



ACCESS for ELLs 2.0
Interpretive Guide
for Score Reports

Kindergarten–Grade 12
Spring 2016

© 2016 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, on behalf of WIDA. *ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports* (“*Interpretive Guide*”) may not be reproduced, modified, or distributed without prior written permission from WIDA. This Interpretive Guide is for your personal, noncommercial use only. Fair use of this *Interpretive Guide* includes reproduction for the purpose of training or teaching (including multiple copies for lesson planning).

Version 1.1 Revised March 17, 2016

Contents

Introduction.....	3
About the Assessment.....	3
Organization of This Guide.....	3
Part I: ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores.....	4
Description of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Grade Level Clusters	4
ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Online Test versus Paper Test.....	5
ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores (Grades 1–12).....	5
Raw Scores	6
Scale Scores	6
Proficiency Level Scores.....	7
Composite Scores.....	7
Composite Scale Scores	8
Special Notes Regarding ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores.....	10
Score Caps	10
NA Notation.....	10
Incomplete Tests.....	10
Confidence Bands Depicting Standard Error of Measurement.....	11
Part II: Kindergarten ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores.....	13
Differences between Kindergarten Scores and Grades 1–12 Scores	13
Limited Scale Score Range	13
Two Types of Proficiency Level Scores	13
Rationale for two Proficiency Levels	14
Part III: ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Score Reports.....	16
Introduction.....	16
Suggestions on How to Use ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores.....	17
Can Do Descriptors	18
Individual Student Report.....	19
About This Report.....	19
Report at a Glance.....	19
How to Use This Report.....	20
Speaking and Writing Interpretive Rubrics	23
Speaking and Writing Scoring Scales	23
Kindergarten Individual Student Report	24
About This Report.....	24
Report at a Glance.....	24
How to Use This Report.....	26

Parent/Guardian Report (Kindergarten only)	27
About This Report.....	27
Report at a Glance.....	27
How to Use This Report.....	27
Student Roster Report.....	29
About This Report.....	29
Report at a Glance.....	29
How to Use This Report.....	31
School Frequency Report	33
About This Report.....	33
Report at a Glance.....	33
How to Use This Report.....	33
District Frequency Report	35
About This Report.....	35
Report at a Glance.....	35
How to Use This Report.....	35
Appendix A: WIDA Performance Level Definitions	38
Appendix B: List of Available Languages	40
Appendix C: Sample Parent/Guardian Letter.....	42
Appendix D: WIDA Interpretive Rubrics.....	43
Appendix E: WIDA Scoring Scales.....	45

Introduction

Welcome to the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Interpretive Guide for Score Reports, 2016. The aim of the Interpretive Guide is to assist stakeholders in understanding the scores reported for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 test takers.

About the Assessment

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, a large-scale language proficiency test for K–12 students, is one component of WIDA’s comprehensive, standards-driven system designed to improve the teaching and learning for English language learners (ELLs). The test was developed in partnership with the Center for Applied Linguistics. In 2015–16 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 was delivered online for the first time. Prior to this year, the test had been available only as a paper and pencil assessment.

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 scores should be considered one of multiple criteria used in educational decision making.

The purpose of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is to monitor student progress in English language proficiency (ELP) on a yearly basis and to serve as a criterion to aid in determining when ELLs have attained language proficiency comparable to that of their English-proficient peers. The test is carefully designed to be representative of the social and academic language demands within a school setting as exemplified in the *WIDA English Language Development (ELD) Standards* (2004, 2007, 2012).

WIDA Technical Report #1, *Development and Field Test of ACCESS for ELLs* (2006), provides extensive information on the conceptualization of the assessment, from its anchor in the ELD Standards through each developmental phase. It details the procedures for standard setting, which determined the cut scores for the six language proficiency levels. Annual Technical Report #4 explains how grade-level **cluster** cut scores were converted to grade-**specific** cut scores in 2007, which is how proficiency level scores are now reported. To obtain a copy of these reports, please visit the WIDA website: www.wida.us.

The high quality of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0’s technical properties ensures that the test is a reliable and valid measure of English language proficiency. Therefore, WIDA is confident that the information contained in the score reports is an accurate reflection of the students’ English language proficiency at a given point in time.

Organization of This Guide

Part I addresses the types of scores reported by ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 for students in Grades 1–12. These students may take the test entirely online, entirely using paper booklets, or take the test online while completing the writing domain by hand. Unless stated otherwise, statements about the test and score reports refer to all methods of test delivery and student response.

Part II addresses Kindergarten ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, which remains paper-based. Almost all of the information included about Grades 1–12 also applies to Kindergarten, but Kindergarten reports differ in a few ways. Therefore, those working with Kindergarten scores should review both Part I and Part II.

Part III provides examples of each type of score report. Along with each sample, detailed information is offered on the meaning and the use of the data in the reports.

Part I: ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores

This section provides detailed information about the types of scores generated by ACCESS for ELLs 2.0.

Description of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Grade Level Clusters

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is a secure, large-scale ELP test anchored in the WIDA ELD Standards. Test forms are broken down into grade-level clusters:

Format	Grade-Level Clusters
Online	K, 1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, 9–12
Paper	K, 1, 2, 3, 4–5, 6–8, 9–12

For more information about the Kindergarten test, see page 15.

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 uses multiple choice questions and constructed response performance-based tasks to assess the four domains of Listening, Reading, Writing, and Speaking. Different methods are used to score these four domains.

- Listening and Reading are machine scored by Data Recognition Corporation (DRC).
- For Grade levels 1–12, Writing is assessed through a set of performance-based tasks. Whether keyboarded or handwritten, student responses are centrally scored by trained raters at DRC, using the WIDA Writing Scoring Scale; see page 23.
- For Grade levels 1–12, Speaking is assessed through a set of performance-based tasks and the method used to score Speaking depends on the administration mode. Responses from students taking the online test are captured by the computer and sent to be scored centrally at DRC. Responses from students taking the paper-based Speaking test are scored locally by the Test Administrator. Both the online and paper tests assess speaking through a scripted exchange that allows students to demonstrate proficiency at the different WIDA English language proficiency levels. Both the online and paper Speaking tests are rated using the same WIDA Speaking Scoring Scale; see page 23.

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Online Test versus Paper Test

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 may be administered online or as a paper-based test. Both formats generate the same types of scores. Therefore, this document does not go into much detail about how the tests differ, but in brief:

Online Test	Paper Test
The grade level clusters are 1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, and 9–12.	The grade level clusters are 1, 2, 3, 4–5, 6–8, and 9–12.
The adaptive Listening and Reading tests are administered first, and the student’s performance determines his or her tier placement for Speaking and Writing.	Teachers must select which tier of the test to give to each of their students prior to the start of the test.
Writing tests are scored centrally; keyboarded responses are sent automatically to be scored, and handwritten responses need to be mailed.	Handwritten responses are mailed in and the Writing tests are scored centrally.
For the Speaking test, students speak into a headset to record their answers, which are centrally scored.	The paper-based Speaking test is administered and scored locally.

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores (Grades 1–12)

An individual student’s results on ACCESS for ELLs are reported as scale scores and as English language proficiency level scores for each of the four language domains:

- Listening
- Speaking
- Reading
- Writing

Scale scores and proficiency levels are also reported for four different combinations of language domains. These combinations are known as composite scores, and include the following:

- Oral Language (Listening and Speaking)
- Literacy (Reading and Writing)
- Comprehension (Listening and Reading)
- Overall Composite Score (a combination of all four language domains)

Raw Scores

Raw scores indicate the actual number of items or tasks to which the student responded correctly out of the total number of items or tasks. However, raw scores are not reported on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 score reports because they are generally not useful for interpreting student performance. This is because raw scores do not take item difficulty into account.

Scale Scores

In contrast to raw scores, scale scores are reported in a consistent way to take into account differences in item difficulty between test administrations. Because they are reported on a consistent scale, they allow stakeholders to compare scores across periods of time and between students. Scaling allows scores across grades and tiers to be compared on a single vertical scale from Kindergarten through Grade 12.

With the vertical scale, scale scores across grades can be compared to one another within (but not across) a language domain (Listening, Speaking, Reading, or Writing). Each domain has a separate scale; therefore, a scale score of 300 in Listening is not the same as 300 in Speaking.

The range of possible scale scores across all ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 forms, Kindergarten through grade-level cluster 9–12 is 100–600. However, depending on the tier and grade level, each form has a different range of possible scale scores that fall within this 100–600 range. For example, the Kindergarten ACCESS for ELLs test form only has a possible scale score range of 100–400.

The online version of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is an adaptive test, so as students progress through the test, their performances determine what questions they see next. A low-proficiency student sees easier items, and a student with a higher level of English proficiency sees more difficult questions. The student who gets 10 difficult items correct demonstrates more proficiency than the student who gets 10 easy items correct. Scaling takes this level of performance into account.

Scaling also is necessary for the paper-based test. For the paper test, students are given tiered forms of different difficulty levels. Scaling accounts for the differences in difficulty of each tiered form (A, B, or C) **within** a grade-level cluster. Tier A, for example, contains easier items than Tier C. To reflect the difficulty of the Tier C form, a student who gets 10 items correct on the Tier C Listening test receives a **higher** ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 scale score in Listening than a student who gets 10 items correct on the Tier A Listening test.

Scale scores can be used to monitor a student's growth over time within (not across) a language domain (Listening, Speaking, Reading, or Writing).

Key Points on Proficiency Level Scores

- They are interpretations of grade level specific (not grade-level cluster) scale scores.
- The interpretation of scale scores to proficiency level scores is domain specific.
- They describe student performance based on six ELP levels.
- The Literacy, Oral, Comprehension, and Overall (or Composite) proficiency levels are derived from the scale scores for the domains, not the proficiency level scores.
- To monitor growth over time, it is recommended to use scale scores and not the proficiency level scores.

