



ALTERNATE  
ACCESS for ELLs®

SPRING 2018  
**Interpretive Guide for  
Score Reports**  
Grades 1-12

© 2018 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, on behalf of WIDA. *Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Interpretive Guide for Score Reports* 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 4/12/18*

# Contents

Introduction.....	3
About the Assessment.....	3
Organization of This Guide.....	4
<b>Part 1: Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Overview.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Description of Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Grade Level Clusters .....	5
Supports Embedded within the Test Design .....	5
Performance Definitions.....	6
<b>Part 2: Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Scores .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Raw Scores .....	7
Scale Scores .....	7
Proficiency Level Scores.....	8
Composite Scores .....	9
Cut Scores.....	10
Confidence Bands Depicting Standard Error of Measure.....	12
<b>Part 3: Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Suggestions on How to Use Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Scores .....	16
Individual Student Report.....	16
How to Use This Report.....	17
Student Roster Report.....	21
Frequency Reports.....	24
Appendix A: Alternate ACCESS for ELLS Performance Level Descriptors .....	29
Appendix B: Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Speaking and Writing Rubrics.....	30
Appendix C: Sample Parent Guide for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports .....	32



## Introduction

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

### About the Assessment

Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is a large-scale language proficiency test for students with significant cognitive disabilities in Grades 1–12. It is one component of WIDA’s comprehensive, standards-driven system designed to improve teaching and learning for English language learners (ELLs). Designed specifically for students with significant cognitive disabilities, Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is individually administered in paper and pencil format. Developed in partnership with the Center for Applied Linguistics, the first operational year was 2013, with 7,591 students participating from 29 states.

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

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; 2015) requires that all students identified as ELLs be assessed annually for English language proficiency, including students who receive special education services. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004) also mandates that students with disabilities participate in state-wide and district-wide assessment programs, including alternate assessments with appropriate accommodations when it is documented in their Individualized Education Programs (IEP). WIDA created the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs to meet federal accountability requirements and to provide educators with a measure sensitive to English language proficiency growth of ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities.

The purpose of Alternate ACCESS for ELLs 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 with significant cognitive disabilities 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).

The WIDA Technical Brief, *Alternate ACCESS for ELLs, Series 100 Development and Operational Field Test* (2012), provides extensive information on the conceptualization of the assessment, from its anchor in the ELD standards through each developmental phase. *WIDA’s Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Standard Setting Study: Technical Brief* (2012) details the procedures for standards-setting, which determined the cut scores for the six language proficiency levels. To obtain copies of the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs technical reports, please visit [www.wida.us](http://www.wida.us).

The Alternate ACCESS for ELLs technical properties ensures that the test is a reliable and valid measure of English language proficiency. Thus, 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 1 provides an overview of the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment, and provides information on administration needed to understand how a score is obtained.

Part 2 addresses the types of scores reported by Alternate ACCESS for ELLs for students in Grades 1–12.

Part 3 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 1:

# Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Overview

This section provides background and administration information needed to understand scoring.

## Description of Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Grade Level Clusters

Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is divided into four grade-level clusters. The clustering of grade levels reflects the fact that language proficiency increases over a time that does not necessarily correspond with grade level. Students participate in the assessment based on the grade level at which they are enrolled.

- Grades 1–2
- Grades 3–5
- Grades 6–8
- Grades 9–12

Alternate ACCESS for ELLs uses multiple-choice questions and constructed response performance-based tasks to assess the language domains of Listening, Reading, Writing, and Speaking. The test administrator scores the items during administration. Completed test books are returned for score compilation, performance level assignment, and development of score reports.

Both Listening and Reading domains contain nine multiple-choice questions arranged by increasing linguistic difficulty.

The Speaking domain consists of eight constructed-response tasks divided into two parts (A and B). Tasks within each part are arranged by increasing linguistic difficulty, thus the first task in Part A and the first task in Part B have the same level of difficulty.

The Writing domain contains 10 constructed-response tasks divided into three parts (A, B, and C). Tasks in each part of the Writing section are also arranged by increasing linguistic difficulty; however, while the first task in Part A and Part B have the same level of difficulty, the first task in Part C is more reflective of the difficulty of the last item in part B.

## Supports Embedded Within the Test Design

The design of the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs provides test takers with supported opportunities to demonstrate their developing English language proficiency. Supports embedded within the test include simplified language; repetition of questions; modeling of tasks; heavy reliance on graphics rather than on text; larger size of testing materials, fonts, and graphics; and availability of cues and supplemental questions. Additionally, during test administration individualized supports and accommodations that meet state-specific guidelines may be used.

## Cueing System

The cueing system for selected-response tasks (Reading and Listening domains) provides students with multiple opportunities to complete each task successfully. Students have up to four opportunities to provide the expected response. Cue A provides the initial prompt and question. The test administrator

repeats Cue A, if needed, allowing a second opportunity to respond successfully. If the score for Cue A is Incorrect or No Response, the test administrator gives Cue B. Cue B simplifies the initial prompt. If the score for Cue B is Incorrect or No Response, the test administrator provides Cue C to the student. Cue C includes the simplified prompt and provides the answer to the question. Tasks scores include Correct (Cue A, B or C), Incorrect, or No Response.

The cueing system for constructed response questions in the Speaking domain also includes multiple opportunities within each task for a student to provide a response. The level of support remains constant during the multiple attempts; however, test administrators encourage responses through scripted rephrasing of the question. Students have up to four opportunities to provide the expected response. Tasks scores include Meets, Approaches, or No Response.

The cueing system for constructed-response questions in the Writing domain also provides several opportunities for the student to produce an expected answer. The test administrator models tasks for the student prior to the prompt for Writing Tasks 1–9. Task 10 provides a word bank but does not include modeling of the task. For all tasks, the test administrator provides increasing support until the student meets expectations, or reaches the maximum number of attempts for the item. Task scores in Parts A and B include Meets, Approaches, or No Response. Scores for the two open-ended tasks in Part C use the *Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Writing Rubric* (Appendix B). Task scores include Meets (1, 2, 3), Approaches, or No Response.

