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Background to the Study
In the current educational climate in the U.S., elementary students are taking more tests than ever before. English language learners (ELLs) represent one of the fastest growing demographics in public schools and have been greatly affected by new assessment policies because the language of the tests presents them with significant linguistic challenges (Abedi, Lord, Hofstetter, & Baker, 2000; Menken, 2008; Rivera & Collum, 2006a). Test accommodations are one way to increase the likelihood that test scores reflect ELLs’ content mastery rather than their level of language proficiency, yet apart from the work of Lee and her colleagues in science content (Lee, 2004; Lee, Maerten-Rivera, Buxton, Penfield, & Secada, 2009) relatively few ELL accommodations studies have been conducted in classroom contexts. In fact, to date there has been no empirical examination of exactly how, or indeed if, routine content tests are typically modified at all (Cizek, 2007).

The purpose of this dissertation study was to make a contribution to the understanding of how ELLs’ math and science content knowledge is routinely assessed in mainstream elementary classrooms. The research questions explored the assessment practices and beliefs of elementary teachers, as well as ELLs’ perceptions of the classroom assessments in which they participated. A mixed method design was utilized incorporating multiple data sources, including a wide-scale teacher survey (n=213), classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student interviews with math and science teachers (n=10) and fourth grade ELLs (n=50).

Findings
Given the broad scale of this study, the main findings are summarized here in brief. Results from the survey suggested that the majority of classroom content teachers (65%) were not certain of the proficiency levels of the ELLs in their classrooms, nor were they certain which of their students were identified as requiring English as a Second Language (ESL) services. ELLs who were dually identified as having Special Education and ESL needs were found to consistently receive more accommodations than any other group. Twenty-one classroom assessment practices were observed and reported in use in the ten focal classrooms. Practices that were universally implemented were: additional time, teacher assistance, and reading items aloud. Practices which
were reported to be commonly implemented were: shortened tests, time management by the teacher, collaborative test-taking, and paraphrasing of test items. Practices that were infrequently implemented in both classroom and survey report were native language accommodations such as oral translation, English-English dictionary use, bilingual dictionary use, and bilingual tests. For accommodations to be effective for ELLs, they need to be linguistically appropriate (Acosta, Rivera, & Shafer Willner, 2008); however, appropriate native language accommodations were found not to be implemented routinely in this study. Four accommodated grading practices: grade modification, explicit item correction, retesting/retaking assessments, and test exemption, were also identified in the focal classrooms as being typical of teachers’ practice. Grade elevation was universally reported in all ten classrooms as a normal grading practice. To illustrate this point, one teacher explained his grading practices for ELLs thus, “Sometimes I just simply go by how my heart feels. I honestly do that.”

The beliefs underlying teachers’ decision-making processes were found to be a determining factor in ELL assessment, and teacher accounts of ELLs’ performance were often found to be in direct contrast with ELLs’ perceptions of the same assessment events. All ten focal teachers expressed a belief that some aspect of ELLs’ home lives, i.e., a lack of parental commitment or a general lack of English at home, had a negative impact on students’ academic success. In contrast to this common teacher belief, a large number of children reported speaking some English at home (40%), living in stable family environments with their mother, father, or both parents (92%), and working hard to meet their parents’ expectations for them (74%). One child, Tomy, explained his Dad’s reaction if he brought home a bad grade, “No, he wouldn’t be very happy, but he’ll still love me.” These findings echo long-standing work related to lowered teacher expectations for at-risk populations, such as ELLs and students of color (Brown, Benkovitz, Muttilllo, Urban, 2005; Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999). They also reinforce assertions related to a deficit perspective commonly associated with ELLs (Pettit, 2011). Misalignment of teacher and student accounts of assessment events was noted throughout the study and suggested that misunderstanding may be an integral part to classroom assessment of ELLs.

Teacher beliefs related to ELLs’ language proficiency tended to fall into two categories: students who could participate in regular classroom instruction and assessment and students who could not. Teachers identified oral proficiency in English as a major indicator of students’ ability to function in fourth grade content classrooms, a finding which supports previous research that students at the lowest levels of English proficiency have the greatest need for accommodations (Acosta, Rivera, Shafer-Willner, 2008). In fact, eight of ten teachers reported encountering assessment difficulties with students who could not yet communicate orally at a high enough language proficiency level. In terms of language, many students expressed a limited understanding of their own language processes; that is, despite being bilingual, the children lacked metacognitive skills for talking about their language acquisition processes. Thirty students (60%) expressed a belief that their developing English language did not affect their ability to do well on content tests in spite of the fact that many were still at beginner and intermediate levels of language proficiency. When asked what it would be like to take a test in their native languages, thirty students (60%) said that they thought it would be difficult, not because they
didn’t know the content of the tests, but because they didn’t know how to read in their native languages. Magdalena expressed the opinions of many students as to why translated tests would be difficult, “It would be like kinda harder to read because I'm like here, and now sometimes I forget how to read in Spanish.”

