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# **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** August 13, 2019

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TONY THURMOND, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Update on the Inclusion of English Learner Students in the Academic Indicator, Availability of At-Risk and Long-Term English Learner Reports in DataQuest, and Incorporation of the English Learner Progress Indicator Status into School and Local Educational Agency Assistance Eligibility.

## Summary of Key Issues

This Information Memorandum provides an update on:

1. The inclusion of reclassified students in the English learner (EL) student group in the Academic Indicator.
2. The release of At-Risk and Long-Term English Learner reports in DataQuest.
3. An update on the development of a methodology to use the Status on the English Learner Progress Indicator for assistance eligibility in the 2019–20 school year.

## Attachments

Attachment 1: Inclusion of Reclassified Students in the English Language Student Group for the Academic Indicator (6 Pages)

Attachment 2: Availability of At-Risk and Long-Term English Learner Reports in DataQuest (1 Page)

Attachment 3: Development of a Methodology to Use the Status of the English Learner Progress Indicator for Assistance Eligibility in the 2019–20 School Year (8 Pages)

# **Attachment 1**

## Inclusion of Reclassified Students in the English Language Student Group for the Academic Indicator

The federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) includes a provision that allows states to include students who are reclassified as fluent English proficient (RFEP) in the English learner (EL) student group for up to four years in the academic indicator. States are required to define the EL student group for the academic measures in their ESSA plan.

California’s accountability system reports the performance of the EL student group for all state indicators. The definition of ELs varies by state indicators. Table 1 displays which students are incorporated in the EL student group for each indicator. (This table is adapted from the 2018 Dashboard flyer, “Who Is Included in the English Learner Student Group?” which is available at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/englishlearnergroup.pdf>.)

**Table 1**

**Who is Included in the EL Student Group for Each State Indicator**

| **Indicator** | **Who Counts as an EL?** |
| --- | --- |
| Academic Performance | Students who are reported as EL during the time of testing, including students who were reclassified (or RFEP) within the past four years. |
| Chronic Absenteeism | Students who are reported as an EL at any time during the 2017–18 academic year. |
| College/Career Readiness | Students who are reported as EL at any time during the four-year cohort, or the Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) graduation rate, for the Class of 2018. |
| English Learner Progress | Results for students who took the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). |
| Graduate Rate | Students who are reported as EL at any time during the four-year cohort, or the DASS graduation rate, for the Class of 2018. |
| Suspension Rate | Students who are reported as an EL at any time during the 2017–18 academic year. |

In January 2017, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the definition for the EL student group for the Academic Indicator, which includes current EL students and ELs reclassified for four years or less(<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02.doc> and

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/jan17item02a1addendum.doc>). This definition supports a central premise that school and district performance on the Academic Indicator reflects the effectiveness of the entire EL program—from initial designation through successful reclassification. This is borne out by the data (Tables 2 and 3), which shows that, among districts and schools that receive a Red performance level for their EL student group in English language arts (ELA) or mathematics, a significant percent of RFEP students have a negative Distance from Standard (DFS).

**Table 2:**

**Districts and Schools with Red Performance Level for ELA and Mathematics**

**Percent of EL and RFEP Students Contributing to the Negative DFS Score**

| Content Area | Number of Red Performing Districts/Schools | Percent of Red Performing Districts and Schools that have Negative DFS for both EL Only and RFEP Students |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ELA | 89 Districts | 97.8% |
| ELA | 1,019 Schools | 91.8% |
| Mathematics | 102 Districts | 100% |
| Mathematics | 942 Schools | 100% |

A strong EL program moves students toward language proficiency as quickly as possible to allow students better access to the curriculum while supporting EL students in their mastery of the standards in all content areas. Including RFEP students in the Academic Indicator identifies local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools whose full continuum of EL students have not received the support necessary to master the standards measured by the statewide assessments.

It is important to note that this definition of ELs in the Academic Indicator gained the support of several nationally known researchers: Robert Linquanti from WestEd; Pete Goldschmidt from the California State University, Northridge; Kenji Hakuta from Stanford University; and Delia Pompa with the Migration Policy Institute. However, for transparency purposes, the SBE requested that the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) provide further disaggregation of the current DFS scores and the increase from the prior year for the following student groups: English learners only, RFEP, and English only.

