

# Framework for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments

DRAFT

**DRAFT**

**October 2007**

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, LEP Partnership, Office of the Deputy Secretary of Education, by the Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center



**CONTENTS**

Introduction	p. 2
Section 1: English Language Proficiency Standards	p. 6
Section 2: English Language Proficiency Assessments	p. 29
Recommendations for Application of the Framework	p. 54
Resources	p. 57
References	p. 64
Acknowledgements	p. 68

DRAFT

## INTRODUCTION

Addressing the needs of the Nation's more than five million limited English proficient (LEP)<sup>1, 2</sup> students (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2006) is central to meeting the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Improving instruction and closing the achievement gap for English language learners (ELLs) is highly dependent on the development and proper utilization of high-quality systems of State standards and assessments. We need to be able to measure what ELLs know and do not know, both in terms of English language skills and academic content knowledge, so that educators have the data required to inform classroom instruction for both English language acquisition and academic content.

### **NCLB Requirements Regarding English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments**

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by NCLB, requires each State educational agency (SEA) to submit a plan to the Secretary of Education describing how the agency will establish standards and objectives for raising the level of English proficiency that are derived from the four recognized domains of language—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—and comprehension. These standards and objectives are to align<sup>3</sup> with the achievement of challenging academic content and academic achievement standards for all students that States have implemented under Title I of the ESEA.

The general requirement for testing for English language proficiency is nearly identical under both Titles I and III. Both require local educational agencies (LEAs) and SEAs to provide for an annual assessment of English language proficiency in the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Title III also requires LEAs and SEAs to report student progress in English comprehension. Comprehension can be demonstrated through reading and listening.

English language proficiency (ELP) standards are meant to guide the design and administration of local language education programs. ELP assessments are a primary tool for identifying ELLs and measuring students' progress in their English language

---

<sup>1</sup> Limited English proficient (LEP) students are (a) 3 to 21 years of age, (b) enrolled or preparing to enroll in elementary or secondary school, (c) either not born in the United States or have a native language other than English, and (d) owing to difficulty in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English, not able to meet the State's proficient level of achievement to successfully achieve in English-only classrooms or not able to participate fully in society (Title IX, Section 9101).

<sup>2</sup> The language of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) refers to the targeted student population for this framework as "limited English proficient" (LEP). We recognize that many researchers and practitioners prefer the term English Language Learner (ELL). Consistent with this more general, common usage, the remainder of this framework will use the latter term.

<sup>3</sup> According to Title III, Section 3113, the State ELP standards are to be aligned with the achievement of challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards. See definitions of *alignment* and *linkage* in footnote on pp. 10-11 of this document.

acquisition. Such assessments also are used to hold States and LEAs accountable under Title III for helping ELLs attain English language skills and knowledge, including the language necessary for achievement in the core academic content areas.

NCLB is clear that the main purposes of ELP standards, assessments, and language instruction educational programs are to help ensure that ELLs attain proficiency in English and meet the same academic content and student achievement standards as all students are expected to meet.

### **Purpose of the Framework**

States have requested assistance from the U.S. Department of Education (Department) on how to evaluate the technical quality of ELP standards and assessments. Key issues where they believe assistance would be beneficial include how to demonstrate the validity and reliability of the systems of standards and assessments and the alignment of ELP standards to ELP assessments as well as to the achievement of challenging content standards in the core subject areas required to be assessed under NCLB. In October 2006, Deputy Secretary Raymond Simon set as a Department priority that the LEP Partnership provide resources to help States with their ELP standards and assessment implementation, issues, and challenges (for more information on the LEP Partnership see <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/lep-partnership>).

The purpose of this *Framework for High-Quality ELP Standards and Assessments* (Framework) is to provide States with information on suggested elements, possible considerations, and resources in order to help States evaluate and improve the quality of their current ELP standards and assessments. This Framework also will help States identify their technical assistance needs related to ELP standards and assessments and, therefore, help the Department provide States with the assistance they need to improve and implement their Title III standards and assessments effectively. This Framework is applicable both to States that have established their own ELP standards and assessments, and to States that are members of a consortium.<sup>4</sup> This Framework, however, does not establish any legally binding requirements on States or their local educational agencies (LEAs).

The Framework is intended to guide the establishment of rigorous, valid, and accessible State ELP standards and assessments that support effective instruction. This Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems (e.g., for State accountability workbooks) or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability requirements under Title III; rather, this Framework addresses the validity and reliability of ELP standards and assessments for placement and proficiency determinations.

---

<sup>4</sup> Each State in a consortium should make sure that the ELP standards are useful and meaningful to the State vis-à-vis its ELL population, and the technical evidence associated with the ELP assessment is applicable to both the State's particular ELL population (key subgroups, as defined by the State, vis-à-vis the consortium's subgroup definitions) and context (e.g., priorities, uses of results) of the State.

## **Development of the Framework**

On June 6, 2007, the Department published a Federal Register notice announcing a series of public meetings and a comment period during which stakeholders were invited to submit recommendations regarding the content of the *Framework for High-Quality ELP Standards and Assessments*.

Specifically, the Department invited comment on the following four questions:

1. What are the critical elements that States should examine to ensure that their ELP standards promote effective instruction to raise LEP students' level of English proficiency? (Section 3113(b)(2))
2. What are the critical elements that States should examine to ensure that their ELP assessments provide a valid and reliable assessment of English language proficiency? (Section 3122(a)(3)(A)(ii))
3. What are the critical elements that States should examine to ensure that their ELP standards are aligned with their ELP assessments? (Sections 3113(b)(2) and (3)(D) and 3122(a)(3)(A)(ii))
4. What are strategies that States can use to ensure that their ELP standards are aligned with the achievement of challenging State academic content standards and student academic achievement standards they have adopted under Title I? (Section 3113(b)(2))

In addition to inviting public comment, the Department's public meetings featured roundtable discussions with experts in the fields of standards and assessments, English language acquisition, applied linguistics, and language research. A list of the roundtable participants, as well as transcripts of the roundtable discussions and public meetings, is available at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/lep-partnership/>.

Throughout the process of developing this Framework, the Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center, working with the Department, received valuable recommendations not only from technical experts in standards, assessment, psychometrics, English language acquisition, applied linguistics, and language research, but also from parents, teachers, administrators, researchers, and others with experience and expertise in Title I and Title III programs.

## **Next Steps**

This first draft of the Framework will be shared with additional experts and practitioners, as well as with States, for review and comment and to solicit States to volunteer to undertake self-review of their State ELP standards and assessments using the Framework. The purpose of this self-review will be to serve as a means of improving the Framework as a tool for States, not to judge the quality of the States' standards and assessments as

part of any formal review. The Department plans to provide technical assistance to States willing to undertake such a review and will revise the Framework document, in spring 2008, as necessary, based on the outcomes from the self-review.

### **Overview of Structure and Content of the Framework**

The Framework document is divided into two main sections. Section 1 focuses on ELP standards. Section 2 focuses on ELP assessments. Within these two major sections of the Framework, the document outlines general issues and possible considerations for evaluating and improving the quality of State ELP standards and assessments. The Framework includes a set of suggested elements necessary for high-quality ELP standards and assessments, possible considerations and strategies to address each suggested element, and concludes with a list of resources to consult for more information.

DRAFT

## SECTION 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS

The cornerstone of any substantive education reform lies in the creation and implementation of rigorous standards. The impact of rigorous standards is undeniable: they can provide a clear direction for what students should know and be able to do and establish clear expectations for schools, teachers, parents, and students.

Various States, researchers, technical assistance providers, and educators refer to standards for English language acquisition in different ways. During the Department’s public meetings, references were made to English language development (ELD) standards and to English as a Second Language (ESL) standards, as well as standards for English language learners (ELLs). For the purposes of the Framework, we refer to the English language acquisition standards as **English language proficiency (ELP) standards**, which is consistent with the language used in Title III of the ESEA. ELP standards are distinguished from English language arts (ELA), or reading standards, as defined by Title I of the ESEA, which define *content* knowledge and skills rather than *language* knowledge and skills.<sup>5</sup> While we recognize that there are important relationships between English language acquisition and academic content knowledge—and that the learning of both happens simultaneously for ELLs—we intend this Framework to focus specifically on ELP standards and assessments.

ELP standards should define the knowledge and skills necessary for students to attain English language proficiency and to participate effectively in the academic content areas in English. Therefore, ELP standards should define, in addition to the language skills and knowledge specific to the needs of ELLs, the “academic language” necessary for all students to access content in ELA, reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and other academic content areas. Broadly defined, academic language is the language (e.g., lexical, grammatical, and discourse features specific to and reflective of a particular context or content area) students need to meaningfully engage with academic content and achieve proficiency in English in the academic setting (Sato, 2007).<sup>6</sup> In this sense, ELP standards are not limited to the ESL teacher or classroom but are appropriate for all educators of ELLs. ELP standards also should be well grounded in the theory and research relevant to the language acquisition process.

---

<sup>5</sup>The distinction being made between ELP standards and ELA/Reading standards is that ELP skills and knowledge are necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate proficiency in ELA/Reading, as well as in other academic content areas (e.g., mathematics, science, social studies). However, there is obviously more overlap between ELP and ELA/Reading standards than between ELP and other academic content standards because of their focus on English language.

<sup>6</sup>While there may not be just one accepted definition of academic language, there are numerous resources available on the issue (e.g., Aguirre-Munoz, Parks, Benner, Amabisca, & Boscardin, 2006; Bailey, 2007; Bailey, Butler, & Sato, 2007; Butler, Bailey, Stevens, Huang, & Lord, 2004; Cummins, 1980, 2005; Halliday, 1994; Scarcella & Zimmerman, 1998; Schleppegrell, 2001) that may be considered when developing ELP standards and assessments.

## **Section 1 Overview**

This section presents suggested elements necessary for the evaluation and implementation of high-quality English language proficiency (ELP) standards. The suggested elements and possible considerations are based on research-supported theory (including second language acquisition, English language development/acquisition, and measurement) and applied research relevant to the development of standards that will facilitate student progress toward and attainment of proficiency in English, including English language skills and knowledge necessary for achievement in the academic content areas. Although there is overlap among the suggested elements, they are listed separately in this Framework to facilitate State processes for addressing the elements and to reflect their individual contribution to a valid and reliable ELP standards system. Although these elements are listed separately, States should keep in mind the inter-relationships among these suggested elements for establishing a comprehensive and cohesive plan for addressing the needs of their English language learners (ELLs).

Generally, as States evaluate and implement their ELP standards, they should consider the following:

- The characteristics of the State's ELL population;
- The process and people involved in developing, implementing, and evaluating the ELP standards;
- The degree to which the ELP standards fit into the State's larger plan for educating all of its students;
- The degree to which the ELP standards address academic language; and
- The theoretical and research/empirical foundation for ELP standards.

## **Issues Relevant to the Development of High Quality English Language Proficiency Standards**

Three issues are described briefly below and addressed where relevant in the Suggested Elements and Possible Considerations presented in Section 1 of this Framework. States should keep these factors in mind as they evaluate and improve their English language proficiency standards. Doing so will better ensure the development and implementation of high-quality standards that facilitate the proficiency and achievement of these students, meet the requirements of Title III, and help address the persistent achievement gap.

### The Nature of the Domain: English Language Proficiency

Clear models or frameworks of how students acquire language (i.e., English for students who are speakers of other languages) and clear definitions of what constitutes proficiency in English are necessary for establishing high-quality ELP standards. Researchers have a long-standing debate on the very nature of language acquisition and proficiency (Del Vecchio & Guerrero, 1995; Menken, 2000; Walqui, 2000).



In this Framework, States are encouraged to re-examine the theoretical (e.g., theories of second language acquisition, English language development/acquisition, sociocultural development, sociolinguistics)<sup>7</sup> and research bases for their definition of English language proficiency, as well as evaluate the breadth, depth, complexity, and articulation of the associated skills and knowledge expected of students as they progress toward and achieve “proficiency” (See relevant Suggested Elements and Possible Considerations.). Clarity of the theoretical and research-based underpinnings of the State’s definition of English language proficiency and the manner and purposefulness with which the State uses such a foundation to drive its standards development and implementation are integral to ensuring high-quality standards.

### The Heterogeneity of the English Language Learner Population

English language learners are diverse in their educational history, level of literacy, background experiences, sociocultural practices, and socioeconomic status. This diversity<sup>8</sup> may affect the ways in which different groups of ELLs access and interpret academic content in curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Abedi, 2004; Abedi & Dietel, 2004; Kopriva, 2000; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003). Some ELLs also will be eligible for a range of special education services, if they have been identified as having learning or other disabilities.

In this Framework, States are encouraged to involve experts who have familiarity with the range of diversity represented in their ELL population (e.g., in standards review, professional development regarding the standards and their instruction) in the development and implementation of ELP standards. These experts should be included among other experts (e.g., applied linguists, experts in second language acquisition, English language development) at appropriate points in the design, development, review, and implementation of the State’s ELP standards (See relevant Suggested Elements and Possible Considerations.). Consideration of the heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population should *not be interpreted* to suggest different standards or achievement expectations for different ELL subgroups; only one set of ELP standards should be developed for all of the State’s ELLs. Given that standards are major levers for improving student achievement by articulating goals and focusing instruction, the standards should be accessible to all students. That is, the State’s ELP standards should be conceptualized and designed so that they guide and support instruction that can be differentiated, as necessary, to meet the varying needs of the State’s ELLs.

---

<sup>7</sup> While there may not be just one accepted theory of English language development/acquisition (as there is not one accepted theory for teaching mathematics, for example) much has been validated by experts across several fields, and therefore needs to be considered when developing statewide systems of standards and assessments.

<sup>8</sup> The point is not that ELLs are diverse/heterogeneous; rather it is how they are diverse/heterogeneous. For example, ELLs differ in their level of literacy and amount of formal education in their native language. Some ELLs are newly arrived; however, most are second or third generation in the U.S. ELLs speak and write languages that may have sound systems, grammatical structures, and writing systems that are different from those of English to varying degrees, which can affect the rate and ease of English language acquisition and English literacy learning. The nature of the diversity/heterogeneity of this group may affect the implementation of standards (e.g., curriculum, instruction) and assessments.

### State Context Factors: History, Policies, Resources

There are a number of political and resource issues that affect the development and implementation of standards in States. These contextual factors, specific and unique for each State, include system readiness, familiarity with the population, past and current practices and programs, and structures and resources to support the instruction and assessment of the population. For example, States that have a history of large numbers of ELLs (e.g., California, Texas, Florida) will have different policies, practices/structures, and resources available to support the achievement of their ELLs compared to states that have recently experienced significant increases in ELLs (“rapid-growth” States such as South Carolina, Kentucky, and Indiana have experienced an increase in their PreK-12 public school ELL population by more than 400% in the 2004-2005 school year from the 1994-1995 school year [National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2006].).

### **Overview of Suggested Elements for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Standards**

Below is an overview of the suggested elements related to high-quality ELP standards. As mentioned previously, suggested elements are listed separately in this Framework to facilitate State processes for addressing the elements and to reflect their individual contribution to a valid and reliable ELP standards system. Although these elements are listed separately, States should keep in mind the inter-relationships among these suggested elements for establishing a comprehensive and cohesive plan for addressing the needs of their ELLs. Each suggested element is described in greater detail in the following section.

- 1.1: The State has a comprehensive and coherent plan for its English language proficiency (ELP) standards.
- 1.2: The State’s ELP standards are developed on sound theoretical and research bases relevant to English language acquisition and English language proficiency.
- 1.3: The purpose of the State’s ELP standards (i.e., to guide instruction and assessment) is clearly stated.
- 1.4: The ELL population for which the State’s ELP standards are intended is clearly described, taking into account the heterogeneity of the population (i.e., major relevant demographic, socio-cultural, and language characteristics).
- 1.5: The State’s ELP standards include language skills and knowledge necessary for students’ achievement of challenging State academic content.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

1.6: The structure of the State’s ELP standards (format, organization/hierarchy, levels of detail) is appropriate for the instructional and assessment (including reporting) purposes and uses of the ELP standards.

1.7: The State’s ELP standards are stated with sufficient clarity and definition to guide curriculum and assessment development for the ELL population.

1.8: The State’s ELP standards are articulated vertically and horizontally.

1.9: The State ELP standards, including those in the four recognized language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, are aligned<sup>9</sup> with *the achievement of* challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards (based on Title III, Section 3113); that is, the State ELP standards are *linked* to the State academic content standards.

1.10: The State has ensured alignment between its ELP standards and language proficiency level descriptors.

1.11: The State’s system of ELP standards and assessments is aligned.

1.12: The State provides guidance and training to LEAs—both ESL teachers and content area teachers—on the ELP standards and their purpose and use.

1.13: The State monitors and evaluates the implementation of ELP standards in LEAs, schools, and classrooms.

---

<sup>9</sup> According to Title III, Section 3113, the State ELP standards are to be aligned with the achievement of challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards. Therefore, in order to appropriately support ELL achievement of challenging academic content and academic achievement standards, this Suggested Element presents considerations for establishing the necessary *linkage* between State ELP standards and the language skills and knowledge students need to achieve in the academic content areas—that is, the linkage between the State ELP standards and the State academic content standards. The result of the process of this linkage should be an alignment of a State’s English language proficiency standards to the achievement by ELL students, and former ELL students, of challenging academic content standards. **Alignment** refers to the degree to which the content (e.g., skills, concepts) in two sets of standards or in an assessment and set of standards match in terms of breadth, depth, and range of complexity. Alignment relationships tend to be direct relationships (matches between skills, content) and are typically observed between standards and assessments for a single student population (e.g., general education, English language learners, students with disabilities). **Linkage** refers to relationships that tend to be developmental, foundational, or proximal and is typically observed between standards and/or assessments developed for different student populations (e.g., general education, English language learners, students with disabilities) (WestEd, 2004; Sato, Lagunoff, Worth, Bailey, & Butler, 2005; Bailey, Butler, & Sato, 2007).

**SECTION 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS**

**Suggested Elements for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Standards**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>11</sup></b>
<p>1.1 The State has a comprehensive and coherent plan for its English language proficiency (ELP) standards to ensure that its standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are appropriate for grades K-12;</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Include specific language skill and knowledge expectations for each grade range and language proficiency level defined by the State;</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cover each of the four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing;</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Can be applied to <i>all</i> eligible public school students and students in the State.</li> </ul>	<p>The State has ELP standards that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are appropriate for each grade range (across grades K-12);</li> <li>▪ Are appropriate for each of the four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing;</li> <li>▪ Are appropriate for each language proficiency level within each grade range defined by the State;</li> <li>▪ Incorporate language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding<sup>12</sup> necessary for achievement in the content areas;</li> <li>▪ Address the needs of the State’s English language learners (ELLs); and</li> <li>▪ Are based on relevant theory and/or research.</li> </ul> <p>The State’s plan for the development and validation of its ELP standards is comprehensive and coherent—documentation of the plan is complete, accurate, and clearly written so that the range of users and the general public can readily understand the State’s plan for its ELP standards. Related materials also include a description of the relationship between the State’s ELP standards and the State’s academic content standards (e.g., how and the degree to which the skills and knowledge of the standards are intended to converge/diverge<sup>13</sup>).</p>

<sup>10</sup> Suggested elements are listed separately in this Framework to facilitate State processes for addressing the elements and to reflect their individual contribution to a valid and reliable ELP standards system. Although these elements are listed separately, States should keep in mind the inter-relationships among these suggested elements for establishing a comprehensive and cohesive plan for addressing the needs of their ELLs.

<sup>11</sup> Some considerations are repeated across suggested elements to ensure that States address the considerations as appropriate.

<sup>12</sup> Language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding include summarization, comparison-contrast, and persuasion.

<sup>13</sup> ELP language skills and knowledge are necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate proficiency in the academic content areas (e.g., ELA, mathematics, science, social studies). However, there is obviously more overlap (convergence) between the language and content of ELP and ELA/Reading than between ELP and other academic content standards because of their focus on English language. The State should clearly explain its intended relationship between its ELP standards and its content area standards.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>11</sup></b>
	<p>The State’s ELP standards should be developed with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, accountability, policy, content, and the ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee, surveys, public hearings, public comment, or public review.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in standards setting reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts represented in the process, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>1.2 The State’s ELP standards are developed on sound theoretical and research bases relevant to English language acquisition and English language proficiency.</p>	<p>The State’s process for developing its ELP standards includes clear descriptions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expectations for increasing language proficiency levels in English that build upon skills in preceding levels;</li> <li>▪ Expectations that include language skills needed to succeed in the content areas (academic language<sup>14</sup>), including language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding necessary for achievement in the content areas;</li> <li>▪ Expectations related to the specific language skills and knowledge needed for English language proficiency;</li> <li>▪ The relationships among the language domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing);</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The State has theory- and/or research-based rationale for the ELP and academic language expectations—that is, the State has theory- and/or research-based support for the State’s decisions regarding its definition of</li> </ul>

<sup>14</sup> Broadly defined, academic language is the language (e.g., lexical, grammatical, and discourse features specific to and reflective of a particular context or content area) students need to meaningfully engage with academic content and achieve proficiency in English in the academic setting (Sato, 2007). While there may not be just one accepted definition of academic language, there are a good number of resources available that address the issue of academic language (e.g., Aguirre-Munoz, Parks, Benner, Amabisca, & Boscardin, 2006; Bailey, 2007; Bailey, Butler, & Sato, 2007; Butler, Bailey, Stevens, Huang, & Lord, 2004; Cummins, 1980, 2005; Halliday, 1994; Scarcella & Zimmerman, 1998; Schleppegrell, 2001) which ought to be considered when developing ELP standards and assessments.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>11</sup></b>
	<p>ELP and the language skills and knowledge associated with its grade ranges and language proficiency levels.</p> <p>State materials regarding the State’s definition of English language proficiency are complete, accurate, and clearly written so that the range of users and the general public can readily understand the domain definition underlying the State ELP standards.</p> <p>The State’s definition of ELP should be developed with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input may come from individuals and organizations with expertise in English language acquisition and development, applied linguistics, standards, assessment, and measurement, and with the ELL population. The process ensures appropriate accessibility of the standards; that is, language (words, phrases), symbols, and content that are generally regarded as biased against members of the ELL population have been removed.</p>
<p>1.3 The purpose of the State’s ELP standards (i.e., to guide instruction and assessment) is clearly stated.</p>	<p>The purpose of the State’s ELP standards to guide instruction and assessment is clearly stated, including appropriate descriptions of the differentiation among expectations related to identification, placement, and progress monitoring, such that all eligible ELLs have appropriate access to services and the opportunity to develop proficiency in the English language and acquire language necessary for achievement in the academic content areas.</p> <p>State materials related to the ELP standards are complete, accurate, and clearly written so that the range of users and the general public can readily understand the purpose of the State ELP standards.</p> <p>State materials that include or are based on the ELP standards explicitly address the purpose and use of the standards vis-à-vis relevant local, State, and federal policy/requirements for ELLs.</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>11</sup></b>
	<p>The State’s articulation of the purpose of its ELP standards should include broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input may come from the range of relevant stakeholders and experts familiar with the State’s curriculum, instruction, assessment, policy, second language acquisition, and ELL population.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in articulating the purpose of the State’s ELP standards reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts represented in the process, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities.</p>

DRAFT

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>11</sup></b>
<p>1.4 The ELL population for which the State’s ELP standards are intended is clearly described, taking into account the heterogeneity of the population (i.e., major relevant sociodemographic, sociocultural, and language characteristics).<sup>15</sup></p>	<p>The State’s process for defining its ELL population involves multiple sources of information, including State data, input from diverse panels of educators, higher education representatives, parents, and community members familiar with the ELL population and their educational needs, and experts in second language acquisition, language testing, and the ELL population. The broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts represented in the process also includes individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>State materials defining/describing its ELL population are complete, accurate, and clearly written so that the range of users and the general public can readily understand the population definition.</p>
<p>1.5 The State’s ELP standards include language skills and knowledge necessary for students’ achievement of challenging State academic content.</p>	<p>The State’s process for identifying and defining academic language—the language skills students need in each of the language domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing) to access information and achieve in the academic content areas, including language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding necessary for achievement in the content areas, includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A clear definition of academic language supported by relevant theory and/or research; that is, the State has theory- and/or research-based support for the State’s decisions regarding its definition of academic language and the language skills and knowledge associated with its grade</li> </ul>

<sup>15</sup> The State ELP standards should reflect consideration of the heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population. Consideration of the heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population *should not be interpreted to* suggest different standards or achievement expectations for different ELL subgroups; only one set of ELP standards should be developed for all of the State’s ELLs. However, given that standards are major levers for improving student achievement by articulating goals and focusing instruction, the standards should be accessible to all students. That is, the State’s ELP standards should be conceptualized and designed so that they can guide and support instruction that can be differentiated, for example, to meet the varying needs of the State’s ELLs vis-à-vis key characteristics of their backgrounds (e.g., language, culture) that affect their learning.

<sup>16</sup> This suggested element is not recommending that States develop language acquisition profiles for each major linguistic or sociocultural group. Rather, this suggested element encourages States to understand and clearly articulate who their ELLs are—without a clear understanding of *who* needs to develop English language proficiency, it is difficult to know *how* to effectively facilitate such development (i.e., via standards that guide the instruction and assessment of these students that appropriately consider their access needs).



