

Longitudinal Analysis using English Language Proficiency Assessment for Beaverton School District

Course Title: Research Methods in Engineering Management Course Number: ETM 565 / 665 Instructor: Dr. Timothy R. Anderson Term: Spring Year: 2011 Author: Fei Huang

Table of Content:

Abbreviation:				
Introduction:	4			
Background Information	5			
The ELD program in BSD:	5			
Oregon ELPA:				
Oregon AMAOs:	9			
ELPA Longitudinal Analysis	11			
Conclusion & Recommendation	16			
Reference:	17			
Appendix				
Appendix A: ELPA Scale Score Correlations				
Appendix B: ELPA Level Correlations				
Appendix C: Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey Scores Table				
Appendix D: BSD ELL Intake & Investigation Flowchart Process				
Appendix E: AMAO Annual Measurement of Achievement Objectives				
•				

Abbreviation:

AMAO – Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives BSD – Beaverton School District CALP - Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency ELA – English Language Arts ELD – English Language Development ELL – English Language Learner ELPA – English Language Proficiency Assessment ESEA – Elementary and Secondary Education Act ESL – English as Second Language HLS – Home Language Survey NCLB - No Child Left Behind OAKS - Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills ODE – Oregon Department of Education PRS – Parent Refused Service SPED – Special Education WMLS-RNU - Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey®-Revised Normative Update

Introduction:

Federal Law, NCLB Titles III requires all States and School Districts to provide ELD service to ensuring that all ELL to have equal and meaningful access from their public education. [1] [2]

All ELD service must follow ORS 336.079; "Special English courses for certain children. Specific courses to teach speaking, reading and writing of the English language shall be provided at kindergarten and each grade level to those children who are unable to profit from classes taught in English. Such courses shall be taught to such a level in school as may be required until children are able to profit from classes conducted in English." [3]

In compliance with Title III of the Federal ESEA (NCLB), all State must also implement ELPA to measure the proficiency in non-native English speakers as they progress through ELD services. As well as AMAO to measure and report on progress toward and attainment of English proficiency and academic achievement standards; and hold local education agencies accountable for meeting increasing AMAO targets for English language proficiency over time. [4]

This purposes report will going to detail explain how ELPA & AMAO is structured in Oregon and given a detail analysis of advantage and disadvantage when evaluated ELD program with ELPA & AMAO using a longitudinal analysis approach.

Background Information

The ELD program in BSD:

In compliance with Federal and State Law, when family transfer into any Oregon school district, the district is responsible to collect family language information through the "Home Language Survey". [5]

Home Language Survey
29. Is a language other than English the language the student first learned to speak or the language used at home or with friends?
IF YES, INDICATE LANGUAGE
IF YES, YOUR CHILD'S ENGLISH ABILITY WILL BE ASSESSED. ENGLISH LANGUAGE SERVICES WILL ONLY BE PROVIDED IF STUDENT IS ELIGIBLE.
30. SEND PRINTED MATERIALS IN LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME (JE AVAILABLE)?

Generally once student is identify that there is a language other then English the language the student first learned to speak or the language use at home with or with Friends; then the ESL department will be require to assess this student's English ability to in order to verify if the student will be qualified for the ELD program in BSD. There is one exception to the rule which is a "Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas students, and whom come from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency". [2]

The English language assessment tool adopted by BSD is "Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey®–Revised Normative Update", which was created by a third party vendor name "Riverside Publishing". [6]

WMLS includes seven individually administered tests, which are "Picture Vocabulary, Verbal Analogies, Letter-Word Identification, Dictation, Understanding Directions, Story Recall and Passage". Once the tests are administered the tester needs to input the score into the WMLS-R NU Scoring and Reporting Program, this program provides all derived scores for the individual tests and clusters. "The program prints a student's scores and a narrative report of the student's language competence. In addition, the program provides age/grade profiles, as well as standard score or percentile rank profiles. The estimated time to input and receive a student's scores and narrative is less than five minutes." [6]

WMLS gives lots variety and very detail scores, the one score that was commonly use by most of the school district is CALP level. CALP range mostly integers from level 1 to 6, with exception of level 3.5 and 4.5. [Please see Appendix C] Test administrator does not require administrating all 7 test in order to get valid CALP level, and not all school district administrate all 7 tests either. Some school district only administrate a minimum of 4 test to determent the CALP level, never the less BSD choose to administrate all 7 tests to get the completed detail score on student's English language ability. If a student's WMLS's Bored English Ability Total's CALP score is below 4.5 then BSD will enroll this student into the ELD program. Not all students require take or retake the BSD's WMLS test to enter BSD's ELD program. BSD also honor other Oregon school districts WMLS test, and ELPA results, as long as the test was administrate within the one year time frame. [Please see Appendix D] Of course any verification will require detail report to just justify the verified decision. If later the student is not perform well in the main steam class due to English language barriers the student English ability maybe be reassess based on the parents & teacher's request and again qualified into the BSD's ELD program.

