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Reading comprehension and related processes form the foundation for most of the academic work one does in school. To support the teaching and learning of reading skills for English learners (ELs), teachers seek guidance, resources and intervention programs (Callahan, 2013; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005; Rivera, Moughamian, Lesaux, & Francis, 2008; Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages [TESOL], 2010; Walqui & Heritage, 2012). Educators express a need for understanding how to measure EL reading comprehension progress, tailor successful reading instruction, support academic language and content learning, and support overall student success (TESOL, 2010). Reading assessments for formative purposes are argued to be a promising approach for addressing the challenges teachers face, and supporting EL reading in particular (Heritage, 2008, 2012; Wei, 2010). This paper describes the design, development, and piloting of a formative measurement system to support EL reading comprehension in the middle grades, the English Learner Formative Assessment (ELFA) system. In particular, this paper reports on a small-scale usability study where the ELFA system was used by eight middle school teachers supporting ELs. We aim to share the lessons we learned during the development and trial of ELFA formative assessment materials for future development and effective implementation of formative assessment for ELs. Our specific research questions and research design are described in the Current Study section.

Relevant Literature

Formative assessment can be viewed as part of an instructional process, where teachers gather evidence of students’ learning through assessment during instruction and adapt their instruction to address students’ needs. That is, formative assessment is not a test instrument itself (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Heritage, 2010;
Herman, 2013). The formative assessment process is involved with dynamic roles for both teachers and students (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Formative assessment is also described as assessment for and as learning as opposed to of learning (Bennett, 2010). These qualities of formative assessment may be particularly beneficial for ELs who have diverse needs from their heterogeneous backgrounds. First, identifying learning goals involves, for example, knowledge of individual language proficiency (Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2008), prior content knowledge (Scarcella, 2002, 2003), and background characteristics (Abedi, 2004), which may present unique opportunities for ELs. Formative assessment uses evidence to drive instruction, which aids in individualized pacing and instructional differentiation (August & Shanahan, 2006; Gándara et al., 2005; Rivera et al., 2008; Walqui & Heritage, 2012). The descriptive nature of feedback on learning used in formative assessment is also particularly effective for ELs, as grades and tests may be culturally-normed and less meaningful for diverse groups (Durán, 2008). Finally, formative assessment captures areas of learning to inform instructional lessons for ELs in real time, like natural language samples, that can be used to identify the strengths and needs of students more accurately (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Heritage, Kim, Vendlinski, & Herman, 2009).

Despite the potential benefits of formative assessment for ELs, little empirical evidence is available to support its development or use (Alvarez, Ananda, Walqui, Sato & Rabinowitz, 2014; Kingston & Nash, 2012; Santos, Darling-Hammond & Cheuk, 2012). One of the reasons might be the challenges in its implementation. Previous studies have provided empirical evidence with regard to challenges for teachers in the use of effective formative assessment (Bailey & Heritage, 2008; Heritage et al., 2009; Heritage, Walqui, & Linquanti, 2013; Wylie & Heritage, 2010). These include the high demand on teachers’ skills and the lack of time to carefully plan and execute effective formative tasks and processes. All teachers have these responsibilities, but there are additional demands placed on those who teach ELs. For example, middle grade teachers typically have scant to no coursework on English language and literacy development or pedagogy (Gándara et al., 2005).

Moreover, while setting goals based on learning progression models is fundamental to formative assessment (Heritage, 2008), models specific to ELs are still evolving (Callahan, 2013). Adding to these challenges, there are few resources for the implementation of effective formative assessment for teachers of ELs. This provides a disincentive for teachers to make formative assessment a part of their practice (Heritage, 2010; 2012). This study was designed to respond to this need, and to contribute to the empirical research on the use of a formative assessment system to support middle school EL reading comprehension.

Overview of the English Learner Formative Assessment (ELFA) System

Federally funded with a research grant, ELFA was developed and piloted with and for middle school teachers serving ELs as an assessment system for formative purposes. It was also designed to serve as a template or architecture for further individualized development of formative assessment tasks.
The ELFA Architecture and its Components

ELFA is designed to support intermediate and advanced ELs’ reading comprehension of academic argumentative texts and to provide teachers with information to guide instruction. It includes targeted learning goals, assessment learning activities, and teacher support resources. We describe the major components of the ELFA system below.