**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>11</sup></b>
	<p>ranges and language proficiency levels;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Criteria and procedures appropriate for identifying and defining the language skills and knowledge necessary to achieve grade-level content in the academic content areas. Criteria should be theory- and/or research-based. Procedures could include a review of academic language in curriculum materials, study guides, and textbooks related to the implementation of the academic content standards; and</li><li>▪ Involvement of individuals with relevant expertise (e.g., applied linguistics, language testing, content area expertise, curriculum and instruction, and the ELL population).</li></ul> <p>State materials include a clear explanation of the relationship between the ELP standards and language needed for achievement of grade-level academic content standards (e.g., a crosswalk of academic language skills and the language needed to achieve in the content areas) for each grade range and language proficiency level defined by the State. The materials are prepared in a manner that allows for the full range of users to appropriately access and readily understand the information presented.</p> <p>(See related Suggested Elements 1.1 and 1.9)</p>

DRAFT

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
<p>1.6 The structure of the State’s ELP standards (format, organization/hierarchy, levels of detail) is appropriate for the instructional and assessment (including reporting) purposes and uses of the ELP standards.</p>	<p>The State’s process for specifying the structure of its ELP standards appropriately addresses/accommodates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expectations for increasing English language proficiency levels reflected in the standards;</li> <li>▪ Expectations for the specific language skills and knowledge needed for English language proficiency;</li> <li>▪ Expectations of language skills needed to achieve in the academic content areas (academic language);</li> <li>▪ The theory and/or research bases for the ELP standards; and</li> <li>▪ The purpose(s) and use(s) of the standards in instruction, assessment, and reporting.</li> </ul> <p>The State’s process includes consideration of and meaningful decisions related to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of standards;</li> <li>▪ Level of detail included in the standards (e.g., supporting skills, indicators, enablers, benchmarks)—standards should be parsimonious;</li> <li>▪ Wording of the standards (standards statements should include wording that is precise and enables implementation and measurement of the standards; wording should be as clear and as consistent as possible);</li> <li>▪ Differentiation between statements of expected student learning outcomes (the <i>what</i>) and suggestions for curriculum/instruction (the <i>how</i>)—standards should focus on the former;</li> <li>▪ Specific language skills and knowledge needed for English language proficiency;</li> <li>▪ Differences in the standards (e.g., wording, detail, structure) that reflect <i>real</i> differences affecting structure (e.g., differences due to the language domain, nature of the skill/set of skills, language proficiency level, grade</li> </ul>

DRAFT

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
	<p>range);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Degree of overlap of language skills and knowledge versus delineation within and across language proficiency levels as well as within and across language domains and grade ranges;<sup>17</sup> and</li> <li>▪ Use(s) of the standards in instruction, assessment, and reporting.</li> </ul> <p>State materials clearly explain the structure of the standards (format, organization, levels of detail) vis-à-vis their purpose(s) and use(s) in instruction, assessment, and reporting. The materials are prepared in a manner that allows for the full range of users to appropriately access and readily understand the information presented.</p> <p>The State’s process for specifying the structure of its ELP standards (overall and within and across the language domains, language proficiency levels, and grade ranges) should include broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, accountability, policy, content, and the ELL population, and also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in specifying the structure of the State’s ELP standards reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts represented in the process, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities.</p>

DRAFT

---

<sup>17</sup> The degree to which language skills and knowledge across grade ranges and proficiency levels are repeated and overlap (spiraled) should be purposeful and grounded in theory and/or research/data.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
<p>1.7 The State ELP standards are stated with sufficient clarity and definition to guide curriculum and assessment development for the ELL population.</p>	<p>The State’s ELP standards include specific language skills and knowledge that can be operationalized in curriculum and assessment—the ELP standards and the student learning outcomes reflected in the standards are stated parsimoniously and precisely in order to enable implementation (curriculum, instruction) and measurement (assessment). The State’s process includes the consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Level of detail included in the standards (e.g., supporting skills, indicators, enablers, benchmarks)—standards should be parsimonious;</li> <li>▪ Wording of the standards (standards statements should include wording that is precise and enables implementation and measurement of the standards; wording should be as clear and as consistent as possible);</li> <li>▪ Differentiation between statements of expected student learning outcomes (the <i>what</i>) and suggestions for curriculum/instruction (the <i>how</i>)—standards should focus on the former;</li> <li>▪ Degree of overlap of language skills and knowledge versus delineation within and across language proficiency levels as well as within and across language domains and grade ranges; and</li> <li>▪ The heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population.<sup>18</sup></li> </ul> <p>State documentation illustrates how the ELP standards are linked to grade-level content standards (academic language) for curriculum and instructional purposes, including language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding necessary for achievement in the content areas.</p> <p>State documentation includes descriptions and/or examples of key language competencies for each language proficiency level and each language domain</p>

<sup>18</sup>The State ELP standards should reflect consideration of the heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population. Consideration of the heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population *should not* be interpreted to suggest different standards or achievement expectations for different ELL subgroups; only one set of ELP standards should be developed for all of the State’s ELLs. However, given that standards are major levers for improving student achievement by articulating goals and focusing instruction, the standards should be accessible to all students. That is, the State’s ELP standards should be conceptualized and designed so that they can guide and support instruction that can be differentiated, for example, to meet the varying needs of the State’s ELLs vis-à-vis key characteristics of their backgrounds (e.g., language, culture) that affect their learning.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
	<p>across the State’s grade ranges, including examples of academic language necessary for achievement in the content areas—the expectation of what English language skill/knowledge is to be acquired and when it is to be acquired is clear.</p> <p>State documentation clearly articulates and explains criteria defining the distinction between English language skills and knowledge appropriate for State versus local assessments.<sup>19</sup></p> <p>The State’s process for clearly defining its ELP standards to guide curriculum and assessment should include broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, accountability, policy, content, and the ELL population, and also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in clearly defining the ELP standards to guide curriculum and assessment (e.g., state curricular documents/frameworks/guides, state mandated curriculum, state-mandated assessment, local assessment) reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts represented in the process, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>1.8 The State ELP standards are articulated<sup>20</sup> vertically and horizontally.</p>	<p>For <i>vertical</i> articulation of its ELP standards, the State has a process for ensuring that, as skills and knowledge move from lowest language proficiency level and grade level or grade range to highest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Levels of language skills and knowledge appropriately increase in complexity, and the incremental increase is based on theory and/or</li> </ul>

<sup>19</sup> Local assessment refers to a teacher, school, or district-developed assessment separate from the State-mandated assessment. Such assessments may be designed to provide information on specific student English language skills and knowledge of interest to local practitioners, thereby augmenting information provided by the State-mandated assessment.

<sup>20</sup> *Articulation* is used instead of *alignment* because of the nature of the English language proficiency domain, which has skills and knowledge that fall along a continuum and may develop at different rates across the language domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing).

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
<p align="center" style="font-size: 48px; opacity: 0.3; transform: rotate(-15deg);">DRAFT</p>	<p>research;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prerequisite language skills and knowledge appear as appropriate in lower language proficiency levels and grade ranges;</li> <li>▪ Broader, deeper, and new language skills and knowledge appear in higher language proficiency levels and grade ranges (building from skills and knowledge in lower/prior levels) and are introduced at the appropriate language proficiency level and grade range;</li> <li>▪ Language skills and knowledge that are expected to be acquired are explicit at the appropriate language proficiency level and grade range;</li> <li>▪ The balance of representation—coverage and complexity of language skills and knowledge—shifts appropriately across language proficiency levels and grade range; and</li> <li>▪ Repetition of standards (language skills and knowledge) is purposeful, and it is clear what English language skill/knowledge is to be acquired and when it is to be acquired.</li> </ul> <p>For <i>horizontal</i> articulation of its ELP standards, the State has a process for ensuring that skills and knowledge are appropriate for the language proficiency levels and grade ranges for each language domain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The level of complexity of language skills and knowledge across language domains are comparable within a grade range, unless differences are supported by theory and/or research;</li> <li>▪ Repetition of language skills and knowledge across the language domains within a language proficiency level and grade range is purposeful and meaningful.</li> </ul> <p>The State has a clear depiction (e.g., graphic, written description) of the vertical and horizontal relationships of the State ELP standards across language domains, language proficiency levels, and grade ranges.</p> <p>State documents explicitly address the vertical and horizontal articulation of the language skills and knowledge of the ELP standards within and across language domains, language proficiency levels, and grade ranges as</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
	<p>appropriate, as well as the process/methodology for establishing vertical and horizontal articulation of its ELP standards.</p> <p>Qualifications of individuals involved in the determination of the vertical and horizontal articulation of the ELP standards include expertise in curriculum, instruction, standards, assessment, measurement, content, English language acquisition, applied linguistics, and the ELL population.</p> <p>The State’s process for conceptualizing and determining the vertical and horizontal articulation of its ELP standards (overall and within and across the language domains, language proficiency levels, and grade ranges) should include broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, accountability, policy, content, and the ELL population, and the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the vertical and horizontal articulation of the State’s ELP standards reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts represented in the process, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> While this element is presented in terms of <i>articulation</i>, aspects of <i>alignment</i> and <i>linkage</i> also are relevant. See other relevant Suggested Elements for more information (e.g., Suggested Element 1.9).</p>
<p>1.9 The State’s ELP standards, including those in the four recognized language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, are aligned<sup>21</sup> with the achievement of challenging</p>	<p>The State has a process for ensuring a match (linkage) between ELP language skills in each of the language domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and the language skills students need to achieve in the academic content areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All relevant aspects of grade-level academic content language are</li> </ul>

<sup>21</sup> According to Title III, Section 3113, the State ELP standards are to be aligned with the achievement of challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards. Therefore, in order to appropriately support ELL student achievement of challenging academic content and academic achievement standards, this Suggested Element presents considerations for establishing necessary *linkage* between State ELP standards and the language skills

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
<p>State academic content and student academic achievement standards (based on Title III, Section 3113); that is, the State’s ELP standards are linked to the State academic content standards.</p>	<p>identified and considered: forms, functions, as well as language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding necessary for achievement in the content areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The ways in which and degree to which language and content converge/diverge is clear;<sup>22</sup></li> <li>▪ At a minimum, language skills and knowledge in the ELP standards are evaluated according to the degree to which they:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cover relevant aspects of grade-level academic content language (breadth, depth, complexity—as described previously) in the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• Cover the range of language complexity necessary for achievement in the content areas, including levels of language complexity consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding reflected in the State’s academic content standards; and</li> <li>• Reflect a balance of representation—coverage of language skills and knowledge and complexity of language skills and knowledge—consistent with the language needed for achievement of grade-level academic content reflected in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The State has documents related to the match (linkage) between the State ELP standards and the State academic content standards that indicates that these</p>

and knowledge students need to achieve in the academic content areas—that is, linkage between the State ELP standards and the State academic content standards. The result of the process of this linkage should be an alignment of a State’s English language proficiency standards to the achievement by ELL students, and former ELL students, of challenging academic content standards. **Alignment** refers to the degree to which the content (e.g., skills, concepts) in two sets of standards or in an assessment and set of standards match in terms of breadth, depth, and range of complexity. Alignment relationships tend to be direct relationships (matches between skills, content) and are typically observed between standards and assessments for a single student population (e.g., general education, English language learners, students with disabilities). **Linkage** refers to relationships that tend to be developmental, foundational, or proximal and is typically observed between standards and/or assessments developed for different student populations (e.g., general education, English language learners, students with disabilities) (WestEd, 2004; Sato, Lagunoff, Worth, Bailey, & Butler, 2005; Bailey, Butler, & Sato, 2007).

<sup>22</sup> The distinction being made here between *language* and *content* is that ELP language skills and knowledge are necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate proficiency in the academic content areas (e.g., ELA, mathematics, science, social studies). However, there is obviously more overlap (convergence) between the language and content of ELP and ELA/Reading than between ELP and other academic content standards because of the focus on English language in both ELP and ELA.



**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
	<p>standards were reviewed specifically to evaluate the degree of concurrence between these sets of standards, focusing on language skills and knowledge in general and particularly on the language skills and knowledge necessary to achieve the grade-level content in the academic content areas. Documentation could include a crosswalk of language skills expected in the ELP standards and the academic content standards. The process/methodology for establishing the linkage between the State ELP standards and the State academic content standards is included in relevant State documents.</p> <p>Qualifications of individuals involved in linking the ELP standards to State academic content standards include expertise in curriculum, instruction, standards, assessment, measurement, content, English language acquisition, applied linguistics, and the ELL population.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in linking the ELP standards to State academic content standards reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts represented in the process, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Other types of alignment also are recommended to demonstrate the validity of the ELP standards and assessment systems (e.g., alignment of ELP standards to the ELP assessment blueprint). See other relevant Suggested Elements in both the Standards and the Assessments sections of this Framework.</p>
<p>1.10 The State has ensured alignment between its ELP standards and language proficiency level descriptors.</p>	<p>The State’s ELP proficiency level descriptors fully reflect its ELP standards for each grade range and language domain and describe the language skills and knowledge expectations for each language proficiency level from “beginning” through “advanced,” including appropriate vertical articulation of language skills and knowledge across the language proficiency levels and horizontal articulation across language domains.</p> <p>The “proficient” designation represents the attainment of language skills and knowledge expectations for English language proficiency as defined by the</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
	<p>State and based on relevant theory and research (see Suggested Element 1.2).</p> <p>“Proficiency”—overall as well as in each of the language domains (as appropriate)—is defined in a manner consistent with the ELP standards.</p> <p>Each language proficiency level descriptor clearly defines the language skills and knowledge for the attainment of that level of proficiency. The language proficiency level descriptors are consistent with the ELP standards in terms of wording, structure, and use. Differences across language proficiency level descriptors reflect real differences in language skill and knowledge expectations (e.g., along the expected continuum of English language acquisition) vis-à-vis proficiency and progress toward proficiency as well as functional differences (e.g., for reporting purposes).</p> <p>The process used to review the alignment between the ELP standards and language proficiency level descriptors indicates that these standards were reviewed specifically to evaluate their degree of consistency, focusing on the language skills and knowledge necessary to progress toward and achieve English language proficiency.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in evaluating the degree of consistency between the ELP standards and language proficiency level descriptors reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population, including ELLs with disabilities</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Other types of alignment also are recommended. See other relevant Suggested Elements for more information.</p>
<p>1.11 The State’s system of ELP standards and assessments is aligned.</p>	<p>See relevant Suggested Element in Section 2: English Language Proficiency Assessments.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Other types of alignment also are recommended. See other relevant Suggested Elements for more information.</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
<p>1.12 The State provides guidance and training to LEAs—both ESL teachers and content area teachers—on the ELP standards and their purpose and use.</p>	<p>The State has a process and schedule for communicating the purpose and use of the State’s ELP standards. The process reflects broad and purposeful dissemination of relevant information/guidance and coordinated training efforts. The guidance and training provided by the State builds upon/makes use of existing structures and systems (at State and LEA levels), to the degree possible and appropriate.</p> <p>The process includes the full range of relevant stakeholders familiar with the State’s infrastructure, resources, and goals as well as with the State’s professional development, curriculum, instruction, assessment, policy, second language acquisition, and the ELL population.<sup>23</sup></p> <p>Appropriate differentiation among expectations related to identification, placement, and progress monitoring are clear in order to ensure consistent understanding of the implementation of the standards and that all eligible students have appropriate access to services and opportunity to develop proficiency in the English language and acquire language necessary for achievement in the content areas.</p> <p>Documents related to the ELP standards are complete, accurate, and clearly written so that the full range of users and the general public can readily understand the content.</p> <p>State materials that include or are based on the ELP standards explicitly address the purpose and use of the standards vis-à-vis relevant local, State, and federal policy/requirements for ELLs.</p>