Scaling also accounts for the differences in difficulty of the test forms **across** grade-level clusters. This means that a student taking the grade-level cluster 4–5 Tier B Reading test who gets all items correct receives a *lower* scale score in Reading than a student who gets all items correct on the Grade-level Cluster 6–8 Tier B Reading test. The 4–5 student receives a scale score of 446 while the 6–8 student receives a scale score of 462 in the Reading domain.

Proficiency Level Scores

The proficiency level scores are interpretive scores. That is, they provide stakeholders with an interpretation of the scale scores. They help stakeholders understand what the numeric score means in terms of the language skills of the student. They describe student performance in terms of the six WIDA English language proficiency levels: (1–Entering, 2–Emerging, 3–Developing, 4–Expanding, 5–Bridging, 6–Reaching).

Proficiency level scores are presented as whole numbers followed by a decimal. The whole number indicates the student’s language proficiency *level* as based on the WIDA ELD Standards. The decimal indicates the *proportion* within the proficiency level range that the student’s scale score represents, rounded to the nearest tenth.

The interpretation of scale scores to proficiency level scores is grade specific, not grade-level cluster specific. For example, a Reading scale score of 303 for a fifth grade student is interpreted as Level 2.0. The same scale score for a fourth grader results in Level 2.5, and for a third grade student that scale score results in Level 3.1.

Each domain reports a separate score; therefore, the same scale score in Listening and Reading does not become the same proficiency level score. For example, for a sixth grade student in grade-level cluster 6–8, a scale score of 380 for Listening becomes a proficiency level score of 5.0, while a scale score of 380 for Reading becomes a proficiency level score of 5.9.

Composite Scores

Students receive four different composite scores derived from a combination of weighted language domain scores. The four composite scores are Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, and Overall score.

Composite scores are compensatory. Compensatory means that a high score in one language domain could inflate the composite score, compensating for a low score in another language domain; conversely, a low score in a language domain could bring down the composite.

Only students that complete all domains of ACCESS for ELLS 2.0 will receive the four composite scores.

Composite scores should be used with caution after careful consideration of their compensatory nature. Attention must be given to the individual language domain scores that comprise the composite score as well as their weights.

The same Overall Scale Score for two students can reflect two very different profiles. For example, one student may be very strong in Listening and Reading, but weaker in Speaking and Writing, while another student with the same Overall Scale Score is strong in Reading and Writing, but weaker in Listening and Speaking. **A student’s individual performance in each language domain provides a more comprehensive and realistic profile than that from a single overall score.**

Composite scores are reported as both scale scores and as proficiency level scores.

Composite Scale Scores

To arrive at the composite scale scores, the relevant language domains are weighted and then added together. Literacy (Reading and Writing) scale scores carry greater weight than scale scores for oral language (Listening and Speaking) due to their relative emphasis and importance to success in school.

The weighting used to calculate each of the composite scale scores is as follows in Table 1:

Type of Composite Score	Contribution of Language Domains (By Percent)			
	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
Oral Language	50%	50%	–	–
Literacy	–	–	50%	50%
Comprehension	30%	–	70%	–
Overall	15%	15%	35%	35%

Table 1: Contribution of Language Domains to ACCESS for ELLs Composite Scores

Once composite scale scores have been calculated, they are interpreted as composite proficiency levels.

The proficiency level scores in the four language domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) and combinations of domains offer a portrait of student language performance. This information, along with the WIDA Standards Framework components, including the WIDA Can Do Descriptors, Key Uses Edition, the Performance Definitions, the Model Performance Indicators, and the WIDA 2012 Amplified English Language Development (ELD) Standards (2012) (available at www.wida.us), help determine the most appropriate instructional strategies for ELLs.

The following table summarizes the two types of scores reported on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 and offers suggestions and cautions on their uses.

	Information Provided & Suggested Uses	Keep in Mind
Scale Scores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a psychometrically derived score (accounting for all tier and grade level differences) for each language domain (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing) Reports scores on a scale from 100–600 Provides way to monitor student growth over time (within a language domain, using growth charts) Provided on the Individual Student & Student Roster Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparisons cannot be made across Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing domains; only <i>within</i> domains To monitor growth over time, it is recommended to use scale scores and not the proficiency level scores.
Proficiency Level Scores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a score in terms of the six WIDA language proficiency levels Provides individual domain scores which can be used with the WIDA Can Do Descriptors to get a profile of the student’s English language performance Informs targeted language instruction using the WIDA ELD Standards Provides information to help determine program eligibility Provided on the Individual Student and Student Roster Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scores provide only one source of data and should be used in conjunction with other data sources when making decisions about instruction, assessment and services for English Language Learners. The range of scale score points for each proficiency level cut differs depending on the grade and domain and therefore proficiency level scores do not represent interval data.

Table 2: Suggestions and Cautions on the use of Scale and Proficiency Level Scores

Special Notes Regarding ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores

Score Caps

Scores for the language domains of Listening and Reading (and subsequently the Comprehension composite) on the paper test are capped for the Tier A and Tier B forms of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0. Placing a cap on the tier means that students cannot receive a proficiency level score above 4.0 for Tier A and above 5.0 for Tier B. Scale scores at the upper end are collapsed so that students who correctly answer most or all of the items on Tier A or Tier B do not receive a scale score that would equate to a proficiency level score above 4.0 and 5.0 respectively. As a consequence of capping scores for Listening and Reading, students who take Tier A or Tier B forms are less likely to receive an Overall Score above proficiency level 4.0 or 5.0, respectively.

Listening and Reading scores for the online test are not capped, because these domains of the online test are adaptive, meaning that as the student navigates through the test content, the test items presented become easier or more difficult based on the student's performance on previous items. Students will be placed into the appropriate Tier for Speaking and Writing based on their performance on the Listening and Reading domains. Students who test online may be placed into a Pre-A Tier for Speaking. The Pre-A Speaking test is a special test form that has been developed for newcomers with minimal ability to produce spoken English. It is a shortened and simplified Speaking test, and as such, scores are capped at Proficiency Level 1.

NA Notation

If a report shows a notation of NA for a language domain or domains, it means that the student was not tested for that language domain(s).

Composite or overall scores are **not** computed if any language domain score is missing. For example, if a student is unable to participate in the Speaking part of the test, the student receives NA for Speaking, Oral Language, and the Overall Score. Similarly, a student who has a non-scoring code marked for Reading receives NA for Reading, Literacy, Comprehension, and the Overall Score.

Incomplete Tests

If an ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 test booklet is returned to DRC with completed demographic information, either on a Pre-ID label or bubbled in, it is scanned and scored. If a whole domain of the test is left blank, and none of the non-scoring codes are marked on the booklet, DRC assumes that the student has attempted the domain. Consequently, the student receives the lowest possible score for the blank domain(s) for the designated grade level. These same scoring criteria apply to the online test. If the student has logged in to the online test but not answered any of the questions, the student is awarded the lowest possible score for that domain.

Confidence Bands Depicting Standard Error of Measurement

The Individual Student Report includes confidence bands for both domain and composite scale scores. Confidence bands are a graphic depiction of the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) of the scale score. Figure 1 shows a sample.





Language Domain	Proficiency Level (Possible 1.0-6.0)						Scale Score (Possible 100-600) and Confidence Band See <i>Interpretive Guide for Score Reports</i> for definitions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	100	200	300	400	500	600
Listening 			4.0							368		
Speaking 		2.2								320		
Reading 			3.4							356		
Writing 			3.5							355		
Oral Language 50% Listening + 50% Speaking			3.2							344		
Literacy 50% Reading + 50% Writing			3.5							356		
Comprehension 70% Reading + 30% Listening			3.7							360		
Overall* 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking			3.4							352		

Figure 1: Sample Language Domain and Composite Scores

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is a reliable and valid test of English language proficiency. Nevertheless, it—like all tests—is subject to a statistical concept known as the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM). This error is unrelated to potential errors introduced by scoring; DRC’s advanced scoring systems assure over 99.99% scoring accuracy. The SEM quantifies the variation of scores achieved if a student were able to take the same test over and over again without any change in ability.

In other words, imagine a hypothetical student, Lisa, taking ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 under these different conditions:

- Scenario 1: Lisa is healthy and well-rested the day she takes the test.
- Scenario 2: Lisa is feeling sick the day she takes the test.
- Scenario 3: While Lisa takes the test, she hears loud noises going on in the next room.

Even though Lisa sees all the same test questions in each scenario, and her English proficiency level is constant, she will probably not get exactly the same score in every scenario. Because ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is a reliable test, her scores would still be very similar to each other—but not exactly the same.

Therefore, ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 uses the SEM, which quantifies this variation. Applying the SEM, confidence bands are calculated to show a range of scores—so even if Lisa took the test under one of the other scenarios, her score would still fall in that range.

In the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 score report, confidence bands are placed around the student's score as a graphical representation of the SEM. These bands, which correspond to scale scores and not proficiency level scores, illustrate a student's possible range of language proficiency based on his or her test score with a 95% probability of accuracy.

The SEMs for domain scores and the SEMs for composite scores are estimated differently. For domain scores, the SEMs are computed based on modern test theory using conditional SEMs; that is, each score on a domain test form (e.g., Reading, Grades 4–5, Tier A) has a different estimated SEM. For composite scores, the SEMs are estimated based on classical test theory and each composite score (e.g., Literacy, Grades 4–5) has the same SEM.

Confidence bands are important, as they remind test users that a single test score represents a range of possible outcomes and should never be interpreted as the only possible outcome.

Statistically speaking, the confidence bands, such as those used for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, assure that there is a 95% probability that the student's average score, if he or she were to take the test over and over again, is within the Confidence Band reported on the score report.