ELFA design framework. A framework document was developed to inform teachers of the specific construct and subskills that were intended to be measured in the ELFA assessment (see Wolf, Shore, & Blood, 2014). The explicit, written description of the construct and subskills was intended to help teachers interpret student responses and understand the gap between the current status and the next step needed for each student. It began with a description of basic and higher-order reading skills and includes subskills found to be differentially influential in EL reading comprehension (August, Francis, Hsu, & Snow, 2006; Gottardo & Mueller, 2009; Lesaux & Kieffer, 2010; Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005; Wong-Filmore & Snow, 2000). As the focus is specific to the comprehension of argumentative text, the overall approach was also guided by one of the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts: “Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence” (National Governors Association for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010, p. 60). See Figure 1 for the subconstructs and subskills measured in the ELFA assessments.

Figure 1. ELFA subconstructs and subskills. Adapted from “Formative Assessment as a Means to Improve Teaching and Learning for English Learners,” by M. K. Wolf and J. R. Shore, 2014, Paper presented at the ETS Research Forum. Copyright 2014 by Educational Testing Service.
ELFA assessment forms. The ELFA system includes a set of nine reading assessment forms that teachers can use over the course of their instruction. These nine forms are divided into three difficulty categories, developing, intermediate, and experienced, based on the linguistic complexity of the articles in each form. In each assessment form students engage with one main persuasive reading article and a shorter article presenting a counterargument.

Each assessment form also consists of two parts, both based on the same two reading articles and covering the same constructs and subskills. Part 1 contains a collaborative set of activities and items, and Part 2 includes an individual set. The collaborative tasks that comprise Part 1 were designed to be completed with a peer or in a small group. They were also designed with a purposeful sequence, scaffolded to allow ELs to unpack the given passage and sequentially utilize basic to higher-order reading comprehension skills (see Figure 2).

Teachers interact with students during Part 1 to collect evidence of reading comprehension skills (see Figures 3 and 4 for sample tasks). During Part 2, students work on tasks individually to demonstrate the same skills independently.

![Figure 2. Task sequencing in ELFA. Adapted from “Formative Assessment as a Means to Improve Teaching and Learning for English Learners,” by M. K. Wolf and J. R. Shore, 2014, Paper presented at the ETS Research Forum. Copyright 2014 by Educational Testing Service.](http://digscholarship.unco.edu/jeri/vol5/iss2/4)

---

1 ELFA developers utilized readability software called e-rater and TextEvaluator to measure dimensions of the linguistic complexity of the passages (Sheehan, 2012; Sheehan, Kostin, & Napolitano, 2012). These tools provided developers with a profile of the linguistic complexity of each reading passage (e.g., the total number of words, lexical density, number of academic words, complexity of sentence structures, grade-level difficulty indices). All reading passages were also rated by focus groups of ESL teachers at the middle-school level for appropriateness of topic, interest, relevance, and language complexity for their students and feedback was provided on which were most relevant, engaging and appropriate for each level. For more information see Wolf, Shore, & Blood, 2014.
Figure 3. Task sample: Warm-up. Adapted from *English Learner Formative Assessment (ELFA), Form 6* by Educational Testing Service. Copyright 2013 by Educational Testing Service.

Figure 4. Task sample: Getting a main idea. Adapted from *English Learner Formative Assessment (ELFA), Form 6* by Educational Testing Service. Copyright 2013 by Educational Testing Service.