The January 2017 SBE agenda item also provided the following two additional reasons for including RFEP students in the EL student group four years:

* Excluding RFEPs from the group significantly reduces the number of schools with a valid N size to receive a color for accountability purposes.
* Because most of the reclassification criteria are locally determined by LEAs, the EL and RFEP student populations may have different characteristics across LEAs and schools, making comparability an issue in an accountability system. For example, the EL only students in one district may have more students performing at ELPAC levels 1 and 2, compared to other districts that may have more students who are proficient on the ELPAC in their EL group. This same issue would also apply to the RFEP student group because LEAs have locally adopted criteria for reclassifying students. Therefore, including students who are RFEP for four years stabilizes the group, allowing for better comparison across LEAs and schools. (Note, beginning in January 2019, the ELPAC overall score at level 4 criteria is used statewide for the first reclassification criteria, all other criteria remain locally determined. The Observation Protocol for Teachers of English Learners (OPTEL) is being piloted this fall as a potential statewide tool to standardize two additional criteria. The OPTEL will be presented to the SBE in July of 2020.)

Also important to note is that the EL student group is included in all state indicators and is the only student group with its own indicator, the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI). The ELPI, beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, only includes students who are currently classified as ELs and are therefore required to take the ELPAC. The ELPI Status will be reported in the 2019 Dashboard and is designed to determine whether EL students are making sufficient progress in English acquisition in contrast to the Academic Indicator that measures student’s mastery of academic standards. The inclusion of the ELPI will provide another important piece of information on the success of schools and LEAs ELD programs.

In the January 2017 SBE agenda item, the California Department of Education (CDE) noted the importance of continuing to review the data closely and make recommendations, if needed, to respond to changes over the coming years, most notably the transition to the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) in 2018. Potential legislation to modify the reclassification criteria may also prompt the SBE to revisit the Academic and English Learner Indicators in future years.

Using the most recently available data, the CDE conducted simulations to evaluate the appropriateness of continuing to apply the current definition for the EL student group to the Academic Indicator. This Information Memorandum presents this data, which continues to show that reducing the number of years since students are reclassified from inclusion in the EL student group would result in fewer LEAs and schools receiving a performance level (color).

## Current Data on English Learners and the Academic Indicator

Tables 3 and 4 provide updated data on the number and percent of schools and LEAs identified in each of the performance categories for ELA, based on three different definitions of the EL student group:

1. ELs and students reclassified for up to four years (2015–18): Current definition
2. ELs and students reclassified for up to three years (2016–18)
3. ELs and students reclassified for up to two years (2017–18)

**Table 3**

**School Comparison: EL Student Group Data for ELA**

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 1,019  15.8% | 2,032  31.4% | 2,403  37.1% | 659  10.2% | 358  5.5% | 6,471 | Baseline\* |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 653  10.6% | 1,661  27.1% | 2,939  48.0% | 469  7.7% | 397  6.5% | 6,119 | -352  Schools\*\* |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 689  12.2% | 1,864  32.9% | 2,585  45.6% | 280  4.9% | 255  4.5% | 5,673 | -798  Schools\*\* |

\*Criteria currently applied to the EL student group

\*\*Difference in number of schools receiving a color based on valid N size (30 or more students in the EL student group)

**Table 4**

**LEA Comparison: EL Student Group Data for ELA**

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 89  13.4% | 237  35.6% | 275  41.3% | 51  7.7% | 14  2.1% | 666 | Baseline |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 55  8.6% | 154  24.0% | 370  57.7% | 41  6.4% | 21  3.3% | 641 | -25  Districts |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 70  11.2% | 201  32.1% | 316  50.4% | 27  4.3% | 13  2.2% | 627 | -39  Districts |

The data in Tables 3 and 4 show that significantly fewer schools and LEAs would receive a performance level for their EL student groups (and thus would not be held accountable for the academic achievement of their EL students) when the inclusion of reclassified students is reduced from four years to three or two years.

Tables 5 and 6 provide the same information for mathematics and the results are similar.