### **Semi-adaptive Testing**

The semi-adaptive design of the *Alternate ACCESS for ELLs* provides test takers an opportunity to demonstrate their English language proficiency without presentation of overly difficult items. Testing in each domain ends when a score of Incorrect, Approaches, or No Response is marked on three consecutive tasks.

### **Performance Definitions**

The Individual Student Report includes the Performance Definitions for alternate English language proficiency (see Figure A-1 in Appendix A). These definitions provide a global overview of the language acquisition process for each language proficiency level and serve as a summary and synthesis of the *2011 Alternate Model Performance Indicators* (AMPIs) for each language proficiency level. These definitions were formed using three criteria or descriptors. They are based on ELL students' increasing comprehension and production in the following areas:

- Linguistic Complexity – the amount and quality of speech or writing for a given situation
- Language Forms and Conventions – the syntactic and conventional uses of language



## PART 2:

## Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Scores

Reported as scale scores and as English language proficiency level scores, Alternate ACCESS for ELLs provides student results for each of the four language domains:

- Listening
- Reading
- Speaking
- Writing

Four different combinations of language domains, known as composite scores, receive scale scores and proficiency levels calculated from the scores received on each individual domain. These combinations 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. Raw scores are not reported on all domains on the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs score reports because they are generally not useful for interpreting student performance.

For the Listening and Reading domains, the number of tasks correct and whether a task was scored correct at Cue A, Cue B, or Cue C is provided on the score report. A score of Correct Cue A earns a slightly higher quantitative score than a Correct Cue B score. Similarly, a Correct Cue B score earns a slightly higher quantitative score than a Correct Cue C score. The percentages for each cue are derived from the number of correct responses, not the total number of tasks. This information is provided to help stakeholders understand the amount of support provided to obtain the scores.

### Scale Scores

In contrast to raw scores, scale scores report results in a consistent way to take into account differences in item difficulty between test administrations. The consistent scale lets stakeholders compare scores across periods of time and between students. This single vertical scale allows score comparisons across grades and tiers from Grade 1 through Grade 12.

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


With the vertical scale, scale scores across grades can be compared to one another within a language domain (e.g., Listening-to-Listening, Reading-to-Reading, etc.). Each domain has a separate scale. Thus scale scores cannot be compared across domains (e.g., Listening-to-Reading, etc.). A scale score of 920 in Listening is not the same as 920 in Speaking. The range of possible scale scores for the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs test form is 910–960.

# 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 also describe student performance in terms of the six Alternate language proficiency levels (A1-Initiating, A2-Exploring, A3-Engaging, P1-Entering, P2-Emerging, and P3-Developing).

Whole numbers represent Proficiency Level scores, indicating the student’s language proficiency level. Each language proficiency level is defined in the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Performance Definitions, which are shown on page 3 of the Individual Student Report (Figure A-1 in Appendix A).

**Figure 1. Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Proficiency Levels**



Proficiency level scores are reported for each of the four individual language domains (Listening, Reading, Speaking, and Writing) and four composite scores. The proficiency level scores in the four individual language domains and composite scores offer a profile of student performance. This information, along with the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Performance Definitions and 2011 Alternate Model Performance Indicators help give a picture of what students can do in English and may inform educators about appropriate English language support.

**Key Points on Proficiency Level Scores**

- The interpretation of scale score to proficiency level scores is domain specific
- They describe the student performance based on six Alternate ELP levels
- The 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 proficiency scores.

The Listening, Reading, and Speaking domains have possible proficiency level scores of up to P2 – Emerging, and the Writing domain has a possible proficiency level of up to P3 – Developing.

## Composite Scores

Composite Scores provide another way of looking at performance. For example, when you examine a student's scale scores in both Listening and Reading together, you can understand more about a student's comprehension. WIDA has identified several different ways to group scale scores to create composite scores in Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, and an Overall score. These groupings, known as composite scores, are provided along with the student's individual domain 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. Only students that complete all domains of Alternate ACCESS for ELLs will receive the four composite scores.

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.

Use composite scores 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.

Remember, 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.

## Variables That Can Affect Composite Scores

### NA Notation

Some score reports may have one or more language domains left blank or marked NA (Not available).

NA appears if one of the four Do Not Score codes has been filled in. The domain is left blank when the student did not test or a test was not received and a Do Not Score code was not filled in.

Composite or overall scores are **not** computed if any language domain score is missing. For example, if a student has a non-scoring code marked for the Speaking part of the test, the student receives NA for Speaking, Oral Language, and the Overall Score. Similarly, if a student was unable to participate in Reading and the Do Not Score code was not filled in, the area of the score report for Reading, Literacy, Comprehension, and the Overall Score will be left blank. NA overrules blank fields, so for example, if Listening is marked NA and Speaking is blank, Oral Language and Overall Score will be marked NA.

### Incomplete Tests

If an Alternate ACCESS for ELLs 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 back of 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.

### 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 the table.

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

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%

### Composite Proficiency Levels

Once composite scale scores are 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 *Alternate Performance Definitions, the 2012 Amplification of the English Language Development Standards*, and the 2011 Alternate Model Performance Indicators (available at [www.wida.us](http://www.wida.us)), help educators determine the most appropriate instructional strategies for ELLs.

### Cut Scores

Cut scores indicate the score point where one language proficiency level ends and the next begins. These cut scores identify the beginning of each proficiency level. They are based on both statistical and human judgment.

The following table summarizes the types of scores reported on Alternate ACCESS for ELLs and offers suggestions and cautions on their use.





