



Ventura County Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)
Mary E. Samples, Assistant Superintendent



*Guidelines for Reclassification of
English Learner
Special Education Students
2011*

*Ventura County SELPA
5100 Adolfo Road
Camarillo, CA 93012
(805) 437-1560*

www.venturacountyselpa.com

For more information about this document contact:

Fran Arner-Costello, Director, Programs and Services at farnerco@vcoe.org

1. Assessment for Children Entering in Kindergarten



Assessment needs to be conducted within the first 30 days of kindergarten for all students with a language other than English on the Home Language Survey. For students already being served in special education preschool, at the transition to kindergarten IEP meeting, it needs to be noted on the “*English Language Development*” portion of the IEP whether the student will take CELDT (*with or without accommodations*) or an alternate assessment.

2. Alternate Assessment



If the student cannot meaningfully take all or any portion of the CELDT, note how ELD level will be determined using alternate assessment. Specify which tool will be used for each portion of the assessment. You must consult with your district Language Assessment Team on this. The IEP team may use the “CELDT Participation Criteria” form to assist in their decision (Attachment A).

If alternate assessment is used, the student must be assessed in all areas, including, listening, speaking, reading and writing. Use the Ventura County Comprehensive Alternate Language Proficiency Survey for Students with Moderate/Severe Disabilities (VCCALPS).

3. The IEP



There are five places that the needs of English Learners (ELs) are addressed on the Ventura County SELPA IEP forms:

A Student Information and Services Page- The form requires that the native language be specified. Also, you must indicate whether the student is English Only (EO), English Learner (EL), Initially Fluent English Proficient (IFEP), or Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP). If RFEP, you need to indicate the date student was reclassified. If they were considered IFEP in preschool, they will need to be reassessed with CELDT upon entering kindergarten.

B Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance - In the “Communication” section, if the student is an EL, it should be noted, including communication in primary language as well as English. Under “STAR Program” record the score as well as current levels from the most recent language proficiency survey in Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing and note date of most recent assessment. If this is a preschooler, the level is noted on the Strategies and Adaptations for Instruction and Assessment Preschool Level.

C Annual Goals/Goals and Objectives- For **each goal**, if the student is an EL, the language of instruction for the goal must be noted. There must at least one English Language Development Goal. English/Language Arts goals must be at the appropriate level of language development for the student.

D Least Restrictive Environment – Check “yes” under “Special Factors” for “Language Needs of ELs.”

E English Language Development Information- Note how the student will take CELDT (with

or without accommodations or modifications), or alternate assessment. Also indicate type of ELD services to be provided, as well as location and frequency, ELD Goal number(s) and strategies for accessing core curriculum.

(See Appendix B for IEP checklist for ELs)

4. The Reclassification Process



Each district will develop a process for consideration of reclassification of Special Education Students who are ELs. It may be done as part of an IEP meeting, but does not become part of the IEP.

A Step One: District person in charge of CELDT testing (*in collaboration with special education director if appropriate*) compiles results of all special education students who have not met overall reclassification criteria. They are sorted by school sites.

B Step Two: The IEP team meets. Team should include district English Learner program personnel. Parent opinion and consultation is required.

C Step Three: Using the “*Worksheet for IEP Team Recommendation for Reclassification of Special Education English Learners to Fluent English Proficient*” form (Attachment C), team considers whether disability is impacting performance. See Instructions for completing the form (Attachment D.)

D Step Four: If the team agrees to recommend reclassification as RFEP, the bottom box “The IEP team determines that the primary reason the student does not meet reclassification criteria is due to the disability rather than limited English proficiency and the student no longer needs English Learner services” is checked. The form is sent to the appropriate district or site English Language Reclassification representative.

E Step Five: If it is determined through the district process that the student will be reclassified, the Special Education Case Manager and parent will be notified. The student will be noted as an “RFEP” on the subsequent IEP, and the date of district reclassification noted (not the date of the IEP). Once the student is reclassified, CELDT (or alternate) testing is no longer required, nor is the “*English Language Development Information*” page.

Additional Resources



All located on the SELPA website.



