

Discuss Data & Rate Items
Sample District

1. Annual Progress in Learning English (Title III, Annual Measurable Achievement Objective [AMAO] 1)

a. What percent of EL students in your LEA met AMAO 1? (Examine performance on AMAO 1 since 2007-08.)

AMAO 1: Percent of EL Students Making Annual Progress in Learning English				
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Target	50.1%	51.6%	53.1%	54.6%
Percent Meeting Target	55.8%	57.4%	62.2%	60.2%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)	YES	YES	YES	YES

Briefly discuss the trends that you observe over time for your AMAO 1 results.

Based on the data in this table, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

2. Annual Progress in Attaining English-language Proficiency (Title III AMAO 2)

a. What percent of ELs in a language instruction educational program, based on the state's former AMAO 2 cohort definition, met the English Proficient level on CELDT?

AMAO 2: Percent of EL Students Attaining English Proficiency		
	2007-08	2008-09
Target	28.9%	30.6%
Percent Meeting Target	28.5%	30.4%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)	NO	NO

2. Annual Progress in Attaining English-language Proficiency (Title III AMAO 2)

b. What percent of ELs in a language instruction educational program for fewer than 5 years met the English Proficient level on CELDT?

AMAO 2: Percent of EL Students Attaining English Proficiency			
		2009-10	2010-11
Target		17.4%	18.7%
Percent Meeting Target		25.9%	24.7%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)		YES	YES

2. Annual Progress in Attaining English-language Proficiency (Title III AMAO 2)

c. What percent of ELs in a language instruction educational program for 5 years or more met the English Proficient level on CELDT?

AMAO 2: Percent of EL Students Attaining English Proficiency			
		2009-10	2010-11
Target		41.3%	43.2%
Percent Meeting Target		54.9%	54.2%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)		YES	YES

Briefly discuss the trends that you observe over time for your AMAO 2 results.

Consider This

Based on the data in this tables, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

3. Progress in Achieving Academic Standards (Title III AMAO 3 and Title I Adequate Yearly Progress for EL subgroup)

a. Did the EL subgroup meet AMAO 3 targets for participation rate in English-language arts (ELA)? In mathematics?

AMAO 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for EL Subgroup at the LEA Level: Participant Rate								
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
Participation Rate Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Actual Participation Rate	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

If participation rate targets were not met, discuss the observations you have made about student participation.

Based on the data in this table, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

3. Progress in Achieving Academic Standards (Title III AMAO 3 and Title I Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for EL subgroup)

b. Did the EL subgroup meet the AMAO 3 targets for percent proficient in ELA? In mathematics?

AMAO 3: AYP for EL Subgroup at the LEA Level: % Proficient								
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
% Proficient Target	34.0%	34.6%	45.0%	45.5%	56.0%	56.4%	67.0%	67.3%
% Proficient or Above	28.3%	31.0%	32.8%	34.6%	35.9%	38.6%	40.1%	45.0%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

Briefly discuss the trends that you observed over time for AMAO 3 for ELA and mathematics.

Based on the data in this table, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

PERFORMANCE ON THE CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT TEST (CELDT)

4. AMAO 1: How are EL students at each level of the CELDT meeting their growth target?

Prior Year CELDT Level	# in Proficiency Level Prior Year	% in Proficiency Level Prior Year	Number Meeting Growth Target	Percent Meeting Growth Target	State Avg. Meeting Growth Target
Beginning	402	7.6%	249	61.9%	64.0%
Early Intermediate	584	11.1%	334	57.2%	59.8%
Intermediate	1727	32.7%	613	35.5%	36.9%
Early Adv./ Advanced: Not English Proficient	205	3.9%	131	63.9%	49.5%
Early Adv./ Advanced: English Proficient	2364	44.8%	1854	78.4%	72.4%
Total	5282	100.0%	3181	60.2%	

What summary statements can be made about your data? At which CELDT proficiency levels do students make the most/least progress?