**Table 5**

**School Comparison: EL Student Group Data for Mathematics**

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 942  14.6% | 2,275  35.2% | 2,001  30.9% | 853  13.2% | 397  6.1% | 6,468 | Baseline |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 578  9.5% | 1,976  32.3% | 2,423  39.6% | 720  11.8% | 415  6.8% | 6,112 | -356  Schools |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 621  11.0% | 1,868  32.9% | 2,410  42.5% | 469  8.57% | 304  5.5% | 5,672 | -796  Schools |

**Table 6**

**LEA Comparison: EL Student Group Data for Mathematics**

| **EL and RFEP Students** | **Red** | **Orange** | **Yellow** | **Green** | **Blue** | **Total** | **Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EL + 4 Years RFEP | 102  15.3% | 293  44.1% | 193  29.0% | 53  8.0% | 24  3.6% | 665 | Baseline |
| EL + 3 Years RFEP | 73  11.4% | 173  27.0% | 322  50.2% | 48  7.5% | 25  3.9% | 641 | -24  Districts |
| EL + 2 Years RFEP | 84  13.4% | 188  29.9% | 300  47.8% | 32  5.1% | 24  3.8% | 628 | -37  Districts |

This data shows a significant decrease in the number of schools and districts receiving a performance level for mathematics for their EL students when the inclusion of reclassified students is reduced from four years to three or two years.

The application of the current definition for the EL student group– ELs and students reclassified for up to four years (2015–18)—continues to hold more schools and districts accountable for the effectiveness of the entire EL program—from initial designation through successful reclassification. For example, if the inclusion of RFEP students were reduced to two years, 798 schools (12.3 percent) and 39 LEAs would not receive a performance level (color) for the English learner group in ELA. The results are similar for mathematics: 796 schools and 37 LEAs would not receive a performance color. In addition, it is important to note the data reflects that the number of RFEP students who reach Level 3 on the Smarter Balanced Assessment increases substantially between students who have been reclassified for two years verses students who have been reclassified for four years (i.e., percentage of schools with an ELA Green performance level is 10.2 percent in the EL +4 Years RFEP category vs. 4.9 percent EL + 2 Years RFEP category).

# **Attachment 2**

## Availability of At-Risk and Long-Term English Learner Reports in DataQuest

At the July 2019 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, there was interest from SBE members in disaggregating information about the English learner (EL) student group by number of students classified as Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) for the new four-and five-year Graduation Rate. The California Department of Education (CDE) committed to returning to the SBE with options for consideration of this information in the 2020 California School Dashboard.

As described at the SBE meeting, the 2018–19 LTELs and At-Risk for LTEL (AR-LTEL) reports reflect a significant one-year increase in LTEL and AR-LTEL counts from previous years. As outlined in California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 313.1, there are four criteria to determine LTELs and AR-LTELs. Due to the one-year transition from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) to the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), the criteria to use English Learner Proficiency assessment data could not be used to determine EL students who are considered AR-LTEL or LTEL because two years of ELPAC data are required. The English language proficiency assessment criteria for LTELs, as outlined in California *EC* Section 313.1(a), and AR-LTELs, as outlined in *EC* Section 313.1(b), was not available in 2017–18. As a result of removing this criteria from determining LTELs and AR-LTELs, the number of LTELs and AR-LTELs increased.

These reports are available on the CDE DataQuest website, LTEL and AR-LTEL Data Reports at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filesltel.asp> and display, at the state-, county-, and LEA-LEVEL, the number and percent of students AR-LTEL and the number and percent of LTEL students.

# **Attachment 3**

**Development of a Methodology to Use the Status of the English Learner Progress Indicator for Assistance Eligibility in the 2019–20 School Year**

This attachment provides background on the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI); the current work of the California Department of Education (CDE) with stakeholders, experts, and practitioners, and methodology considerations for using two years of English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) Summative Assessment (SA) data to determine Status for the 2019 California School Dashboard (Dashboard).

## Background

The ELPI is distinguished from other measures included in the Dashboard, because it is the only indicator required under the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to measure **progress towards proficiency** rather than the end goal of proficiency itself. This means that two years of data are required to determine Status on this indicator. The State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the original methodology for the ELPI at their September 2016 meeting. As a result, ELPI Status measures English Learner (EL) student growth toward English Language Proficiency (ELP) and ELPI Change measures the year-to-year change in the rate that local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools move EL students toward ELP.

