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## Summary of Key Issues

On October 24, 2022, the California Department of Education (CDE) publicly released the 2021–22 aggregated results for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

The 2021–22 CAASPP summary reports included all results for the following assessments:

* Smarter Balanced English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics summative assessments
* California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and mathematics
* California Science Test
* California Spanish Assessment

The CAA for Science results will be publicly released in December.

The 2021–22 ELPAC summary reports included all results for the following assessments:

* Initial ELPAC
* Summative ELPAC
* Summative Alternate ELPAC

The aggregate results can be found on the Test Results for California’s Assessments website at <https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/>.

The 2021–22 administration marks the return to full statewide administration of CAASPP testing for the first time since 2018–19. The statewide Initial and Summative ELPAC testing was available to students throughout the pandemic to ensure that eligible students were identified and received appropriate programs and services. The Alternate ELPAC operational field test in 2021–22 provided the results to inform the Summative Alternate ELPAC reporting for the first time.

When comparing 2021–22 results to test results prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is important to consider the environmental conditions and challenges experienced by students, families, and educators during the pandemic. Statewide assessment results are only one piece of the bigger picture and should be considered alongside other measures such as classroom and district assessments to better understand students’ strengths and areas for improvement. Educators familiar with the specific context surrounding teaching and learning can consider assessment results to make data-driven program decisions.

On October 24, 2022, the CDE publicly released the statewide assessment data via a news release (Attachment 1). As part of the release the CDE provided an *Interpretation Guide to the 2021–22 Statewide Assessment Results* (Attachment 2). This guide was developed to provide essential background and factors to consider when interpreting California’s 2021–22 statewide assessment results.

## Attachment(s)

* Attachment 1: 2021–22 Assessment Date Show Impact of COVID-19, Demonstrate Importance of State Recovery Efforts (4 Pages).
* Attachment 2: *Interpretation Guide to the 2021–22 Statewide Assessment Results* (46 Pages).
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2021–22 Assessment Data Show Impact of COVID-19, Demonstrate Importance of State Recovery Efforts

***Data show hopeful signs of recovery compared to 2021, though English language arts and mathematics scores still down from pre-pandemic levels.***

***According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, California students lost less ground between 2019 and 2022 than students nationally in math and reading and held steady in eighth grade reading while the nation as a whole declined.***

SACRAMENTO––The California Department of Education (CDE) released assessment data today that provide further evidence of the impact of COVID-19 on student academic achievement and underscore the urgency of continuing to address student needs through focused efforts such as expanded learning time and learning acceleration strategies.

Statewide, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards on the 2022 Smarter Balanced summative assessments declined by 4 percentage points (from 51 percent to 47 percent) for English language arts (ELA) and 7 percentage points (from 40 percent to 33 percent) for mathematics when compared to students who took the tests in 2018–19—before the pandemic. The results released today include California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) data.

However, a comparison with data from the state’s 2020–21 ELA and mathematics assessments suggests that recovery may already be underway. In the spring of 2021, about 25 percent of students in grades three through eight and eleven—or about 740,000 students—participated in the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics. An analysis of that cohort—looking at the same students who took the test in 2021 and comparing their results to 2022—showed steeper-than-normal achievement gains at most grade levels, a hopeful sign that the state’s robust investments in accelerating learning are paying off.

The release today follows the earlier posting of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results in reading and math for fourth- and eighth-graders nationwide. Like most of the country, California’s NAEP math scores declined from 2019 to 2022, though not by as much as the average drop nationally. In reading, California fourth graders’ scores also experienced a small decline that was less than the drop nationally. Of particular note: California eighth graders held steady with no decline in reading over the 2019 NAEP while the nation as a whole saw a drop.

As a result, California moved up in NAEP’s state-by-state ordering in both math and reading. In addition, Los Angeles Unified School District was the only Trial Urban District Assessment participant to show significant gains in grade eight reading.

“These baseline data underscore what many of us know: that the road to recovery is long and our students will need sustained support over many years,” said State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond. “California has worked proactively to provide additional resources to help our students beyond 2024, when the federal relief funding expires. Through the $7.9 billion Learning Recovery Block Grant available to schools in this year’s state budget, $4 billion in the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program, and $250 million for literacy coaches for our most vulnerable students, the CDE will continue to work with schools so they identify the right tools and resources to address academic, behavioral, and mental health needs.”

## Statewide 2022 Scores Decline from Pre-Pandemic Levels, Some Bright Spots

State data released today come from the spring 2022 administration of the ELPAC and CAASPP, which includes Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics, the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and mathematics, and the California Spanish Assessment.

The 2022 assessment administration marked the return to full statewide participation in CAASPP and ELPAC testing for the first time since 2019.

For ELA and mathematics, lower grades saw larger differentials from 2019 than higher grades.

For the California Science Test (CAST), student scores were generally consistent with pre-pandemic levels, with small increases for some groups in some grades and small decreases in others.

For CAAs for ELA and mathematics, results were consistent with prior years.

For the Summative ELPAC, English learners in grades five through twelve performed better in 2022 than in 2019, while lower grades tested showed slight declines. The percentage of students overall achieving at the highest performance level—indicating they have well-developed oral and written English language skills—was 16 percent in 2018–19, decreasing to 14 percent in 2020–21 and returning to 16 percent in 2021–22. Increases in 2021–22 were seen in nearly all grade levels and were especially strong at grade twelve.

## While Limited in Scope, 2022 Cohort Analysis Shows Marked Improvement from Prior Year, Suggesting Acceleration Efforts Are Working

The increases in matched cohort student scores in ELA and mathematics between 2020–21 and 2021–22 suggest that the state’s focus on learning recovery is working and critical to helping all students excel and thrive in years to come. (More specific details about the *Two-Year Matched Cohort Analysis are* available in the Interpretation Guide to the 2021–22 Statewide Assessment Results document on the CDE California Assessment Results News Release web page [<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caasppelpacnews.asp>].)

Since 2021, California has invested $4.4 billion one-time and $4 billion ongoing in state funds in expanding learning opportunities beyond traditional school hours and $7.9 billion in the Learning Recovery Block Grant to fund such programs as high-dose tutoring.

“Now is not the time to take our foot off the accelerator when it comes to doing everything we can to help all our students progress toward mastery of our learning standards and thrive in every way in school,” said California State Board of Education President Linda Darling-Hammond. “California’s investments in important initiatives such as high-dose tutoring, professional development for teachers, and expanded learning time, and in such areas as mental health and wellness, are critical to lifting up academic performance across the board while supporting students’ well-being.”

## Considering Context of Assessment Results

Data from the 2021–22 spring assessments should be considered “baseline data” for measuring student progress going forward due to the challenges presented by the pandemic.

In the 2019–20 school year—a year in which schools quickly pivoted to remote learning after the discovery of COVID-19 in California—the U.S. Department of Education waived all testing requirements.

To further prevent the spread of virus before the development and widespread distribution of vaccines, most students learned from home for most of 2020–21 and returned to campuses in the spring either full-time or with hybrid (in-class and remote) instruction.

In the 2020–21 school year, the U.S. Department of Education required states to administer statewide academic assessments in ELA, mathematics, and science as well as the English language proficiency assessments—with some flexibilities. Districts that were unable to administer the statewide summative assessment in 2020–21, because it was not a viable option due to factors related to COVID-19, gauged student learning through locally selected assessments that met certain requirements.

In addition to these flexibilities, the California State Board of Education also approved use of adjusted test blueprints for the Smarter Balanced ELA and math tests, mindful of the need to maximize instructional time to accelerate learning and to minimize difficulties in online testing conditions.

Assessment results for the CAASPP and ELPAC are available to the public on the Test Results for California’s Assessments website [<https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/>]

To provide essential background and factors to consider when interpreting California’s 2021–22 statewide assessment results, the CDE created the *Interpretation Guide to the 2021–22 Statewide Assessment Results*, which can be found on the CDE California Assessment Results News Release web page. [<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caasppelpacnews.asp>]

NAEP results, including those for California and all other states, are available on The Nation’s Report Card website. [<https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/>]
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**News Release**

**2021–22 Assessment Data Show Impact of COVID-19, Demonstrate Importance of State Recovery Efforts**

***Data show hopeful signs of recovery compared to 2021, though English language arts and mathematics scores still down from pre-pandemic levels.***

***According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, California students lost less ground between 2019 and 2022 than students nationally in math and reading and held steady in eighth grade reading while the nation as a whole declined.***

SACRAMENTO––TheCalifornia Department of Education (CDE) released assessment data today that provide further evidence of the impact of COVID-19 on student academic achievement and underscore the urgency of continuing to address student needs through focused efforts such as expanded learning time and learning acceleration strategies.

