# Item 4 Attachment 3: Matrix of the U.S. Department of Education’s Resubmission Elements Cross-Referenced with California’s Consolidated ESSA State Plans

| **Item Number** | **ESSA State Plan Section** | **U.S. Department of Education Resubmission Elements (February 14, 2018)** | **Page Numbers: Attachment 1** | **Page Numbers: Attachment 2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | A.4.iii.a.1: Academic Achievement Long-term Goals | CDE included additional tables that showed baseline data for all students and each student subgroup and added long-term goals for high school students. However, both are inclusive of the change component. ESEA Section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa) requires that these goals are solely measured by grade-level proficiency in the year for which accountability determinations are made. | 21-30 | 21-30 |
| 2 | A.4.iii.a.2: Academic Achievement Measurements of Interim Progress | CDE noted that the State would ensure that LEAs report their measurements of interim progress through the required LEA report card. ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A) requires that a State establish *State-designed* measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students. | 30  Appendix A  136-140 | 30  Appendix A 137-141 |
| 3 | A.4.iii.b.1: Long-term Goals for Four-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate | CDE included additional tables that showed baseline data for all students and each student subgroup. However, the data are inclusive of the change component. ESEA Section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb) requires that these goals are solely measured by graduation rate in the year for which accountability determinations are made. | 37-40 | 37-40 |
| 4 | A.4.iii.b.3: Measurements of Interim Progress | CDE noted that the State would ensure that LEAs report their measurements of interim progress through the required LEA report card. ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A) requires that a State establish *State-designed* measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for all students and for each subgroup of students. | 41  Appendix A  140-143 | 41  Appendix A 142-144 |
| 5 | A.4.iii.c.1: English Language Proficiency Long-term Goals | CDE still identified long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English learners in terms of both status and change. The ESEA requires a State to identify and describe ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress, including baseline data, for English learners, for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as defined by the State and measured by the assessments described in subsection (b)(2)(G). | 44-49 | 44-48 |
| 6 | A.4.iii.c.2: Measurements of Interim Progress | CDE noted that the State would ensure that LEAs report their measurements of interim progress through the required LEA report card. ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A) requires that a State establish *State-designed* measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for progress in achieving English language proficiency. | 49  Appendix A  143-145 | 48  Appendix A 144-146 |
| 7 | A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement Indicator | CDE still proposed to include measures in addition to grade-level proficiency on statewide assessments in its Academic Achievement indicator, including both change and measures within the CCI. For the Academic Achievement indicator required under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i)(I), a State may include only a measure of proficiency on the annual assessments. The CCI proposed by CDE may be included as a School Quality or Student Success indicator. Additionally, CDE noted that the participation rate will not affect the calculation and determination of color-coded performance levels on the Academic Achievement indicator. ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii) requires that a State calculate the Academic Achievement indicator by including in the denominator the greater of 95 percent of all students (or 95 percent of students in each subgroup, as the case may be) or the number of students participating in the assessments. | 49-52 | 48-51 |
| 8 | A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools | This item was resolved by the January 2018 resubmission of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan. | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 9 | A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate Indicator | CDE was not measuring graduation rates for all students and each student subgroup based only on the graduation rate in the year for which accountability determinations are being made. ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(iii) requires that the Graduation Rate indicator include only measures based on the four-year and, at a State’s discretion, extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the year for which accountability determinations are being made. | 53 | 53 |
| 10 | A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator | CDE includes in its Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator not only students who were reclassified in the current year but also students who were reclassified in the prior year, meaning that they were not English learners in the year for which accountability determinations are being made. Section 1111(c)(4)(B)(iv) of the ESEA requires a State to include in this indicator only those students currently classified as English learners. Note that ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B) provides a narrow exception that permits students previously identified as English learners to be included in the subgroup of English learners only for purposes of measuring the performance of English learners on the statewide reading/language and mathematics assessments for purposes of the State-determined accountability system. | 54-56 | 53-55 |
| 11 | A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s) | This item was resolved following the January 2018 resubmission of the ESSA State Plan. | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 12 | A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators | CDE contends that much more weight (i.e., 85.7 percent of the overall performance determination within California’s system of meaningful differentiation) is attributed to academics. However, this revision does not address the identified issue that the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s) could greatly outweigh all of the other indicators, given that a school could receive a rating of red on all academic indicators but not be identified for improvement because of a non-red rating on a School Quality or Student Success indicator. ESEA Section 1111(c)(4)(C)(ii)(II) requires that the academic indicators, in the aggregate, receive much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate. | 61-62  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) | 62  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) |
| 13 | A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation | CDE did not address the issue that schools with fewer than 30 students will not receive a performance color and that the State appears not to have a methodology that it will use to identify such schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. | 62-64 | 62-64 |
| 14 | A.4.vi.a: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing | CDE noted that the state would begin its identification of lowest-performing LEAs based on the LCFF statute beginning in the fall of 2018 using the 2018 Dashboard results. The state plan highlighted that the state would look at the Title I schools in the lowest performing LEAs (according to the LCFF) rather than looking at the lowest performing schools overall. CDE explained on the December 21 call that there was no preferential treatment with respect to the identification of Title I schools within the LCFF, but did not insert this language into the revised plan, thereby still making it unclear how the lowest 5% of schools will be selected. | 64-66  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) | 64-66  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) |
| 15 | A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates | CDE did not update the language within this section of the plan and still indicates that it will identify for comprehensive support and improvement all public high schools with a graduation rate of less than 67 percent over each of the three consecutive years prior to identification (rather than in the most current school year alone or averaged over multiple years). | 66  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) | 66-67  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) |
| 16 | A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—“Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups | This item was resolved by the January 2018 resubmission of the ESSA State Plan. However, staff have proposed revisions to this section in conjunction with the other school identification sections. | 67  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) | 67  (See addendum when available for proposed revisions) |
| 17 | A.4.viii.a: Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools | CDE updated its exit criteria so that a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement would need to improve its performance across indicators so that it no longer has a color combination that meets the criteria which caused it to be initially identified but did not explicitly identify the color combinations that would be permissible for exit in order to demonstrate that the school has made continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success. | 69 | 69-70 |
| 18 | A.4.viii.b: Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support | CDE updated its exit criteria so that a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement would need to improve its performance across indicators so that it no longer has a color combination that meets the criteria which caused it to be initially identified but did not explicitly identify the color combinations that would be permissible for exit in order to demonstrate that the school has made continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success. | 69-70 | 70 |
| 19 | A.5: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators | CDE noted that the State is currently determining the process through which teacher mis-assignment data will be collected and that they would collect the data no later than spring 2019. ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B) requires a State to describe how low income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. | 78-83 | 78-84 |
| 20 | B.1: Supporting Needs of Migratory Children | This item was resolved by the January 2018 resubmission of the ESSA State Plan. | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 21 | C.2: Program Objectives and Outcomes | This item was resolved by the January 2018 resubmission of the ESSA State Plan. | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 22 | E.1: Entrance and Exit Procedures | The ESEA requires a State to develop standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners. CDE noted that the state legislature is considering additional legislation to define the implementation of the teacher evaluation and parent consultation criteria. While a state is not required to have these consultation criteria, if they are used as part of the exit procedures, the ESEA requires that they are standardized and statewide. | 115-117 | 116-118 |
| 23 | H.1: Outcomes and Objectives | This item was resolved by the January 2018 resubmission of the ESSA State Plan. | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 24 | I.7: Assistance from Counselors | This item was resolved by the January 2018 resubmission of the ESSA State Plan. | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |