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# **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:**  February 16, 2023

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

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

**SUBJECT:** Revised Update on the Implementation of the Local, State and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Local Control Funding Formula Eligibility for Differentiated Assistance for Districts and County Offices of Education

The California Department of Education (CDE) recently reviewed the business rules used to determine eligibility for differentiated assistance for local educational agencies (LEAs). Based on this review, the CDE found that four additional LEAs are now eligible for differentiated assistance. Additionally, fifteen LEAs, including county offices of education (COEs) are no longer eligible for differentiated assistance based on revised business rules. All changes, including the impact on priority area and student group data, are reflected in this updated information memorandum. The CDE also provided information on LEAs who meet the criteria under *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 52072 and 52072.5.

## Summary of Key Issues

In conjunction with the release of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) the CDE is providing this update to the State Board of Education (SBE) on LEAs (defined here as districts and county offices of education) eligible for differentiated assistance. This is a requirement under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and the determinations are based on their performance on the 2022 Dashboard.

This Memorandum provides an overview of the 2022 differentiated assistance eligibility criteria for districts and COEs. The Memorandum also includes the number of student groups meeting the state indicator criteria, geographic distribution, and student group performance.

### Background

California’s public-school accountability system is designed to reinforce the expectation that every school and LEA can improve while also ensuring additional support is provided to LEAs that need it. It also intentionally focuses on assisting the receiving LEA to build the necessary capacity to improve student outcomes.

Under the LCFF, LEAs including districts, COEs, and charter schools are eligible for differentiated assistance based on their performance on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard) which is available at <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>. The last time LEAs were evaluated for differentiated assistance eligibility was in December 2019 following the release of the 2019 Dashboard. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, LEAs that were determined to be eligible based on the 2019 Dashboard have continued to be eligible due to a pause in the state and federal accountability requirements.

Differentiated assistance is intended not only to help the LEA address the underlying causes that led to its eligibility for assistance, but also to strengthen the LEA’s overall ability to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies and programs and adjust, as appropriate, to improve student outcomes.

### 2022 Differentiated Assistance Eligibility Criteria

Districts or COEs with at least one student group meeting the criteria in at least two LCFF Priority Areas (see Table 2) are eligible for differentiated assistance. Table 1 provides student groups used in LCFF differentiated assistance determinations and the corresponding abbreviation.

Due to requirements under Assembly Bill (AB) 130, this year, DA eligibility is based solely on data from the 2021–22 school year (also known as Status) on the 2022 Dashboard. Therefore, compared to prior Dashboards, performance levels are not reported using colors. Instead, the 2022 Dashboard reports performance levels using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for all state measures.

Please note, in 2019 differentiated assistance eligibility determinations used performance colors on the state indicators from the 2019 Dashboard. Since the eligibility criteria for differentiated assistance are not the same between 2019 and 2022, comparisons between these years **are not** valid or reliable. An overview of the changes on the 2022 Dashboard are available in an informational flyer, Reporting Current Year Data Only on the 2022 Dashboard, at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/reportcurrentyear22.pdf>.

At the September 2022 SBE meeting, the SBE approved the use of Status only for the state indicators for 2022 differentiated assistance determinations (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr22/documents/sep22item02rev.docx>). This method uses the lowest available Status levels on the State indicators as a proxy for Red in eligibility determinations.

In 2022, charter schools continue to not be eligible for differentiated assistance. This is due to changes that were made to the eligibility criteria following the 2019 identification process in AB 130 section 123(d) (Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021), and the parameters set forth in California *Education Code* (*EC*) section 47607.3(a). Charter schools will resume eligibility for differentiated assistance with the release of the 2023 Dashboard.

#### Table 1: Student Group Abbreviations and Descriptions

| **Student Group****Abbreviation** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| AA | African American |
| AI | American Indian |
| AS | Asian |
| EL | English Learners |
| FI | Filipino |
| FOS | Foster |
| HI | Hispanic |
| HOM | Homeless |
| PI | Pacific Islander |
| SED | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |
| SWD | Students with Disabilities |
| TOM | Two or More Races |
| WI | White |

Due to the unavailability of the College/Career Indicator and two years of local indicator data to determine “not met for two or more years” on the 2022 Dashboard, only LCFF Priority Areas 4, 5, and 6 are used to determine districts and COEs eligible for 2022 differentiated assistance. Table 2 provides the 2022 Differentiated Assistance Criteria by LCFF State Priority Area.

