## mathe school district of PHILADELPHIA

## English Learner Performance

 on the 2021-22 ACCESS, Star Reading, and Star Math AssessmentsThe ACCESS assessment is administered to English Learners (ELs) annually each winter to measure their progress toward English proficiency. Star Computer Adaptive Tests (CATs) are a suite of assessments administered 3-4 times during the school year to students in grades $K-12$ that measure students' reading and math skills, monitor achievement and growth, and track how well students understand skills aligned to state and Common Core standards. Although some ELs are excused from participation in Star, most take Star Reading and Math. This report examines EL performance on the ACCESS and EL performance on Star within the context of ACCESS performance.

## Key findings include:

- English Learners' ACCESS and Star performance were generally aligned with each other. For example, ELs who scored in the highest ACCESS levels, on average, also scored in the highest Star performance groups, and ELs who scored in the lowest ACCESS levels, on average, also scored in the lowest Star performance groups.
- Nearly all students, on average, displayed growth on Star Reading and Math from fall to spring, regardless of their ACCESS level. In half of the ACCESS levels, students even moved to higher Star Reading performance groups from fall to spring.
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## Background

Every year, English Learners (ELS) nationally take the ACCESS assessment to measure their English proficiency level. In the School District of Philadelphia (SDP), all students ${ }^{1}$ take the Star Reading and Star Math assessments multiple times per year ${ }^{2}$ to measure student proficiency and growth in literacy and mathematics skills. Unlike end-of-year standardized assessments that provide a summative description of student performance, within-year assessments like Star provide real-time information about students' knowledge of reading and math skills that teachers and school administrators use to inform instructional decisions and monitor student progress.

The goal of this report is to examine EL performance on the ACCESS, and the relationship between EL performance on the ACCESS assessment and EL performance on Star Reading and Star Math in 2021-22 within the context of ACCESS performance.

## About the ACCESS Assessment

Assessing Communication and Comprehension in English State to State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ ) is a standards-based English language proficiency test for students in grades K-12 designed to measure English language learners' proficiency in English. It assesses social and instructional English as well as the language associated with Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies within the school context across the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

ELs take the ACCESS assessment annually in January to determine their progress toward English proficiency. The ACCESS assessment identifies students who could use additional support to achieve English proficiency and to track progress toward potentially exiting students from English as a Second Language (ESL) programming. The ACCESS assessment provides six proficiency levels and score ranges that range from students entering English language proficiency (Level 1) to reaching English language proficiency (Level 6; Table 1).

Table 1. ACCESS performance groups

| Proficiency Level | Score Ranges | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level 1 | $1.0-1.9$ | Entering |
| Level 2 | $2.0-2.9$ | Emerging |
| Level 3 | $3.0-3.9$ | Developing |
| Level 4 | $4.0-3.9$ | Expanding |
| Level 5 | $5.0-4.9$ | Bridging |
| Level 6 | $6.0+$ | Reaching |

[^0]When ELs achieve Level 4 on ACCESS, they are eligible for reclassification, which means exiting English as a Second Language services (ESL). ${ }^{3}$ Meeting Level 4 is not the sole determinant for reclassification: SDP students must also be recommended for reclassification by their teachers based on student performance on language use inventories, a more holistic view of students' speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills than are tested on the ACCESS. ${ }^{4}$ For example, a student could score in ACCESS Level 6, but have very low performance on the language use inventories and not be reclassified. ${ }^{5}$ Likewise, a student could score in ACCESS Level 2, but could also have very high marks on the language use inventories and not be reclassified. In general, however, as ELs start scoring in ACCESS Levels 4, 5, and 6, they are considered for reclassification and could presumably be exited from EL status, and thus would not take the ACCESS again afterwards.

Therefore, the ACCESS test is unlike many other standardized tests (like PSSA and Star administered in SDP), ${ }^{6}$ where students take the tests each year (or multiple times per year), regardless of performance, and the goal is to increase the number of students scoring in the highest levels. ${ }^{7}$ On the ACCESS assessment, the better students perform, the more likely they are to be reclassified and not take the ACCESS in future years. ${ }^{8}$ This process decreases the number and proportion of students who would score in ACCESS Levels 4,5, and 6 compared to the number and proportion of students who would score in the ACCESS Levels 1,2 , and 3 . Thus, when we describe the results of these analyses, it is important to keep in mind that the population of students who score in ACCESS Levels 4, 5 , and 6 is much smaller than the population of students who scored in ACCESS Levels 1,2 , and 3 . This pattern has two implications: 1 ) the average results are skewed toward the performance of students with lower English proficiency, and 2) as the analyses dig into differences by student groups, sometimes performance of students in ACCESS Levels 5 and 6 are excluded from the analyses due to extremely small group sizes.

## About the Star Assessments

SDP uses Star Assessments, a suite of tests developed by Renaissance Learning, to assess students' reading and math skills. Starting in the 2021-22 school year, SDP expanded Star to grades K-12 so that the same within-year assessment would be used across all grade levels. In 2021-22, Star

[^1]Assessments were administered to students in grades K-12 four times a year. Star tests used by the District and presented in this report are computer adaptive tests, or CATs. Star CATs adjust the difficulty of items administered to the student depending on how well the student performed on previous items within a given testing session. The Star CATS have a short practice test to identify students who are not ready to take the Star CAT. This practice test is typically very simple, and is meant to identify students who have trouble navigating the platform, or potentially cannot comprehend the practice questions. When a student fails the practice test they do not take the rest of the CAT. This practice test has the potential to impact ELs more than their peers, and may decrease EL Star CAT participation rates. ${ }^{9}$ These tests are designed to broadly assess students' skills across a number of literacy or math domains.

To examine system-level trends in reading performance, in addition to other schoolwide and classroom-level purposes, SDP uses the Star Early Literacy (K-2), the Star Reading (3-12) CATs, and the Star Math (3-12) CATs.

The following domains make up the Star Early Literacy/Star Reading assessments for each grade level:

- The Star Early Literacy assessment domains for grades K-2 include Word Knowledge and Skills, Comprehension Strategies and Constructing Meaning, and Number and Operations.
- The Star Reading assessment domains for grades 3-12 include Word Knowledge and Skills, Comprehension Strategies and Constructing Meaning, Analyzing Literary Text, Understanding Author's Craft, and Analyzing Argument and Evaluating Text.

Scores on Star Early Literacy and Star Reading estimate students' proficiency in specific domains based on overall proficiency and indicate a student's progress toward meeting grade-level expectations. Scores are also reported on a common scale, allowing comparison of student proficiency across the tests. ${ }^{10}$ Throughout this report, Star Early Literacy and Star Reading will be referred to as Star Reading for simplicity.

Students in grades 3-12 take the Star Math CAT, while students in K-2 take the Star Math Curriculum Based Measures (or CBMs); only students who took the Star Math CAT (grades 3-12) are included in the math analysis of this report. ${ }^{11}$

- The domains that make up the Star Math assessment include Number and Operations, Algebra, Geometry and Measurements, and Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability.

Scores on Star Math (CAT) estimate students' proficiency in specific domains based on overall proficiency, which is different than directly testing students' proficiency on each specific skill.

[^2]The Star CATs provide several metrics that describe student performance. The metrics used in this analysis are the national percentile rank and Star performance groups.

## National Percentile Rank

National percentile rank is a norm-referenced performance measure that compares students' scaled scores to a nationally representative sample of grade-level peers. ${ }^{12}$ The national percentile rank is useful for understanding student skill development in comparison to students of the same grade nationally. Based on the number of correct responses, each student is assigned a national percentile rank. Percentiles range from 1-99. For example, a national percentile rank in the 23 rd percentile indicates that the student is performing better than $23 \%$ of the nationally normed sample based on their number of correct responses. While national percentile ranks are a familiar metric for most readers, they should not be used in arithmetic operations, such as averaging national percentile ranks across multiple students in the same student group, because the intervals between national percentile ranks are not the same across the percentile range. ${ }^{13}$

## Normal Curve Equivalent

Normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores are another type of norm-referenced performance measure, and are one way to address the limitations of percentile ranks. Like percentile ranks, NCEs range from 1-99 and describe student performance among a nationally normed sample. However, unlike national percentile ranks, NCEs are interval-scaled so that the intervals between scores along the entire range of NCE scores are the same. Therefore, NCEs can be used to calculate an average or to calculate differences between groups. NCEs are scaled with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.06. ${ }^{14}$

## Normal Curve Equivalent-Based National Percentile Rank

A challenge of NCE is that it is not interpreted the same way as an NPR. Therefore, after averaging NCE across student groups, we can convert NCE back to NPR, and interpret average student-group NPR via an NCE-based NPR value. Average group NCE scores in the current sample were converted to an NCE-based NPR value using the following formula: $100 \times$ Normal Distribution x ((NCE50)/21.06). ${ }^{15}$ See the Report Addendum for differences between traditional NPR values provided by Star and averaged within groups, and the NCE-based NPR values used in this report. ${ }^{16}$

## Performance Groups

The Star performance groups metric provides information about student performance in four categories: At/Above Benchmark, On Watch, Strategic Intervention, and Intensive Intervention.

[^3]They are based on the student's NPR. Both Star assessments place students into performance groups depending on how they perform on the tests. For each test, At/Above Benchmark indicates that a student is performing at grade level.

Critically, the At/Above Benchmark percentile rank cutoff is at the $40^{\text {th }}$ percentile for Star Reading and Early Literacy, and the At/Above Benchmark percentile rank cutoff is at the $70^{\text {th }}$ percentile for Star Math, making it more challenging to score in At/Above Benchmark on Star Math (Table 2).

Table 2. Star performance groups

| Performance Groups | Star Reading and Early Literacy | Star Math |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| At/Above Benchmark | $\geq 40^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | $\geq 70^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |
| On Watch | $25^{\text {th }}-39^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | $25^{\text {th }}-69^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |
| Strategic Intervention | $10^{\text {th }}-24^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | $10^{\text {th }}-24^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |
| Intensive Intervention | $<10^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | $<10^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |

SDP guidance explains that ELs are expected to take the Star Reading and Star Math CAT just like non-ELs in SDP. There are a few notable exceptions: 1) ELs in grades 3-8 who are enrolled in the United States for the first time after the final Thursday in April of the prior school year are considered first-year ELs and are exempt from taking the Star Reading CAT until the next school year; 2) ELs in grades 9-12 who are enrolled in the United States for the first time after the final Thursday in May of the prior school year are considered first-year ELs and are exempt from taking the Star Reading CAT until the next school year.

Additionally, ELs who have been enrolled in school in the United States for fewer than three years and whose home language is Spanish may take the Star Math CAT in English or Spanish. Star Reading Spanish results are not used for District-wide accountability (with the potential exception of Dual Language schools), but ELs may take Star Reading in Spanish as a supplementary assessment for classroom use. Because Star assessments are available only in English and Spanish, these options are limited to ELs whose home language is Spanish. In this report, unless explicitly broken out by test language, data from students who took Star Math in Spanish are included in analyses and collapsed in with data from students who took Star Math in English. Data on Star Reading in Spanish are not included due to small sample size.

## Research Questions

We examined two primary research questions:

1. How did students perform on the ACCESS assessment in the 2021-22 school year?
2. (Of students who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22), how did students perform on Star Reading and Star Math, by ACCESS level, in the 2021-22 school year?

## Analytic Approach

This report used two samples of students to investigate our research questions. The first sample included ELs who took the ACCESS in the 2021-22 school year. This sample was used to investigate research question 1: How did students perform on the ACCESS assessment in the 2021-22 school year?

The second sample included ELs who took the Star Reading and Star Math tests in the 2021-22 school year who also have an ACCESS score. For the second sample, students' ACCESS levels were based on their most recent score, meaning that ELs who did not take the ACCESS in 2021-22 were included in the sample, but their ACCESS levels were based on a prior administration of the test. ${ }^{17}$ This sample was used to investigate research question 2: How did students perform on Star Reading and Star Math, by ACCESS level, in the 2021-22 school year?

## How did students perform on the ACCESS assessment in the 2021-22 school year?

## Demographic characteristics

Over 15,000 ELs took the ACCESS assessment and had a score in 2021-22. The number of test takers was lower in the higher grades. Over 1,000 ELs took the ACCESS in each grade K-9, and fewer than 1,000 ELs took the ACCESS in each grade 10-12 (Figure 1).