When a student is determent to be a qualified ELL student, parent will always have the right to decline the ESL service. Thought it is not recommend, due to the benefit of the ELD program. You can clearly see based on OAKS reading test that 82.27% of Former ELLs – (ELLs who reclassify from the ELD program) meet or exceed the state reading test, which has much higher performance compare to the PRS students only 42.96% meet or exceed the state reading test.

	OAKS	OAKS	OAKS		OAKS	OAKS	OAKS
	Read	Read	Read	Grand	Read Lv	Read Lv	Read Lv
LEP Status	Lv 1-2	Lv 3	Lv 4-5	Total	1-2	3	4-5
Active ELLs	782	536	888	2206	35.45%	24.30%	40.25%
Withdrawal ELLs	54	23	24	101	53.47%	22.77%	23.76%
Active ELLs Total	836	559	912	2307	36.24%	24.23%	39.53%
1st Year Monitoring	20	76	452	548	3.65%	13.87%	82.48%
2nd Year Monitoring	26	77	427	530	4.91%	14.53%	80.57%
Post Monitoring	49	126	856	1031	4.75%	12.22%	83.03%
Former ELLs Total	95	279	1735	2109	4.50%	13.23%	82.27%
Parent Refused Service	94	60	116	270	34.81%	22.22%	42.96%
Language Changed	2	5	8	15	13.33%	33.33%	53.33%
Not Eligible	36	98	1079	1213	2.97%	8.08%	88.95%
Native English Speakers	909	1347	12617	14873	6.11%	9.06%	84.83%
Grand Total	1972	2348	16467	20787	9.49%	11.30%	79.22%
All SPED Students	817	555	1287	2659	30.73%	20.87%	48.40%
All TAG Students	3	20	2926	2949	0.10%	0.68%	99.22%

Of course, there are occurrence when a former ELL student get pull back into the ELD program due to low performance as a resulted of English language barriers. However, this only occurs between $1\% \sim 2\%$ of the overall reclassified former ELL population.

As of 2008-2009 school years, an ELL student can only reclassify from ELL when he or she reached English proficiency that was indicate by an ELPA test score of a level 5, or a level 4 with their ELL's teacher's promotion. Student who reclassified from the ELD program no longer require to taking ELPA.

Oregon ELPA:

In compliance with Federal and State Law, the state of Oregon implements ELPA that requires all ELL students who are currently in enrolled within any Oregon public school to take ELPA test once a year. This is including to all active ELL, PRS and students whom were reclassified from their ELD program within the current school year.

On top of a consolidated Composite score, ELPA also report scores on each of its sub tests, such as reading, writing, speaking, listening and comprehensive. Each score content an integer level range from 1 to5, and integer scale score or raw score range from 0 to 600 plus SEM-standard error of measurement score. Depend on student's grade level their raw score is used to collected 5 level score. Below is the table that summarizes relationship between ELPA raw and level score by grade. [7]

	ELPA	ELPA	ELPA	ELPA	ELPA
	Level	Level	Level	Level	Level
Grade	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0
KG	0 ~ 481	482 ~ 491	492 ~ 497	498 ~ 506	507+
1	$0 \sim 491$	492 ~ 506	507 ~ 513	514 ~ 522	523+
2	0 ~ 494	495 ~ 507	508 ~ 520	514 ~ 522	523+
3	0 ~ 500	501 ~ 513	514 ~ 520	521 ~ 528	529+
4	0 ~ 496	497 ~ 507	508 ~ 513	514 ~ 520	521+
5	$0 \sim 496$	497 ~ 507	508 ~ 515	516 ~ 522	523+
6	0 ~ 496	497 ~ 505	506 ~ 514	515 ~ 521	522+
7	$0 \sim 496$	497 ~ 506	507 ~ 516	517 ~ 523	524+
8	0 ~ 498	499 ~ 507	508 ~ 517	518 ~ 525	526+
9	0 ~ 490	491 ~ 500	501 ~ 514	515 ~ 525	526+
10	$0 \sim 492$	493 ~ 500	501 ~ 515	516 ~ 526	527+
11	0 ~ 493	494 ~ 500	501 ~ 514	515 ~ 527	528+
12	$0 \sim 497$	498 ~ 503	504 ~ 515	516 ~ 529	530+

ELPA Proficiency Level Descriptors				
ELPA				
Level	Proficiency Level			
01	B - Beginning Level			
02	EI = Early Intermediate Level			
03	I = Intermediate Level			
04	EA = Early Advanced Level			
05	A = Advanced (Proficient)			

Oregon AMAOs:

AMAOs the Annual Measurement of Achievement Objectives is state defined targets that are used to measure the effectiveness of English Language Development programs of each school district. There are four AMAO targets that each school district is require to meet, if a school district fail to meet any one of the AMAO target, the school district is consider did not meet the AMAOs as whole.

