



State required Reclassification, Monitoring, and Re-designation of English Learners (ELs)

State required reclassification criteria

Districts must employ uniform procedures in accordance with state requirements for reclassifying English learners (ELs) as former ELs (FELs) when they attain proficiency. This document outlines the procedure and rules for doing so.

An EL must demonstrate the ability to access challenging academic content and interact with other students and teachers both academically and socially in an English language setting in order to be considered for reclassification. Evidence of this ability is demonstrated by the student on the annual English language proficiency assessment, ACCESS for ELLs®, and gathered by teachers using standardized language use inventories (Appendix A).

Using the following system, the ACCESS for ELLs® and the language use inventory together produce a single score. If that score exceeds the state-defined threshold, then the student is eligible to be reclassified.

See Appendix D for a sample reclassification cover sheet. Districts are free to develop their own form of documenting the reclassification decision for ELs, but it must, at a minimum, include the information contained on the sample form.

Two language use inventories must be completed. An ESL teacher must complete one of the inventories when possible. The other inventory may be completed by a single content teacher or a team of content teachers. In cases in which an ESL teacher cannot complete an inventory (e.g. students whose parents have refused services and who are not seen by an ESL teacher or ELs in higher proficiency levels who do not work with an ESL teacher regularly), both inventories may be completed by content teachers or teams of teachers. If only one teacher can accurately complete the inventory (e.g. elementary classes in which the classroom teacher is ESL certified and provides both content and language instruction and there is no other teacher or administrator who can accurately complete the inventory), one inventory may be completed and the single score is multiplied by two. **The two inventories do not need to agree.**

The language use inventories must be completed prior to the release of ACCESS scores each year for students who, based on teacher input and previous ACCESS scores, are likely to reach the threshold. Once ACCESS scores are released, the points are added to the points from the rubrics to determine if students are eligible to be reclassified.

NOTE: In some cases, students who were not identified as likely to reach the ACCESS score threshold and for whom no language use inventories were completed will unexpectedly achieve a score exceeding the threshold. Language use inventories may be completed after ACCESS scores are released in these limited cases, but they must be completed prior to October 1 of the following school year.

The reclassification window begins when ACCESS scores are published and ends on October 1 of the following school year. Although language use inventories must be completed as part of the reclassification decision-making and evidence-gathering process prior to the opening of the window, no changes to a student's status can be made in local data systems or in PIMS between October 1 and the date on which the district receives ACCESS scores each year.

Districts must develop local plans for how to:

- select content teachers who will complete the inventories
- manage the decision-making/reporting process using this procedure and these criteria
- train staff to use the rubrics and evaluate the students' language use
- hold teachers accountable for completing the inventories
- select students for whom inventories will be completed in anticipation of qualifying ACCESS scores

Each language use inventory produces a single score and the sum of the two inventory scores is added to the ACCESS for ELLs® *points assigned* to determine if the student meets the minimum threshold for reclassification.

The following tables display the points possible from the ACCESS for ELLs® and the language use inventories:

ACCESS Proficiency Level Score	Points Assigned
4.5-4.7	3.6
4.8-5.0	4.5
5.1-5.3	5.8
>5.3	8.4

Language Use Inventories		ESL Teacher			Content Teacher		
		Low	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	High
Rubric 1	Interaction	0	0.3	0.5	0	0.3	0.5
	Listening	0	0.3	0.5	0	0.3	0.5
	Speaking	0	0.3	0.5	0	0.3	0.5
	Reading	0	0.3	0.5	0	0.3	0.5
Rubric 2	Writing: Cohesion	0	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0.3
	Writing: Word/Phrase	0	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0.3
	Writing: Grammar/Sentences	0	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0.3
	Writing: Genre - Narrative	0	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0.3
	Writing: Genre - Report & Essays	0	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0.3
	Writing: Genre - Arguments	0	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0.3

Total possible points from both inventories 7.6
Total Possible Points from all components: 16

Threshold for reclassification: 10.5

When this reclassification score is equal to or greater than the cutoff, then a student *should* be reclassified. However, if there is compelling evidence to suggest that a student should remain identified as an EL when his/her score exceeds the cutoff, and this evidence is documented along with the ACCESS for ELLs® score report and language use inventory forms, then the EL status may be retained.

