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• Quick overview of EL accountability under ESSA
• A view of English language proficiency and PARCC performance
• Things to think about with accountability for recently arrived English learners (RAELs)
Accountability for ELs under ESSA
Every Student Succeeds Act - ESSA

• Big Takeaways
  – Title III accountability now part of Title I accountability
  – States have been given much greater authority to design accountability systems (within constraints)
Accountability 1111(c)

States must

• Declare minimum cell size
• Establish long-term and interim goals for each subgroup
  – Academic achievement
  – 4-year cohort adjusted graduation rates
  – **For ELs increases in the percentage of students making progress in English proficiency**
Accountability 1111(c)

States shall for all public schools

• Use these indicators in their accountability system for all students and all subgroups:
  – Proficiency on the academic achievement assessments
  – Growth or another differentiating indicator differentiating student performance in elementary, middle and high school (high school not required)
  – Graduation rate
  – **Progress in achieving English proficiency**
  – Additional indicator (e.g., school climate)
Assessments 1111(b)(3)

- States given two options for recently arrived ELs in assessing Reading or ELA
  - Exclude year 1 administration and use proficiency scores for year 2 accountability
  - Include year 1 administration, use growth in year 2 accountability, and use proficiency in year 3 accountability
A quick look at the relationship between English language proficiency (on ACCESS) and English language arts achievement (on PARCC)
Note, the next four slides reflect preliminary results.
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ESSA RAEL Options

- **Option #1**: 1111(3)(A)(i) - 2 years: exclude year 1 with no accountability, include achievement in year 2
- **Option #2**: 1111(3)(A)(ii) - 3 years: include year 1 with no accountability, include growth in year 2 for academic achievement, and include academic achievement in year 3
- **Option #3**: (in NPRM) and combination of Option 1 & 2 based on ELP level.

*Currently US Ed is researching the efficacy of these options.*
Option 1 - Models

• Percent Proficient:

\[
\text{Percent Proficient} = \frac{\text{Number of Students Proficient}}{\text{Total Number of Students (including RAELs)}}
\]

• Weighted Percent Proficient*:

\[
\text{Weighted Percent Proficient} = \frac{\text{Number of Students Proficient}}{\text{Total Number of EO Students} + \sum (\text{RAEL Level} \times \text{RAEL weight})}
\]

* Exhibit 26b, page 59 in Cook, Linquanti, Chinen and Jung (2012)
Option 2 - Models

• General model:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of EO Students Proficient} + \Sigma \text{RAELs meeting growth model target/weights}}{\text{Total Number of Students (including RAELs)}}
\]

• Growth alternatives
  – Student growth percentiles (SGPs) or adequate growth percentiles (AGPs)
  – Value tables
  – Linear model approach**
SGPs Graphically

---

**Achievement**

- Grade 3 (2009-2010): Scale Score 449
- Grade 4 (2010-2011): Scale Score 533
- Grade 5 (2011-2012): Scale Score 579
- Grade 6 (2012-2013): Scale Score 602
- Grade 7 (2013-2014): Scale Score

**Growth**

- Grade 3 (2009-2010): Growth Percentile 69, Growth Level High
- Grade 4 (2010-2011): Growth Percentile 85, Growth Level Very High
- Grade 5 (2011-2012): Growth Percentile 74, Growth Level High

---

**Reading**

- Achievement Scale Score
- Growth Percentile
- Growth Level
Value Tables

Proficiency Scale Broadly Distributed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 / Year 2</th>
<th>Ia</th>
<th>Ib</th>
<th>Ila</th>
<th>Iib</th>
<th>≥III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linear Model Approach

Value-Added Example

Teacher X

The difference between the predicted performance and the actual performance represents the value added by the teacher’s instruction.

The predicted performance represents the level of performance the student is expected to demonstrate after statistically accounting for factors through a value-added model.

Prior Performance  | Current Performance  | Predicted Performance

Student E
Key Things to Consider

• What is Maryland’s theory of action regarding the inclusion/exclusion of RAEL students in PARCC ELA assessments?

• What model best fits Maryland’s theory of action?

• Does the applied RAEL accountability model identify the appropriate schools?
Thanks!!