting data* should be required by the state?** (see page 4)
3. **Which of the recommended EL reporting data, if any, should be included in the accountability system?** (see page 5)
4. **What should be the criteria for which ELs are captured into the accountability system?** (see page 5)
5. **What factors should be considered in the design of the weighting of the ELPA in the accountability system?** (see page 6)
6. **How should Nevada consider newcomers to be included in State content assessment accountability?** (see page 6)

Appendix A – ESSA Title III Reporting Requirements (see page 7)

Appendix B - ESSA Title I Accountability Measures (see pages 8-9)

## Indepth Questions

Please note that Question 1 asks you to respond to significant work that was initiated as a proposal prior to ESSA and that addresses what subsequently became a requirement for EL accountability under ESSA; while the next generation of Nevada’s accountability system is yet to be developed, Question 1 asks you to review the background information and to respond to the proposed performance indicator.

### 1. What comments/input do you have regarding the measure of English Learner progress on the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) being developed with the intent to be included in Nevada’s accountability system?

- a. **Under NCLB:** Review of Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 1 criteria and targets:
  - 1) 50+% of students make a minimum of .5 proficiency level gain on the ELPA (increase 1% annually; reset to 50% when the ACCESS for ELLs was adopted);
  - 2) Inadequate/invalid school level measure and target:
    - i. Generally, too low for elementary schools/students – young learners and low level beginning students grow quickly at first;
    - ii. Generally, too high for secondary schools/students – language acquisition slows for students with high-middle and advanced proficiency levels;
    - iii. Did not account for typical individual student’s language development trajectories, including plateaus for periods of time relative to multiple non-academic factors (i.e. personality factors such as introvert, extrovert, and risk taker; exposure to language; age).
  - 3) Adequate District level measure and target.
- b. **Under Flexibility Waiver** opportunities, Nevada was negotiating with the federal government to pilot meaningful AMAO 1 (and 2-Attainment) criteria and targets for instructional purposes at the school and classroom levels:
  - 1) Criteria based on time in program (allowable) **and** initial proficiency level (not allowed by Federal Register interpretation of Title III Law, but the Fed’s had already approved a Nevada pilot for AMAO 3 that changed policy; we had solid foundation for a comprehensive change in policy to include all AMAOs in our updated pilot proposal);
  - 2) The mechanism for calculating and reporting EL performance needed to be the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) points awarded for EL performance at the school level:
    - i. Propose that the ELPA become part of the NSPF;
    - ii. Propose that Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) be the measure:
      - a. AGP is a **growth to target** measure that compares student peers as determined by previous performance (proxy for initial proficiency level) and grade level (since 90% of our ELs are born in the US, this is a viable proxy for time in program);
      - b. AGP calculations for the ELPA evaluate if a student is on track for reaching proficiency within 5 years;

- c. AGP targets would be set consistent with methodology to set targets for content assessment performance for all students.
  - 3) The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) eliminated AMAOs for Title III and put EL student accountability into Title I assessment:
    - i. EL student performance (growth) on the ELPA is a **required indicator** for state accountability systems;
    - ii. Since Nevada was already designing a proposal to justify what is now required under ESSA, we already had a foundation of work toward this opportunity (see “c” below);
    - iii. Under Title III law in ESSA, certain EL student performance “reporting” is required (see question 2 below).
- c. The Nevada State Board of Education approved AGP Performance Indicators for ZOOM schools and programs.
  - 1) Nevada Senate Bill 405 required the department to develop performance indicators for ZOOM schools and programs to evaluate progress of ELs toward English language proficiency;
  - 2) Nevada contracted with eMetric to develop a statewide Nevada Growth Website:
    - i. In the absence of Content Assessment data (SBAC, End of Course Study), eMetric input 3 years of the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs – ELPA – data and calculated growth measures including AGP for 2014-15;
    - ii. 2015-16 ELPA data is currently being input for growth calculation and performance reporting – the site is projected to be opened to the public this fall;
    - iii. NDE and eMetric conducted a comparison study of the Nevada Growth Model and WIDA growth calculations for Nevada students taking the ACCESS for ELLs.
      - a. The two growth models each have different purposes:
        - i. WIDA Growth is designed specifically to inform instructional practice and is not intended to be used for accountability;
        - ii. Nevada Growth Model introduces stability factors to the data designed to provide validity and reliability for accountability purposes;
        - iii. Correlation between the two approaches is high:
          - 1. 0.798 at the student level
          - 2. 0.839 at the school level
          - 3. 0.899 at the district level
      - b. Functional conclusion: while AGP provides a valid and reliable method to implement accountability, it also provides meaningful and useful data to inform instructional practice.
  - 3) *Since content assessment AGP was part of the previous NSPF, teachers and instructional leaders already have some degree of familiarity with the measure.*

