## **Executive Summary**

In November 2007, staff members from the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and CTB/McGraw-Hill worked in collaboration to perform standard setting on the English Language Proficiency Assessments (ELPA). Oregon educators with specialization in English-language development convened to study the ELPA, consider the English-language skills required of students in each proficiency level, and discuss these expectations with their colleagues.

CTB conducted the Oregon ELPA Standard Setting in Salem, Oregon. The purpose of the standard setting was to recommend cut scores on the ELPA to divide students into five proficiency levels: *Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced* and *Advanced*. The Bookmark Standard Setting Procedure (BSSP) was used to set the proficiency standards for the ELPA.

A committee of educators from across the state of Oregon convened to engage in the standard setting workshop November 5 – 6, 2007. Participants convened to recommend a well-articulated set of proficiency standards at six grades: Kindergarten and Grades 1, 2, 5, 7, and 11. Proficiency standards for the remaining grades were statistically interpolated based on participants' recommendations.

The ODE divided participants into five grade groups, each with approximately 3 participants. Participants were divided into assigned grade groups that were balanced in terms of relevant demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, geographic location). The standard setting consisted of training, orientation, three rounds of judgments, an articulation discussion, and proficiency level description writing.

Following the standard setting, ODE made adjustments to the recommended cut scores. These adjustments were made to accommodate the cut scores to their impact on students, that is, so that a more appropriate distribution of students by proficiency level could be achieved based on 2006-07 performance data. The final recommended cut scores adopted for the ELPA program are shown in Table 1. The impact data associated with these cut scores—the percentage of students classified in each proficiency level—are shown in Table 2.

This report summarizes the results of the Oregon ELPA Standard Setting. A day-by-day synopsis is included in Section B. The master agenda is included in Section C. The overheads presented to participants during training and orientation are in Section D. Section E presents details of the participants' Bookmark judgments for each group. In Section F, estimates are given of the percentages of students in each proficiency level at plus/minus one, two, and three standard errors of the participants' recommended final round cut scores. Section G contains graphical representations of participants' judgments. The training materials given to participants are provided in Section H. Section I contains the results of the participants' evaluation of the workshop. Section J

contains the data and charts from the articulation discussion as well as the final recommendations given to the state. As a reference for the reader, Section K presents *The Bookmark Standard Setting Procedure: Methodology & Recent Implementations* (Lewis, Green, Mitzel, Baum, & Patz, 1998). The proficiency level descriptions are included in Section L.

Table 1. Final recommended cut scores for ELPA.

Grade	Beginning	Early Intermediate	Intermediate	Early Advanced	Advanced
K	<482	482	492	498	507
1	<492	492	507	514	523
2	<495	495	508	514	523
3*	<501	501	514	521	529
4*	<497	497	508	514	521
5	<497	497	508	516	523
6*	<497	497	506	515	522
7	<497	497	507	517	524
8*	<499	499	508	518	526
9*	<491	491	501	515	526
10*	<493	493	501	516	527
11	<494	494	501	515	528
12*	<498	498	504	516	530

<sup>\*</sup>Based on interpolated data.

Table 2. Impact data associated with the final cut scores for the ELPA.

Grade	Beginning	Early Intermediate	Intermediate	Early Advanced	Advanced
K	15.8%	44.6%	21.3%	13.7%	4.7%
1	14.0%	41.3%	21.4%	17.2%	6.1%
2	13.9%	38.7%	19.9%	20.9%	6.5%
3*	10.9%	31.1%	25.8%	21.9%	10.3%
4*	9.3%	24.4%	23.7%	29.0%	13.5%
5	6.9%	16.3%	28.5%	32.2%	16.2%
6*	6.7%	13.9%	33.1%	32.0%	14.2%
7	7.5%	11.7%	36.1%	31.3%	13.4%
8*	8.1%	10.9%	35.1%	34.1%	11.8%
9*	8.6%	8.9%	33.1%	40.1%	9.3%
10*	8.6%	8.6%	33.0%	40.9%	8.9%
11	8.8%	7.6%	30.0%	46.2%	7.4%
12*	8.8%	6.9%	29.6%	48.1%	6.5%

<sup>\*</sup>Based on interpolated data.

Table 3. Recommended Changes in Cut Scores.

The recommendations from this session and comparisons to current standards are presented in the table below. Recommended standards are presented in **bold**; current standards are in (parentheses); arrows indicate the direction of the recommended change [ $\mathbb{Q}$  lower,  $\mathbb{Q}$  higher, or  $\Leftrightarrow$  unchanged].

Grade Level	Early Intermediate	Intermediate	Early Advanced	Advanced
K	<b>482</b> (489) ↓	<b>492</b> (496) <sup>‡</sup>	<b>498</b> (503) <sup>‡</sup>	<b>507</b> (512) ⇩
1	<b>492</b> (501) ⇩	<b>507</b> (512) ⇩	<b>514</b> (517) ₽	<b>523</b> (526) ⇩
2	<b>495</b> (498) ↓	<b>508</b> (507) û	<b>514</b> (512) 企	<b>523</b> (522) 企
3	<b>501</b> (503) ↓	<b>514</b> (513) û	<b>521</b> (519) 企	<b>529</b> (526) 企
4	<b>497</b> (497) ⇔	<b>508</b> (506) û	<b>514</b> (513) û	<b>521</b> (519) û
5	<b>497</b> (498) ↓	<b>508</b> (508) ⇔	<b>516</b> (515) û	<b>523</b> (522) 企
6	<b>497</b> (496) 企	<b>506</b> (505) û	<b>515</b> (513) û	<b>522</b> (519) 企
7	<b>497</b> (497) ⇔	<b>507</b> (506) û	<b>517</b> (514) 企	<b>524</b> (521) û
8	<b>499</b> (499) 👄	<b>508</b> (507) û	<b>518</b> (515) 企	<b>526</b> (524) 企
9	<b>491</b> (492) ↓	<b>501</b> (503) 🖟	<b>515</b> (514) 企	<b>526</b> (525) 企
10	<b>493</b> (492) û	<b>501</b> (503) <sup>‡</sup>	<b>516</b> (514) û	<b>527</b> (526) û
11	<b>494</b> (495) ↓	<b>501</b> (505) 🖟	<b>515</b> (514) 企	<b>528</b> (527) 企
12	<b>498</b> (498) ⇔	<b>504</b> (509) 🖟	<b>516</b> (516) ⇔	<b>530</b> (529) 企

## **Recommended ELPA Cut Scores**

With Magnitude and Direction of Recommended Change

