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# **ITEM ADDENDUM**

**DATE:** March 13, 2018

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

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Item 4 – Update on the Development of the California State Plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act: Approval of the Revisions to the State Plan for Resubmission to the U.S. Department of Education.

## Summary of Key Issues

This Item Addendum provides proposed revised language for the remaining sections of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan that the State Board of Education (SBE) will consider for approval at the March 2018 meeting. The first section, Overview of Items, provides a brief description of the background and recommended changes. The second section, Proposed Revisions to California’s Consolidated State Plan, details the specific proposed revisions to the ESSA State Plan.

Due to the timing of posting this Item Addendum the week of the SBE meeting, the California Department of Education (CDE) will modify the recommendation included in the Item. Specifically, the CDE will recommend that the SBE defer action on the Title I accountability items in the revised State Plan to allow for impact analysis and stakeholder feedback and consider these items in an additional SBE meeting to be scheduled.

### **Overview of Items**

### *Weighting of Indicators*

The CDE proposes revisions to these sections to conform with proposed revisions to the sections on long-term goals and indicators (the “Status and Change” issue identified in Item 4). Together with the proposed revisions to the school identification sections, these revisions address U.S. Department of Education (ED) feedback on this issue.

ESSA State Plan Sections: A.4.v.a & b

Attachment 3 item number: 12

#### School Identification

Previous SBE discussions focused on the potential for using the identification of local educational agencies (LEAs) for differentiated assistance under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) to address ESSA’s school-level identification requirements. As noted in the January 2018 SBE agenda item on ESSA, Item 5, Attachment 4 (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jan18item05a4.docx>), the LEAs receiving assistance based on the Fall 2017 Dashboard encompass more than 2900 Title I schools that collectively serve more than 50 percent of California’s Title I students.

In general, the ED interpreted the relevant statutory provisions to require states to identify individual schools based on specific performance criteria, such that identification of LEAs for support cannot itself address these requirements. To meet ED’s interpretation of the provisions, the CDE proposes using the color-coded performance levels on Dashboard indicators to identify at least the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools statewide. Additionally, the CDE proposes using a three-year average for identifying high schools with a graduation rate below 67 percent, rather than identifying high schools with a graduation rate below 67 percent for three consecutive years.

As noted, prior SBE discussions centered on how to align school-level identification under the ESSA with LEA assistance under the LCFF so that the LCFF’s focus on LEAs and student group performance remained the primary focus of California’s system of support for LEAs and schools. That goal was the basis for the inclusion of a “baseline methodology” in earlier versions of the State Plan. As a result of moving to an exclusively school-based methodology for identifying the lowest performing Title I schools, the CDE further recommends removing language about LEA assistance under the LCFF from the State Plan. The State Plan does not require a description of how the state will address ESSA’s school improvement requirements for identified schools. The details on how to do so under the current proposal can be developed with further stakeholder input between now and the initial identification of schools this fall. As part of that process, the SBE may wish to consider modifying the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) plan summary template to include school-level prompts so that school improvement requirements for LEAs with comprehensive support schools can be addressed through the LCAP process.

The CDE also recommends revisions to the subsections on targeted support. SBE members expressed concern about data presented at the January 2018 showing the potential impact on the scope of targeted support if California used an “expanded baseline methodology” to identify schools for comprehensive support. The proposed revision would define a “consistently underperforming” student group as any student group whose performance on the Dashboard indicators meets the criteria used to identify the lowest performing Title I schools for comprehensive support in three out of four consecutive years, rather than in a single year. The timeline in the proposed definition aligns with the timeline for certain LEA assistance provisions under the LCFF, including eligibility for technical assistance for charter schools (*Education Cod*e Section 47607.3). The CDE recommends revisions to other subsections on targeted support to conform with the “consistently underperforming” definition.

ESSA State Plan Sections: A.4.vi

Attachment 3 item number: 14, 15, 16

#### Annual Measurement of Achievement (Participation Rate)

The CDE proposes revisions to this section to conform with proposed revisions to Section A.4.iv.a, which describes the academic achievement indicator. The proposed revisions to this section were inadvertently excluded from the Item. The CDE will conduct technical review in light of the proposed revisions to the academic achievement indicator to include Grade 11 assessments.