#### Table 2: 2022 Differentiated Assistance Criteria by LCFF State Priority Area

| **LCFF State Priority Area** | **State Indicators Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| Pupil Achievement (Priority 4) | * **Very Low** Status on both the ELA and Mathematics Academic Indicator; or
* **Very Low** Status on the English Learner Progress Indicator
 |
| Pupil Engagement (Priority 5) | * **Very Low** Status on the Graduation Rate Indicator; or
* **Very High** Status on the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
 |
| School Climate (Priority 6) | * **Very High** Status on the Suspension Rate Indicator
 |

#### Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

Under EC Section 2575.2, COEs receive dollars to assist school districts identified for DA as part of their principal apportionment, specifically in the calculation for second principal apportionment (P-2). All COEs with one or more districts eligible for DA receive a base of $200,000 in additional LCFF state aid. In addition to the base amount, COEs generate additional funds based on the total number and size of the districts eligible for DA in their jurisdiction pursuant to EC Section 52071 (see Table 3). This funding is allocated based on a three-year average of eligible districts.

Details of the funding calculation can be found on the Funding Rates and Information webpage at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/pa/pa2223rates.asp>.

#### Table 3: Funding for County Offices of Education to Provide Support

| **Entitlement** | **Multiplier** | **School District Prior Year Annual Average Daily Attendance** | ***EC* 2575.2 Allowance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Base | Per County | N/A | $200,000 |
| Small District | Per District | 1 to 2,499 | $100,000 |
| Medium District | Per District | 2,500 to 9,999 | $200,000 |
| Large District | Per District | 10,000 or more | $300,000 |

#### Overview of the 2022 Differentiated Assistance Determinations Results

The 2022 Dashboard provides communities with transparent and meaningful information about performance from the 2021–22 academic year of districts, schools, county offices of education through specific state indicators: Academic Performance, English Learner progress, Chronic absenteeism, Graduation Rate, and Suspension Rate. Additionally, local measures are available based on information collected by districts, county offices of education, and charter schools. To assist LEAs to review their data and use it to inform their Local Control Accountability Plans and their communities, the CDE prepared the **2022 Dashboard Summary.** The Summary includes an attachment with a quick summary of select statewide data reports. The 2022 Dashboard Summary and numerous resources developed to support the release of the restart of the Dashboard are available on the Dashboard Communications Toolkit webpage at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/dashboardtoolkit.asp>.

The 2022 Dashboard results show that graduation rates hit historic highs and chronic absenteeism rates mirror national trends. Suspension rates are slightly down and there is an increase in the percentage of English learners making progress on language acquisition. The Academic Indicators for English Language Arts and Mathematics show the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In this unique context, the number of school districts and county offices of education eligible for differentiated assistance based on 2022 Dashboard indicators is 617.

To help provide additional context with these numbers, the CDE is providing the SBE with tables for each state indicator that provide the number of districts at each status level for each student group (see Table 8 through Table 13). As an example, the leading indicator for the eligibility of districts and COEs is the Chronic Absenteeism indicator as shown on Table 4. It is important to note that the Chronic Absenteeism indicator only applies to LEAs for grades kindergarten through grade 8 for accountability purposes. As shown in Table 12, the Graduation Rate indicator is considered the high school measure (grade nine through grade twelve) for Pupil Engagement (LCFF Priority Area 5).

#### Table 4: District Status Level Performance by LCFF Priority Area/Dashboard Indicator

| **LCFF Priority Area/Indicator** | **# of Districts with >29 students** | **Very High** | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** | **Very Low** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority 5: Chronic Absenteeism** | 849 | 608 (71.6%) | 176 (20.7%) | 50 (5.9%) | 12 (1.4%) | 3 (0.4%) |

### District and County Office of Education Eligibility for Differentiated Assistance

Based on the criteria in Table 2 and the results from the 2022 Dashboard, a total of 617 districts and COEs are eligible to receive differentiated assistance. The data file containing the assistance status for districts and COEs is available on the Local Control Funding Formula web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>

Table 5 provides a summary of the number of districts and COEs with the number of student groups that met the criteria for the districts and COEs in the given row (e.g., two districts/COEs are eligible based on 11 student groups in each of those districts/COEs meeting the state indicator criteria for differentiated assistance).

