

2019 Supplemental Budget Decision Package

Agency: 350 – Supt of Public Instruction

DP code/title: 2-digit RecSum code and short, descriptive title limited to 35 characters. This will appear on DP and RecSum reports. English Learners Assessments

Budget period: 2019 Supp

Budget level: ML

Agency RecSum text: Brief description of your proposal. A cogent “elevator pitch” including a concise problem statement, proposed solution and outcomes affected by the proposal. Agencies should strive not to exceed 100 words. Summary text should not repeat references to cost or FTEs, displayed directly below in the fiscal detail.

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) [28A.180.090](#) requires school districts to assess all prospective and eligible English learners (ELs) in order to identify students in need of language assistance services. The identification process begins with an initial screening using a placement or screener assessment. Once identified, students receiving language supports are tested annually until they are determined to be proficient in English. The population of ELs is projected to continue growing, and total costs are projected to rise correspondingly. The Superintendent requests funding to support continuation of the state assessment measuring the English language acquisition of K-12 students that are classified as ELs.

Fiscal detail: To be completed by budget staff

Operating Expenditures	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
General Fund – State 001-01	\$0	\$5,167,000	\$5,217,000	\$5,498,000
Total Expenditures	\$0	\$5,167,000	\$5,217,000	\$5,498,000
Biennial Totals	\$5,167,000		\$10,715,000	
Staffing	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
FTEs	0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Average Annual	0.5		1.0	
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Obj. A	\$0	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000
Obj. B	\$0	\$43,000	\$43,000	\$43,000
Obj. C	\$0	\$4,994,000	\$5,044,000	\$5,325,000
Obj. E	\$0	\$43,000	\$43,000	\$43,000
Obj. G	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Obj. J	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Obj. N	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Revenue	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Biennial Totals	\$0		\$0	

Package description

Your detailed package description should elaborate upon the RecSum description provided above. This detailed description should provide the Governor, OFM, the Legislature and the public an understanding of the problem you are addressing.

To thoroughly describe the package and its justification, agencies are strongly encouraged to use:

- High-quality narrative descriptions
- Informative tables
- Charts and graphs
- Logic models
- Timelines
- Flowcharts
- Maps or other graphics

School districts are required to administer a screener for initial identification of English learners (ELs). For all identified ELs, school districts must administer an annual assessment to determine progress toward English language proficiency and continued eligibility for English language development services. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) designates both assessment types.

Assessments Include:

1. English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) annual assessment of English learner proficiency, administered to students in grades K-12 who are in the transitional bilingual instructional program.
2. ELPA21 screener to assess English proficiency of students who might be eligible for transitional bilingual instructional services.
3. An alternate assessment for ELs and students with significant cognitive disabilities.

School districts are required to administer the screener to all newly enrolled students whose Home Language Survey indicates the possibility of the student being an EL. School districts administer the annual assessment to all eligible ELs in grades K-12. Additionally, school districts must administer an assessment – as designated by OSPI – that is appropriate to assess EL students with significant cognitive disabilities.

As required in the 2015 federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) law, administration of an English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment is part of Washington's K-12 accountability framework, which includes measurement of EL growth toward acquiring English language proficiency.

The Superintendent requests the resources necessary (as outlined in Table 1) to continue providing EL assessments to students in, or students who are potentially eligible for, Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) services.

What is the problem, opportunity or priority you are addressing with the request?

- Describe in detail the problem you propose to solve.
- What is the relevant history or context in which the DP request is made?
- Why is this the opportune time to address this problem?

- Have you previously proposed this request? If so, when and how was it received in the budgeting process at that time?

This request will ensure OSPI is able to meet its current fiscal obligation and fund the continuation of existing state assessments for English learners in order to meet the mandates included in the following state and federal laws:

- The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the 2015 [Every Student Succeeds Act](#) (Section 1111(b)(1)(f) and 111(b)(2)(g)).
- State law (Revised Code of Washington [RCW] [28A.180.090](#))

What is your proposed solution?

- How do you propose to address this problem, opportunity or priority?
- Why is this proposed solution the best option?
- Identify who will be affected by this DP and how.
- How many clients will or will not be served? Served by whom?

To meet the requirements associated with assessment administration and managing the technical assistance needs of schools and school districts, the proposed solution is for the budget set-aside to be equal to the total program cost to administer TBIP, as outlined in Table 1 below.

What are you purchasing and how does it solve the problem?

- What will this funding package actually buy?
- What services and/or materials will be provided, when and to whom?
- How will these purchases achieve the desired outputs, efficiencies and outcomes?

The TBIP assessment budget provides for administration of the assessments outlined in the package description above. In 2018, approximately 130,000 students participated in the annual English learner progress assessment across grades K-12. In addition, approximately 1,300 students with significant cognitive disabilities were expected to be assessed using the alternate English learner assessment.