ESSA State Plan Sections: A.4.viii

Attachment 3 item number: Not Applicable

#### Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

The proposed edits to this section were inadvertently excluded from Attachments 1 and 2. The CDE’s proposed edits are included in this Addendum.

The following overview is excerpted from the Item:

CDE suggests this section of the State Plan be supplemented to add additional details of the timeline to be undertaken to standardize English Learner Entrance and Exit Criteria for English learners in California, including: the adoption by the SBE of a new English Language Proficiency Assessment for California reclassification criteria, the development of the standardized Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol, and work with the Legislature to begin to change the reclassification criteria in California *Education Code*.

ESSA State Plan Sections: E.1

Attachment 3 item number: 22**Proposed Revisions to California’s Consolidated State Plan**

### *Weighting of Indicators*

**Section A.4.v.a & b (Meaningful Differentiation)**

* + 1. Annual Meaningful Differentiation *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))*
			1. Describe the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.

California has developed a multiple measures accountability system that uses percentile distributions to create a five-by-five grid. This five-by-five grid provides 25 results that combine “Status” and “Change” to make an overall determination for each of <begin add> California’s Dashboard <end add> <begin delete> ~~the~~ <end delete> indicators.<begin delete> ~~The accountability system provides equal weight to both~~ <end delete>“Status” and “Change”<begin add> receive equal weight in determining overall performance.<end add>

“Status” is determined using the current year performance (i.e., current year graduation rate), and “Change” is the difference between performance from the current year and the prior year, or between the current year and a multi-year weighted average.

To determine the percentile cut scores for “Status,” LEAs and schools were ordered from highest to lowest and four cut points were selected based on the distribution. These cut points created five “Status” levels:

* Very High
* High
* Medium
* Low
* Very Low

For “Change” cut scores, LEAs and schools were ordered separately from highest to lowest for positive change and lowest to highest for negative change. These cuts points created five “Change” levels:

* Increased significantly
* Increased
* Maintained
* Declined
* Declined significantly

Each indicator has its own unique set of cut points for “Status” and “Change,” which are determined in consultation with the CDE’s Technical Design Group to ensure validity and reliability in the indicator’s measurement. The cut points will generally remain in place for seven years, although the SBE may adjust the cut points earlier if statewide data demonstrate that the existing cut points no longer support meaningful differentiation of schools. By combining the results of both “Status” and “Change,” one of five color-coded “Performance Levels” can be assigned for each indicator:

* Blue
* Green
* Yellow
* Orange
* Red

The following table is a sample of the five-by-five grid California will use to illustrate school, LEA, and student group performance relative to each indicator:

**Table 20. Sample Five-by-Five Grid**

| **Levels** | **Change: Declined Significantly** | **Change: Declined** | **Change: Maintained** | **Change: Increased** | **Change: Increased Significantly** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Status: Very High** | Yellow | Green | Blue | Blue | Blue |
| **Status: High** | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Blue |
| **Status: Medium** | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green |
| **Status: Low** | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Yellow |
| **Status: Very Low** | Red | Red | Red | Orange | Yellow |

Schools receive a color-coded performance level for all students and each student group with at least 30 students on each indicator that applies based on the grades served by the school.

The differing possible combinations of colors on the indicators that apply for each school allow<begin add> meaningful <end add>differentiation of performance for all students and each student group. For example, a school with all Green indicators is higher performing than another school with all Yellow indicators, but lower performing than a third school with all Green indicators except for one Blue indicator.

<begin add> Similarly, the five distinct levels within Status and Change allow meaningful differentiation within each component used to determine overall performance.<end add>

* + - 1. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

For each indicator, “Status” and “Change” have equal weight. In addition, each indicator is given equal weight when meaningfully differentiating schools, with ELA and Mathematics assessments considered as two separate indicators for school differentiation.<begin delete> ~~Because six of the seven possible school-level indicators are academic and only one indicator (suspension rates) is a School Quality or Student Success Indicator~~<end delete>

<begin add> Seven of the eleven possible school-level indicators described in this plan are academic. Two of these represent the “Status” component in determining a color-coded performance level on a Dashboard indicator, contributing half of the overall color-coded performance levels for two of California’s Dashboard indicators (Graduation Rate Indicator and English Learner Progress Indicator). The “Change” components of these two Dashboard indicators serve as student success indicators. Due to the combination of “Status” and “Change” to determine an overall color-coded performance level for each of California’s Dashboard indicators, two-thirds of<end add><begin delete>~~much more weight (i.e., 85~~ .~~7 percent of~~ <end delete>the overall performance determination within California’s system of meaningful differentiation is <begin add>therefore <end add>attributed to academics without devaluing the importance of school quality<begin delete> ~~(i.e., suspension rates).~~<add delete>