Part II: Kindergarten ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores

Most of the information about ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 applies to all students in Grades K–12. However, Kindergarten scores are reported and interpreted differently. This is because the kind of preliteracy that is developmentally appropriate for Kindergarten students is not fully comparable with the literacy and language of the other grades.

The original *WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards* (2004) guided the initial development of ACCESS for ELLs. The 2004 Edition of the standards described model performance indicators (MPI) for a K–2 grade-level cluster. The second edition of the *WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards* (2007) separated Kindergarten from Grades 1–2 and instead placed it within a Kindergarten set of MPIs. The 2007 Edition of the Standards were used to develop the current Kindergarten ACCESS test which was introduced in the 2008–09 school year. The ACCESS for ELLs Kindergarten assessment remains a paper-based, face-to-face test.

The Kindergarten test form is individually administered and adaptive. Additional features embedded in the test design make it developmentally appropriate for this age group.

- Reading and Writing items allow students to demonstrate preliteracy skills that many Kindergarteners are still in the process of acquiring.
- Rather than including a wide variety of themes and topics as the different domains are assessed, tasks for all four domains were developed around just two unifying themes, a narrative text and an expository text. This minimizes the number of cognitive leaps a student has to make within each test domain.
- Many items involve the use of manipulative cards to engage the students in familiar types of activities.

Two proficiency level interpretations are provided for Kindergarten ACCESS, one for **instructional purposes** and the other for **accountability purposes**. The instructional scores will be marked by the prefix **K**, for example, **K2.8**.

All of these characteristics were designed to help create a developmentally appropriate instrument.

Differences between Kindergarten Scores and Grades 1–12 Scores

Limited Scale Score Range

While the entire range of possible scale scores for the entire battery of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 forms (K–12) is 100–600, the possible scale score range specifically for the Kindergarten ACCESS test form is 100–400.

Two Types of Proficiency Level Scores

Two types of individualized reports are created for Kindergarten students. The Individual Student Report contains two proficiency level interpretations for teachers. One is for instructional purposes (marked by the prefix “K”). The other is for accountability purposes, and can be used as a baseline to monitor growth over time. The difference between the two is explained further on page 24, where a sample Kindergarten Individual Student Report can be viewed.

The other kind of Kindergarten report is designed for Parents/Guardians. It is further explained on page 27.

Rationale for two Proficiency Levels

The Model Performance Indicators (MPIs – see the 2012 Amplified WIDA Standards) for Kindergarten are more developmentally appropriate for Kindergarten students because they place more emphasis on preliteracy skills at lower proficiency levels. Only at the higher proficiency levels were students actually demonstrating the ability to read and write, marking the start of their journey to develop academic English language proficiency.

Therefore, a Kindergarten student getting a high raw score is still not demonstrating the same literacy level or command of a range of topics and themes as a student in the other grades. Scale scores work by mapping the performances of student in all grades onto the same scale. Because the Kindergarten test does not cover all the same skills as Grades 1–12, it does not make use of the full scale. That is why the possible scale score range for Kindergarten is 100–400.

Most decisions about students use the overall composite proficiency level, in which literacy skills are weighted heavily. While WIDA always advocates the use of multiple criteria for high-stakes decision-making, it is reasonable to acknowledge that test scores play an important role. Since there is a lack of research on how well preliteracy skills predict ELLs' future performance in school, the instructional cut scores established in the Kindergarten ACCESS standards setting study, particularly for Reading and Writing, may not be adequate predictors of future academic success. If they were to be used as criteria for exit from support services, this could lead to many Kindergarten students being placed out of English language support services without sufficient evidence that they are ready to continue building their literacy skills without such support. Thus, after reviewing the impact of applying the current operational cut scores that are along the same scale as Grades 1–12, the WIDA Consortium Board decided that these cut scores should remain in effect to inform program design and instruction and that a separate set of cut scores should be used for **accountability** purposes.

The instructional **proficiency levels** are based on interpretations of the Kindergarten standards and take into account preliteracy skills. Teachers may use these scores to plan instruction for their ELL students.

The **accountability scores** can be used as a baseline to monitor growth over time.

The following table graphically illustrates the relationship between the instructional proficiency levels and the accountability proficiency levels for the domain of Writing. The accountability levels are superimposed on the instructional levels, with a scale score range of 100–600 (please note that while all grades on ACCESS share a common scale, scale scores on Kindergarten ACCESS do not exceed a score of 400).

Accountability Proficiency Level	1		2	3	4	5	6
Instructional Proficiency Level	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	
Scale Score	100			400			

Table 3: Comparing Accountability and Instructional Proficiency Levels for Kindergarten Writing

It can be seen that a student would have to be rated as a high K3 in order to place into accountability Proficiency Level 2. This is because in Grades 1–2, even at the lowest proficiency level (1.0), the MPIs assume that the student can do some basic writing, at least copying, and at Level 2.0, that the student is writing at least at the word level. However, in the Kindergarten MPIs, Levels K1.0, K2.0 and K3.0 tend to show a progression of “prewriting” activities. At Level K1.0, the student is generally drawing, at Level K2.0, the student is generally copying, often only at the level of letters (rather than words). At Level K3.0, the child may be copying at the word level.

Therefore, the instructional proficiency levels are based on interpretations of the Kindergarten ELD standards, in which the first three levels describe preliteracy writing skills such as tracing and copying, all of which are subsumed under Proficiency Level 1 in the Grade-level Cluster 1–2 Standards.

Because it may be easier to conceptualize the differences between the two types of proficiency level interpretations when viewing what the score reports actually look like, examples and further clarifications and suggestions begin on page 24.

Part III: ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Score Reports

Introduction

This section details the information contained in each of the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 score reports and explains potential use of the data in various contexts. Table 4 summarizes the target audience or stakeholders for each score report and the types of information available from the test. Along with the score reports, teachers and administrators are encouraged to interpret ELL’s performance by referring to the WIDA ELD Standards (2004, 2007, 2012) and Can Do Descriptors.

Score Report	Audience or Stakeholder	Types of Information	Potential Uses
Individual Student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students • Parents/Guardians • Teachers • School Teams 	<p>Individual student’s scores for each language domain, and four composites: Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, and Overall Score.</p> <p>Reported scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scale scores • confidence bands • language proficiency levels <p>This report is available in multiple languages through DRC’s WIDA AMS system.</p>	<p>Share with parents at parent/teacher conferences</p> <p>Share with all teachers who work with ELLs in order to inform classroom instruction and assessment</p>
Parent/ Guardian (Kindergarten only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students • Parents/Guardians • Teachers • School Teams 	<p>Proficiency levels for each language domain and composite score. This report is available in multiple languages through DRC’s WIDA AMS system.</p>	<p>Share with parents at parent/teacher conferences</p>
Kindergarten Individual Student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Administrators • School Teams 	<p>Individual student’s scores for each language domain and composite score.</p> <p>Reported scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scale scores • confidence bands • proficiency level for accountability purposes • proficiency level for instructional purposes 	<p>Share with all teachers who work with ELLs in order to inform classroom instruction and assessment</p>

Score Report	Audience or Stakeholder	Types of Information	Potential Uses
Student Roster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Program Coordinators/ Directors • Administrators 	Scale scores and language proficiency levels for each language domain and composite score by school, grade, student, tier, and grade-level cluster	Share with grade level teams of teachers to inform classroom instruction and assessment
School Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Coordinators/ Directors • Administrators 	Number of students and percent of total tested at each proficiency level for each language domain and composite score for a single grade within a school	Share with all building staff, use to inform building level programmatic decisions
District Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Coordinators/ Directors • Administrators • Boards of Education 	Number of students and percent of total tested at each proficiency level for each language domain and composite score.	Share with district staff, use to inform district level programmatic decisions

Table 4: ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Score Reports, Audiences, Types of Information, and Potential Uses

Suggestions on How to Use ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Scores

The Interpretive Guide for Score Reports, 2016, is a resource for all member states in the WIDA Consortium. As the Consortium is currently comprised of multiple member states, this guide presents overarching suggestions with broad applicability. It is intended to assist stakeholders familiar with the test in interpreting the scores and using the information to help describe the English language proficiency of their ELLs. Individual member states are welcome to supplement this information.

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is an English language proficiency (ELP) test that is a representation of the WIDA ELD Standards. As such, stakeholders should note that ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is a standards-referenced assessment. Stakeholders should take time to discuss the meaning of the results in relation to the standards and how the results affect the services, curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment of ELLs.

Before examining data in the score reports, teachers and administrators should familiarize themselves with the WIDA Performance Definitions and Can Do Descriptors, Key Uses Edition. The Performance Definitions are in Appendix A. The Can Do Descriptors are on the WIDA website. A more detailed discussion of the Can Do Descriptors is in the next section.

The following are suggestions for disseminating ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 score results:

- Target certain reports to specific stakeholders. Perhaps add a rationale for state or local policies or procedures that are being contemplated, formulated, or implemented based on test results. Provide a state specific context that will help administrators and teachers understand the meaning and significance of the reports.
- Offer professional development opportunities to the various stakeholders impacted by the results to help them better understand scores and how to use them. For teachers, in particular, ensure that the test results are referenced to the ELD Standards. For purposes of interpreting the scores and information, present examples of reports of students/schools (with their identities withheld) for discussion.
- Summarize or consolidate the suggestions for using the information from each score report to target specific audiences. In the case of the Individual Student Report, any additional information accompanying the report should be parent friendly and translated into your state's major languages.
- Examine different configurations of the data in the reports (by language domain and combinations of language domains, including the overall score) for individual and groups of students (such as by grade or tier) to develop a statewide, district or school plan for organizing services for ELLs for the upcoming school year.
- Archive copies of the guide along with copies of the score reports so that new personnel can become familiar with data from ACCESS for ELLs 2.0.