#### Table 5: Districts and County Offices of Education Eligible to Receive Differentiated Assistance Based Solely on State Indicators

| **# of Student Groups that Met the State Indicator Criteria** | **Number of Districts/COEs in 2022** |
| --- | --- |
| 11 | 2 |
| 10 | 2 |
| 9 | 10 |
| 8 | 12 |
| 7 | 23 |
| 6 | 36 |
| 5 | 59 |
| 4 | 72 |
| 3 | 96 |
| 2 | 131 |
| 1 | 174 |

### Geographic Distribution of Districts and County Offices of Education Eligible for Differentiated Assistance

The districts and COEs that are eligible for differentiated assistance are geographically diverse and are located in 57 of California’s 58 counties. Table 6 shows, for each county, the number of districts eligible to receive differentiated assistance based on the criteria outlined above.

In Table 6, under the header “Number of Entities,” two numbers are provided. The first number indicates how many districts and COEs in the county are eligible for differentiated support. The second number, in parentheses, indicates how many districts and COEs are in the county (note: COEs are included in both counts). Counties with an asterisk are single district counties. Both the county and district receive a Dashboard report because each entity serves a different set of schools. Therefore, both the county and district may be eligible for differentiated support and, conversely, one may be eligible and the other may not.

#### Table 6: Number of Districts and County Offices of Education Eligible to Receive Differentiated Assistance, by County

| **County Name** | **Number of Entities** | **County Name** | **Number of Entities** | **County Name** | **Number of Entities** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 14 (19) | Marin | 6 (18) | San Mateo | 14 (24) |
| Alpine\* | 1 (2) | Mariposa\* | 1 (2) | Santa Barbara | 10 (21) |
| Amador\* | 1 (2) | Mendocino | 8 (13) | Santa Clara | 18 (32) |
| Butte | 10 (14) | Merced | 12 (21) | Santa Cruz | 5 (12) |
| Calaveras | 4 (5) | Modoc | 2 (4) | Shasta | 14 (26) |
| Colusa | 4 (5) | Mono | 1 (3) | Sierra\* | 0 (2) |
| Contra Costa | 10 (19) | Monterey | 16 (25) | Siskiyou | 9 (26) |
| Del Norte\* | 1 (2) | Napa | 3 (6) | Solano | 6 (7) |
| El Dorado | 11 (16) | Nevada | 4 (10) | Sonoma | 15 (39) |
| Fresno | 23 (32) | Orange | 19 (29) | Stanislaus | 18 (26) |
| Glenn | 4 (9) | Placer | 9 (16) | Sutter | 4 (13) |
| Humboldt | 14 (32) | Plumas | 1 (2) | Tehama | 7 (14) |
| Imperial | 11 (17) | Riverside | 22 (24) | Trinity | 2 (10) |
| Inyo | 3 (7) | Sacramento | 14 (14) | Tulare | 23 (44) |
| Kern | 35 (47) | San Benito | 3 (12) | Tuolumne | 8 (12) |
| Kings | 11 (12) | San Bernardino | 32 (34) | Ventura | 15 (20) |
| Lake | 6 (7) | San Diego | 31 (44) | Yolo | 5 (6) |
| Lassen | 6 (11) | San Francisco\* | 2 (2) | Yuba | 4 (6) |
| Los Angeles | 63 (80) | San Joaquin | 9 (15) | N/A | N/A |
| Madera | 7 (10) | San Luis Obispo | 6 (11) | N/A | N/A |

### Student Group Distribution of Districts and County Offices of Education Eligible for Differentiated Assistance

Table 7 provides the number of districts and COEs that were eligible for differentiated assistance based on student group performance.

#### Table 7: Priority Area Combinations That Districts and County Offices of Education Met (By Student Group) to be Eligible for Differentiated Assistance

| **Indicator Criteria Met** | **AA** | **AI** | **AS** | **EL** | **FI** | **FOS** | **HI** | **HOM** | **PI** | **SED** | **SWD** | **TOM** | **WH** | **Totals by Indicator** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic/ELPI Status, Suspension, Graduation/Chronic | 60 | 20 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 100 | 11 | 85 | 3 | 24 | 167 | 6 | 3 | 496 |
| Academic/ELPI Status, Graduation/Chronic | 11 | 10 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 23 | 61 | 117 | 9 | 65 | 306 | 2 | 9 | 804 |
| Graduation/Chronic, Suspension | 84 | 39 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 110 | 24 | 60 | 16 | 66 | 21 | 44 | 60 | 539 |
| Academic/ELPI Status, Suspension | 7 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 73 |
| **Total Student Groups Meeting Criteria** | 162 | 70 | 2 | 230 | 1 | 243 | 99 | 272 | 30 | 158 | 520 | 52 | 73 | NA |

### District Student Group Results by Indicator

LEAs with at least one student group meeting the criteria (based the lowest available Status levels) in at least two LCFF Priority Areas (see Table 2 for these groupings) are eligible for differentiated assistance. Table 8 through Table 13 provide the number of districts at each status level for each student group for each state indicator used on the 2022 Dashboard.

#### Table 8: LCFF Priority Area 4: Pupil Achievement

#### English Language Arts Indicator District Student Group Results

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Very Low** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | **Very High** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **African American** |  308 | 86(9.8%) | 176(20.1%) | 32(3.7%) | 14(1.6%) | 0(0%) |
| **Asian** | 373 | 0(0%) | 38(4.3%) | 43(4.9%) | 95(10.9%) | 197(22.5%) |
| **Filipino** | 272 | 0(0%) | 8(0.9%) | 26(3.0%) | 114(13%) | 124(14.2%) |
| **Hispanic** | 767 | 100(11.4%) | 546(62.4%) | 62(7.1%) | 46(5.3%) | 13(1.5%) |
| **American Indian** | 90 | 36(4.1%) | 44(5.0%) | 4(0.5%) | 4(0.5%) | 2(0.2%) |
| **Pacific Islander** | 102 | 15(1.7%) | 64(7.3%) | 11(1.3%) | 10(1.1%) | 2(0.2%) |
| **Two or More Races** | 418 | 10(1.1%) | 130(14.9%) | 50(5.7%) | 97(11.1%) | 131(15.0%) |
| **White** | 730 | 25(2.9%) | 298(34.1%) | 90(10.3%) | 200(22.9%) | 117(13.4%) |
| **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged** | 821 | 130(14.9%) | 576(65.8%) | 71(8.1%) | 39(4.5%) | 5(0.6%) |
| **English learners** | 663 | 267(30.5%) | 334(38.2%) | 22(2.5%) | 31(3.5%) | 9(1.0%) |
| **Students with Disabilities** | 666 | 545(62.3%) | 107(12.2%) | 8(0.9%) | 5(0.6%) | 1(0.1%) |
| **Foster** | 202 | 140(16.0%) | 62(7.1%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) |
| **Homeless** | 432 | 235(26.9%) | 188(21.5%) | 6(0.7%) | 3(0.3%) | 0(0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students at the district level and student group level; 15 for Foster and Homeless Student Groups.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of districts (875) was used for the denominator.

#### Table 9: LCFF Priority Area 4 Pupil Achievement

#### Mathematics Indicator District Student Group Results

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Very Low** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | **Very High** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **African American** | 307 | 148(16.9%) | 148(16.9%) | 11(1.3%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) |
| **Asian** | 372 | 2(0.2%) | 73(8.4%) | 52(5.9%) | 70(8.0%) | 175(20.0%) |
| **Filipino** | 271 | 0(0%) | 47(5.4%) | 75(8.6%) | 107(12.2%) | 42(4.8%) |
| **Hispanic** | 769 | 229(26.2%) | 466(53.3%) | 49(5.6%) | 19(2.2%) | 6(0.7%) |
| **American Indian** | 90 | 48(5.5%) | 39(4.5%) | 0(0%) | 1(0.1%) | 2(0.2%) |
| **Pacific Islander** | 102 | 28(3.2%) | 64(7.3%) | 7(0.8%) | 3(0.3%) | 0(0%) |
| **Two or More Races** | 417 | 29(3.3%) | 166(19.0%) | 60(6.9%) | 85(9.7%) | 77(8.8%) |
| **White** | 730 | 42(4.8%) | 346(39.6%) | 150(17.2%) | 134(15.3%) | 58(6.6%) |
| **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged** | 821 | 245(28.0%) | 507(58.0%) | 46(5.3%) | 19(2.2%) | 4(0.5%) |
| **English learners** | 664 | 323(37.0%) | 270(30.9%) | 30(3.4%) | 27(3.1%) | 14(1.6%) |
| **Students with Disabilities** | 664 | 547(62.6%) | 101(11.6%) | 11(1.3%) | 5(0.6%) | 0(0%) |
| **Foster** | 200 | 162(18.5%) | 38(4.3%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) |
| **Homeless** | 435 | 287(32.8%) | 145(16.6%) | 3(0.3%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students at the district level and student group level; 15 for Foster and Homeless Student Groups.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of districts (874) was used for the denominator.