<begin add> As noted, the differing possible combinations of colors on the indicators that apply for each school allow meaningful differentiation of performance for all students and each student group. For example, a school with all Green indicators is higher performing than another school with all Yellow indicators, but lower performing than a third school with all Green indicators except for one Blue indicator. Accordingly, the academic indicators receive much greater weight, in the aggregate, than the other indicators within California’s system of meaningful differentiation.<end add>

#### School Identification

**Section A.4.vi. Identification of Schools**

* + 1. Identification of Schools *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))*
			1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

<begin delete>~~Using the system of meaningful differentiation based on performance on the state indicators described in sections A.4.v.a and A.4.v.b above, California will identify the lowest-performing Title I schools beginning in fall 2018.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~In 2013–14 California enacted the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), which is the foundation for California’s integrated accountability system. Under LCFF, LEAs are the primary focus for improving outcomes and opportunities for students and addressing disparities, based on the recognition that LEAs play an essential role in supporting schools to sustain improvement. LCFF requires LEAs to adopt and annually update Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs), which must identify goals and actions/services for all students and student groups within the priority areas identified in the LCFF statutes. These priority areas are the foundation of the new multiple measures accountability system for all schools.~~<end delete>

<begin delete> ~~LCFF also required the SBE to adopt criteria for identifying LEAs that will be offered technical assistance based on low performance by one or more student groups across the statutory priority areas. The SBE approved criteria tied to state and local indicators included in the California School Dashboard, and LEA assistance begin in the 2017–18 school year based on the Fall 2017 Dashboard release. The technical assistance provisions focus improvement efforts on local educational agencies rather than schools and through the emphasis on building local capacity to sustain improvement instead of dictating specific interventions centrally. Two hundred and twenty-eight LEAs, representing 54 percent of California’s non-charter Title I schools and over two million California students, have been identified for assistance under LCFF for the 2017-18 school year. LEAs will be identified for assistance under LCFF annually.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~California is committed to aligning state and federal education policies to the greatest extent possible to develop an integrated local, state, and federal accountability and continuous improvement system grounded in the LCFF. Accordingly, California will focus the identification of Title I schools in greatest need of support under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) within LEAs identified for support under LCFF.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~In the fall of 2018, California will begin the identification of the lowest performing schools for federal purposes. Using the 2018 Dashboard results, California will again identify the lowest performing LEAs for technical assistance based on the LCFF statute. Building on this, California will then use the “baseline methodology” to identify Title I schools that are in greatest need of assistance. For the purposes of data simulations completed to date, greatest need of assistance is defined as schools with all Red indicators and schools with all Red indicators except for one Orange indicator.~~<end delete>

<begin add> Consistent with the system of meaningful differentiation described in sections A.4.v.a and A.4.v.b above, California will use the color combinations that schools receive on California School Dashboard indicators to identify the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools statewide for comprehensive support.<end add>

<begin add> The selection criteria for the selection of at least the lowest performing of 5 percent of Title I schools is based on all of the following criteria:

* Schools with all red indicators;
* Schools with all red but one indicator of any other color;
* Schools with all red and orange indicators; and
* Schools with five or more indicators where the majority are red.

Based on simulations completed using the fall 2017 Dashboard data, these business rules result in the selection of at least 5 percent of Title I schools statewide. Under this approach, performance on a single indicator is not determinative of selection among the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools.<end add>

<begin add> The Chronic Absence Indicator and College/Career Indicators will receive color-coded performance levels for the first time on the 2018 Dashboard, increasing the number of indicators for which schools can receive color-coded performance levels. Accordingly, when the color-coded performance levels for those indicators become available prior to the initial identification of schools for the 2018-19 school year, the SBE will need to review the business rules, or color combinations, used to identify the Title I schools in greatest need of assistance for comprehensive support.<end add>

<begin delete>~~Any LEA that has a Title I school in greatest need of assistance, but is not identified for technical assistance under LCFF, will be identified for technical assistance.~~<end delete>