The 2017 Dashboard reported on ELPI Status, Change, and overall performance color using multiple years of California English Language Development Test (CELDT) data. In 2017–18, California transitioned to a new English language proficiency assessment, the ELPAC. The ELPAC is substantially different from the CELDT, because the ELPAC is aligned to the 2012 California English language development standards. An additional difference between the assessments lies in the fact that CELDT was administered in the fall and ELPAC is administered in the spring which means the measurement of student progress is not the same due to the timing of these two tests in relation to the student’s coursework. For these reasons, the CELDT results and the ELPAC results are not comparable. As noted above, ELPI Status requires an initial two years of ELPAC SA results to measure EL students progressing towards proficiency. ELPI Change requires at least three years of data to measure the year-to-year change in the rate LEAs and schools move EL students toward ELP.

In spring 2018, the CDE ELPI Workgroup, which is comprised of LEA representatives, researchers, and EL experts, met to discuss the incorporation of ELPAC SA results into the ELPI. Additionally, the Technical Design Group (TDG) discussed this topic at their meeting in June 2019. The ELPI Workgroup and the TDG supported the CDE’s recommendation to:

* Use the 2017 ELPI methodology as the framework for the ELPI methodology using ELPAC SA results.
* Report Status on the 2019 Dashboard using two years of ELPAC SA results and Change and color on the 2020 Dashboard once three years of data becomes available.
* Adopt a three-year ELPI timeline by reporting ELPAC performance levels on the 2018 Dashboard, ELPI Status on the 2019 Dashboard, and ELPI Status, Change and performance color on the 2020 Dashboard.

At the July 2018 SBE meeting, the SBE adopted the CDE’s recommendation for the ELPI three year plan (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>). For the 2019 Dashboard, two years of ELPAC SA results, including information from both the spring 2018 and spring 2019 test administrations, will be used to report Status for the ELPI. For the 2020 Dashboard, the CDE will have three years of ELPAC SA results, including information from the spring 2018, spring 2019, and spring 2020 test administrations, at which time the CDE will be able to calculate Change for the ELPI.

## Stakeholder, Expert, and Practitioner Outreach

Since the July 2018 SBE meeting, the CDE has been working on the development of the methodology for ELPI Status for the 2019 Dashboard. To assist with this ongoing development of the ELPI, the CDE continues to engage with EL stakeholders, researchers, technical experts, and practitioners across the state. The following is an update on the CDE’s stakeholder engagement efforts related to the ELPI:

* **ELPI Workgroup:** The CDE met with the ELPI Workgroupin May 2019. The CDE discussed and asked for feedback on conducting data simulations on the splitting of the ELPAC SA performance levels for accountability purposes and setting the ELPI Status cut scores by grade span. Two additional meetings are scheduled with the Workgroup prior to the November 2019 SBE meeting to obtain input on the ELPI methodology and the results of the data simulations using two years of ELPAC SA results to create ELPI performance levels and set Status cut scores by grade span.
* **Bilingual Coordinators Network (BCN):** The CDE presented at the March and May 2019 BCN meetings and provided regular updates, engaged in discussion, and asked for their feedback regarding the ELPI and EL-related data. The CDE will continue providing updates to and seeking feedback from the BCN at the September and November meetings.
* **Technical Design Group:** The CDE met with the TDGin April and June 2019. The CDE discussed and asked for feedback on conducting data simulations on the splitting of the ELPAC SA performance levels for accountability purposes and setting the ELPI Status cut scores by grade span. The CDE will present at the October TDG meeting the results of the data simulations using two years of ELPAC data, including recommendations on how to split ELPAC levels 2 and 3 and how to set cut scores and distributions for ELPI Status by grade span.
* **California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG):** At the June 2019 CPAG meeting, the CDE updated the CPAG on the federal ESSA waiver regarding the inclusion of RFEPs and LTELs in the ELPI. The CDE will provide the CPAG with an update on the ELPI and using the ELPI Status for LEA and school eligibility for assistance determinations at the CPAG meeting on August 22, 2019.
* **ESSA Stakeholder Meetings:** The CDE will provide the ESSA Stakeholder group with an update on the ELPI and using the ELPI Status for LEA and school eligibility for assistance determinations at the ESSA Stakeholder meetings on August 16, 2019, and October 18, 2019.
* **California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE):** At the 2019 CABE conference in March, the CDE presented on the use of multiple data sources on EL students to assist schools and districts in transitioning to the new ELPAC. The CDE also held a session on the overview of the California School Dashboard.
* **Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Stakeholder Meeting:** The CDE provided the LCFF Stakeholders with an update on the ELPI methodology considerations and use of ELPI Status for LEA and school eligibility for assistance determinations at their meeting on August 7, 2019.

