**Guidance for English Language Proficiency (ELP) Band Committees**

1. **Student Eligibility Requirements:**

It is important to recall that an English Language Proficiency (ELP) band committee should be convened only for English learners who meet **all** of the following criteria:

1. Student is in 3rd grade or above (3rd-12th grades). Students in kindergarten-2nd grade are not eligible for ELP band committees.
2. If ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 was taken, student has scored 4.3-4.7 on their Overall score, or if student has disabilities that preclude him or her from taking all ACCESS 2.0 domains, he or she has scored 4.3-4.7 or above on all domains taken. If Alternate ACCESS for ELLs was taken, student has scored A3-P1 or above on their Overall score for two consecutive years of testing, or if student has disabilities that preclude him or her from taking all Alternate ACCESS domains, he or she has scored A3-P1 or better on all domains taken for two consecutive years of testing.
3. Student has scored Proficient or Advanced on his or her most current OSTP ELA or OAAP ELA test.
4. Student has met the minimum number of criteria as set forth by the appropriate ELP rubric. Students who have not met the minimum criteria should not go to an ELP band committee even if they have met the appropriate ACCESS score requirements, and are not eligible for reclassification as English proficient and exit from EL services.
5. **Purpose of ELP Band Committee:**

If an English learner has met all of the above criteria, he or she should have an ELP band committee formed to:

1. Evaluate the available data, and
2. Make a decision as to whether the EL should be reclassified as English proficient and exited from EL services.
3. **ELP Band Committee Requirements:**

At minimum, the ELP band committee **must** include the following district staff:

1. **A district EL representative.** The person who serves in this role is up to district discretion, but whenever possible, this role should be filled by an EL Coordinator or EL teacher who has worked closely with the EL and is most familiar with the student’s English language development.
2. **A classroom teacher who works with the EL.** The person who serves in this role is up to district discretion, but whenever possible, this role should be filled by a teacher who has worked closely with the EL in a capacity that has allowed the teacher to regularly observe the student’s English language development and evaluate his or her academic performance.
3. **An administrator or counselor.** The person who serves in this role is up to district discretion, but whenever possible, this role should be filled by a counselor or administrator that is most familiar with the student.

If the EL is dually identified and served on an IEP or 504, the ELP band committee **must** also include the following district staff:

1. **The SpEd teacher** most familiar with the student’s academic performance and English language development.
2. **Mandatory Evaluation Criteria:**

Districts must use the OSDE-created ELP band rubrics as the centerpiece of their decision making process. OSDE also encourages districts to gather and evaluate any additional information they believe to be useful and relevant in making decisions regarding whether a given student should be declared English proficient and exited from EL services. However, additional information beyond that required by the appropriate ELP band rubric is not required. Please see **V) Suggested Evaluation Criteria** below for examples of additional data that districts may choose to include in the decision making process at their discretion.

1. **Suggested Evaluation Criteria:**

In addition to the mandatory criteria set forth by the appropriate rubric, districts who wish to maintain best practices in making programming decisions for ELs who have scored within the ELP band should consider gathering and examining the following:

1. **Student writing samples.** Writing samples should ideally:
   1. Include work from throughout the school year, thereby providing ELP band committee members with examples highlighting the student’s English language development in the school year leading up to him or her scoring within the ELP band on his or her most recent ACCESS test.
   2. Include work that shows all elements leading up to the student’s production of a longer work; i.e., note cards, outline, rough drafts, and a final draft of a student paper or project.
   3. Include multiple works. Since the length and complexity of writing assignments varies by grade level, elementary level ELP band committees may wish to examine 4-5 writing samples, while secondary level ELP band committees may only wish to examine 2-3 longer samples.
   4. Include writing samples of works from multiple content area courses, including ELA, math, and science.
2. **Language inventory or inventories.** Ideally, language inventories:
   1. Should be completed by **both** an EL Coordinator or EL teacher, **and** by at least one classroom teacher, though it is even more meaningful if multiple content area teachers can participate in observing the student’s language use.
   2. Should be completed over an extended period of at least 2-4 months. This allows observers to gather information about the student’s language use and development over time, and in a variety of situations in multiple content area courses.
   3. Should be conducted for both the student’s use of English and the student’s use of his or her native language(s) whenever possible.
3. **Videos or notes recorded during student language use in the classroom.** Ideally, the videos or notes would record instances of the student using English in a variety of situations. Here are some examples of such situations:
   1. Oral presentations (individual and/or group presentations)
   2. Discussions with other students during group work
   3. Participation in labs or other hands-on activities that require communication with others to complete
4. **Portfolio of student work samples.** Portfolios should ideally:
   1. Include work from throughout the school year, thereby providing ELP band committee members with examples highlighting the student’s English language development in the school year leading up to him or her scoring within the ELP band on his or her most recent ACCESS test.
   2. Include examples of work from all core content areas, and at minimum, examples of work in the areas of math, science, and ELA.
   3. Include examples of work that demonstrates students’ use and interpretation of both social, informal language, and use and interpretation of formal, academic language and technical terms.