Although much literature has focused on children’s aversion to tests and the negative effect that assessment can have on learning environments (Jones, et al., 1999; Mulvenon, Stegman, & Ritter, 2005), a majority of ELLs in this study reported that they liked taking tests. Seventy-eight percent of ELL participants reported that they liked math tests and 64% reported to like science tests. Of the fifty ELL participants, 22 (44%) reported that tests presented them with opportunities to learn, recognizing assessments as formative tools designed for their learning. When students were asked about the accommodations in place for them, forty-six (92%) claimed to like them, giving reasons such as accommodations helped them to learn or earn better scores. Only four children (8%) spoke of any concerns related to the stigma of accommodations implementation; two of those children spoke to the stigma of being exempted from regular assessment that their non-ELL peers were required to take. When asked about fairness of accommodations, several ELLs said that they appreciated being given extra time, though they thought it was unfair that their English-speaking classmates were not afforded the same opportunity. Many students also reported that trying was an important factor in doing well on tests, supporting previous findings in work conducted relating to effort and motivation with native English speaking students (Brookhart, 2007; Brookhart & DeVoge, 1999; Brookhart, Walsh & Zientarski, 2006).

A majority of students spoke positively about teachers’ modified grading practices because they typically resulted in higher test scores; nonetheless, 70% of students did not understand some aspect of how their work was evaluated by their teachers. Because accommodated scoring practices were found to be frequent among all teachers there was a lack of alignment between classroom grades and state standardized test scores, which caused a number of ELLs in the study genuine concern. Competing rating systems used to grade students’ work were also reported to be the cause of significant confusion, and students in the study reported that B could mean Basic on a high-stakes rating scale, Good on a standard A through F rating scale, or Bien on rating scales from their countries of origin. Additionally, the use of percentages to rate fourth graders presented conceptual difficulty since percentages as a mathematical concept was taught as part of the fourth grade math curriculum.

**Implications of the Study**

In sum, numerous implications of this study were characterized along three strands: 1) implications for professional development, 2) implications for assessment, and 3) implications for policy. These strands have great consequences for the academic success of ELLs and serve as critical points of consideration in going forward.

To answer Cizek’s (2007) call, increased teacher professional development in the area of assessment is necessary for teachers so they can better evaluate ELLs at varying proficiency levels on classroom assessments. A stronger understanding of the basic principles of assessment,
and the need for systematic implementation and withdrawal of accommodations for ELLs could help content teachers develop greater expertise when assessing ELLs’ content knowledge. Further teacher training in multicultural education and second language acquisition was requested by a majority of participant teachers to better inform their practice, and could function to dispel some of the misinformation found to be held by teachers about ELLs and their communities.

In reference to assessment theory, the variable implementation of accommodations and the prevalence of accommodated grading practices for ELLs suggest that “a hodgepodge of factors” come into play when teachers assess student performance (McMillan, 2004, p. 203). These haphazard systems can cause content test scores, and subsequent grades and school decisions to be an inaccurate account of ELL student content knowledge. Students need to be accountable to their own learning through measurable outcomes, and consistent and transparent systems of assessment are essential to this process. Without such systems in place, grades become an imprecise and ultimately meaningless measure of student performance. To that end, school based grading systems and test use should be reconsidered according to constructs of assessment theory in order to facilitate a more informed discussion of the place of classroom tests and the role of classroom accommodations as a whole.

The results of this study also have many implications for policy. High-stakes testing procedures, which rely on student familiarity with accommodations from classroom tests, are likely misguided, because many test accommodations offered on high-stakes tests were not found to be implemented in the classroom to a great extent. In accordance with other work done relating to marginalization of ELL populations in school (Menken, 2006; Pettit, 2011), de facto school policies supporting the placement of ELLs into the lowest content tracks should be revisited to ensure that ELLs receive the most appropriate education that they are entitled to by law. In the schools that had multiple content sections, ELLs were found in great numbers in the lowest tracks where accommodations were administered to all content learners on a whole-class basis. Whole class accommodations policies represent a conflation of ELLs with children in Special Education or with other learning needs, and cannot optimally serve students in either population. Results from this study suggest that teachers need more guidance to understand and attend to the unique linguistic needs that ELLs have when engaging in content assessment.
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