Ventura County SELPA (2005). “Guidelines for Assessment for Special Education of English Learners,” Camarillo, CA (*under Publications*)



Ventura County SELPA (2006). “Guidelines for Speech-Language Pathologists.” Camarillo, CA. (Chapter XI- “Assessment of ELs” and Chapter XII “Intervention for ELs.”) (*under Publications*)



Attachments

- A. CELDT Participation Criteria for Alternate Assessments
- B. IEP Checklist for ELs
- C. Worksheet for IEP Team Recommendation for Reclassification of Special Education English Learners to Fluent English Proficient
- D. Reclassification Form Instructions
- E. Suggested Considerations for Review of IEPs or 504 Plan
- F. Understanding CELDT Administration

Date: _____

Page ____ of ____

CELDT Participation Criteria for Alternate Assessment

Alternate assessments provide an alternate means to measure the English language proficiency of students with disabilities whose individualized education program (IEP) teams have determined that they are unable to participate in the CELDT even with variations, accommodations, and/or modifications. In order to aid an IEP team in its determination of whether a student should use alternate assessments, the following may be considered:

Circle “Agree” or “Disagree” for each item:

- | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|--|
| Agree | Disagree | The student requires extensive instruction in multiple settings to acquire, maintain, and generalize skills necessary for application in school, work, home, and community environment. |
| Agree | Disagree | The student demonstrates academic/cognitive ability and adaptive behavior that require substantial adjustments to the general curriculum. The student may participate in many of the same activities as their non-disabled peers; however, their learning objectives and expected outcomes focus on the functional applications of the general curriculum. |
| Agree | Disagree | The student cannot address the performance level assessed in the CELDT, even with accommodations or modifications. |
| Agree | Disagree | The decision to participate in the alternate assessment is not based on the amount of time the student is receiving special education services. |
| Agree | Disagree | The decision to participate in the alternate assessment is not based on excessive or extended absences. |
| Agree | Disagree | The decision to participate in the alternate assessment is not based on language, cultural, or economic difference. |
| Agree | Disagree | The decision to participate in the alternate assessment is not based on the deafness/blindness, visual, auditory, and/or motor disabilities. |
| Agree | Disagree | The decision to participate in the alternate assessment is not primarily based on a specific categorical label. |
| Agree | Disagree | The decision for alternate assessment is an IEP team decision, rather than an administrative decision. |

If the answer to any of the statements is “Disagree”, the team should consider including the student in the CELDT with the use of any necessary accommodations or modifications.

IEP Team Decision: _____ is eligible for participating in the CELDT.

IEP Team Decision: _____ is **not** eligible for participating in the CELDT.

IEP CHECKLIST FOR ELs

STEPS FOR PROOFREADING IEPS TO INSURE COMPLIANCE FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS

1. SIS page – Check to see if the student is listed as an English Learner.
2. ELD page – Be sure that the assessment instrument is listed (CELDT or VCCALPS) and that the date of most recent assessment is within the last year (or most recent available), not old test dates. Verify that the ELD levels are correct for that date. Note how student will participate in ELD testing this year. If CELDT, note variations or accommodations. Indicate how student will participate in English Language Development Services. Select ELD program, number of minutes per day of ELD instruction, and location. Note the goals which will contribute to English Language development and strategies for accessing core curriculum.

Note: Preschoolers will not have an ELD page. Instead, use the Strategies and Adaptations for Instruction and Assessment Preschool Level page to note EL level, goals, and services.

3. LRE page – Check that you have marked "Yes "under special factors for English Learners. It will automatically indicate "See English Language Development Page."
4. **Goals** or **Goals and Objectives** pages

Be sure that:

- Every goal has the **Language of Instruction** marked (English and/or Spanish).
- The goal number listed on the ELD page is the correct number for the ELD goal and that ELD is included in the **Area of Need**.
- The goal is linguistically appropriate, meaning that it is appropriate for the EL level.
- There are 3 goals banks that address EL – The "ELD" goals bank, "Preschool EL" bank, and "ELA by ELD" bank. All correlate goals with EL levels.

WORKSHEET FOR IEP TEAM RECOMMENDATION FOR RECLASSIFICATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION ENGLISH LEARNERS TO FLUENT ENGLISH PROFICIENT

Ventura County SELPA IEP

For use for consideration of reclassification of English Learners with IEPs who do not meet regular district reclassification criteria.