ELs with Disabilities - taking the ACCESS for ELLs®

An EL with a disability who has not met the criteria outlined above may be considered for reclassification if:

1. The student has an IEP, **AND**
2. The student has been continuously enrolled in an LIEP for at least four years, **AND**
3. The student's overall composite proficiency level score on the ACCESS for ELLs® has not increased by more than 10% between any two years or total over the three most recent testing cycles, **AND**
4. The school has documented evidence* that the student has been provided with the appropriate level of language support, including ELD instruction, throughout his/her enrollment in the LIEP, **AND**
5. A school-based team recommends reclassification. *See below for team composition and recommendation protocol.*

* Documented evidence can include schedules indicating ELD instructional times, specific language supports used, ELD curriculum indicating areas of language instruction covered, language use evaluations based on WIDA rubrics or PA reclassification rubrics, modifications made to assessments, IEP addressing ELD instruction or language needs, etc.

To calculate the percent difference between scores, use the following formula:

$$\Delta \text{OCPL} / \text{OCPL1} (100) = \% \text{ change}$$

Δ OCPL: *Difference between the overall composite proficiency level from year one and year two, year two and year three, or year one and year three*

OCPL1: *overall composite proficiency level from the first of the two years being compared*

For example, the percent difference between a score of 4.3 and 4.5 is $(.2/4.3)*100$, which is 4.65%.

School-based team composition and recommendation protocol:

The following individuals must be included on the team that considers the body of evidence and determines whether to reclassify an EL with a disability:

- At least one expert on the student's English language acquisition
- At least one expert on the student's special education goals and services
- At least one expert on the student's general education content achievement
- At least one family member (and any requisite interpreters/cultural liaisons)
- Any related service providers who work with the student

A single team member may fill more than one of the roles identified above.

High Priority Evidence to consider:

- Standardized or curriculum-based assessments special education teachers and related service providers use to monitor students' progress towards IEP goals that are relevant to developing English language proficiency
- Classroom observations of students' language use
- Language samples demonstrating listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills
- Student work samples or portfolios
- Teacher input on students' English language development progress
- Family input on students' language development and use at home
- Data related to how the student was initially identified as an EL
- Review of English learner services across the most recent four years to ensure the student has received adequate English language development instruction and language support for content learning during that time

Evidence to consider if available:

- Assessments that evaluate students' proficiency in their home/primary language
- Language use inventories
- Comparable data from similar EL peer group (other ELs with similar profiles)

Questions that must be addressed by the team:

1. Has the student received adequate ELD instruction and language supports commensurate with his/her ELP level for the most recent four years?
2. Is this student able to effectively communicate in English?
3. Is the EL making progress toward meeting PA Core Standards in listening, speaking, reading, and writing on par with ELs who have similar profiles?
4. Are any ACCESS for ELLs domain scores that affect the student's ability to reach an overall composite proficiency level of 4.5 directly related to the student's disability?

If the answer to any of these questions is 'no', then the team must carefully consider the student's continued participation in the LIEP until such time that the student will no longer benefit from continued specialized English language development instruction and supports.

See Appendix E for a sample reclassification cover sheet. Districts are free to develop their own form of documenting the reclassification decision for ELs with disabilities, but it must at a minimum include the names of the team members involved, the evidence that was analyzed, the student's current ACCESS scores, and answers to the four questions above. The form should be filed with the student's permanent record.

ELs with Disabilities (taking the Alternate ACCESS for ELLS®)

ELs who are eligible for and take the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs® may be considered for reclassification when:

1. they achieve a score of at least P2 on two consecutive administrations of the test **OR** achieve the same score for three consecutive administrations of the test, **AND**
2. the IEP team, with input from an ESL/bilingual education professional, recommends reclassification.

Although language use inventories are not required for ELs with disabilities as part of the reclassification process, teachers should consider completing them in cases where it is appropriate as a way to document language proficiency at the time of reclassification and for future reference if needed.

For more detailed guidance related to ELs with disabilities, please see the guidance contained on the Bureau of Special Education website at www.pattan.net.

Monitoring of former ELs

Districts must include in their LIEP uniform procedures in accordance with state requirements for actively monitoring the progress of former ELs (FELs) for a period of two years after reclassification and reporting FELs to the state for an additional two years (total of four years of monitoring status).

Active Monitoring Period – first two years after reclassification

Districts must ensure that ELs in the first two years after reclassification do not struggle academically as a result of persistent language barriers. In order to do this, districts must develop and implement a process for actively monitoring students' progress and achievement in the general academic program delivered without specialized, planned language supports.

Districts are free to create their own process, but it must, at a minimum, include tracking student progress in all core academic classes and soliciting feedback from core academic teachers periodically throughout the school year with sufficient frequency to preclude a student falling significantly behind.

