



**Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)  
Measures of School Success and Reporting Discussion English Learners  
ESL Coordinators**

**Meeting Summary of 11/18/16**

**Introduction**

Terry Richard, DOE ELL, convened the meeting at 1:05 p.m. on November 18, 2016 at the Collette Center in Dover. After opening remarks she explained that ESL Coordinators will provide further input to questions that are a part of the ESSA State Plan that pertain to English Language Learners. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement process, DOE has been conducting community conversations and in-depth Discussion Group meetings for Student and School Supports and Measures of School Success and Reporting.

Ms. Richard introduced meeting facilitator, Dr. Devona Williams, (Goeins-Williams Associates) who is facilitating the ESSA Group discussion process. Dr. Williams explained the input of ESL Coordinators will be added to feedback received on this topic. Drafts of the state's ESSA plan are being prepared now with the final report expected to be completed in March 2017. Approximately 17 people participated in the discussion. The facilitator guided the process, asking the participants to discuss three sets of questions relating to the State's ESSA Plan and report their charted responses. This information is summarized below.

**State Plan, Section 4: Accountability System – Subgroups; discussion questions**

- Describe the statewide uniform procedures for:
  - Former English learners consistent with §200.16(b)(1).
  - Recently arrived English learners in the State to determine if an exception is appropriate for an English learner consistent with section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and §200.16(b)(4).
- English Learner Growth to Language Proficiency
  - Provide feedback on how growth targets should be determined
  - Provide feedback on how ELP progress will be included in the DSSF weighting

**Discussion Questions:**

- 1. English Learners enter our schools with varying levels of education with and/or without records, at varying ages through age 21, and with varying English language proficiency levels. What should we take into consideration when setting growth targets for English learners?**
  - a. Should we consider differentiated targets?**
- 2. How should the State determine whether an exception from being included in the accountability system is appropriate?**



3. **ESSA provides that for not more than four years after a student stops being identified as an English Learner, a state may include the results of the student's assessments within the results for the English Learner subgroup for the purposes of the state accountability system. How should we apply this flexibility within our accountability system?**

### Charted Responses

#### *Group 1*

1. When setting growth targets we should consider how long they have been exposed to the English language, grade level and language level.
  - The lower the language level, the faster the increase in the language level so lower language levels have higher growth scores than higher language levels. See WIDA research (new Access 2.0)
2. Portfolio or project assessment should be an option for Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE).
  - The portfolio is an opportunity to demonstrate content standard and language growth with projects, work samples and rubric scored. The lower the proficiency/education, the more appropriate individuals are for portfolio or project assessment.
  - The opportunity for exclusion should be based on the length of time in the US educational system, language levels, and decoding levels.
3. Use the four years! Investigate four year plan from Connecticut.

#### *Group 2*

1. More than just the Access scores should be taken into consideration.
  - Targets should be differentiated especially considering the large number of students entering with a lack of exposure to the educational environment and interrupted formal education.
2. The state should set up specific guidelines when determining the appropriateness of an exception. These guidelines should take into consideration the length of time in the US, years of quality/formal education in their native country.
3. Use the four years to create a database in order to track the students within this timeframe.

#### *Group 3*

1. Dual identified if have plateaued. Create a growth chart based on historical data. Must arrange growth for grade based on history and starting point. Question attainment. Look at teacher/student ratio, service being provided, the number of times a para is available per week, and the quality of the service.
2. Take the first year but not accountability. Good baseline to track progress for program evaluation. Gap in formal education. Sliding scale based on age and grade.



3. Do not include for accountability.

#### *Group 4*

1. The growth targets should be differentiated based on WIDA; grade bands and proficiency level (PL) and capped at PL 5.0.
2. The state should take in consideration the time in US and interrupted schooling or exempt students until they demonstrate proficiency in English.
3. Four year inclusion of reporting monitored results of former English learners would be beneficial.

#### **State Plan, Section 4: Accountability System – Subgroups**

Describe the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with §200.17(a)(3).

#### **Discussion Question:**

1. **Minimum n-size refers to the smallest number of students that will be used when reporting results or using a measure for accountability purposes. It is important to ensure that the minimum n- size balances the need to provide necessary and useful information for the evaluation of subgroup outcomes with the need to protect student identity/privacy. What should the State consider as the minimum n-size for including a subgroup in accountability reporting?**

#### **Charted Responses**

##### *Group 1*

- N size should stay at 30. Rationale: Go any lower than 30, 1 or 2 students makes a huge impact.

##### *Group 2*

- Our opinion is to go higher so there is less fluctuation.

##### *Group 3*

- A few kids could make a huge difference in many subgroups. The higher the number, the better (200)

##### *Group 4*

- N=30; this will allow for the anonymity of small groups of students.



#### **State Plan, Section 4: Accountability System – Participation Rate**

Describe how the State is factoring the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of schools required under §200.15, including if the State selects another equally rigorous State-determined action than those provided under §200.15(a)(2)(i)-(iii) that will result in a similar outcome for the school in the system of annual meaningful differentiation and will improve the school's participation rate so that the school meets the applicable requirements.

#### **Discussion Question:**

- 1. How should we factor in the 95 percent student participation requirement in our accountability system?**

#### **Chartered Responses**

##### *Group 1*

##### 95% Participation

- N size should equal 30 for participation considering multiplier

##### *Group 2*

- Tiered system in which schools that don't reach participation requirement must do a, b, or c. Those who do not reach the 95% requirement will receive a profit sharing incentive.

##### *Group 3*

- This should be a simple checkbox – if yes, great!
- Eliminate the penalty.
- More importantly, who is DOE counting in the denominator?

##### *Group 4*

- Continue using the 95% debit/credit multiplier. It seems to be working and it can be explained.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.