The funding includes contracts with vendors who support the annual administration of the assessment, including:

- Test item development,
- Assessment development,
- Assessment research and psychometrics,
- Standard setting (establishing thresholds for performance),
- Test administration,
- Scoring of the tests, and
- Individual score reports for students

Additionally, the TBIP budget also includes a 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff position to coordinate the assessment administration and support of school districts.

What alternatives did you explore and why was this option chosen?

- What are the consequences of not funding this proposal?

- Describe the pros/cons of alternatives. Explain why this request is the best option.
- What other options did you explore? For example, did you consider:
 - » Options with lower costs.
 - » Services provided by other agency or unit of government.
 - » Regulatory or statutory changes to streamline agency processes.
 - » Redeployment of existing resources to maximize efficient use of current funding.
 - » Option to maintain the status quo.

Both state and federal law require the administration of the English learner assessment and screener. The assessments for annual testing and screening of prospective new ELs belong to the ELPA21 consortium and were developed specific to Washington's adopted English language proficiency standards. With each new assessment, or at the end of a contract cycle, OSPI goes through a request for proposals (RFP) process to select a vendor to administer the tests and provide other supports. The alternate assessment (testing of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities) is owned by the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium and, at present, is the only existing instrument for this purpose.

Assumptions and calculations

You must clearly display the caseload/workload/service-level changes and cost/savings assumptions and calculations supporting expenditure and revenue changes proposed. Please attach an electronic version (Excel) of detailed fiscal models and/or fiscal backup information.

The intent here is not to repeat the fiscal detail summarized above, but to expand and provide all underlying assumptions and calculations associated with this proposal. All calculations must include impacts to the 2019-21 *and* 2021-23 biennia and must support the fiscal summary detail.

Expansion or alteration of a current program or service

If this proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide detailed historical financial information for the prior two biennia (2015-17 and 2017-19).

This is not an expansion or alteration. It is a continuation of current EL assessments as required by RCW [28A.180.090](#). Funding to implement the Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program is as follows:

- FY 2016: \$2,815,396
- FY 2017: \$3,752,572
- FY 2018: \$4,269,671
- FY 2019 (projected): \$5,166,262

Detailed assumptions and calculations

- Provide detailed caseload/workload and cost information associated with adopting this proposal.
- Identify discrete expenditure/revenue calculations. Many DPs contain multiple components to achieve a desired outcome. If this package contains discrete funding proposals, the fiscal models or details must break out the complete costs/savings of each component part.
- Clearly explain all one-time expenditure or revenue components.

Funding Breakdown				
Table 1	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21
ELPA21 Annual Assessment				
Annual # students tested (assumes 5% growth/year)	-	135,000	141,750	148,840
Cost per student	\$0	\$28	\$28	\$28
Test accommodations	\$0	\$352,480	\$365,980	\$380,160
Single year adjustment for prior period accommodations	\$0	\$216,095	\$0	\$0
Contract Total	\$0	\$4,348,575	\$4,334,980	\$4,547,680
ELPA21 Screener				
Screener test # students tested	-	33,750	35,440	37,210
Cost per student	\$0	\$9	\$9	\$9
Additional scoring costs (step 3)(\$2/student for 33% of students)	\$0	\$22,275	\$23,390	\$24,559
Screener accommodations	\$0	\$82,412	\$82,412	\$82,412
Contract Total	\$0	\$408,437	\$424,762	\$441,861
WIDA (Alternate EL Assessment)				
Alternate assessment # students tested (assumes 1% of annual ELPA21 Contract)	-	1,350	1,418	1,488
Cost per student	\$0	\$175	\$200	\$225
Contract Total	\$0	\$236,250	\$283,600	\$334,800
Total Contract Costs	\$0	\$4,993,262	\$5,043,342	\$5,324,341
Total Administrative Costs	\$0	\$173,000	\$173,000	\$173,000
Total TBIP Needed	\$0	\$5,166,262	\$5,216,342	\$5,497,341

Funding Breakdown				
Table 1	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21
ELPA21 Annual Assessment				
Annual # students tested (assumes 5% growth/year)	-	135,000	141,750	148,840
Cost per student	\$0	\$28	\$28	\$28
Test accommodations	\$0	\$352,480	\$365,980	\$380,160
Single year adjustment for prior period accommodations	\$0	\$216,095	\$0	\$0
Contract Total	\$0	\$4,348,575	\$4,334,980	\$4,547,680

ELPA21 Screener				
Screener test # students tested	-	33,750	35,440	37,210
Cost per student	\$0	\$9	\$9	\$9
Additional scoring costs (step 3)(\$2/student for 33% of students)	\$0	\$22,275	\$23,390	\$24,559
Screener accommodations	\$0	\$82,412	\$82,412	\$82,412
Contract Total	\$0	\$408,437	\$424,762	\$441,861
WIDA (Alternate EL Assessment)				
Alternate assessment # students tested (assumes 1% of annual ELPA21 Contract)	-	1,350	1,418	1,488
Cost per student	\$0	\$175	\$200	\$225
Contract Total	\$0	\$236,250	\$283,600	\$334,800
Total Contract Costs	\$0	\$4,993,262	\$5,043,342	\$5,324,341
Total Administrative Costs	\$0	\$173,000	\$173,000	\$173,000
Total TBIP Needed	\$0	\$5,166,262	\$5,216,342	\$5,497,341

Table 1. Breakdown of total funding needed in order to fulfill requirements for the Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program.