**Teacher Versions of the assessments.**

All ELFA forms include teacher versions (see Figure 5). These are the student forms accompanied by notes and specific guidance intended to support the integration of tasks and teacher interaction during Part 1 in the form of probing and drill-down questions. General screening questions are provided, as well as guidance on how to drill down to uncover students’ thinking and confirm understanding of Part 1 tasks.
Current Study

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this collective case study was to examine the extent to which the ELFA system and its materials were usable and useful for the intended, formative purpose. Specifically, we posited the following research questions:

1. Value: Did ELFA add value to EL instruction?
2. Efficiency: Was ELFA a good use of planning and instructional time?
3. Feasibility: Was ELFA a feasible system for use in classes supporting ELs?
4. Learnability: To what extent were teachers able to learn to use the ELFA system?
5. Professional Knowledge Building: What teacher learning took place while using ELFA?

For the present study, we focused on eight teachers’ use of Part 1 of the system. Part 1 of ELFA provided opportunities to observe teacher/student interactions, collaborative peer work, and the use of ELFA to inform and guide instruction; that is, Part 1 focused on all aspects of formative assessment.

Methods

We employed a case study approach in order to closely examine how teachers use ELFA materials as part of their regular instruction in classrooms. Our case study may be described as a collective case study, defined as a case study that focuses on a collection of cases to both examine trends that emerge and identify differences between them. As Black and William (1998) indicate, pedagogy can be very different across contexts that support formative systems. The fact that EL classrooms come with such a range of backgrounds and needs makes a research study necessary.
**Teacher-participants.** A total of eight teachers from six middle schools participated in this study. Among them, seven were ESL teachers and one was an English language arts (ELA) teacher with both ELs and non-ELs in her classroom. All had bachelor’s degrees in secondary education and ranged in teaching experience, having taught both ELs and non-ELs between five to 30 years. All were teaching in urban school districts and supported ELs with intermediate to advanced English language proficiency (ELP) at the time of data collection. Some teachers supported mixed level classes (e.g., intermediate and advanced in the same classroom) while other teachers had a homogeneous class of students with either intermediate or advanced ELP. Participating 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes were chosen based on the similarity of their ESL programs. Students’ ELP levels were determined by each state’s annual summative ELP assessment. Most students were long-term ELs while some students (8%) were newcomers. Table 1 describes each of the teachers’ settings, experience, learners served, and languages to further contextualize the case study settings.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher ID</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>School EL Size</th>
<th># of Years Teaching</th>
<th># of ELs</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Student ELP Levels</th>
<th>Home Languages Spoken</th>
<th>Other Languages Spoken by Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,7,8</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6,7,8</td>
<td>Int-Adv</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Int-Adv</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Int-Adv</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that because the unit of study was the teacher, we focused our analysis on the teacher and the overall classes - not the individual students.

**Study instruments.** Interviews were conducted during training and before and after each ELFA use session, based on a set of interview protocols. The questions were guided by the research questions. An observation protocol was also used to systematically document the details of all sessions in which ELFA was used in classrooms. The protocol included taking detailed notes of the teacher’s introduction of the ELFA forms, classroom discourse, teacher interaction with students, and the use of the teacher’s version of ELFA, including the probing questions. For further
examples of specific items, see Figures 3 and 4 above.

Procedure. The participating teachers were first provided with all of the ELFA materials for review prior to training. Next, teachers attended three small group (two or three teachers) webinars intended to introduce the ELFA system and provide guidance on how to use it for formative assessment purposes.

A week after the training, each teacher used the ELFA assessment forms and teacher versions over the course of two weeks (two to four lessons for each teacher). At least two researchers observed each lesson. Teacher interviews took place before and after each lesson, and were recorded and transcribed.

Analysis of data. A coding scheme was developed to analyze the observation notes and interview transcripts. Following the procedure suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), a pair of researchers performed a preliminary round of coding while making detailed notes. The initial coding and memos were discussed among the researchers and the coding scheme was refined. The pair of researchers conducted multiple readings of the observation notes and interview transcripts to reach consensus on their codings based on the final coding scheme. Table 2 summarizes the coding scheme that was applied to the study’s data.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Scheme for the Usability of ELFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Learnability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Themes (Professional Knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Using the coding described in Table 2, several themes emerged from the data to answer our research questions. In addition to findings about the usability of the ELFA system, other themes emerged, demonstrating the changes in each teachers’ thinking.
Four Dimensions in the Usability of ELFA