Out of the four AMAO targets, three of them are measured using ELPA; one measured use ELL student's OAKS Reading & Math performance. [8]

AMAO1 measured the proficiency level gain on the ELPA per year of academic instruction for all identified ELLs. This target only including student who participate Oregon ELPA in two consecutive years of the current school year. Numerator includes students who have move one or more ELPA level within the last two school year, and denominator will include all student who participate Oregon ELPA in two consecutive years. The AMAO1 target for 2009-10 is 50%. This target increases yearly. The target for the 2010-2011 school year is 53%. [8]

AMAO2 meanly uses ELPA to measure the number of students who have reclassified from the ELD services for proficiency, and there are two targets in AMAO2 a school district will require to meet. AMAO2A AMAO2A measures the total number of ELL students in a district obtaining proficiency, while the AMAO2B measure applies only to students who have been in the program for five or more years. These targets also increase annually. The target for AMAO2A in 2009-10 is 14% and is set to increase to 15.5% in 2010-11. The target for AMAO2B in 2009-10 is 22% and is set to increase to 24% in 2010-11. [8]

AMAO 3: Is the federal requirement that school districts make Adequate Yearly Progress for their ELL students in reading/language arts and math. Toward this end, ELL students are required to take the yearly OAKS assessment. [8]

Please see Appendix E for detail break down of how AMAOs will be change for the next 5 years, and sample AYP report for Beaverton School District.

ELPA Longitudinal Analysis

From the ELPA raw and level score relationship table you may have already notice, that there is another interesting issue. Which is unique to Oregon ELPA compare to other state standard test, this is the ELPA's grade band system. Oregon ELPA divide the test into four grade band, they are grade KG-01, 02-03, 04-05, 06-08 and 09-12. Test questions within the same grade band have very similar difficulties; test question from higher grade level band will be much harder compare to the lower grade level band.

0910					
Test		ELPA Raw		ELPA Raw	
Grade		Score	No	Score	Grand
Band	Grade	Decreased	Change	Increased	Total
BK-1	KG	1.19%	0.15%	98.66%	673
	1	36.67%	4.62%	58.71%	649
BK-1	Total	18.61%	2.34%	79.05%	1322
B2-3	2	3.72%	1.59%	94.69%	565
	3	43.84%	5.97%	50.19%	536
B2-3	Total	23.25%	3.72%	73.02%	1101
B4-5	4	5.45%	2.08%	92.47%	385
	5	20.41%	3.74%	75.85%	294
B4-5 Total		11.93%	2.80%	85.27%	679
	6	5.63%	1.30%	93.07%	231
B6-8	7	6.25%	2.68%	91.07%	224
	8	35.85%	5.03%	59.12%	159
B6-8	Total	13.68%	2.77%	83.55%	614
	9	13.68%	2.77%	83.55%	188
B9-12	10	19.21%	4.64%	76.16%	151
	11	25.00%	6.76%	68.24%	148
	12	42.86%	0.00%	57.14%	7
B9-12	Total	21.86%	4.86%	73.28%	494
Granc	l Total	18.41%	3.14%	78.46%	4210

2009-2010 to 2010-2011 School Year ELPA Scale Score [Raw]

As you may already see from the ELPA Scale Score [Raw] table, student's raw score is likely to increase if they take the ELPA test within the same grade band. However, a large percentage of student's ELPA raw score has drop when taking the ELPA test while cross grade bands.

2009-2010 to 2010-2011 School Year ELPA Level							
0910 Test Grade		ELPA Level Score	No	ELPA Level Score	Grand		
Band	Grade	Decreased	Change	Increased	Total		
BK-1	KG	15.45%	41.90%	42.64%	673		
	1	20.49%	52.08%	27.43%	649		
BK-1	Total	17.93%	46.90%	35.17%	1322		
B2-3	2	10.09%	48.85%	41.06%	565		
	3	2.61%	28.54%	68.84%	536		
B2-3	Total	6.45%	38.96%	54.59%	1101		
B4-5	4	1.56%	29.61%	68.83%	385		
	5	4.08%	37.07%	58.84%	294		
B4-5 Total		2.65%	32.84%	64.51%	679		
	6	1.73%	36.80%	61.47%	231		
B6-8	7	4.46%	29.46%	66.07%	224		
	8	5.66%	52.20%	42.14%	159		
B6-8	Total	3.75%	38.11%	58.14%	614		
	9	3.75%	38.11%	58.14%	188		
B9-12	10	5.96%	51.66%	42.38%	151		
	11	8.11%	63.51%	28.38%	148		
	12	0.00%	85.71%	14.29%	7		
B9-12	Total	7.29%	55.26%	37.45%	494		
Grand	I Total	9.14%	42.26%	48.60%	4210		

This phenomenon is somewhat calibrated or controlled during the when transfer from ELPA raw score to ELPA level. Notice from ELPA Level table that looks like there are still some outliers; however, we don't know for sure if this is really the leftover outliers from calibration or actual student's

performance. As of now, this is very hard to verify due to insufficient data.