4. Survey Items: AMAO 1 -- CELDT Growth Targets by Proficiency Level

Rationale: English learners develop English language through an SBE-adopted/approved core program in English language development (ELD) and English-Language Arts (ELA). LEAs must ensure that students are appropriately placed, instructed and

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following items.)	Rating
4.1 The LEA ensures that teachers utilize SBE-adopted/approved materials for English-language development. (1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	
4.2 The criteria for grouping ELs for ELD instruction in a self-contained classroom are clearly defined, implemented and monitored. (2.3)	
4.3 In secondary departmentalized settings, criteria for placing ELs in separate ELD classes are clearly defined, implemented and monitored. (2.3)	
4.4 The criteria for providing ELD in a mainstream English class are clearly defined, implemented and monitored. (2.3, 2.4)	
4.5 Formative assessments are used on an ongoing basis to monitor the progress of ELs in ELD. (7.1)	
4.6 Summative assessments are used periodically to monitor the progress of ELs in ELD. (7.1)	
4.7 All teachers providing instruction to ELs in ELD are appropriately authorized to deliver ELD instruction. (5.1, 6.1)	
4.8 The LEA ensures that teachers utilize the SBE-adopted or approved basic core and Universal Access materials to support English learners in ELA. (1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	
4.9 The LEA ensures that school schedules allocate the appropriate number of minutes for basic core/strategic intervention, ELD and intensive intervention as identified. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)	
4.10 Formative assessments are used on an ongoing basis to monitor the progress of ELs in ELA. (7.1)	
4.11 Summative assessments are used periodically to monitor the progress of ELs in ELA. (7.1)	

Table Average

Based on the data in this table, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

5.a. AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in language instruction educational programs in U.S. schools?

[REQUIRED]

Length of Time in US Schools	Number Percent	Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient	Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient	Intermediate	Early Intermediate	Beginning	Total (by Time)
6 or more years	n=	2169	196	1286	261	91	4003
	%	54%	5%	32%	7%	2%	69%
5 years	n=	138	6	126	44	15	329
	%	42%	2%	38%	13%	5%	6%
4 years	n=	95	7	140	64	37	343
	%	28%	2%	41%	19%	11%	6%
3 years or less	n=	201	18	320	247	300	1086
	%	19%	2%	29%	23%	28%	19%
Total (by ELD level)	n=	2603	227	1872	616	443	5761
	%	45%	4%	32%	11%	8%	

Discuss the progress in English acquisition that your students are demonstrating based on the time in language instruction educational programs in U.S. schools.

5.a. Survey Items: AMAO 2 -- CELDT Growth Targets by Time in language instruction educational programs in U.S. Schools

Rationale: If students are making adequate progress learning English, they should reach English-language proficiency in a reasonable amount of time (per criteria in AMAO 1 and AMAO 2). The following survey items address the program needs of long-term ELs.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following items.)	Rating
5.a.1 The LEA develops, implements and monitors criteria for determining EL placement into and exit from intensive and strategic interventions in ELA. (2.1, 2.4, 7.1)	
5.a.2 The LEA ensures that teachers employ research-based instructional strategies within the context of the SBE-adopted/approved materials in ELA and ELD to help ELs progress through proficiency levels on the CELDT. (2.3, 5.2, 6.1)	
5.a.3 The LEA monitors staff use of the research-based instructional strategies in ELA and ELD designed to help ELs progress through proficiency levels on the CELDT. (4.1)	
5.a.4 Collaboration among all relevant staff around multiple sources of student data informs targeted professional development to meet EL instructional needs in subject area content and ELD. (7.1, 8.1)	

Table Average

Based on the data in this table, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

5.b. AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in language instruction educational programs in our district?

[OPTIONAL-High School Districts May Not Find Useful]

Length of Time in District	Number Percent	Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient	Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient	Inter-mediate	Early Inter-mediate	Beginning	Total (by Time)
6 or more years	n= %	0	0	0	0	0	0
5 years	n= %	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 years	n= %	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 years or less	n= %	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total (by ELD level)	n= %	0	0	0	0	0	0

Discuss the progress in English acquisition that your students are demonstrating based on the time they have been in language instruction educational programs in your district.