Name: _____ D.O.B: _____ Date of Meeting: _____

Description of how either primary or secondary disability affects language (if applicable): _____

Grade First Entered School: _____ Years in the U.S.: _____ Years in EL Program: _____

Current English Learner Program Model: _____

Current English Language Development Services: _____

THE TEAM CONSIDERED THE FOUR CRITERIA OF RECLASSIFICATION (EC 313(D)) IN ORDER TO ASSIST THE RECLASSIFICATION TEAM.

I. English Language Proficiency Assessment

Assessment Name: CELDT or Alternate Assessment(s): _____

Current School Year Data **Date:** _____

Overall Score/Level: _____; Listening Score/Level: _____; Speaking Score/Level: _____; Reading Score/Level: _____ Writing Score/Level: _____

(For alternate only) Primary Language: Overall Score/Level: _____; Listening Score/Level: _____; Speaking Score/Level: _____;

Reading Score/Level: _____ Writing Score/Level: _____

Previous School Year Data **Date:** _____

Overall Score/Level: _____; Listening Score/Level: _____; Speaking Score/Level: _____; Reading Score/Level: _____ Writing Score/Level: _____

(Note: For reclassification, English overall proficiency level must be early advanced or higher AND Listening intermediate or higher, Speaking intermediate or higher, Reading intermediate or higher, and Writing intermediate or higher.)

Student met language proficiency level criteria as assessed by CELDT or Alternate. Yes No

(If yes, proceed to section 2. If no, consider the following):

Yes No N/A The IEP team reviewed other informal measures of proficiency and determined it is likely the student is proficient in English. *(Only allowed if student's Overall proficiency level was in the upper end of the Intermediate level)*

Yes No The IEP team has determined that the student's disability impacts his or her ability to manifest English proficiency.

Areas affected: Listening Speaking Reading Writing

If yes, explanation: _____

(Possible indicators: Student has similar academic deficits and error patterns in English as well as primary language; error patterns in listening, speaking, reading, and writing are typical of students with that disability versus students with second language issues)

(If either of the above are checked "yes", indicate "yes" to the following statement):

The IEP team has determined the student has demonstrated an appropriate level of English Language Proficiency commensurate with his/her abilities. Yes

No

(If yes, proceed to section 2.)

2. Teacher's Evaluation of Student Academic Performance

Evaluation was based on: Classroom performance District-wide assessments Progress toward IEP Goals Other: _____

Student met academic performance indicators set by district. Yes No *If yes, proceed to section 3, if no, consider the following:*

Yes No The IEP team has determined that the deficit is due to the disability, and unrelated to English Language proficiency.

If yes, explanation: _____

(If the above is checked "yes", indicate "yes" to the following statement):

The IEP team has determined the student has demonstrated an appropriate level of academic performance commensurate with his/her abilities. Yes No

(If yes, proceed to section 3.)

3. Comparison of Performance in Basic Skills

Assessment(s) taken: CST CMA CAPA CAHSEE Date: _____

Reading/Language Arts Score _____

(Note: Score in Reading/Language Arts (RLA) must be at least beginning of basic level to midpoint of basic – each district may select exact cut point.)

Student met performance criteria. Yes No *If yes, proceed to question 4, if no, check all that apply:*

Yes No Student's Basic Skills assessment scores appear to be commensurate with his/her intellectual ability.

Yes No Error patterns noted mirror the patterns of errors made by students with the same disability versus a language difference

Yes No Student has received ELD services for more than three years and academic progress in ELA is commensurate with that of peers who manifest similar disabilities who are not English learners

(If any of the above are checked "yes", indicate "yes" to the following statement):

The IEP team has determined that the student has demonstrated an appropriate level of performance in RLA Basic Skills commensurate with his/her abilities.

Yes No

(If yes, proceed to section 4.)

4. Parent Opinion and Consultation

Yes No The parent/guardian participated in this discussion. Parent comments: _____

If no, an opportunity for parent consultation must be given before a final decision will be made by reclassification personnel.