Can Do Descriptors

The Can Do Descriptors, Key Use Edition provide examples of what students can do at various levels of English language proficiency in Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The descriptors inform the use of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 scores as they may assist teachers and administrators in interpreting the meaning of the scores. Educators should be using the Can Do Descriptors in conjunction with the other components of the WIDA Standards Framework including Performance Definitions and Model Performance Indicators along with the previous edition of the Can Do Descriptors.

The Can Do Descriptors are organized by grade-level bands: K, 1, 2–3, 4–5, 6–8, and 9–12 and correspond to those in ACCESS for ELLs 2.0. Within each grade-level band, the descriptors are organized by Key Use: Recount, Explain, Argue, and Discuss and within each Key Use, there are examples across WIDA's six levels of language proficiency.

The WIDA ELD Standards as well as the Can Do Descriptors, Key Uses Edition can be found on the WIDA Consortium website at www.wida.us.

Individual Student Report

About This Report

The Individual Student Report contains detailed information about the performance of a single student within Grades 1–12. Its primary users are students, parents/guardians, teachers, and school teams.

The Individual Student Report is provided in English. Translations of the report are available in 46 additional languages through DRC’s WIDA AMS system. The translated report should accompany (not replace) the official report in English. The list of languages and the Spanish translation are included in Appendix B.

Communication with the student’s parents/guardians is important. Whenever possible, send a letter in the family’s native language along with the Individual Student Reports in English. A sample letter is provided in Appendix C.

Report at a Glance

Demographic Information about the Student

Identifying information is located at the top right of the score report. This consists of the student’s name (last, first, and middle initial), date of birth, grade, and test tier, as well as state and district identification numbers, school, district, and state.

Student’s English Language Proficiency Level by Language Domains

Results of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 are reported by test section.

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assesses language in four domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing). In the score report, each language domain is represented by a label, icon, and visual display of the results.

The four domain scores are followed by the four composite scores (Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, Overall Score). In the score report, each composite score is represented by a label, a breakdown of how individual domains are used to calculate it, and a visual display of the results.

The proficiency level is presented both graphically and as a whole number followed by a decimal. The shaded bar of the graph reflects the exact position of the student’s performance on the six point ELP scale. The whole number reflects a student’s ELP level (1–Entering, 2–Emerging, 3–Developing, 4–Expanding, 5–Bridging, and 6–Reaching) in accord with the WIDA ELD Standards. ELLs who obtain Level 6, Reaching, have moved through the entire second language continuum, as defined by the test.

The decimal indicates the proportion within the proficiency level range that the student’s scale score represents, rounded to the nearest tenth. For example, a proficiency level score of 3.5 is half way between the 3.0 and 4.0 cut scores.

To the right of the proficiency level is the reported scale score and resultant confidence band. The confidence band reflects the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) of the scale score, a statistical calculation of a student’s likelihood of scoring within a particular range of scores if he or she were to take

the same test repeatedly without any change in ability. **Confidence bands are important because they remind test users that a single test score represents a range of possible outcomes and should never be interpreted as the only possible outcome.**

If a student does not complete one or more language domain(s), NA (Not Available) is inserted in that language domain as well as all applicable composite scores, including the Overall Score.

As discussed in Part I of this document, students with identical Overall Scores may have very different profiles in terms of their oral language and literacy development.

Description of English Language Proficiency Levels

The Individual Student Report provides information about the proficiency levels obtained by the student and describes what many students at the reported proficiency level may be expected to be able to do in English. For example, if the student received a proficiency level score of 2.2 for Speaking, his or her report will include a description of the type of spoken language he or she may be expected to be able to produce.

Figure 2 shows a sample Individual Student Report.

How to Use This Report

For Parents/Guardians

- This report gives information on a student's English language proficiency, the language needed to access content and succeed in school; it does not give information on a student's academic achievement or knowledge of the content areas. It provides family members and students (and other stakeholders) with a graphic representation of the extent to which an ELL listens, speaks, reads, and writes English. It also provides information on a student's Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension and Overall Score based on the WIDA ELD Standards.
- The report shows how much English a student has acquired in each language domain as indicated by the levels of English language proficiency.
- Oral language development (listening and speaking) contributes to literacy (reading and writing) development. Generally, the acquisition of oral language outpaces that of literacy. Likewise, acquisition of receptive language (listening and reading), generally proceeds at a faster rate than that for productive language (speaking and writing). Of the four language domains, Writing is usually the last for ELLs to master.
- The students' foundation in their home or primary language is a predictor of their English language development. Those who have strong literacy backgrounds in their native language will most likely acquire literacy in English at a quicker pace than those students who do not. Therefore, for some students, gains in their English language proficiency may be explained by their performance in their primary language.
- The Individual Student Report describes one indicator of a student's English language proficiency—the extent to which the student has acquired listening, speaking, reading, and writing—that is reflective of an ELP test given on an annual basis. School work and local assessment throughout the year provide evidence from additional sources of a student's English language development.



ACCESS for ELLs 2.0*
English Language Proficiency Test

Sample Student

Birth Date: mm/dd/yyyy | Grade: sample grade
Tier: sample tier
District ID: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | State ID: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School: sample school
District: sample district
State: sample state

Individual Student Report 2016

This report provides information about the student's scores on the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 English language proficiency test. This test is based on the WIDA English Language Development Standards and is used to measure students' progress in learning English. Scores are reported as Language Proficiency Levels and as Scale Scores.

Language Domain	Proficiency Level (Possible 1.0-6.0)						Scale Score (Possible 100-600) and Confidence Band See Interpretive Guide for Score Reports for definitions					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	100	200	300	400	500	600
Listening	4.0						368					
Speaking	2.2						320					
Reading	3.4						356					
Writing	3.5						355					
Oral Language 50% Listening + 50% Speaking	3.2						344					
Literacy 50% Reading + 50% Writing	3.5						356					
Comprehension 70% Reading + 30% Listening	3.7						360					
Overall* 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking	3.4						352					

*Overall score is calculated only when all four domains have been assessed. NA: Not available

Domain	Proficiency Level	Students at this level generally can...
Listening	4	understand oral language in English related to specific topics in school and can participate in class discussions, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchange information and ideas with others • Connect people and events based on oral information • Apply key information about processes or concepts presented orally • Identify positions or points of view on issues in oral discussions
Speaking	2	communicate ideas and information orally in English using language that contains short sentences and everyday words and phrases, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share about what, when, or where something happened • Compare objects, people, pictures, events • Describe steps in cycles or processes • Express opinions
Reading	3	understand written language related to common topics in school and can participate in class discussions, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classify main ideas and examples in written information • Identify main information that tells who, what, when or where something happened • Identify steps in written processes and procedures • Recognize language related to claims and supporting evidence
Writing	3	communicate in writing in English using language related to common topics in school, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe familiar issues and events • Create stories or short narratives • Describe processes and procedures with some details • Give opinions with reasons in a few short sentences

For details regarding the scores on this report, refer to the Interpretive Guide for Score Reports at www.wida.us/scorereport

Figure 2: Individual Student Report

- A baseline is established the first time a student takes a test. To determine year to year progress of a student's English language proficiency, reports of results from ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 for two consecutive years need to be compared. Three or more consecutive years of results from ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 establish ELP trend data for that student.
- Share information from the report with family members, such as at parent conferences or family nights, or during home visits. The Can Do Descriptors that describe the expectations of ELLs at each level of English language proficiency may be a helpful tool to share with family members (and they are available in Spanish). Teachers might explain the results from ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 by showing what their student "can do" in each language domain.
- Information from the Individual Student Report may be useful in meetings at school (for example, for Pre-referral Teams, School Improvement, or local Boards of Education), when family members are present, in explaining a student's English language proficiency. To the extent feasible, family members should receive the Individual Student Report in their native language and in English (available at www.wida.us).

For Teachers

- Data generated from ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 are based on the WIDA ELD Standards. The results, by being standards-referenced, help inform curriculum, instruction, and assessment of ELLs. This information, along with the Can Do Descriptors of expected student performance at each level of English language proficiency, is a starting point for teacher planning and collaboration.
- The Overall Score is a single number that is a summary of a student's global language proficiency. It is compensatory. As such, high scores in some language domains may raise low scores in other domains. Students with the same Overall Score may have different ELP profiles. Therefore, a student's performance in individual domains should be examined to determine the relative strength of each language domain and its contribution to the varying composites (Oral Language, Literacy, and Comprehension).
- The scale scores and proficiency levels yield a profile of a student's English language proficiency. The individual components of the profile may serve as the basis for differentiating instruction and assessment. As there is a strong relationship between scores on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 and the WIDA ELD Standards, ideas for differentiation for the varying levels of language proficiency can be taken from the standards' strands of model performance indicators.
- **No single score or language proficiency level**, including the Overall Score (Composite) and its corresponding proficiency level, should be used as the sole determiner for making decisions regarding a student's English language proficiency.
- Sharing student information from score reports is encouraged for all educators who work with ELLs. This information may be useful in serving as one criterion for entry and exit decisions, determining the extent and type of language service, suggesting placement in classes, or curriculum planning.
- The data in the reports need to be contextualized to be meaningful; that is, to the extent possible, include both previous test scores and demographic information on the students when presenting the results. In addition, when disseminating information on the students' productive language, refer to criteria in the Speaking and Writing Rubrics. In addition, the Can Do Descriptors may help further explain student expectations at each level of English language proficiency.

- As each language domain has its own scale, comparisons cannot be made across Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing based on scale scores. For example, a scale score of 425 in Listening is not indicative of the same language proficiency level as that for the identical scale score in Speaking. In contrast, the proficiency levels (as scale score interpretations) may be used to make comparisons across domains.
- A student’s progress or growth in English language proficiency can only be determined when two consecutive years of data are available.

Speaking and Writing Interpretive Rubrics

Two interpretive rubrics are useful in interpreting performance-based information in this score report. They are the WIDA Speaking Rubric and the WIDA Writing Rubric (see Appendix D).