**Table 2: Suggestions and Cautions on the use of Scores**

	<b>Information Provided &amp; Suggested Uses</b>	<b>Keep in Mind</b>
<b>Raw Scores</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide the total number of correct responses and whether the correct response was scored at Cue A, Cue B, or Cue C for the Listening and Reading domains</li> <li>• May shed light on the amount of support the student needed prior to successfully engaging and responding to a prompt</li> <li>• Appear on the Individual Student Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generalizations about student performance such as academic content knowledge or classroom achievement cannot be made from raw scores</li> <li>• Do not include information on tasks that were not administered, were incorrect, or to which the student did not respond</li> <li>• Student progress cannot be tracked between school years using raw scores</li> <li>• Results cannot be compared with other students</li> <li>• Scores do not represent item difficulty levels</li> </ul>
<b>Scale Scores</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a psychometrically derived score for each language domain</li> <li>• Scores are reflected in a scale from 910-960</li> <li>• Provide a way to monitor student growth over time (within a language domain)</li> <li>• Appear on the Individual Student and Student Roster Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparisons cannot be made across domains, only within domains</li> <li>• To monitor growth over time, use scale scores and not the proficiency level scores</li> </ul>
<b>Proficiency Level Scores</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a score in terms of the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs language proficiency levels</li> <li>• Provide individual domain scores</li> <li>• Provide 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 with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> <li>• Appear on the Individual Student and Student Roster Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 ELLs</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

## Confidence Bands Depicting Standard Error of Measure

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 2 shows a sample.

**Figure 2. Sample Language Domain and Composite Scores**

Student's level of English Proficiency by language domain				
Language Domain	Proficiency Level**			Scale Score (Possible 910-960) and Confidence Band See Interpretive Guide for Score Reports for definitions
	A1	A2	A3 P1 P2 (P3)	
Listening 			P1	940
Speaking 		A3		932
Reading 			P1	941
Writing 	A1			910
Oral Language 50% Listening + 50% Speaking		A3		936
Literacy 50% Reading + 50% Writing		A2		926
Comprehension 70% Reading + 30% Listening			P1	941
Overall* 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking		A2		929

Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is a reliable test of English language proficiency. Nevertheless, like all tests, it is subject to a statistical concept known as the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM). The SEM quantifies the variation of scores that a student would achieve if he or she were able to take the same test over and over again without any change in his or her ability.

In the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs 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.

Imagine a student, Orsola, taking Alternate ACCESS for ELLs under these different conditions:

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

Even though Orsola 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 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is a reliable test, her scores would still be very similar to each other—but not exactly the same.

The SEMs for domain scores and the SEMs for composite scores are estimated differently. The domain score SEMs are computed based on modern test theory using conditional SEMs; that is, each score on a domain test form has a different estimated SEM. The composite score SEMs are estimated based on classical test theory and each composite score 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.

## PART 3:

## Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports

This section details the information contained in each of the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs score reports and explains potential use of the data in various contexts. The following table 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 ELLs performance by referring to the WIDA ELD Standards (2004, 2007, 2012).

**Table 3. Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports, Audiences, Types of Information, and Potential Uses**

Score Report	Audience or Stakeholder	Types of Information	Potential Uses
Individual Student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students</li> <li>• Parents/Guardians</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• School Teams</li> </ul> <p>This report is available in multiple languages through DRC's WIDA AMS system.</p>	<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"> <li>• Raw scores in the Listening and Reading domains</li> <li>• Scale scores</li> <li>• Confidence bands</li> <li>• Language proficiency levels</li> </ul>	<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>
Student Roster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Program Coordinators/Directors</li> <li>• Administrators</li> </ul>	<p>Scale scores and language proficiency levels for each language domain, and four composites by school, grade, student, and grade-level cluster</p>	<p>Share with grade-level teams of teachers to inform classroom instruction and assessment</p>
School Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Coordinators/Directors</li> <li>• Administrators</li> </ul>	<p>Number of students and percent of total tested at each proficiency level for each language domain, and four composites by grade within a school</p>	<p>Share with building staff; use to inform building level programmatic decisions</p>
District Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Coordinators/Directors</li> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Boards of Education</li> </ul>	<p>Number of students and percent of total tested at each proficiency level for each language domain and composite scores by proficiency levels for grades within a district</p>	<p>Share with district staff; use to inform district level programmatic decisions</p>
State Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Assessment Personnel</li> <li>• State Title III Personnel</li> <li>• State Boards of Education</li> </ul>	<p>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 state.</p>	<p>Share with state staff; use to inform state level programmatic decisions</p>



## Suggestions on How to Use Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Scores

This guide is a resource for all member states in the WIDA Consortium. As the consortium is currently made up 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.

Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is an English language proficiency (ELP) test that is a representation of the WIDA ELD Standards. As such, stakeholders should note that Alternate ACCESS for ELLs 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 with significant cognitive disabilities.

Before examining data in the score reports, teachers and administrators should familiarize themselves with the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Performance Definitions (Figure A-1 in Appendix A) for the levels of English language proficiency.

The following are suggestions for disseminating Alternate ACCESS for ELLs 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 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Performance Definitions. 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. 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) to develop a statewide, district or school plan for organizing services for ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities for the upcoming school year.
- **Archive copies of the guide along with copies of the score reports** so that IEP teams and new personnel can become familiar with data from Alternate ACCESS for ELLs.

## Individual Student 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.

One report is provided in English for each individual student. Translations of the report are available in 46 additional languages through DRC's WIDA AMS system.

Communication with the student's parents or guardians is important. A *Parent Guide for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports* is available to assist educators as they explain score reports to parents or guardians (see Appendix C). Whenever possible, send a Parent Guide in the family's native language along with the Individual Student Reports in English. Translations of the Parent Guide and optional letters with sample language for communication home is provided on the WIDA website at <https://www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS20.aspx#scoring>.

