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Our Proposal

States should publicly report outcomes for English learners (ELs) by the following language classifications:

- ✔ Current ELs
- ✔ Former ELs
- ✔ Ever ELs (Current ELs + Former ELs)
- ✔ Never ELs

More exploration is needed to determine which group(s) should be used for accountability purposes.
Definitions - Language Classifications

• Current English learners: Students currently classified as ELs

• Former English learners: Students who were previously classified as ELs but have been reclassified

• Ever English learners: The combined group of current and former ELs

• Never English learners: Students who have never been classified as ELs (includes initially proficient students)
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Present Circumstances
Among 2016-17 Oregon Students Ever Classified as ELs, the Proportion Who Are Current ELs and the Proportion Who Are Former ELs, by Grade
# Accountability under ESSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Allowable Student Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>Current EL + Monitored (4 Years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Current EL (any time in high school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Indicator</td>
<td>Current EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards Achieving ELP</td>
<td>Current EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Quality or Student Success</td>
<td>Current EL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing EL Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frameworks</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current EL vs. Non-EL</td>
<td>Misleading inferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current EL + Monitored vs. Other Students</td>
<td>Inconsistency of interpretations and inferences across indicators, grades, and usage (i.e., accountability vs. public reporting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ☐ Only relevant for achievement  
| ☐ 2 years of monitored ELs under NCLB (beginning in 2006-07 per amended regulations)  
| ☐ 4 years of monitoring ELs under ESSA | |
| Ever EL vs. Never EL | May mask performance of Current ELs (especially in higher grades) |
Instead, report outcomes for four groups

• Current ELs
• Former ELs
• Ever ELs (Current + Former)
• Never ELs
Uses for the Expanded Analytic Framework
Uses include:

• Understanding how outcomes change across grade levels
• Understanding system performance
• Understanding where intervention is needed
• Understanding reasons for patterns that emerge
• Including more schools in accountability systems
• Identifying schools under accountability systems
Understanding How Outcomes Change Across Grade Levels
Distribution of ELA Scale Scores by Grade for Ever and Never ELs, 2016-17
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Understanding System Performance
Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, by language proficiency group, 2016-17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Adjusted Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current ELs</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>1,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELs</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>5,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever ELs (Current + Former)</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>7,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never ELs</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>38,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding Where Intervention Is Needed
Equity Indicator under ESSA: Discipline

Percentage of 6th-8th graders with at least one suspension or expulsion, by language proficiency group, 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Suspended or Expelled</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current ELs</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELs</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>15,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever ELs (Current + Former)</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>25,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never ELs</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>108,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity Indicator under ESSA: 9th grade on-track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage on-track</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current ELs</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former ELs</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>5,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever ELs (Current + Former)</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>6,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never ELs</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>28,929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding Reasons for Patterns that Emerge
Percentage of Students in Special Education by Language Classification and Grade, 2016-17
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Including more schools/districts in accountability systems
Including more schools/districts in accountability systems

• Using the current EL category may exclude schools/districts from identification and improvement efforts due to the small number of current ELs. (This is particularly the case for high schools).

• Using the ever EL category increases the inclusion of schools/districts.
Example: High school graduation

- Oregon provides accountability ratings for high schools with at least 20 students in particular subgroups.
- This chart shows the number of schools with ratings when using three years of data.
- 64 schools have ratings for all four groups.
Identifying Schools under Accountability Systems
Proportion of High Schools with Each Graduation Accountability Rating by Language Proficiency Subgroup
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Note: Level 1: Less than 67%; Level 2: 67-73%; Level 3: 74-81%; Level 4: 82-89%; Level 5: >=90%
Imagine Schools with Different Percentages of Students Graduating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current ELs</th>
<th>Former ELs</th>
<th>Ever ELs</th>
<th>Never ELs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Graduation accountability rating scales: 1=Less than 67%. 2=67-73%. 3=74-81%. 4=82-89%. 5=90% or greater.
- Which schools should be identified as in need of improvement and/or technical assistance?
- How might interventions for schools be different given their different patterns of student performance?
Implementation of the Expanded Analytic Framework
Oregon’s Experience

• Windows of opportunity (e.g., ESEA flexibility waiver, state EL accountability system, etc.)
• Support from agency leadership
• Collaboration across offices (e.g., IT, Title III, Equity, Accountability)
• Support from stakeholders
• Partnership with research universities
• Data were available to inform former EL flag
• Partial implementation but intention is full implementation
Examples of Uses in Other States and Districts

- California
  - Has long reported disaggregated data about current and former ELs (sometimes referred to as Reclassified Fluent English Proficient students)

- Chicago
  - Recent report includes information about current ELs, former ELs, ever ELs, and never ELs

- Unfortunately, there are a variety of different labels used, or the same labels used in the different ways, which can lead to confusion.
  - For example, in New York, the term “Ever ELL” means a student who used to be classified as an ELL but has been reclassified.
  - In some cases, such as Massachusetts, the state reports data for former ELs, but this only includes the subgroup used for accountability purposes, meaning students who have exited EL status within the past four years.
Policy Implications
Policy Implications

• States and districts should report outcomes for current, former, ever, and never ELs.
• The next reauthorization of ESSA should require these four reporting categories.
Rationale for Public Reporting

• Current reporting practices with respect to English learners:
  ❑ perpetuate deficit perspectives
  ❑ display data that are incomparable across grades
  ❑ do not adequately display changes in performance
Rationale for Accountability

- The usage of the current EL student group under ESSA:
  - perpetuates deficit perspectives
  - does not reflect the efforts of schools and districts
  - masks the performance of a large number of children
  - excludes a large number of schools due to small n-sizes
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