In order to do a control cohort longitudinal analysis with ELPA we will need to follow the student's ELPA score on yearly basis, in this study we will be use four years of worth of ELPA data, from 2007-2008 to 2010-2011 school year.

School Year	ELPA Level 01 # of Student	ELPA Level 02 # of Student	ELPA Level 03# of Student	ELPA Level 04 # of Student	ELPA Level 05 # of Student	All Student Count
2007-2008	678	1593	1571	1790	959	6591
2008-2009	620	1549	1543	1807	815	6334
2009-2010	519	1249	1404	1828	1157	6157
2010-2011	550	1295	1198	1618	1091	5752

Above table shows the number of BSD students completed ELPA in the last four school years.

Note: During this study, we do not have completed data set from the 2010-2011 school year, the

5,752 is only dataset we go as of May 15th, 2011.

However, due to the natural of the public school and ELD program in Oregon, and high mobility rate of the ELL population, there are only 2,184 ELL students who completed ELPA for four consecutive years. The table below shows the average difference of student ELPA scale score [Raw] of the 2,184 students.

<mark>0708</mark> 0809 Grade	0809 0910 Grade	<mark>0910</mark> 1011 Grade	Student Count	0708 0809 ELPA Raw Diff Ave	0809 0910 ELPA Raw Diff Ave	0910 1011 ELPA Raw Diff Ave
KG - 01	01 - 02	02 - 03	452	16.50	3.44	9.08
01 - 02	02 - 03	03 - 04	434	1.16	11.47	0.62
02 - 03	03 - 04	04 - 05	306	8.93	2.11	8.40
03 - 04	04 - 05	05 - 06	218	-0.25	7.89	4.06
04 - 05	05 - 06	06 - 07	181	6.45	2.78	7.75
05 - 06	06 - 07	07 - 08	167	1.44	6.57	8.03
06 - 07	07 - 08	08 - 09	124	5.43	5.91	0.81
07 - 08	08 - 09	09 - 10	120	3.93	2.57	4.18
08 - 09	09 - 10	10 - 11	101	2.09	3.42	3.86
09 - 10	10 - 11	11 - 12	81	3.85	2.95	2.75
Grand Total		2184	6.26	5.53	5.38	

In the above table Cells that are highlighted are the grade band jump, for example from KG and 1^{st} grade ELL student will take ELPA in the grade band difficult. However, a 2^{nd} grade ELL will take the next higher level of grade band test which is much harder. Just a recap the ELPA grade band are KG- 1^{st} , 2^{nd} - 3^{rd} , 4^{th} - 5^{th} , 6^{th} - 8^{th} and 9^{th} 12^{th} .

As you may have already notice due to the ELPA grade band difference, student who took the ELPA in different grade band is likely to have lower average raw score growth, and student who took ELPA within the same grade band is likely to have higher average raw score growth. Due this natural it is extremely difficult to use ELPA's scale score (raw) to measure the effectiveness of the ELD program in BSD, and we will be force to use the calibrated ELPA level to do our analysis.

The table below shows average ELPA level difference in the past year. Again the grade band

0708	0809	0910		0708 0809	0809 0910	0910 1011
0809	0910	1011	Student	ELPA Lvi	ELPA Lvi	ELPA Lvi
Grade	Grade	Grade	Count	Diff Ave	Diff Ave	Diff Ave
KG - 01	01 - 02	02 - 03	452	0.37	0.24	0.34
01 - 02	02 - 03	03 - 04	434	-0.06	0.59	0.83
02 - 03	03 - 04	04 - 05	306	0.22	1.02	0.86
03 - 04	04 - 05	05 - 06	218	0.47	0.79	0.64
04 - 05	05 - 06	06 - 07	181	0.65	0.45	0.67
05 - 06	06 - 07	07 - 08	167	0.22	0.53	0.71
06 - 07	07 - 08	08 - 09	124	0.40	0.46	0.35
07 - 08	08 - 09	09 - 10	120	0.25	0.53	0.33
08 - 09	09 - 10	10 - 11	101	0.56	0.22	0.32
09 - 10	10 - 11	11 - 12	81	0.30	0.27	0.15
Grand To	otal		2184	0.29	0.54	0.58

jumps are highlighted, also highest and lowest ELPA level difference is also highlight.

As of this point it is still very hard to confirm if the level difference between school years are the difference between student performances or simply the calibration difference between the ELPA tests.

To verify this, a correlation analysis has been done to between ELPA's composite scale score & level to all five of each sub test which include reading, writing, speaking, listening and comprehensive. This correlation analysis is use in order to prove that when the relationship when the ELPA scale score changes it has the same effect to it's correlated calibrated ELPA level.

Please see Appendix A & B for detail result.

