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2012 ELD Standards and the Next Generation Assessment

• New ELD standards (2012)
• ELD standards implementation plan (2013)
• ELD professional development materials (2013–14)
• English–language arts (ELA)/ELD curriculum Framework (2014–15)
• Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium operational tests (2014–15)
• Next generation ELD assessment (2015–16)
2012 ELD Standards and Next Generation Assessment (cont.)

Technical Aspect of the Standards

- Aligned with, and support, the California Common Core Content Standards for ELA
- Three proficiency levels instead of five: Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging
- General description of ELs’ abilities at “early stage of” and “exit from” each level
- Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing domains are not explicit
Impact on CELDT: Integrating the new standards into the assessment

- Review structure of current CELDT for necessary changes to align with the new standards.
- Create new items as needed to assess new standards.
- Pilot the items.
- Field-test the items.
- Administer new standards-aligned K–1 and possibly grade two assessments in 2015–16.
ELPA21 Consortium

- Oregon: lead procurement state
- California: Executive Board member state
- Council of Chief State School Officers: project management partner
- Stanford University: partner
- Thirteen states in consortium
ELPA21 Consortium

The U.S. Department of Education awarded $6.3 million to the ELPA21 Consortium to:

• Develop an ELP assessment system that includes a diagnostic screener and an annual summative test.

• Develop ELP assessments that correspond to the college and career readiness standards for English–language arts and mathematics.

• Align ELP assessments with a common set of English language development standards.

• Have operational-ready tests by 2016–17.
# CELDT and ELPA21 Key Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELDT</th>
<th>ELPA21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Paper and pencil test</td>
<td>• Computer-based test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Same test for both initial assessment and annual assessment</td>
<td>• Diagnostic screener and annual summative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aligned with CA ELD Standards</td>
<td>• Aligned with common ELP standards that correspond to the Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Testing grade spans: K, 1, 2, 3–5, 6–8, 9–12</td>
<td>• Testing grade spans: K, 1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, 9–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• California owns the test items</td>
<td>• Open Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One test form that is refreshed annually with 30% new test questions</td>
<td>• Two forms of summative test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background of Early Literacy and the CELDT

- 2007: Passage of state law (*Education Code* Section 60810) to add early literacy assessment for K–1 (reading and writing)
- 2008–09: K–1 items developed by WestEd
- 2009–10: First operational administration K–1 reading and writing
- 2010: Comparison study of performance of ELs and English-fluent students on the CELDT (i.e., EO study)
- 2013: K–1 legislative report on the early literacy assessment
CELDT 2010–11 Edition

K–1 EO Study

The comparison study began in the fall of 2010 to compare the performance of ELs with that of English-fluent students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium/Small</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,484</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium/Small</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1 General demographics for population included in the K–1 English-only study
### CELDT 2010–11 Edition

#### K–1 EO Study (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fig. 2 Average Scale Score Comparison of English Learner Students and English- Fluent Students
Fig. 3 Percentage of survey respondents rating each domain of the CELDT as useful for initial identification.
Fig. 4 Percentage of survey respondents rating each domain of the CELDT as useful for instructional decisions
• K–1 test results for 2009–10 through 2011–12 confirmed the need to separate the K–1 test.

• The CELDT contractor, Educational Data Systems, is working on the separation.

• Separate K and grade one tests will be fully implemented by the 2015–16 edition of the CELDT.
K–1 Early Literacy Assessment: Results and Administrative Process

Recommendation #1:

1. Separate the K–1 tests by grade.
   • Items necessary to evaluate grade one students (especially reading and writing) are too difficult for incoming kindergarten students.
   • Items needed to differentiate among kindergarteners are too easy for grade one students.
   • The greatest amount of individual students’ growth on the CELDT is seen at the early grades.
K–1 Early Literacy Assessment: Results and Administrative Process (cont.)

Fig. 5 Average Individual Gain on Overall CELDT Score
K–1 Early Literacy Assessment: Results and Administrative Process (cont.)

Fig. 6 2010–11 Reading Scale Score Distribution
K–1 Early Literacy Assessment: Results and Administrative Process (cont.)

Fig. 7 2010–11 Writing Scale Score Distribution
K–1 Early Literacy Assessment: Results and Administrative Process (cont.)

Recommendation #2:

2. Reevaluate the weighting of the K–1 domains.

• Current weights for the Overall score:
  – 45% each for listening and speaking
  – 5% each for reading and writing

• Use listening and speaking domain scores for K–1 only as a definition for English proficient on the CELDT.
K–1 Early Literacy Assessment: Results and Administrative Process (cont.)

CDE’s Responses to the Recommendations:

1. Develop and administer separate K and grade one tests in the 2015–16 school year.
   • K–1 Separation Educators’ Meeting held on October 11, 2012

2. Consider whether to increase the K–1 weights for the reading and writing domain scores on the CELDT
   • New recommendations will be brought to the State Board of Education before 2015–16.
CELDT Reporting

• New report: CELDT Test Results by Prior Overall Performance Level
  – Current CELDT overall performance and most recent previous CELDT overall performance
  – State, county, district, and school levels

• DataQuest Web page
  http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
CELDT Reporting (cont.)

Percent of LEAs/Consortia Meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Met AMAO 1</th>
<th>Met AMAO 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CELDT Reporting (cont.)

CELDT Results by Prior Overall Performance Level
(Sacramento County)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Performance Level</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Beginning</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Early Intermediate</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Intermediate</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Early Advanced</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intermediate</td>
<td>6,671</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>14,347</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Advanced</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,746</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CELDT Reporting (cont.)

CELDT Results by Prior Overall Performance Level
(Sacramento County)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Performance Level</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Beginning</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Early Intermediate</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Intermediate</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Early Advanced</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intermediate</td>
<td>6,671</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>14,347</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Advanced</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,746</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CELDT Reporting (cont.)

CELDT Results by Prior Overall Performance Level
(Sacramento County)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Performance Level</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Beginning</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Early Intermediate</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Intermediate</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Early Advanced</th>
<th>Current Year Percent Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intermediate</td>
<td>6,671</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>14,347</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Advanced</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,746</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Resources

Interpretation of Results

• **2012–13 Guide to Test Reports**
  – Formerly known as *Test Results Interpretation Guides (TRIGs)*

• **2012–13 Test Performance Descriptors**
  – Previously in the *TRIGs* with *only* the Overall Test Performance Descriptors
  – Now includes *all four domains*

http://celdt.org/resources/im/
New Resources (cont.)

• **2012–13 CELDT Information Guide**
  – Guidance about American Sign Language and reclassification for English learners with severe cognitive disabilities
  – Checklist of key actions for the administration of the CELDT to students with disabilities

• **CELDT 101 – Updated Soon**
  – Information about the new ELD standards

http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta tg/el/resources.asp
New Resources (cont.)

CELDT Fundamentals

• Video 1: CELDT Overview
• Video 2: Who Takes the CELDT?
• Video 3: CELDT Administration Basics
• Video 4: The CELDT Student Performance Level Score Report

http://celdt.org/training
Contact Information

CELDT Program

Lily Roberts, Ph.D., Administrator
English Language Proficiency Assessment Office

Phone: 916–319–0784
E-mail: celdt@cde.ca.gov
Web page: http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/