Statewide, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards on the 2022 Smarter Balanced summative assessments declined by 4 percentage points (from 51 percent to 47 percent) for English language arts (ELA) and 7 percentage points (from 40 percent to 33 percent) for mathematics when compared to students who took the tests in 2018–19—before the pandemic. The results released today include California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) data.

However, a comparison with data from the state’s 2020–21 ELA and mathematics assessments suggests that recovery may already be underway. In the spring of 2021, about 25 percent of students in grades three through eight and eleven—or about 740,000 students—participated in the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics. An analysis of that cohort—looking at the same students who took the test in 2021 and comparing their results to 2022—showed steeper-than-normal achievement gains at most grade levels, a hopeful sign that the state’s robust investments in accelerating learning are paying off.

The release today follows the earlier posting of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results in reading and math for fourth- and eighth-graders nationwide. Like most of the country, California’s NAEP math scores declined from 2019 to 2022, though not by as much as the average drop nationally. In reading, California fourth graders’ scores also experienced a small decline that was less than the drop nationally. Of particular note: California eighth graders held steady with no decline in reading over the 2019 NAEP while the nation as a whole saw a drop.

As a result, California moved up in NAEP’s state-by-state ordering in both math and reading. In addition, Los Angeles Unified School District was the only Trial Urban District Assessment participant to show significant gains in grade eight reading.

“These baseline data underscore what many of us know: that the road to recovery is long and our students will need sustained support over many years,” said State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond. “California has worked proactively to provide additional resources to help our students beyond 2024, when the federal relief funding expires. Through the $7.9 billion Learning Recovery Block Grant available to schools in this year’s state budget, $4 billion in the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program, and $250 million for literacy coaches for our most vulnerable students, the CDE will continue to work with schools so they identify the right tools and resources to address academic, behavioral, and mental health needs.”

**Statewide 2022 Scores Decline from Pre-Pandemic Levels, Some Bright Spots**

State data released today come from the spring 2022 administration of the ELPAC and CAASPP, which includes Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics, the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and mathematics, and the California Spanish Assessment.

The 2022 assessment administration marked the return to full statewide participation in CAASPP and ELPAC testing for the first time since 2019.

For ELA and mathematics, lower grades saw larger differentials from 2019 than higher grades.

For the California Science Test (CAST), student scores were generally consistent with pre-pandemic levels, with small increases for some groups in some grades and small decreases in others.

For CAAs for ELA and mathematics, results were consistent with prior years.

For the Summative ELPAC, English learners in grades five through twelve performed better in 2022 than in 2019, while lower grades tested showed slight declines. The percentage of students overall achieving at the highest performance level—indicating they have well-developed oral and written English language skills—was 16 percent in 2018–19, decreasing to 14 percent in 2020–21 and returning to 16 percent in 2021–22. Increases in 2021–22 were seen in nearly all grade levels and were especially strong at grade twelve.

**While Limited in Scope, 2022 Cohort Analysis Shows Marked Improvement from Prior Year, Suggesting Acceleration Efforts Are Working**

The increases in matched cohort student scores in ELA and mathematics between 2020–21 and 2021–22 suggest that the state’s focus on learning recovery is working and critical to helping all students excel and thrive in years to come. (More specific details about the *Two-Year Matched Cohort Analysis* are available in the Interpretation Guide to the 2021–22 Statewide Assessment Results document on the [CDE California Assessment Results News Release web page](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caasppelpacnews.asp).)

Since 2021, California has invested $4.4 billion one-time and $4 billion ongoing in state funds in expanding learning opportunities beyond traditional school hours and $7.9 billion in the Learning Recovery Block Grant to fund such programs as high-dose tutoring.

“Now is not the time to take our foot off the accelerator when it comes to doing everything we can to help all our students progress toward mastery of our learning standards and thrive in every way in school,” said California State Board of Education President Linda Darling-Hammond. “California’s investments in important initiatives such as high-dose tutoring, professional development for teachers, and expanded learning time, and in such areas as mental health and wellness, are critical to lifting up academic performance across the board while supporting students’ well-being.”

**Considering Context of Assessment Results**

Data from the 2021–22 spring assessments should be considered “baseline data” for measuring student progress going forward due to the challenges presented by the pandemic.

In the 2019–20 school year—a year in which schools quickly pivoted to remote learning after the discovery of COVID-19 in California—the U.S. Department of Education waived all testing requirements.

To further prevent the spread of virus before the development and widespread distribution of vaccines, most students learned from home for most of 2020–21 and returned to campuses in the spring either full-time or with hybrid (in-class and remote) instruction.

In the 2020–21 school year, the U.S. Department of Education required states to administer statewide academic assessments in ELA, mathematics, and science as well as the English language proficiency assessments—with some flexibilities. Districts that were unable to administer the statewide summative assessment in 2020–21, because it was not a viable option due to factors related to COVID-19, gauged student learning through locally selected assessments that met certain requirements.

In addition to these flexibilities, the California State Board of Education also approved use of adjusted test blueprints for the Smarter Balanced ELA and math tests, mindful of the need to maximize instructional time to accelerate learning and to minimize difficulties in online testing conditions.

Assessment results for the CAASPP and ELPAC are available to the public on the [Test Results for California’s Assessments website](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/).

To provide essential background and factors to consider when interpreting California’s 2021–22 statewide assessment results, the CDE created the *Interpretation Guide to the 2021–22 Statewide Assessment Results*, which can be found on the [CDE California Assessment Results News Release web page](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/caasppelpacnews.asp).

NAEP results, including those for California and all other states, are available on [The Nation’s Report Card website](https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/).

**Statewide Results Summary and Interpretation Guide**

The purpose of this interpretation guide is to provide essential background information and factors to consider when interpreting California’s 2021–22 statewide assessment results, which include statewide summary results for the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

The 2021–22 administration marks the return to full statewide administration by local educational agencies (LEAs) of the CAASPP and ELPAC for the first time since 2018–19. The 2019–20, 2020–21, and 2021–22 school years presented unprecedented challenges for communities, educators, students, and parents/guardians due to the impacts of the 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. To reduce the overall testing time for students, while still providing a valid measure of student achievement in English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics, California used the 2020–21 and 2021–22 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics adjusted form blueprints that were initially approved by the California State Board of Education in November 2020. This allowed for more participation in testing given the challenges of remote engagement for many students. The federal testing requirement was waived altogether for the 2019–20 school year because of the outbreak of COVID-19, so statewide data does not exist for that school year.

To access the 2021–22 CAASPP and ELPAC statewide assessment results, visit the [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/) website.

**Suggested Interpretation Guidance**

The context surrounding teaching and learning in the 2021–22 school year was different for many LEAs compared to the prepandemic context and should be considered when interpreting the 2021–22 CAASPP results. The continued impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on students, families, and educators is significant, and has impacted student assessment results. However, there are other considerations to consider as well.

In 2021–22, approximately 2.9 million students were administered the ELA and mathematics assessments. This is comparable to test administrations prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., 2018–19 and earlier), when more than 3.2 million students were assessed for ELA and mathematics via the CAASPP. However, in 2020–21, LEAs used locally selected assessments when administering the CAASPP was not a viable option. In that year, almost 750,000 students completed the Smarter Balanced ELA and mathematics assessments, which resulted in some differences in the demographics of the test-taking population (detailed later in this guide). Additionally, when comparing 2021–22 results to test results prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is important to consider the environmental conditions and challenges experienced by students, families, and educators during the pandemic.

When making decisions or inferences about education programs and policies, it is important to use a variety of data sources. Even though California has returned to full statewide administration of the CAASPP, the specific context and conditions of the learning experience within any given school and LEA must be considered. Assessment results are only one measure of student achievement and should be used in conjunction with other data and measures (e.g., other state Dashboard data, report card grades, class tests, and observations) when making instructional or programmatic decisions.

Transparency during this time is imperative; therefore, the California Department of Education (CDE) is providing the statewide data tables that follow for informational purposes.