The IEP team determines that the primary reason the student does not meet reclassification criteria is due to the disability rather than limited English proficiency and the student no longer needs English Learner services. Yes No

Name of EL Representative who provided input for this discussion: _____

This worksheet will be forwarded to the appropriate site or district English Language Reclassification representative. The final decision will be made through that process. Parent and Special Education Case Manager will be informed of the decision.

**Worksheet for IEP Team Recommendation for Reclassification
of Special Education English Learners to Fluent English Proficient**

This form is to be used for the IEP team to consider whether or not to recommend to the district or site level Reclassification team or process that the student be reclassified as Fluent English Proficient (RFEP). It is to be used when the student has not met regular reclassification criteria set by the district, and the team wants to consider whether or not the student's disability is impacting their performance on any of the four criteria for reclassification as per Ed Code 313(D). This form would not be used for a preschool student.

This form can be completed as part of a Special Education review, but only with input from a representative from the department responsible for English Language Development.

- a. **English Language Proficiency Assessment:** This section considers performance on the CELDT or alternate form of English Language Proficiency assessment (Ventura County Comprehensive Alternate Language Proficiency Survey – VCCALPS). The Ed Code requires that a student may be reclassified only if he/she has achieved an overall proficiency level of Early Advanced or higher. The student must also achieve at intermediate or higher in listening, speaking, reading and writing. If the student met those criteria, check “Yes” and move to question #2.

If the student *did not meet* the required overall level of proficiency and required level in each of the tests, consider the next two questions.

- a. If the student's overall proficiency is in the upper end of Intermediate, the team may review other informal measures of proficiency such as teacher and parent reports or observation by an expert in English Language Development. Check “Yes” if the team feels it is likely the student is proficient in English.
- b. If the team feels that the student's disability impacts his or her ability to demonstrate English proficiency, check “Yes” and explain. Possible indicators are that the student demonstrates similar academic deficits in English as well as the primary language, that the student's language development is low in both languages, or error patterns in speaking, reading, and writing are typical of other non-ELs with similar disabilities.

If either of the questions above are checked “Yes” the team may check “Yes” to “The IEP team has determined the student has reached an appropriate level of English Language Proficiency commensurate with his/her abilities” and proceed to #2. If “No” stop here.

- b. **Teacher's Evaluation of Student Academic Performance:** Check the sources of data used by the teacher to evaluate academic performance. If the student met the academic performance indicators set by the district, check “Yes” and proceed to section #3.

If the student *did not meet* the performance indicators set by the district, the team should consider whether it believes that the deficit in academic performance is due to the disability,

unrelated to English Language proficiency. Indicators would be similar to those under question #1, for example, the student demonstrates similar deficits as other students with the same disability, or student shows similar performance errors in primary language as well as English. If the team feels that the causative factor is the disability rather the acquisition of English, check “Yes.”

If the team checks “Yes” to the above question, the team will also check “Yes” to the statement “The IEP team has determined the student has reached an appropriate level of academic performance commensurate with his/her abilities.” and progress to section #3. If “No” stop here.

- c. **Comparison of Performance in Basic Skills:** Indicate the Basic Skills assessment(s) the student has taken and date(s). The Ed Code requires that the student’s score in Reading/Language Arts must be at least beginning of basic level to midpoint of basic. Check with your district to see the cut point that the district uses. If the student has met the cut point in Reading/Language Arts, check “Yes” and proceed to question #4. If the student has taken the CAHSEE in addition to another STAR assessment, indicate date(s) and score(s).

If the student *did not meet* the cut point for Reading/Language Arts, check all of the following boxes that apply. **If any of those boxes are checked “Yes”, the team may also check “Yes” to the statement “Considering the disability, the IEP team has determined that the student has reached an appropriate level of performance in RLA Basic Skills commensurate with his/her abilities.” and progress to section #4. If “No,” stop here.**

- d. **Parent Opinion and Consultation:** Check “Yes” if the parent or guardian participated in the discussion, and note their comments, if any.
- e. **Summary:** To be recommended for reclassification, sections 1, 2 and 3 must indicate that **either**
- a. The student met the established criteria **or**
 - b. The IEP team has checked “Yes” for the statement “The IEP team has determined...”

For section 4, there must be evidence that the parent participated in the discussion. It is not required that the parent agrees that the student be reclassified, but they must have the opportunity to participate in the discussion.