## ELPI Methodology Considerations

In spring 2019, the ELPI Workgroup and the TDG provided feedback and support for the CDE’s recommendation to conduct data simulations to determine the feasibility of splitting ELPAC overall performance levels 2 and 3 to create ELPI performance levels. These groups also supported conducting simulations to set Status cut scores by grade span once two years of ELPAC SA results become available. The CDE is currently conducting data simulations using two years of ELPAC SA results. The simulations include splitting the ELPAC overall performance levels 2 and 3 into the ELPI performance levels and setting the Status cut scores by grade span.

Splitting ELPAC SA overall performance levels 2 and 3 into ELPI performance levels is being pursued to ensure that the ELPI reflects the average growth trajectory of ELs toward proficiency cited in prior research. Therefore, enough ELPI performance levels will be created to allow for EL progress to the ELPAC English language proficiency criterion (overall performance level 4 on the ELPAC SA) over a period of five to seven years. This would result in 6 ELPI levels:

1. ELPI Level1 (ELPAC SA Level 1)
2. ELPI Level 2L (ELPAC SA Low Level 2)
3. ELPI Level 2H (ELPAC SA High Level 2)
4. ELPI Level 3L (ELPAC SA Low Level 3)
5. ELPI Level 3H (ELPAC SA High Level 3)
6. ELPI Level 4 (ELPAC SA Level 4)

Splitting the ELPAC performance levels 2 and 3 for accountability purposes would allow for EL progression towards ELPAC Level 4 over a period five to seven years.

Prior research indicates EL student performance varies by grade, with students in the lower grades and lower ELP levels making more rapid gains in ELP than students in higher grades and higher ELP levels. (See Hakuta, Kenji, et al., 2000: “How Long Does It Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?” and Halle, Tamara, et al., 2013: “Predictors and Outcomes of Early vs. Later English Language Proficiency Among English Language Learners.”) Analysis conducted by the CDE on the 2018 ELPAC SA results showed that as grade level increases, the percent of students in Level 1 on the ELPAC SA increases. This trend was particularly noticeable in grades 9–12. Therefore, the CDE is considering setting ELPI Status cut scores by grade span similar to the Academic Indicator for grades 1–8 and grades 9–12. The CDE is also conducting data simulations on different grade spans to determine the most appropriate methodology for setting ELPI Status cut scores. As previously noted, the CDE will continue to meet with the ELPI Workgroup and the TDG to discuss the results and obtain feedback on the data simulations.

Note: ELPI Status reports the rate of EL students’ progressing towards ELP and as a result requires two years of ELPAC SA results to measure progress. ELPI Change requires three years of data to show the rate at which LEAs and schools are improving upon their ability to move their EL students towards ELP. With the ELPAC SA results currently limited to two years of data, the CDE will only report out on ELPI Status for the 2019 Dashboard. For the 2020 Dashboard, the CDE will report ELPI Status, Change, and overall performance color using three years of ELPAC SA results.

## ELPI Status for School and LEA Eligibility for Assistance Determinations

In November, 2018, the SBE approved the use of the ELPI Status for 2019 LCFF differentiated assistance and ESSA school assistance determinations.

In spring 2019, the CDE proposed to the ELPI Workgroup and the TDG to use only the ELPI Status of “Very Low” for LEA and school eligibility determinations. Both the ELPI Workgroup and the TDG supported the CDE’s recommendation. The ELPI Workgroup and the TDG recommended that the CDE not assign a color to ELPI Status because it may cause confusion with educators. The very low determination will only be used this year. Next year, there will be a color.

LCFF Eligibility Criteria

LEAs are eligible for LCFF differentiated assistance if they have at least one student group that meets the criteria in more than one priority area. Generally, a student group with a “Red” color on two state indicators meets the criteria. However, priority area 4 (Pupil Achievement) is an exception because this priority includes three state indicators, namely English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA), Mathematics (Math), and ELPI. LEAs may be identified for support based on:

**State Indicators Only**: Requires that one or more student groups meet the criteria in at least two LCFF State Priority Areas.

**Local Indicators Only**: Requires that at least two local indicators have a performance level of “Not Met For Two or More Years.”

**A Combination of Local and State Indicators**: This is a combination of at least one student group meeting the criteria in one priority area and only one local indicator having a performance level of “Not Met For Two or More Years” in a different priority area.