Figure 1. The number of ELs who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22 by grade level


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023

[^4]Nearly 5,000 ELs who took the ACCESS were in their first year as an EL; these ELs took the WIDA test in SDP in the 2021-22 school year ${ }^{18}$ (Figure 2). Almost 3,000 ELs who took the ACCESS were in their third year as an EL, and about 2,000 were in their fourth year as an EL. About 4,000 students (or about 25\%) who took the ACCESS in 2021-22 were in their 6+ year as an EL, which is also referred to as long-term ELs. ${ }^{19}$

Figure 2. The number of ELs who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22 by the number of years as an EL


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023
Note: Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, classification and reclassification processes to determine English Learner status were interrupted because a very small number of students took the WIDA English proficiency screener that identifies English Learners ${ }^{20}$ (information used for classifying students as ELs) and the ACCESS in 2020-21 (information used for reclassifying students as former ELs). Due to this interruption, there is a very small population of students who were tested in 2021-22 after being classified in 2020-21 ( 137 students in the bar representing 2 years as an EL). If WIDA and ACCESS testing had not been interrupted by virtual schooling due to the Covid-19 pandemic, it is likely that a percentage of students who had spent one year as an EL in 2021-22 $(4,815)$ would be in the next column of students who had spent two years as an EL in 2021-22, increasing the number from $137 .{ }^{21}$

[^5]Over half of ELs, or over 8,000 students, who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22 were Hispanic/Latinx (Figure 3). Just shy of 3,500, or about $25 \%$, of ELs who took the ACCESS were Asian and about 2,000 (15\%) were White. ${ }^{22}$
Figure 3. The number of ELs who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22 by student race/ethnicity


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023
Over 10,000 ELs who took the ACCESS assessment were economically disadvantaged, and fewer than 1,500 had an IEP (Figure 4). ${ }^{23}$

[^6]Figure 4. The number of ELs who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22 by economic disadvantage and special education status


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023
The majority of ELs' home language was Spanish (Table 3). Languages with over 1,000 ELs who took the ACCESS included Portuguese and Chinese.

Table 3. The number of ELs who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22 by top 16 student home language

| Home Language | Students with 2021-22 ACCESS scores |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spanish | 7,616 |
| Portuguese | 1,451 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | 1,283 |
| Arabic | 754 |
| Russian | 545 |
| Vietnamese | 342 |
| Uzbek | 261 |
| Khmer | 262 |
| Bengali | 207 |
| Pashto | 178 |
| Tajik | 180 |
| French | 181 |
| Chinese (Yue/Cantonese) | 156 |
| Haitian Creole | 155 |
| Albanian | 150 |
| Ukrainian | 131 |

Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023

## How did students perform on the ACCESS assessment in the 2021-22 school year?

Of the 15,183 ELs who took the ACCESS assessment in 2021-22, 27\% scored in Level 1, $24 \%$ in Level 2, and 30\% in Level 3 (Figure 5). Additionally, fewer than 20\% of ELs scored in Levels 4-6. This means the majority of ELs were entering, emerging, or developing in 2021-22 (see Table 1). ${ }^{24}$

Figure 5. The percentage of ELs who scored in each of the six ACCESS levels


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023
Note: Together, the bars in this figure sum to about 100\%; due to rounding, the total may be close to $99 \%$ or 101\%.

[^7]By grade level, ACCESS performance for students in grades K-5 varied more than for students in grades 6-12 (Figure 6). For grades K-5, there was a trend for ACCESS performance to incrementally improve as grade levels increased. For example, only $2 \%$ of kindergarteners scored in ACCESS Levels 4-6, but this increased to $4 \%$ for $1^{\text {st }}$ graders, $8 \%$ for $2^{\text {nd }}$ graders, $15 \%$ for 3 rd graders, $37 \%$ for $4^{\text {th }}$ graders, and $43 \%$ for $5^{\text {th }}$ graders. Conversely, while $83 \%$ of incoming kindergarten students who were identified as EL scored in ACCESS Level 1, the percentage of Level 1 students decreased to $38 \%$ for $1^{\text {st }}$ graders, $28 \%$ for $2^{\text {nd }}$ graders, $26 \%$ for $3^{\text {rd }}$ graders, $15 \%$ for $4^{\text {th }}$ graders, and $13 \%$ for $5^{\text {th }}$ graders. For ELs in grades 6-12, however, ACCESS performance tended to remain similar across grades, with the percentage of students who scored in ACCESS Levels $4-6$ ranging from $15 \%-22 \%$, and the percentage who scored in Level 1 ranging from $22 \%-27 \%$.
Figure 6. ACCESS performance by 2021-22 grade level


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023

When looking at ACCESS performance by the number of years students have been an EL, performance differed more among students who had been an EL for one to six years than for students who had been an EL for 7+ years (Figure 7). It is important to note that the number of ELs in each column varies widely. For students who had been an EL for one to six years, there was a trend for ACCESS performance to incrementally improve by the number of years students had been an EL. For example, only 7\% of students who had been an EL for one year scored in ACCESS Levels 4-6, and this increased to $10 \%$ for students who had been an EL for two years, $13 \%$ for students who had been an EL for three years, $22 \%$ for students who had been an EL for four years, $35 \%$ for students who had been an EL for five years, and $36 \%$ for students who had been an EL for six years. However, for students who had been an EL for 7+ years, the percentage of ELs scoring in ACCESS Levels 4-6 hovered around $18 \%-28 \%$.

Figure 7. ACCESS performance by 2021-22 number of years as an EL


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023
How to read this figure: Below the label for Years as an $E L$, " n " refers to the number of students in the column. To calculate the number of students in each ACCESS level by years as an EL within a column, multiply the number in the parentheses by the percentage in the box.

Performance on the ACCESS differed by student race/ethnicity (Figure 8). A higher percentage of Asian (34\%) ELs students scored in ACCESS Levels 4-6 than Multi-Racial/Other (24\%), White (23\%), Black/African American (18\%), and Hispanic/Latinx (11\%) ELs.

Figure 8 . ACCESS performance by student race/ethnicity


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023
Performance on the ACCESS was rather similar by economic disadvantage status (Figure 9). Additionally, a lower percentage of students with an IEP (6\%) scored in ACCESS Levels 4-6 than students without an IEP (20\%).

Figure 9. ACCESS performance by economic disadvantage and special education status


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023

Performance on the ACCESS differed by home language (Figure 10), primarily for Spanish speakers, Portuguese speakers, and Chinese speakers compared to students who speak other home languages. Between $10 \%-11 \%$ of Spanish and Portuguese speakers scored in ACCESS Levels 4 and 5 , with none scoring in ACCESS Level 6 . In comparison, $45 \%$ of Chinese speakers scored in ACCESS Levels 4,5 , and 6 , a higher rate than speakers of any other home languages in Figure 10. For all other home languages, between 20\%-33\% of ELs scored in ACCESS Levels 4 and above.

Figure 10. ACCESS performance by home language


Source: Qlik ACCESS for ELs App, data downloaded January 6, 2023

# How did students perform on Star Reading and Star Math, by ACCESS Level, in the 2021-22 school year? 

## Demographic characteristics

The number of ELs with Star data in 2021-22 who also had an ACCESS score varied slightly between Star assessment windows. Overall, about 14,000 ELs who had ACCESS scores took Star Reading in the four Star assessment windows (Table 4) and about 11,000 ELs who had ACCESS scores took Star Math in the four Star assessment windows (Table 5). The difference in the number of test-takers between Star Reading and Math are primarily due to grades K-2 students not taking Star Math, while they do take Star Reading. Additionally, unless noted otherwise, the ACCESS score in this report is students' most recent ACCESS test. This means that if students did not take the ACCESS in 2020-21 or 2021-22, their 2019-20 ACCESS score or their original WIDA screener determines their ACCESS group. This sample for this research question is slightly different from the sample in the section above.

Grades K-5 students made up more than $50 \%$ of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Reading scores in each assessment window, and made up about 65\% in the spring assessment window (Table 4). Hispanic/Latinx students consistently made up 53\% of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Reading scores in each assessment window, while $24 \%$ were Asian and $15 \%$ were White. About $70 \%$ of the population of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Reading scores were economically disadvantaged, and about 10\% had an IEP. About 75\% of ELs scored in ACCESS Levels 1-3, compared to fewer than $25 \%$ of ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 4-6. About half of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Reading scores in each assessment window had a home language of Spanish.

Table 4. Students with ACCESS scores and scores on the Star Reading assessments in 2021-22 in each of the four Star administration windows

| Student Group | Students with ACCESS scores and 2021-22 scores in: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 Star | Winter 2 Star | Spring Star |
| English Learners with ACCESS <br> Scores | 13,962 | 13,936 | 14,456 | 13,261 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 - 2 2}$ Grade Level |  |  |  |  |
| K | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| 1 | $11 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| 2 | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| 3 | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| 4 | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| 5 | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| 6 | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| 7 | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 8 | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 9 | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 10 | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| 11 | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| 12 | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ |


| Student Group | Students with ACCESS scores and 2021-22 scores in: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 Star | Winter 2 Star | Spring Star |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Asian | 24\% | 24\% | 24\% | 24\% |
| Black/African American | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| Hispanic/Latinx | 53\% | 53\% | 53\% | 53\% |
| Multi-Racial/Other | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| White | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| Economic Disadvantage Status |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 69\% | 69\% | 70\% | 71\% |
| Not Economically Disadvantaged | 31\% | 31\% | 30\% | 29\% |
| Special Education Status |  |  |  |  |
| Has IEP | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Does not have an IEP | 90\% | 91\% | 91\% | 91\% |
| ACCESS Level |  |  |  |  |
| 1.0-1.9 | 28\% | 30\% | 31\% | 33\% |
| 2.0-2.9 | 32\% | 32\% | 31\% | 31\% |
| 3.0-3.9 | 16\% | 15\% | 14\% | 13\% |
| 4.0-4.9 | 20\% | 20\% | 19\% | 19\% |
| 5.0-5.9 | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 4\% |
| $6+$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Top 16 Most Frequent Home Languages |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish | 49\% | 49\% | 49\% | 49\% |
| Portuguese | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Arabic | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Russian | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| Vietnamese | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Uzbek | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Khmer | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bengali | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Pashto | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Tajik | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Chinese (Yue/Cantonese) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| French | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Albanian | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Ukrainian | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Haitian Creole | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 4, 2023
Note: Cells with $0 \%$ can have up to 60 students in the percentage. See Appendix A Table A1 for the numbers of students in each cell.

Grades 3-6 students made up about 50\% of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Math scores in each assessment window in 2021-22 (Table 5). Hispanic/Latinx students consistently made up about $50 \%$ of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Math scores in each assessment window, while about $24 \%$ were Asian and about $15 \%$ were White. About $85 \%$ of the population of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Math scores were economically disadvantaged, and about $10 \%$ had an IEP. More than 70\% of ELs scored in ACCESS Levels 1-3, compared to fewer than 30\% of ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 4-6. In each assessment window, about half of ELs with an ACCESS score and Star Math scores had Spanish as home language, although this percentage slightly declined from the fall to spring windows.