**2. What categories of disaggregated EL student reporting data should be required by the state?**

- a. Title III under ESSA requires districts receiving Title III funds to provide a *biannual* report to the NDE of EL programs and activities, “that includes ...
  - 1) the number and percentage of English learners in the programs and activities who are making progress toward achieving English language proficiency ... and disaggregated, at a minimum by English learners with a disability;
  - 2) the number and percentage of English learners in the programs and activities attaining English language proficiency... by the end of each school year as determined by the [ELPA]...;
  - 3) the number and percentage of English learners who exit the language instruction educational programs based on their attainment of English language proficiency;
  - 4) the number and percentage of English learners meeting challenging State academic standards for each of the 4 years after... [attaining English proficiency]... disaggregated, at a minimum, by English learners with a disability;
  - 5) the number and percentage of English learners who have not attained English language proficiency within 5 years of initial classification as an English learner and first enrollment in the local educational agency...”
  - 6) See Appendix for a complete list and description of the Title III reporting requirements.
- b. Regarding the required reporting components above:
  - 1) Items 1 and 2 are being captured and represented on the Nevada Growth Website;
  - 2) Currently, item 3 in Nevada is the same as item 2;
  - 3) Item 4 is information that will be available to disaggregate on the Growth Website when content assessment data is available;
  - 4) Item 5 will require some procedural adjustments to make it available on the Growth Website;
  - 5) Each of the items, as they are available on the Growth Website, can be disaggregated for ELs with disabilities.
- c. Should the federally required reporting elements be reported for all districts and schools annually?
- d. Should any other EL performance data be required by the state for annual reporting?

**3. Which of the recommended EL reporting data, if any, should be included in the accountability system?**

- a. Growth on the ELPA is required to be part of the accountability.
- b. Attainment of English proficiency is implicit in AGP.
- c. Each of the other listed reports are required to be used for Title III Program monitoring and are intended to be used to evaluate all district and school EL program services relative to EL Policies/Plans as required by the State Board of Education under SB 405.

**4. What should be the criteria for which ELs are captured into the accountability system?**

- a. ESSA Sec 1111(c)(4)(B)(iv) specifies ELPA progress performance indicators to be included for each of the grades 3 through 8 and one of grades 9 through 12. (see Appendix B)
  - 1) A majority of EL students are grades K to 2;
  - 2) The most significant progress toward proficiency occurs in grades K to 3;
  - 3) Even though “n” count is 10 in Nevada, many schools would not meet the grade level “n” count for ELs;
  - 4) Many of the schools not meeting grade level “n” count would be held accountable if the requirement is by school level.

**5. What factors should be considered in the design of the weighting of the ELPA in the accountability system?**

- a. How should the system:
  - 1) Help to focus accountability measures towards appropriate and meaningful instructional practice for ELs, regardless of high or low EL population?
  - 2) Consider students who are identified into multiple accountability subgroups?
- b. *Please consider the relative importance of the five required outcome indicators under ESSA for Nevada’s accountability system [ESSA Sec 1111(c)(4)(B)] (see Appendix B); Academic achievement as measured by :*
  - 1) Proficiency on annual content assessments for all public schools;
    - i. High school *may* include growth on content assessments;
  - 2) Growth on annual content assessments for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools;
  - 3) High School Graduation Rate;
  - 4) Progress (growth) in achieving EL Proficiency as measured by the ELPA;
  - 5) A minimum of one additional indicator of school quality or student success;
    - i. Listed examples include:
      - a. Student engagement;
      - b. Educator engagement;
      - c. Student access to and completion of advanced coursework;
      - d. Postsecondary readiness;
      - e. School climate and safety;
    - ii. Note: Required Indicator numbers 1-4 must “afford: substantial weight to each such indicator; and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than is afforded to the indicator or indicators utilized by the State and described in [number 5]...” [ESSA Sec 1111(c)(4)(C)(ii)]

**6. How should Nevada consider newcomers to be included in State content assessment accountability? Under ESSA:**

- a. Option 1: not assessed first year; full accountability beginning year 2.
- b. Option 2: assessed first year, but not part of accountability; second year accountability determined as a growth measure; full accountability beginning year 3.