Additional monitoring period – third and fourth years after reclassification

Districts are required to continue reporting FELs to the state in PIMS for an additional two years after the active monitoring period. Districts are not required to actively monitor the progress and academic achievement of ELs in the general education program during these years. At the end of the fourth year after reclassification, ELs are coded as *Former ELs – no longer monitored* for the remainder of their time in school.

Re-designating former ELs

If it is determined during the active monitoring phase that an EL is struggling academically as a result of persistent language barriers, then the district must have plans in place to re-designate that former EL as an active EL and re-enroll him/her in the LIEP. The district must demonstrate that the FEL is struggling as a result of persistent language acquisition needs and not academic needs, which require academic supports and/or interventions.

FELs who have been re-designated as active ELs must meet the state-required criteria to be reclassified as FELs. In cases such as these, the monitoring process starts over from year 1 upon the second reclassification.

Appendix A

Grade: Kindergarten

Rubric 1 - Interaction, Listening, Speaking, and Reading Language Use Inventory

Student:

PASID:

Date:

Evaluator's name:

Content Area:

Observation Date(s) (range of dates during which the observation information was gathered):

This rubric should be used to evaluate a student's use of language as part of the reclassification process. The evaluation must consist of multiple observations, although it is not necessary to complete multiple inventories. It is recommended that the teacher who will complete this inventory be well-trained in the use of the rubric and begin to make notes of the students' language use in enough time to develop a firm evaluation before completing this inventory.

Interaction:

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can engage in very short social exchanges, and sustain the conversation with substantial support. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities, possibly using provided language frames or structures.	Can function in most social situations in the classroom. Can enter unprepared in conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or connected to everyday life. Can use provided language frames or structures as models for original expression.	Can use language spontaneously, flexibly, and effectively for social and academic purposes. Can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate contributions skillfully to those of other speakers.	

Listening:

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can understand the main point in simple messages in slow and clear standard speech. Can understand phrases and high frequency vocabulary related to familiar topics.	Can understand the main points in slow and clear standard speech on familiar topics in discussions, presentations, and educational videos.	Can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signaled explicitly.	

Speaking:

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms about familiar topics.	Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms about familiar and academic topics.	Can present clear, expanded discourse about a familiar or academic topic using some content-specific vocabulary.	

Reading:

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding with substantial support or inability.	Can apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding with limited prompting and support.	Can apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding.	

Total Points:

Grade: Kindergarten

Rubric 2 - Written Expression Language Use Inventory

Expansion of Repertoires: Cohesion

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can use drawings and/or labels to link some or most details in a story.	Can use drawings OR words to link details in a story.	Can use drawings, words AND simple phrases to link details in a story.	

Accuracy: Word/ Phrase

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can sequence some letters needed to produce frequently used sight words, but with significant errors that hinders readability. Not able to be to produce phrases or sentences.	Can sequence most letters needed to produce recognizable frequently used/sight words. May include inventive spelling. Can produce phrases and some simple sentences.	Can sequence most letters needed to produce recognizable words. May include inventive spelling following recognizable conventions. Can produce simple sentences.	

Accuracy: Grammar/

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Consistent errors that may hinder the meaning of the writing regarding grammar.	Regularly contains some grammatical inaccuracy in either capitalization of "I" and beginning of sentence, people names, ending punctuation.	Maintains some grammatical accuracy in capitalization of "I" and beginning of sentence, people names, ending punctuation.	

Accuracy: Genre Narratives

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Draw a picture with some labels to describe the picture or story.	Draw a picture and write labels or simple phrases to describe the picture or story.	Draw a picture and write several connected sentences to describe the picture or story.	

Accuracy: Genre Information

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Draw a picture with some labels to describe a single familiar topic with minimal detail or elaboration.	Draw a picture and write labels or simple phrases about a single familiar or academic topic with limited detail or elaboration.	Draw a picture and write several connected sentences about a single familiar or academic topic with detail or elaboration such as form and function.	

Accuracy: Genre Arguments

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Draw and label to explain likes or dislikes about a familiar topic.	Can express an opinion about a familiar topic or a book. May draw and uses labels or a simple sentence to explain reasons. May use conjunction words such as "because" to support their opinion.	Can express an opinion about a familiar topic or a book. May draw and use 1 or more written sentences to explain reasons. Uses conjunction words such as "because" to support their opinion.	

Total Points:

Grade: 1

Rubric 1 - Interaction, Listening, Speaking, and Reading Language Use Inventory

Student:

PASID:

Date:

Evaluator's name:

Content Area:

Observation Date(s) (range of dates during which the observation information was gathered):

This rubric should be used to evaluate a student's use of language as part of the reclassification process. The evaluation must consist of multiple observations, although it is not necessary to complete multiple inventories.