These rubrics may be used to help interpret the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Speaking and Writing scores and also to help inform instructional practices. The interpretive rubrics provide detailed information on the types of spoken and written language proficiency students may be expected to exhibit, based on their reported proficiency levels.

For example, the Sentence Level descriptions of the rubric address language forms and conventions. One characteristic of Level 2 (Emerging) is “repetitive sentence and phrasal patterns and formulaic grammatical structures used in social and instructional situations or across content areas.” Students at this level of proficiency may benefit from classroom activities which focus on improving their ability to use a wider range of written phrases and structures.

However, these rubrics are not used for operational scoring of the Speaking and Writing domains.

Speaking and Writing Scoring Scales

For operational scoring, raters use the Speaking Scoring Scale and the Writing Scoring Scale (see Appendix E). The scoring scales are derived from the interpretive rubrics. The differences between the interpretive rubrics and the scoring scales may seem subtle but are in fact important.

The scoring scales are designed to be as straightforward as possible for use in operational scoring, with the goal of maximizing rater reliability. For this reason, the scoring scales present less detailed descriptions of student performance than within the the interpretive rubrics. The aim of the scoring scales is to retain the detail that is most important for raters to reliably score a student speaking or writing performance. These scales are for operational scoring only and should not be used to interpret test scores or inform classroom instruction.

Interpretive Rubrics	Scoring Scales
Used by teachers to understand scores and incorporate them into instruction.	Used by trained raters to assign scores operationally.

Kindergarten Individual Student Report

About This Report

The Kindergarten Individual Student Report contains detailed information about the performance of a single kindergarten student. Its primary users are teachers, administrators, and school teams.

Report at a Glance

The Kindergarten Individual Student Report is identical in layout and content to the Individual Score Report for Grades 1–12 as described above, save for one key difference: for Kindergarten, two proficiency level interpretations are provided.

Proficiency Level Scores—Accountability Purposes

The accountability proficiency levels are interpretations of the scale scores. They are indicated by a shaded bar that reflects the exact position of the student on the six point ELP scale and a whole number followed by a decimal. The decimal indicates the proportion within the proficiency level range that the student's scale score represents, rounded to the nearest tenth. For example, a proficiency level score of 3.5 is half way between the 3.0 and 4.0 cut scores.

The accountability proficiency levels for Kindergarten are on the same scale and have the same meaning as proficiency level scores for Grades 1–12. They may also be compared to a school or district's Kindergarten proficiency level scores from previous years.

When proficiency level scores (rather than scale scores) are used for accountability purposes, including charting student progress over time, scores from the Kindergarten year serve as the baseline data. By starting with the Kindergarten accountability proficiency level, schools and districts will be able to chart student progress over time. If the instructional score was used for this purpose, it might look as though many students lost English language proficiency between Kindergarten and first grade, due to the higher literacy demands on the Grades 1–12 assessments.

Proficiency Level Scores—Instructional Purposes

Like the accountability proficiency levels, the instructional proficiency levels—denoted by a prefix “K,”—are also interpretations of the scale scores.

The instructional proficiency levels appear to the right of the accountability proficiency levels. To help differentiate them, the instructional proficiency levels appear as a numeral only, without a shaded bar graph.

Instructional proficiency levels do not have the same meaning as proficiency level scores for Grades 1–12. This is because they are based on the Kindergarten Model Performance Indicators, which progress from preliteracy skills at the lower levels to more advanced reading and writing tasks as students approach academic language proficiency.



ACCESS for ELLs 2.0®
English Language Proficiency Test

Sample Student

Birth Date: mm/dd/yyyy | Grade: sample grade
District ID: sample ID
State ID: sample ID
School: sample school
District: sample district
State: sample state

Kindergarten Individual Student Report 2016

This report provides information about the student's scores on the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 English language proficiency test. This test is based on the WIDA English Language Development Standards and is used to measure students' progress in learning English. Scores are reported as Language Proficiency Levels and as Scale Scores. Proficiency Level scores are interpreted and reported in two ways: (1) for Accountability Purposes and (2) for Instructional Purposes (see columns below). The Accountability Proficiency Level score is used to monitor student performance from year-to-year. The Instructional Proficiency Level is used to describe how the student is able to use the English language in Kindergarten, where students are developing skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Language Domain	Proficiency Level		Scale Score (Possible 100-600) and Confidence Band See <i>Interpretive Guide for Score Reports</i> for definitions
	Accountability (Possible 1.0 - 6.0)	Instructional (Possible K1.0 - K6.0)	
	1 2 3 4 5 6		100 200 300 400 500 600
Listening	3.7	4.8	269
Speaking	4.2	5.3	348
Reading	5.3	6.0	280
Writing	2.6	4.1	246
Oral Language 50% Listening + 50% Speaking	3.9	4.9	309
Literacy 50% Reading + 50% Writing	3.4	5.3	263
Comprehension 70% Reading + 30% Listening	4.9	6.0	277
Overall* 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking	3.6	5.2	277

*Overall score is calculated only when all four domains have been assessed. NA: Not available

Proficiency Level	Description of English Language Proficiency Levels
1 – Entering	Knows and uses minimal social language and minimal academic language with visual and graphic support
2 – Emerging	Knows and uses some social English and general academic language with visual and graphic support
3 – Developing	Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support
4 – Expanding	Knows and uses social English and some technical academic language
5 – Bridging	Knows and uses social and academic language working with grade level material
6 – Reaching	Knows and uses social and academic language at the highest level measured by this test

For details regarding the scores on this report, refer to the Interpretive Guide for Score Reports at www.wida.us/scorereport

Figure 3: Kindergarten Individual Student Report

For teachers, the most important information to be gleaned from test results is how individual students are performing in relation to standards developed with their age and grade level in mind. The instructional proficiency level scores provide this information about Kindergarteners, so they can be used along with the WIDA ELD Standards or Can Do Descriptors to help teachers create lessons geared toward and intended to advance a student's level of language proficiency.

Figure 3 shows a sample Kindergarten Individual Student Report.

How to Use This Report

- The Description of English Language Proficiency Levels at the bottom of the report provides a brief summary of all six proficiency levels. This will help educators put the proficiency level attained by their students in context.
- Educators who work with Kindergarten ELL students can find that suggested uses of information in the Individual Student Report for Grades 1–12 (on page 20) also apply to Kindergarten students.
- To determine which of the proficiency levels to look at, think about whether the intended use has to do with instruction in individual classrooms and what individual students can work on (instructional proficiency levels) or whether the intent is to form some kind of comparison—to the proficiency levels attained by students in other grades, for example, or to compare a single student's gains in proficiency from one year to the next. In that case, accountability proficiency levels would be more appropriate.
- For schools deciding where to place students in first grade, the important question is whether a student can be expected to succeed without English language support. The accountability proficiency level score can help guide ELL support decisions for first grade teachers. This score mathematically accounts for the fact that Kindergarten ACCESS measures preliteracy as well as early literacy, and therefore must be lower to protect the ELL placement status of students who may appear to have high levels of English language proficiency according to the instructional scores, but who have yet to fully develop literacy skills, a process that may require support. The accountability scores will be a useful starting point for discussions between Kindergarten and Grade 1 teachers about where students should be placed for the next school year or if they can be exited from ELL support at the end of Kindergarten. Remember, test scores should never be used as the only criterion for high-stakes decision-making. Rather, WIDA recommends the use of multiple criteria including teacher judgment.

Parent/Guardian Report (Kindergarten only)

About This Report

The Parent/Guardian Report contains detailed information about the performance of a single Kindergarten student. Its primary users are students and parents or guardians.

Report at a Glance

The Parent/Guardian Report is very similar in layout and content to the Individual Student Report for Grades 1–12 as described earlier. Like it, the Parent/Guardian Report contains just one proficiency level score, the one reported to educators as the accountability score.

The Parent/Guardian Report does not include scale scores or confidence bands. Rather, it simply gives each of the student's proficiency levels both as a number and as a shaded bar.

Figure 4 shows a sample Parent/Guardian Report.

How to Use This Report

- The Description of English Language Proficiency Levels at the bottom of the report provides a brief summary of all six proficiency levels. This will help parents put the proficiency level attained by their children in context. The Parent/Guardian Report also places the formulae used to calculate the composite scores at the bottom of the page.
- Earlier in the document, a number of strategies were introduced when communicating with parents or guardians regarding the Individual Student Report for Grades 1–12. Suggestions included accompanying the score report with a sample letter for parents (see Appendix B) and other tips for communicating the data in the report to parents or guardians (see page 22). These strategies will also help communicate the information in the Kindergarten Parent/Guardian Report.



District:	Student:	
School:	State ID:	District ID:
Grade:	Birth Date:	

Report Purpose: This report gives information about your child's level of social and academic English language proficiency. Social language is used to communicate for everyday purposes. Academic language is used to communicate the content of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Student's English Language Proficiency Level					
Test Section	1 – Entering	2 – Emerging	3 – Developing	4 – Expanding	5 – Bridging
Listening					
Speaking					
Reading					
Writing					
Oral Language^A (Listening and Speaking)					
Literacy^B (Reading and Writing)					
Comprehension^C (Listening and Reading)					
Overall^D (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing)					

6 – Reaching

Proficiency Level	Description of English Language Proficiency Levels
1 – Entering	Knows and uses minimal social language and minimal academic language with visual and graphic support
2 – Emerging	Knows and uses some social English and general academic language with visual and graphic support
3 – Developing	Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support
4 – Expanding	Knows and uses social English and some technical academic language
5 – Bridging	Knows and uses social and academic language working with grade level material
6 – Reaching	Knows and uses social and academic language at the highest level measured by this test
Other Information	Test Section Is Blank – If the student was absent for this Section of the test A – Oral Language = 50% Listening + 50% Speaking – will be blank if student was absent for one or both of the Sections B – Literacy = 50% Reading + 50% Writing – will be blank if student was absent for one or both of the Sections C – Comprehension Score = 70% Reading + 30% Listening - will be blank if student was absent for one or both of the Sections D – Overall Score = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking - will be blank if student was absent for one or more of the Sections

K-PG-RPT

Figure 4: Blank Parent/Guardian Report

Student Roster Report

About This Report

The Student Roster Report contains information on a group of students within a single school and grade. It provides scale scores for individual students on each language domain and composite score are provided, identical to those in the Individual Student Report. Its intended users are teachers, program coordinators/directors, and administrators.