Table 5. Students with ACCESS scores and scores on the Star Math assessments in 2021-22 in each of the four Star administration windows

| Student Group | Students with ACCESS scores and 2021-22 scores in: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 Star | Winter 2 Star | Spring Star |
| English Learners with ACCESS Scores | 11283 | 11371 | 12503 | 11557 |
| Grade Level |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| 2 | 4\% | 4\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| 3 | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| 4 | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% |
| 5 | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| 6 | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% |
| 7 | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| 8 | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| 9 | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% |
| 10 | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% |
| 11 | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% |
| 12 | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 2\% |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Asian | 24\% | 24\% | 24\% | 25\% |
| Black/African American | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 7\% |
| Hispanic/Latinx | 52\% | 52\% | 51\% | 51\% |
| Multi-Racial/Other | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| White | 14\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| Economic Disadvantage Status |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 88\% | 86\% | 85\% | 86\% |
| Not Economically Disadvantaged | 45\% | 48\% | 48\% | 47\% |
| Special Education Status |  |  |  |  |
| Has IEP | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Does not have an IEP | 90\% | 91\% | 91\% | 91\% |


| Student Group | Students with ACCESS scores and 2021-22 scores in: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 Star | Winter 2 Star | Spring Star |
| ACCESS Level |  |  |  |  |
| 1.0-1.9 | 22\% | 24\% | 27\% | 28\% |
| 2.0-2.9 | 32\% | 31\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| 3.0-3.9 | 18\% | 17\% | 16\% | 15\% |
| 4.0-4.9 | 24\% | 23\% | 22\% | 22\% |
| 5.0-5.9 | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| 6+ | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Top 16 Most Frequent Home Languages |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish | 49\% | 47\% | 46\% | 45\% |
| Portuguese | 9\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Arabic | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Russian | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| Vietnamese | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Uzbek | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Khmer | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bengali | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Pashto | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Tajik | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Haitian Creole | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| French | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Ukrainian | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Chinese (Yue/Cantonese) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Albanian | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Star Assessment Language |  |  |  |  |
| English | 97\% | 96\% | 96\% | 96\% |
| Spanish | 7\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 4, 2023
Note: Cells with $0 \%$ can have up to 60 students in the percentage. See Appendix A Table A2 for the numbers of students in each cell.

## How did students perform on Star Reading and Star Math, by ACCESS level, in the 2021-22 school year?

For both Star Reading and Star Math, ELs with higher ACCESS performance had higher Star performance and larger average increases on Star from fall to spring, compared to students with lower ACCESS performance.

On average, ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 6+ (dark blue) performed in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in 2021-22, with their average NPR increasing from the $54^{\text {th }}$ percentile in fall to the $67^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring (Figure 11). ${ }^{25}$ ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 (light blue) moved,

[^8]on average, from the On Watch range in fall to the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading by spring, with average NPR increasing from the $37^{\text {th }}$ percentile in fall to the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring. This means that, on average, compared to their peers nationally, ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 5 or 6+ were performing on grade level on Star Reading in spring 2021-22. ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 (green) moved, on average, from the Strategic Intervention range (19th percentile) to the On Watch range ( $26^{\text {th }}$ percentile) on Star Reading from fall to spring.

On average, ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 (yellow line) moved from the Intensive Intervention Star Reading range to the Strategic Intervention range on Star Reading in 2021-22, with their average NPR increasing from the $7^{\text {th }}$ percentile in fall to $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring. ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1 (red) and 2 (orange) scored, on average, in the Intensive Intervention Star Reading range, with their average NPR increasing from the $2^{\text {nd }}$ or $3^{\text {rd }}$ percentile in fall to the $4^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring.

Figure 11. Average Star Reading NPR performance by ACCESS level


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 3, 2023
Note: See Table 6 for Winter NPR values. See Table 7 for the number of students in each ACCESS level group in each window, or the number of students for each marker. See Figure A1 in the appendix for a visualization by the size of Star performance groups. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for Average NPR.

Table 6. Average Star Reading NPR performance by ACCESS level

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 19 | 22 | 25 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 37 | 43 | 49 | 50 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 54 | 63 | 67 | 67 |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure 11.

Table 7. Number of students in each ACCESS level group who took Star Reading in each testing window

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 3,974 | 4,201 | 4,540 | 4,370 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 4,425 | 4,400 | 4,505 | 4,051 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 2,190 | 2,039 | 2,058 | 1,753 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 2,812 | 2,738 | 2,796 | 2,563 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 502 | 499 | 499 | 467 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 59 | 59 | 58 | 57 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22, or the number of students for each marker in Figure 11.

On average, ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 6+ (dark blue) performed in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in 2021-22, increasing from the $71^{\text {st }}$ percentile to the 89 th percentile from fall to spring (Figure 12). ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 (light blue) moved, on average, from the On Watch range to the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in 2021-22, increasing from the $60^{\text {th }}$ percentile to the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile from fall to spring. On average, ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 (green) performed in the On Watch range on Star Math in 2021-22, with average NPR increasing from the $34^{\text {th }}$ percentile in fall to the $47^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring.

ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 (yellow) performed, on average, in the Strategic Intervention range, moving from the $17^{\text {th }}$ percentile to the $22^{\text {nd }}$ percentile on Star Math from fall to spring. On average, ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 2 (orange) moved from the Intensive Intervention range to the Strategic Intervention range on Star Math in 2021-22, with average NPR increasing from the $8^{\text {th }}$ percentile in fall to $11^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring. ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 1 (red) performed, on average, in the Intensive Intervention range on Star Math in 2021-22, with average NPR increasing from the $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile in fall to $7^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring.

Figure 12. Average Star Math NPR Performance by ACCESS level


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 3, 2023
Note: See Table 8 for Winter NPR values. See Table 9 for the number of students in each ACCESS level group in each window, or the number of students for each marker. See Figure A2 in the appendix for a visualization by the size of Star performance groups. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for NCE-based Average NPR.

Table 8. Average Star Math NPR performance by ACCESS level

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 8 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 17 | 20 | 22 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 34 | 43 | 47 | 47 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 60 | 69 | 75 | 75 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 71 | 81 | 89 | 89 |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure 12.

Table 9. Number of students in each ACCESS level group who took Star Math in each testing window

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 2,464 | 2,762 | 3,394 | 3,280 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 3,596 | 3,516 | 3,776 | 3,412 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 2,004 | 1,891 | 1,978 | 1,760 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 2,662 | 2,637 | 2,791 | 2,564 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 497 | 505 | 505 | 483 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 60 | 61 | 59 | 58 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22, or the number of students for each marker in Figure 12.

## Grades K-3 ELs had the greatest increases in Star Reading and Math performance from fall to spring 2021-22 when compared to students in higher grade bands who scored in the same ACCESS level.

Grades K-3, 4-5, and 6-8 ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 5 (light blue) and 6+ (dark blue) performed, on average, in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in the spring 2021-22 assessment window, with grades 4-5 and 6-8 ELs moving from the On Watch range in the fall to the At/Above Benchmark range in spring (Figure 13). In contrast, grades 9-10 ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Reading in both 2021-22 fall and spring assessment windows, and grades 11-12 ELs moved from the Strategic Intervention range to the On Watch range from fall to spring.

Additionally, of ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 (green), grades K-3 ELs performed, on average, in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in both assessment windows, whereas grades 45 ELs moved from the Strategic Intervention range to the On Watch range from the fall to spring 2021-22 assessment windows. On average, grades 6-8, 9-10, and 11-12 ELs performed in the Strategic Intervention range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

For ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 (yellow), grades K-3 ELs moved, on average, from the Strategic Intervention range to the On Watch range from the fall to spring 2021-22 assessment windows, and grades K-3 ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 2 (orange) moved from the Intensive Intervention range to the Strategic Intervention range from the fall to spring 2021-22 assessment windows. In comparison, grades K-3 ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 1 (red) and grades 4-5, 6-8, 910, and 11-12 ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1, 2, and 3 performed, on average, in the Intensive Intervention range from fall to spring 2021-22.

Overall, K-3 ELs had higher average performance and higher NPR growth from fall to spring 202122 on Star Reading than students in higher grades.

Figure 13. Average Star Reading NPR performance by grade bands


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 9, 2023
Note: See Table 10 for NPR values. See Table 11 for the number of students in each ACCESS level and grade band in each window. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for NCE-based Average NPR.

Table 10. Average Star Reading NPR performance by grade band

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{3}$ | Fall | 3 | 6 | 19 | 41 | 64 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 8 | 14 | 36 | 63 | 83 | Sup |
| $\mathbf{4}-\mathbf{5}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 37 | 54 |
|  | Spring | 2 | 3 | 9 | 25 | 49 | 68 |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 38 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 1 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 47 | Sup |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 32 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 34 | Sup |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 22 | N/A |
|  | Spring | 1 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 28 | N/A |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure 13. Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group, and thus the NPR averages are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table 11 for numbers of students in each cell.

Table 11. Number of students in each grade band who took Star Reading in each testing window

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ |
| $\mathbf{K - 3}$ | Fall | 2,603 | 1,775 | 374 | 436 | 45 | 1 |
|  | Spring | 3,243 | 1,857 | 359 | 425 | 46 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{4}-\mathbf{5}$ | Fall | 370 | 737 | 364 | 768 | 259 | 54 |
|  | Spring | 403 | 745 | 314 | 761 | 257 | 52 |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 439 | 889 | 743 | 905 | 96 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 426 | 857 | 688 | 877 | 91 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 260 | 582 | 405 | 419 | 57 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 156 | 355 | 248 | 334 | 44 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 302 | 442 | 304 | 284 | 45 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 142 | 237 | 144 | 166 | 29 | 0 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level and grade band who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

Grades K-3 ELs, grades 4-5 ELs, and grades 6-8 ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 5 (light blue) and 6+ (dark blue) performed, on average, in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math during the spring 2021-22 assessment window (Figure 14). In contrast, grades 9-10 and 11-12 ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Reading in both 2021-22 assessment windows. This includes grades 11-12 ELs moving from the At/Above Benchmark range in fall to On Watch in spring.

For ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 (green), grades K-3 students moved, on average, from the On Watch range in fall to the At/Above Benchmark range in spring. Additionally, grades 4-5, 6-8, 9-10, and 11-12 ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 (green) performed, on average, in the On Watch range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows. Grades K-3 ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 (yellow) also performed in the On Watch range during this time.
On average, among ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3, grades 4-5, 6-8, 9-10, and 11-12 ELs—and grades K-3 ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 2 (orange)—performed in the Strategic Intervention range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 2 or ACCESS Level 1 (red) in grades 4-5, 6-8, 9-10, and 11-12 performed, on average, in the Intensive Intervention range in fall and spring or moved from the Intensive Intervention range to the Strategic Intervention range from the fall to spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

Overall, while K-3 ELs had higher average performance on Star Math than students in other grade bands, grades 4-5 students had higher NPR growth from fall to spring 2021-22 on Star Math than students in other grades bands, particularly for grades 4-5 ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 4, 5, and 6.

Figure 14. Average Star Math NPR performance by grade band


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 9, 2023
Note: See Table 12 for NPR values. See Table 13 for the number of students in each ACCESS level and grade band in each window. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for NCE-based Average NPR.

Table 12. Average Star Math NPR performance by grade band

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{3}$ | Fall | 7 | 11 | 33 | 56 | 79 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 11 | 20 | 48 | 73 | 84 | Sup |
| $\mathbf{4}-\mathbf{5}$ | Fall | 3 | 4 | 11 | 25 | 53 | 71 |
|  | Spring | 5 | 8 | 17 | 46 | 75 | 89 |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 7 | 8 | 14 | 33 | 64 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 8 | 10 | 18 | 42 | 78 | Sup |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 5 | 7 | 18 | 39 | 64 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 5 | 8 | 18 | 41 | 69 | Sup |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 4 | 9 | 20 | 38 | 73 | N/A |
|  | Spring | 4 | 10 | 23 | 42 | 68 | N/A |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure 14. Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group, and thus the NPR averages are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table 13 for numbers of students in each cell.

Table 13. Number of students in each grade band who took Star Math in each testing window

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{3}$ | Fall | 702 | 842 | 236 | 258 | 31 | 1 |
|  | Spring | 1,000 | 934 | 294 | 340 | 42 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{4}-\mathbf{5}$ | Fall | 556 | 807 | 366 | 798 | 268 | 55 |
|  | Spring | 785 | 824 | 336 | 813 | 269 | 53 |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 651 | 959 | 745 | 936 | 99 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 974 | 979 | 714 | 917 | 99 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 313 | 625 | 402 | 426 | 58 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 394 | 469 | 264 | 331 | 50 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 242 | 363 | 255 | 244 | 41 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 127 | 206 | 152 | 163 | 23 | 0 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level and grade band who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, at each ACCESS level, Asian and White ELs had slightly higher Star Reading and Math performance and higher NPR growth from fall to spring 2021-22 than Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and MultiRacial/Other ELs.

On average, Asian ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 5 (light blue) and 6+ (dark blue) performed in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Figure 15). In contrast, Hispanic/Latinx and White ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 moved, on average, from the On Watch range in the fall to the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in the spring 2021-22 assessment window, while the average performance for Black/African American ELs at Level 5 stayed in the On Watch range in fall and spring.

Asian and White ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 (green) moved, on average, from the Strategic Intervention range in fall to the On Watch range in the spring 2021-22 assessment window, while Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Multi-Racial/Other ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 performed in the Strategic Intervention range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

On average, Asian and White ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 (yellow) moved from the Intensive Intervention range in fall to the Strategic Intervention range in the spring 2021-22 assessment window. In comparison, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Multi-Racial/Other ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 performed, on average, in the Intensive Intervention range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

While Asian ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 2 (orange) moved, on average, from the Intensive Intervention range in fall to the Strategic Intervention range in the spring, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Multi-Racial/Other, and White ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 2 performed in the Intensive Intervention range in both the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

Finally, of ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 1 (red), all student groups on average performed in the Intensive Intervention range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

Overall, at each ACCESS level, Asian and White ELs had higher average performance and had higher NPR growth from fall to spring 2021-22 on Star Reading than Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Multi-Racial/Other ELs.

Figure 15. Average Star Reading NPR performance by student race/ethnicity


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: See Table 14 for NPR values. See Table 15 for the number of students by race/ethnicity in each ACCESS level in each window. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for NCE-based Average NPR.

Table 14. Average Star Reading NPR performance by student race/ethnicity

| Student Groups | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ |
| Asian | Fall | 5 | 5 | 9 | 23 | 40 | 58 |
|  | Spring | 7 | 10 | 14 | 32 | 51 | 72 |
| Black/African <br> American | Fall | 3 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 29 | 66 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 4 | 8 | 23 | 38 | 44 |
| Hispanic/Latinx | Fall | 2 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 36 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 4 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 47 | Sup |
| Multi-Racial/ <br> Other | Fall | 2 | 2 | 7 | 17 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 2 | 5 | 6 | 18 | Sup | Sup |
| White | Fall | 3 | 3 | 8 | 19 | 33 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 4 | 7 | 13 | 28 | 51 | Sup |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure 15. Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group, and thus the NPR averages are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table 15 for numbers of students in each cell.

Table 15. Number of students by student race/ethnicity who took Star Reading in each testing window

| Student Groups | Star <br> Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ |
| Asian | Fall | 630 | 886 | 530 | 1,017 | 258 | 32 |
|  | Spring | 702 | 822 | 439 | 954 | 239 | 32 |
| Black/African American | Fall | 195 | 330 | 199 | 209 | 25 | 3 |
|  | Spring | 208 | 283 | 157 | 188 | 24 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latinx | Fall | 2,584 | 2,502 | 1,096 | 1,059 | 104 | 8 |
|  | Spring | 2,799 | 2,328 | 888 | 953 | 94 | 7 |
| Multi-Racial/ Other | Fall | 27 | 54 | 49 | 56 | 8 | 1 |
|  | Spring | 28 | 41 | 37 | 47 | 8 | 1 |
| White | Fall | 525 | 642 | 309 | 462 | 103 | 15 |
|  | Spring | 618 | 566 | 227 | 414 | 99 | 14 |

Note: These are the numbers of students by race/ethnicity in each ACCESS level who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, Asian ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 6+ (dark blue line) performed in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Figure 16). Asian and White ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 (light blue line) moved, on average, from the On Watch range in fall to the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in the spring 2021-22 assessment window. In comparison, Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

Asian, Multi-Racial/Other, and White ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 (green) performed, on average, in the On Watch range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment window. Additionally, Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 moved from the Strategic Intervention range in fall to the On Watch range in the spring 2021-22 assessment window.

Of ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 (yellow line), Asian ELs performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows, White ELs moved from the Strategic Intervention range in fall to the On Watch range in the spring 2021-22 assessment window, and Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Multi-Racial/Other ELs performed in the Strategic Intervention range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

For ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 2 (orange line), Asian ELs moved, on average, from the Strategic Intervention range in fall to the On Watch range in spring, White ELs performed in the Strategic Intervention range in fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows, Multi-Racial/Other ELs moved from the Intensive Intervention range to the Strategic Intervention range from the fall to spring 2021-22 assessment windows, and Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx ELs performed in the Intensive Intervention range in both assessment windows.

Finally, of ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 1 (red), Asian ELs performed, on average, in the Strategic Intervention range in both assessment windows, while, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Multi-Racial/Other, and White ELs performed in the Intensive Intervention range in both assessment windows.

Overall, Asian and White ELs had higher average performance and had higher NPR growth from fall to spring 2021-22 on Star Math than Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Multi-Racial/Other ELs.

Figure 16. Average Star Math NPR performance by student race/ethnicity


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: See Table 16 for NPR values. See Table 17 for the number of students by race/ethnicity in each ACCESS level in each window. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for NCE-based Average NPR.

Table 16. Average Star Math NPR performance by student race/ethnicity

| Student Groups | Star <br>  Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ |  |
| Asian | Fall | 12 | 16 | 31 | 48 | 69 | 84 |
|  | Spring | 15 | 25 | 40 | 65 | 83 | 95 |
| Black/African <br> American | Fall | 4 | 5 | 12 | 24 | 40 | 58 |
|  | Spring | 5 | 7 | 16 | 31 | 52 | 80 |
| Hispanic/Latinx | Fall | 5 | 6 | 11 | 22 | 41 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 6 | 8 | 15 | 32 | 60 | Sup |
| Multi-Racial/ <br> Other | Fall | 4 | 6 | 15 | 31 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 4 | 11 | 16 | 32 | Sup | Sup |
| White | Fall | 6 | 11 | 24 | 40 | 60 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 8 | 17 | 31 | 56 | 75 | Sup |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure 16. Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group, and thus the NPR averages are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table 17 for numbers of students in each cell.

Table 17. Number of students by student race/ethnicity who took Star Math in each testing window

| Student Groups | Star <br> Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ |
| Asian | Fall | 318 | 629 | 475 | 961 | 256 | 32 |
|  | Spring | 496 | 688 | 434 | 942 | 244 | 32 |
| Black/African American | Fall | 162 | 296 | 182 | 209 | 26 | 3 |
|  | Spring | 203 | 278 | 154 | 200 | 25 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latinx | Fall | 1,652 | 2,100 | 1,029 | 999 | 104 | 9 |
|  | Spring | 2,019 | 1,919 | 887 | 955 | 103 | 8 |
| Multi-Racial/ Other | Fall | 19 | 51 | 49 | 48 | 8 | 1 |
|  | Spring | 22 | 43 | 44 | 47 | 7 | 1 |
| White | Fall | 306 | 509 | 262 | 438 | 99 | 15 |
|  | Spring | 526 | 475 | 236 | 412 | 101 | 14 |

Note: These are the numbers of students by race/ethnicity in each ACCESS level who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

## Chinese (Mandarin) speaking ELs had the highest Star Reading and Math performance in comparison to speakers of other languages who scored in the same ACCESS levels.

On average, Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 5 and 6+ performed in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Table 18). Portuguese-, Russian-, and Spanish-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 stayed, on average, in the On Watch range in fall and spring 2021-22. Additionally, Arabicspeaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows. Arabic- and Russian-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 moved, on average, from the Strategic Intervention range in fall to the On Watch range in spring. Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 performed, on average, in the Strategic Intervention range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

On average, Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 performed in the Strategic Intervention range on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows. Arabic- and Russian-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 moved, on average, from the Intensive Intervention range in fall to the Strategic Intervention range in spring. Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 performed in the Intensive Intervention range in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1 and 2 moved, on average, from the Intensive Intervention range in the fall to the Strategic Intervention range in the spring. Additionally, Arabic-, Portuguese-, Russian-, and Spanish-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1 and 2 performed in the Intensive Intervention range on Star Reading in both 2021-22 assessment windows.

Overall, Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking ELs had the highest average Star Reading performance in comparison to speakers of other languages who scored in the same ACCESS levels.

Table 18. Average Star Reading NPR performance by home language

| Student Groups | Star Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ |
| Albanian | Fall | 9 | 5 | 7 | 29 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 20 | 10 | 11 | 35 | Sup | Sup |
| Arabic | Fall | 5 | 4 | 8 | 17 | 28 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 7 | 6 | 11 | 25 | 36 | Sup |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | Fall | 8 | 7 | 10 | 25 | 42 | 57 |
|  | Spring | 13 | 13 | 17 | 36 | 54 | 71 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chinese (Yue/ } \\ & \text { Cantonese) } \end{aligned}$ | Fall | 9 | 7 | 14 | 23 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 10 | 15 | 18 | 33 | Sup | Sup |
| French | Fall | Sup | 2 | 7 | 19 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | Sup | 2 | 8 | 16 | Sup | N/A |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 2 | 3 | 9 | 14 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 4 | 6 | 14 | 32 | Sup | N/A |
| Khmer | Fall | 3 | 5 | 7 | 23 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 6 | 8 | 9 | 23 | Sup | N/A |
| Pashto | Fall | 4 | 3 | 6 | 18 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 5 | 5 | 12 | 23 | Sup | N/A |
| Portuguese | Fall | 2 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 32 | N/A |
|  | Spring | 3 | 3 | 8 | 21 | 47 | N/A |
| Russian | Fall | 4 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 36 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 4 | 9 | 14 | 33 | 56 | Sup |
| Spanish | Fall | 2 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 39 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 4 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 49 | Sup |
| Tajik | Fall | 2 | 4 | 7 | 20 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 4 | 13 | 13 | 25 | Sup | Sup |
| Uzbek | Fall | 4 | 4 | 10 | 16 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 7 | 9 | 14 | 25 | Sup | N/A |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 4 | 4 | 9 | 21 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 5 | 8 | 17 | 31 | Sup | N/A |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group, and thus NPR averages are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table 19 for numbers of students in each cell. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for NCE-based Average NPR.

Table 19. Number of students by home language who took Star Reading in each testing window

| Student Groups | Star Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ |
| Albanian | Fall | 25 | 30 | 19 | 52 | 13 | 1 |
|  | Spring | 27 | 27 | 16 | 48 | 13 | 1 |
| Arabic | Fall | 164 | 222 | 138 | 182 | 28 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 159 | 196 | 109 | 162 | 27 | 2 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | Fall | 215 | 261 | 156 | 423 | 157 | 25 |
|  | Spring | 221 | 260 | 140 | 412 | 154 | 25 |
| Chinese (Yue) Cantonese) | Fall | 36 | 38 | 18 | 40 | 11 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 33 | 37 | 16 | 36 | 11 | 2 |
| French | Fall | 18 | 59 | 36 | 40 | 12 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 18 | 43 | 29 | 35 | 11 | 0 |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 33 | 51 | 32 | 28 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 38 | 41 | 24 | 26 | 1 | 0 |
| Khmer | Fall | 42 | 80 | 54 | 68 | 7 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 44 | 68 | 47 | 65 | 6 | 0 |
| Pashto | Fall | 43 | 57 | 37 | 39 | 5 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 57 | 48 | 25 | 34 | 3 | 0 |
| Portuguese | Fall | 537 | 380 | 114 | 149 | 21 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 699 | 331 | 81 | 127 | 21 | 0 |
| Russian | Fall | 96 | 148 | 86 | 148 | 49 | 6 |
|  | Spring | 147 | 129 | 69 | 127 | 43 | 6 |
| Spanish | Fall | 2,309 | 2,372 | 1,053 | 989 | 90 | 8 |
|  | Spring | 2,430 | 2,216 | 857 | 897 | 81 | 7 |
| Tajik | Fall | 30 | 63 | 27 | 46 | 3 | 4 |
|  | Spring | 42 | 58 | 16 | 36 | 2 | 3 |
| Uzbek | Fall | 47 | 86 | 39 | 64 | 18 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 63 | 76 | 27 | 61 | 15 | 0 |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 61 | 89 | 60 | 109 | 17 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 53 | 79 | 55 | 95 | 13 | 0 |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: These are the numbers of students by home language in each ACCESS level who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 5 and 6+ performed in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Table 20). Russian-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5 and Chinese-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 moved, on average, from the On Watch range in fall to the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in the spring 2021-22 assessment window.

Arabic-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 4 and 5, Portuguese-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 4 and 5, Spanish-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 5, Russian-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 3 and 4, and Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1, 2, and 3 performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows.

Arabic-, Portuguese-, and Spanish-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 performed, on average, in the Strategic Intervention range in the fall and spring windows, whereas Russianspeaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1 and 2 moved from the Strategic range in the fall to the On Watch range in the spring.

On average, Arabic-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1 and 2 moved from the Intensive Intervention range in fall to the Strategic Intervention range in spring. Finally, Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 1 and 2 performed, on average, in the Intensive Intervention range in both assessment windows.

Table 20. Average Star Math NPR performance by home language

| Student Groups | Star <br> Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ |
| Albanian | Fall | 4 | 30 | 29 | 50 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 27 | 18 | 25 | 61 | Sup | Sup |
| Arabic | Fall | 7 | 8 | 19 | 33 | 46 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 10 | 14 | 19 | 47 | 56 | Sup |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | Fall | 27 | 27 | 47 | 57 | 73 | 85 |
|  | Spring | 43 | 41 | 56 | 73 | 87 | 95 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chinese (Yue/ } \\ & \text { Cantonese) } \end{aligned}$ | Fall | 19 | 38 | 32 | 56 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 34 | 53 | 53 | 77 | Sup | Sup |
| French | Fall | Sup | 7 | 18 | 29 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | Sup | 16 | 30 | 25 | Sup | N/A |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 3 | 4 | 16 | 25 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 8 | 6 | 17 | 34 | Sup | N/A |
| Khmer | Fall | 4 | 8 | 18 | 38 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 6 | 10 | 20 | 47 | Sup | N/A |
| Pashto | Fall | 3 | 8 | 19 | 27 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 5 | 17 | 34 | 46 | Sup | N/A |
| Portuguese | Fall | 4 | 7 | 14 | 26 | 42 | N/A |
|  | Spring | 5 | 9 | 15 | 37 | 58 | N/A |
| Russian | Fall | 21 | 17 | 32 | 45 | 67 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 20 | 29 | 46 | 63 | 81 | Sup |
| Spanish | Fall | 5 | 6 | 11 | 22 | 42 | Sup |
|  | Spring | 7 | 8 | 15 | 32 | 62 | Sup |
| Tajik | Fall | 7 | 7 | 29 | 33 | Sup | Sup |
|  | Spring | 12 | 21 | 50 | 41 | Sup | Sup |
| Uzbek | Fall | 19 | 14 | 31 | 44 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 18 | 26 | 42 | 59 | Sup | N/A |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 10 | 17 | 35 | 51 | Sup | N/A |
|  | Spring | 14 | 22 | 40 | 65 | Sup | N/A |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group, and thus NPR averages are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table 21 for numbers of students in each cell. See Appendix B for performance comparisons to former ELs. See Appendix C for NCE-based Average NPR.

Table 21. Number of students by home language who took Star Math in each testing window

| Student Groups | Star Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ |
| Albanian | Fall | 9 | 21 | 15 | 47 | 12 | 1 |
|  | Spring | 15 | 15 | 19 | 49 | 13 | 1 |
| Arabic | Fall | 85 | 190 | 118 | 172 | 28 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 115 | 164 | 108 | 163 | 29 | 2 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | Fall | 90 | 188 | 132 | 400 | 158 | 25 |
|  | Spring | 120 | 210 | 138 | 410 | 157 | 25 |
| Chinese (Yue/ Cantonese) | Fall | 14 | 19 | 13 | 37 | 12 | 2 |
|  | Spring | 17 | 31 | 13 | 36 | 11 | 2 |
| French | Fall | 23 | 54 | 30 | 41 | 12 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 20 | 54 | 26 | 38 | 11 | 0 |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 31 | 50 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 35 | 46 | 29 | 32 | 1 | 0 |
| Khmer | Fall | 22 | 66 | 55 | 66 | 7 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 30 | 63 | 49 | 64 | 6 | 0 |
| Pashto | Fall | 24 | 47 | 34 | 32 | 5 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 43 | 38 | 28 | 32 | 3 | 0 |
| Portuguese | Fall | 377 | 344 | 103 | 142 | 20 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 780 | 329 | 82 | 135 | 21 | 0 |
| Russian | Fall | 50 | 96 | 74 | 131 | 48 | 6 |
|  | Spring | 117 | 104 | 70 | 125 | 45 | 6 |
| Spanish | Fall | 1,471 | 1,981 | 996 | 935 | 91 | 9 |
|  | Spring | 1,570 | 1,800 | 859 | 894 | 90 | 8 |
| Tajik | Fall | 12 | 34 | 22 | 43 | 3 | 4 |
|  | Spring | 38 | 47 | 19 | 33 | 1 | 3 |
| Uzbek | Fall | 23 | 49 | 33 | 66 | 17 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 38 | 56 | 28 | 62 | 15 | 0 |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 46 | 78 | 54 | 104 | 14 | 0 |
|  | Spring | 41 | 67 | 50 | 88 | 14 | 0 |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: These are the numbers of students by home language in each ACCESS level who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

## Conclusions

Overall, ACCESS performance was generally aligned to Star performance. For the most part, ELs who scored in ACCESS Levels 5 or 6+ performed, on average, in the At/Above Benchmark range for Star Reading throughout the year and performed in the At/Above Benchmark range for Star Math by spring. Following this pattern, ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 4 performed, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Reading and Math, and ELs who scored in ACCESS Level 3 generally scored On Watch on Star Math in the spring. ELs scoring in ACCESS Levels 1 and 2, performed, on average, in Strategic Intervention on Star Reading and Math, but even ELs with the lowest English proficiency still made sizeable gains from fall to spring that allowed them to move into higher Star performance groups.

While trends varied for different student groups, higher ACCESS performers consistently had higher Star performance than lower ACCESS performers when holding other student demographic variables constant as much as possible. There were notable patterns of ELs in lower grades having higher Star performance than their peers in the same ACCESS level in higher grades, as well as ELs who had been an EL in SDP for fewer years having higher Star performance than their peers in the same ACCESS level who had been an EL in SDP longer.

Based on these analyses and other work understanding the context for ELs in SDP, we can point to three groups of ELs.

1) ELs with high English competency and high performance on the ACCESS and Star assessments: These ELs are likely learning English quickly, as reflected in both their assessments, and will more quickly be reclassified from an EL to Exiting EL status, and may continue to demonstrate high Star achievement as part of the Former EL group. ${ }^{26}$
2) ELs with high English competency but low performance on the ACCESS and Star assessments: ELs' high English proficiency could be confirmed by school staff or through an alternative EL proficiency metric like a language use inventory, but their English competency may not be reflected on the ACCESS because they struggle with standardized tests or because they generally have lower academic performance, and these challenges are also reflected in their Star performance metrics.
3) ELs with low English competency and low performance on the ACCESS and Star assessments: Generally, if students cannot understand English, they cannot have strong Star performance. Critically, however, when students have both low ACCESS and Star performance, it is extremely difficult without knowing individual students to ascertain whether low performance is primarily due to low English proficiency, low academic achievement, or both. For example, students who have high academic performance in their first language, but do not have this achievement reflected in Star because they are not yet proficient in English would likely have strong Star performance after attaining English proficiency. By using ACCESS and Star as the only metrics, this population is

[^9]indistinguishable from the other lower performing groups. Additionally, students may also have low academic performance (found in other classroom-level metrics) coupled with low English proficiency, and may be struggling to learn English for the same reasons their academic achievement suffers. This further complicates their academic progress, as the longer it takes them to learn English, the longer it will take them to learn grade-level content and have the opportunity to catch up with their English-proficient peers.

It is important to recognize the caveat that ELs are not a monolith, especially in the student race/ethnicity and home language analysis. For the purpose of looking at patterns by student race/ethnicity (a common way the District examines student performance) and home language, these analyses grouped students by one demographic characteristic, without being able to account for all of the other critical characteristics that contribute to English proficiency and Star performance. Additionally, as we try to identify groups of students who have high performance on the ACCESS by demographic characteristic, or multiple overlapping demographic characteristics (e.g., home language and race/ethnicity), the numbers of students in the groups are so small that it is not appropriate to display their average data or compare them to much larger populations of students, which limits the analyses and the patterns we can infer from this data. This analysis is a starting point to understand the EL populations that are generally making strong English proficiency growth and populations who can benefit from more supports.

## Appendix A: Star Performance Group Percentages

Table A1. Students with ACCESS scores and scores on the Star Reading assessments in 2021-22 in each of the four Star administration windows

| Student Group | Students with 2021-22 ACCESS scores and scores in: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 Star | Winter 2 Star | Spring Star |
| English Learners with ACCESS Scores | 13,962 | 13,936 | 14,456 | 13,261 |
| 2021-22 Grade Level |  |  |  |  |
| K | 1,236 | 1,330 | 1,492 | 1,502 |
| 1 | 1,584 | 1,687 | 1,822 | 1,826 |
| 2 | 1,332 | 1,376 | 1,490 | 1,482 |
| 3 | 1,082 | 1,127 | 1,119 | 1,121 |
| 4 | 1,273 | 1,294 | 1,309 | 1,282 |
| 5 | 1,279 | 1,249 | 1,281 | 1,250 |
| 6 | 1,078 | 1,069 | 1,092 | 1,063 |
| 7 | 991 | 929 | 967 | 922 |
| 8 | 1,005 | 995 | 1,018 | 956 |
| 9 | 901 | 873 | 871 | 622 |
| 10 | 824 | 738 | 742 | 517 |
| 11 | 671 | 622 | 622 | 419 |
| 12 | 706 | 646 | 631 | 299 |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 17 | 16 | 19 | 17 |
| Asian | 3,348 | 3,343 | 3,434 | 3,184 |
| Black/African American | 961 | 958 | 978 | 863 |
| Hispanic/Latinx | 7,355 | 7,338 | 7,680 | 7,072 |
| Multi-Racial/Other | 197 | 205 | 199 | 164 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 27 | 26 | 31 | 24 |
| White | 2,057 | 2,049 | 2,115 | 1,937 |
| Economic Disadvantage Status |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 9,702 | 9,684 | 10,167 | 9,460 |
| Not Economically Disadvantaged | 4,260 | 4,251 | 4,289 | 3,801 |
| Special Education Status |  |  |  |  |
| Has IEP | 1,336 | 1,297 | 1,311 | 1,213 |
| Does not have an IEP | 12,626 | 12,638 | 13,145 | 12,048 |
| ACCESS Level |  |  |  |  |
| 1.0-1.9 | 3,974 | 4,201 | 4,540 | 4,370 |
| 2.0-2.9 | 4,425 | 4,400 | 4,505 | 4,051 |
| 3.0-3.9 | 2,190 | 2,039 | 2,058 | 1,753 |
| 4.0-4.9 | 2,812 | 2,738 | 2,796 | 2,563 |
| 5.0-5.9 | 502 | 499 | 499 | 467 |
| 6+ | 59 | 59 | 58 | 57 |


| Student Group | Students with 2021-22 ACCESS scores and scores in: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 Star | nter 2 Star | Spring Star |
| Top 16 Most Frequent Home Languages |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish | 6,825 | 6,781 | 7,068 | 6,492 |
| Portuguese | 1,200 | 1,242 | 1,332 | 1,258 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | 1,238 | 1,246 | 1,273 | 1,213 |
| Arabic | 735 | 724 | 751 | 654 |
| Russian | 534 | 521 | 555 | 521 |
| Vietnamese | 334 | 323 | 325 | 293 |
| Uzbek | 255 | 263 | 263 | 243 |
| Khmer | 252 | 241 | 250 | 231 |
| Bengali | 200 | 197 | 205 | 174 |
| Pashto | 180 | 188 | 199 | 166 |
| Tajik | 172 | 173 | 185 | 156 |
| Chinese (Yue/Cantonese) | 146 | 149 | 150 | 136 |
| French | 164 | 163 | 164 | 135 |
| Albanian | 140 | 144 | 146 | 132 |
| Ukrainian | 130 | 124 | 128 | 130 |
| Haitian Creole | 144 | 144 | 153 | 129 |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 4, 2023
Note: Cells with $0 \%$ can have up to 60 students in the percentage.
Table A2. Students with ACCESS scores and scores on the Star Math assessments in 2021-22 in each of the four Star administration windows