Value. Value was defined as whether the teachers perceived the ELFA system as providing them with something they did not already have. Five of the teachers (T1, T3, T4, T6 and T8) commented that ELFA was useful because it was more aligned with their instructional planning than other tests available to them. For two of the teachers (T1 and T3), discussion of what they liked about ELFA started with an expression of what they did not like about other available materials. For example, as one teacher (T3) noted, current materials available for middle school ELs place too much focus on foundational skills rather than higher-order thinking skills. The results are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression of Value</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aligned with instructional planning         | T1, T3, T4, T6, T8 | “I’ve been so dissatisfied with the materials that exist because they challenge [students] to understand grammar and vocabulary but they’re not really doing the academic tasks and enriching activities that are going to reinforce their academic growth in the general sense” (T3).  
“Part of my problem is that materials appropriate for their skill levels, the vocabulary and the things that are being discussed, are everyday things. The kids have been here in the U.S. for a long time, so everyday tasks are covered ... to get them stepped up to be able to argue and discuss and do academic tasks and use academic language to complete tasks, I think that is something that is different from what we are currently using” (T1). |
| Dissatisfaction with other available materials | T1, T3   |                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Better aligned with instructional practice and philosophy | T4       | “...these [ELFA] materials are more aligned with what I want my kids [ELs] to be doing, and it’s better than what I’m currently using... They have to demonstrate a lot of ... skills....to have them interact in a way that’s a bit more enriching and in-depth, it’s valuable...” (T4). |
| Well-designed forms                          | T6, T8   | “This feels really targeted at looking at breaking down subskills and trying to look critically at it” (T6)  
“If I were to have this kind of assessment and the assessment would pinpoint to me the areas of need, I can group the students according to those areas of need at a time” (T8). |
In summary, five of the participating teachers specifically remarked on the value in the ELFA system as an approach that expanded their current resources and their understanding of skills, in addition to being a classroom-based assessment system that could readily be integrated into instructional planning.

**Efficiency.** Efficiency was defined as whether teachers found the use of ELFA to be an efficient use of their time. Many of the participating teachers’ concept of efficiency evolved over the case study period. At the start, four of the teachers worried aloud about the time it took to use ELFA in the classroom (T1, T4, T5 and T8). During the pre-observation interviews, one of these teachers (T4) said, “I think there’s incredible amount of opportunity in ELFA for collaboration and cooperative learning... I was really interested in something, but we didn’t have time and had to move on to the next one!” In the initial lessons, participating teachers tended to focus on “getting everything done.” They were watchful of the time and anxious about completing items and the activities. Views changed over time.

During observations, and through interviews, it was found that teachers began to emerge with a more of a focus on the process of learning, and less on the “right” answer. During observations, researchers noted that five of the eight teachers emerged as more and more oriented toward the activity than the timing (T1, T2, T4, T5, and T8). This was seen in actions like encouraging learners to talk about the article in their own words, to confirm their understanding with peers, and develop a way to express why they might choose certain answers in activities. This finding is further supported explicitly in interviews; for example, after the second lesson of ELFA integration, one teacher (T4) expressed, “I was freaking out about the time, but what I should have done is just get to work ... to see if they can do it.”

After the second period using ELFA one teacher (T5) said, “Once I read it, I just was concerned about time. We move really slow at these levels...but as we moved through, the ELFA highlights areas and we can pick and choose. I shouldn’t be worried about speed, but about their real understanding...”

Overall, initial concern about the efficiency of integrating ELFA into their instruction was resolved through the flexibility in the use the assessment. It was also helpful for teachers to discuss during interviews how to use ELFA after each lesson to better understand the intent.

**Learnability.** Learnability was defined as how easily and smoothly teachers were able to work the materials into their teaching practice. Upon reviewing the codings of this dimension, teachers were found to fall into three groups: “knowledge building,” “emerging awareness,” and “evolving practice” groups. Results are summarized in Table 4 below.