**Important Terminology**

It is important to introduce some terminology used throughout this interpretation guide to describe the observed patterns:

* ***Decrease***means student scores are lower than they were for a previous group of students, but without accounting for differences between groups.
* ***Increase*** means student scores are higher than they were for a previous group of students, but without accounting for differences between groups.
* ***Cohort*** means a group of students included in the analysis who share a common characteristic. The following cohorts were used in the analysis included in this interpretation guide:

A single-year cohort means a group of students in the same grade in the same year (e.g., this year’s grade four student cohort versus last year’s grade four student cohort).

A demographic cohort means a group of students in the same grade, in the same year, and in the same student group (e.g., the 2018–19 cohort of grade seven students who were economically disadvantaged).

A matched cohort means following the same group of students across multiple grades and years (e.g., the students who were seventh graders in 2020–21 who became eighth graders in 2021–22).

**2021–22 CAASPP Summary Reports**

The CAASPP summary reports include results for the following assessment programs:

* Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics
* California Science Test (CAST)
* California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) for ELA and mathematics
* California Spanish Assessment (CSA)

The results for the CAA for Science will be released publicly in December 2022.

For more information about each assessment, go to the CDE [CAASPP System](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/) web page.

**Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and Mathematics**

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics are administered to students in grades three through eight and grade eleven. They are designed to measure students’ mastery of the Common Core State Standards in ELA and mathematics. Students in grade eleven are encouraged to take advantage of the Early Assessment Program, which allows them to demonstrate, through the statewide assessments, their readiness for college-level coursework in English and mathematics. Student scores can inform their placement as a first-time freshman in the appropriate general education English and mathematics courses once they enroll at the California State University (CSU) or a participating California Community College.

**Overall Summary**

Table 1 and table 2 (Smarter Balanced for ELA and Smarter Balanced for mathematics, respectively) show, by student group, numbers of students tested, percentages of all tested students coming from that group, and the percentage of the tested students from that group who met or exceeded standards. The tables provide those results for 2018–19, 2020–21, and 2021–‍22.

In table 1 and table 2, the three columns entitled *Percent Tested in 2018–19*, *Percent Tested in 2020–21\**, and *Percent Tested in 2021–22* show that, for the student demographic groups reported here, the cohorts tested in all three years were reasonably similar, with 2020–21 having slightly larger discrepancies than the other two years. For example, the largest percentage-point differences (marked with “\*\*”) were no greater than 5 percentage points, with proportionally fewer Hispanic or Latino students in that year (51 percent vs. 55 percent in 2018–‍19) and fewer economically disadvantaged students (61 percent vs. 56 percent in 2018–‍19). However, only 25 percent of eligible students were assessed using the CAASPP in 2020–21, which may account for these differences.

Additionally, the asterisk (\*) in the columns for 2020–21 data indicates that the difference in the number of students assessed in 2020–21 may create differences in other demographic areas not captured in California data systems that impact statewide assessment data for that year. This data should not be compared to other years without accounting for differences between the portion of students who tested in 2020–21 and the larger populations of students who tested in other years.

Table 1 shows the student data for Smarter Balanced for ELA.

Table 1. Smarter Balanced for ELA Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested in** 2018–19 | **Number Tested in** 2020–21\* | **Number Tested in** 2021–22 | **Percent** Tested in 2018–19 | **Percent** Tested in 2020–21\* | **Percent** Tested in 2021–22 | **Percent Met or Exceeded in** 2018–19 | **Percent Met or Exceeded in** 2020–21\* | **Percent Met or Exceeded in** 2021–22 |
| All Students | 3,165,580 | 743,626 | 2,969,670 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 51 | 49 | 47 |
| Female | 1,548,642 | 367,928 | 1,449,399 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 56 | 54 | 51 |
| Male | 1,616,938 | 375,522 | 1,518,659 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 46 | 44 | 43 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 15,700 | 4,846 | 12,866 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 33 | 33 |
| Asian | 294,249 | 73,151 | 290,032 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 77 | 75 | 75 |
| Black or African American | 167,750 | 30,412 | 149,464 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 33 | 34 | 30 |
| Filipino | 69,448 | 16,343 | 70,214 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 72 | 70 | 70 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,743,796 | 381,635 | 1,668,656 | 55 | 51\*\* | 56\*\* | 41 | 38 | 36 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 14,492 | 3,413 | 12,636 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 43 | 40 |
| Two or more races | 146,023 | 40,838 | 152,711 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 66 | 60 | 60 |
| White | 714,122 | 192,988 | 613,091 | 23 | 26 | 21 | 66 | 60 | 61 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 1,930,727 | 414,024 | 1,777,246 | 61\*\* | 56\*\* | 60 | 39 | 36 | 35 |
| English learner | 511,610 | 115,004 | 529,009 | 16 | 15 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 12 |
| Foster youth | N/A | N/A | 10,775 | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | 21 |
| Homeless | 113,488 | 17,398 | 90,821 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 33 | 30 | 28 |
| Migrant education | 25,360 | 5,984 | 21,964 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 25 | 25 |
| Military | 33,653 | 8,876 | 44,566 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 60 | 54 | 51 |
| Students with disability | 366,469 | 78,348 | 350,431 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 15 | 16 |

Table 2 shows the student data for Smarter Balanced for Mathematics.

Table 2. Smarter Balanced for Mathematics Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested in** 2018–19 | **Number Tested in** 2020–21\* | **Number Tested in** 2021–22 | **Percent** Tested in 2018–19 | **Percent** Tested in 2020–21\* | **Percent** Tested in 2021–22 | **Percent Met or** Exceeded in 2018–19 | **Percent Met or Exceeded in 2020–21**\* | **Percent Met or Exceeded in** 2021–22 |
| All Students | 3,173,560 | 749,948 | 2,973,472 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 40 | 34 | 33 |
| Female | 1,552,022 | 370,627 | 1,450,770 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 39 | 33 | 32 |
| Male | 1,621,538 | 379,148 | 1,521,097 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 40 | 34 | 35 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 15,664 | 4,748 | 12,827 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 19 | 21 |
| Asian | 296,973 | 73,090 | 291,725 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 74 | 69 | 69 |
| Black or African American | 167,125 | 31,224 | 148,723 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 18 | 16 |
| Filipino | 69,696 | 16,442 | 70,089 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 60 | 53 | 54 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,749,679 | 385,277 | 1,671,626 | 55 | 51\*\* | 56\*\* | 28 | 20 | 21 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 14,455 | 3,495 | 12,616 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 27 | 25 |
| Two or more races | 146,184 | 41,361 | 153,397 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 55 | 47 | 47 |
| White | 713,784 | 194,311 | 612,469 | 22 | 26 | 21 | 54 | 45 | 48 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 1,935,813 | 416,875 | 1,778,270 | 61\*\* | 56\*\* | 60 | 27 | 20 | 21 |
| English learner | 524,483 | 116,896 | 540,458 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 13 | 8 | 10 |
| Foster youth | N/A | N/A | 10,707 | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | 10 |
| Homeless | 114,958 | 18,457 | 91,954 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 23 | 16 | 16 |
| Migrant education | 25,732 | 5,947 | 22,279 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 13 | 14 |
| Military | 33,599 | 8,669 | 44,476 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 48 | 38 | 37 |
| Students with disability | 365,094 | 79,183 | 348,888 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 11 |

**Score Trends by Grade Level**

Figure 1 through figure 7 show ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for, respectively, grades three through eight and grade eleven. Each figure has two panels: one for ELA on the left and one for mathematics on the right. These figures include the following notations:

* 2020–21 is marked with an open circle to call out the fact that less than the total population of enrolled students was tested.
* The 2020–21 data is connected to 2018–19 and 2021–22 data with dotted lines to indicate that comparing 2018–19 results to more recent years must incorporate the considerations noted previously.

***Patterns in the Data***

There are some notable patterns visible in figure 1 through figure 7. Refer to the [Important Terminology](#_Important_Terminology) section of this interpretation guide for definitions used when describing the patterns.

**Grades three through six.** Figure 1 through figure 4 visually show a decrease in performance in 2020–21 over 2018–19 and some increase in 2021–22 over 2020–21. It is encouraging that the gains between 2020–21 and 2021–22 were experienced even as the population of students included in 2021–22 contained proportionally greater numbers of economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English learners, and students experiencing homelessness, as well as Black or African American and Hispanic or Latino students—groups that have historically scored lower on state assessments than others.

