



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

The English Learner Indicator (ELI)



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI

- Students identified as English learners (ELs) are given an annual test to determine their English language acquisition.
- Currently, the annual test is the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI (Cont.)

- A new test that is aligned to the new standards, the English Language Proficiency Assessment for California (ELPAC), is currently under development and will be fully implemented in 2018–19.
- The goal is to design the ELI to allow for an easy transition from the CELDT to the ELPAC.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI (Cont.)

- Both the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) require ELs to make progress towards English proficiency, currently measured by the CELDT.
- LCFF also requires the local control accountability plans (LCAPs) to report the percent of ELs who have been reclassified fluent English proficient (RFEP).
 - Note: RFEP criteria vary by local educational agency (LEA)



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI (Cont.)

- At the May State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE members requested that the Department bring back an option for the ELI that contains a composite measure of EL proficiency rates, RFEP rates, and long-term EL rates.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Recommendations

- Various ELI models were presented to the Bilingual Coordinators Network (BCN) and Technical Design Group (TDG).
- Both the BCN and the TDG recommended that LEAs and schools should be held accountable for moving ELs up one proficiency level each year. In addition, they recommended that the Intermediate level be divided into: “Low” Intermediate and “High” Intermediate.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Recommendations (Cont.)

- Dividing the Intermediate level acknowledges the substantial growth that can be made within the level due to the large range of scale scores in this particular level.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Recommendations (Cont.)

- The TDG also recommended that:
 - LEAs and schools receive credit for reclassifying EL students,
 - Long-term EL data be included at the LEA-level, when it becomes available, but not at the school-level.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed ELI Model

Previous CELDT Overall Level	Current CELDT Overall Level
Beginning	Early Intermediate
Early Intermediate	Low Intermediate
Low Intermediate	High Intermediate
High Intermediate	Early Advanced
Early Advanced or Adv Not Proficient	Early Advanced or Adv Proficient
Early Advanced or Adv Proficient	Early Advanced or Adv Proficient

+

**RFEP
Students***

*Students who are reclassified in the prior year (e.g., July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014)



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed ELI Model (Cont.)

- **Status:** Status is the percent of ELs that moved up a performance level plus prior year RFEP
- **Change:** Change is the difference in Status from current year to prior year:

*Current Year Status Results minus
Prior Year Status Results*



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

ELI Distribution

- The distributions were based on the rate of EL students who increased at least one level on CELDT in the current year plus EL students that were reclassified in the prior year.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Status Cut Points

Status: The following table provides the proposed cut points for each status level:

Status Level	Status Cut Point
Very Low	Less than 60% of EL students increased at least one level or were RFEP'd
Low	60% to less than 67% of EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were RFEP'd
Median	67% to less than 75%, of EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were RFEP'd
High	75% to less than 85% EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were RFEP'd
Very High	85% or more EL students increased at least one CELDT level or were RFEP'd



TOM TORLAKSON
 State Superintendent
 of Public Instruction

Status Cut Points (Cont.)

Percentile	Moved Up at Least One Performance Level + RFEP	Status Level
5	52.81	Very Low
10	57.40	
14.6	60.00	Low
15	60.23	
20	62.30	
25	63.85	
30	65.40	
35	66.70	
37.3	67.00	Median
40	67.70	
45	68.60	
50	69.70	
55	70.70	
60	71.90	
65	73.10	
70	74.60	High
71.7	75.00	
75	76.05	
80	77.96	
85	80.17	
90	83.58	Very High
91.5	85.00	
95	88.28	

See Handout 1



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Change Cut Points

Change: The following table provides the proposed cut points for each change level:

Change Level	Change Cut Point
Declined Significantly	ELI declined by more than 10%
Declined	ELI declined 1.5% to 10%
Maintained	ELI declined or increased by less than 1.5%
Increased	ELI increased by 1.5% to less than 10%
Increased Significantly	ELI increased by 10% or more



TOM TORLAKSON
 State Superintendent
 of Public Instruction

Change Cut Points (Cont.)