The coding results from the learnability dimension suggest that teachers were generally able to integrate ELFA into their teaching practice, but with varying levels of ease.

**Feasibility.** As far as the implementation of a new program or strategy such as ELFA is concerned, its feasibility in the given context is an important consideration. In this collective case study, feasibility was defined as the degree to which ELFA would be a good fit in the current curriculum teachers were responsible for delivering to their students.
As seen in the results for efficiency and learnability, some variation was noted in the teachers’ perceptions of feasibility. The results for feasibility are summarized in Table 5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Building</td>
<td>T1, T2, T8</td>
<td>“I wondered if it’s important that [students] do this right now or have them get on with the task...that was me struggling and figuring out what I should be doing” (T1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Awareness</td>
<td>T3, T4, T5</td>
<td>“It would be helpful for there to be an option to have somebody come out and say “this is how it looks,” and everybody’s together and we’re doing it all together as a group” (T3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I should have spent more time with the ELFA materials before this went down...sat have with the team and learn the system better” (T4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolving Practice</td>
<td>T6, T7</td>
<td>I think that’s something that...is helpful and easy to do. I’m actually pretty excited about that” (T6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Next week I’m continuing with ELFA, so if these materials became available to me on a website then I would be quite capable of getting the materials and incorporating them into instruction” (T7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasible</td>
<td>T5, T6</td>
<td>“...working together, implementing strategies, and having the time, we could definitely do this. ...So I don’t think it's too difficult” (T5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it would be relatively simple. I can do this given the support materials, and colleagues” (T6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolving</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>“Some students found it hard to work collaboratively...they wanted to go at their own pace ... There was real guidance, though, so...it is a good learning. It fits our goals” (T4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Emerging Themes

Besides usefulness and usability, additional themes emerged across our eight teacher participants. These spanned changes in teachers’ conceptualization and articulation about formative assessment to evolution of their understanding of ELs’ reading comprehension skills. The results we present in this section include these themes in assessment thinking that emerged upon coding of the observation notes and interview transcript data.

Changes in the understanding of formative assessment. During the debriefing interviews after each of the observation days, teachers had opportunities to discuss their perspectives on the use of ELFA and ask clarifying questions. The cycle of pre-interview, lesson, and post-interview seemed to serve as professional development on the use of ELFA for the teachers. One notable theme was the participating teachers’ thinking around the intended purpose of ELFA as a formative assessment system. While all teachers were in support of formative assessment conceptually, four teachers (T2, T4, T5 and T7) explicitly expressed that they could understand the basic tenets of formative assessment.

However, during the first observations, researchers found that all of the teachers’ talk during circulation among the students focused mainly on clarifying the directions of ELFA tasks. The majority of the teachers also encouraged students to not dwell on answers and move on in order to complete the ELFA assessment. In all but one of the classes the researchers observed on the first day, teachers neither used the teacher version of the assessment nor asked any probing questions to confirm understanding as to why students chose certain answers.

That said, by the third or fourth day of integration, observation notes began to reveal changes in teacher thinking among six of the eight teachers. Six teachers clearly began to express a change in their concept of formative assessment (T1, T2, T5, T6, T7, and T8). Some teachers also talked about looking at the suggested probing questions for each item from the teacher version the night before the observation (T3 and T4). They commented that the teacher version helped them get their thoughts in order for upcoming lessons. Although observations did not reveal instances of using probing questions in all cases (four of the eight teachers, T1, T2, T5 and T8, used them during observations), interviews revealed changes in teacher thinking among all teachers, which we might predict would influence future lessons. Further, five teachers (T1, T2, T3, T5, and T7) also began to discuss the focus on higher-order thinking in various ways, demonstrating an understanding of formative assessment as a progression of learning. These findings are summarized in Table 6 below.
Table 6