Figure 1, which uses data from [table A.1](#tableA1), displays ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade three. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 1. Mean scale score trends for ELA and mathematics—grade three

Figure 2, which uses data from [table A.2](#tableA2), displays ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade four. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 2. Mean scale score trends for ELA and mathematics—grade four

Figure 3, which uses data from [table A.3](#tableA3), displays ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade five. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 3. Mean scale score trends for ELA and mathematics—grade five

Figure 4, which uses data from [table A.4](#tableA4), displays ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade six. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 4. Mean scale score trends for ELA and mathematics—grade six

**Grades seven and eight.** Figure 5 and figure 6 visually show a decrease in performance in 2020–21 and another in 2021–22, with decreases being relatively larger in mathematics than in ELA (resulting in 2020–21 and 2021–22 mean scale scores at historically low points).

Figure 5, which uses data from [table A.5](#tableA5), displays ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade seven. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 5. Mean scale score trends for ELA and mathematics—grade seven

Figure 6, which uses data from [table A.6](#tableA6), displays ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade eight. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 6. Mean scale score trends for ELA and mathematics—grade eight

**Grade eleven.** Figure 7 shows an increase in performance in 2020–21 to historically high levels and a marked decrease in 2021–22 to much lower levels (with relatively larger changes in mathematics). The unusual increase in 2020–21 scores may have been due to the fact that students in grade eleven who were college bound were substantially overrepresented as a result of CSU placement policies that encouraged them to take advantage of the statewide assessment to demonstrate their readiness for college-level coursework in English and mathematics.

Figure 7, which uses data from [table A.7](#tableA7), displays ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade eleven. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 7. Mean scale score trends for ELA and mathematics—grade eleven

**Two-Year Matched Cohort Analysis**

A two-year matched cohort analysis is provided next to explore how much learning increased for the same students at two points in time between 2020–21 and 2021–22. This analysis takes advantage of an availability to measure students’ prior scores in 2020–21 and a baseline taken from scores obtained in the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years to compare against scores obtained in the 2021–22 school year. These results were produced by the following means:

* Establishing the prepandemic relationships between scores one year and one grade level apart (i.e., 2017–18 and 2018–19)
* Using those established prepandemic relationships to estimate how students who tested in 2020–21 would have scored in 2021–22 if the only difference were the school year in which they were in the same grade level (This analysis assumes that relationships between scores one grade level and one year apart would not have changed for any other reason than learning increasing or continuing to decrease in 2021–22.)
* Students starting out at different places on the score in one grade level tend to show different gains in the next grade levels (For ease of interpretation, gains for students starting out in different places on the score scale were combined to give a single estimate of typical learning.)[[1]](#footnote-2)

A caution with this analysis is that the data used is limited to students who tested in 2020–21. It is unclear whether the same degree of increases or decreases in learning would be applicable to students who were not tested with the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments in
2020–21.

Figure 8 through figure 12 show these results for grades four through eight, respectively. In these figures, the various elements of each panel have the following meaning:

* The circle at the left of the solid, top, diagonal line is the location of the average score in 2017–18.
* The circle at the right of the solid, top, diagonal line is where that same average student scored in 2018–19 after progressing one grade level in one year.
* The circle at the left of the solid, bottom, diagonal line is where the average **tested** student scored in 2020–21.
* The circle at the right of the solid, bottom, diagonal line is where that same average **tested** student scored after progressing one grade level in one year.

The results in these figures indicate that, as shown in figure 8 through figure 12, the average scale scores in 2020–21 started out lower than the average scale scores in 2017–18. Additional elements of these figures have the following meaning:

* The circle at the right of the bottom, dashed, diagonal line is where the average 2020–21 tested student would have scored in 2021–22.
* The connector between the bottom two circles at the right gives an estimate of the rate of change, either positive or negative, between 2020–21 and 2021–22.

Rate of change is the difference between mean scale scores from one year and grade to the next year and next grade. These figures show the rate of change for the portion of students tested in 2020–21 compared to their expected rate of change, calculated based on the two years before the pandemic.

Figure 8, which uses data from [table A.8](#tableA8), displays the mean scale scores for the 2020–21 grade three matched cohorts into grade four in 2021–22. The rate of change for this cohort was 26 percent greater in ELA and 20 percent greater in mathematics than would have been expected for a similar prepandemic group of students (i.e., students in 2017–18 with similar grade three mean scale scores followed into grade four in 2018–19).

 

Figure 8. Mean scale scores for grade four matched cohorts

Figure 9, which uses data from [table A.9](#tableA9), displays the mean scale scores for the 2020–21 grade four matched cohorts into grade five in 2021–22. The rate of change for this cohort was 21 percent greater in ELA and 24 percent greater in mathematics than would have been expected for a similar prepandemic group of students (i.e., students in 2017–18 with similar grade four mean scale scores followed into grade five in 2018–19).

 

Figure 9. Mean scale scores for grade five matched cohorts

Figure 10, which uses data from [table A.10](#tableA10), displays the mean scale scores for the 2020–21 grade five matched cohorts into grade six in 2021–22. The rate of change for this cohort was 2 percent less in ELA and 35 percent greater in mathematics than would have been expected for a similar prepandemic group of students (i.e., students in 2017–18 with similar grade five mean scale scores followed into grade six in 2018–19).

 

Figure 10. Mean scale scores for grade six matched cohorts

Figure 11, which uses data from [table A.11](#tableA11), displays the mean scale scores for the 2020–21 grade six matched cohorts into grade seven in 2020–21. The rate of change for this cohort was 25 percent greater in ELA and 52 percent greater in mathematics than would have been expected for a similar prepandemic group of students (i.e., students in 2017–18 with similar grade six mean scale scores followed into grade seven in 2018–19).

 

Figure 11. Mean scale scores for grade seven matched cohorts

Figure 12, which uses data from [table A.12](#tableA12), displays the mean scale scores for the 2020–21 grade seven matched cohorts into grade eight in 2021–22. The rate of change for this cohort was 14 percent less in ELA and 35 percent less in mathematics than would have been expected for a similar prepandemic group of students (i.e., students in 2017–18 with similar grade seven mean scale scores followed into grade eight in 2018–19).

 

Figure 12. Mean scale scores for grade eight matched cohorts

**California Science Test Scores and Results**

The CAST is administered to students in grades five and eight and once in high school (i.e., grade ten, eleven, or twelve). It is aligned with the California Next Generation Science Standards and is designed to measure what students should know and be able to do in science and understand about how science works in the natural world. This assessment uses questions that bring together science content, practices, and concepts and covers all three science domains: Earth and Space Sciences, Life Sciences, and Physical Sciences. The results from each content area are combined to form an overall science score.

**Overall Summary**

Table 3 shows, by student group, numbers of students tested, percentages of all tested students coming from that group, and the percentages of the tested students from that group who met or exceeded standards. The table provides those results for 2018–19, 2020–21, and 2021–22.

In table 3, the three columns entitled *Percent Tested in 2018–19*, *Percent Tested in 2020–21\**, and *Percent Tested in 2021–22* show that, for the student demographic groups reported here, the cohorts tested in all three years were reasonably similar, with 2020–21 having slightly larger discrepancies than the other two years. The largest percentage-point differences related to the student demographics groups measured in this table (marked with “\*\*”) were no greater than 5 percent. However, more than 75 percent of eligible students were not assessed using the CAST in 2021–22, which is likely driving these differences.

Additionally, the asterisk (\*) in the columns for 2020–21 data indicates that the difference in the number of students assessed in 2020–21 may create differences in other demographic areas not captured in California data systems that impact statewide assessment data for that year. This data should not be compared to other years without accounting for differences between the portion of students who tested in 2020–21 and the larger populations of students who tested in other years.

Table 3 shows the student data for the CAST.