Based on the data in this table, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

6. How are EL students at the Intermediate level on CELDT performing on the CST (ELA and Math) by grade level?

What percent of students are in each of the following performance levels: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced?

a. ELA CST Performance of District EL Students at Intermediate level on CELDT

(as percent of Intermediate level EL population tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n=	7	3	3	5	16	23	12	69
	%	7%	3%	4%	9%	11%	25%	14%	11%
Below Basic	n=	11	24	22	19	56	35	47	214
	%	11%	25%	27%	34%	39%	38%	54%	33%
Basic	n=	45	48	46	29	70	33	26	297
	%	46%	51%	55%	52%	49%	35%	30%	45%
Proficient	n=	28	18	9	3	1	2	2	63
	%	29%	19%	11%	5%	1%	2%	2%	10%
Advanced	n=	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	12
	%	7%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Total (by grade)	n=	98	95	83	56	143	93	87	655
	%	15%	15%	13%	9%	22%	14%	13%	

Where do the majority of your Intermediate ELs score on the CST/ELA? What else do you want to know about these students? How will you get that information?

6.a. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST ELA Performance for ELs

Rationale: Many ELs in California score at the Intermediate level on the CELDT. These students still require differentiated instruction and interventions to reach both English language proficiency and grade level proficiency in ELA. It is important to consider the needs of newcomers as well as long-term ELs when determining their instructional services.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following items.)	Consider This	Rating
6.a.1 Teachers implement Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies for ELs in R/LA to ensure that ELs have meaningful access to grade appropriate core curriculum. (5.1)		
6.a.2 All teachers providing SDAIE to ELs are appropriately authorized to do so. (5.1)		
6.a.3 The ELA and ELD instruction for ELs is aligned with the EPCs, the Reading/Language Arts Framework and the CA English-Language Arts Standards. (1.1, 1.2, 1.3)		
6.a.4 The ELA and ELD program for English learners utilizes SBE-adopted materials at grades K-8 including all ancillary materials and SBE-approved, standards aligned materials at grades 9-12. (1.1, 1.2, 1.3)		
6.a.5 The SBE-adopted instructional materials and other standards-aligned instructional materials (in English and/or L1) are fully implemented for ELs. (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3)		
6.a.6 English learners at the Intermediate level on CELDT are provided strategic and intensive interventions as needed in addition to ELD, utilizing SBE-adopted and approved materials. (1.2, 1.3)		

Table Average

Based on the data in Table 6a and Table 9 (CAHSEE) for high schools and the results of the survey items, identify questions to investigate further.

6.b. Math CST Performance of District EL Students at Intermediate level on CELDT

(as percent of Intermediate level EL population tested at each grade level)

Math CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade 8	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
		2	3	4	5	6	7	Gen. Math	Algebra	
Far Below Basic	n=	2	0	0	9	18	11	3	18	61
	%	2%	0%	0%	16%	12%	11%	60%	21%	9%
Below Basic	n=	11	14	19	19	62	34	2	38	199
	%	11%	15%	22%	33%	42%	35%	40%	45%	30%
Basic	n=	27	18	34	24	49	37	0	25	214
	%	28%	19%	39%	42%	33%	39%	0%	29%	32%
Proficient	n=	44	37	26	4	18	13	0	4	146
	%	45%	39%	30%	7%	12%	14%	0%	5%	22%
Advanced	n=	14	26	9	1	1	1	0	0	52
	%	14%	27%	10%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	8%
Total (by grade)	n=	98	95	88	57	148	96	5	85	672
	%	15%	14%	13%	8%	22%	14%	1%	13%	

Where do the majority of your Intermediate ELs score on the CST/Math? What else do you want to know about these students? How will you get that information?

6.b. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST Math Performance for ELs.