In the Table 1 example, the EL student group at Crystal Unified School District met the criteria for LCFF differentiated assistance based on state or local indicators. Note that the ELPI only reports on the EL student group.

### **Table 1: Crystal Union School District**

| **Student Groups** | **State Indicators** | **Priority Area** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| African American | (No Colors) | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | (No Colors) | N/A |
| Asian | (No Colors) | N/A |
| English Learners | **Suspension** (green)**, Graduation** (orange)**, CCI** (red)**, ELA** (red)**, Math** (red)**, EPLI Status - Very Low** | 4, 8 |
| Filipino | (No Colors) | N/A |
| Foster Youth | (No Colors) | N/A |
| Hispanic | **Suspension** (green)**, Graduation** (orange)**, CCI** (green)**, ELA** (orange)**, Math** (red) | 4 |
| Homeless | (No Colors) | N/A |
| Pacific Islander | (No Colors) | N/A |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | **Chronic** (red)**, Suspension** (green) | 5 |
| Students with Disabilities | **Suspension** (green) | N/A |
| Two or More Races | (No Colors) | N/A |
| White | **Suspension** (green)**, Graduation** (orange)**, CCI** (orange)**, ELA** (green)**, Math** (green) | N/A |

Because Crystal Unified School District’s EL student group received a “Very Low” ELPI Status and a “Red” on the ELA and Math indicators (Priority Area 4) and received a “Red” on the College/Career Indicator (Priority Area 8), this LEA is eligible for Differentiated Assistance under LCFF.

ESSA Eligibility Criteria

For ESSA eligibility for assistance, schools can be eligible for support and improvement in the following categories, but only one category at a time:

* Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) based on school level Dashboard data
* Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) based on two years of student group level Dashboard data, regardless of Title I status
* Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) based on two years of student group level Dashboard data, regardless of Title I status

Two groups of schools are eligible for CSI. The hierarchy is:

* All high schools (regardless of Title I status) with average graduation rates below 67 percent
* Lowest performing Title I schools

All Title I schools not eligible based on graduation rate can be eligible for CSI if one of the following criteria is met:

* Schools with all **Red** indicators (or ELPI Status of “Very Low”)
* Schools with all **Red** (or ELPI Status of “Very Low”) but one indicator of **any other color**
* Schools with five or more indicators where **majority** are **Red** (or ELPI Status of “Very Low”)
* Schools with all **Red** (or ELPI Status of “Very Low”) and **Orange** indicators

Note: The criteria for CSI eligibility shown above are based on current year school level indicator data and are applied in a hierarchy as the color combinations are not mutually exclusive.

The example in Table 2 shows how another Title I high school would be eligible for CSI using ELPI Status.

### **Table 2: Quartz High School (Title I School)**

| **Dashboard Year** | **State Indicator** | **Performance Level** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | ELA | Orange |
| 2019 | Math | Red |
| 2019 | ELPI Status | **Very Low** |
| 2019 | Suspension | Red |
| 2019 | Graduation Rate | Green |

Quartz High School (Title I school) is eligible for CSI because it met the “Five or more indicators where the majority are Red (or ELPI Status of “Very Low”)” criterion.

The example in Table 3 below shows how a different school becomes eligible for ATSI for the EL student group. Note that the ELPI only reports on the EL student group and that color combinations are not required to be the same for both years.

### **Table 3: EL Student Group at Agate Middle School Eligible for ATSI Example**

| **State Indicators** | **2018 Dashboard** | **2019 Dashboard** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ELA | Red | Orange |
| Mathematics | Red | Red |
| **ELPI Status** | n/a | **Very Low** |
| Chronic Absenteeism | Red | Orange |
| Suspension Rate | Green | Orange |

Agate Middle School is eligible for ATSI because the EL student group met:

* All **Red** but one indicator of any other color criterion on the 2018 Dashboard; and
* All **Red** (or ELPI Status of “Very Low”) and **Orange** indicators criterion on the 2019 Dashboard.

At the September 2019 SBE meeting, the CDE will provide the SBE with an update on the status of the data simulations using the first and second year of ELPAC SA results. The CDE will provide the TDG and ELPI Workgroup with a summary of those results in September and October of 2019, with final recommendations for the ELPI methodology to be approved at the November 2019 SBE meeting.