Table 3. CAST Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested in 2018–19** | **Number Tested in 2020–21\*** | **Number Tested in 2021–22** | **Percent Tested in 2018–19** | **Percent Tested in 2020–21\*** | **Percent Tested in2021–22** | **Percent Met or Exceeded in2018–19** | **Percent Met or Exceeded in 2020–21\*** | **Percent Met or Exceeded in2021–22** |
| All Students | 1,477,006 | 247,801 | 1,506,167 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 29 | 29 |
| Female | 724,036 | 123,042 | 734,670 | 49 | 50 | 49 | 30 | 28 | 28 |
| Male | 752,970 | 124,691 | 770,378 | 51 | 50 | 51 | 30 | 29 | 30 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7,486 | 1,714 | 6,418 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 19 | 20 |
| Asian | 141,013 | 25,169 | 148,929 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 59 | 60 | 59 |
| Black or African American | 78,167 | 8,992 | 74,770 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Filipino | 36,890 | 6,234 | 38,723 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 44 | 43 | 47 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 802,572 | 128,992 | 846,924 | 54 | 52 | 56 | 19 | 16 | 18 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 6,870 | 943 | 6,504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 19 | 21 |
| Two or more races | 53,277 | 11,645 | 69,382 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 45 | 41 | 43 |
| White | 341,893 | 64,112 | 314,517 | 23 | 26\*\* | 21\*\* | 44 | 40 | 44 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 877,811 | 139,681 | 887,068 | 59 | 56 | 59 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| English learner | 190,718 | 31,167 | 209,968 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

Table 3 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | Number Tested in 2018–19 | Number Tested in 2020–21\* | Number Tested in 2021–22 | Percent Tested in 2018–19 | Percent Tested in 2020–21\* | Percent Tested in 2021–22 | Percent Met or Exceeded in 2018–19 | Percent Met or Exceeded in 2020–21\* | Percent Met or Exceeded in 2021–22 |
| Foster youth | N/A | N/A | 5,176 | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | 9 |
| Homeless | 50,767 | 6,889 | 44,173 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 13 | 13 |
| Migrant education | 11,475 | 2,075 | 11,076 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 12 |
| Military | 17,482 | 3,396 | 23,607 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 34 | 33 | 31 |
| Students with disability | 160,762 | 25,257 | 168,782 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 8 |

**Score Trends by Grade Level and Grade Band**

Figure 13 shows the CAST mean scale score trends across time for, respectively, grade five, grade eight, and high school. This figure includes the following notations:

* 2020–21 is marked with an open circle to call out the fact that less than the total population of enrolled students was tested.
* The 2020–21 data is connected to 2018–19 and 2021–22 data with dotted lines to indicate that comparing 2018–19 results to more recent years must incorporate the considerations noted previously.

Figure 13, which uses data from [table A.13](#tableA13), shows a decrease in performance in 2020–21 and a return to 2018–19 levels in 2021–22 for grades five and eight, and an increase from 2018–19 to 2020–21 in high school, maintaining that level in 2021–22. Because the CAST was new in 2018–19, longer-term trend data is unavailable to inform hypotheses about why these changes may have occurred. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*) were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 13. Mean scale score trend for the CAST—grade five, grade eight, and high school

**California Alternate Assessments for ELA and Mathematics**

The CAAs were developed for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and are administered to these students one-on-one. The CAAs for ELA and mathematics are administered to eligible students in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs for ELA and mathematics are aligned with alternate achievement standards—called the Core Content Connectors—and linked to the Common Core State Standards for ELA and mathematics.

**Overall Summary**

The ELA section of the CAA program includes subsections on reading (e.g., literacy, informational, vocabulary, and foundational) and writing. The results from each subsection are combined to form an overall ELA score. The mathematics section of the CAA program includes subsections (e.g., mathematical operations, geometry, ratio and proportional relationships, function, equations, etc.) that are combined to form an overall mathematics score. Students are considered having achieved Understanding on a CAA section if they scored at Level 3 for that grade level for the section.

Table 4 and table 5 (CAA for ELA and CAA for mathematics, respectively) show, by student group, numbers of students tested, percentages of all tested students coming from that group, and the percentages of the tested students from that group who achieved Level 3. The tables provide those results for 2018–19, 2020–21, and 2021–22.

Overall, there were small decreases in the proportions of students meeting Level 3 from 2018–‍19 to 2021–22 in both ELA (from 16 percent to 14 percent) and mathematics (from 10 percent to 8 percent).

Table 4 shows the student data for the CAA for ELA.

Table 4. CAA for ELA Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Percent of Students in Level 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested in** 2018–19 | **Number Tested in** 2020–21 | **Number Tested in** 2021–22 | **Percent** Tested in 2018–19 | **Percent** Tested in 2020–21\* | **Percent** Tested in 2021–22 | **Percent Level 3 in 2018–19** | **Percent Level 3 in 2020–21** | **Percent Level 3 in** 2021–22 |
| All Students | 37,492 | 11,118 | 33,189 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 16 | 17 | 14 |
| Female | 12,190 | 3,484 | 10,373 | 33 | 31 | 31 | 15 | 16 | 13 |
| Male | 25,302 | 7,634 | 22,813 | 67 | 69 | 69 | 16 | 17 | 15 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 241 | 82 | 180 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 22 | 19 |
| Asian | 2,900 | 904 | 2,864 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 10 |
| Black or African American | 3,039 | 699 | 2,508 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 13 |
| Filipino | 984 | 245 | 963 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 21,458 | 5,897 | 19,339 | 57 | 53 | 58 | 16 | 17 | 15 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 168 | 41 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 11 |
| Two or more races | 1,523 | 534 | 1,459 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 17 | 21 | 14 |
| White | 7,179 | 2,716 | 5,727 | 19 | 24 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 16 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 24,552 | 6,813 | 21,325 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 17 | 19 | 15 |
| English learner | 11,157 | 2,604 | 8,691 | 30 | 23 | 26 | 15 | 16 | 14 |
| Foster youth | N/A | N/A | 347 | N/A | N/A | 1 | N/A | N/A | 17 |
| Homeless | 1,260 | 336 | 1,019 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Migrant education | 206 | 57 | 188 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 21 | 18 |
| Military | 293 | 163 | 423 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 15 | 17 |

Table 5 shows the student data for the CAA for Mathematics.

Table 5. CAA for Mathematics Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Percent of Students in Level 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested in 2018–19** | **Number Tested in 2020–21** | **Number Tested in 2021–22** | **Percent Tested in 2018–19** | **Percent Tested in 2020–21\*** | **Percent Tested in 2021–22** | **Percent Level 3 in 2018–19** | **Percent Level 3 in 2020–21** | **Percent Level 3 in 2021–22** |
| All Students | 37,349 | 10,973 | 32,989 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| Female | 12,136 | 3,445 | 10,310 | 32 | 31 | 31 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| Male | 25,213 | 7,528 | 22,676 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 11 | 10 | 9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 238  | 78  | 176 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 9 |
| Asian | 2,906 | 891  | 2,844 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| Black or African American | 3,021 | 684  | 2,479 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 7 |
| Filipino | 982 | 245  | 955 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 21,369 | 5,822 | 19,239 | 57 | 53 | 58 | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 169 | 41  | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 11 |
| Two or more races | 1,516 | 531  | 1,449 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| White | 7,148 | 2,681 | 5,699 | 19 | 24 | 17 | 11 | 10 | 10 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 24,471 | 6,707 | 21,189 | 66 | 61 | 64 | 11 | 9 | 9 |
| English learner | 11,151 | 2,567 | 8,653 | 30 | 23 | 26 | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| Foster youth | N/A | N/A | 345 | N/A | N/A | 1 | N/A | N/A | 9 |
| Homeless | 1,260 | 333 | 1,011 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Migrant education | 206 | 57 | 189 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 5 | 10 |
| Military | 291 | 160 | 421 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 10 | 9 |

**Score Trends by Grade Level**

Figure 14 through figure 20 show the CAA for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for, respectively, grades three through eight and grade eleven. These figures include the following notations:

* 2020–21 is marked with an open circle to call out the fact that less than the total population of eligible students was tested.
* The 2020–21 data is connected to 2018–19 and 2021–22 data with dotted lines to indicate that comparing 2018–19 results to more recent years must incorporate the considerations noted previously.

Figure 14 through figure 20 visually show a decrease in performance in 2020–21 and some increase in 2021–22. The recovery places 2021–22 achievement closer to achievement identified in 2014–‍15, rather than in 2018–19.

Figure 14, which uses data from [table A.14](#tableA14), displays CAAs for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade three. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 14. Mean scale score trends for the CAAs for ELA and mathematics—grade three

Figure 15, which uses data from [table A.15](#tableA15), displays CAAs for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade four. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)‌—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 15. Mean scale score trends for the CAAs for ELA and mathematics—grade four

Figure 16, which uses data from [table A.16](#tableA16), displays CAAs for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade five. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)‌—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 16. Mean scale score trends for the CAAs for ELA and mathematics—grade five

Figure 17, which uses data from [table A.17](#tableA17), displays CAAs for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade six. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 17. Mean scale score trends for the CAAs for ELA and mathematics—grade six

Figure 18, which uses data from [table A.18](#tableA18), displays CAAs for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade seven. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 18. Mean scale score trends for the CAAs for ELA and mathematics—grade seven

Figure 19, which uses data from [table A.19](#tableA19), displays CAAs for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade eight. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)‌—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 19. Mean scale score trends for the CAAs for ELA and mathematics—grade eight

Figure 20, which uses data from [table A.20](#tableA20), displays CAAs for ELA and mathematics mean scale score trends across time for grade eleven. Test administrations indicated with an asterisk (\*)—that is, 2019–20 and 2020–21—were impacted by the pandemic.