| Student Group | Students with 2021-22 ACCESS scores and scores in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 Star | Winter 2 Star | Spring Star |  |  |  |
| English Learners with ACCESS Scores | 11,283 | 11,371 | 12,503 | 11,557 |  |  |  |
| Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 234 | 261 | 325 | 343 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 497 | 483 | 688 | 743 |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1,339 | 1,417 | 1,532 | 1,525 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1,452 | 1,506 | 1,589 | 1,571 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 1,398 | 1,402 | 1,519 | 1,509 |  |  |  |
| 6 | 1,175 | 1,233 | 1,331 | 1,330 |  |  |  |
| 7 | 1,093 | 1,125 | 1,214 | 1,165 |  |  |  |
| 8 | 1,124 | 1,158 | 1,264 | 1,190 |  |  |  |
| 9 | 1,029 | 1,055 | 1,144 | 924 |  |  |  |
| 10 | 797 | 737 | 804 | 586 |  |  |  |
| 11 | 620 | 572 | 648 | 457 |  |  |  |
| 12 | 525 | 422 | 445 | 214 |  |  |  |
|  | Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Asian | 2,667 | 2,754 | 3,026 | 2,833 |  |  |  |
| Black/African American | 878 | 885 | 942 | 863 |  |  |  |
| Hispanic/Latinx | 5,894 | 5,857 | 6,420 | 5,892 |  |  |  |
| Multi-Racial/Other | 178 | 177 | 191 | 166 |  |  |  |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 26 | 30 | 31 | 28 |  |  |  |
| White | 1,630 | 1,658 | 1,882 | 1,764 |  |  |  |


| Student Group | Students with 2021-22 ACCESS scores and scores in: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall Star | Winter 1 S | nter 2 S | Spring Star |
| Economic Disadvantage Status |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 7,451 | 7,342 | 8,067 | 7,529 |
| Not Economically Disadvantaged | 3,832 | 4,029 | 4,436 | 4,028 |
| Special Education Status |  |  |  |  |
| Has IEP | 1,100 | 1,054 | 1,094 | 1,001 |
| Does not have an IEP | 10,183 | 10,317 | 11,409 | 10,556 |
| ACCESS Level |  |  |  |  |
| 1.0-1.9 | 2,464 | 2,762 | 3,394 | 3,280 |
| 2.0-2.9 | 3,596 | 3,516 | 3,776 | 3,412 |
| 3.0-3.9 | 2,004 | 1,891 | 1,978 | 1,760 |
| 4.0-4.9 | 2,662 | 2,637 | 2,791 | 2,564 |
| 5.0-5.9 | 497 | 505 | 505 | 483 |
| 6+ | 60 | 61 | 59 | 58 |
| Top 16 Most Frequent Home Languages |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish | 5,487 | 5,320 | 5,721 | 5,223 |
| Portuguese | 985 | 1136 | 1399 | 1346 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | 993 | 1018 | 1102 | 1061 |
| Arabic | 594 | 584 | 633 | 580 |
| Russian | 406 | 422 | 494 | 468 |
| Vietnamese | 294 | 284 | 292 | 259 |
| Uzbek | 189 | 208 | 219 | 200 |
| Khmer | 217 | 211 | 226 | 213 |
| Bengali | 149 | 160 | 169 | 153 |
| Pashto | 141 | 153 | 174 | 143 |
| Tajik | 117 | 123 | 162 | 140 |
| Haitian Creole | 143 | 143 | 151 | 142 |
| French | 159 | 163 | 177 | 148 |
| Ukrainian | 98 | 97 | 107 | 110 |
| Chinese (Yue/Cantonese) | 98 | 105 | 122 | 111 |
| Albanian | 105 | 107 | 119 | 112 |
| Star Assessment Language |  |  |  |  |
| English | 10,921 | 10,910 | 12,052 | 11,118 |
| Spanish | 823 | 920 | 938 | 878 |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 4, 2023

Students who scored in ACCESS Level 1 had an 11-point increase in the percentage of students scoring At/Above Benchmark on Star Reading from fall (3\%) to spring (14\%) 2021-22 (Figure A1). Additionally, students who scored in ACCESS Level 2 had a 7-point increase in the percentage of students scoring At/Above Benchmark on Star Reading from fall (3\%) to spring (10\%) 2021-22. Students who scored in ACCESS Level 3 had an 8-point increase in the percentage of students scoring At/Above Benchmark on Star Reading from fall (5\%) to spring (13\%) 2021-22. Students who scored in ACCESS Level 4 had a 13-point increase in the percentage of students scoring At/Above Benchmark on Star Reading from fall (20\%) to spring (33\%) 2021-22. Students who scored in ACCESS Level 5 had a 19-point increase in the percentage of students scoring At/Above Benchmark on Star Reading from fall ( $47 \%$ ) to spring ( $66 \%$ ) 2021-22. Students who scored in ACCESS Level 6 had a 15-point increase in the percentage of students scoring At/Above Benchmark on Star Reading from fall (71\%) to spring (86\%) 2021-22.

Figure A1. Percentage of ELs who scored in At or Above Benchmark on Star Reading in fall and spring 2021-22


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 3, 2023
Note: The n count under the columns label represents the number of students who took the assessment in each window. To calculate the number of students who scored in each performance group in each window, multiple the n count under the label by the percentage in the block in the column.

Students who scored in ACCESS Level 1 had a 3-point increase in the percentage of students scoring At/Above Benchmark on Star Math from fall (2\%) to spring (5\%) 2021-22 (Figure A2). Additionally, students who scored in ACCESS Level 2 had a 4-point increase the percentage of students scoring At or Above Benchmark on Star Math from fall (2\%) to spring (6\%). Students who scored in ACCESS Level 3 had a 7-point increase the percentage of students scoring At or Above Benchmark from fall (5\%) to spring (12\%) on Star Math.

Students who scored in ACCESS Level 4 had a 16-point increase the percentage of students scoring At or Above Benchmark from fall (15\%) to spring ( $31 \%$ ) on Star Math. Students who scored in ACCESS Level 5 had a 21-point increase the percentage of students scoring At or Above Benchmark from fall ( $41 \%$ ) to spring ( $62 \%$ ) on Star Math. Students who scored in ACCESS Level 6+ had a 33-point increase the percentage of students scoring At or Above Benchmark from fall (50\%) to spring (83\%) on Star Math.

Figure A2. Percentage of ELs who scored in At or Above Benchmark on Star Math in fall and spring 2021-22


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 3, 2023
Note: The n count under the columns label represents the number of students who took the assessment in each window. To calculate the number of students who scored in each performance group in each window, multiple the n count under the label by the percentage in the block in the column.

## Appendix B: Former EL Star Performance

## How did students who performed at different English proficiency levels on ACCESS score on Star?

On average, former ELs (grey) performed in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in 2021-22, with their average NPR increasing from the $41^{\text {st }}$ percentile in fall to $42^{\text {nd }}$ percentile in spring (Figure B1). Their average performance falls between students who scored in ACCESS Levels 4 and 5.

Figure B1. Average Star Reading NPR performance by ACCESS level


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 13, 2023 Note: See Table B1 for Winter NPR values. See Table B2 for the number of students in each ACCESS level group in each window.

Table B1. Average Star Reading NPR performance by ACCESS level

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 19 | 22 | 25 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 37 | 43 | 49 | 50 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 54 | 63 | 67 | 67 |
| Former ELs | 41 | 41 | 41 | 42 |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure B1.

Table B2. Number of students in each ACCESS level group who took Star Reading in each testing window

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 3,974 | 4,201 | 4,540 | 4,370 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 4,425 | 4,400 | 4,505 | 4,051 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 2,190 | 2,039 | 2,058 | 1,753 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 2,812 | 2,738 | 2,796 | 2,563 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 502 | 499 | 499 | 467 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 59 | 59 | 58 | 57 |
| Former ELs | 3,313 | 3,184 | 3,106 | 2,531 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, Former ELs (grey) performed in the On Watch range on Star Math in 2021-22, with their average NPR increasing from the $63^{\text {rd }}$ percentile in fall to $68^{\text {th }}$ percentile in spring (Figure B2). Their average performance falls between students who scored in ACCESS Levels 4 and 5.

Figure B2. Average Star Math NPR performance by ACCESS level


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 13, 2023
Note: See Table B3 for Winter NPR values. See Table B4 for the number of students in each ACCESS Level group in each window.

Table B3. Average Star Math NPR Performance by ACCESS level

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 8 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 17 | 20 | 22 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 34 | 43 | 47 | 47 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 60 | 69 | 75 | 75 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 71 | 81 | 89 | 89 |
| Former ELs | 63 | 67 | 67 | 68 |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure B2.

Table B4. Number of students in each ACCESS level group who took Star Math in each testing window

| ACCESS Level | Fall | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | Spring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | 2,464 | 2,762 | 3,394 | 3,280 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | 3,596 | 3,516 | 3,776 | 3,412 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | 2,004 | 1,891 | 1,978 | 1,760 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | 2,662 | 2,637 | 2,791 | 2,564 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 497 | 505 | 505 | 483 |
| $\mathbf{6 +}$ | 60 | 61 | 59 | 58 |
| Former ELs | 3,182 | 3,004 | 2,970 | 2,474 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, grades K-3, 4-5, and 6-8 former ELs scored in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in both fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Figure B3). In contrast, grades 9-10 and 11-12 former ELs scored, on average, in the On Watch range but at higher percentiles than current ELs on Star Reading in both 2021-22 fall and spring assessment windows. Their average performance is generally above students who scored in ACCESS Level 5.

Figure B3. Average Star Reading NPR performance by grade bands


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 13, 2023
Note: See Table B5 for NPR values. See Table B6 for the number of students in each student group in each window.

Table B5. Average Star Reading NPR performance by grade band

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ | Former ELs |  |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{3}$ | Fall | 3 | 6 | 19 | 41 | 64 | Sup | 67 |  |
|  | Spring | 8 | 14 | 36 | 63 | 83 | Sup | 67 |  |
| $\mathbf{4}-\mathbf{5}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 37 | 54 | 56 |  |
|  | Spring | 2 | 3 | 9 | 25 | 49 | 68 | 59 |  |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 38 | Sup | 44 |  |
|  | Spring | 1 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 47 | Sup | 46 |  |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 32 | Sup | 37 |  |
|  | Spring | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 34 | Sup | 37 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 1 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 22 | N/A | 35 |  |
|  | Spring | 1 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 28 | N/A | 35 |  |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure B3. Cells with Suppressed have fewer than 20 students in the group and are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR.

Table B6. Number of students in each grade band who took Star Reading in each testing window

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ | Former ELs |  |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{3}$ | Fall | 2,603 | 1,775 | 374 | 436 | 45 | 1 | 26 |  |
|  | Spring | 3,243 | 1,857 | 359 | 425 | 46 | 1 | 24 |  |
| $\mathbf{4 - 5}$ | Fall | 370 | 737 | 364 | 768 | 259 | 54 | 152 |  |
|  | Spring | 403 | 745 | 314 | 761 | 257 | 52 | 149 |  |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 439 | 889 | 743 | 905 | 96 | 2 | 1015 |  |
|  | Spring | 426 | 857 | 688 | 877 | 91 | 2 | 966 |  |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 260 | 582 | 405 | 419 | 57 | 2 | 1049 |  |
|  | Spring | 156 | 355 | 248 | 334 | 44 | 2 | 803 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 302 | 442 | 304 | 284 | 45 | 0 | 1071 |  |
|  | Spring | 142 | 237 | 144 | 166 | 29 | 0 | 589 |  |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level l group who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, grades K-3 Former ELs stayed in the At/Above Benchmark range in fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Figure B4). Additionally, grades 4-5 former ELs moved, on average, from the On Watch range to the At/Above Benchmark range from the fall to spring 2021-22 assessment windows. Finally, grades 6-8, 9-10, and 11-12 former ELs scored, on average, in the On Watch range on Star Math in both 2021-22 assessment windows. Their average performance is a bit higher or equivalent to students who scored in ACCESS Level 5.

Figure B4. Average Star Math NPR performance by grade band


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 13, 2023
Note: See Table B7 for NPR values. See Table B8 for the number of students in each student group in each window.