## Report at a Glance

### Demographic Information About the Student

Identifying information is located in the table at the top of the first page of the score report. This demographic information table provides information including the student's name (last, first and middle initial), birthdate, grade level, IEP status, the student's district and state identification number, and the school, district, and state where the student is enrolled. Additionally, the demographic table has data about whether the student participates in other alternate assessments, the number of years exposed to academic English, and the student's primary and/or secondary disability.

### Student's English Language Proficiency Level

Results of Alternate ACCESS for ELLs are reported by each language domain assessed (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing). A label, icon, and visual display of the results represent each language domain on the score report.

The four composite scores (Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, Overall Score) follow the four domain scores. Similar to the individual language domains; a label, a breakdown of how individual domains are used to calculate it, and a visual display of the results represent each composite score.

The proficiency level is presented both graphically and as a whole number. 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 (A1–Initiating, A2–Exploring, A3–Engaging, P1–Entering, P2–Emerging, and P3–Developing) in accord with the WIDA ELD Standards.

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

## Student Performance Within the Listening and Reading Domains

This table on the student report provides information on the number of correct responses received on the Listening and Reading Sections. It is intended to illustrate the relationship between student performance and the amount of support provided.

## Test Administration Information

Page 2 of the score report provides information about the testing session and the test administrator. Test administrators identified information about the test environment and accommodations provided to the student during the testing session. Test administrators also provided information about their role at the school and familiarity of the student's abilities.

## Performance Level Descriptors

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 A3—Engaging for Speaking, school personnel anticipate the student to use everyday social and instructional words in English. This information appears on page 3 of the report.

Figure 3 shows a sample Individual Student Report.

## How to Use This Report

What does the report show?	
It describes one indicator of a student's English language proficiency, the language needed to access content and succeed in school.	A profile of a student's English language proficiency:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• how much English the student has acquired in each language domain</li></ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• information on the student's Oral Language, Literacy, and Comprehension</li></ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a graphic representation of the extent to which the student listens, speaks, reads, and writes English</li></ul>

How can it be used when talking with parents/guardians, and what additional resources for doing so are available?	
A copy of the Individual Student Report in the family's native language, through WIDA AMS	Help family members understand the student's English language proficiency at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• parent conferences</li><li>• family nights</li><li>• home visits</li></ul>
Parent Guide for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Report, available in 13 languages on <a href="http://www.wida.us">www.wida.us</a>	Teachers might explain the results from Alternate ACCESS for ELLs by showing what their student "can do" in each language domain.

How else can educators use this report?	
WIDA encourages sharing the Individual Student Report with all educators working with ELLs, including the student's IEP team.	<p>As a tool to aid in teacher planning and collaboration, it can provide information that serves as one criterion when determining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entry and exit decisions</li> <li>• The extent and type of language services</li> <li>• Placement in classes</li> <li>• Curriculum planning</li> <li>• A student's progress or growth</li> </ul>

**Considerations for Score Interpretation**

The report provides information on English proficiency. It does not provide information on a student's knowledge of academic content.

The student's foundation in his or her home or primary language is a predictor of English language development. English learners 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.

Students do not typically acquire proficiency in Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing at the same pace. Generally the following is true:

- Oral language (L+S) is acquired faster than literacy (R+W)
- Receptive language (L+R) is acquired faster than productive language (S+W)
- Writing is usually the last domain mastered

**When measuring progress, remember the following things:** To examine a student's progress or growth in English language proficiency, two (or more) consecutive years of data are necessary.

- Year 1: Baseline established
- Year 2: Comparison of growth possible
- Years 3–on: There is enough data to establish a trend

Use scale scores to make comparisons across grade levels, but not across domains.

**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 B).

These rubrics may be used to help interpret the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Speaking and Writing scores and 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 Speech Features descriptions of the rubric address language forms and conventions. One characteristic of A2 (Exploring) is "single words or syllables of single words." Students at this level of proficiency may benefit from classroom activities which focus on combining words to increase meaning (e.g., moving from "go" to "I go" or "you go").

**Figure 3-A. Sample Individual Student Report (Page 1)**



**Alternate ACCESS for ELLs<sup>®</sup>**  
English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students  
with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

**Individual Student Report**  
**20XX**

<b>Student:</b> Veloce Thompson		
Birth Date: 03/03/2001	Grade: 09	IEP Status: Yes
District ID: 1962	State ID: 345454	
School: Midtown High School	District: Forest Hills	State: WI
Does the student take any state alternate assessment(s)?: Yes	# of years student has been exposed to academic English: 06	
Primary Disability: Autism	Secondary Disability (if applicable): Not Indicated	

This report provides information about the student's scores on the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency test. This test is based on the WIDA Alternate 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.

Student's level of English Proficiency by language domain			
Language Domain	Proficiency Level**	Scale Score (Possible 910-960) and Confidence Band	
		See Interpretive Guide for Score Reports for definitions	
	A1 A2 A3 P1 P2 (P3)	910 920 930 940 950 960	
<b>Listening</b>	P2		945
<b>Speaking</b>	P1		942
<b>Reading</b>	P1		940
<b>Writing</b>	A2		929
<b>Oral Language</b> 50% Listening + 50% Speaking	P2		944
<b>Literacy</b> 50% Reading + 50% Writing	A3		935
<b>Comprehension</b> 70% Reading + 30% Listening	P2		942
<b>Overall*</b> 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking	A3		937

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

\*\*The Listening, Speaking, and Reading domains do not include test items targeting proficiency levels P3 and above; therefore, students cannot demonstrate English proficiency at levels P3 and higher. However, in Writing, students may score up to proficiency level P3.