Figure 20. Mean scale score trends for the CAAs for ELA and mathematics—grade eleven

**California Spanish Assessment**

The CSA is an optional test presented in Spanish to assess the California Common Core State Standards *en Español*. The CSA consists of reading, writing mechanics, and listening sections that are combined to form an overall CSA score. The CSA is available for administration to students in grades three through eight and high school.

Table 6 shows, by student group, numbers of students tested; percentages of all tested students coming from that group; and the percentages of students of the tested students from that group who obtained Score Reporting Range 3. The table provides those results for 2018–19 and 2021–‍22. The 2020–21 CSA results are not included because of the relatively small sample size. Overall, the proportion of students tested who obtained Score Reporting Range 3 decreased between 2018–19 and 2021–22, from 13 percent to 11 percent. Note that the 2020–‍21 CSA results were not included because of the relatively small sample size.

Table 6. CSA Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Percent of Students in Score Reporting Range 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested in 2018–19** | **Number Tested in 2021–22** | **Percent Tested in 2018–19** | **Percent Tested in 2021–22** | **Percent Score Reporting Range 3 in 2018–19** | **Percent Score Reporting Range 3 in 2021–22** |
| All Students | 39,127 | 46,170 | 100 | 100 | 13 | 11 |
| Female | 20,362 | 23,705 | 52 | 51 | 15 | 12 |
| Male | 18,765 | 22,458 | 48 | 49 | 10 | 9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 58 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9 |
| Asian | 306 | 317 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 19 |
| Black or African American | 566 | 724 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Filipino | 201 | 287 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 16 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 33,936 | 40,432 | 87 | 88 | 12 | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 27 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Two or more races | 505 | 1,291 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 13 |
| White | 3,328 | 3,011 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 15 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 27,895 | 31,977 | 71 | 69 | 11 | 9 |
| English learner | 13,960 | 17,865 | 36 | 39 | 5 | 5 |
| Foster youth | N/A | 45 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Homeless | 2,077 | 1,806 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| Migrant education | 553 | 737 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 11 |
| Military | 230 | 449 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 9 |
| Students with disability | 2,215 | 2,780 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 |

**2021–22 ELPAC Summary Reports**

The ELPAC is the mandated state test for determining English language proficiency (ELP). It is administered as an initial assessment to newly enrolled students whose primary language is not English, as indicated on a home language survey; and, annually, as a summative assessment to students who have been previously identified as English learner (EL) students. The ELPAC is administered to students in kindergarten through grade twelve.

The general and Alternate ELPAC are aligned with the [2012 California English Language Development Standards (2012 ELD Standards)](https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf). The Alternate ELPAC is aligned through the [English Language Development Connectors (ELD Connectors)](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/documents/eldconnectorsaltelpac.docx).

The general ELPAC has four domains: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The Alternate ELPAC has two communication modes: expressive (Speaking and Writing) and receptive (Listening and Reading). Additional information about the development and administration of the ELPAC can be found at on the CDE [ELPAC](https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/) web page.

The ELPAC results presented in this interpretation guide include the following assessment programs:

* Initial ELPAC
* Summative ELPAC
* Summative Alternate ELPAC

**Initial ELPAC**

The purpose of the Initial ELPAC is to determine the ELP of students entering California schools for the first time. Identifying students who need help learning in English is important so they can obtain the support they need to do well in school while receiving instruction in all school subjects.

Table 7 provides, by grade level assessed, the numbers of students enrolled, numbers of students who received scores, and percentages of students who scored within each performance level for the Initial ELPAC. Students are considered to have well-developed English language skills if they have achieved an initial fluent English proficient level for that grade level. Approximately 16 percent of students across all grades performed at that level in 2021–22, ranging from 12 percent at grade three level to as high as 28 percent at grade twelve.

Table 7. Initial ELPAC Test Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Performance Level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **Number Enrolled** | **Number Tested Who Received Scores** | **Percent in Novice English Learner Level** | **Percent in Intermediate English Learner Level** | **Percent in Initial Fluent English Proficient Level** |
| All Students | 210,898 | 208,585 | 68 | 16 | 16 |
| Kindergarten | 134,215 | 133,652 | 66 | 19 | 14 |
| 1 | 12,800 | 12,612 | 68 | 17 | 16 |
| 2 | 6,633 | 6,488 | 69 | 14 | 18 |
| 3 | 5,823 | 5,709 | 79 | 9 | 12 |
| 4 | 5,453 | 5,333 | 73 | 9 | 18 |
| 5 | 5,033 | 4,928 | 72 | 9 | 20 |
| 6 | 4,824 | 4,719 | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| 7 | 5,118 | 4,995 | 69 | 12 | 20 |
| 8 | 4,877 | 4,771 | 68 | 12 | 21 |
| 9 | 10,869 | 10,448 | 78 | 8 | 14 |
| 10 | 6,425 | 6,258 | 72 | 10 | 18 |
| 11 | 5,361 | 5,261 | 68 | 10 | 22 |
| 12 | 3,467 | 3,411 | 62 | 11 | 28 |

Table 8 shows, by student group, the numbers of students enrolled, numbers of students who received scores, and percentages of students who scored within each performance level for the Initial ELPAC. Students are considered to have well-developed English language skills if they have achieved an initial fluent English proficient level for that grade level.

Table 8. Initial ELPAC Test Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Performance Level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Enrolled** | **Number Tested Who Received Scores** | **Percent in Novice English Learner Level** | **Percent in Intermediate English Learner Level** | **Percent in Initial Fluent English Proficient Level** |
| All Students | 210,898 | 208,585 | 68 | 16 | 16 |
| Female | 101,668 | 100,587 | 64 | 18 | 18 |
| Male | 109,181 | 107,952 | 72 | 15 | 13 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 405 | 401 | 68 | 14 | 18 |
| Asian | 35,721 | 35,463 | 48 | 21 | 31 |
| Black or African American | 1,429 | 1,402 | 51 | 22 | 27 |
| Filipino | 2,299 | 2,275 | 33 | 29 | 38 |

Table 8 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Enrolled** | **Number Tested Who Received Scores** | **Percent in Novice English Learner Level** | **Percent in Intermediate English Learner Level** | **Percent in Initial Fluent English Proficient Level** |
| Hispanic or Latino | 144,089 | 142,893 | 75 | 15 | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 647 | 636 | 53 | 27 | 20 |
| Two or more races | 10,446 | 9,816 | 68 | 13 | 19 |
| White | 15,862 | 15,699 | 56 | 18 | 26 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 121,328 | 120,685 | 75 | 15 | 10 |
| Foster youth | 525 | 511 | 68 | 23 | 9 |
| Homeless | 10,510 | 10,439 | 83 | 10 | 7 |
| Migrant education | 3,410 | 3,402 | 89 | 7 | 4 |
| Military | 1,473 | 1,466 | 52 | 22 | 26 |

**Summative ELPAC**

The purposes of the Summative ELPAC are to measure progress toward ELP, assist in identifying needed EL programs and services, and inform reclassification decisions.

**Overall Summary**

Table 9 shows, by student group, numbers of students tested, percentages of all tested students coming from that group, and the percentages of the tested students from that group who are in Level 4. The table provides those results for 2018–19, 2020–21, and 2021–22. Because of the focus on assessing ELs to guide appropriate instruction during the pandemic, the number of students assessed in each of these years was quite comparable, representing a large share of the EL population. Students represented in the Summative ELPAC mean scale scores change over time as students are reclassified and exited from EL status.

Students are considered to have well-developed English language skills if they have achieved at Level 4 for that grade level and are eligible for reclassification. The percentage of students achieving at Level 4 was 16 percent in 2018–19, decreased to 14 percent in 2020–21, and returned to 16 percent in 2021–22. Increases in 2021–22 occurred in nearly all grade levels (exceptions were grades one and nine) and were especially larger at grade twelve. (Refer to figure 21 through figure 23.)

Table 9 shows the student data for the Summative ELPAC.

Table 9. Summative ELPAC Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Percent of Students in Level 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested in 2018–19** | **Number Tested in 2020–21** | **Number Tested in 2021–22** | **Percent Tested in 2018–19** | **Percent Tested in 2020–21** | **Percent Tested in 2021–22** | **Percent Level 4 in 2018–19** | **Percent Level 4 in 2020–21** | **Percent Level 4 in 2021–22** |
| All Students | 1,077,309 | 1,006,033 | 1,058,286 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 16 | 14 | 16 |
| Female | 485,558 | 460,592 | 483,861 | 45 | 46 | 46 | 17 | 15 | 16 |
| Male | 591,751 | 545,372 | 574,274 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 16 | 13 | 16 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,513 | 1,423 | 1,616 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Asian | 112,981 | 105,766 | 104,779 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 27 | 28 | 28 |
| Black or African American | 5,315 | 4,946 | 5,054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 20 | 21 |
| Filipino | 12,926 | 11,045 | 10,369 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 23 | 25 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 876,210 | 824,256 | 870,482 | 81 | 82 | 82 | 15 | 11 | 14 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 3,303 | 2,861 | 3,059 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| Two or more races | 4,598 | 11,212 | 16,700 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | 21 | 15 |
| White | 48,769 | 44,524 | 46,227 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 23 | 24 | 22 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 905,747 | 832,503 | 867,362 | 84 | 83 | 82 | 15 | 12 | 14 |
| Foster youth | N/A |  N/A  | 3,263 | N/A |  N/A  | 0 | N/A | N/A | 11 |
| Homeless | 57,998 | 41,137 | 56,445 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 9 | 11 |
| Migrant education | 26,152 | 24,171 | 25,258 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 11 |
| Military | 5,962 | 6,825 | 9,493 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 18 | 18 |
| Students receiving special education services | 190,883 | 178,149 | 171,356 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 7 |

**Score Trends by Grade Level**

Figure 21 through figure 23 show the Summative ELPAC mean scale score trends across time for, respectively, kindergarten through grade two, grades three through eight, and high school. The 2019–20 results include approximately 40 percent of eligible EL students. (Testing was suspended in spring 2020 and an additional window was provided in the fall, from August 20 through October 29, 2022.)

Figure 21, which uses data from [table A.21](#tableA21), shows a decreasing trend for kindergarten through grade two from 2017–18 through 2020–21, with increases or stable results in 2021–22. Note that cohorts of English learner student populations tend to be more naturally variable in terms of demographics from year to year than the full student populations.

Figure 21. Mean scale score trends for the Summative ELPAC—kindergarten, grade one, and grade two

Figure 22, which uses data from [table A.22](#tableA22), shows relatively stable results for grades three through eight from 2017–18 through 2019–20, with decreases in all grade levels from 2019–20 to 2020–21 and a marked increase from 2020–21 to 2021–22.

Figure 22. Mean scale score trends for the Summative ELPAC—grades three through eight

Figure 23, which uses data from [table A.23](#tableA23), shows varied results without a clear pattern over time for grades nine through twelve. Given that high school EL cohorts are smaller than for lower grades, they also tend to be more naturally variable from year to year, so the lack of a clear pattern compared to lower grades is not a surprising result.

Figure 23. Mean scale score trend for Summative ELPAC—high school grades

**Summative Alternate ELPAC**

The Alternate ELPAC replaced all locally determined alternate assessments for ELP and provides a consistent, standardized measurement of ELP across the state for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The Alternate ELPAC was administered for the first time as an operational field test during the 2021–22 test administration, producing the Summative Alternate ELPAC test results.

**Overall Summary**

Table 10 provides, by grade level assessed, the numbers of students enrolled, numbers of students who received scores, and percentages of students who scored within each performance level for the Summative Alternate ELPAC. Students are considered to have well-developed English language skills if they have achieved a fluent English proficient level for that grade level. Overall, 29 percent of students taking the Alternate ELPAC scored at that level.

Table 10. Summative Alternate ELPAC Test Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Grade Level and Performance Level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Level | Number Eligible | Number Tested Who Received Scores | Percent in Novice English Learner Level | Percent in Intermediate English Learner Level | Percent in Fluent English Proficient Level |
| All Students | 19,697 | 16,669 | 30 | 41 | 29 |
| Kindergarten | 1,431 | 1,297 | 43 | 42 | 15 |
| 1 | 1,401 | 1,266 | 39 | 45 | 17 |
| 2 | 1,346 | 1,219 | 44 | 39 | 17 |
| 3 | 1,664 | 1,475 | 32 | 46 | 22 |
| 4 | 1,589 | 1,388 | 28 | 46 | 26 |
| 5 | 1,546 | 1,368 | 24 | 43 | 33 |
| 6 | 1,464 | 1,252 | 26 | 38 | 37 |
| 7 | 1,497 | 1,258 | 24 | 37 | 39 |
| 8 | 1,354 | 1,114 | 21 | 35 | 44 |
| 9 | 1,078 | 902 | 26 | 45 | 29 |
| 10 | 1,085 | 849 | 29 | 40 | 31 |
| 11 | 1,165 | 896 | 25 | 39 | 35 |
| 12 | 3,077 | 2,385 | 29 | 39 | 32 |

Table 11 shows, by student group, the numbers of students enrolled, numbers of students who received scores, and percentages of students who scored within each performance level for the Summative Alternate ELPAC. Students are considered to have well-developed English language skills if they have achieved a fluent English proficient level for that grade level.

Table 11. Summative Alternate ELPAC Test Results—Number and Percent of Students Tested by Student Group and Performance Level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Eligible** | **Number Tested Who Received Scores** | **Percent in Novice English Learner Level** | **Percent in Intermediate English Learner Level** | **Percent in Fluent English Proficient Level** |
| All Students | 19,697 | 16,669 | 30 | 41 | 29 |
| Female | 6,505 | 5,444 | 31 | 42 | 27 |
| Male | 13,189 | 11,223 | 30 | 41 | 29 |

Table 11 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Eligible** | **Number Tested Who Received Scores** | **Percent in Novice English Learner Level** | **Percent in Intermediate English Learner Level** | **Percent in Fluent English Proficient Level** |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 28 | 26 | 27 | 46 | 27 |
| Asian | 2,857 | 2,400 | 32 | 44 | 24 |
| Black or African American | 155 | 129 | 42 | 32 | 26 |
| Filipino | 385 | 315 | 30 | 45 | 25 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 15,100 | 12,829 | 29 | 41 | 30 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 75 | 62 | 37 | 40 | 23 |
| Two or more races | 245 | 197 | 38 | 41 | 22 |
| White | 852 | 711 | 32 | 41 | 27 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 14,458 | 12,408 | 29 | 41 | 30 |
| Foster youth | 87 | 78 | 31 | 31 | 38 |
| Homeless | 641 | 543 | 26 | 41 | 34 |
| Migrant education | 198 | 175 | 18 | 45 | 37 |
| Military | 119 | 109 | 35 | 32 | 33 |

**Appendix**

Table A.1 contains the data for figure 1.

Table A.1. Smarter Balanced Grade Three Data Table for Figure 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2014–15** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 2403 | 2414 | 2415 | 2424 | 2425 | 2403 | 2409 |
| Mathematics | 2415 | 2425 | 2428 | 2431 | 2434 | 2410 | 2418 |

Table A.2 contains the data for figure 2.

Table A.2. Smarter Balanced Grade Four Data Table for Figure 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2014–15** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 2446 | 2454 | 2456 | 2464 | 2466 | 2447 | 2454 |
| Mathematics | 2454 | 2460 | 2463 | 2468 | 2472 | 2449 | 2454 |

Table A.3 contains the data for figure 3.

Table A.3. Smarter Balanced Grade Five Data Table for Figure 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2014–15** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 2487 | 2496 | 2490 | 2496 | 2502 | 2490 | 2491 |
| Mathematics | 2480 | 2485 | 2486 | 2490 | 2495 | 2474 | 2476 |

Table A.4 contains the data for figure 4.

Table A.4. Smarter Balanced Grade Six Data Table for Figure 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2014–15** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 2512 | 2519 | 2519 | 2519 | 2525 | 2511 | 2515 |
| Mathematics | 2504 | 2509 | 2509 | 2511 | 2514 | 2494 | 2498 |

Table A.5 contains the data for figure 5.

Table A.5. Smarter Balanced Grade Seven Data Table for Figure 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2014–15** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 2532 | 2542 | 2542 | 2544 | 2548 | 2544 | 2542 |
| Mathematics | 2518 | 2525 | 2525 | 2524 | 2527 | 2517 | 2509 |

Table A.6 contains the data for figure 6.