**Table 10: LCFF Priority Area 4: Pupil Achievement**

**English Learner Progress Indicator District Results\***

| **# of Districts** | **Very Low** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | **Very High** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 673\* | 29(4.3%) | 192\*\*(29.6%) | 291(42.8%) | 137(19.9%) | 24(3.4%) |

**\***Met the N-size requirement of 30 or more students in the current and prior year Summative ELPAC results.

\*\*Includes districts that have been automatically assigned a Low ELPI Status based on testing less than 95 percent of the EL students on the ELPAC Summative.

Note: Because most districts and schools have no significant, or only one significant race/ethnic student group within the EL group, student group data are not reported for the ELPI.

#### Table 11: LCFF Priority Area 5: Pupil Engagement

#### Chronic Absenteeism Indicator District Student Group Results

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Very High** | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** | **Very Low** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **African American** |  327 | 289 (34%) | 33 (3.9%) | 4 (0.5%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) |
| **Asian** | 381 | 105 (12.4%) | 126 (14.8%) | 90 (10.6%) | 43 (5.1%) | 17 (2.0%) |
| **Filipino** | 285 | 65 (7.7%) | 154 (18.1%) | 54 (6.4%) | 8 (0.9%) | 4 (0.5%) |
| **Hispanic** | 746 | 601 (70.8%) | 115 (13.5%) | 17 (2%) | 11 (1.3%) | 2 (0.2%) |
| **American Indian** | 149 | 137 (16.1%) | 11 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) |
| **Pacific Islander** | 135 | 127 (15%) | 6 (0.7%) | 2 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| **Two or More Races** | 486 | 326 (38.4%) | 109 (12.8%) | 42 (4.9%) | 5 (0.6%) | 4 (0.5%) |
| **White** | 740 | 473 (55.7%) | 193 (22.7%) | 59 (6.9%) | 10 (1.2%) | 5 (0.6%) |
| **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged** | 806 | 696 (82%) | 88 (10.4%) | 17 (2%) | 5 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) |
| **English learners** | 644 | 504 (59.3%) | 112 (13.2%) | 21 (2.5%) | 2 (0.2%) | 5 (0.6%) |
| **Students with Disabilities** | 669 | 597 (70.3%) | 59 (6.9%) | 10 (1.2%) | 2 (0.2%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| **Foster** | 314 | 296 (34.9%) | 13 (1.5%) | 3 (0.4%) | 2 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) |
| **Homeless** | 486 | 472 (55.6%) | 9 (1.1%) | 2 (0.2%) | 3 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students at the district level and student group level; 15 for Foster and Homeless Student Groups.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of districts (849) was used for the denominator.

#### Table 12: LCFF Priority Area 5: Pupil Engagement

#### Graduation Rate Indicator District Student Group Results

| **Student Groups** | **Total** | **Very Low** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | **Very High** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **African American** | 125 | 8(1.9%) | 14(3.4%) | 47(11.4%) | 40(9.7%) | 16(3.9%) |
| **Asian** | 163 | 1(0.2%) | 0(0.0%) | 10(2.4%) | 42(10.2%) | 110(26.7%) |
| **Filipino** | 100 | 0(0.0%) | 0(0.0%) | 5(1.2%) | 24(5.8%) | 71(17.2%) |
| **Hispanic** | 365 | 20(4.9%) | 12(2.9%) | 128(31.1%) | 130(31.6%) | 75(18.2%) |
| **American Indian** | 11 | 0(0.0%) | 1(0.2%) | 5(1.2%) | 4(1.0%) | 1(0.2%) |
| **Pacific Islander** | 14 | 0(0.0%) | 2(0.5%) | 8(1.9%) | 3(0.7%) | 1(0.2%) |
| **Two or More Races** | 132 | 1(0.2%) | 3(0.7%) | 20(4.9%) | 42(10.2%) | 66(16.0%) |
| **White** | 314 | 6(1.5%) | 8(1.9%) | 73(17.7%) | 112(27.2%) | 115(27.9%) |
| **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged** | 404 | 22(5.3%) | 23(5.6%) | 155(37.6%) | 140  (34.0%) | 64(15.5%) |
| **English learners** | 257 | 31 (7.5%) | 76 (18.4%) | 120 (29.1%) | 21(5.1%) | 9(2.2%) |
| **Students with Disabilities** | 287 | 43 (10.4%) | 118 (28.6%) | 109 (26.5%) | 15(3.6%) | (0.5%) |
| **Foster** | 94 | 42 (10.2%) | 31(7.5%) | 18(4.4%) | 1(0.2%) | 2(0.5%) |
| **Homeless** | 257 | 51 (12.4%) | 68 (16.5%) | 103 (25.0%) | 24(5.8%) | 11(2.7%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students at the district level and student group level; 15 for Foster and Homeless Student Groups.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of districts (412) was used for the denominator.