**Student's performance within the Listening and Reading Domains**


Each Task in the Listening and Reading Sections provide students with three opportunities (Cue A, Cue B, & Cue C) to demonstrate what they can do. Cue A provides the initial prompt and question. If the score for Cue A is Incorrect or No Response, Cue B is administered. Cue B simplifies the initial prompt. If the score for Cue B is Incorrect or No Response, Cue C is administered. Cue C includes the simplified prompt and provides the answer to the question. The table below provides the number of correct responses to the Listening and Reading Sections and does not report information on tasks that were not administered, incorrect, or to which the student did not respond.

	# of Correct Responses (out of 9)	Less Support  More Support					
		Cue A		Cue B		Cue C	
		# Correct	% of Correct Responses	# Correct	% of Correct Responses	# Correct	% of Correct Responses
<b>Listening</b>	9	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%
<b>Reading</b>	9	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%

For details regarding the scores on this report, refer to the Interpretive Guide for Score Reports at [www.wida.us/altreport](http://www.wida.us/altreport)

ALT-ISR

**Figure 3-B. Sample Individual Student Report (Page 2)**

	<b>Alternate ACCESS for ELLs<sup>®</sup></b> English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities	<b>Individual Student Report</b> <b>20XX</b>
<b>Test Administration Information</b>		
<b>Test Environment</b>		
Familiar environment to student (e.g. familiar classroom, office, home)		YES
Quiet environment		YES
Minimal distractions		YES
One-to-one interaction with test administrator		YES
<b>Areas of the test where accommodations were used</b>		
Test directions		
Presentation format		
Response format		YES
Setting format/environment		
Timing/scheduling		
Other		
<b>Test Administrator Title</b>		
Special education teacher		YES
ESL/Bilingual teacher		
General education teacher		
Speech/language pathologist		
School psychologist		
School counselor		
LEA test administrator		
Other		
<b>Test Administrator's knowledge of student's abilities</b>		
Knowledge of student's current IEP		YES
Knowledge of the student's academic programming		YES
Has previously implemented accommodations for the student		YES
Has an established relationship with the student		YES
Limited knowledge of the student's abilities		
Unfamiliar with student's abilities		

## Student Roster Report

The Student Roster Report contains information on a group of students within a single school and grade. It provides language domain and composite scale scores for individual students, identical to those in the Individual Student Report. Its intended users are teachers, program coordinators/directors, and administrators. It is not intended to make comparisons across grades, as each cohort of students is different, but to provide an overview of the program as a whole.

One report is provided for each grade within a school, and each report shows information about all the students in that grade that took Alternate ACCESS for ELLs.

### 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 grade-level cluster.

Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is divided into grade-level clusters that mirror those of the ELD Standards. 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). Figure 4 shows a sample Student Roster Report.

### How to Use This Report

This report lists individual scale scores, along with their corresponding proficiency levels for each grade, according to grade-level clusters for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs. As this language proficiency test is standards-referenced, any comparison should be made between the student in relation to the criteria or standards.

School or district administrators, including coordinators or directors of language and special education services, principals, and assistant superintendents may examine the scores from each language domain 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?
- 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? For example, are some students enrolled in dual language programs or has there been a recent influx of new ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities, or a lack of communication systems?
- How might we begin to address these differences using English language acquisition supports, special education services, and best practice?

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


### **Communicating About the Data in this Report**

In making year-to-year comparisons about students, scale scores can be useful to show gains. By having scale scores 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 with significant cognitive disabilities. These data provide a snapshot of the performance of the students at one point in time.

This score report may be useful when examining the profiles of students who are within the potential range of exiting support services, and when considering 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 with significant cognitive disabilities for the upcoming year.



Figure 4. Sample Student Roster Report



**Alternate ACCESS for ELLs®**

English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students  
with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

District: Forest Hills  
School: Midtown High School  
Grade: 12

**Student Roster Report — 20XX**

STUDENT NAME STATE STUDENT ID	Cluster	Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing		Oral Language <sup>A</sup>		Literacy <sup>B</sup>		Comprehension <sup>C</sup>		Overall Score <sup>D</sup>			
		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	Prof Level
Sortita Aprile	9-12	939	P1	945	P2	937	P1	948	P2	942	P1	943	P1	938	P1	942	P1		

A – Oral Language = 50% Listening + 50% Speaking

B – Literacy = 50% Reading + 50% Writing

NA – Not available = Student Booklet is marked with a Non-Scoring Code of Absent, Invalide, Declined, or Deferred Special Education/504

The domains of Listening, Speaking, and Reading do not include test items targeting levels P3 and above; therefore, students taking this test cannot demonstrate English language proficiency at levels P3 and higher. However, in the Writing domain, students may score up to Proficiency level P3.

C – Comprehension = 70% Reading + 30% Listening

D – Overall Score = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking

Overall Scores are computed when all 4 domains have been completed.

Page 1 of 1

## Frequency Reports

There are three types of frequency reports. They all show the number and percent of tested students to attain each proficiency level within a given population. The three frequency reports are the School Frequency Report, the District Frequency Report, and the State Frequency Report.

The broader view provided by the frequency reports contrasts with the Individual Student Report and the Student Roster Report, which both provide information about students at the level of the individual test taker. The primary audience for frequency reports typically includes program coordinators/directors, administrators, and boards of education.

### 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.

Remember that skills corresponding to the proficiency level of P3-Developing are measured only in the writing domain on Alternate ACCESS for ELLs. Thus the corresponding cells in the Listening, Speaking, and Reading sections are grayed out.

The 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 910; the highest possible scale score is 960. 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 Alternate ACCESS for ELLs in the stated grade of the specified school/district/state.

### How to Use This Report

Use the information contained in the report to gain a sense of the school-wide effort in educating ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities. 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 alternate academic achievement tests, to see if there is any crossover.

Unless there are relatively large numbers of students, results are not generalizable. Students taking Alternate ACCESS for ELLs usually account for approximately 1% of the school/district/state ELL population. In low incidence schools, these numbers might be quite small; in urban areas, the numbers of students might be substantially larger.

