**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:

$$\textit{Current Year Status Results minus Prior Year Status Results}$$

**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 | |
| 71.7 | 75.00 | High |
| 75 | 76.05 | |
| 80 | 77.96 | |
| 85 | 80.17 | |
| 90 | 83.58 | |
| 91.5 | 85.00 | Very High |
| 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 | |
| 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 | |

See Handout 2

**TOM TORLAKSON**
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

# Statewide Summary ELI Results

| | 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 | |
| 70 | 74.60 | |
| 71.7 | 75.00 | High |
| 75 | 76.05 | |
| 80 | 77.96 | |
| 85 | 80.17 | |
| 90 | 83.58 | |
| 91.5 | 85.00 | Very High |
| 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<br>by more than 10% | Declined<br>by 1.5% to 10% | Maintained<br>Declined or improved by less than 1.5% | Increased<br>by 1.5% to less than 10% | Increased Significantly<br>by 10% or more |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very High<br>85% or more | Yellow | Green | Blue | Blue | Blue |
| High<br>75% to less than 85% | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Blue |
| Median<br>67% to less than 75% | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green |
| Low<br>60% to less than 67% | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Yellow |
| Very Low<br>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.