Below is the summarize correlation analysis

	0708 ELPA	0809 ELPA	0910 ELPA	1011 ELPA
Pearson Correlation Matrix	Composite	Composite	Composite	Composite
ELPA 2007-2011 School Year	Raw	Raw	Raw	Raw
ELPA Composite Raw	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
ELPA Reading Raw	0.91	0.90	0.92	0.91
ELPA Writing Raw	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.93
ELPA Listening Raw	0.88	0.86	0.86	0.88
ELPA Speaking Raw	0.71	0.71	0.69	0.68
ELPA Comprehension Raw	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96
Total Number of ELPA Test	6591	6334	6157	5752

	0708 ELPA	0809 ELPA	0910 ELPA	1011 ELPA
Pearson Correlation Matrix	Composite	Composite	Composite	Composite
ELPA 2007-2011 School Year	Level	Level	Level	Level
ELPA Composite Level	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
ELPA Reading Level	0.86	0.84	0.84	0.83
ELPA Writing Level	0.85	0.83	0.85	0.88
ELPA Listening Level	0.79	0.76	0.75	0.80
ELPA Speaking Level	0.61	0.62	0.56	0.66
ELPA Comprehension Level	0.90	0.89	0.90	0.90
Total Number of ELPA Test	6591	6334	6157	5752

Generally the calibrated ELPA levels have a lower correlations rate between 2% to 10%, and this lowered correlation rate is consistent across each sub tests, with exception speaking test, especially in the 2009-2010 school year. The correlation of the speaking test level to the composite level has the lowest correlation rate of all other sub test and school year!

However, we can not denied that correlation rate between the ELPA scale score and level are also close enough, that using ELPA level in our longitudinal analysis can still yield somewhat meaningful result. Unfortunately due to way that the Oregon's ELPA has set up it is not a good enough measurement tool to measure the effectiveness of the ELD program for more then two consecutive year.

Conclusion & Recommendation

Based on our analysis within this study, we will not recommend performing a longitudinal analysis using the ELPA score in order to measure BSD's ELD program's effectiveness for more then two consecutive year.

This is due to: First, ELL student reclassified from the ELD program once they reach the maximum ELPA Proficiency level 5. Thus if more then two years of ELPA data has been used for this longitudinal analysis model, we will be looking at only the student who have under performed, but neglect students who reclassified from the ELL program who continue making progress; Second, because of ELPA's grade band system the scale score (raw) can not be use directly apply in the longitudinal analysis model, and the flawed calibrated ELPA level may not be able to provide accurate result to justify ELD program effectiveness in order to make program or staff changes.

However, ELPA level can still be use longitudinally as negative indicator to identify the individual who under performed. This will help the ELD teacher and school team to create prevention plan or at least trigger interventions and referrals needs.

Reference:

[1] NCLB & Titles I and III http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html

[2] Title IX General Provisions (25)

http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg107.html

[3] ORS 336.079

https://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/336.079

[4] NCLB 2002, Public Law 107-110, 115 Statute 1425

http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf

[5] BSD Student Enrollment Forms

http://www.beaverton.k12.or.us/home/parents/forms/

[6] Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey®-Revised Normative Update

http://www.riversidepublishing.com/products/wmls/index.html

[7] ELPA Proficiency Level Descriptors

http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/standards/contentperformance/elpaprofleveldescriptors060 7.doc

[8] AMAOs - Annual Measurement of Achievement Objectives

http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/superintendent/release/amao-faq.pdf

Appendix

Appendix A: ELPA Scale Score Correlations

Correlations between 2007-2008 School Year ELPA Composite Scale Score [Raw] and Each ELPA Sub Test Scale Score [Raw]

		0708 ELPA Composite Raw	0708 ELPA Reading Raw	0708 ELPA Writing Raw	0708 ELPA Listening Raw	0708 ELPA Speaking Raw	0708 ELPA Comprehension Raw
0708 FL PA	Pearson Correlation	1	.911(**)	.922(**)	.879(**)	.705(**)	.953(**)
Composite Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FL PA	Pearson Correlation	.911(**)	1	.816(**)	.759(**)	.509(**)	.946(**)
Reading Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.922(**)	.816(**)	1	.743(**)	.562(**)	.830(**)
Writing Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
-	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.879(**)	.759(**)	.743(**)	1	.563(**)	.915(**)
Listening Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.705(**)	.509(**)	.562(**)	.563(**)	1	.565(**)
Speaking Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.953(**)	.946(**)	.830(**)	.915(**)	.565(**)	1
Comprehension Pow	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Näw	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591

		0809 ELPA Composite Raw	0809 ELPA Reading Raw	0809 ELPA Writing Raw	0809 ELPA Listening Raw	0809 ELPA Speaking Raw	0809 ELPA Comprehension Raw
0800 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	1	.897(**)	.909(**)	.864(**)	.714(**)	.948(**)
Composite Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0800 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.897(**)	1	.792(**)	.728(**)	.497(**)	.942(**)
Reading Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0800 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.909(**)	.792(**)	1	.710(**)	.537(**)	.811(**)
Writing Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0800 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.864(**)	.728(**)	.710(**)	1	.555(**)	.906(**)
Listening Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0809 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.714(**)	.497(**)	.537(**)	.555(**)	1	.561(**)
Speaking Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0809 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.948(**)	.942(**)	.811(**)	.906(**)	.561(**)	1
Comprehension	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Naw	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334