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. The existence of a significant cognitive disability should not be considered the sole reason for limited English language proficiency scores. 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. Perhaps educational professionals need additional opportunities to co-plan specific English language development instruction.

Frequency Reports for two consecutive years provide cross-sectional data (unless the set of students from one year to the next is identical, which is highly unlikely). Keep this fact in mind when inspecting how the first graders, for example, performed at a specified school in Year 1 in comparison to second graders in Year 2. A group of first graders one year compared with a group of first graders the next year also represents cross-sectional data.

Figure 5. Sample School Frequency Report

Proficiency Level		Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing		Oral Language <sup>a</sup>		Literacy <sup>b</sup>		Comprehension <sup>c</sup>		Overall Score <sup>d</sup>	
		# 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
A1 – Initiating		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
A2 – Exploring		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
A3 – Engaging		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%
P1 – Entering		0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
P2 – Emerging		4	100%	2	50%	3	75%	1	25%	4	100%	2	50%	4	100%	2	50%
P3 – Developing*								1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Highest Score</b>		947		945		948		953									
<b>Lowest Score</b>		945		942		940		929									
<b>Total Tested</b>		4															

**School Frequency Report - 20XX**


District: Forest Hills  
 School: Midtown High School  
 Grade: 09  
 Cluster: 9-12

**Alternate ACCESS for ELLs<sup>®</sup>**  
 English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students  
 with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

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


\*The domains of Listening, Speaking, and Reading do not include test items targeting levels P3 and above; therefore, students taking this test cannot demonstrate English language proficiency at levels P3 and higher. However, in the Writing domain, students may score up to Proficiency level P3.

Figure 6. Sample District Frequency Report

 <b>Alternate ACCESS for ELLs®</b> English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities		District: Forest Hills Grade: 06 Cluster: 6-8		<b>District Frequency Report - 20XX</b>														
				Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing		Oral Language <sup>d</sup>		Literacy <sup>b</sup>		Comprehension <sup>c</sup>		Overall Score <sup>a</sup>
Proficiency Level	# 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	# of Students at Level	% of Total Tested
A1 – Initiating	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
A2 – Exploring	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
A3 – Engaging	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
P1 – Entering	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
P2 – Emerging	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
P3 – Developing*									0	0%			0	0%			0	0%
<b>Highest Score</b>	944		943		946		938											
<b>Lowest Score</b>	944		943		946		938											
<b>Total Tested</b>	1																	

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  
 \*The domains of Listening, Speaking, and Reading do not include test items targeting levels P3 and above; therefore, students taking this test cannot demonstrate English language proficiency at levels P3 and higher. However, in the Writing domain, students may score up to Proficiency level P3.

Figure 7. Sample State Frequency Report


		<b>Alternate ACCESS for ELLs®</b> English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities		State: MU Grade: 06 Cluster: 6-8												
<b>State Frequency Report - 20XX</b>																
Proficiency Level	Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing		Oral Language <sup>d</sup>		Literacy <sup>b</sup>		Comprehension <sup>c</sup>		Overall Score <sup>a</sup>	
	# 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
A1 – Initiating	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
A2 – Exploring	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
A3 – Engaging	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
P1 – Entering	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
P2 – Emerging	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
P3 – Developing*									0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Highest Score</b>	944		943		946		938									
<b>Lowest Score</b>	944		943		946		938									
<b>Total Tested</b>	1															

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

\*The domains of Listening, Speaking, and Reading do not include test items targeting levels P3 and above; therefore, students taking this test cannot demonstrate English language proficiency at levels P3 and higher. However, in the Writing domain, students may score up to Proficiency level P3.

# Appendix A: Alternate ACCESS Performance Level Descriptors

Figure A-1. Individual Student Report (Page 3)

 <b>Alternate ACCESS for ELLs<sup>®</sup></b> English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities		<b>Individual Student Report</b> <b>20XX</b>
<p><b>At each grade level, toward the end of a given alternate level of English language proficiency, and with instructional support...</b></p>		
	<b>English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities will produce (Productive):</b>	<b>English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities will process (Receptive):</b>
<b>Level P3 Developing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific content language, including cognates and expressions</li> <li>• Words or expressions with multiple meanings used across content areas</li> <li>• Repetitive grammatical structures with occasional variation</li> <li>• Sentence patterns across content areas</li> <li>• Short and some expanded sentences with emerging complexity</li> <li>• Expanded expression of one idea or emerging expression of multiple ideas</li> </ul>	Students may score up to alternate proficiency level P3 in the domain of Writing. The domains of Listening, Speaking, and Reading do not include test items targeting alternate proficiency level P3 and above; therefore, students taking this test cannot demonstrate English language at alternate proficiency level P3 and higher in those domains.
<b>Level P2 Emerging</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General content words and expressions across content areas</li> <li>• Social and instructional words and expressions across content areas</li> <li>• Formulaic grammatical structures</li> <li>• Repetitive phrasal and sentence patterns across content areas</li> <li>• Phrases or short sentences</li> <li>• Emerging expression of ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General content words and expressions, including cognates</li> <li>• Social and instructional words and expressions across content areas</li> <li>• Compound grammatical constructions</li> <li>• Repetitive phrasal and sentence patterns across content areas</li> <li>• Multiple related simple statements</li> <li>• An idea with details</li> </ul>
<b>Level P1 Entering</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General content-related words</li> <li>• Everyday social and instructional words and expressions</li> <li>• Phrase-level grammatical structures</li> <li>• Phrasal patterns associated with common social and instructional situations</li> <li>• Words, phrases, or chunks of language</li> <li>• Single words used to represent ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General content-related words</li> <li>• Social and instructional words and expressions</li> <li>• Simple grammatical constructions</li> <li>• Common social and instructional forms and patterns</li> <li>• Single statements or questions</li> <li>• An idea within words, phrases, or chunks of language</li> </ul>
<b>Level A3 Engaging</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiar words associated with daily routine</li> <li>• Representations of sounds, words, or ideas with drawing symbols, letters, or numbers</li> <li>• Routinely practiced patterns associated with common social and instructional situations</li> <li>• Oral approximations of words or phrases</li> <li>• Symbols or letters to represent ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Symbols, letters, and/or numbers</li> <li>• Spoken social and instructional words, and familiar expressions</li> <li>• Routinely practiced social and instructional forms and patterns</li> <li>• Familiar statements or questions associated with daily routine</li> <li>• An idea within visual representations or familiar language</li> </ul>
<b>Level A2 Exploring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different sounds and gestures to communicate</li> <li>• Markings or symbols to communicate (e.g., with writing utensil or assistive device)</li> <li>• Approximations of routinely practiced words</li> <li>• Varied tone and inflection to convey needs, desires, or moods (to convey adherence to social norms)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routinely practiced oral cues</li> <li>• Familiar visual representations associated with daily routines</li> <li>• Environmental symbols and shapes</li> <li>• Spoken words associated with familiar people, daily routine, and/or environment</li> </ul>
<b>Level A1 Initiating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imitations of sounds</li> <li>• Varied body movements to communicate (e.g., eye gaze, grasp writing utensil)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiar voices and communicative sounds</li> <li>• Change in expression (e.g., facial, body, vocal)</li> </ul>
<p><b>...within sociocultural contexts for language use.</b></p>		