<sup>23</sup> The heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population should be considered when developing guidance and training to LEAs; that is, the relevant materials should explain key characteristics of the ELL population that may affect instruction (e.g., linguistic background, cultural background, level of proficiency in native language) and provide guidance on how instruction can effectively be differentiated, for example, to meet the varying needs of the State’s ELLs vis-à-vis the characteristics (e.g., linguistic, cultural) that affect their learning. Consideration of the heterogeneity of the State’s ELL population should *not be interpreted to* suggest different standards or achievement expectations for different ELL subgroups; only one set of ELP standards should be developed for all of the State’s ELLs. However, given that standards are major levers for improving student achievement by articulating goals and focusing instruction, the standards should be accessible to all students.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
<p align="center" style="font-size: 48px; opacity: 0.3; transform: rotate(-15deg);">DRAFT</p>	<p>State materials illustrate/describe how the ELP standards are linked to grade-level content standards (language skills, academic language) for curriculum and instructional purposes, including language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding necessary for achievement in the content areas.</p> <p>State documentation includes descriptions and/or examples of key language competencies for each language proficiency level and each language domain across the State’s grade ranges, including examples of academic language necessary for achievement in the content areas—the expectation of what English language skill/knowledge is to be acquired and when it is to be acquired is clear.</p> <p>Factors affecting the distinction between language skills and knowledge appropriate for State versus local assessments are clear (e.g., some standards may be difficult to assess in a technically defensible or practical manner on a Statewide assessment, such as standards that require student production of complex language samples that necessitate a combination of skills across language domains).</p> <p>Individuals involved in the specification and development of the guidance materials reflect a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned the State’s ELL population, including ELLS with disabilities.</p>
<p>1.13 The State monitors and evaluates the implementation of ELP standards in LEAs, schools, and classrooms.</p>	<p>The State has a process and schedule for monitoring the implementation of the State’s ELP standards, including a plan for evaluating the guidance and training it provides to LEAs and teachers. To the degree appropriate and feasible, this process and schedule should be a part of/combined with the State’s existing monitoring and evaluation systems and structures.</p> <p>The State relies on multiple sources of data/information for evaluating the fidelity and effectiveness of the implementation of its ELP standards (e.g.,</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**

<b>Suggested Element</b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element</b>
	<p>internal and external monitoring, qualitative data/analyses, quantitative data/analyses).</p> <p>State materials relevant to these monitoring and evaluation processes explicitly address the purpose and use of the standards vis-à-vis relevant local, State, and federal policy/requirements for ELLs.</p> <p>The process includes the full range of relevant stakeholders familiar with the State’s infrastructure, resources, and goals as well as with the State’s professional development, curriculum, instruction, assessment, policy, evaluation, and ELL population.</p> <p>The process should be developed with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of professional development, curriculum, instruction, assessment, measurement, accountability, policy, content, evaluation, State and local systems, and the ELL population, and the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p>

DRAFT

## SECTION 2: ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENTS

### Section 2 Overview

This section presents suggested elements necessary for the implementation and evaluation of high-quality English language proficiency (ELP) assessments. The suggested elements and possible considerations (i.e., guidance, criteria) are based on research-supported theory (including second language acquisition, English language development/acquisition, socio-cultural, measurement) and applied research relevant to the development of assessments that will measure student progress toward and attainment of proficiency in English, including English language skills and knowledge necessary for achievement in the academic content areas. Although there is overlap among the suggested elements, they are listed separately in this Framework to facilitate State processes for addressing the elements and to reflect their individual contribution to a valid and reliable ELP assessment system. Although these elements are listed separately, States should keep in mind the inter-relationships among these suggested elements for establishing a comprehensive and cohesive plan for addressing the needs of their English language learners (ELLs).<sup>24</sup>

Generally, as States evaluate and implement their ELP assessments, they should consider the following:

- The characteristics of the State’s ELL population;
- The process and people involved in developing, implementing, and evaluating the ELP assessments;
- The degree to which the ELP assessments fit into the State’s larger plan for educating all of its students; and
- The degree to which the ELP assessments align with the State’s ELP standards.

### Issues Relevant to the Development of High Quality English Language Proficiency Assessments

Criteria relevant to the development and evaluation of academic content standards and assessments have been written about extensively (AERA, APA, NCME, 1999; Green, 1998; Messick, 1989; Webb, Horton, & O’Neal, 2002). Such criteria have been used to ensure that both standards and assessments are of high quality and are technically sound. Some researchers had been concerned whether the methods and procedures used to develop assessment for general population are directly transferable for assessment aimed at diverse ELL populations (Rabinowitz & Sato, 2005).

---

<sup>24</sup> The language of NCLB refers to the targeted student population for this framework as “limited English proficient” (LEP). We recognize that many researchers and practitioners prefer the term English Language Learner (ELL). Consistent with this more general, common usage, this framework will use the term English Language Learner (ELL).

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

The applicability of such criteria to assessments for ELLs is affected by a number of inter-related factors that include:

- The nature of the domain (i.e., English language proficiency);
- The heterogeneity of the ELL population;
- Similarities and differences in the applicability of technical criteria;
- Access and accommodations; and
- State context factors (i.e., history, policies, resources).

These factors are described briefly below and are addressed where relevant in the Suggested Elements and Possible Considerations presented in Section 2 of this Framework. States should keep these factors in mind as they evaluate and improve their English language proficiency assessments for their ELL population. Doing so will ensure technically adequate assessments that facilitate the valid measurement of English language proficiency and achievement of these students, meet the rigorous requirements of Title III, and yield information that will help address the persistent achievement gap.

### The Nature of the Domain: English Language Proficiency

Clear models or frameworks of what acquiring a language involves (i.e., English for students who are speakers of other languages) and clear definitions of what constitutes proficiency in English are necessary for establishing high-quality English language proficiency (ELP) standards and the assessments based on these standards. Researchers have a long-standing debate on the very nature of language acquisition and proficiency (Del Vecchio & Guerrero, 1995; Menken, 2000; Walqui, 2000).

In this Framework, States are encouraged to re-examine the theoretical (e.g., theories of second language acquisition, English language development/acquisition, sociocultural development, sociolinguistics)<sup>25</sup> and research bases for the State's definition of English language proficiency, as well as evaluate the breadth, depth, complexity, and articulation of the associated skills and knowledge expected of students as they progress toward and achieve "proficiency" (See relevant Suggested Elements and Possible Considerations.). Clarity of the theoretical and research-based underpinnings of the State's definition of English language proficiency and the manner and purposefulness with which the State uses such a foundation to drive its assessment development and implementation process are integral to ensuring high-quality assessments that fairly and accurately meet all intended purposes of the State's assessment system.

---

<sup>25</sup> While there may not be just one accepted theory of English language development/acquisition (as there is not one accepted theory for teaching mathematics, for example) much is known and has been validated by experts across several fields, and therefore needs to be considered when developing Statewide systems of standards and assessments.

### The Heterogeneity of the English Language Learner Population

English language learners are diverse in their educational history, background experiences, sociocultural practices, and socioeconomic status. This diversity<sup>26</sup> may affect how different groups of ELLs interpret academic content in curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Abedi, 2004; Abedi & Dietel, 2004; Kopriva, 2000; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003). Some also will be eligible for a range of special education services, if they have been identified as having learning or other disabilities.

In this Framework, States are encouraged to involve experts who have familiarity with the range of diversity represented in their ELL population as they design and implement their assessments for these students (e.g., item content and bias review, field test design and statistical analyses of field test results, test administration training). These experts should be included among other experts (e.g., applied linguists, experts in second language acquisition, English language development, and language testing) at appropriate points in the design, development, review, and implementation of the State's ELP assessments (See relevant Suggested Elements and Possible Considerations.).

Consideration of the heterogeneity of the State's ELL population should *not be interpreted to* suggest different assessments or achievement expectations for different ELL subgroups. Rather, the State's ELP assessment should be accessible to all students. That is, the State's ELP assessment and its tasks (e.g., graphics, cultural/situational references in a test item) should reflect sensitivity to the backgrounds and experiences (e.g., cultural, geographic) of ELLs that may affect their performance on the assessment.

### Similarities and Differences in the Applicability of Technical Criteria

Some researchers had been concerned whether the methods and procedures used to develop assessment for general population are directly transferable for assessment aimed at diverse ELL populations (Rabinowitz & Sato, 2005). Some criteria may not transfer directly or may be less critical for establishing the technical adequacy of ELP assessments. Thus, procedures and criteria widely used for technical reviews of assessments for non-ELL populations and the establishment of the validity of these assessments may need to be modified before they are applied to the assessment of more specialized populations such as ELLs.

This *does not* suggest that current psychometric processes are insufficient. Rather, the suggestion is that some standard practices may need to be tailored because of the particular characteristics of this population and types of tests used to assess them for Title III purposes. Just as there are important differences in developing and validating

---

<sup>26</sup> The point is not that ELLs are diverse/heterogeneous; rather it is how they are diverse/heterogeneous. For example, ELLs differ in their level of literacy and amount of formal education in their native language. Some ELLs are newly arrived; however, most are second or third generation in the U.S. Some ELLs speak and write languages that may have sound systems, grammatical structures, and writing systems that are different from those of English to varying degrees, which can impact the rate and ease of English language acquisition and English literacy learning. The nature of the diversity/heterogeneity of this group may affect the implementation of standards (e.g., curriculum, instruction) and assessments.



## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

assessments for general education students without disabilities versus students with disabilities, there may be important differences (some of which have been described previously) in developing and validating assessments for ELLs. This has also been found true for multiple-choice tests versus performance assessments; ELP tests typically have performance-based sections that can suffer from small sample sizes and affect statistical analyses due to bias or reliability estimates (Kopriva, 2000).

In this Framework, States are encouraged to consider the specific characteristics of their ELL population and the nature of the ELP domain as they:

- Articulate the purpose(s) and role of the ELP assessment in the State's assessment system;
- Develop item and test design specifications and test blueprints;
- Define the assessment's sampling/norming group and groups with whom they may want to pilot items/tasks;
- Plan the State assessment's field test design and statistical analyses (including differential item functioning and other bias identification methodologies);
- Establish criteria and protocols for bias and sensitivity reviews (linguistic, sociocultural, etc.) and specify the full range of experts and committee members within and outside of the educational community necessary for such reviews;
- Develop administration and scoring protocols and specify the qualifications of those needed for test administration and scoring;
- Develop a standard setting protocol and articulate language proficiency level descriptors consistent with the language skills and knowledge specified in the State ELP standards; and
- Monitor and evaluate the implementation of the State ELP assessment, including examining the burden on teachers and LEAs of the administration, scoring, reporting, and security protocols.

Many of the procedures and criteria found appropriate and essential for establishing the technical adequacy of assessments for ELLs are similar to those relevant to the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of State academic content assessments. Therefore, this Framework encourages States to build on or extend wherever possible their current systems (e.g., for Title I), in order to address requirements for their ELP assessments. This will help support a more technically sound, coherent State assessment system. As States routinely review and revise both assessments (Title I and Title III), opportunities to create greater coherence across the two may occur.

### Access and Accommodations

Appropriate access<sup>27</sup> and accommodations<sup>28</sup> for ELLs on ELP assessments should not result in the simplification or alteration of the test's targeted constructs or the misrepresentation of students' achievement of English language proficiency. Rather, methods for providing access and selecting accommodations for ELLs should be based on sound theory (e.g., second language acquisition, English language development/acquisition, measurement) and practice as well as research-based evidence. These methods should be sensitive to the specific characteristics and needs of this population of students and the nature of the assessed domain (English language proficiency).