If all the above criteria are met, the team can check the “Yes” box in the summary statement “The IEP team determines that the primary reason the student does not meet reclassification criteria is due to the disability rather than limited English proficiency and the student no longer needs English Language Development services.”

If the student did not meet all of the above criteria, the box is checked “No.” The team can consider reclassification again at another time.

If the box is checked “Yes” the form is sent to the appropriate site or district level English Language Reclassification representative. If it is determined that the student will be

reclassified, the Special Education Case Manager and parent will be notified. On IEPs in subsequent years, the student will be noted as an RFEP and the date of reclassification *by the district* noted (not the date of the IEP meeting). CELDT testing is no longer required, nor is the **English Language Development Information** form. Place the **Worksheet for IEP Team Recommendation for Reclassification of Special Education English Learners to Fluent English Proficiency** in the EL portion of the cumulative file. It is not a part of the IEP document.

Understanding CELDT Administration with Variations, Accommodations, Modifications, and/or Alternate Assessments

In California, students with disabilities who participate in state assessments are permitted to use variations, accommodations, modifications, and/or alternate assessments during testing as determined by their individualized education programs (IEPs) or Section 504 Plans. The impact on a student's California English Language Development Test (CELDT) results when variations, accommodations, modifications, and/or alternate assessments are used is described below. *Matrix 1. Matrix of Test Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications for Administration of California Statewide Assessments (October 2007)* is available on the CELDT Resources Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/resources.asp>. A second document, *Matrix 2. Matrix of Test Variations for Administration of California Statewide Assessments for English Learners (October 2007)* found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/resources.asp> does not apply to the CELDT.

Variations

A test variation is the first level of any change in the assessment environment or process as shown in the *Matrix 1. Matrix of Test Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications for Administration of California Statewide Assessments (October 2007)*. Some variations may be used by all students, and other variations may be used to take the CELDT if they are regularly used in the classroom. The student's teacher and/or IEP or Section 504 Plan team determine whether variations are appropriate for an individual student. Test variations do not alter the test construct. Use of test variations, therefore, does not affect the calculation or interpretation of the CELDT scale scores.

Accommodations

An accommodation is the second level of change in the assessment environment or process that does not fundamentally alter what the test measures or affect the comparability of scores. Accommodations may include variations in scheduling, setting, aids, equipment, and presentation format. The IEP or Section 504 Plan team determines whether accommodations are appropriate for an individual student. Accommodations do not alter the test construct. Use of accommodations, therefore, does not affect the calculation or interpretation of the CELDT scale scores.

Modifications

A modification means any variation in the assessment environment or process that fundamentally alters what the test measures or affects the comparability of scores. The CELDT results on the Student Performance Level Report will indicate that the student received the Beginning score in each domain for which modifications were used. The Student Performance Level Report also will have a note indicating that the results should be interpreted with caution. When students take one or more domains of the test with modifications, the scale score for the domain(s) and the overall scale score are considered not valid. The student's individual item responses along with his or her raw scores will be provided in the electronic data file. The student's scores should be interpreted by the IEP team, with the assistance of school district assessment staff, to ensure appropriate instructional placement.

Alternate Assessments

Alternate assessments provide another means to measure the English language proficiency of students with disabilities whose IEP teams have determined that they are unable to participate in one or more parts of the CELDT even with variations, accommodations, and/or modifications. The CELDT results on the Student Performance Level Report will indicate that the student received the Beginning score in each domain for which alternate assessments were used. The Student Performance Level Report also will have a note indicating that the results should be interpreted with caution. When students take an alternate assessment for one or more domains of the CELDT, the scale score for the domain(s) and the overall scale score are considered not valid. The student's individual item responses along with his or her raw scores will be provided in the electronic data file. The student's scores should be interpreted by the IEP team, with the assistance of school district assessment staff, to ensure appropriate instructional placement.

More Information

For further information on interpreting tests administered with test variations, accommodations, modifications, and/or alternate assessments, refer to the National Center on Educational Outcomes policy posted at <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/Policy11.htm> (Outside Source). Guidance on the standards and assessment requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 is available on the No Child Left Behind Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/>.