## Appendix B: Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Speaking and Writing Rubrics

**Table B-1. Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Speaking Rubric**

Level	Speech Features
P2–Emerging	<p>Phrases or short sentences.</p> <p>General language related to the task; groping for vocabulary when going beyond the highly familiar is evident.</p> <p>When using simple discourse, is generally comprehensible and fluent; communication may be impeded by groping for language structures or by phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors when going beyond phrases and short, simple sentences.</p>
P1–Entering	<p>Single words or chunks of memorized oral language.</p> <p>General vocabulary from school setting and related to task.</p> <p>When using memorized language, is generally comprehensible; communication may be significantly impeded when going beyond the highly familiar.</p>
A3–Engaging	<p>Single words or chunks of mimicked oral language.</p> <p>Mimicked high frequency vocabulary words related to the task.</p> <p>When using mimicked language, is generally comprehensible; communication may be significantly impeded when going beyond mimicked language.</p>
A2–Exploring	<p>Single syllables or syllables of single words; speech is mimicked.</p> <p>Mimicked sounds and syllables of high frequency vocabulary words related to the task.</p> <p>Language is minimal.</p>
A1–Initiating	<p>Communicative vocalizations, which may be imitated (e.g., grunts).</p> <p>Indiscriminant sounds and syllables.</p>



**Table B-2. Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Writing Rubric**

Level	Text Features
P3–Developing	One or more simple and expanded sentences. Words in the sentence(s) may be original or adapted from model or source text. Generally comprehensible. Comprehensibility may be impeded from time to time by errors when text becomes more complex. Text is related to the task.
P2–Emerging	One or more simple phrases. Text is original or adapted from the model or source text. Comprehensible when text is adapted from model or source text. Comprehensibility may be impeded by errors in original text. Text is related to the task.
P1–Entering	One or more general content words. Text is original or adapted from the model or source text. Generally comprehensible when text is adapted from model or source text. Comprehensibility may be significantly impeded in original text. Text is related to the task.
A3–Engaging	Single words and numbers. All or part of text is copied. If original text is present, it is not related to the task. Comprehensibility of the text may be significantly impeded by imprecise letter, symbol, or number formation. Text may or may not be related to the task.
A2–Exploring	Common single-digit numbers, letters, symbols, or syllables. All or part of text is copied. Comprehensibility of the text may be significantly impeded by imprecise letter, symbol, or number formation. Text may or may not be related to the task.
A1–Initiating	Pictorial representations and imprecise, but intentional markings, such as drawings and scribbles. Representations may or may not be related to the task.

# Appendix C: Sample Parent Guide for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports

**Figure C-1: Sample Parent Guide for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports**

## Parent/Guardian Guide to the 20XX Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Report

Alternate ACCESS for ELLs is an English language proficiency assessment for Grades 1–12. The test measures the English language development of students identified as English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities.

### What is the Individual Student Report?

The Individual Student Report shows your child's scores on Alternate ACCESS for ELLs. This report is for families and educators.

The top of the report includes your child's name, date of birth, grade level, school and district name, state, and the district and state identification numbers. It also includes information related to your child's special education services.

<b>Student:</b>		
Birth Date: mm/dd/yyyy	Grade: sample grade	IPP Status:
District ID: sample ID	State ID: sample ID	
School: sample school	District: sample district	State: sample state
Does the student take any state alternate assessments?	If so, what student has been exposed to academic English?	
Primary Disability:	Secondary Disability, if applicable:	

### What does the Individual Student Report tell me?



The report shows the eight scores your child could receive on the test. If your child took all four sections of the test, he/she will receive all eight scores. NA, or not available, indicates no score was reported. There are four *Language Domain* scores and four *Composite Scores*.

*Language Domain* scores are reported for Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. These scores reflect the four sections of the test.

*Composite Scores* are combinations of your child's Language Domain scores. The four Composite Scores are Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, and the Overall score.

### How are the scores reported?

*Proficiency Level* scores are reported as a letter and number combination, for example A2 or P1. These scores correspond to the six WIDA English Language Proficiency Levels. A score beginning with the letter "A" can be thought of as a beginner score, while a "P" can be thought of as a more advanced score in regards to English proficiency. The graph on the report is shaded to represent your child's Proficiency Level score. A score of P3 can only be received in Writing. The table on page 3 of the report provides examples of what students at your child's proficiency level can do with English.