Report at a Glance

The only information from the Individual Student Report that does not carry over to the Student Roster Report is the confidence bands. The information is also presented more compactly. The table format allows the performances of multiple individuals to be viewed at once.

Demographic Information

The top of the report shows the district, school, and grade. Student names and their state IDs are listed along the left, followed by tier and grade-level cluster.

- Tier: ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 has three forms within a grade-level cluster (except Kindergarten). Tier refers to the form of the test administered that roughly corresponds to a student's position along the second language acquisition continuum: Tier A (Beginning); Tier B (Intermediate); or Tier C (Advanced).
- Cluster: ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is divided into grade-level clusters that mirror those of the ELD Standards (see page 4). While the Individual Student Report includes information on the student's grade and tier, the Student Roster Report also includes grade-level cluster.

Scale Scores

Scale scores for individual students on each language domain (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing) and composite score (Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, and Overall Score) are provided. They are identical to those in the Individual Student Report.

Proficiency Levels

Each scale score is interpreted into an ELP level, presented as a whole number and a decimal. The whole number indicates the student's ELP level as based on the WIDA ELD Standards (1–Entering, 2–Emerging, 3–Developing, 4–Expanding, 5–Bridging, and 6–Reaching). The decimal indicates the proportion within the proficiency level range that the student's scale score represents, rounded to the nearest tenth. For example, a student at language proficiency level 4.5 has a scale score that falls half way between the cut points for Level 4 and for Level 5.

Figure 5 shows a sample Student Roster Report.



ACCESS for ELLs 2.0®
English Language Proficiency Test

District:
School:
Grade:

Student Roster Report – 2016

STUDENT NAME STATE STUDENT ID	Tier	Cluster	Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing		Oral Language ^A		Literacy ^B		Comprehension ^C		Overall Score ^D		
			Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score	Prof Level	Scale Score

Overall Scores are computed when all 4 domains have been completed
NA – Not Available = Student Booklet is marked with a Non-Scoring Code of Absent, Invalide, Declined or Deferred Special Education/504
A – Oral Language = 50% Listening + 50% Speaking
B – Literacy = 50% Reading + 50% Writing
C – Comprehension = 70% Reading + 30% Listening
D – Overall Score = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking

Figure 5: Blank Student Roster Report

How to Use This Report

- As ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is standards-referenced, any comparison should be made between students in relation to the standards. It is not intended for teachers or administrators to make comparisons between students or grades.
- School or district administrators, including coordinators or directors of language services, principals and assistant superintendents may examine the scores from each language domain within a tier and grade-level cluster to detect any patterns in student performance. Here are some questions to ask:
 - What are the similarities and differences in student performance for individual and combined language domains within a grade and tier?
 - To what extent are differences attributed to students' second language development, the design or delivery of instructional services, or other factors?
 - Are these differences justifiable or explainable, such as having students enrolled in dual language programs or having a recent influx of new ELLs?
 - How might we begin to address these differences using the ELD Standards?

Although these questions may not be easily answered, if there are sizable differences between Listening, Speaking, and Reading in comparison with Writing among groups of students, for example, then further investigation may be warranted.

- This report has both a general estimate of a student's range of English language proficiency as well as a student's actual scores and proficiency levels. The general estimate is represented by the tier.
- ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 scale scores form a vertical scale across tiers and grade-level clusters. Each language domain score and composite score are independent and have their own vertical scale. The range of possible scale scores for the entire battery of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 forms, Kindergarten through grade-level cluster 9–12 is 100–600.
- Some ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 test takers are newcomers, students with limited or interrupted formal schooling, or ELLs whose initial literacy development is in their native language. The proficiency of these students may cluster toward the bottom of the scale. The majority of students fall mid-range along the English language proficiency level scale. At the upper end are those students who have progressed through the continuum of second language acquisition and are approaching the “Reaching” level of English language proficiency.
- In making year-to-year comparisons about students, it might be useful to show gains in both scale scores and language proficiency levels (using numerals and decimals). As there are five levels (with Level 6 meaning the student has completed the continuum), the distance between each proficiency level represents a range of approximately 20%. Therefore, there may be some students who progress within a language proficiency level without crossing over to the next highest one; these gains may want to be captured.
- By having tier, scale score, and language proficiency levels for students by grade and grade-level cluster, the information in this report may be useful in developing school and district improvement plans for ELLs. These data provide a snapshot of the performance of the students at one point in time. (The Individual Student Report has more detailed, individual student information.)

- As the Student Roster Report lists all students by tier and grade-level cluster, it may be used as a starting point for grouping students for support services, according to their Overall Score or by their profiles according to language domains. In many elementary schools, for example, students are grouped homogeneously for reading, so that score may be one indicator weighted in the selection process.
- This score report may be useful in examining the profiles of students who are within potential range of exiting support services and to consider what other data sources are needed to make that decision. Conversely, for profiles of other student groups, student results may trigger some ideas for professional development of teachers serving ELLs for the upcoming year.

School Frequency Report

About This Report

The School Frequency Report provides information about the number and percent of tested students to attain each proficiency level **within one school and grade**. This broader view contrasts with Individual Student Report and Student Roster Report, which both provide information about students at the level of the individual test taker. This report's primary audience includes program coordinators/directors and administrators.

Report at a Glance

The six levels of English language proficiency with their brief definitions form the vertical axis of this table. Then, each language domain and combination of domains is divided into two columns. The first column reports how many students scored at each language proficiency level. The second column shows the same group, but as a percentage of the total number of students in that grade tested by the school.

The School Frequency Report provides the highest and lowest scale scores reported in the four language domains for ELLs tested in the stated grade of the specified school. The lowest possible scale score is 100 for Kindergarten; the highest possible scale score is 600, although scale scores over 500 are rare. The difference between the highest and lowest score is the range of performance.

The shaded row at the bottom left-hand side of the page relates the total number of ELLs tested on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 in the stated grade of the specified school.

Figure 6 shows a sample School Frequency Report.

How to Use This Report

- Use the information contained in the report to gain a sense of the school-wide effort in educating ELLs. Compare results of ELLs with those of proficient English students, in particular, former ELLs who are being monitored as well as other linguistically and culturally diverse students. Use multiple data sources, including performance on their state academic achievement tests, to see if there is any crossover.
- The results should not be generalized unless there are relatively large numbers of students. In low incidence schools, these numbers might be quite small; in urban areas, the numbers of students might be substantially larger.
- Use both the numbers of students at each language proficiency level and the corresponding percents of total tested. If numbers are low, the percents may appear distorted if shown in isolation.
- Information provided in this report may have to be further contextualized to be meaningful; numbers alone cannot explain why the distribution of students assigned to language proficiency levels falls as it does. For example, there may be a rather large proportion of ELLs at the lower end of the continuum in all language domains. The reasons for these results may not be evident unless student demographics and educational history are considered. Perhaps the school recently received new students with limited exposure to English. Perhaps the students in this grade have high degrees of mobility and have not had continuous, uninterrupted schooling.



ACCESS for ELLs 2.0®
English Language Proficiency Test

District:
School:
Grade:
Cluster:

School Frequency Report – 2016																
Proficiency Level	Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing		Oral Language ^a		Literacy ^b		Comprehension ^c		Overall Score ^d	
	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested
1 – Entering Knows and uses minimal social language and minimal academic language with visual and graphic support																
2 – Emerging Knows and uses some social English and general academic language with visual and graphic support																
3 – Developing Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support																
4 – Expanding Knows and uses social English and some technical academic language																
5 – Bridging Knows and uses social and academic language working with grade level material																
6 – Reaching Knows and uses social and academic language at the highest level measured by this test																
Highest Score																
Lowest Score																
Total Tested																

A - Oral Language = 50% Listening + 50% Speaking
 B - Literacy = 50% Reading + 50% Writing
 C - Comprehension = 70% Reading + 30% Listening
 D - Overall Score = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking

Figure 6: Blank School Frequency Report

District Frequency Report

About This Report

The presentation of information in this report is identical to that of the School Frequency Report except the numbers and percents refer to ELLs in a stated grade of a specified district rather than a school. Therefore, the descriptions of the features of this report are repeated from those previously stated. This report's primary audience includes program coordinators/directors, administrators, and boards of education.

Report at a Glance

The presentation of information in this report is identical to that of the School Frequency Report except the numbers and percents refer to ELLs in a stated grade of a specified district rather than a school. Therefore, the descriptions of the features of this report are repeated from those previously stated.

The six levels of English language proficiency with their brief definitions form the vertical axis of this table. Then, each language domain and combination of domains is divided into two columns. The first column reports how many students scored at each language proficiency level. The second column shows the same group, but as a percentage of the total number of students in that grade tested by the district.

The District Frequency Report provides the highest and lowest scale scores reported in the four language domains for ELLs tested in the stated grade of the specified district. The lowest possible scale score is 100 for Kindergarten; the highest possible scale score is 600, although scale scores over 500 are rare. The difference between the highest and lowest score is the range of performance.

The shaded row at the bottom left-hand side of the page relates the total number of ELLs tested on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 in the stated grade of the specified district.

Figure 7 shows a sample District Frequency Report.