As discussed previously, the ELL population is unique in a number of key ways (Liu, Anderson, Swierzbis, & Thurlow, 1999; Solano-Flores & Li, 2006) that have an impact on how to assess this population and validate the results. Additionally, the assessed domain of English language proficiency requires careful consideration in terms of the nature of this domain and how it is both similar to and different from academic content domains (e.g., English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies). Furthermore, as ELLs develop English language proficiency, their language abilities often develop at different rates across language domains (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, writing), providing another layer of complexity to ensuring appropriate access to test content and valid measurement of their English language proficiency skills and knowledge.

In this Framework, States are encouraged to consider factors that may interfere with their ELLs' ability to access the tested content (e.g., familiarity with assessment item/task format or presentation, familiarity with the sociocultural context and/or graphics associated with the assessment items/tasks). Appropriate access for ELLs (both with and without disabilities) maximizes their understanding of what is being asked of them and enables them to fully demonstrate their English language proficiency skills and knowledge across the language domains. Additionally, States should consider and clearly specify strategies that appropriately facilitate access in each language domain without compromising the integrity of the assessment and its targeted content/constructs in each of the language domains (e.g., oral prompting requires listening comprehension).

With regard to accommodations on ELP assessments, some ELLs will be eligible for special education services if they have been identified as having learning or other disabilities, and they will require assessment accommodations per their Individualized

---

<sup>27</sup> Appropriate *access* for ELLs on ELP assessments involves the removal of construct-irrelevant factors that may interfere with ELLs' demonstration of English language proficiency across the language domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing).

<sup>28</sup> Appropriate *accommodations* for ELLs on ELP assessments involve changes in testing conditions (e.g., presentation, setting, scheduling/timing) implemented to increase access to test content for the student population. Such changes are deemed fair and reasonable when standardized administration conditions do not provide an equal opportunity for all students to demonstrate what they know and can do. An accommodation is intended to minimize or remove the effects of construct-irrelevant factors on test performance. It is assumed that with or without the accommodation, the same construct is being assessed (Abedi & Lord, 2001; Butler & Stevens, 2001; Holmes & Duron, 2000; Rivera & Stansfield, 2001).

Education Programs (IEPs). Therefore, in this Framework, States are encouraged to carefully articulate their protocols guiding the selection and implementation of accommodations appropriate for their ELP assessments. It is critical that States allow only accommodations that will not alter the assessed constructs, as with other student subgroups. Additionally, States should consider and clearly specify modality-appropriate accommodations that facilitate access for ELLs without compromising the integrity of the assessment and its targeted content/constructs across the language domains.

### State Context Factors: History, Policies, Resources

As discussed in Section 1 of this Framework, there are a number of political and resource factors that affect the development of ELP assessments and their implementation. These contextual factors include readiness, familiarity with the population, and structures and resources to support the instruction and assessment of the population. For example, States that have a history of large numbers of ELLs (e.g., California, Texas, Florida) will have different policies, practices/structures, and resources available to support the achievement of their ELLs compared to states that have recently experienced significant increases in ELLs (“rapid growth” States such as South Carolina, Kentucky, and Indiana have experienced an increase in their PreK-12 public school ELL population by more than 400% in the 2004-2005 school year from the 1994-1995 school year [National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2006]).

### **Overview of Suggested Elements for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Assessments**

Below is an overview of the suggested elements related to high-quality ELP assessments. As mentioned previously, suggested elements are listed separately in this Framework to facilitate State processes for addressing the elements and to reflect their individual contribution to a valid and reliable ELP assessment system. Although these elements are listed separately, States should keep in mind the inter-relationships among these suggested elements for establishing a comprehensive and cohesive plan for addressing the needs of their English language learners (ELLs). Each suggested element is described in greater detail in the following section.

2.1: The State has a comprehensive and cohesive plan to ensure that its English language proficiency (ELP) assessment system meets technical requirements (validity, reliability, freedom from bias). This plan includes ensuring that local assessments meet technical requirements when the State’s ELP assessments for Title III purposes include assessments developed or adopted at both the local and State levels.

2.2: The State’s ELP assessment system is comprised of measures of language skills and knowledge necessary for attaining English language proficiency and for the achievement of challenging State academic content, and these measures are appropriate for each language domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and also for comprehension.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

2.3: The State's ELP assessments are valid for each of their intended uses/purposes (i.e., initial screening, comprehensive evaluation, progress monitoring).

2.4: The State's ELP assessment system yields coherent and valid information for its ELL population, grade ranges, and language proficiency levels, and yields information necessary for Title III instructional and accountability purposes.

2.5: The State's ELP assessments are reliable for each of their intended uses/purposes (i.e., initial screening, comprehensive evaluation, progress monitoring).

2.6: The State's ELP assessments are fair and accessible to the State's ELL population for which they are intended, including ELLs with disabilities.

2.7: The State has a coherent approach to ensuring alignment between each of its ELP assessments, or combination of assessments, and the ELP standards and language skills and knowledge of the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure.

2.8: The State has a system for monitoring and improving the quality of its assessment system, including a plan for ongoing procedures to maintain and improve alignment between the State's ELP assessment and ELP standards over time.

2.9: The State's reporting system facilitates appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretation and use of its ELP assessment data.

2.10: The State reports participation and assessment results for all ELLs in its reports at the school, LEA, and State levels, and the reports for any group or subgroup do not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

2.11: The State produces interpretive guidance following each administration of its ELP assessments.

2.12: The State has a validated standard-setting process, and its associated language proficiency levels, descriptions of language competencies for each language proficiency level, and cut scores appropriately differentiate among English language skills and knowledge in each language domain and each grade range that are necessary for demonstrating progress toward and attainment of English language proficiency, per the State's ELP standards and the theory and research on which the standards are based.

**SECTION 2: ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENTS**

**Suggested Elements for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Assessments**

Suggested Element <sup>29</sup>	Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element <sup>30</sup>
<p>2.1 The State has a comprehensive and coherent plan to ensure that its English language proficiency (ELP) assessment system meets technical requirements (validity, reliability, freedom from bias)<sup>31</sup>.</p> <p>This plan includes ensuring that local assessments<sup>32</sup> meet technical requirements when the State’s ELP assessments for Title III purposes include assessments developed or adopted at both the local and State levels.</p> <p>This plan also includes State ELP assessments employing a matrix design.<sup>33</sup></p> <p>Assessments may include:<sup>34</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Initial screening (for identification purposes)</li> <li>▪ Comprehensive evaluation (for placement purposes)</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s plan for developing, implementing, and validating its ELP assessments (initial screening, comprehensive evaluation, progress monitoring) for grades K-12 in the four language domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing), and as appropriate, for providing guidance to local educational agencies (LEAs) for assessments for Title III purposes ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The assessments are accessible to the State’s English language learner (ELL) population;</li> <li>▪ The assessments are unbiased;</li> <li>▪ The assessments yield reliable and comparable results;</li> <li>▪ The assessments yield valid results and judgments based on these results (e.g., level of English language proficiency);</li> <li>▪ The assessments are aligned with the State’s ELP standards and will yield information consistent with language proficiency levels defined by the State across the language domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and grade ranges;</li> <li>▪ The content covered by the assessment (i.e., in terms of language skills</li> </ul>

<sup>29</sup> Suggested elements are listed separately in this Framework to facilitate State processes for addressing the elements and to reflect their individual contribution to a valid and reliable ELP assessment system. Although these elements are listed separately, States should keep in mind the inter-relationships among these suggested elements for establishing a comprehensive and cohesive plan for addressing the needs of their ELLs.

<sup>30</sup> Some considerations are repeated across suggested elements to ensure that States address the considerations as appropriate.

<sup>31</sup> This Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems (e.g., for State accountability workbooks) or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability; rather this Framework addresses the validity and reliability of ELP assessments for placement and proficiency determinations.

<sup>32</sup> This aspect of the suggested element is included to be consistent with the Title I Peer Review Guidance. We anticipate that, beyond the identification and placement process, very few States will incorporate local assessments to measure student progress toward English language proficiency.

<sup>33</sup> This element is included to be consistent with the Title I Peer Review Guidance. We anticipate that the matrix design may be likely if used to denote an embedded field test section of the test.

<sup>34</sup> This Framework is not suggesting that a single assessment necessarily serve all three purposes. Rather, the Framework encourages States to make sure that all elements of its assessment system are coherent and satisfy appropriate technical requirements (validity, reliability, freedom from bias).

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Progress monitoring (for measuring progress toward English language proficiency)</li> </ul>	<p>and knowledge, breadth, depth, and range of complexity) reflects the ELP standards and supports the assessment’s purpose;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Local assessments for identification and/or placement) yield results that can be compared and aggregated as necessary and appropriate to serve the information, accountability, and reporting needs of the State; and</li> <li>▪ There is a clear process for refining/updating the State ELP assessment system as necessary.</li> </ul> <p>The State’s processes for developing and implementing assessments employing a matrix design ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All forms of an assessment are appropriately aligned with the State’s ELP standards and language proficiency levels across the grade ranges and language domains;</li> <li>▪ All forms of the assessment meet the State’s assessment blueprint;</li> <li>▪ All forms of an assessment are equivalent to one another in terms of coverage of English language skills and knowledge, range of difficulty, and quality; and</li> <li>▪ All assessments yield comparable results across the State’s ELL population.</li> </ul> <p>To the degree possible and appropriate, the State plan/processes build on or extend its existing systems/procedures (e.g., for Title I) for ensuring that its ELP assessments meet technical requirements.</p> <p>Evaluations related to the technical quality of the local assessments (i.e., comparability, reliability, validity, alignment/linkage, accessibility, freedom from bias, usability of results/data for local and State purposes) are conducted by the State and/or by independent evaluators with relevant expertise (e.g., consultants, organizations, State Technical Advisory Committee), as appropriate, for the type of assessment evaluated (i.e., initial screening, comprehensive evaluation).</p>

DRAFT

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	<p>State and/or LEA documents (e.g., technical manuals, administration guides) appropriately reflect the development, implementation, and standardization of the assessment processes/protocols (training, administration, scoring, reporting, security), and as appropriate, address the technical aspects of ELP assessments employing a matrix design.</p> <p>The State’s plan should be developed with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, the State’s systems and infrastructure, and the State’s ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s plan reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.2 The State’s ELP assessment system is comprised of measures of language skills and knowledge necessary for attaining English language proficiency and for the achievement of challenging State academic content, and these measures are appropriate for each language domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and also for comprehension.</p>	<p>The State’s procedures for developing measures for each ELP language domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing) as well as for comprehension reflect purposeful inclusion of the breadth, depth, and range of complexity of language associated with the attainment of English language proficiency and includes language skills and knowledge consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding<sup>35</sup> necessary for the achievement of challenging State academic content. The State’s process includes test blueprints, item specifications, and criteria for determining the inclusion of relevant English language proficiency skills and knowledge.</p> <p>The State has documented evidence (e.g., percentages of items in blueprint, results of factor analyses) that supports actual (as opposed to intended) inclusion of appropriate language skills and knowledge necessary for attaining English language proficiency and for the achievement of challenging State academic content, as well as evidence of adequate coverage of the breadth,</p>

<sup>35</sup> Language skills consistent with higher-order thinking skills and understanding include summarization, comparison-contrast, and persuasion.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	<p>depth, and range of complexity of these language skills and knowledge.</p> <p>The State’s procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the State’s ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.3 The State’s ELP assessments are <b>valid</b> for each of their intended uses/purposes<sup>36</sup> (i.e., initial screening, comprehensive evaluation, progress monitoring) with respect to <i>all</i> of the following categories (from AERA, APA, NCME, 1999):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The purpose(s) of the assessments is specified, including delineation of the types of uses and decisions most appropriate for each assessment; <i>and</i></li> <li>b. The assessments are measuring the language skills and knowledge described in the State’s ELP standards and <i>not</i> knowledge, skills, or other characteristics that are not specified in the ELP standards for all grade ranges, language proficiency levels, and language domain expectations; <i>and</i></li> <li>c. The assessment items and tasks are assessing the breadth,</li> </ul>	<p>The State has established clear criteria for the administration, scoring, analysis, and reporting components of the State ELP assessment system. The State developed a set of management controls or standards for each of these components and has communicated these criteria to its contractor(s), LEAs, and schools. The State requires its contractor(s) to provide specific information on the degree to which each criterion is met.</p> <p>The State uses an extensive system of training and monitoring to ensure that each person who is responsible for handling or administering any portion of its assessments does so in a way that protects the security of the assessments and maintains equivalence of administration conditions across students and schools. The State’s system includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Criteria for administration, scoring, analysis, and reporting that are communicated to State contractor(s), as appropriate.</li> <li>▪ Test security policy and consequences for violation that are</li> </ul>

<sup>36</sup> This Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems (e.g., for State accountability workbooks) or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability; rather this Framework addresses the validity and reliability of ELP assessments for placement and proficiency determinations.