Table A.6. Smarter Balanced Grade Eight Data Table for Figure 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2014–15** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 2553 | 2559 | 2559 | 2559 | 2561 | 2554 | 2553 |
| Mathematics | 2534 | 2541 | 2540 | 2541 | 2540 | 2523 | 2518 |

Table A.7 contains the data for figure 7.

Table A.7. Smarter Balanced Grade Eleven Data Table for Figure 7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2014–15** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 2592 | 2600 | 2602 | 2592 | 2597 | 2605 | 2590 |
| Mathematics | 2560 | 2568 | 2565 | 2561 | 2564 | 2577 | 2544 |

Table A.8 contains the data for figure 8.

Table A.8. Grade Four Two-Year Matched Cohort Data Table for Figure 8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **Number of Students in 2017–18 to 2018–19 Matched Cohort** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **Number of Students in 2020–21 to 2021–22 Matched Cohort** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** | **Predicted** | **Difference Between Observed and Predicted** | **Rate of Change as a Percent** |
| ELA | 418,349 | 2425 | 2468 | 75,519 | 2403 | 2460 | 2448 | 12 | 26 |
| Mathematics | 419,636 | 2432 | 2474 | 80,407 | 2410 | 2463 | 2454 | 9 | 20 |

Table A.9 contains the data for figure 9.

Table A.9. Grade Five Two-Year Matched Cohort Data Table for Figure 9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **Number of Students in 2017–18 to 2018–19 Matched Cohort** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **Number of Students in 2020–21 to 2021–22 Matched Cohort** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** | **Predicted** | **Difference Between Observed and Predicted** | **Rate of Change as a Percent** |
| ELA | 438,353 | 2465 | 2504 | 78,160 | 2447 | 2498 | 2489 | 9 | 21 |
| Mathematics | 439,439 | 2469 | 2497 | 83,103 | 2449 | 2485 | 2478 | 7 | 24 |

Table A.10 contains the data for figure 10.

Table A.10. Grade Six Two-Year Matched Cohort Data Table for Figure 10

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **Number of Students in 2017–18 to 2018–19 Matched Cohort** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **Number of Students in 2020–21 to 2021–22 Matched Cohort** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** | **Predicted** | **Difference Between Observed and Predicted** | **Rate of Change as a Percent** |
| ELA | 440,485 | 2497 | 2526 | 78,722 | 2490 | 2520 | 2521 | -1 | -2 |
| Mathematics | 441,278 | 2491 | 2515 | 83,550 | 2473 | 2507 | 2498 | 9 | 35 |

Table A.11 contains the data for figure 11.

Table A.11. Grade Seven Two-Year Matched Cohort Data Table for Figure 11

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **Number of Students in 2017–18 to 2018–19 Matched Cohort** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **Number of Students in 2020–21 to 2021–22 Matched Cohort** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** | **Predicted** | **Difference Between Observed and Predicted** | **Rate of Change as a Percent** |
| ELA | 453,731 | 2520 | 2550 | 81,904 | 2512 | 2550 | 2542 | 8 | 25 |
| Mathematics | 454,241 | 2512 | 2528 | 81,803 | 2495 | 2521 | 2512 | 9 | 52 |

Table A.12 contains the data for figure 12.

Table A.12. Grade Eight Two-Year Matched Cohort Data Table for Figure 12

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **Number of Students in 2017–18 to 2018–19 Matched Cohort** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **Number of Students in 2020–21 to 2021–22 Matched Cohort** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** | **Predicted** | **Difference Between Observed and Predicted** | **Rate of Change as a Percent** |
| ELA | 443,909 | 2546 | 2563 | 91,408 | 2545 | 2560 | 2563 | -3 | -14 |
| Mathematics | 444,188 | 2526 | 2543 | 91,276 | 2518 | 2529 | 2535 | -6 | -35 |

Table A.13 contains the data for figure 13.

Table A.13. CAST Data Table for Figure 13

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| Grade 5 | 201 | 199 | 201 |
| Grade 8 | 401 | 399 | 401 |
| High School | 599 | 601 | 601 |

Table A.14 contains the data for figure 14.

Table A.14. CAAs Grade Three Data Table for Figure 14

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 339 | 342 | 340 | 341 | 341 | 340 |
| Mathematics | 331 | 333 | 335 | 334 | 332 | 333 |

Table A.15 contains the data for figure 15.

Table A.15. CAAs Grade Four Data Table for Figure 15

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 437 | 439 | 438 | 439 | 437 | 437 |
| Mathematics | 432 | 433 | 434 | 434 | 432 | 432 |

Table A.16 contains the data for figure 16.

Table A.16. CAAs Grade Five Data Table for Figure 16

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 537 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 538 |
| Mathematics | 532 | 533 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 533 |

Table A.17 contains the data for figure 17.

Table A.17. CAAs Grade Six Data Table for Figure 17

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 637 | 638 | 639 | 640 | 642 | 640 |
| Mathematics | 631 | 634 | 635 | 635 | 636 | 634 |

Table A.18 contains the data for figure 18.

Table A.18. CAAs Grade Seven Data Table for Figure 18

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 736 | 736 | 738 | 741 | 742 | 740 |
| Mathematics | 732 | 733 | 735 | 738 | 738 | 737 |

Table A.19 contains the data for figure 19.

Table A.19. CAAs Grade Eight Data Table for Figure 19

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 838 | 840 | 840 | 841 | 843 | 842 |
| Mathematics | 831 | 834 | 834 | 836 | 839 | 837 |

Table A.20 contains the data for figure 20.

Table A.20. CAAs Grade Eleven Data Table for Figure 20

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Area** | **2015–16** | **2016–17** | **2017–18** | **2018–19** | **2020–21** | **2021–22** |
| ELA | 940 | 941 | 943 | 942 | 943 | 944 |
| Mathematics | 933 | 934 | 935 | 935 | 936 | 937 |

Table A.21 contains the data for figure 21.

Table A.21. Summative ELPAC Kindergarten Through Grade Two Data Table for Figure 21

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **2017–2018** | **2018–2019** | **2019–2020** | **2020–2021** | **2021–2022** |
| Kindergarten | 1431 | 1426 | 1425 | 1413 | 1419 |
| Grade 1 | 1466 | 1453 | 1453 | 1436 | 1434 |
| Grade 2 | 1487 | 1482 | 1483 | 1468 | 1470 |

Table A.22 contains the data for figure 22.

Table A.22. Summative ELPAC Grades Three Through Eight Data Table for Figure 22

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **2017–2018** | **2018–2019** | **2019–2020** | **2020–2021** | **2021–2022** |
| Grade 3 | 1489 | 1485 | 1486 | 1480 | 1483 |
| Grade 4 | 1504 | 1509 | 1505 | 1496 | 1507 |
| Grade 5 | 1517 | 1521 | 1522 | 1510 | 1522 |
| Grade 6 | 1520 | 1517 | 1522 | 1514 | 1524 |
| Grade 7 | 1526 | 1526 | 1530 | 1526 | 1537 |
| Grade 8 | 1532 | 1533 | 1538 | 1534 | 1548 |

Table A.23 contains the data for figure 23.

Table A.23. Summative ELPAC Grades Nine Through Twelve Data Table for Figure 23

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **2017–2018** | **2018–2019** | **2019–2020** | **2020–2021** | **2021–2022** |
| Grade 9 | 1529 | 1524 | 1529 | 1533 | 1529 |
| Grade 10 | 1538 | 1537 | 1537 | 1538 | 1543 |
| Grade 11 | 1539 | 1531 | 1536 | 1533 | 1541 |
| Grade 12 | 1535 | 1516 | 1522 | 1518 | 1544 |

1. This differing relationship between scores one year and one grade level apart is evident in different slopes of the diagonal lines for students starting out in different deciles (or ranges of scores, each of which has 10 percent of students in this matched cohort). To account for these differing relationships, student scores from 2017–18 were placed into deciles based on the full population of test takers in 2017–18. The score ranges from 2017–18 were then used to place students testing in 2020–21 into 10 groups. This allows the relationship between scores one year and one grade level apart to be applied to the group of students with same starting points. To compute a single, typical rate of change, results were combined across deciles by weighting decile-specific average acceleration or deceleration by the percentage of 2020–21 test takers whose 2020–21 scores were in each 2017–18 decile. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)