How to Use This Report

- This report provides a glimpse of the performance of all ELLs across language domains and combination of domains in a district at the time of testing.
- Information in this report may be useful in planning, developing, or restructuring language services for ELLs at a district level. Variation in students' language proficiency across individual and combined language domains may help shape their type and amount of support. In some states, students' native language is also a component of support that is to be taken into account in program design
- As with the School Frequency Report, this report may be used in conjunction with the Student Roster Report to better explain student performance. The distribution of students along the six English language proficiency levels, to some extent, is a function of the tier that was administered. For example, as students in Tier A are considered "Beginners," they should not be expected to, nor will they be able to score at the highest levels of English language proficiency. In contrast, those students in Tier C received the most challenging items representative of the higher levels of English language proficiency.



ACCESS for ELLs 2.0®
English Language Proficiency Test

District:
Grade:
Cluster:

District Frequency Report – 2016																	
Proficiency Level	Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing		Oral Language ^a		Literacy ^b		Comprehension ^c		Overall Score ^d		
	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested	
1 – Entering Knows and uses minimal social language and minimal academic language with visual and graphic support																	
2 – Emerging Knows and uses some social English and general academic language with visual and graphic support																	
3 – Developing Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support																	
4 – Expanding Knows and uses social English and some technical academic language																	
5 – Bridging Knows and uses social and academic language working with grade level material																	
6 – Reaching Knows and uses social and academic language at the highest level measured by this test																	
Highest Score																	
Lowest Score																	
Total Tested																	

A - Oral Language = 50% Listening + 50% Speaking
 B - Literacy = 50% Reading + 50% Writing
 C - Comprehension = 70% Reading + 30% Listening
 D - Overall Score = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking

Figure 7: Blank District Frequency Report

- Just as in the School Frequency Report, information provided in this report may have to be further contextualized to be meaningful. A description of the students in terms of their language, cultural, and experiential backgrounds would provide a fuller portrait of a district's ELLs.
- For purposes of communicating information to various stakeholders, such as local Boards of Education or community groups, the data may be graphically displayed in the form of a histogram. The numbers of students or percent of total tested could serve as the vertical axis and the language domains and combination of domains could form the horizontal axis. Each language level could then be color-coded and positioned under the corresponding language domains.
- In the same vein, differences in performance of students by grade from year to year on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 may be graphically displayed. To interpret the results more accurately, it is important to note the percent of matched pairs of groups of students; that is, how many ELLs in one year remained in the program and district the next year.

Appendix A: WIDA Performance Level Definitions

WIDA Performance Definitions - Listening and Reading Grades K-12

Within sociocultural contexts for processing language...			
Discourse Dimension		Sentence Dimension	Word/Phrase Dimension
Linguistic Complexity		Language Forms and Conventions	Vocabulary Usage
Level 6 - Reaching Language that meets all criteria through Level 5, Bridging			
At each grade, toward the end of a given level of English language proficiency, and with instructional support, English language learners will process...			
Level 5 Bridging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rich descriptive discourse with complex sentences Cohesive and organized related ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compound, complex grammatical constructions (e.g., multiple phrases and clauses) A broad range of sentence patterns characteristic of particular content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical and abstract content-area language Words and expressions with shades of meaning across content areas
Level 4 Expanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connected discourse with a variety of sentences Expanded related ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A variety of complex grammatical constructions Sentence patterns characteristic of particular content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific and some technical content-area language Words or expressions with multiple meanings across content areas
Level 3 Developing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discourse with a series of extended sentences Related ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compound and some complex (e.g., noun phrase, verb phrase, prepositional phrase) grammatical constructions Sentence patterns across content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific content language, including expressions Words and expressions with common collocations and idioms across content areas
Level 2 Emerging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple related simple sentences An idea with details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compound grammatical constructions Repetitive phrasal and sentence patterns across content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General content words and expressions, including cognates Social and instructional words and expressions across content areas
Level 1 Entering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single statements or questions An idea within words, phrases, or chunks of language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple grammatical constructions (e.g., commands, Wh- questions, declaratives) Common social and instructional forms and patterns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General content-related words Everyday social and instructional words and expressions



Figure A-1: WIDA Performance Definitions Listening and Reading, Grades K-12

WIDA Performance Definitions - Speaking and Writing Grades K-12

Within sociocultural contexts for language use...

	Discourse Dimension	Sentence Dimension	Word/Phrase Dimension
	Linguistic Complexity	Language Forms and Conventions	Vocabulary Usage
Level 6 - Reaching Language that meets all criteria through Level 5, Bridging			
At each grade, toward the end of a given level of English language proficiency, and with instructional support, English language learners will produce...			
Level 5 Bridging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple, complex sentences Organized, cohesive, and coherent expression of ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A variety of grammatical structures matched to purpose A broad range of sentence patterns characteristic of particular content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical and abstract content-area language, including content-specific collocations Words and expressions with precise meaning across content areas
Level 4 Expanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short, expanded, and some complex sentences Organized expression of ideas with emerging cohesion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A variety of grammatical structures Sentence patterns characteristic of particular content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific and some technical content-area language Words and expressions with expressive meaning through use of collocations and idioms across content areas
Level 3 Developing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short and some expanded sentences with emerging complexity Expanded expression of one idea or emerging expression of multiple related ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repetitive grammatical structures with occasional variation Sentence patterns across content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific content language, including cognates and expressions Words or expressions with multiple meanings used across content areas
Level 2 Emerging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phrases or short sentences Emerging expression of ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulaic grammatical structures Repetitive phrasal and sentence patterns across content areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General content words and expressions Social and instructional words and expressions across content areas
Level 1 Entering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Words, phrases, or chunks of language Single words used to represent ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phrase-level grammatical structures Phrasal patterns associated with common social and instructional situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General content-related words Everyday social, instructional and some content-related words

Appendix B: List of Available Languages

List of Report Translations Available

Albanian	Hmong	Russian
Amharic	Ilokano	Samoan
Arabic	Italian	Serbian
Bengali	Japanese	Somali
Bosnian	Karen	Spanish
Burmese	Khmer Krom (Cambodian)	Swahili
Chamarro	Korean	Tagalog
Chinese (Simplified)	Lao	Telugu
Chinese (Traditional)	Malayalam	Tongan
Chuukese	Mandingo	Turkish
French	Marshallese	Ukrainian
German	Nepali	Urdu
Gujarati	Polish	Vietnamese
Haitian Creole	Portuguese	Woloff
Hawaiian	Punjabi	
Hindi	Romanian	



ACCESS for ELLs 2.0*
Prueba de desempeño lingüístico en inglés

Fecha de nacimiento:
Nivel:
ID del distrito:
Escuela:
Distrito:
Estado:

| Grado:

| ID estatal:

Informe individual del estudiante 2016

Este informe brinda información sobre el nivel de desarrollo del alumno en la prueba de desempeño lingüístico en inglés ACCESS for ELLs 2.0. Esta prueba se basa en los estándares de desarrollo del idioma inglés de WIDA y se emplea para medir el progreso de los alumnos en el aprendizaje del inglés. Los resultados se informan como Niveles de desempeño lingüístico del idioma y como Escalas de puntaje.

Forma de lenguaje	Nivel de desempeño lingüístico (Posible 1.0-6.0)						Escala de puntaje (Posible 100-600) e Intervalo de confianza Consulte la Guía de interpretación de los informes de puntuaciones si desea obtener definiciones					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	100	200	300	400	500	600
Escuchar												
Hablar												
Leer												
Escribir												
Lenguaje oral 50% escuchar + 50% hablar												
Capacidad de leer y escribir 50% leer + 50% escribir												
Comprender 70% leer + 30% escuchar												
Puntaje global* 35% leer + 35% escribir + 15% escuchar + 15% hablar												

*El puntaje global se calcula solamente después de evaluar las cuatro formas de lenguaje. NA (por sus siglas en inglés): No disponible

Forma de lenguaje	Nivel de desempeño lingüístico	En este nivel, los alumnos generalmente pueden hacer lo siguiente:
Escuchar		
Hablar		
Leer		
Escribir		

Si desea obtener detalles sobre los resultados en este informe, consulte la Guía de interpretación de los informes de puntuaciones en www.wida.us/scorereport

Sum-ISR-SPAN

Figure B-1: Blank Individual Student Report (Spanish)

Appendix C: Sample Parent/Guardian Letter

Dear Parent or Guardian,

This past year, all ELLs in Kindergarten through Grade 12 took ACCESS for ELLs 2.0. The purpose of the test is to find out how much English your child has learned. We will use this information to help your child improve in listening, speaking, reading, and writing English each year.

Here are your child’s results on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0. The score report tells you about your child’s English using proficiency levels. These levels go from 1 (Entering) to 6 (Reaching). This information is for you to review and keep.

If you have any questions about how your child did on this test, please contact your child’s teacher, principal, or me.