Percentiles	% Change from the Prior Year to Current Year	Change Levels
5	-18.88	Declined Significantly
10	-11.60	
12.4	-10.00	Declined
15	-8.54	
20	-6.20	
25	-4.75	
30	-3.54	
35	-2.40	
39.7	-1.50	Maintained
40	-1.42	
45	-0.70	
50	0.00	
55	0.71	
60	1.40	Increased
62.3	1.50	
65	2.30	
70	3.20	
75	4.70	
80	5.90	
85	8.40	Increased Significantly
88.1	10.00	
90	12.00	
95	18.30	

See Handout 2



Statewide Summary ELI Results

TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
ALL DISTRICTS* (1,076)	150 (13.9%)	314 (29.2%)	231 (21.5%)	283 (26.3%)	98 (9.1%)
ALL SCHOOLS* (6,598)	1,057 (16.0%)	1,851 (28.1%)	1,262 (19.1%)	1,755 (26.6%)	673 (10.2%)

See Handout 3

* Alternative schools, county offices of education, and schools with less than 30 students enrolled or less than 30 EL students were excluded from the count.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Discussion Questions

- Is the red performance category (i.e., less than 60%) which may trigger interventions for schools, and possibly for local educational agencies (LEAs), appropriate?
- Is the green performance category, which establishes a statewide goal of 75% appropriate for all schools and LEAs?

**Distribution for Status
 English Learner Indicator**

STATUS

Percentile	Moved Up at Least One Performance Level + RFEP	Status Level
5	52.81	Very Low
10	57.40	
14.6	60.00	Low
15	60.23	
20	62.30	
25	63.85	
30	65.40	
35	66.70	
37.3	67.00	Median
40	67.70	
45	68.60	
50	69.70	
55	70.70	
60	71.90	
65	73.10	High
70	74.60	
71.7	75.00	
75	76.05	
80	77.96	
85	80.17	
90	83.58	Very High
91.5	85.00	
95	88.28	

Total Number of Districts = 1,181

Distribution for Change English Learner Indicator

Change

Percentiles	% Change from the Prior Year to Current Year	Change Levels
5	-18.88	Declined Significantly
10	-11.60	
12.4	-10.00	Declined
15	-8.54	
20	-6.20	
25	-4.75	
30	-3.54	
35	-2.40	
39.7	-1.50	
40	-1.42	Maintained
45	-0.70	
50	0.00	
55	0.71	
60	1.40	
62.3	1.50	Increased
65	2.30	
70	3.20	
75	4.70	
80	5.90	
85	8.40	
88.1	10.00	Increased Significantly
90	12.00	
95	18.30	

Total Number of Districts = 1,181

English Learner Performance Categories

English Learner Change (Change in Percent Progressing)

English Learner Status (Percent Progressing)	Level	Declined Significantly by more than 10%	Declined by 1.5% to 10%	Maintained Declined or improved by less than 1.5%	Increased by 1.5% to less than 10%	Increased Significantly by 10% or more
	Very High 85% or more	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
	High 75% to less than 85%	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
	Median 67% to less than 75%	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
	Low 60% to less than 67%	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
	Very Low Less than 60%	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

Statewide Districts' Performance

# of Districts	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
1076	150 (13.9%)	314 (29.2%)	231 (21.5%)	283 (26.3%)	98 (9.1%)

Statewide Schools' Performance

# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
6598	1057 (16.0%)	1851 (28.1%)	1262 (19.1%)	1755 (26.6%)	673 (10.2%)

Performance by School Type

School Type	# of Schools	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue
Non Charter	6,177	968 (15.7%)	1748 (28.3%)	1193 (19.3%)	1655 (26.8%)	613 (9.9%)
Charter	421	89 (21.1%)	103 (24.5%)	69 (16.4%)	100 (23.8%)	60 (14.3%)
Small Schools*	7	3 (42.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Non Small Schools	6,591	1054 (16%)	1851 (28.1%)	1262 (19.1%)	1752 (26.6%)	769 (11.7%)

*Small schools have 30 to 99 students enrolled.