**ACCESS for ELLs 2.0: ELP Band Committee Rubric**

**Instructions:** Please note that the following criteria must be met for student to be re-designated English proficient and exited from EL services:

* Student must be found to have met criteria 1 and 2. Students who have not met criteria 1 and 2 should not advance to an ELP band committee, and are not eligible to be re-designated as English proficient and exited from EL services.
* Student must be found to have met **at least 3** of the criteria listed on numbers 3-7. While OSDE strongly suggests that students have criteria 3-7 completed whenever possible, it is not mandatory so long as enough additional data is available to allow the ELP band committee to make a decision.
* The EL representative must agree that the student is English proficient and ready to exit EL services.
* If the student is dually identified, the IEP representative must agree that the student is English proficient and ready to exit EL services.

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Birthdate: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Student Grade Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ School Site: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

State Student Testing Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Student ID Number (District): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document | Criteria | Met | Not Met |
| 1. ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Composite Score (or domain scores for ELs with disabilities that preclude taking all domains)   **\*\*\*Required\*\*\*** | **4.3 - 4.7** Required  Date:  Composite Score: |  |  |
| 1. OSTP-ELA (Score)   **\*\*\*Required\*\*\*** | Student scored ***Basic***or better on most current OSTP ELA Score.  Test Date:  Test Scale Score:  Proficiency Level (circle one):  ***Basic Proficient Advanced*** |  |  |
| 1. OSTP-ELA (Growth) | Student demonstrated adequate growth of at least 3 scale score points compared to prior year’s OSTP ELA score. |  |  |
| 1. RSA Screener\*   \*(*No score prior to spring semester of previous school year may be used)* | Student met performance criteria on most current RSA Screener score. |  |  |
| 1. Grades (ELA) | Student demonstrates mastery over appropriate grade-level subject matter and readiness for the next grade level. |  |  |
| 1. NRT-Reading or ELA (State approved)\*   \*(*No score prior to spring semester of previous school year may be used)* | Student meets  performance requirement and has score at or above the 35th percentile.  (see state approved list of assessments)  Test Name:  Test Date:  Test Score: |  |  |
| 1. Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) | Student scored between 21-25 (Advanced Fluency). |  |  |
| Recommend Proficiency Status | | Yes | No |
| ELD Representative (required) | |  |  |
| IEP-Representative (if applicable) | |  |  |

Based on the criteria listed above the committee recommends the student

Has achieved EL Proficiency:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   Maintains EL status : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(takes ACCESS 2.0 in spring)

EL Proficiency Committee Meeting Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signatures:

ELD Representative:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Site Administrator:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Alternate ACCESS for ELLs: ELP Band Committee Rubric**

**Instructions:** Please note that the following criteria must be met for student to be re-designated English proficient and exited from EL services:

* Student must be found to have met criteria 1. Students who have not met criteria 1 should not advance to an ELP band committee, and are not eligible to be re-designated as English proficient and exited from EL services.
* Student must be found to have met **all 3** of the criteria listed on numbers 1-3.
* The EL representative **must agree** that the student is English proficient and ready to exit EL services.
* The IEP representative **must agree** that the student is English proficient and ready to exit EL services.

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Birthdate: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Student Grade Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ School Site: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

State Student Testing Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Student ID Number (District): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document | Criteria | Met | Not Met |
| 1. Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Composite Score (**or** domain scores for ELs with disabilities that preclude taking all domains)  **\*\*\*Required\*\*\*** | A3 – P1 (2 consecutive years) Required  Date 1:  Date 2:  Composite Score 1:  Composite Score 2: |  |  |
| 2. OAAP/DLM-ELA | Student shows growth at the Essential Element level in the DLM Reading assessment.  Test Date: |  |  |
| 3. Grades (ELA) | Progress in ELA content evidenced through IEP documentation. (e.g., progress reporting, assessment data, Present Levels of Performance, etc…) |  |  |
| Recommend Proficiency Status | | Yes | No |
| ELD Representative (required) | |  |  |
| IEP-Representative (required) | |  |  |

Based on the criteria listed above the committee recommends the student

Has achieved EL Proficiency:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   Maintains EL status : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(takes Alternate ACCESS in spring)

EL Proficiency Committee Meeting Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signatures

ELD Representative:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Site Administrator:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## **Student Language Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM)**

**PURPOSE OF THE SOLOM**

The Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) is an informal rating tool used to rate and monitor the oral English proficiency of limited English proficient (LEP) students. An advantage of the SOLOM is that results are available immediately to classroom personnel to assist with instructional decisions. The SOLOM can be used to group and regroup students for instruction and to identify instructional and curricular areas needing more attention. The SOLOM is sometimes used for identifying LEP students’ eligibility for entry or exit from English learner (EL) services. Finally, the SOLOM can also be used as an instructional planning and monitoring tool.