Sincerely,

(School ELL coordinator, principal, or teacher)

Figure C-1: Sample Parent/Guardian Letter

Appendix D: WIDA Interpretive Rubrics

Revised Writing Rubric of the WIDA™ Consortium Grades 1-12			
	Discourse Level	Sentence Level	Word/Phrase Level
	Linguistic Complexity	Language Forms and Conventions	Vocabulary Usage
Level 6 Reaching	<p>Text is fully comprehensible and appropriate to purpose, situation, and audience; comparable to the writing of English proficient students meeting college- and career-readiness standards; and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> extended connected text (single or multiple paragraphs) that is organized and shows tight cohesion in the precise expression of ideas clear evidence of consistency in conveying an appropriate perspective, register, and genre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a full range of sentence patterns and grammatical structures matched to content area topics consistent use of appropriate conventions to convey meaning, including for effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistent usage of just the right word or expression in just the right context related to content area topics facility with precise vocabulary usage in general, specific, or technical language
Level 5 Bridging	<p>Text is comprehensible and related to purpose; generally comparable to the writing of English proficient peers; and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> extended connected text (single or multiple paragraphs) that is organized and shows a cohesive and coherent expression of ideas clear evidence of conveying an appropriate perspective, register, and genre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a broad range of sentence patterns and grammatical structures matched to the content area topic nearly consistent use of appropriate conventions to convey meaning, including for effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of technical and abstract content-area words and expressions as appropriate usage of words and expressions with precise meaning related to content area topics as appropriate vocabulary usage that fulfills the writing purpose
Level 4 Expanding	<p>Text is generally comprehensible at all times; approaches comparability to the writing of English proficient peers; and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> connected text (sentences or paragraphs) that shows an organized expression of ideas with emerging cohesion some evidence of conveying an appropriate perspective, register, and genre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a range of sentence patterns and grammatical structures characteristic of the content area generally consistent use of appropriate conventions to convey meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of specific and some technical content-area words and expressions as appropriate usage of words and expressions with multiple meanings or common collocations and idioms across content areas as appropriate vocabulary usage that generally fulfills the writing purpose
Level 3 Developing	<p>Original text is generally comprehensible (though comprehensibility may from time to time be compromised in more complex original text) and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> text that shows developing organization in the expression of an expanded idea or multiple related ideas evidence of a developing sense of perspective, register, and genre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a developing range of sentence patterns and grammatical structures common to content areas developing use of conventions to convey meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of some specific content words and expressions as appropriate usage of common cognates, words, or expressions related to content areas as appropriate vocabulary usage that attempts to fulfill the writing purpose
Level 2 Emerging	<p>Some original text and text adapted from model or source text is generally comprehensible (though comprehensibility may often be compromised in attempts at more complex original text) and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> text that shows emerging expression of an idea or ideas and may demonstrate some attempt at organization some amount of text that may be copied or adapted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> repetitive sentence and phrasal patterns and formulaic grammatical structures used in social and instructional situations or across content areas variable use of conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of general content words and expressions usage of social and instructional words and expressions across content areas possible usage of general vocabulary where more specific language is needed
Level 1 Entering	<p>Text that is copied or adapted from model or source text is generally comprehensible (though comprehensibility may be significantly compromised in original text) and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> language that represents an idea or ideas varying amounts of text that may be copied adapted text that may contain some original language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> words, chunks of language, or simple phrasal patterns associated with common social and instructional situations possible use of some conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of highest frequency general content-related words usage of everyday social and instructional words and expressions

Figure D-1: WIDA Writing Interpretive Rubric

Speaking Rubric of the WIDA™ Consortium Grades 1-12			
	Discourse Level	Sentence Level	Word/Phrase Level
	Linguistic Complexity	Language Forms	Vocabulary Usage
Level 6 Reaching	<p>Response is fully comprehensible, fluent, and appropriate to purpose, situation and audience; comparable to the speech of English proficient students meeting college- and career-readiness standards; characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustained, connected oral language characterized by confidence, coherence, and precision in the expression of ideas tailored to purpose, situation, and audience clear evidence of consistency in conveying an appropriate perspective and register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a full range of oral phrase and sentence patterns and grammatical structures matched to content area topics controlled, skilled use of oral language to convey meaning, including for effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistent usage of just the right word or expression in just the right context related to content area topics facility with precise vocabulary usage in general, specific, or technical language
Level 5 Bridging	<p>Response is comprehensible, fluent, and generally related to purpose; generally comparable to the speech of English proficient peers; characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustained, connected oral language that shows appropriate and coherent expression of ideas related to purpose, situation and audience clear evidence of conveying an appropriate perspective and register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a broad range of oral phrase and sentence patterns and grammatical structures matched to the content area topic controlled, fluid use of oral language to convey meaning, including for effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of technical and abstract content-area words and expressions as appropriate usage of words and expressions with precise meaning related to content area topics as appropriate vocabulary usage that fulfills the speaking purpose
Level 4 Expanding	<p>Response is generally comprehensible, fluent, and related to purpose; characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> connected oral language that supports the expression of expanded or related ideas through emerging coherence, detail and clarity some evidence of conveying an appropriate perspective and register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a range of oral phrase and sentence patterns and grammatical structures characteristic of the content area generally controlled and fluid use of oral language to convey meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of specific and some technical content-area words and expressions as appropriate usage of words and expressions with multiple meanings or common idioms across content areas as appropriate vocabulary usage that generally fulfills the speaking purpose
Level 3 Developing	<p>Response is generally comprehensible (though comprehensibility and fluency may from time to time be compromised in more complex speech); characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oral language that shows the development of connected language in the expression of an expanded idea or multiple related ideas evidence of a developing sense of perspective and register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> developing range of oral phrase and sentence patterns and grammatical structures common to content areas developing control in use of oral language to convey meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of some specific content words and expressions as appropriate usage of words or expressions used frequently in content areas, as appropriate vocabulary usage that attempts to fulfill the speaking purpose
Level 2 Emerging	<p>Response is generally comprehensible (though comprehensibility and fluency may often be compromised in more complex speech); characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oral language that shows emerging expression of ideas; some attempt at connecting ideas may at times be evident some amount of language that may be repeated from the prompt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chunks of language, repetitive oral phrase patterns, and formulaic grammatical structures used in social and instructional situations or across content areas variable control in use of oral language to convey meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of general content words and expressions usage of social and instructional words and expressions across content areas possible usage of general vocabulary where more specific language is needed
Level 1 Entering	<p>Response is generally comprehensible (though comprehensibility and fluency may be significantly compromised in language beyond words, oral phrases, or memorized chunks); characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> words, oral phrases, or memorized chunks of oral language used to represent ideas varying amounts of language that may be repeated from the prompt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> words, chunks of language, or simple phrasal patterns associated with common social and instructional situations occasional control in use of oral language to convey meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usage of highest frequency general content-related words usage of everyday social and instructional words and expressions

Figure D-2: WIDA Speaking Interpretive Rubric

Appendix E: WIDA Scoring Scales

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Speaking Scoring Scale	
Score point	Response characteristics
Exemplary use of oral language to provide an elaborated response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use comparable to or going beyond the model in sophistication • Clear, automatic, and fluent delivery • Precise and appropriate word choice
Strong use of oral language to provide a detailed response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use approaching that of model in sophistication, though not as rich • Clear delivery • Appropriate word choice
Adequate use of oral language to provide a satisfactory response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use not as sophisticated as that of model • Generally comprehensible use of oral language • Adequate word choice
Attempted use of oral language to provide a response in English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use does not support an adequate response • Comprehensibility may be compromised • Word choice may not be fully adequate
No response (in English)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not respond (in English)

Scoring processes
Select the score point that best describes the overall response relative to the qualities of the model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check to ensure each bullet point is met • If not, check one level below
Scoring notes & rules
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For P1 tasks, assign a score of Adequate and above if the response includes more than one word in English. This includes an article plus noun (e.g., “a chair”), and words repeated verbatim from the model. • For P3 and P5 tasks, students may take up and use language from the model and should not be penalized for this. This is particularly relevant for personal-preference tasks. • At all task levels, simply repeating or reading all or part of the task question should be scored Attempted. • At all task levels, responses of “I don’t know” should be scored Attempted. <p>Off-task response: The response shows no understanding of or interaction with the prompt. It may answer another, unrelated task. A response that is entirely off task receives a score of Attempted.</p> <p>Off-topic response: The response shows a misinterpretation of the instructions. An off-topic response is <i>related</i> to the prompt, but does not address it. (Note that this does not refer to task completion—for example, if a student is asked for 3 reasons and gives 1, this should be scored based on language use and is not considered off topic.) The maximum score for an off-topic response is Adequate. If any part of the response is on topic, the entire response is scored as on topic.</p>

For scoring use only

Figure E-1: WIDA Speaking Test Scoring Scale

ACCESS for ELLS 2.0 Writing Scoring Scale, Grades 1–12

5+	Score Point 6: D: Sophisticated organization of text that clearly demonstrates an overall sense of unity throughout, tailored to context (e.g., purpose, situation, and audience) S: Purposeful use of a variety of sentence structures that are essentially error-free W: Precise use of vocabulary with just the right word in just the right place
4+	Score Point 5: D: Strong organization of text that supports an overall sense of unity, appropriate to context (e.g., purpose, situation, and audience) S: A variety of sentence structures with very few grammatical errors W: A wide range of vocabulary, used appropriately and with ease
3+	Score Point 4: D: Organized text that presents a clear progression of ideas demonstrating an awareness of context (e.g., purpose, situation, and audience) S: Complex and some simple sentence structures, containing occasional grammatical errors that don't generally interfere with comprehensibility W: A variety of vocabulary beyond the stimulus and prompt, generally conveying the intended meaning
2+	Score Point 3: D: Text that shows developing organization including the use of elaboration and detail, though the progression of ideas may not always be clear S: Simple and some complex sentence structures, whose meaning may be obscured by noticeable grammatical errors W: Some vocabulary beyond the stimulus and prompt, although usage is noticeably awkward at times
1+	Score Point 2: D: Text that shows emerging organization of ideas but with heavy dependence on the stimulus and prompt and/or resembles a list of simple sentences (which may be linked by simple connectors) S: Simple sentence structures; meaning is frequently obscured by noticeable grammatical errors when attempting beyond simple sentences W: Vocabulary primarily drawn from the stimulus and prompt
	Score Point 1: D: Minimal text that represents an idea or ideas S: Primarily words, chunks of language and short phrases rather than complete sentences W: Distinguishable English words that are often limited to high frequency words or reformulated expressions from the stimulus and prompt

D: Discourse Level

S: Sentence Level

W: Word/Phrase Level

Figure E-2: WIDA Writing Test Scoring Scale



©2016 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System,
on behalf of WIDA

www.wida.us