Table B7. Average Star Math NPR performance by grade band

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ | Former ELs |  |
| $\mathbf{K - 3}$ | Fall | 7 | 11 | 33 | 56 | 79 | Sup | 78 |  |
|  | Spring | 11 | 20 | 48 | 73 | 84 | Sup | 85 |  |
| $\mathbf{4}-\mathbf{5}$ | Fall | 3 | 4 | 11 | 25 | 53 | 71 | 65 |  |
|  | Spring | 5 | 8 | 17 | 46 | 75 | 89 | 82 |  |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 7 | 8 | 14 | 33 | 64 | Sup | 59 |  |
|  | Spring | 8 | 10 | 18 | 42 | 78 | Sup | 68 |  |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 5 | 7 | 18 | 39 | 64 | Sup | 63 |  |
|  | Spring | 5 | 8 | 18 | 41 | 69 | Sup | 68 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 4 | 9 | 20 | 38 | 73 | N/A | 67 |  |
|  | Spring | 4 | 10 | 23 | 42 | 68 | N/A | 67 |  |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure B4. Cells with Suppressed have fewer than 20 students in the group and are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR.

Table B8. Number of students in each grade band who took Star Math in each testing window

| Grade <br> Bands | Star | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ | Former ELs |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{3}$ | Fall | 702 | 842 | 236 | 258 | 31 | 1 | 26 |
|  | Spring | 1,000 | 934 | 294 | 340 | 42 | 1 | 24 |
| $\mathbf{4} \mathbf{4 - 5}$ | Fall | 556 | 807 | 366 | 798 | 268 | 55 | 149 |
|  | Spring | 785 | 824 | 336 | 813 | 269 | 53 | 148 |
| $\mathbf{6 - 8}$ | Fall | 651 | 959 | 745 | 936 | 99 | 2 | 1019 |
|  | Spring | 974 | 979 | 714 | 917 | 99 | 2 | 954 |
| $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | Fall | 313 | 625 | 402 | 426 | 58 | 2 | 1036 |
|  | Spring | 394 | 469 | 264 | 331 | 50 | 2 | 769 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ | Fall | 242 | 363 | 255 | 244 | 41 | 0 | 952 |
|  | Spring | 127 | 206 | 152 | 163 | 23 | 0 | 579 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, Asian and White Former ELs scored in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in both fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Figure B5). In comparison, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Multi-Racial/Other former ELs stayed, on average, in the On Watch on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows. The average performance of Former ELs is a bit higher or equivalent to students who scored in ACCESS Level 5, with the exception of Hispanic/Latinx Former ELs.

Figure B5. Average Star Reading NPR performance by student race/ethnicity


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: See Table B9 for NPR values. See Table B10 for the number of students in each student group in each window.

Table B9. Average Star Reading NPR performance by student race/ethnicity

| Student <br> Group | Star <br> Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | 6+ | Former <br> ELs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5 | 5 | 9 | 23 | 40 | 58 | 48 |
|  | Spring | 7 | 10 | 14 | 32 | 51 | 72 | 50 |
| Black/African <br> American | Fall | 3 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 29 | Sup | 33 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 4 | 8 | 23 | 38 | Sup | 37 |
| Hispanic/ <br> Latinx | Fall | 2 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 36 | Sup | 30 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 47 | Sup | 30 |
| Multi-Racial/ <br> Other | Fall | 2 | 2 | 7 | 17 | Sup | Sup | 28 |
|  | Spring | 2 | 5 | 6 | 18 | Sup | Sup | 33 |
| White | Fall | 3 | 3 | 8 | 19 | 33 | Sup | 42 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 7 | 13 | 28 | 51 | Sup | 42 |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure B5. Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group and are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR.

Table B10. Number of students by student race/ethnicity who took Star Reading in each testing window

| Student <br> Group | Star <br> Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ | Former <br> ELs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 630 | 886 | 530 | 1,017 | 258 | 32 | 1,606 |
|  | Spring | 702 | 822 | 439 | 954 | 239 | 32 | 1,259 |
| Black/African | Fall | 195 | 330 | 199 | 209 | 25 | 3 | 224 |
| American | Spring | 208 | 283 | 157 | 188 | 24 | 3 | 165 |
| Hispanic/ <br> Latinx | Fall | 2,584 | 2,502 | 1,096 | 1,059 | 104 | 8 | 926 |
|  | Spring | 2,799 | 2,328 | 888 | 953 | 94 | 7 | 690 |
| Multi-Racial/ <br> Other | Fall | 27 | 54 | 49 | 56 | 8 | 1 | 120 |
|  | Spring | 28 | 41 | 37 | 47 | 8 | 1 | 88 |
| White | Fall | 525 | 642 | 309 | 462 | 103 | 15 | 426 |
|  | Spring | 618 | 566 | 227 | 414 | 99 | 14 | 320 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, Asian Former ELs scored in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in both fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Figure B6). In comparison, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Multi-Racial/Other, and White former ELs stayed, on average, in the On Watch on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows. The average performance of Former ELs is roughly equivalent to students who scored in ACCESS Level 5.

Figure B6. Average Star Math NPR performance by student race/ethnicity


Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 13, 2023
Note: See Table B11 for NPR values. See Table B12 for the number of students in each student group in each window.

Table B11. Average Star Math NPR performance by student race/ethnicity

| Student <br> Group | Star <br> Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ | Former <br> ELs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12 | 16 | 31 | 48 | 69 | 84 | 76 |
|  | Spring | 15 | 25 | 40 | 65 | 83 | 95 | 80 |
| Black/African <br> American | Fall | 4 | 5 | 12 | 24 | 40 | Sup | 46 |
|  | Spring | 5 | 7 | 16 | 31 | 52 | Sup | 52 |
| Hispanic/ <br> Latinx | Fall | 5 | 6 | 11 | 22 | 41 | Sup | 41 |
|  | Spring | 6 | 8 | 15 | 32 | 60 | Sup | 48 |
| Multi-Racial/ <br> Other | Fall | 4 | 6 | 15 | 31 | Sup | Sup | 48 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 11 | 16 | 32 | Sup | Sup | 52 |
| White | Fall | 6 | 11 | 24 | 40 | 60 | Sup | 63 |
|  | Spring | 8 | 17 | 31 | 56 | 75 | Sup | 68 |

Note: The average NPR values reported in this table are the same as those in Figure B6. Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group and are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR.

Table B12. Number of students by student race/ethnicity who took Star Math in each testing window

| Student <br> Group | Star <br> Window | $\mathbf{1 . 0 - 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 - 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 - 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 - 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 - 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 +}$ | Former <br> ELs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 318 | 629 | 475 | 961 | 256 | 32 | 1,543 |
|  | Spring | 496 | 688 | 434 | 942 | 244 | 32 | 1,268 |
| Black/African | Fall | 162 | 296 | 182 | 209 | 26 | 3 | 212 |
| American | Spring | 203 | 278 | 154 | 200 | 25 | 3 | 153 |
| Hispanic/ <br> Latinx | Fall | 1,652 | 2,100 | 1,029 | 999 | 104 | 9 | 896 |
|  | Spring | 2,019 | 1,919 | 887 | 955 | 103 | 8 | 652 |
| Multi-Racial/ <br> Other | Fall | 19 | 51 | 49 | 48 | 8 | 1 | 111 |
|  | Spring | 22 | 43 | 44 | 47 | 7 | 1 | 89 |
| White | Fall | 306 | 509 | 262 | 438 | 99 | 15 | 410 |
|  | Spring | 526 | 475 | 236 | 412 | 101 | 14 | 303 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22.

On average, Chinese (Mandarin)- and Russian-speaking Former ELs scored in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows, whereas Arabic-, Portuguese-, and Spanish-speaking former ELs scored in the On Watch range on Star Reading in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Table B13).

Table B13. Average Star Reading NPR performance by top 14 home languages

| Student Group | Star Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ | Former ELs |
| Albanian | Fall | 9 | 5 | 7 | 29 | Sup | Sup | 46 |
|  | Spring | 20 | 10 | 11 | 35 | Sup | Sup | 47 |
| Arabic | Fall | 5 | 4 | 8 | 17 | 28 | Sup | 38 |
|  | Spring | 7 | 6 | 11 | 25 | 36 | Sup | 37 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Chinese } \\ \text { (Mandarin) } \end{gathered}$ | Fall | 8 | 7 | 10 | 25 | 42 | 57 | 52 |
|  | Spring | 13 | 13 | 17 | 36 | 54 | 71 | 55 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Chinese (Yue/ } \\ \text { Cantonese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Fall | 9 | 7 | 14 | 23 | Sup | Sup | 45 |
|  | Spring | 10 | 15 | 18 | 33 | Sup | Sup | 47 |
| French | Fall | Sup | 2 | 7 | 19 | Sup | N/A | 42 |
|  | Spring | Sup | 2 | 8 | 16 | Sup | N/A | 42 |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 2 | 3 | 9 | 14 | Sup | N/A | Sup |
|  | Spring | 4 | 6 | 14 | 32 | Sup | N/A | Sup |
| Khmer | Fall | 3 | 5 | 7 | 23 | Sup | N/A | 37 |
|  | Spring | 6 | 8 | 9 | 23 | Sup | N/A | 35 |
| Pashto | Fall | 4 | 3 | 6 | 18 | Sup | N/A | 37 |
|  | Spring | 5 | 5 | 12 | 23 | Sup | N/A | 35 |
| Portuguese | Fall | 2 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 32 | N/A | 34 |
|  | Spring | 3 | 3 | 8 | 21 | 47 | N/A | 34 |
| Russian | Fall | 4 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 36 | Sup | 48 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 9 | 14 | 33 | 56 | Sup | 47 |
| Spanish | Fall | 2 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 39 | Sup | 29 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 49 | Sup | 30 |
| Tajik | Fall | 2 | 4 | 7 | 20 | Sup | Sup | 42 |
|  | Spring | 4 | 13 | 13 | 25 | Sup | Sup | 45 |
| Uzbek | Fall | 4 | 4 | 10 | 16 | Sup | N/A | 36 |
|  | Spring | 7 | 9 | 14 | 25 | Sup | N/A | 41 |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 4 | 4 | 9 | 21 | Sup | N/A | 47 |
|  | Spring | 5 | 8 | 17 | 31 | Sup | N/A | 48 |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group and are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table B14 for numbers of students in each cell.

Table B14. Number of students by the top 14 home languages of students who took Star Reading in each testing window

| Student Group | StarWindow | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ | Former ELs |
| Albanian | Fall | 25 | 30 | 19 | 52 | 13 | 1 | 65 |
|  | Spring | 27 | 27 | 16 | 48 | 13 | 1 | 48 |
| Arabic | Fall | 164 | 222 | 138 | 182 | 28 | 2 | 226 |
|  | Spring | 159 | 196 | 109 | 162 | 27 | 2 | 171 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | Fall | 215 | 261 | 156 | 423 | 157 | 25 | 701 |
|  | Spring | 221 | 260 | 140 | 412 | 154 | 25 | 566 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Chinese (Yue/ } \\ \text { Cantonese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Fall | 36 | 38 | 18 | 40 | 11 | 2 | 109 |
|  | Spring | 33 | 37 | 16 | 36 | 11 | 2 | 92 |
| French | Fall | 18 | 59 | 36 | 40 | 12 | 0 | 34 |
|  | Spring | 18 | 43 | 29 | 35 | 11 | 0 | 27 |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 33 | 51 | 32 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
|  | Spring | 38 | 41 | 24 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| Khmer | Fall | 42 | 80 | 54 | 68 | 7 | 0 | 132 |
|  | Spring | 44 | 68 | 47 | 65 | 6 | 0 | 96 |
| Pashto | Fall | 43 | 57 | 37 | 39 | 5 | 0 | 32 |
|  | Spring | 57 | 48 | 25 | 34 | 3 | 0 | 25 |
| Portuguese | Fall | 537 | 380 | 114 | 149 | 21 | 0 | 70 |
|  | Spring | 699 | 331 | 81 | 127 | 21 | 0 | 57 |
| Russian | Fall | 96 | 148 | 86 | 148 | 49 | 6 | 137 |
|  | Spring | 147 | 129 | 69 | 127 | 43 | 6 | 102 |
| Spanish | Fall | 2,309 | 2,372 | 1,053 | 989 | 90 | 8 | 902 |
|  | Spring | 2,430 | 2,216 | 857 | 897 | 81 | 7 | 676 |
| Tajik | Fall | 30 | 63 | 27 | 46 | 3 | 4 | 35 |
|  | Spring | 42 | 58 | 16 | 36 | 2 | 3 | 27 |
| Uzbek | Fall | 47 | 86 | 39 | 64 | 18 | 0 | 33 |
|  | Spring | 63 | 76 | 27 | 61 | 15 | 0 | 21 |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 61 | 89 | 60 | 109 | 17 | 0 | 245 |
|  | Spring | 53 | 79 | 55 | 95 | 13 | 0 | 183 |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22 or the number of students for each cell in Table B13.