Rationale: Many ELs in California score at the Intermediate level on the CELDT. These students still require differentiated instruction and interventions to reach proficiency in mathematics. It is important to consider both how long ELs have been in U.S. schools and their prior instruction and skills in mathematics when determining their instructional services.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following items.)	Consider This	Rating
6.b.1 Criteria are clearly defined for placing ELs in appropriate mathematics classes including interventions if needed. (4.2)		
6.b.2 English learners are placed in grade appropriate mathematics classes including algebra for eighth graders. (1.4)		
6.b.3 English learners have access to advanced coursework in mathematics in departmentalized settings and extended learning opportunities in self-contained settings. (1.1)		
6.b.4 The mathematics program for ELs utilizes SBE-adopted materials at grades K-8 and SBE-approved, standards-aligned materials at grades 9-12. (1.4)		
6.b.5 The SBE-adopted instructional materials including ancillary materials and other SBE-approved, standards-aligned instructional materials (in English and/or L1) are fully implemented for ELs. (2.5)		
6.b.6 Teachers of ELs utilize SDAIE strategies to ensure that ELs have meaningful access to grade-appropriate core curriculum in mathematics. For high school students this includes courses that meet graduation requirements and A-G coursework to enable ELs to meet UC/CSU admissions criteria. (1.4, 2.7, 4.2, 5.2)		
6.b.7 Mathematics teachers at the secondary level who teach ELs are appropriately authorized to teach mathematics and English learners.(3.1)		

Table Average

Based on the data in Table 6b and the results of the survey items, identify questions to investigate further?

7. How are EL students at the English Proficient level on the CELDT performing on the CST (ELA and Math) by grade level?
What percent of students are in each of the following performance levels: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced?

a. ELA CST Performance of District EL Students at English Proficient level on CELDT
(as percent of English proficient EL population tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	17
	%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%
Below Basic	n=	2	5	3	12	25	27	38	112
	%	3%	7%	3%	8%	9%	10%	17%	9%
Basic	n=	9	17	23	50	134	146	118	497
	%	12%	23%	22%	34%	48%	52%	53%	42%
Proficient	n=	39	31	46	48	90	89	49	392
	%	52%	42%	43%	33%	32%	32%	22%	33%
Advanced	n=	25	21	34	33	30	13	9	165
	%	33.3%	28.4%	32.1%	22.8%	10.6%	4.7%	4.1%	13.9%
Total (by grade)	n=	75	74	106	145	282	279	222	1183
	%	6%	6%	9%	12%	24%	24%	19%	

Reflect on your reclassification criteria and discuss the results you note on this table.

7.a. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST ELA Performance for ELs

Rationale: Many ELs reach the English proficient level on CELDT without attaining grade level academic proficiency in ELA. These students may continue to need additional support, including interventions, to reach proficiency in ELA. Teachers and counselors need to have and utilize detailed information about ELs in order to determine the most effective instructional services.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items.)	Consider This	Rating
7.a.1 The LEA provides teachers detailed information about their ELs including English proficiency, academic achievement data and time in U.S. schools. These data are provided in a timely fashion and inform instructional decisions. (7.1)		
7.a.2 The LEA uses a variety of data including English proficiency, academic achievement and time in U.S. schools when placing students in core and intervention classes. (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 7.1)		
7.a.3 The LEA ensures that the teaching and counseling staff closely monitor and support the academic progress of long-term ELs who are achieving below grade level performance in R/LA. (3.1, 7.1, 8.1)		

Table Average

Based on the data in Table 7a and the results of the survey items, identify questions to investigate further.

7.b. Math CST Performance of District EL Students at English Proficient Level on CELDT

(as percent of English Proficient EL population tested at each grade level)

Math CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8 Gen. Math	Grade 8 Algebra	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	2	4	4	0	34	44
	%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	16%	4%
Below Basic	n=	4	0	6	19	33	35	2	82	181
	%	5%	0%	6%	13%	12%	13%	67%	38%	15%
Basic	n=	10	10	12	38	86	104	1	60	321
	%	13%	14%	11%	26%	30%	37%	33%	28%	27%
Proficient	n=	17	20	32	38	109	107	0	38	361
	%	23%	27%	30%	26%	39%	38%	0%	17%	31%
Advanced	n=	44	44	55	49	50	29	0	4	275
	%	59%	59%	52%	34%	18%	10%	0%	2%	23%
Total (by grade)	n=	75	74	105	146	282	279	3	218	1182
	%	6%	6%	9%	12%	24%	24%	0%	18%	

Discuss what these data indicate regarding the access of ELs to grade level appropriate mathematics curriculum.