Correlations between 2008-2009 School Year ELPA Composite Scale Score [Raw] and Each ELPA Sub Test Scale Score [Raw]

		0910 ELPA Composite Raw	0910 ELPA Reading Raw	0910 ELPA Writing Raw	0910 ELPA Listening Raw	0910 ELPA Speaking Raw	0910 ELPA Comprehension Raw
0010 EL DA	Pearson Correlation	1	.917(**)	.913(**)	.858(**)	.695(**)	.963(**)
Composite Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0010 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.917(**)	1	.791(**)	.722(**)	.536(**)	.941(**)
Reading Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0010 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.913(**)	.791(**)	1	.694(**)	.561(**)	.810(**)
Writing Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0010 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.858(**)	.722(**)	.694(**)	1	.584(**)	.906(**)
Listening Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0910 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.695(**)	.536(**)	.561(**)	.584(**)	1	.600(**)
Speaking Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0910 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.963(**)	.941(**)	.810(**)	.906(**)	.600(**)	1
Comprehension	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Naw	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157

Correlations between 2008-2009 School Year ELPA Composite Scale Score [Raw] and Each ELPA Sub Test Scale Score [Raw]

	_	1011 ELPA Composite Raw	1011 ELPA Reading Raw	1011 ELPA Writing Raw	1011 ELPA Listening Raw	1011 ELPA Speaking Raw	1011 ELPA Comprehension Raw
1011 EI DA	Pearson Correlation	1	.906(**)	.930(**)	.883(**)	.684(**)	.960(**)
Composite Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
-	Ν	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752
1011 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.906(**)	1	.814(**)	.747(**)	.521(**)	.939(**)
Reading Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752
1011 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.930(**)	.814(**)	1	.763(**)	.567(**)	.847(**)
Writing Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	Ν	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752
1011 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.883(**)	.747(**)	.763(**)	1	.555(**)	.926(**)
Listening Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	Ν	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752
1011 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.684(**)	.521(**)	.567(**)	.555(**)	1	.575(**)
Speaking Raw	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752
1011 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.960(**)	.939(**)	.847(**)	.926(**)	.575(**)	1
Comprehension Pow	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Naw	Ν	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752

Correlations between 2010-2011 School Year ELPA Composite Scale Score [Raw] vs Each ELPA Sub Test Scale Score [Raw]

Appendix B: ELPA Level Correlations

Correlations between 2007-2008 School Year ELPA Composite Level and Each ELPA Sub Test Level

		0708 ELPA Composite Level	0708 ELPA Reading Level	0708 ELPA Writing Level	0708 ELPA Listening Level	0708 ELPA Speaking Level	0708 ELPA Comprehension Level
0708 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	1	.857(**)	.852(**)	.794(**)	.606(**)	.905(**)
Composite Level	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.857(**)	1	.744(**)	.662(**)	.395(**)	.905(**)
Reading Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
_	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.852(**)	.744(**)	1	.619(**)	.434(**)	.746(**)
Writing Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
_	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.794(**)	.662(**)	.619(**)	1	.456(**)	.844(**)
Listening Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
_	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.606(**)	.395(**)	.434(**)	.456(**)	1	.457(**)
Speaking Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591
0708 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.905(**)	.905(**)	.746(**)	.844(**)	.457(**)	1
Comprehension	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Level	Ν	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591	6591

		0809 ELPA Composite Level	0809 ELPA Reading Level	0809 ELPA Writing Level	0809 ELPA Listening Level	0809 ELPA Speaking Level	0809 ELPA Comprehension Level
0809 FL PA	Pearson Correlation	1	.838(**)	.832(**)	.764(**)	.621(**)	.886(**)
Composite Level	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0809 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.838(**)	1	.709(**)	.631(**)	.390(**)	.894(**)
Reading Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0809 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.832(**)	.709(**)	1	.574(**)	.410(**)	.712(**)
Writing Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0809 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.764(**)	.631(**)	.574(**)	1	.444(**)	.827(**)
Listening Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0800 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.621(**)	.390(**)	.410(**)	.444(**)	1	.450(**)
Speaking Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334
0809 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.886(**)	.894(**)	.712(**)	.827(**)	.450(**)	1
Comprehension	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Level	Ν	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334	6334

Correlations between 2008-2009 School Year ELPA Composite Level and Each ELPA Sub Test Level