On average, Chinese (Mandarin)-speaking Former ELs scored in the At/Above Benchmark range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows, whereas Arabic-, Portuguese-, and Spanish-speaking former ELs scored in the On Watch range on Star Math in the fall and spring 2021-22 assessment windows (Table B15).

Table B15. Average Star Math NPR performance by home language

| Student Group | Star Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ | Former ELs |
| Albanian | Fall | 4 | 30 | 29 | 50 | Sup | Sup | 72 |
|  | Spring | 27 | 18 | 25 | 61 | Sup | Sup | 70 |
| Arabic | Fall | 7 | 8 | 19 | 33 | 46 | Sup | 55 |
|  | Spring | 10 | 14 | 19 | 47 | 56 | Sup | 61 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | Fall | 27 | 27 | 47 | 57 | 73 | 85 | 85 |
|  | Spring | 43 | 41 | 56 | 73 | 87 | 95 | 87 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Chinese (Yue/ } \\ \text { Cantonese) } \end{array}$ | Fall | 19 | 38 | 32 | 56 | Sup | Sup | 80 |
|  | Spring | 34 | 53 | 53 | 77 | Sup | Sup | 82 |
| French | Fall | Sup | 7 | 18 | 29 | Sup | N/A | 53 |
|  | Spring | Sup | 16 | 30 | 25 | Sup | N/A | 62 |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 3 | 4 | 16 | 25 | Sup | N/A | Sup |
|  | Spring | 8 | 6 | 17 | 34 | Sup | N/A | Sup |
| Khmer | Fall | 4 | 8 | 18 | 38 | Sup | N/A | 54 |
|  | Spring | 6 | 10 | 20 | 47 | Sup | N/A | 56 |
| Pashto | Fall | 3 | 8 | 19 | 27 | Sup | N/A | 63 |
|  | Spring | 5 | 17 | 34 | 46 | Sup | N/A | 69 |
| Portuguese | Fall | 4 | 7 | 14 | 26 | 42 | N/A | 47 |
|  | Spring | 5 | 9 | 15 | 37 | 58 | N/A | 53 |
| Russian | Fall | 21 | 17 | 32 | 45 | 67 | Sup | 69 |
|  | Spring | 20 | 29 | 46 | 63 | 81 | Sup | 73 |
| Spanish | Fall | 5 | 6 | 11 | 22 | 42 | Sup | 39 |
|  | Spring | 7 | 8 | 15 | 32 | 62 | Sup | 46 |
| Tajik | Fall | 7 | 7 | 29 | 33 | Sup | Sup | 70 |
|  | Spring | 12 | 21 | 50 | 41 | Sup | Sup | 78 |
| Uzbek | Fall | 19 | 14 | 31 | 44 | Sup | N/A | 76 |
|  | Spring | 18 | 26 | 42 | 59 | Sup | N/A | 77 |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 10 | 17 | 35 | 51 | Sup | N/A | 73 |
|  | Spring | 14 | 22 | 40 | 65 | Sup | N/A | 77 |

Source: Qlik Academic Screeners App - Performance Details, data accessed January 11, 2023
Note: Cells with Sup (suppressed) have fewer than 20 students in the group and are excluded from analyses. Cells with N/A have no students in the group and thus no NPR. See Table B16 for numbers of students in each cell.

Table B16. Number of students by home language of students who took Star Math in each testing window

| Student <br> Group | Star Window | ACCESS Levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-3.9 | 4.0-4.9 | 5.0-5.9 | 6+ | Former ELs |
| Albanian | Fall | 9 | 21 | 15 | 47 | 12 | 1 | 62 |
|  | Spring | 15 | 15 | 19 | 49 | 13 | 1 | 43 |
| Arabic | Fall | 85 | 190 | 118 | 172 | 28 | 2 | 211 |
|  | Spring | 115 | 164 | 108 | 163 | 29 | 2 | 169 |
| Chinese (Mandarin) | Fall | 90 | 188 | 132 | 400 | 158 | 25 | 678 |
|  | Spring | 120 | 210 | 138 | 410 | 157 | 25 | 588 |
| Chinese (Yue/ <br> Cantonese) | Fall | 14 | 19 | 13 | 37 | 12 | 2 | 106 |
|  | Spring | 17 | 31 | 13 | 36 | 11 | 2 | 94 |
| French | Fall | 23 | 54 | 30 | 41 | 12 | 0 | 31 |
|  | Spring | 20 | 54 | 26 | 38 | 11 | 0 | 23 |
| Haitian Creole | Fall | 31 | 50 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
|  | Spring | 35 | 46 | 29 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| Khmer | Fall | 22 | 66 | 55 | 66 | 7 | 0 | 121 |
|  | Spring | 30 | 63 | 49 | 64 | 6 | 0 | 90 |
| Pashto | Fall | 24 | 47 | 34 | 32 | 5 | 0 | 31 |
|  | Spring | 43 | 38 | 28 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 23 |
| Portuguese | Fall | 377 | 344 | 103 | 142 | 20 | 0 | 70 |
|  | Spring | 780 | 329 | 82 | 135 | 21 | 0 | 59 |
| Russian | Fall | 50 | 96 | 74 | 131 | 48 | 6 | 133 |
|  | Spring | 117 | 104 | 70 | 125 | 45 | 6 | 97 |
| Spanish | Fall | 1,471 | 1,981 | 996 | 935 | 91 | 9 | 874 |
|  | Spring | 1,570 | 1,800 | 859 | 894 | 90 | 8 | 630 |
| Tajik | Fall | 12 | 34 | 22 | 43 | 3 | 4 | 36 |
|  | Spring | 38 | 47 | 19 | 33 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
| Uzbek | Fall | 23 | 49 | 33 | 66 | 17 | 0 | 32 |
|  | Spring | 38 | 56 | 28 | 62 | 15 | 0 | 21 |
| Vietnamese | Fall | 46 | 78 | 54 | 104 | 14 | 0 | 237 |
|  | Spring | 41 | 67 | 50 | 88 | 14 | 0 | 189 |

Note: These are the numbers of students in each ACCESS level group who were tested in each window in 2021-22, or the number of students for each cell in Table B15.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ There are exceptions for English Learners who have been in the United States for one year, and for students with severe cognitive disabilities.
    ${ }^{2}$ In 2021-22, Star was administered four times: Fall, Winter 1, Winter 2, and Spring.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ For more information about reclassification in Pennsylvania, see https://www.education.pa.gov/Teachers\%20-\%20Administrators/Curriculum/English\%20As\%20A \%20Second\%20Language/Pages/Reclassification-and-Exit-Criteria.aspx
    ${ }^{4}$ In spring yearly, ESL teachers complete language use inventories, and during the summer months, SDP makes recommendations for reclassifying ELs based on their ACCESS and language use inventory performance.
    ${ }^{5}$ Information from internal documentation: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KtS4RLLEOAC77vNRBNuroX8rNcglAan/view
    ${ }^{6}$ For more information about assessments at SDP visit https://www.philasd.org/era/assessment/ or https://www.philasd.org/research/category/assessments/
    ${ }^{7}$ For more information, see Sugarman, J (2018). A Guide to Finding and Understanding English Learner Data. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. p. 12 https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/guide-finding-understanding-english-learner-data
    ${ }^{8}$ Appendix B includes comparisons to Former ELs, or ELs who had high enough English proficiency to be exited from EL status.

[^2]:    ${ }^{9}$ For more information about Star practice tests, see
    https://renaissance.widen.net/view/pdf/xutuykoglg/SRRPTechnicalManual.pdf?t.download=true\&u=zceria
    ${ }^{10}$ See https://www.philasd.org/research/2022/06/09/star-tests-in-the-school-district-of-philadelphia-a-summary-of-metrics-that-describe-achievement-and-growth/
    ${ }^{11}$ Students who have scored 852 on Star Early Literacy have the opportunity to take Star Math even if they are in first or second grade. Therefore, a small group of first and second grade students are included in the Star Math analysis.

[^3]:    ${ }^{12}$ In 2021-22, norm-referenced metrics on the Star CATs were based on a national sample of students who took the tests in the 2014-15 school year.
    ${ }^{13}$ For example, the test score interval between the $23^{\text {rd }}$ percentile and $24^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the interval between the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile and $51^{\text {st }}$ percentile are not equivalent to each other.
    ${ }^{14}$ In this report, they are derived from the percentile ranks using the equation $\mathrm{NCE}=21.06^{*} \mathrm{z}$-score +50
    (Lipsey et al., 2012), where the z-score comes from the percentile rank value.
    ${ }^{15}$ We calculated in Microsoft Excel using the following formula: 100*NORMSDIST((NCE-50)/21.06)
    ${ }^{16}$ For more information about NCE-NPR conversions and equivalencies see the addendum to this report: https://www.philasd.org/research/2023/08/11/english-learner-performance-on-the-2021-22-access-star-reading-and-star-math-assessments/

[^4]:    ${ }^{17}$ For School District of Philadelphia staff, this analysis matches the Qlik Academic Screeners Application in Winter 2023.

[^5]:    ${ }^{18}$ Many of these students enrolled in SDP in 2021-22 and received the WIDA in that year. However, other students in this group enrolled in SDP in 2020-21 but did not take the WIDA until 2021-22 due to testing limitations during the Covid-19 pandemic, and were therefore not categorized as ELs in administrative records until 2021-22.
    ${ }^{19}$ Long-term English Learners is a general classification applied to students who have been enrolled in school in the United Sates for six or more years and are still considered English Learners, or have not exited EL status. This classification is general and glosses over the nuances of students and different reasons why students may have an EL status for numerous years.
    ${ }^{20}$ Students who have a home language other than English when they register for SDP are recommended for the WIDA evaluation. For more information about WIDA, visit https://wida.wisc.edu/assess/screener
    ${ }^{21}$ English Learners in Pennsylvania have the right to attend school until the age of 21. For more information visit https://www.education.pa.gov/Policy-Funding/BECS/PACode/Pages/EducatingELs.aspx or https://www.elc-pa.org/

[^6]:    ${ }^{22}$ For more information about SDP EL race/ethnicity see https://www.philasd.org/research/2022/06/23/ exploratory-analysis-of-english-learners-identified-race-ethnicity-and-home-language-in-the-school-district-of-philadelphia-2019-20/
    ${ }^{23}$ Note that SDP students' economic disadvantage data comes from the State of Pennsylvania and is based on families' eligibility for income-tested federal assistance programs, like TANF and SNAP. Because families who are new to the United States and who live below the poverty line may not be registered for government benefits immediately upon their arrival to the United States, we may be missing groups of students who are economically disadvantaged from the economic disadvantage data. Therefore, the economically disadvantaged group is likely undercounting students.

[^7]:    ${ }^{24}$ Recall that we expect there to be a higher percentage of ELs with lower performance on the ACCESS because as students' English proficiency improves, they are reclassified from being ELs to exited out of EL status, and no longer take the ACCESS. This is in contrast to other assessments where the pool of students is similar yearly for each performance group, but for the ACCESS, by design, the testing pool shrinks for higher level performers.

[^8]:    ${ }^{25}$ As a reminder, the ACCESS levels in the Star analyses refer to students' most recent ACCESS assessment. If they did not take the ACCESS in 2021-22, their ACCESS level may be from 2020-21 or an earlier year.

[^9]:    ${ }^{26}$ For examples of Former EL Star performance, see https://www.philasd.org/era/wp-content/uploads/sites/865/2022/08/Spring-2022-Progress-Monitoring-Report-Reading-Goals-1-2.pdf or https://www.philasd.org/era/wp-content/uploads/sites/865/2022/07/Progress-Monitoring-Report-Math-Goal-3-Spring-2022.pdf