<begin delete>~~Under this approach, the technical assistance provided to LEAs that have an identified school will include working with the LEA on analyzing the needs of that school and its students and developing a plan for improvement, consistent with the ESSA’s school improvement requirements. Focusing assistance and support for schools within the LEAs identified for support under the state accountability system will:~~

* ~~Ensure that supports provided to schools are consistent and aligned with the supports provided to the LEA;~~
* ~~Enable agencies providing support and LEAs receiving support to leverage all available resources;~~
* ~~Enhance the ability for all supports to focus on building the capacity of LEAs to support~~ *~~all~~* ~~schools based on the differential needs of students across school sites, as demonstrated by the multiple measures within the LCFF priority areas; and~~
* ~~Ensure that assistance provided to identified schools builds on the existing LCAP process within LEAs.~~

~~The SBE will consider a proposed plan supplement at its March 2018 meeting for submission to the federal Department of Education that further describes the approach for identifying the lowest performing Title I schools.~~<end delete>

* + - 1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

California will use <begin add>the average of <end add>three years of graduation rate data to identify schools with a high school graduation rate less than 67 percent. Any school with a graduation rate less than 67 percent<begin add> averaged over<end add><begin delete>~~in all~~<end delete> three years will be identified for comprehensive assistance.

Three years of data will be used to identify schools; therefore, newly opened schools will not be identified for comprehensive support and improvement until the third year of data is available. However, all schools and student groups with a graduation rate below 67 percent will be given the lowest performance level, Red, on the California School Dashboard. This performance level will be used as part of the criteria when determining schools under consideration of comprehensive support in addition to the lowest 5 percent (section A.4.vi.a).

California will identify high schools beginning in the 2018–19 school year.

* + - 1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

California will determine whether any school identified for additional targeted support, as specified in section A.4.vi.f, did not meet the exit criteria specified in section A.4.viii.b within four years. The <begin add>earliest that the <end add>initial identification of any “additional targeted support” school that did not exit such status for comprehensive support and improvement will occur <begin add>is <end add><begin delete>~~in~~ <end delete>fall 202<begin delete>~~1~~<end delete><begin add>4<end add>.

* + - 1. Frequency of Identification. Provide, for each type of school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years*.*

California will identify schools once every three years for each type of school identified.

* + - 1. Targeted Support and Improvement. Describe the State’s methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))*

California’s definition of a school with one or more “consistently underperforming” student group” is a school in which any student group, on its own, meets the criteria for being identified for comprehensive support <begin add>pursuant to section vi(a) above in three out of four consecutive years (beginning with the 2018-19 school year).<end add> The methodology for identifying such schools is to determine whether any student group at a school has the color-coded performance levels on applicable indicators that match the color-coded performance levels used as criteria for identifying the lowest performing schools receiving Title I, Part A funds for comprehensive support <begin add>in three out of four consecutive years.<end add>

California will identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” student group <begin add>(i.e., schools that meet the specified criteria in three out of four consecutive years)<end add> annually.<begin delete>~~Because California will identify schools for comprehensive support every three years (see section vi.d above), those criteria will not be updated annually. California will use the most recent criteria for identifying schools for comprehensive support to identify any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” student group during the two years between identifying schools for comprehensive support within these three-year cycles.~~<end delete>

* + - 1. Additional Targeted Support. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. *(ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))*

<begin add> Any school with a student group that meets the definition of “consistently underperforming” will be eligible for additional targeted support because the criteria used for the “consistently underperforming” definition are based on the criteria used to identify the lowest performing Title I schools for comprehensive support.<end add><begin delete> ~~California will use the same methodology that is used to identify schools for comprehensive support for the lowest-performing 5 percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the state. Any school that has a student group with one of the combinations of color-coded performance levels used in the determination of the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools will be identified for additional targeted support.~~ <end delete>These <begin delete>~~additional~~ <end delete>schools will be identified <begin add>annually, with<end add><begin delete>~~beginning in the~~<end delete> 20<begin add>20<end add><begin delete>~~18~~–<end delete><begin add>21<end add><begin delete>~~19~~<end delete> <begin add>being the first year such schools can be identified based on the definition of “consistently underperforming.<end add><begin delete>~~”school year, and will be identified every three years~~.<end delete>

* + - 1. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Not applicable.