**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
<p>depth, and range of complexity of the intended ELP language skills and knowledge and the items and tasks are appropriate for the grade ranges, language proficiency levels, and language domains; <u>and</u></p> <p>d. The scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the State’s definition of English language proficiency as well as with the definition of each language domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and comprehension, and their structures (i.e., item interrelationships are consistent with the framework from which the test arises); <u>and</u></p> <p>e. The test scores are related to external variables as intended (e.g., scores are correlated strongly with relevant measures of English language proficiency and are weakly correlated, if at all, with irrelevant characteristics/constructs); <u>and</u></p> <p>f. Decisions based on the results of the State ELP assessments are consistent with the purposes for which the assessments were designed; <u>and</u></p> <p>g. The State ELP assessments produce intended consequences, and unintended consequences have been considered and proactively and appropriately addressed.</p>	<p>communicated to the public and to local educators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A written plan for training and monitoring assessment administration conditions across the State, even parts of the State’s ELP assessment system that are local assessments.</li> <li>▪ Monitoring of assessment administration conditions across the State, based on the particulars of its written plan.</li> </ul> <p>The State has developed a validity plan that includes all appropriate categories of validity (e.g., content, predictive, construct, consequential) for each intended purpose (i.e., initial screening, comprehensive evaluation, progress monitoring).</p> <p>The State has a process and schedule for addressing and documenting validity evidence in each of the categories (a-g) as well as a process and schedule for addressing any deficiencies either in the validity of the State’s ELP assessments or in its approach to gathering/documenting validity evidence.</p> <p>Processes/evidence supporting the State’s ELP assessment validity include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minutes or policies of the State Board of Education or State legislative code, technical reports, etc. that clearly define the purpose(s) and role of the State’s ELP assessment system (category a)</li> <li>▪ Studies that provide evidence (qualitative and/or quantitative) that supports the validity of interpretations/uses of results from the State’s ELP assessments vis-à-vis their stated purpose(s) (categories b-g)</li> <li>▪ Studies that provide evidence of comparability of assessments (e.g., computer-based and paper-based) and assessment results across groups and time, including equating or linking studies that support assessment comparability and a process for addressing any deficiencies identified.</li> <li>▪ Studies address:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal validity</li> <li>• Content validity (i.e., related to the State’s definition and operationalization of English language proficiency overall and by language domain)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment/Linkage (see Suggested Element 2.8)</li> <li>• Criterion/Predictive validity</li> <li>• Construct validity</li> <li>• Consequential validity</li> <li>• Comparability</li> </ul> <p>The State has a plan for addressing issues that threaten the validity of its ELP assessment. The plan is based on theory, research, and best practices, as appropriate. And, the plan involves the input of relevant experts (e.g., the State’s Technical Advisory Committee).</p> <p>The State’s validity plan and procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the State’s ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s plan and procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.4 The State’s ELP assessment system yields coherent and valid information for its ELL population, grade ranges, and language proficiency levels, and yields information necessary for Title III instructional and accountability purposes.<sup>37</sup></p>	<p>The State has a plan for ensuring that for each grade range and language domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing), the ELP assessment system provides coherent and valid information by ensuring alignment/linkage of the ELP assessments (i.e., vertical and horizontal alignment; alignment to language proficiency level descriptors; linkage to content area standards) as well as alignment of the ELP assessments to the ELP standards (see other</p>

<sup>37</sup> This Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems (e.g., for State accountability workbooks) or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability; rather this Framework addresses the validity and reliability of ELP assessments for placement and proficiency determination.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	<p>relevant Suggested Elements in this section for more detail).</p> <p>The State’s plan ensures that for each grade range and language domain, the ELP assessment system provides coherent and valid information by ensuring that assessment results appropriately inform determination of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) and includes specification of the relative contribution and plan for how the assessment results contribute to determining AMAOs.<sup>38</sup></p> <p>State materials clearly indicate the purpose of each assessment (placement, progress, etc.) and intended use of the assessment results vis-à-vis Title III requirements.</p> <p>The State’s plan and procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the State’s ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s plan and procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>

---

<sup>38</sup> As mentioned previously, this Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability. However, for the purpose of providing clarification, the AMAOs referred to here relate to measures of progress in learning English (in each of the language domains required under Title III) and attainment of proficiency in English.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
<p>2.5 The State’s ELP assessments are <b>reliable</b> for each of their intended uses/purposes<sup>39</sup> (i.e., initial screening, comprehensive evaluation, progress monitoring) with respect to <i>all</i> of the following categories (based on AERA, APA, NCME, 1999):</p> <p>a. The scores are reliable for the State’s ELL population; <i>and</i></p> <p>b. There is evidence of consistency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- of the conditional standard error of measurement and student classification is consistent at each cut score across ELL subgroups (e.g., subgroups based on level of English language proficiency);</li> <li>-- of item responses (internal consistency); across forms of the test, if applicable;</li> <li>-- of results over time; and</li> <li>-- within and across raters in scoring (intra- and inter-rater reliability); <i>and</i> <p>c. There is generalizability of results across the State’s ELL population and LEAs (i.e., generalizability for all relevant sources of variance across groups, schools, and sampled content).</p> </li></ul>	<p>The State has a process for addressing and documenting evidence of reliability in each of the categories (a-c) as well as a process for addressing any deficiencies either in the reliability of the State’s ELP assessments or in its approach to gathering/documenting evidence of reliability.</p> <p>Processes/evidence supporting the reliability of State’s ELP assessment include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Studies that provide evidence of the precision of the assessments at cut scores and evidence of a systematic process for addressing any deficiencies identified;</li> <li>▪ Studies that provide evidence of consistency of student level classification and evidence of a systematic process for addressing any deficiencies identified; and</li> <li>▪ Studies that address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal consistency and other traditional measures of reliability;</li> <li>• Inter- and intra-rater reliability for constructed-response items/tasks, as appropriate; and</li> <li>• Generalizability (e.g., g studies).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The State’s plan and procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the State’s ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s plan and procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including</p>

<sup>39</sup> This Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems (e.g., for State accountability workbooks) or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability; rather this Framework addresses the validity and reliability of ELP assessments for placement and proficiency determination.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

Suggested Element <sup>29</sup>	Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element <sup>30</sup>
<p>2.6 The State’s ELP assessments are <b>fair and accessible</b> to the State’s ELL population for which they are intended, including ELLs with disabilities, with respect to each of the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The assessments provide an appropriate variety of accommodations for ELLs with disabilities <i>and</i></li> <li>b. Steps have been taken to ensure fairness and accessibility in the development of the assessments <i>and</i></li> <li>c. The use of accommodations yields meaningful scores.</li> </ol>	<p>ELLs with disabilities.</p> <p>The State has appropriate judgmental (e.g., committee reviews) and data-based (e.g., DIF studies) procedures/processes at key points throughout the assessment’s development and implementation to ensure that its ELP assessments are fair and accessible to all ELL subgroups for which they are intended, including ELLs with disabilities.</p> <p>State materials (e.g., training materials, review guidelines) clearly define criteria, which are research based, for judging fairness and accessibility for the State’s ELL population.</p> <p>State materials (e.g., training materials, administration and technical manuals) clearly define the policies and procedures for selecting accommodations for use with the State’s ELP assessments, including specifications that clearly delineate which accommodations may be used for specific sections of the test (e.g., accommodations appropriate for each language domain tested).</p> <p>There is research-based rationale for the appropriateness of accommodations and the impact of the accommodations on the test scores of ELLs with disabilities.</p> <p>The State has a process for examining its accommodations in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Their appropriateness vis-à-vis the ELLs with disabilities eligible for the State ELP assessment, and the degree to which the use of the accommodations is consistent with instructional approaches for each student, as determined by a student’s IEP or 504 plan;</li> <li>▪ Their impact on the assessed constructs (i.e., English language proficiency skills and knowledge) and the inferences based on student performance on accommodated ELP assessments;</li> <li>▪ The degree to which scores for ELLs with disabilities that are based on accommodated administration conditions allow for valid inferences about these students’ English language proficiency skills and knowledge and can be combined meaningfully with scores from non-accommodated</li> </ul>

DRAFT

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	<p>administration conditions; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The degree of effectiveness of specific accommodations for different groups of ELLs with disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>The State has a plan and schedule for routinely monitoring the extent to which accommodations used during ELP assessment administration are consistent with those specified in the IEP or 504 plans for eligible ELLs with disabilities.</p> <p>The State’s plan and procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the State’s ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s plan and procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.7 The State has a coherent approach to ensuring alignment between each of its ELP assessments, or combination of assessments, and the ELP standards and language skills and knowledge of the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure.</p>	<p>The State has developed an assessment system consistent with its ELP standards, including English language skills and knowledge necessary for achievement in the academic content areas (academic language<sup>40</sup>).</p> <p>The State has a process to ensure that full alignment is achieved between its ELP assessment and ELP standards initially and maintained over time through quality control reviews. This process includes:</p>

<sup>40</sup>Broadly defined, academic language is the language (e.g., lexical, grammatical, and discourse features specific to and reflective of a particular context or content area) students need to meaningfully engage with academic content and achieve proficiency in English in the academic setting (Sato, 2007). While there may not be just one accepted definition of academic language, there are numerous resources on the topic (e.g., Aguirre-Munoz, Parks, Benner, Amabisca, & Boscardin, 2006; Bailey, 2007; Bailey, Butler, & Sato, 2007; Butler, Bailey, Stevens, Huang, & Lord, 2004; Cummins, 1980, 2005; Halliday, 1994; Scarcella & Zimmerman, 1998; Schleppegrell, 2001) that may be considered when developing ELP standards and assessments.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
<p>More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The State’s ELP assessments and ELP standards are aligned <b>comprehensively</b>, meaning that the assessments reflect the full <b>range</b> (breadth, depth, complexity) of the ELP standards, including the range of language skills and knowledge needed for achievement in the content areas.</li> <li>▪ The State’s ELP assessments reflect the same <b>degree and pattern of emphasis</b> that are reflected in the State’s ELP standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Necessary qualifications/expertise of individuals (internal, external) involved in the State’s assessment development process;</li> <li>▪ Necessary qualifications/expertise of individuals (internal, external) involved in the State’s alignment process;</li> <li>▪ Criteria for identifying and defining the academic language in the State’s academic content standards, including the language knowledge and skills associated with higher-order thinking and understanding challenging academic content (see related Suggested Elements 1.5 and 1.9 in Section 1: Standards);</li> <li>▪ Criteria and methodology appropriate for evaluating the degree of alignment between the State’s ELP standards and assessments, given their targeted population, specific purpose(s), and “content” (i.e., English language proficiency skills and knowledge and academic language); and</li> <li>▪ Independent alignment studies (i.e., conducted by an entity other than the State or its assessment contractor) that yield evidence of degree of alignment and an associated systematic process for addressing any gaps or weaknesses identified in these studies.</li> </ul> <p>If the State has multiple assessments within a grade range or language domain, the State has a process for ensuring that this combination of assessments is aligned to the full scope (breadth, depth, range of complexity) of the ELP standards.</p> <p>The State’s assessment plan, assessment blueprints, and/or item/task specifications describe how all ELP standards are assessed and how the language domains are sampled to lead to valid inferences about student performance on the standards, individually and in the aggregate.</p> <p>The State has a written plan to ensure that its assessment system reflects the full range of language skills and knowledge (breadth, depth, complexity) specified in its ELP standards, as well as the range of language skills and knowledge needed for achievement in the academic content areas. This plan yields evidence that:</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

Suggested Element <sup>29</sup>	Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element <sup>30</sup>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The full scope of the standards and their differential emphases are reflected in the assessment plan/blueprints/specifications; and</li> <li>▪ The assessments match the plan/blueprints/specifications.</li> </ul> <p>The number of score points on the State’s ELP assessment is consistent with the representation of language skills and knowledge within and across each language domain. The State has detailed assessment specifications and a description of the process used to ensure that its ELP assessment system reflects the degree and patterns of emphasis that are specified in its ELP standards.</p> <p>The State is implementing on-going quality control reviews to ensure that the system remains fully aligned over time.</p> <p>The State’s plan and procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, alignment/linkage, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the State’s ELL population <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s plan and procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.8 The State has a system for monitoring and improving the quality of its assessment system.</p>	<p>The State has a process for using the information gained through its series of studies related to validity, reliability, fairness/accessibility, and alignment/linkage to eliminate gaps and address weaknesses, and the State has a plan for regular quality review.</p> <p>The State has a process and schedule for monitoring the implementation of the</p>



**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	<p>State’s ELP assessments and related consequences.</p> <p>The State relies on multiple sources of data/information for evaluating the quality and effectiveness of its ELP assessments (e.g., internal and external monitoring, qualitative data/analyses, quantitative data/analyses).</p> <p>Documents relevant to these monitoring and evaluation processes explicitly address the purpose(s) and use(s) of the findings vis-à-vis relevant local, State, and federal policy/requirements for ELLs.</p> <p>The State’s procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the ELL population, and familiarity with the State’s infrastructure, resources, and goals <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.9 The State’s reporting system facilitates appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretation and use of its ELP assessment data.<sup>41</sup></p> <p>The State has a process for producing itemized score analyses</p>	<p>The State’s reporting system includes supporting information to facilitate accurate and appropriate interpretation of data for those who will receive and use its reports, such as information about the content and structure of its assessments, and how the ELP assessments are related to its ELP and academic content standards.</p>