**APPENDIX A:** Every Student Succeeds Act: TITLE III Part A-English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

**“Subpart 2—Accountability and Administration**

**“SEC. 3121. REPORTING**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity that receives a subgrant from a State educational agency under subpart 1 shall provide such agency, at the conclusion of every second fiscal year during which the subgrant is received, with ~~an evaluation~~ a report, in a form prescribed by the agency, ~~on the activities conducted and children served under such subpart~~ that includes—

“(1) a description of the programs and activities conducted by the entity with funds received under subpart 1 during the 2 immediately preceding fiscal years, ~~which shall include a description of how such programs and activities supplemented programs funded primarily with State or local funds ;~~

“(2) ~~a description of the~~ the number and percentage of English learners in the programs and activities who are making progress toward achieving English language proficiency, as described in section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), in the aggregate and disaggregated, ~~at a minimum, by English learners with a disability;~~

“(3) the number and percentage of English learners in the programs and activities attaining English language proficiency based on State English language proficiency standards established under section 1111(b)(1)(F) by the end of each school year, as determined by the State’s English proficiency assessment under section 1111(b)(2)(G);

“(4) the number and percentage of English learners who exit the language instruction educational programs based on their attainment of English language proficiency;

“(5) the number and percentage of English learners meeting challenging State academic ~~content and student academic achievement~~ standards for each of the 2 4 years after such children are no longer receiving services under this part, ~~in the aggregate and disaggregated, at a minimum, by English learners with a disability;~~

“(6) the number and percentage of English learners who have not attained English language proficiency within 5 years of initial classification as an English learner and first enrollment in the local educational agency; and

“(7) any other information that the State educational agency may require.

“(b) USE OF REPORT.—~~An evaluation~~ A report provided by an eligible entity under subsection (a) shall be used by the entity and the State educational agency for improvement of programs and activities ~~under this part ;~~

**APPENDIX B:** Every Student Succeeds Act: TITLE I Sec 1111(c)(4)(B)

“(B) INDICATORS.—Except for the indicator described in clause (iv), annually measure, for all students and separately for each sub-group of students, the following indicators:

“(i) For all public schools in the State, based on the long-term goals established under subparagraph (A), academic achievement—

“(I) as measured by proficiency on the annual assessments required under subsection (b)(2)(B)(v)(I); and

“(II) at the State’s discretion, for each public high school in the State, student growth, as measured by such annual assessments.

“(ii) For public elementary schools and secondary schools that are not high schools in the State—

“(I) a measure of student growth, if determined appropriate by the State; or

“(II) another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

“(iii) For public high schools in the State, and based on State-designed long term goals established under subparagraph

“(I) the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; and

“(II) at the State’s discretion, the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

“(iv) For public schools in the State, progress in achieving English language proficiency, as defined by the State and measured by the assessments described in subsection (b)(2)(G), within a State-determined timeline for all English learners—

“(I) in each of the grades 3 through 8; and

“(II) in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under subsection (b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during the grade 9 through grade 12 period, with such progress being measured against the results of the assessments described in subsection (b)(2)(G) taken in the previous grade.

“(v)(I) For all public schools in the State, not less than one indicator of school quality or student success that—

“(aa) allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance;

“(bb) is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (with the same indicator or indicators used for each grade span, as such term is determined by the State); and

“(cc) may include one or more of the measures described in subclause (II).

“(II) For purposes of subclause (I), the State may include measures of—

“(III) student engagement;

“(IV) educator engagement;

“(V) student access to and completion of advanced coursework;

“(VI) postsecondary readiness;

“(VII) school climate and safety; and

“(VIII) any other indicator the State chooses that meets the requirements of this clause.