#### Annual Measurement of Achievement (Participation Rate)

**Section A.4.viii. Annual Measurement of Achievement**

* + 1. Annual Measurement of Achievement *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))*: Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

California will report through the California School Dashboard whether schools and student groups met the 95 percent participation requirement based on a set of four unique symbols (for example, a color coded image or icon specific to participation rate).

1. The first icon to indicate that the school and all student groups met the 95 percent participation rate
2. A second icon to indicate that the schoolwide participation was met, but one or more student groups did not meet the participation rate
3. A third icon to indicate that the participate rate is at least 85 percent but less than 95 percent
4. A fourth icon to indicate the participation rate is less than 85 percent

Because California will report ELA and mathematics separately, each content area will have an icon for the participation rate.

<begin delete>~~California will offer assistance specific to meeting the 95 percent participation rate to schools that do not meet that participation rate through the statewide system of support (described in A.4.viii.c). They will therefore be held accountable for meeting the participation rate threshold and, if they do not meet the threshold, will receive support designed to help them meet the threshold as part of California’s comprehensive school accountability system. The participation rate will not affect the calculation and determination of color-coded performance levels on the academic indicators.~~<end delete>

#### Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

* 1. Entrance and Exit Procedures *(ESEA section 3113(b)(2)):* Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

The statewide California entrance procedures ensure that all students who may be English learners (ELs) are assessed for such status using a valid and reliable instrument within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the state. Upon enrollment, parents of new students complete a standardized, statewide Home Language Survey (HLS). If the answer to any of the first three questions on the survey is a language other than English, the student is assessed to determine if the student is an EL. The state’s English language proficiency (ELP) assessment guidance document, available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/documents/celdt1618guide.pdf>, contains the standardized entrance procedures.

For this initial assessment, California is administering the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) in the 2017–18 school year while field testing the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) initial assessment. In 2018–19, the ELPAC initial assessment will replace the CELDT as the state’s initial ELP assessment. Regulations for the implementation of the ELPAC initial assessment will be finalized in October 2017 and contain detailed updated entrance procedures. Validity of the ELPAC is assured through the processes used to develop the assessment instrument including content review, alignment studies, standard setting procedures, and comparison studies.

California has established processes to ensure timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the state in the development of our standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures by engaging stakeholders in meetings throughout the state; eliciting input and feedback at statewide conferences and trainings; soliciting participation in various committees; soliciting public comment during the regulations process; and providing policy updates. Evaluations, written feedback, and attendance records are evidence of timely and meaningful consultation, as well as collaboration to co-develop guidance documents and provide professional development.

<begin add>In November 2018, a study related to the use of the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California(ELPAC) scores will be presented to the State Board of Education to adopt a new ELPAC reclassification criteria. The standardized Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol will be developed in 2018–19 and piloted in 2019–20.<end add>

<begin add>In January 2019, work with the Legislature will begin to change the reclassification criteria in California Education Code. This process generally takes one year. Legislation will include the standardized, statewide Language Observation Tool and Parent Involvement Protocol.<end add>

<begin add>If the Legislature enacts law to change the reclassification criteria including the Language Observation Tool, and Parent Involvement Protocol, the law goes into effect on July 1, 2020.<end add>

<begin add>The Regulatory Process would begin in 2020–21, and full implementation is expected in 2021–22.<end add>

<begin delete>~~In accordance with the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 11303, the current standardized reclassification procedures for ELs are as follows, pursuant to California Education Code Section 313:~~

1. ~~Assessment of language proficiency using the state test of English language proficiency;~~
2. ~~Teacher evaluation including a review of the student’s curriculum mastery;~~
3. ~~Parent opinion and consultation; and~~
4. ~~Comparison of student performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based on the performance of English proficient students of the same age.~~ <end delete>

<begin delete>~~California ensures that the same standardized procedures are used for exiting students from the EL subgroup as are used for Title I reporting and accountability purposes. The ELPAC annual summative assessment will be administered as an operational assessment statewide in spring 2018. To ensure that exit from EL status is conducted in a valid and reliable manner, a cut-score validation study and multi-method exit criterion study will be conducted based on data received from the ELPAC summative assessment.~~ <end delete>

<begin delete>~~The California legislature is considering legislation to further define the implementation of the teacher evaluation and parent consultation criteria, which are not required in ESSA, but are of interest to the State.~~ <end delete>

## Attachment(s)

None