#### Table 13: LCFF Priority Area 6: School Climate

#### Suspension Indicator District Student Group Results

| **Student Groups** | **Total\*** | **Very High** | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** | **Very Low** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **African American** |  398 | 175 (18.4%) | 129 (13.6%) | 45 (4.7%) | 26 (2.7%) | 23 (2.4%) |
| **Asian** | 444 | 3 (0.3%) | 15 (1.6%) | 65 (6.8%) | 129 (13.6%) | 232 (24.4%) |
| **Filipino** | 337 | 2 (0.2%) | 12 (1.3%) | 42 (4.4%) | 123 (12.9%) | 158 (16.6%) |
| **Hispanic** | 846 | 56 (5.9%) | 232 (24.4%) | 311 (32.7%) | 141 (14.8%) | 106 (11.2%) |
| **American Indian** | 237 | 89 (9.4%) | 56 (5.9%) | 52 (5.5%) | 15 (1.6%) | 25 (2.6%) |
| **Pacific Islander** | 180 | 29 (3.1%) | 52 (5.5%) | 47 (4.9%) | 27 (2.8%) | 25 (2.6%) |
| **Two or More Races** | 573 | 66 (6.9%) | 107 (11.3%) | 154 (16.2%) | 123 (12.9%) | 123 (12.9%) |
| **White** | 839 | 79 (8.3%) | 187 (19.7%) | 230 (24.2%) | 193 (20.3%) | 150 (15.8%) |
| **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged** | 904 | 122 (12.8%) | 303 (31.9%) | 259 (27.3%) | 117 (12.3%) | 103 (10.8%) |
| **English learners** | 728 | 47 (4.9%) | 182 (19.2%) | 245 (25.8%) | 152 (16%) | 102 (10.7%) |
| **Students with Disabilities** | 770 | 228 (24.0%) | 274 (28.8%) | 156 (16.4%) | 56 (5.9%) | 56 (5.9%) |
| **Foster** | 438 | 279 (29.4%) | 74 (7.8%) | 30 (3.2%) | 4 (0.4%) | 51 (5.4%) |
| **Homeless** | 589 | 178 (18.7%) | 194 (20.4%) | 103 (10.8%) | 38 (4.0%) | 76 (8.0%) |

\*Total = Number of districts with 30 or more students at the district level and student group level; 15 for Foster and Homeless Student Groups.

Note: For all percentages calculated above, the total number of districts (950) was used for the denominator.

### Eligibility of LEAs Meeting Criteria Under *EC* 52072 and 52072.5

Additionally, the 2022 LCFF COE/District Assistance Status Spreadsheet was recently updated to include LEAs that meet the criteria set forth in *EC* 52072 (b)(1) and 52072.5 (b)(1). This information is available on the LCFF web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>. The criteria are activated when three or more pupil subgroups meet the DA criteria for multiple LCFF priorities in three out of four consecutive years (or if an LEA has less than three student groups, all of the student groups have met the differentiated assistance criteria for three out of four consecutive years). These LEAs may be referred to CCEE for advice and support as part of technical assistance in the System of Support. If after receiving advice and assistance from CCEE, CCEE finds either that (1) the district has failed, or is unable, to implement the recommendations of the CCEE, or (2) the “inadequate performance” of the district is either so persistent or acute as to require intervention by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI), then the SSPI, with approval of the SBE, may intervene in that LEA. Meeting the criteria does not automatically require a change in support offered through Differentiated Assistance and/or referral to the CCEE for additional support.