**ADMINISTRATION**

The classroom teacher can use the SOLOM to rate LEP students after at least three weeks of classroom instruction. The classroom teacher may use the SOLOM to monitor LEP student growth in English by re-profiling individual LEP students every semester or trimester. When

used for instructional planning, the SOLOM is done by observing a student interact with typical instructional content materials. Having observed the language skill of each student, the teacher selects the SOLOM description which most closely matches the current proficiency of that student in each of the five categories: comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar. When used for eligibility screening, it is best to use one set of materials consistently with all students. Also, it is strongly recommended that **at least one** other educator independently rate the same LEP student and the two SOLOM scores be compared. The average between the two scores is the most accurate reflection of the LEP student’s oral proficiency.

**SCORING**

The number at the top of each column on the SOLOM determines the

point value of each box checked in that column.

1. Write the score for each category.

2. Total the scores for all five categories.

3. Match the total to the developmental stage.

|  |
| --- |
| **English Developmental Stage SOLOM Score**  **Pre Production 0 - 5**  **Early Production 6 - 10**  **Speech Emergence 11 - 15**  **Intermediate Fluency 16 - 20**  **Advanced Fluency** **21 - 25** |

**Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM)**

Student’s Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Grade\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Teacher\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Language observed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Score** |
| **A.Comprehension** | Cannot be said to  understand even  simple conversation | Has great difficulty  following what is  said. Can  comprehend only  “social  conversation”  spoken slowly and  with frequent  repetitions | Understands most  of what is said at  slower-than-normal  speed with  repetitions | Understands nearly  everything at  normal speech,  although occasional  repetition may be  necessary | Understands  everyday  conversation and  normal classroom  discussions without  difficulty |  |
| **B. Fluency** | Speech is so halting  and fragmentary as  to make  conversation  virtually impossible | Usually hesitant:  often forced into  silence by language  limitations | Speech in everyday  conversation and  classroom  discussion  frequently disrupted  by the student’s  search for the  correct manner of  expression | Speech in everyday  conversation and  classroom  discussion generally  fluent, with  occasional lapses  while the student  searches the correct  manner of  expression | Speech in everyday  conversation and  classroom  discussion fluent  and effortless  approximating that  of a native speaker |  |
| **C. Vocabulary** | Vocabulary  limitations so  extreme as to make  conversation  virtually impossible | Misuse of words  and very limited  vocabulary:  comprehension  quite difficult | Student frequently  uses the wrong  words:  conversation  somewhat limited  because of  inadequate  vocabulary | Student  occasionally uses  inappropriate terms  and/or must  rephrase ideas  because of lexical inadequacies | Use of vocabulary  and idioms are  approximately that  of a native speaker |  |
| **D. Pronunciation** | Pronunciation  problems so severe  as to make speech  virtually  unintelligible | Very hard to  understand because  of pronunciation  problems. Must  frequently repeat to  be understood | Pronunciation  problems  necessitate  concentration on the  part of the listener:  occasionally may be  misunderstood | Always intelligible  though one is  conscious of a  definite accent and  occasional  inappropriate  intonation | Pronunciation and  intonation  approximate that of  a native speaker |  |
| **E. Grammar** | Errors in grammar  and word order so  severe as to make  speech virtually  unintelligible | Grammar and word  order errors make  comprehension  difficult. Must  often rephrase/be  restricted to basic  patterns | Makes frequent  errors of grammar  and word order  which occasionally  obscure meaning | Occasionally makes  grammatical and/or  word errors which  do not obscure  meaning | Grammatical usage  and word order  approximate that of  a native speaker |  |

**Based on your observation of the student, indicate with an “X” across the square in each category which best describes the student’s abilities.**

**Scoring Considerations:**

1. The SOLOM should only be administered by persons who themselves score at level 4 or above in the language being assessed.

2. The SOLOM yields the most information regarding a student’s proficiency when the student is observed and evaluated both while using his or her native language(s) and while using the target language of English. However, it is not necessary to evaluate the student in both languages in order to obtain information regarding the student’s proficiency in English using the SOLOM.

3. The SOLOM is intended to gather information regarding student language use in academic settings. While teachers may choose to observe student language use in a variety of situations and settings, SOLOM scores are to be based upon their *academic* language use in the classroom (as opposed to their language use in social, informal settings).