		0910 ELPA Composite Level	0910 ELPA Reading Level	0910 ELPA Writing Level	0910 ELPA Listening Level	0910 ELPA Speaking Level	0910 ELPA Comprehension Level
0910 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	1	.842(**)	.850(**)	.752(**)	.559(**)	.897(**)
Composite Level	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0910 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.842(**)	1	.706(**)	.586(**)	.383(**)	.876(**)
Reading Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0910 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.850(**)	.706(**)	1	.548(**)	.397(**)	.709(**)
Writing Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0910 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.752(**)	.586(**)	.548(**)	1	.462(**)	.823(**)
Listening Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0010 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.559(**)	.383(**)	.397(**)	.462(**)	1	.464(**)
Speaking Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157
0910 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.897(**)	.876(**)	.709(**)	.823(**)	.464(**)	1
Comprehension	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Level	Ν	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157	6157

Correlations between 2009-2010 School Year ELPA Composite Level and Each ELPA Sub Test Level

		1011 ELPA Composite Level	1011 ELPA Reading Level	1011 ELPA Writing Level	1011 ELPA Listening Level	1011 ELPA Speaking Level	1011 ELPA Comprehension Level
1011 FL PA	Pearson Correlation	1	.835(**)	.881(**)	.795(**)	.664(**)	.897(**)
Composite Level	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	5754	5754	5754	5754	5752	5754
1011 FI PA	Pearson Correlation	.835(**)	1	.754(**)	.632(**)	.450(**)	.877(**)
Reading Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	Ν	5754	5754	5754	5754	5752	5754
1011 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.881(**)	.754(**)	1	.655(**)	.523(**)	.771(**)
Writing Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
-	Ν	5754	5754	5754	5754	5752	5754
1011 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.795(**)	.632(**)	.655(**)	1	.482(**)	.855(**)
Listening Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
_	Ν	5754	5754	5754	5754	5752	5754
1011 FI DA	Pearson Correlation	.664(**)	.450(**)	.523(**)	.482(**)	1	.503(**)
Speaking Level	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	Ν	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752	5752
1011 ELPA	Pearson Correlation	.897(**)	.877(**)	.771(**)	.855(**)	.503(**)	1
Comprehension	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Level	Ν	5754	5754	5754	5754	5752	5754

Correlations between 2010-2011 School Year ELPA Composite Level and Each ELPA Sub Test Level

Appendix C: Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey Scores Table

TABLE OF SCORES

Test/CLUSTER	Raw	GE	EASY	DIFF	<u>RPI</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>SS (68% Band)</u>	CALP
Picture Vocabulary	26	1.0	<k.0< th=""><th>2.4</th><th>81/90</th><th>34</th><th>94 (89-99)</th><th>_</th></k.0<>	2.4	81/90	34	94 (89-99)	_
Verbal Analogies	10	K.7	<k.0< th=""><th>1.6</th><th>69/90</th><th>26</th><th>90 (86-94)</th><th>-</th></k.0<>	1.6	69/90	26	90 (86-94)	-
Letter-Word Identification	23	1.6	1.4	1.8	66/90	31	93 (89-96)	-
Dictation	21	1.3	1.0	1.7	64/90	25	90 (86-94)	-
Understanding Directions	-	K.4	<k.0< th=""><th>1.4</th><th>66/90</th><th>15</th><th>85 (80-89)</th><th>-</th></k.0<>	1.4	66/90	15	85 (80-89)	-
Story Recall	-	1.9	<k.0< th=""><th>9.7</th><th>90/90</th><th>50</th><th>100 (91-109)</th><th>-</th></k.0<>	9.7	90/90	50	100 (91-109)	-
Passage Comprehension	8	1.1	K.9	1.3	28/90	17	86 (83-89)	-
ORAL LANGUAGE	_	K.8	<k.0< td=""><td>1.9</td><td>76/90</td><td>26</td><td>90 (87-94)</td><td>3.5</td></k.0<>	1.9	76/90	26	90 (87-94)	3.5
ORAL LANGUAGE-TOTAL		K.8	<k.0< td=""><td>2.2</td><td>78/90</td><td>20</td><td>88 (84-91)</td><td>3.5</td></k.0<>	2.2	78/90	20	88 (84-91)	3.5
READING-WRITING	-	1.5	1.3	1.8	65/90	31	92 (90-95)	3
BROAD ENG ABIL	-	1.4	1.0	1.8	71/90	26	90 (88-93)	3.5
BROAD ENG ABIL-TTL	-	1.2	K.8	1.7	69/90	20	87 (85-89)	3.5
LISTENING	-	K.5	<k.0< th=""><th>1.5</th><th>68/90</th><th>15</th><th>84 (80-88)</th><th>3.5</th></k.0<>	1.5	68/90	15	84 (80-88)	3.5
ORAL EXPRESSION	-	1.3	<k.0< th=""><th>3.4</th><th>86/90</th><th>37</th><th>95 (90-100)</th><th>4</th></k.0<>	3.4	86/90	37	95 (90-100)	4
READING	-	1.4	1.2	1.6	46/90	22	88 (86-91)	3
WRITING	-	1.3	1.0	1.7	64/90	25	90 (86-94)	3
LANGUAGE COMP	-	1.2	K. 7	1.6	65/90	14	84 (79-88)	3
APP LANG PROF	-	1.1	K.7	1.6	65/90	15	84 (81-87)	3