7.b. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST Math Performance for ELs at the English Proficient Level on CELDT

Rationale: Many ELs reach the English proficient level on CELDT without attaining grade level academic proficiency in mathematics. These students may continue to need additional support, including interventions, to reach grade level proficiency in mathematics. Teachers and counselors need to have and utilize detailed information about ELs in order to determine the most effective instructional services.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items.)	Consider This	Rating
7.b.1 The LEA provides teachers detailed information about their ELs including English proficiency, academic achievement data, previous mathematics instruction and time in U.S. schools. These data are provided in a timely fashion and inform placement and instructional decisions. (7.2)		
7.b.2 Mathematics intervention courses are available for ELs working below grade level per the recommendations of the CA Mathematics Framework and the Academic Program Survey (APS). (1.5, 1.6)		
7.b.3 SBE-adopted/approved mathematics intervention materials are fully implemented for students who need intervention. (1.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)		
7.b.4 The LEA ensures that teaching and counseling staff carefully monitor and support the progress of ELs who are not yet scoring proficient in mathematics to ensure that they receive support classes and/or interventions as needed to reach proficiency. (1.5, 1.6, 7.2)		

Table Average

Based on the data in Table 7b and the results of the survey items, identify questions to investigate further.

8. How are Reclassified-Fluent English Proficient (R-FEP) students performing on the CST (ELA and Math) by grade level?

a. ELA CST Performance of District RFEP Students

(as percent of RFEP students tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Below Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	0	8	12	13	33
Basic	n= 1 % 100%	2	100%	3	5	80	95	108	294
Proficient	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	2	10	107	176	138	433
Advanced	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	18	19	85	91	143	356
Total (by grade)	n= 1 % 0%	2	0%	23	35	280	374	403	1118

Consider your LEA's reclassification criteria and describe your observations about performance of R-FEP students in ELA.

8.a. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST ELA Performance for RFEP Students

Rationale: Most ELs are reclassified fluent English Proficient (R-FEP) before they reach proficient on the CST in ELA. Many former ELs drop in performance after reclassification. These students may require extra support, including interventions to help them reach grade level proficiency in ELA.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items unless otherwise specified.)	Rating
8.a.1 R-FEPs are monitored for two years after reclassification for their progress in ELA. (20 USC 6841; 5 CCR 11304, Education Code 313 [d], Section 11510, Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Title III Section 3121 [a] 4)	
8.a.2 Instructional support, including interventions, is provided as needed for R-FEPs who are not yet proficient in ELA. (1.2, 1.3)	

Table Average

Based on the data in this table and the results of the survey items, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

8.b. Math CST Performance of District R-FEP Students

(as percent of R-FEP students tested at each grade level)

Math CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade 8	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
		2	3	4	5	6	7	Gen. Math	Algebra	
Far Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	13	15
	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%		4%	1%
Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	1	22	17	0	89	129
	%	0%	0%	0%	3%	8%	5%		24%	12%
Basic	n=	0	0	2	6	58	87	0	87	240
	%	0%	0%	9%	17%	21%	23%		24%	22%
Proficient	n=	1	1	1	7	112	176	0	147	445
	%	100%	50%	4%	20%	40%	47%		40%	41%
Advanced	n=	0	1	20	21	87	93	0	33	255
	%	0%	50%	87%	60%	31%	25%		9%	24%
Total (by grade)	n=	1	2	23	35	281	373	0	369	1084
	%	0%	0%	2%	3%	26%	34%	0%	34%	

Consider your LEA's reclassification criteria and describe your observations about performance of R-FEP students in mathematics.