It is recommended that the teacher who will complete this inventory be well-trained in the use of the rubric and begin to make notes of the students' language use in enough time to develop a firm evaluation before completing this inventory.

Interaction

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can engage in very short social exchanges, and sustain the conversation with substantial support. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities, possibly using provided language frames or structures.	Can function in most social situations in the classroom. Can enter unprepared in conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or connected to everyday life. Can use provided language frames or structures as models for original expression.	Can use language spontaneously, flexibly, and effectively for social and academic purposes. Can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate contributions skillfully to those of other speakers.	

Listening

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can understand the main point in simple messages in slow and clear standard speech. Can understand phrases and high frequency vocabulary related to familiar topics.	Can understand the main points in slow and clear standard speech on familiar topics in discussions, presentations, and educational videos.	Can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signaled explicitly.	

Speaking

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms about familiar topics.	Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms about familiar and academic topics.	Can present clear, expanded discourse about a familiar or academic topic using some content-specific vocabulary.	

Reading

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding with substantial support or inability.	Can apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding with limited prompting and support. Read grade level text with support for purpose and understanding.	Can apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding. Read grade-level text with purpose and understanding.	

Total Points:

Grade 1

Rubric 2 - Written Expression Language Use Inventory

Expansion of Repertoires: Cohesion

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can produce groups of words with little to no structure and little to no use of organizational patterns.	Can produce sentences with limited structure. Shows limited use of organizational patterns, and simple connectors like "and" and "because".	Can produce clear, structured sentences, showing some use of a range of organizational patterns, and connectors.	

Accuracy: Word/ Phrase

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can use basic sentence patterns with memorized phrases, groups of a few words, and formulate in order to communicated limited information in familiar situations.	Can use more varied vocabulary that extends beyond the everyday to include some content-specific vocabulary. Can express him/ herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions.	Can select language to express him/ herself clearly using content-specific vocabulary.	

Accuracy: Grammar/ Sentence

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Frequent grammatical errors that may hinder the meaning of the writing.	May produce errors in grammar that do not hinder the meaning of the writing. Mostly writes frequently used grammatical patterns (S-V-O or "I ...").	Maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy (capitalization of "I", beginning of sentence, people names/places, ending punctuation, simple tenses. May use a variety of sentence structures.	

Accuracy: Genre Narratives

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can produce a series of simple phrases and sentences on familiar topics with limited to no sequential flow. Writes minimal description or elaboration.	Can produce linearly structured narrative story with limited descriptions and limited sequential words. Uses some language to delineate either beginning, middle or end.	Can produce linearly structured narrative story with details explaining the experience with elaborations and some sequential words. Uses language to delineate beginning, middle, and end. May use pictures to illustrate their familiar story.	

Accuracy: Genre Information

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can produce a series of simple phrases and sentences on familiar topics with limited to no factual details. Writes minimal description or elaboration.	Can present with limited connection some factual information with an introduction using details on a familiar topic, but not an academic topic.	Can present connected factual information with an introduction using details from a source on an academic topic.	

Accuracy: Genre Arguments

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can express a point of view on a familiar topic in words or simple phrases without use of a conjunction word and no supporting reasons.	Can express a single-stance on a familiar topic in a single sentence stating a reason with a conjunction word such as "because".	Can express a single-stance on a familiar topic in multiple sentences with a supporting reason. May use conjunction words such as "because" to support their opinion.	

Total Points:

Grades 2-3

Rubric 1 - Interaction, Listening, Speaking, and Reading Language Use Inventory

Student:

PASID:

Date:

Evaluator's name:

Content Area:

Observation Date(s) (range of dates during which the observation information was gathered):

This rubric should be used to evaluate a student's use of language as part of the reclassification process. The evaluation must consist of multiple observations, although it is not necessary to complete multiple inventories. It is recommended that the teacher who will complete this inventory be well-trained in the use of the rubric and begin to make notes of the students' language use in enough time to develop a firm evaluation before completing this inventory.

Interaction

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can engage in very short social exchanges, and sustain the conversation with substantial support. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities, possibly using provided language frames or structures.	Can function in most social situations in the classroom. Can enter unprepared in conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or connected to everyday life. Can use provided language frames or structures as models for original expression.	Can use language spontaneously, flexibly, and effectively for social and academic purposes. Can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate contributions skillfully to those of other speakers.	