<sup>41</sup> This Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems (e.g., for State accountability workbooks) or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability; rather this Framework addresses the validity and reliability of ELP assessments for placement and proficiency determination.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
<p>(e.g., by language domain, by language skill clusters) so that parents, teachers, and principals can interpret and address the specific English language needs of students.</p>	<p>In its reports at the student, classroom, school, and LEA levels, the State includes results for each of its ELP standards and also each of the language domains within these standards, to the extent that these subscores are based on enough items or score points to be meaningful.</p> <p>The State’s reporting system supports longitudinal reporting for the purposes of tracking student improvement/achievement.</p> <p>The State’s reporting system for its ELP assessment is similar to its other assessment reporting systems, as appropriate and feasible.</p> <p>The State has designed reports and communicated assessment results in terms of its language proficiency levels and the meaning of these levels.</p> <p>The State uses a variety of ways to disseminate information related to assessment results, such as manuals, bulletins, reports of results, and Websites to reach the full range of users of the assessment results. Effective dissemination of information may necessitate the translation of materials into other languages for users who do not read English.</p> <p>The State has a system for training educators on the appropriate interpretation and use of assessment results. State training materials include: the purpose and content of the assessments, the reliability of the assessment scores, sufficient information to allow use of the assessment results in making sound educational decisions or for conducting scientifically based research to improve educational outcomes, and ways in which the assessment results should <i>not</i> be used.</p> <p>The State’s reporting system (e.g., score reports, interpretive guides) should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied</p>

DRAFT

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	<p>linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the ELL population, and familiarity with the State’s infrastructure, resources, and goals <i>and</i> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State’s development and implementation of its reporting system reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.10 The State reports participation and assessment results for all ELLs in its reports at the school, LEA, and State levels, and the reports for any group or subgroup do not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.</p>	<p>The State reports participation and performance results for all ELLs and for each required subgroup at the school, LEA, and State levels</p> <p>The State has established and justified the minimum number and minimum and maximum proportions of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for any group or subgroup to ensure that personally identifiable information about any individual student is not reported publicly. The State has clear descriptions of rules for determining whether data are reported for a group or subgroup as well as a description of how these rules are implemented and monitored.</p> <p>The State has a system for securely maintaining student-level assessment data to protect student confidentiality.</p> <p>The State has a clear policy and detailed procedures for allowing access to its student-level assessment data as well as a process for ensuring that electronic student files that are needed by both the LEA and SEA are available and can be shared across systems in a manner that is secure both physically and electronically.</p>
<p>2.11 The State produces interpretive guidance following each administration of its ELP assessments. a. The reported information is valid and reliable information regarding language proficiency in relation to the State’s ELP standards;</p>	<p>The State has a plan and schedule for disseminating as soon as possible after each assessment administration the assessment scores and information regarding student performance across the language domains defined in the State’s ELP standards. These reports indicate which of the language proficiency levels the student’s scores correspond to.</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
<p>b. The reports provide information for parents, teachers, and principals to help them understand and address students' English language needs and is displayed in a format and language that is understandable to parents, teachers, and principals and are the reports accompanied by interpretive guidance for these audiences.</p> <p>c. The State reports are delivered to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as possible after the assessment is administered.</p>	<p>The State includes interpretive guidance with each of the reports and supports local efforts to translate this guidance as needed to make it accessible to parents who do not read English. The guidance includes information about the reliability of the scores that are reported.</p> <p>The State includes interpretive guidance with each of the reports and supports local efforts to appropriately use the information to guide curricular and instructional strategies/programs for the ELLs.</p> <p>Documentation clearly depicts the scoring and reporting timeline for the State ELP assessment.</p> <p>All total scores, language domain scores, and subdomain scores have sufficient reliability at the level each is reported.</p> <p>The State's procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the ELL population, and familiarity with the State's infrastructure, resources, and goals <i>and</i> also from the State's Technical Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The composition of groups involved in the State's development and dissemination of its guidance reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State's ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.</p>
<p>2.12 The State has a validated standard-setting process, and its associated language proficiency levels, descriptions of language competencies for each language proficiency level, and cut scores appropriately differentiate among English language skills and knowledge in each language domain and each grade</p>	<p>The standard-setting approach is appropriate for the State's reporting and use of the ELP assessment results. For example, if separate language domain scores are reported with proficiency levels (performance categories), the State has used an appropriate standard setting approach.</p> <p>The State's ELP assessments yield scores that reflect the full range of English</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
<p>range that are necessary for demonstrating progress toward and attainment of English language proficiency, per the State ELP standards and the theory and research on which the standards are based.</p>	<p>language proficiency reflected by the State’s ELP standards, and assessment results are expressed in terms of the language proficiency levels, not just scale scores or percentiles.</p> <p>The State’s ELP assessments have sufficient items/tasks (score points) at each language proficiency level to allow students to demonstrate the full range of language skills and knowledge specified in the State’s ELP standards.</p> <p>The State’s ELP assessments yield scores that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP language proficiency levels overall and across each language domain and grade range.</p> <p>State documentation and interpretive materials related to the ELP language proficiency levels are complete, accurate, and clearly written so that the range of users and the general public can readily understand the information. The documentation may address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of language proficiency levels and the labels for each level;</li> <li>▪ The relative contribution of each language domain and overall performance (total score) to judgments of proficiency;</li> <li>▪ The standard-setting methodology, including the method(s) used to determine cut scores;</li> <li>▪ Descriptions of the individuals involved in the standard-setting process, including the articulation of the proficiency level descriptors; and</li> <li>▪ The validation of the State language proficiency levels against external measures (e.g., performance on content assessments).</li> </ul> <p>The State’s procedures should be developed and implemented with broad input from within and outside of the educational community. Such input might come from committees of specialists with relevant knowledge of curriculum (PK-16), instruction, assessment, measurement, psychometrics, accountability, policy, content, applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language testing, and the ELL population, and familiarity with the State’s infrastructure, resources, and goals <u>and</u> also from the State’s Technical Advisory Committee.</p>

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

<b>Suggested Element<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>Possible Considerations for Addressing the Suggested Element<sup>30</sup></b>
	The composition of groups involved in the State’s standard setting procedures reflects a broad range of relevant stakeholders and experts, including individuals knowledgeable and concerned about the State’s ELL population including ELLs with disabilities.

DRAFT

## Recommendations for Application of the Framework

The purpose of this Framework is to provide a clear statement of the criteria that States (including consortia<sup>42</sup>) and their development partners should address as they develop and implement their ELP standards and assessments. The ultimate goals for the LEP Partnership in developing this Framework are: (1) the development of high-quality ELP standards and ELP assessments and (2) the effective implementation of these standards and assessments in ways that support students' attainment of English language proficiency and language skills and knowledge necessary for achievement in the academic content areas.

Therefore, the purpose of this Framework is to provide States with information on:

- **Suggested elements** related to evaluating and improving the quality of English language proficiency (ELP) standards and assessments;
- **Possible Considerations** to assist States in the evaluation and improvement of the quality of their ELP standards and assessments—this includes specific and practical guidance on how to approach each suggested element; and
- **Resources** States can use to inform their evaluation and improvement of the quality of their ELP standards and assessments.

This Framework is intended for use by States to **evaluate** and **improve** their current ELP standards and assessments and to **identify technical assistance needs** related to their ELP standards and assessments and the implementation of Title III requirements for these standards and assessments, per the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

To the extent appropriate and practicable, this draft Framework for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments:

- Uses/adapts language from the Title I *Standards and Assessments Peer Review Guidance* (April 2004). This is done to (a) encourage efficiencies between State NCLB Title I and Title III implementation efforts, (b) build from knowledge and experience States have developed to meet standards and assessment requirements for Title I, and (c) apply “lessons learned” from standards and assessment implementation and guidance for Title I.
- Addresses challenges that States are facing as they work to meet the requirements of Title III, including those issues raised during the public comment period of the three public meetings organized by the U.S. Department of Education (June 20, July 18, and July 26, 2007).
- Is based on research in relevant areas including standards, assessment, second language acquisition, academic language, alignment and linkage, and the English language learner population.

---

<sup>42</sup>Each State in a consortium should make sure that results from validity studies conducted by the consortium are applicable to both the particular ELL population (key subgroups, as defined by the State vis-à-vis the consortium's definition of subgroups) and context (e.g., priorities, uses of results) of the State.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Includes input from experts with knowledge and experience in relevant areas including standards, curriculum, assessment, professional development, psychometrics, second language acquisition, academic language, alignment and linkage, and the English language learner population.
- Seeks to balance specific and practical guidance with flexibility needed by States, given their varying population characteristics, resources, experiences, and stages of implementation.
- Provides States with structure/detail whether they are in earlier stages of implementation or already have full systems in place and need theory- and research-based criteria/parameters for evaluation and improvement.

This Framework presents information for a model ELP standards and assessment program that is based on research-based theory (including second language acquisition, English language development/acquisition, sociocultural, measurement), applied research, and best/promising practices. It is intended to guide the establishment of valid and accessible State ELP standards and assessments that support effective instruction. The Department believes that high-quality ELP standards and assessments are more likely when the Framework is applied using a transparent evaluation and support process that involves experts with knowledge and experience in relevant areas of the field, including English language acquisition, academic language, standards, curriculum, assessment, psychometrics, alignment and linkage, and the English language learner population, in an on-going conversation with States. This Framework does not address the validity and reliability of State accountability systems (e.g., for State accountability workbooks) or how the results/uses of ELP assessments ought to contribute to State accountability; rather this Framework addresses the validity and reliability of ELP standards and assessments for placement and proficiency determinations.

The Department invites comments on this first draft document from all States. Reviewers are invited to comment on/make recommendations related to:

- The appropriateness and clarity of each suggested element;
- The comprehensiveness, coherence, and relationships among the suggested elements as a set; and
- The clarity and utility of the possible considerations related to each suggested element.

Additionally, reviewers are invited to:

- Nominate resources for inclusion in “Recommended Resources” and
- Recommend terminology and definitions for the Glossary.

It is anticipated that the refinement of this Framework will be further enhanced by a self-review and feedback from States (see the Introduction of the draft Framework [pp. 4-5] for a description of the pilot review). The Department will work with States or groups of States willing to engage in a self-review of the Framework document by conducting a self-review of State ELP standards and assessments. Information gathered from the pilot will focus on informing and improving another draft of this Framework document as well as identifying States’ technical assistance needs. For States involved in the review, no report will be



**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

made to the Department by expert peers and technical assistance providers about State ELP standards or assessment systems.

**Instructions for submitting comments/recommendations:**

Email comments and recommendations to either the LEP Partnership or to the Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center.

LEP Partnership

**LEP.Partnership@ed.gov**

Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center

**lepframework@aacompcenter.org**

or

Edynn Sato, Ph.D., Director of Special Populations at **esato@wested.org**

Comments and recommendations should be submitted no later than **December 15, 2007**.

DRAFT

## Resources<sup>43</sup>

The following are resources relevant to English language proficiency, the English language learner population, and standards and assessments. This list of resources is representative, not inclusive.

- Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 4–14.
- Abedi, J., & Dietel, R. (2004). Challenges in the No Child Left Behind Act for English language learners. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85, 782-785.
- Abedi, J., & Nambiar, V. V. (Eds.). (in press). *English language proficiency assessment in the United States: Current status and future practice*. Davis: University of California, Davis, School of Education, and University of California, Los Angeles, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Albus, D., Klein, J. A., Liu, K., & Thurlow, M. (2004). *Connecting English language proficiency, statewide assessments, and classroom proficiency* (LEP Projects Report No. 5). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved September 27, 2007, from <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/LEP5.html>
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: AERA.
- Anderson, M. E., Minnema, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Hall-Lande, J. (2005). *Confronting the unique challenges of including English language learners with disabilities in statewide assessments*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved on September 18, 2007, from <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/ELLsDisReport9.html>
- Apthorp, H. S., D'Amato, E. D., & Richardson, A. (2002). *Effective standards-based practices for Native American students: A review of research literature*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1982). The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 449-465.
- Bailey, A. L. (2007). *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