8.b. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST Math Performance for R-FEP Students

Rationale: Most ELs are reclassified as fluent English Proficient before they reach proficient on the CST in mathematics. Many former ELs drop in performance after reclassification. These students may require extra support, including interventions to help them reach grade level proficiency in mathematics.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items unless otherwise specified.)	Rating
8.b.1 R-FEPs are monitored for two years after reclassification for their progress in mathematics. (20 USC 6841; 5 CCR 11304, Education Code 313 [d], Section 11510 and Title III Section 3121 [a] 4)	
8.b.2 Instructional support, including interventions, is provided as needed for R-FEPs who are not yet proficient in mathematics. (1.5, 1.6)	
8.b.3. R-FEPs are placed in Algebra or more advanced courses in eight grade. Those who require an algebra support class are placed in algebra and a support class. (1.5, 1.5, 7.2)	

Table Average

Based on the data in this table and the results of the survey items, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

PERFORMANCE ON THE CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAM CAHSEE

9. How are EL Students performing on the CAHSEE according to the length of time they have been in the U.S. schools?

(use total ELs tested on combined 10th grade census test)

Performance of EL Students on CAHSEE	Number Percent	Number of Years in U.S. Schools				Total ELs
		0 to 3 Years	4 to 5 Years	6 or more Years	Unknown Years	
Tested in ELA	n=	49	26	693	0	768
Passed ELA	n=	20	14	394	0	428
	%	41%	54%	57%		56%
Proficient ELA	n=	8	4	136	0	148
	%	16%	15%	20%		19%
Tested in Math	n=	48	26	690	1	765
Passed Math	n=	33	20	427	0	480
	%	69%	77%	62%	0%	63%
Proficient Math*	n=	18	12	148	0	178
	%	38%	46%	21%	0%	23%

Note: CAHSEE Passed vs. Proficient

Describe your observations about the performance of ELs on the CAHSEE overall and by years in U.S. schools.

9. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CAHSEE Mathematics and ELA Performance for ELs

Rationale: ELs are required to pass the CAHSEE in order to be eligible to receive a high school diploma. Many ELs who have been in U.S. schools for more than 5 years do not pass the CAHSEE1. LEAs must ensure that all ELs requiring support receive it in order to pass the CAHSEE as well as to meet the AYP performance standard. 1. A passing score of 350 entitles students to be eligible to receive a diploma. A proficient score of 380 or higher is required to meet the AYP performance standard.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items.)	Rating
9.1 ELs are provided appropriate interventions and support to pass the CAHSEE. (1.3, 1.5, 1.6)	
9.2 ELs are provided appropriate interventions and support to reach proficiency on the CAHSEE. (1.3, 1.5, 1.6)	

Table Average

10. How are R-FEP students performing on the CAHSEE according to the length of time they have been in the U.S. schools?

(use total R-FEPs tested on combined 10th grade census test)

Performance of R-FEP Students on CAHSEE	Number Percent	Number of Years in U.S. Schools				Total R-FEPs
		0 to 3 Years	4 to 5 Years	6 or more Years	Unknown Years	
Tested in ELA	n=	0	0	2	628	630
Passed ELA	n=	0	0	1	599	600
	%			50%	95%	95%
Proficient ELA	n=	0	0	1	418	419
	%			50%	67%	67%
Tested in Math	n=	0	0	2	629	631
Passed Math	n=	0	0	1	586	587
	%			50%	93%	93%
Proficient Math*	n=	0	0	0	385	385
	%			0%	61%	61%

Describe your observations about the performance of ELs on the CAHSEE overall and by years in U.S. schools.

10. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CAHSEE Mathematics and ELA Performance for R-FEPs

Rationale: Many ELs are reclassified R-FEP before reaching proficiency in English language arts and mathematics. Some of these students are unable to pass or reach proficiency on the CAHSEE2. The LEA must ensure that R-FEPs requiring support received in order to pass the CAHSEE as well as to meet the AYP performance standard. 2. A passing score of 350 entitles students to be eligible to receive a diploma. A proficient score of 380 or higher is required to meet the AYP performance standard.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items.)	Rating
10.1 R-FEPs are provided appropriate interventions and support to pass the CAHSEE. (1.3, 1.5, 1.6)	
10.2 R-FEPs are provided appropriate interventions and support to reach proficiency on the CAHSEE. (1.3, 1.5, 1.6)	

Table Average

Based on the data in Tables 9 and 10 and the results of the survey items, identify questions to investigate further.

August 2011
Language Policy and Leadership Office
California Department of Education