Listening

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can understand the main point in simple messages in slow and clear standard speech. Can understand phrases and high frequency vocabulary related to familiar topics.	Can understand the main points in slow and clear standard speech on familiar topics in discussions, presentations, and educational videos.	Can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signaled explicitly.	

Speaking

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms about familiar topics with little to no content-specific vocabulary.	Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms and some content-specific vocabulary about familiar and academic topics.	Can present clear, expanded discourse about a familiar or academic topic using content-specific vocabulary.	

Reading

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can read very short, simple texts and find specific, predictable information with illustrations. Limited understanding of words/phrases with multiple meanings.	Can understand grade-level fiction and non-fiction texts on unfamiliar topics with some support. Use grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding. Begins to understand words/phrases with multiple meanings.	Can understand grade-level fiction and non-fiction texts on unfamiliar topics. Use grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding. Begins to understand idiomatic expressions and words/phrases with multiple meanings.	

Total Points:

Grade: 2-3

Rubric 2 - Written Expression Language Use Inventory

Expansion of Repertoires: Cohesion

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can produce groups of words with little to no structure and little to no use of organizational patterns.	Can produce linear sequence of sentences in writing with limited structure. Shows some use of organizational patterns, and simple connectors like “and”, “but”, and “because”.	Can produce clear, structured language, showing some use of a range of organizational patterns, connectors, and cohesive devices (such as causal, sequential or comparative).	

Accuracy: Word/ Phrase

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can use basic sentence patterns with memorized phrases, groups of a few words, and formulate in order to communicated limited information in familiar situations.	Can use more varied vocabulary that extends beyond the everyday to include some content-specific vocabulary. Can express him/ herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions.	Can select language to express him/ herself clearly using content-specific vocabulary.	

Accuracy: Grammar/ Sentence

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Frequent grammatical errors that may hinder the meaning of the writing.	May produce errors in grammar that do not hinder the meaning of the writing. Mostly writes frequently used grammatical patterns (S-V-O or “I ...”).	Maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy (capitalization, punctuation, simple tenses, and simple subject-verb agreement). May use a variety of sentence structures.	

Accuracy: Genre Narratives

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can produce a series of simple phrases and sentences on familiar topics with limited to no sequential flow. Writes minimal description or elaboration.	Can produce linearly structured narrative story with limited elaborations and some sequential words. Uses some language to delineate beginning, middle and end.	Can produce linearly structured narrative story giving robust descriptions of experiences with elaborations and sequential words. Uses language to delineate beginning, middle and end.	

Accuracy: Genre Informative

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can produce a series of simple phrases and sentences on a research topic. Uses linked sentences to provide very short descriptions of details with little to no use of organizational structure.	Can present information using limited grouping with vague connections. Either the introduction or conclusion is omitted. Uses minimal facts with evidence of phrases or text taken directly from other sources.	Can present information grouped and connected logically with an introduction and conclusion using facts from text or other sources in their own words.	

Accuracy: Genre Opinion/Argument

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can express a point of view on a familiar topic in a series of simple sentences which may present supporting details. Uses no conjunction words.	Can express a single-stance on a familiar subject in a text with a delineated introduction or conclusion with 2 or fewer supporting reasons. Uses some conjunction words to link supporting details.	Can express a single-stance on a familiar or academic subject in a clear, well-structured text with delineated introduction and conclusion with 3 or more supporting reasons. Uses conjunction words to link supporting details.	

Total Points:

Grades: 4-12

Rubric 1 - Interaction, Listening, Speaking, and Reading Language Use Inventory

Student:

PASID:

Date:

Evaluator's name:

Content Area:

Observation Date(s) (range of dates during which the observation information was gathered):

This rubric should be used to evaluate a student's use of language as part of the reclassification process. The evaluation must consist of multiple observations, although it is not necessary to complete multiple inventories. It is recommended that the teacher who will complete this inventory be well-trained in the use of the rubric and begin to make notes of the students' language use in enough time to develop a firm evaluation before completing this inventory.

Interaction

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can engage in very short social exchanges, and sustain the conversation with substantial support. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities, possibly using provided language frames or structures.	Can function in most social situations in the classroom. Can enter unprepared in conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or connected to everyday life. Can use provided language frames or structures as models for original expression.	Can use language spontaneously, flexibly, and effectively for social and academic purposes. Can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate contributions skillfully to those of other speakers.	

Listening

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can understand the main point in simple messages in slow and clear standard speech. Can understand phrases and high frequency vocabulary related to familiar topics.	Can understand the main points in slow and clear standard speech on familiar topics in discussions, presentations, and educational videos.	Can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signaled explicitly.	