*Scale Scores* are reported as numbers that range from 910 – 960, for example 920. These scores reflect your child's grade level and difficulty level of the test items that he/she successfully

completed. Scale scores are helpful to see the progress your child makes in English language development from year to year. The graph on the report shows your child's Scale Score for each of the eight scores, and it also shows the *Confidence Band* for each of his/her Scale Scores.

*Confidence Bands* are the shaded area around each of your child's Scale Scores. This shows the possible range for your child's score with a 95% probability of accuracy. In other words, if your child took the same test repeatedly, there is a 95% chance that his/her scores would be within the shaded range.

**Figure C-2: Sample Parent Guide for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports**

*Performance within the Listening and Reading Domains* shows the number of correct responses your child received with different levels of support. For example, Cue A means your child heard the question repeated twice. Cue B means the wording of the question was simplified and then repeated. Cue C means the wording of the question was simplified and repeated; and that clues to the correct answer were also provided. These supports are designed to measure how much English your child understands.

	# of Correct Responses (out of 9)	Less Support → More Support					
		Cue A		Cue B		Cue C	
		# Correct	% of Correct Responses	# Correct	% of Correct Responses	# Correct	% of Correct Responses
Listening	5	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%
Reading	3	0		1	33.3%	2	66.6%

*Test Administration Information* can be found on page 2 of your child's score report. The image to the right is an example of page 2. This page of the score report provides you helpful information about where your child took the test (top section), what supports were provided to your child (2<sup>nd</sup> section), and information about the person who gave your child the test (last two sections). If you have any questions on the information reported on page 2, please contact your child's school.

**WIDA** | Alternate ACCESS for ELLs<sup>®</sup> | Individual Student Report  
English Language Proficiency Test for ELL Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities | 2016

**Test Administration Information**

**Test Environment**

Familiar environment to student (e.g. familiar classroom, office, home)	
Quiet environment	
Minimal distractions	
One-to-one interaction with test administrator	

**Areas of the test where accommodations were used**

Test directions	
Presentation format	
Response format	
Setting/Environment	
Timing/scheduling	
Other	

**Test Administrator Title**

Special education teacher	
ELL/Bilingual teacher	
General education teacher	
Spanish language pathologist	
School psychologist	
School counselor	
ELL test administrator	
Other	

**Test Administrator's knowledge of student's abilities**

Knowledge of student's content	
Knowledge of the student's academic programming	
Has previously implemented accommodations for the student	
Has an established relationship with the student	
Limited knowledge of the student's abilities	
Unfamiliar with student's abilities	

*Proficiency level descriptions* can be found on page 3 of your child's score report. Descriptions of what children at each level of language proficiency can do are provided for speaking and writing (*productive*) and listening and reading (*receptive*). The image below shows the proficiency level descriptions for P3 Developing.

	English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities will produce (Productive):	English language learners with significant cognitive disabilities will process (Receptive):
<b>Level P3 Developing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific content language, including cognates and expressions</li> <li>Words or expressions with multiple meanings used across content areas</li> <li>Repetitive grammatical structures with occasional variation</li> <li>Sentence patterns across content areas</li> <li>Short and some expanded sentences with emerging complexity</li> <li>Expanded expression of one idea or emerging expression of multiple ideas</li> </ul>	Students may score up to alternate proficiency level P3 in the domain of Writing. The domains of Listening, Speaking, and Reading do not include test items targeting alternate proficiency level P3 and above; therefore, students taking this test cannot demonstrate English language at alternate proficiency level P3 and higher in those domains.

**Figure C-3: Sample Parent Guide for Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Score Reports**

**What should I look for in my child’s report?**

We encourage families to look at all of the scores reported for their child. Here are some suggestions for how to interpret, or make sense of, your child’s scores:

- *Look at the Language Domain scores.* Look at his/her Proficiency Level scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. Which scores are closer to P2? Which scores are closer to A1?
- *Look at the Composite Scores.* Look at his/her Proficiency Level scores for Oral Language, Literacy, Comprehension, and the Overall Score. Which scores are closer to A1? Which scores are closer to P2?
- *Compare this year’s scores with last year’s scores, if available.* If your child took Alternate ACCESS for ELLs last year, compare his/her scores from one year to the next. Is there a difference in his/her Proficiency Level scores? Is there a difference in the amount of support he/she is receiving in Listening and Reading?

**How are the test scores used?**

Scores from Alternate ACCESS for ELLs can be used in many ways. Parents can use the scores to advocate for their child, especially when meeting with the school team that creates their child’s Individualized Education Program (IEP). Teachers use the scores to plan instruction and assessments. Districts use the scores to evaluate their language support programs, to monitor student progress in acquiring English, and to determine if a student is eligible to exit an English language support program. Scores are also used to meet federal and state accountability requirements.

**Questions to ask**

We encourage families to discuss the scores with their child’s teacher(s). Here are some questions to ask:

- What scores does he/she need to exit the English language support program?
- Will my child take this test every year?
- How are the scores shared with his/her teachers?
- What type of English language support do you provide my child?
- What would you like to know about how my child uses language at home?
- Why did my child receive a score of NA?
- What does a score of NA mean?

If you have questions about your child’s Alternate ACCESS for ELLs scores, please contact your child’s school.

**Alternate ACCESS for ELLs reports the following eight scores:**

- Listening
- Speaking
- Reading
- Writing
- Oral Language
- Literacy
- Comprehension
- Overall

Scores are reported as

**Key Terms to Know**

**English language learners** are students who are eligible to receive support at school with the English language.

**Language development** is a process that takes time. Students move along this process at different rates.

**Language proficiency** is a measurement of where students are in the process of language development.





©2018 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System,  
on behalf of WIDA

[www.wida.us](http://www.wida.us)