Other Emerging Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in concept of formative assessment</td>
<td>T1, T2, T5, T6, T7, T8</td>
<td>“I need to slow down, ask questions and look for clues in what students do and say to help pinpoint challenges. I feel like it’s making me think differently about assessment. It’s way more powerful than a score” (T7). “What I would do differently next time is do it with them and then repeat the activity over and over again with different documents as we move forward ... And I would keep working in different ways until they would be able to get the process” (T8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on higher-order thinking</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3, T5, T7</td>
<td>“The information we get here, it’s about learning and informing my job here. It’s just terrific, really. It’s so surprising now, refreshing. It’s not about a score, but it’s still an assessment” (T5). “This really supports my decision making and plans for the week. For example, tomorrow I will work on those word families. They clearly had trouble with those...” (T3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of deep probing and confirmation of understanding</td>
<td>T1, T3, T4, T7</td>
<td>“Today was such an eye opener when [students] had to identify subjects and verbs in complex sentences! In my mind I was thinking, “How could you not know this?” I wouldn’t have realized I needed to go back there” (T1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on wide range of subskills</td>
<td>T1, T3, T5, T7, T8</td>
<td>“It’s useful data that I can scan through. I can pick and choose where to go based on evidence in items from all the students...” (T7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observations and teacher discussions indicate that some teachers were accustomed to thinking about assessment only in the context of summative assessments and scores. As an aspect of formative assessment driving instruction, the use of evidence is a clear indicator of changes in teacher thinking about assessment. The researchers looked for indications that teachers might be delving deeply into student thinking and confirming understanding for the purpose of informing future instruction. During the initial lessons with ELFA, the researchers observed that all teachers had the tendency to move through lessons quickly, spending little time on items if students got the correct answers. However, observations painted a very different picture after several days of ELFA use and reflection.
Examples of using evidence to inform thinking or even modify instruction were clear in all but one of the classrooms. In half of the classes (T1, T3, T4 and T7), the teachers began probing deeply and confirming understanding. They were speaking of using this information to make instructional planning based on evidence. As indicated in these comments, teachers began to take time to think about possible next activities based on what they observed during their use of the ELFA system.

**Changes in the understanding of reading comprehension skills and instruction.** Another notable theme lay in teachers’ expanded views of the underlying sources of reading comprehension difficulties for ELs that may be attributed to the use of ELFA. At the start of their collaboration with the ELFA team, most teachers described the major source of ELs’ reading comprehension difficulty in terms of deficiency in vocabulary knowledge. Seven of the eight participating teachers mentioned that a major focus of their instruction supporting ELs was on words. Most described similar sentiments to T4, who said:

“We are always working on vocabulary. They get the words, we go online, find definitions, and memorize definitions. And there is nothing else you can do. When you learn a second language, you memorize...that’s the only way you can learn it.”

As the teachers were using the ELFA assessment forms, their teaching and activities in class began to change. For example, one teacher (T3) described,

“The paraphrasing is great. I did have to remind them that paraphrasing was putting that same idea in your own words. A lot of them were a little off. But in doing this, I realized that they were getting the main ideas and vocabulary to do so. It wasn’t only about building vocabulary. It was about building the ideas and concepts that formed text.”

Observations also provided some insight into teachers’ conceptual understanding of reading comprehension and how ELFA might have been seen to influence it. While using ELFA, all teachers were asking questions, probing about the difference between the topic, main idea, and main argument. One of the teachers (T4) held a class discussion on the similarities between the main idea and the main argument. During the observations, three teachers (T2, T4 and T5) dove deeply into students’ conceptual knowledge about text. During the post-observation interviews, one teacher (T2) reflected by saying, “What I would do is have them do a paragraph by paragraph summary. Maybe that would help them locate the main idea vs. main argument. Maybe breaking it into pieces...” Another teacher (T5) said, “I usually teach a lot of pre-vocabulary, but this (ELFA) makes me wonder if instead, the time could be better spent focusing on working on main ideas and concepts, then activities that have students demonstrate their comprehension.”