Speaking

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms about familiar topics.	Can connect phrases to talk about familiar topics using simple sentences. Can briefly give reasons and explanations for reactions, opinions, and plans.	Can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating subthemes, developing particular points, and finishing with an appropriate conclusion.	

Reading

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.3)	HIGH (.5)	Value
Can read very short, simple texts and find specific, predictable information in everyday materials (such as advertisements, letters, schedules, and menus).	Can understand texts with a familiar organization that include high frequency content-specific language. Begins to understand some idiomatic expressions and words/phrases with multiple meanings.	Can understand long and complex fiction and non-fiction texts on unfamiliar topics, appreciating distinctions of style.	

Total Points:

In the event that a teacher finds it challenging to distinguish between two levels in the Interaction, Listening, Speaking, and Reading Inventory rubric, the extension rubric in Appendix B can be used to assist in deciding. It offers a finer level of detail. That rubric is only for reference. It is not completed as part of the inventory.

Grades: 4-12

Rubric 2 - Written Expression Language Use Inventory

Expansion of Repertoires: Cohesion

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can link groups of words with simple connectors like “and,” “but,” and “because.”	Can link simple and discrete elements into a connected, linear sequence of points. Uses similar language to describe different relationships between ideas (such as additive, causal, sequential, comparative, or conditional).	Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of a range of organizational patterns, connectors, and cohesive devices.	

Accuracy: Word/ Phrase

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can use basic sentence patterns with memorized phrases, groups of a few words, and formulae in order to communicate limited information in familiar situations.	Can use more varied vocabulary that extends beyond the everyday to include some content-specific vocabulary. Can express him/ herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions on familiar topics.	Can strategically select language to express him/ herself clearly in an appropriate style on a wide range of academic topics without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.	

Accuracy: Grammar/ Sentence

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can employ some simple structures with minimal or partial consistency. Formulates short, simple sentences with a predictable structure.	Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used grammatical patterns associated with predictable situations. Uses mostly simple sentences.	Maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy; errors are rare, difficult to spot, and generally corrected when they occur. Uses a variety of sentence structures.	

Accuracy: Genre Narratives

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can use a series of simple phrases and sentences on familiar topics. Can use linked sentences to provide very short, basic descriptions of events and experiences.	Can produce straightforward, detailed descriptions on a range of familiar subjects. Can narrate experiences and events, describing feelings and reactions in simple connected text.	Can put forth clear, smoothly flowing stories and descriptions of experiences in a style appropriate to the genre adopted. Uses language effectively to draw in the reader	

Accuracy: Genre Reports & Essays

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can use a series of simple phrases and sentences on familiar topics. Can use linked sentences to provide very short, basic descriptions of known opinions and phenomena.	Can summarize, report, and give his/her opinion about accumulated factual information on familiar topics and following a standardized format.	Can present information on complex subjects in clear, well structured text, underlining relevant salient issues. Can expand and support interpretations at some length with subsidiary points, reasons, and relevant examples.	

Accuracy: Genre Arguments

LOW (0)	MODERATE (.2)	HIGH (.3)	Value
Can express a point of view on a familiar topic in a series of simple sentences. Can exchange basic factual information and discuss solutions to familiar problems using simple linked sentences.	Can pass on routine factual information and state reasons for actions in brief text following a standardized format.	Can present arguments on complex subjects in clear, well-structured text that may include counter argumentation. Can support arguments at some length with subsidiary points, reasons, and relevant examples.	

Total Points:

In the event that a teacher finds it challenging to distinguish between two levels in the Written Expression Inventory rubric, the rubric in Appendix C can be used to assist in deciding. It offers a finer level of detail. That rubric is only for reference. It is not completed as part of the inventory.

Appendix B

Grades: 4-12

The student's command of language indicates to most audiences that he/she:

Interaction

LOW	LOW+	MODERATE	MODERATE+	HIGH	HIGH+
Can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help formulate what the learner is trying to say. Can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	Can engage in very short social exchanges, and sustain the conversation with substantial support. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities, possibly using provided language frames or structures.	Can function in most social situations in the classroom. Can enter unprepared in conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or connected to everyday life. Can use provided language frames or structures as models for original expression.	Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity (without relying on provided language frames or structures) that makes regular interaction with others possible. Can take an active part in academic discussions in familiar contexts and on familiar topics, accounting for and sustaining his/her views.	Can use language spontaneously, flexibly, and effectively for social and academic purposes. Can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate contributions skillfully to those of other speakers.	Can use language spontaneously, flexibly, and effectively for social and academic purposes. Can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate contributions skillfully to those of other speakers.