The current budget (ESSB 6032, Section 514) provides OSPI with \$4,273,480 for these assessments through a combination of withholdings of allocations to districts and proviso funds. OSPI seeks additional authority in the amount of \$893,520.

FY19 TBIP Assessment Amount Available:	
ESSB 6032 Section 514 FY19 Approp	\$158,812,000
Proviso - Track Bilingual Program Students	-\$35,000
Proviso - TBIP Assessments	-\$198,000
Available For Allocation	\$158,579,000
Withholding For TBIP Assessment (2.57%)	\$4,075,480
 Total Available For TBIP Assessment	
Withholding	\$4,075,480
Proviso	\$198,000
	<hr/>
Total	\$4,273,480
 Total Amount Needed For TBIP Assessment	 \$5,167,000
 Additional Amount Needed For TBIP Assessment	 \$893,520

Workforce assumptions

Include FTE information by job classification, including salary and benefits costs. Work with budget staff to prepare this information.

The OSPI employs a 1.0 ELPA Coordinator who is responsible for the administration of TBIP activities across the state. The annual cost to employ the coordinator is \$84,000 for salary and \$43,000 for benefits. In addition, this position requires \$6,000 per year for travel, goods, and services.

Strategic and performance outcomes

Strategic framework

- How does this package relate and contribute to the Governor's Results Washington goal areas and statewide priorities? [Link to results.wa.gov](http://link.to.results.wa.gov)
- How does the package relate to the agency's strategic plan?
- Identify how this proposal affects agency activity funding by amount and fund source.

This request supports the Results Washington K-12 goals related to student success because the achievement of English learner students is crucial to improving Washington's K-12 schools. English learners comprise more than 11 percent of Washington's K-12 students.

Performance outcomes

- Describe and quantify the specific performance outcomes you expect from this funding change.
- What outcomes and results will occur? What undesired results are reduced, eliminated or mitigated?
- Explain how efficiencies are optimized.
- Identify all Lean initiatives and their expected outcomes.
- Include incremental performance metrics.

Performance outcomes are measured with the provided assessments, including the number of students who achieve English proficiency each year, as well as students demonstrating growth in the four required areas to be assessed: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The goal is to measure the success of English learners' progression to transition out of transitional bilingual services within six years.

Additionally, with enactment of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (the 2015 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), administration of an English language proficiency assessment is now part of the state's accountability framework, which requires measurement of English learners' growth toward acquiring English language proficiency.

Other collateral connections

Intergovernmental

Describe in detail any impacts to tribal, regional, county or city governments or any political subdivision of the state. Provide anticipated support or opposition. Impacts to other state agencies must be described in detail.

Not applicable.

Stakeholder response

Agencies must identify non-governmental stakeholders impacted by this proposal. Provide anticipated support or opposition.

Not applicable.

Legal or administrative mandates

Describe in detail if this proposal is in response to litigation, an audit finding, executive order or task force recommendations.

Not applicable.

Changes from current law

Describe in detail any necessary changes to existing statutes, rules or contracts. Where changes in statute are required, cabinet agencies must provide agency request legislation as an attachment to this DP and submit it through BATS.

Not applicable.

State workforce impacts

Describe in detail all impacts to existing collective bargaining agreements, compensation or benefits.

Not applicable.

State facilities impacts

Describe in detail all impacts to facilities and workplace needs (See Chapter 9 - Leases and Maintenance). Describe in detail all impacts to capital budget requests.

Not applicable.

Puget Sound recovery

If this request is related to Puget Sound recovery efforts, see Chapter 12 of the budget instructions for additional instructions. **(Not applicable to OSPI)**

Other supporting materials

Attach or reference any other supporting materials or information that will help analysts, policymakers and the public understand and prioritize your request.

Not applicable.

Information technology (IT)

ABS will pose the question below for *each* DP. If the answer is yes, you will be prompted to attach an IT addendum. (See Chapter 10 of the budget instructions for additional requirements.)

Information Technology

Does this DP include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

No

Yes

Please download the [IT-addendum](#) and follow the directions on the bottom of the addendum to meet requirements for OCIO review. After completing the IT addendum, please upload the document to continue.