Appendix D: Beaverton School District ELL Department Intake & Investigation Flowchart Process



Beaverton SD ELL Department Intake & Investigation Flowchart Process

07/28/2009

Page 1



Fei Huang EMGT 565 – Spring 2011 Project Report

Appendix E: AMAO Annual Measurement of Achievement Objectives

IIIIIO I Iuig	
School Year	Percent of LEP Students Showing Progress toward Attaining English Language Proficiency
2009- 2010	50% LEP students will move one proficiency level higher at the end of the school year. This is 3% increase from the actual statewide percentage reported in the previous year.
2010- 2011	53% LEP students will move one proficiency level higher at the end of the school year. This is 3% increase from the previous year's target.
2011-2012	57% LEP students will move one proficiency level higher at the end of the school year. This is 4% increase from the previous year's target.
2012-2013	61% LEP students will move one proficiency level higher at the end of the school year. This is 4% increase from the previous year's target.
2013-2014	66% LEP students will move one proficiency level higher at the end of the school year. This is 5% increase from the previous year's target.

AMAO 1 Targets

AMAO2 Targets

AMAO2A: Percentage of All LEP Students Attaining Proficiency.

School Year	Percentage of all LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2009- 2010	14.0% of LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
	This is 1.5% increase over baseline.
2010 2011	15.5% LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year
2010-2011	This is 1.5% increase from the previous year.
2011 2012	17.0% LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
2011-2012	This is 1.5% increase from the previous year.
2012 2013	19.0% LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
2012-2013	This is 2% increase from the previous year.
2013-2014	21.0% LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
	This is a 2% increase from the previous year.

AMAO2B: Percentage of Students Identified as an English Language Learner for 5 or More Years, Attaining English Language Proficiency.

Sahaal Vaan	Percentage of Students Identified as ELL for Five or More Years, Attaining English
School Year	Language Proficiency
2000 2010	22.0% of LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
2009-2010	This is 2% increase over baseline.
2010 2011	24.0% of LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
2010-2011	This is 2% increase from the previous year.
2011 2012	26.5% of LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
2011-2012	This is 2.5% increase from the previous year.
2012 2012	29.0% of LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year.
2012-2015	This is 2.5% increase from the previous year.
2012 2014	32.0% of LEP students will attain proficiency at the end of the school year
2013-2014	This is 3% increase from the previous year.

AMAO3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Samples for Beaverton School District [8] Math Target: 59%

		2008-2009		2009-2010					
Academic Status	Academic Status	# Tests	# Met	# Tests	# Met	Year(s) of data for best status	% Met Status	Margin of Error	Adjusted Status
All Students	MET	2673	1582	2783	1718	2008-2010	60.48	2.19	62.67
Economically Disadvantaged	NOT MET	761	243	884	321	2008-2010	34.29	3.98	38.27
Limited English Proficient	NOT MET	280	57	311	64	2008-2010	20.47	6.64	27.11
Students with Disabilities	NOT MET	344	85	364	102	2008-2010	26.41	6.07	32.48
Asian/Pacific Islander	MET	369	284	389	315	2008-2010	79.02	5.86	84.89
Black (not of Hispanic origin)	NOT MET	78	27	77	24	2008-2010	32.90	12.97	45.87
Hispanic origin	NOT MET	376	85	477	143	2008-2010	26.73	5.53	32.26
American Indian/Alaskan Native	NA	11	6	15	5	2008-2010	42.31	*	*
White (not of Hispanic origin)	MET	1674	1084	1679	1140	2008-2010	66.33	2.79	69.12
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	MET	150	87	138	89	2008-2010	61.11	9.51	70.62

ELA Target: 60%

		2008-2009		2009-2010					
Academic Status	Academic Status	# Tests	# Met	# Tests	# Met	Year(s) of data for best status	% Met Status	Margin of Error	Adjusted Status
All Students	MET	2700	1819	2789	2143	2008-2010	72.18	2.18	74.36
Economically Disadvantaged	NOT MET	776	327	885	486	2008-2010	48.95	3.96	52.91
Limited English Proficient	NOT MET	280	54	312	76	2008-2010	21.96	6.63	28.59
Students with Disabilities	NOT MET	356	129	369	161	2008-2010	40.00	6.00	46.00
Asian/Pacific Islander	MET	374	279	392	319	2008-2010	78.07	5.83	83.90
Black (not of Hispanic origin)	MET	77	36	76	43	2008-2010	51.63	13.05	64.68
Hispanic origin	NOT MET	383	119	478	235	2008-2010	41.11	5.50	46.62
American Indian/Alaskan Native	NA	11	6	16	10	2008-2010	59.26	*	*
White (not of Hispanic origin)	MET	1687	1269	1682	1416	2008-2010	79.70	2.78	82.48
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	MET	153	100	138	116	2008-2010	74.23	9.46	83.69