Listening

LOW	LOW+	MODERATE	MODERATE+	HIGH	HIGH+
Can recognize familiar words and basic phrases on familiar topics when people speak slowly and clearly.	Can understand the main point in simple messages in slow and clear standard speech. Can understand phrases and high frequency vocabulary related to familiar topics.	Can understand the main points in slow and clear standard speech on familiar topics in discussions, presentations, and educational videos.	Can understand extended speech and lectures, presentations, and videos and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar.	Can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signaled explicitly.	Has no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when delivered at fast speed.

Speaking

LOW	LOW+	MODERATE	MODERATE+	HIGH	HIGH+
Can use simple phrases and sentences to describe familiar topics.	Can use a series of connected phrases and short, simple sentences to talk in simple terms about familiar topics.	Can connect phrases to talk about familiar topics using simple sentences. Can briefly give reasons and explanations for reactions, opinions, and plans.	Can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of familiar subjects. Can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.	Can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points, and finishing with an appropriate conclusion.	Can present clear, smoothly flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective structure, which helps the recipient notice significant points.

Reading

LOW	LOW+	MODERATE	MODERATE+	HIGH	HIGH+
Can understand familiar names, words, and very simple sentences, for example on visual representations with little text (such as in posters and ads).	Can read very short, simple texts and find specific, predictable information in everyday materials (such as advertisements, letters, schedules, and menus).	Can understand texts with a familiar organization that include high frequency content-specific language. Begins to understand some idiomatic expressions and words/ phrases with multiple meanings.	Can understand non-fiction texts on unfamiliar topics in which the writer adopts a particular attitude or viewpoint. Can identify relevant details in contemporary fiction.	Can understand long and complex fiction and nonfiction texts on unfamiliar topics, appreciating distinctions of style.	Can read with ease virtually all forms of written language, including structurally or linguistically complex texts.

Grades: 4-12

Expansion of Repertoires: Cohesion

Low	Low+	Moderate	Moderate+	High	High+
Can link words or groups of words with very basic linear connectors like “and” or “then.”	Can link groups of words with simple connectors like “and,” “but,” and “because.”	Can link simple and discrete elements into a connected, linear sequence of points. Uses similar language to describe different relationships between ideas (such as additive, causal, sequential, comparative, or conditional).	Can use a growing number of cohesive devices to link his/her statements into clear, coherent discourse, though there may be some “jumpiness” in a longer text.	Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of a range of organizational patterns, connectors, and cohesive devices.	Can create coherent and cohesive discourse making full and appropriate use of a variety of organizational patterns and wide range of connectors and other cohesive devices.

Accuracy: Word/Phrase

Low	Low+	Moderate	Moderate+	High	High+
Can use high frequency words and simple phrases related to personal details and particular concrete situations.	Can use basic sentence patterns with memorized phrases, groups of a few words, and formulae in order to communicate limited information in familiar situations.	Can use more varied vocabulary that extends beyond the everyday to include some content-specific vocabulary. Can express him/herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions on familiar topics.	Has sufficient range of language to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints on most general topics, without much conspicuous searching for words.	Can strategically select language to express him/herself clearly in an appropriate style on a wide range of academic topics without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.	Shows great flexibility in reformulating ideas to effectively convey finer shades of meaning, emphasize, differentiate, and clarify. Uses appropriately many idiomatic expressions.

Accuracy: Grammar/Sentence

Low	Low+	Moderate	Moderate+	High	High+
Has some control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a memorized repertoire.	Can employ some simple structures with minimal or partial consistency. Formulates short, simple sentences with a predictable structure.	Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used grammatical patterns associated with predictable situations. Uses mostly simple sentences.	Shows relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make errors that cause misunderstanding and can correct most of his/her mistakes. Uses simple and some complex sentences.	Maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy; errors are rare, difficult to spot, and generally corrected when they occur. Uses a variety of sentence structures.	Maintains grammatical accuracy when using complex language, even when attention is otherwise engaged (e.g., in forward planning or monitoring others’ reactions). Uses a range of grammar and sentence structures strategically.

Accuracy: Genre Narrative

Low	Low+	Moderate	Moderate+	High	High+
Can use simple phrases and sentences about familiar topics.	Can use a series of simple phrases and sentences on familiar topics. Can use linked sentences to provide very short, basic descriptions of events and experiences.	Can produce straightforward, detailed descriptions on a range of familiar subjects. Can narrate experiences and events, describing feelings and reactions in simple connected text.	Can produce clear, detailed descriptions of experiences and events. Can follow established genre conventions in marking relationships between ideas and organizing the text.	Can put forth clear, smoothly flowing stories and descriptions of experiences in a style appropriate to the genre adopted. Uses language effectively to draw in the reader.	