Reflections from teachers and observations support a change in orientation about reading comprehension. Observation notes and interviews reveal that seven of the participating teachers, as described here, went from a focus on words to a focus on a wider range of subskills. Rich reflections provided further insight into what the teachers had learned while using ELFA, and also paths for further ELFA development.
Discussion

While views about the value, efficiency, learnability, and feasibility of ELFA were generally positive among the participating teachers, it is also worth noting the important areas that teachers mentioned in the context of improving classroom-based assessments and systems for formative assessment purposes. First, it became clear that any formative assessment system needs to be aligned directly with the key areas teachers feel they need to focus on in instruction, or aligned well with concepts or skills specific to their curriculum. Five of the eight participating teachers specifically pointed to the current lack of appropriate materials to be used for formative purposes for middle school ELs’ reading comprehension skills, and they highlighted the provision of such material as one of ELFA’s areas of strength (T1, T3, T4, T6 and T8). Whereas new academic standards such as the Common Core State Standards have brought higher reading-skill demands for students, it appeared to the teacher-participants in the current study that it is equally important to have both foundational and higher-order reading skill activities and tools to be used for EL students—a perception that is echoed in the current national conversation (see Bailey & Carroll, 2015; Santos et al., 2012).

A second key consideration is that, for any formative assessment system or resource to be an efficient use of time, it must be modular and flexible (T1, T4, T5, T8). By “modular” we mean that formative assessment forms, activities, or tools should contain activities that can be used both individually (to focus on certain skills) or as a group (to cover a variety of skills). Formative systems must also include guidelines for flexible implementation. This flexibility needs to be built not only into the formative assessment system, but also into teacher development.

Another important finding of the present case study was that even the most experienced teachers’ thinking and engagement with formative assessment appeared to change over time while using the ELFA materials. The use of ELFA, and subsequent discussions between the researchers and the teacher-participants, served as professional development for the teachers. Use of formative support systems over time can, we contend, inform practice in a professionally engaging way.

Our finding about the initial mismatch between the teachers’ concepts about formative assessment and the actual use of assessments for formative purposes may be partly attributed to the careful planning required for formative assessment. Formative assessment places large cognitive demands on teachers to collect, interpret, and act upon evidence quickly (Sondergeld, Bell, & Leusner, 2010). As Heritage et al. (2009) indicate, once teachers begin collecting such evidence, they also must learn new ways of pacing, differentiating, organizing, and adapting their instruction. This learning takes time and is not always internalized automatically.

Limitations

As a case study, the findings of this research are not intended to generalize to a larger population of teachers or students, but rather to serve as an illustration of how integration of a new system like ELFA might work across a few settings. The purpose is to provide a deeper understanding of the cases presented, and not a larger perspective of the use of assessments for formative purposes. That said, there were a few limitations in the study.

First, our cases were limited to those in urban environments. This was purposeful,
as we aimed to ensure that our teacher-participants had relevant and extended experiences with ELs. We described these settings with details intended to aid teachers reading this article to decide how relevant the work might be for their own settings.

This study was not an experimental study to examine the effectiveness of ELFA on teaching and learning. Rather, it was an exploratory study, conducted over a short period of time, to investigate the potential usability of ELFA for formative purposes in classrooms with EL students. That said, the short time period means that the study provides a snapshot of the use of ELFA rather than a picture of use over an extended period of time, such as a school year.

The study also focused exclusively on the teachers’ practices and perspectives on formative assessment at this particular ELFA development stage—not on those of their learners. The observed behaviors and expressed perspectives of our educator partners were the unit of study, although student interactions may have influenced these areas.

Conclusions and Future Research

Despite the limitations, the study yielded useful insights and support for future development work and an expanded research agenda for ELFA. Perhaps the most important finding was that teachers not only found value in the system, but they also felt that its use improved their knowledge and practice. Questions worth further exploration are: What longitudinal changes emerge in teachers who support ELs when they integrate formative processes? What other factors facilitate the effective integration of ELFA into the classroom to carry out systematic formative assessment practice? A longitudinal study can offer valuable suggestions to effectively implement formative assessment using a system or tools such as ELFA. Further, a future study should include an investigation of student perspectives on learning and EL students’ reading outcomes in classes where the ELFA is used regularly. The impact on EL students’ reading comprehension outcomes as a result of ELFA use would be a useful and important contribution to the field.
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