---

<sup>43</sup> The list of resources is representative and not inclusive. These resources have not undergone a vetting process to verify their relevance, quality, and utility. Inclusion should not be viewed as an endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education or by the Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Bailey, A. L., Butler, F. A., & Sato, E. (2007). Standards-to-standards linkage under Title III: Exploring common language demands in ELD and science standards. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 20(1), 53-78.
- Baker, E. L. (2005). *Aligning curriculum, standards, and assessments: Fulfilling the promise of school reform* (CSE Report No. 645). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Berk, R. A. (1986). A consumer's guide to setting performance standards on criterion-referenced tests. *Review of Educational Research*, 56(1), 137-172.
- Butler, F. A., & Stevens, R. (1998). *Initial steps in the validation of the second language proficiency descriptors for public high schools, colleges, and universities in California: Writing* (CSE Technical Report No. 497). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Carr, J., & Lagunoff, R. (2006). *The map of standards for English learners, set grades K-5 and 6-12*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. (2003). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement* (Research Brief No. 10). Berkeley, CA: Author. Available: [http://crede.berkeley.edu/research/llaa/1.1\\_final.html](http://crede.berkeley.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html)
- Cizek, G. (2001). *Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods, and perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cook, H. G. (2006). Aligning English language proficiency tests to English language learning standards. In Council of Chief State School Officers, *Aligning assessment to guide the learning of all students: Six reports* (pp. 131-154). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2002). *Alignment study in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies of state standards and assessments in four states*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2006). *Creating aligned standards and assessment systems*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of proficiency in bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics: Current issues in bilingual education, 1980* (pp. 81-103). Washington, DC: Georgetown University.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Cummins, J. (2005). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In P. A. Richard-Amato and M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Academic success for English language learners* (pp. 76-86). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Goh, D. S. (2004). *Assessment accommodations for diverse learners*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gottlieb, M., Carnuccio, L. M., Ernst-Slavit, G., & Katz, A. (2006). *PreK-12 English language proficiency standards*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Haertel, E., & Herman, J. (2005). *A historical perspective on validity arguments for accountability testing* (CSE Report No. 654). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Heritage, M., Silva, N., & Pierce, M. (2007). Academic English: A view from the classroom. In A.L.Bailey (Ed.), *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test* (pp. 171-210). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jaeger, R. M. (1989). Certification of student competence. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 485–514). New York: Macmillan.
- Johnstone, C., Altman, J., & Thurlow, M. (2006). *Universal design online manual*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Knapp, M., Copland, M. A., Plecki, M., & Portin, B. S. (2006). *Leading, learning, and leadership support*. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Kolen, M. J., & Brennan, R. L. (2004). *Test equating, scaling, and linking: Methods and practices* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kopriva, R. (2000). *Ensuring accuracy in testing for English language learners*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Kopriva, R.J. (2007). *Improving testing for English language learners: A comprehensive approach to designing, building, implementing and interpreting better academic assessments*, Erlbaum Routledge Publishers; NY, NY.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Koretz, D. (2005). *Alignment, high stakes, and the inflation of test scores* (CSE Report No. 655). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- LaMarca, P. M., Redfield, D., Winter, P. C., Bailey, A., & Hansche Despriet, L. (2000). *State standards and state assessment systems: A guide to alignment*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Lazarín, M. (2006). *Improving assessment and accountability for English language learners in the No Child Left Behind Act* (Issue Brief No. 16). Washington, DC: The National Council of La Raza.
- Lee, O., & Fradd, S. H. (1998). Science for all, including students from non-English-language backgrounds. *Educational Researcher*, 27(4), 12-21.
- Lewis, D. M., Mitzel, H. C., & Green, D. R. (1996, June) *Standard setting: A bookmark approach*. Paper presented at the Council of Chief State School Officers Large-Scale Assessment Conference, Colorado Springs, CO.
- Linn, R. L. (2003). Performance standards: Utility for different uses of assessments. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(31). Retrieved March 8, 2006, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n31>
- Livingston, S. A., & Zeikey, M. J. (1982). *Passing scores: A manual for setting standards of performance on educational and occupational tests*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Malagón, M. H., Rosenberg, M. B., & Winter, P. C. (2006). Developing aligned performance level descriptors for the English language development assessment K-2 inventories. In Council of Chief State School Officers, *Aligning assessment to guide the learning of all students: Six reports* (pp. 155-173). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13-103). New York: Macmillan.
- Mitzel, H. C. (2005). *Consistency for state achievement standards under NCLB*. Paper presented to CAS SCASS Study Group. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- National Research Council. (2002). In J. Koenig (Ed.), *Reporting test results for students with disabilities and English-language learners*. Washington, DC: National Academies.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- National Task Force on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics. (2007). *Expanding and improving early education for Hispanics* (Main Report). Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Olson, B., Mead, R., & Payne, D. (2002). *A report of a standard setting method for alternate assessments for students with significant disabilities* (NCEO Synthesis Report No. 47). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Rabinowitz, S. (2004). *Design considerations for building out NCLB state assessment systems*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Rabinowitz, S., Roeber, E., Schroeder, C., & Sheinker, J. (with CAS SCASS Study Group: Transitions in Assessment from IASA to NCLB). (2006). *Creating aligned standards and assessment systems*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Rabinowitz, S. N., & Sato, E. (2005). *The technical adequacy of assessments for alternate student populations: Guidelines for consumers and developers*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Raymond, M. R. & Reid, J. B. (2001). Who made thee judge? Selecting and training participants for standard setting. In G. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods, and perspectives* (pp. 119–157). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rivera, C., & Collum, E. (Eds.). (2006). *State assessment policy and practice for English language learners: A national perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., & Fix, M. (2000). *Overlooked & underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Sandova, J. H., Frisby, C. L., Geisinger, K. F., Ramos-Grenier, J., & Scheuneman, J. D. (Eds.). (1998). *Test interpretation and diversity: Achieving equity in assessment*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sato, E. (2007). *Rethinking alignment for English language learner assessments and standards: Issues and implications for extending current models*. Paper commissioned by the Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Sato, E., & Rabinowitz, S. (forthcoming). *Knowing what English language learners know: Implications for assessment, practice, and policy* [working title]. San Francisco: WestEd.

- Scarcella, R. (2003). *Academic English: A conceptual framework*. The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Technical Report 2003-1. Retrieved July 3, 2007, from [http://www.lmri.ucsb.edu/publications/03\\_scarcella.pdf](http://www.lmri.ucsb.edu/publications/03_scarcella.pdf)
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2001). Linguistic features of the language of schooling. *Linguistics and Education*, 12, 431-459.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2006). The challenges of academic language in school subjects. Available in English: <http://www.soe.umich.edu/events/als/downloads/schleppegrellp.html> From I. Lindberg & K. Sandwall (Eds.), *Språket och kunskapen: att lära på sitt andraspråk i skola och högskola* (pp. 47-69). Göteborg, Sweden: Göteborgs universitet institutet för svenska som andraspråk.
- Short, D. J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners* (A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Snow, C. E., Cancini, H., Gonzalez, P., & Shriberg, E. (1989). Giving formal definitions: An oral language correlate of school literacy. In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Classrooms and literacy* (pp. 233-249). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Solano-Flores, G., & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-language learners. *Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 3-13.
- The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) ELL Task Force. (2006). *NCTE position paper on the role of English teachers in educating English language learners (ELLs)*. Retrieved September 20, 2007, from <http://www.ncte.org/edpolicy/ell/about/124545.htm>
- Thurlow, M., Minnema, J., & Treat, J. (2004). *A review of 50 states' online large-scale assessment policies: Are English language learners with disabilities considered?* (ELLs with Disabilities Report No. 5). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Available: <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/ELLsDisReport5.html>
- Webb, N. (1999). *Alignment of science and mathematics standards and assessments in four states*. Madison: University of Wisconsin–Madison, National Institute for Science Education.
- Webb, N. L. (2007). Issues related to judging the alignment of curriculum standards and assessments. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 20(1), 7-25.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Webb, N. L., Alt, M., Ely, R., Cormier, M., & Vesperman, B. (2006). The Web alignment tool: Development, refinement, and dissemination. In Council of Chief State School Officers, *Aligning assessment to guide the learning of all students: Six reports* (pp. 1-30). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Wiley, T. G. (2005). *Literacy and language diversity in the United States*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Winter, P. C., Kopriva, R. J., Chen, C. S., & Emick, J. E. (2006). Exploring individual and item factors that affect assessment validity for diverse learners: Results from a large-scale cognitive lab. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 16(4) 267-276.
- Wise, L., & Alt, M. (2006). Assessing vertical alignment. In Council of Chief State School Officers, *Aligning assessment to guide the learning of all students: Six reports* (pp. 57-74). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Wise, L. L., Zhang, L., Winter, P., Taylor, L., & Becker, D. E. (2006). Vertical alignment of grade-level expectations for student achievement: Report of a pilot study. In Council of Chief State School Officers, *Aligning assessment to guide the learning of all students: Six reports* (pp. 75-130). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.



## References

- Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 4–14.
- Abedi, J., & Dietel, R. (2004). Challenges in the No Child Left Behind Act for English language learners. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85, 782-785.
- Abedi, J., & Lord, C. (2001). The language factor in mathematics tests. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 14(3), 219-234.
- Aguirre-Munoz, Z., Parks, J.E., Benner, A., Amabisca, A. & Boscardin, C.K. (2006). *Consequences and Validity of Performance Assessment for English Language Learners: Conceptualizing & Developing Teachers' Expertise in Academic Language*. CRESST/UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation. Available at <http://www.cse.ucla.edu/products/reports/R700.pdf>.
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: AERA.
- Bailey, A. L. (2007). *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bailey, A., Butler, F., & Sato, E. (2007). Standards-to-standards linkage under Title III: Exploring common language demands in ELD and science standards. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 20 (1), 53-78.
- Butler, F. A., Bailey A. L., Stevens, R., Huang, B., & Lord, C. (2004). *Academic English in fifth-grade mathematics, science, and social studies textbooks*. (Final Deliverable to IES, Contract No. R305B960002; currently available as CSE Rep. No. 642). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).
- Butler, F.A. & Stevens, R. (2001). Standardized assessment of the content knowledge of English Language Learners K-12: Current trends and old dilemmas. *Language Testing* 2001, 18(4), 409-427.
- Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of proficiency in bilingual education. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics: Current issues in bilingual education, 1980* (pp. 81-103). Washington, DC: Georgetown University.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Cummins, J. (2005). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In P.A. Richard-Amato and M.A. Snow (Eds.), *Academic success for English language learners* (pp. 76-86). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Del Vecchio, A., & Guerrero, M. (1995). *Handbook of English language proficiency tests*. Albuquerque: New Mexico Highlands University, Evaluation Assistance Center, Western Region. Retrieved September 21, 2007 from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/eacwest/elptests.htm>
- Green, D. R. (1998). Consequential aspects of the validity of achievement tests: A publisher's point of view. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices*, 17(2), 16–19.
- Halliday, M.A.K., (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Holmes, D. & Duron, S. (2000). *LEP students and high stakes assessment*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, US Department of Education.
- Kopriva, R. (2000). *Ensuring accuracy in testing for English language learners*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Liu, K., Anderson, M. E., Swierzbis, B., & Thurlow, M. (1999). *Bilingual accommodations for limited English proficient students on statewide reading tests: Phase I* (Minnesota Report 20). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Menken, K. (2000). *What are the critical issues in wide-scale assessment of English language learners?* (Issue Brief 6). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Center for the Study of Language and Education.
- Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13-103). New York: Macmillan.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2006). *How many school-aged English language learners (ELLs) are there in the U.S?* (NCELA FAQ No. 1). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 22, 2007 from the World Wide Web at <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/faq/01leps.html>
- Rabinowitz, S., & Sato, E. (2005). *A technical review of high-stakes assessments for English language learners*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Rivera, C. & Stansfield, C.W. (2001). *The effects of linguistic simplification of science test items on performance of Limited English Proficient and monolingual English-speaking students*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

## DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Sato, E. (2007). *Rethinking alignment for English language learner assessments and standards: Issues and implications for extending current models*. Paper commissioned by the Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Sato, E., Lagunoff, R., Worth, P., Bailey, A. L., & Butler, F. A. (2005). *ELD Standards Linkage and Test Alignment Under Title III: A Pilot Study of the CELDT and the California ELD and Content Standards*. (Final Report to the California Department of Education). San Francisco: WestEd.
- Sato, E., & Rabinowitz, S. (forthcoming-a). *Knowing what English language learners know: Implications for assessment, practice, and policy* [working title]. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Sato, E. & Rabinowitz, S. (forthcoming-b). *Linguistic modification as an accommodation for English language learners: Intended versus actual impact on linguistic and cognitive processing* [working title]. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Sato, E., Rabinowitz, S., & Gallagher, C. (forthcoming). *Access and Special Student Populations—the Similarities/Differences in the Needs of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities: Implications for Standards, Assessment, and Instruction* [working title]. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Scarcella, R., & Zimmerman, C. (1998). Academic words and gender: ESL student performance on a test of academic lexicon. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 27–49.
- Schleppegrell, M.J. (2001). Linguistic features of the language of schooling. *Linguistics and Education*, 12 (4), 431-459.
- Solano-Flores, G., & Li, M. (2006). The use of generalizability (g) theory in the testing of linguistic minorities. *Educational Measurement, Issues and Practice*, 25, 13-22.
- Solano-Flores, G. & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-language learners. *Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 3-13.
- Walqui, A. (2000). *Access and engagement: Program design and instructional approaches for immigrant students in secondary school*. McHenry, IL: Delta Publishing.
- Webb, N. L., Horton, M., & O’Neal, S. (2002, April). *An analysis of the alignment between language arts standards and assessments for four states*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT**

WestEd. (2004). Alignment Study: Louisiana Content Standards and the Louisiana Alternate Assessment (LAA). San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

DRAFT

## Acknowledgements

Dr. Edynn Sato and Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz of the Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center (AACC) would like to thank the following reviewers for their input on early versions of the *Framework for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments*.

Jamal Abedi, Ph.D.  
Gary Cook, Ph.D.  
Richard Duran, Ph.D.  
Ellen Forte, Ph.D.  
Carole Gallagher, Ph.D.  
Margot Gottlieb, Ph.D.  
Kevin Huang, Ph.D.  
Dorry Kenyon, Ph.D.  
Rachel Lagunoff, Ph.D.  
Pamela McCabe  
Joseph McCrary D.P.A  
Theodor Rebarber  
Charlene Rivera, Ph.D.  
Marla Perez-Selles  
Ursula Sexton  
Ann-Marie Wiese, Ph.D.

The authors also would like to thank Ms. Holly McKeag and Dr. Roger Frantz for their assistance with the preparation of this document.

The information presented in this Framework may not necessarily reflect the views of the individuals listed. The AACC and its prime host agency, WestEd, are responsible for the contents of this document.