Accuracy: Genre Reports & Essays

Low	Low+	Moderate	Moderate+	High	High+
Can use simple phrases and sentences about familiar topics.	Can use a series of simple phrases and sentences on familiar topics. Can use linked sentences to provide very short, basic descriptions of known opinions and phenomena.	Can summarize, report, and give his/her opinion about accumulated factual information on familiar topics, following a standardized format.	Can develop an idea with appropriate highlighting of significant points and relevant supporting detail. Can evaluate different ideas or solutions to a problem and synthesize information from a number of sources.	Can present information on complex subjects in clear, well-structured text, underlining relevant salient issues.	Can expand and support interpretations at some length with subsidiary points, reasons, and relevant examples.

Accuracy: Genre Arguments

Low	Low+	Moderate	Moderate+	High	High+
Can use simple phrases to express an opinion on a familiar topic.	Can express a point of view on a familiar topic in a series of simple sentences. Can exchange basic factual information and discuss solutions to familiar problems using simple linked sentences.	Can pass on routine factual information and state reasons for actions in brief text following a standardized format.	Can develop an argument, giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view and explain the advantages and disadvantages of various options. Can synthesize arguments from a number of sources.	Can present arguments on complex subjects in clear, well-structured text that may include counter argumentation. Can support arguments at some length with subsidiary points, reasons, and relevant examples.	

Reclassification Cover Sheet

Student Name:

PASID:

DATE:

Grade:

School District:

School:

ACCESS for ELLs® Proficiency Level (overall composite)	Reclassification Points
4.5-4.7	3.6
4.8-5.0	4.5
5.1-5.3	5.8
>5.3	8.4

ACCESS for ELLs® Proficiency Level:

ACCESS for ELLs® Reclassification Points:

Points from language use inventory #1:

Points from language use inventory #2:

TOTAL Points for Reclassification:

Does the total number of points meet or exceed the threshold of 10.5?

Based on the student's ACCESS for ELLs® overall proficiency level score and use of language as observed by his/her teachers, this student **is recommended / is not recommended** for reclassification as a former EL.

If the student's score is equal to or exceeds the threshold of 10.5, but the student is not recommended for reclassification, then provide an explanation below:

Notes:

ESL Teacher/Coordinator Signature:

ESL Teacher/Coordinator Printed Name:

Reclassification Cover Sheet

(for ELs with an IEP only)

Student Name:

PASID:

DATE:

Grade:

School District:

School:

Overall composite proficiency level:

Listening proficiency level:

Speaking proficiency level:

Reading proficiency level:

Writing proficiency level:

Team members present for recommendation discussion:

Required criteria

The student is only eligible for reclassification if all the answers to the following questions are YES.

1. Does the student have an IEP? **YES / NO**
2. Has the student been continuously enrolled in an ESL/bilingual education program for at least four years? **YES / NO**
3. Has the student’s overall composite proficiency level score on the ACCESS for ELLs® **NOT** increased by more than 10% at any point or total over the three most recent testing cycles?
YES / NO
List the three most recent ACCESS overall composite proficiency level scores:
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
4. Is there documented evidence that the student has been provided with the appropriate level of language support, including ELD instruction, throughout his/her enrollment in the LIEP?
YES / NO

Evidence that was evaluated by the team in making the recommendation for reclassification:

1. Has the student received adequate ELD instruction commensurate with his/her ELP level for the most recent four years? **YES / NO**
2. Is this student able to effectively communicate in English? **YES / NO**
3. Is the EL making progress toward meeting PA Core Standards in listening, speaking, reading, and writing on par with ELs who have similar profiles? **YES / NO**
4. Are any ACCESS for ELLs domain scores that affect the student's ability to reach an overall composite proficiency level of 4.5 directly related to the student's disability? **YES / NO**

If yes, explain:

If the answer to any of the above questions is "no", then the notes must contain a description of compelling evidence that the student should be reclassified as a former EL in spite of the fact that there is an indication that he/she may benefit from continued participation in the LIEP.

Based on the student's ACCESS for ELLs® overall proficiency level score and use of language as observed by his/her teachers, this student **is recommended / is not recommended** for reclassification as a former EL.

Notes:

ESL Teacher/Coordinator Signature:

ESL Teacher/Coordinator Printed Name: