

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
Parts I and II**

for  
**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**  
under the  
**ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT**  
As amended in 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2014-15**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015**  
**PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

**PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION**

**SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2014-15 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013 -14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005 -06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS


The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2014-15 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2014-15 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2014-15		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: California Department of Education		
Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Sonya Edwards		
Telephone: 916-327-2014		
Fax: 916-323-5110		
e-mail: sedwards@cde.ca.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jerry Winkler		
		<u>Thursday, March 3, 2016, 1:56:37 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2014-15**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2015  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

California adopted the Common Core State Standards in the 2010-11 school year. These were subsequently updated in 2013. The Next Generation Science Standards were adopted in the fall of 2013.
---

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2015-16	SY 2015-16	SY 2017-18

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

We are still using the old pre-Next Generation Science Standards assessments for science. The achievement standards remain the same.

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2015-16	SY 2015-16	SY 2017-18

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

--

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2014-15, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	20.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2014-15 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No Response
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b) (3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	3,146,556	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	17,505	98.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	390,569	99.5
<i>Asian</i>	S	288,602	99.6
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	S	16,010	99.0
Black or African American	S	181,003	98.4
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,687,118	99.2
White	S	768,308	99.1
Two or more races	S	85,276	99.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	331,236	98.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	619,016	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	S	1,872,104	99.1
Migratory students	S	34,334	99.2
Male	S	1,603,660	99.1
Female	S	1,542,896	99.2

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for the California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	245,493	74.11
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	61,482	18.56
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	24,261	7.32
Total	331,236	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for the California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.		

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

**1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	3,139,668	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	17,579	98.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	386,728	99.3
Asian	S	285,384	99.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	16,016	99.1
Black or African American	S	181,368	98.3
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,682,962	99.1
White	S	768,853	99.0
Two or more races	S	85,410	99.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	332,096	98.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	609,840	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	S	1,883,607	99.0
Migratory students	S	33,765	99.0
Male	S	1,599,801	99.0
Female	S	1,539,867	99.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

**1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments**

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	

**1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	261,794	78.83
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	46,041	13.86
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	24,261	7.31
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	332,096	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.		

**1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	1,336,056	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	7,525	98.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	168,944	99.6
Asian	S	123,464	99.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	6,951	99.1
Black or African American	S	78,316	98.7
Hispanic or Latino	S	706,232	99.2
White	S	334,628	99.3
Two or more races	S	33,823	99.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	139,040	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	208,805	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	S	781,826	99.2
Migratory students	S	13,883	99.3
Male	S	681,493	99.2
Female	S	654,563	99.3

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	76,193	54.80
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,090	2.94
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	48,349	34.77
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	10,408	7.49
Total	139,040	////////////////////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Participation in the California Modified Assessment declined in 2015, with more disabled students taking the regular assessment.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least once in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

## 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	471,572	S	40.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,524	S	29
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,191	S	68.8
<i>Asian</i>	41,186	S	72.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,211	S	36
Black or African American	25,990	S	22.4
Hispanic or Latino	261,232	S	27.8
White	109,391	S	58.0
Two or more races	15,355	S	56.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44,281	S	18.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	152,256	S	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	293,869	S	27.0
Migratory students	5,656	S	18.8
Male	240,960	S	41.0
Female	230,612	S	39.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

## 1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	469,862	S	37.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,530	S	27
Asian or Pacific Islander	53,491	S	62.4
<i>Asian</i>	40,606	S	64.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,205	S	33
Black or African American	25,999	S	23.0
Hispanic or Latino	260,341	S	25.5
White	109,255	S	55.4
Two or more races	15,364	S	54.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44,359	S	14.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	150,633	S	17.1
Economically disadvantaged students	292,893	S	24.2
Migratory students	5,533	S	14.2
Male	240,024	S	33.6
Female	229,838	S	41.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in Grade 3.			

## 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	461,507	S	34.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,436	S	25
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,945	S	64.2
<i>Asian</i>	41,466	S	69.1
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,272	S	27
Black or African American	25,513	S	17.4
Hispanic or Latino	252,472	S	21.7
White	109,415	S	51.8
Two or more races	14,259	S	51.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	48,075	S	13.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	121,099	S	11.4
Economically disadvantaged students	284,975	S	21.2
Migratory students	5,414	S	13.7
Male	234,792	S	35.7
Female	226,715	S	33.6

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

## 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	459,714	S	39.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,442	S	30
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,279	S	65.2
<i>Asian</i>	40,920	S	68.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,279	S	33
Black or African American	25,548	S	23.5
Hispanic or Latino	251,426	S	26.9
White	109,316	S	57.5
Two or more races	14,258	S	57.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	48,136	S	13.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	119,474	S	11.3
Economically disadvantaged students	283,926	S	25.7
Migratory students	5,323	S	15.4
Male	233,857	S	35.5
Female	225,857	S	43.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

## 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in Grade 4.			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	458,410	S	30.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,496	S	17
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,617	S	59.7
<i>Asian</i>	42,486	S	64.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,381	S	23
Black or African American	25,863	S	13.7
Hispanic or Latino	246,430	S	17.4
White	111,570	S	46.4
Two or more races	13,014	S	46.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	49,738	S	9.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	101,354	S	6.5
Economically disadvantaged students	278,844	S	17.1
Migratory students	5,355	S	10.2
Male	233,818	S	31.4
Female	224,592	S	29.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

**1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	456,931	S	44.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,502	S	29
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,023	S	69.3
<i>Asian</i>	41,971	S	72.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,379	S	38
Black or African American	25,923	S	28.0
Hispanic or Latino	245,496	S	32.4
White	111,561	S	62.0
Two or more races	13,017	S	61.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	49,846	S	13.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	99,874	S	11.2
Economically disadvantaged students	277,928	S	31.1
Migratory students	5,260	S	20.8
Male	233,065	S	39.4
Female	223,866	S	50.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

## 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	460,483	S	54.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,499	S	45
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,906	S	75.2
<i>Asian</i>	42,683	S	78.1
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,385	S	45
Black or African American	25,998	S	38.2
Hispanic or Latino	247,685	S	41.6
White	111,931	S	74.5
Two or more races	13,033	S	73.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	53,076	S	41.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102,285	S	21.4
Economically disadvantaged students	280,241	S	41.1
Migratory students	5,340	S	25.6
Male	235,481	S	56.0
Female	225,002	S	53.1
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	454,644	S	32.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,483	S	22
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,852	S	62.8
<i>Asian</i>	42,081	S	68.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,291	S	27
Black or African American	26,085	S	16.1
Hispanic or Latino	242,865	S	19.9
White	111,825	S	48.6
Two or more races	11,690	S	47.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46,619	S	7.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	77,217	S	5.6
Economically disadvantaged students	274,964	S	19.6
Migratory students	4,920	S	13.2
Male	231,837	S	32.2
Female	222,807	S	33.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

**1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	453,228	S	42.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,486	S	31
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,302	S	69.1
<i>Asian</i>	41,630	S	72.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,291	S	38
Black or African American	26,067	S	26.9
Hispanic or Latino	242,102	S	30.3
White	111,684	S	59.0
Two or more races	11,672	S	58.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46,722	S	9.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	75,869	S	7.5
Economically disadvantaged students	274,052	S	29.2
Migratory students	4,839	S	20.1
Male	231,126	S	37.3
Female	222,102	S	48.6

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in Grade 6.			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	446,286	S	33.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,630	S	22
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,534	S	65.2
<i>Asian</i>	40,727	S	71.0
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,308	S	28
Black or African American	26,293	S	16.2
Hispanic or Latino	238,882	S	20.5
White	109,579	S	50.0
Two or more races	10,954	S	49.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44,067	S	7.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	66,421	S	5.8
Economically disadvantaged students	268,272	S	20.5
Migratory students	4,783	S	14.2
Male	226,905	S	33.7
Female	219,381	S	34.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

**1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	445,271	S	43.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,629	S	32
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,967	S	70.1
<i>Asian</i>	40,260	S	73.6
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,309	S	37
Black or African American	26,324	S	27.0
Hispanic or Latino	238,283	S	31.0
White	109,715	S	60.8
Two or more races	10,954	S	59.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44,138	S	9.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	65,091	S	5.7
Economically disadvantaged students	267,581	S	29.9
Migratory students	4,698	S	20.0
Male	226,342	S	38.3
Female	218,929	S	49.3

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not administer a statewide science test in Grade 7.			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	446,654	S	33.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,515	S	22
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,191	S	64.7
<i>Asian</i>	40,918	S	70.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,288	S	26
Black or African American	27,045	S	15.9
Hispanic or Latino	237,459	S	20.3
White	110,750	S	48.4
Two or more races	10,291	S	47.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	43,169	S	6.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58,676	S	6.0
Economically disadvantaged students	264,905	S	20.7
Migratory students	4,576	S	15.1
Male	227,358	S	32.5
Female	219,296	S	34.2

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

**1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	445,821	S	45.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,526	S	33
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,610	S	70.9
<i>Asian</i>	40,447	S	74.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,279	S	38
Black or African American	27,176	S	28.7
Hispanic or Latino	236,902	S	33.1
White	110,886	S	61.7
Two or more races	10,336	S	61.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	43,306	S	9.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	57,394	S	5.7
Economically disadvantaged students	264,339	S	32.3
Migratory students	4,501	S	23.1
Male	226,918	S	39.3
Female	218,903	S	51.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

## 1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	449,383	S	62.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,519	S	55
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,335	S	82.9
<i>Asian</i>	40,974	S	85.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,292	S	57
Black or African American	27,305	S	45.1
Hispanic or Latino	239,112	S	51.8
White	111,331	S	78.8
Two or more races	10,365	S	75.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46,290	S	37.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	59,617	S	23.0
Economically disadvantaged students	266,728	S	51.2
Migratory students	4,563	S	40.3
Male	229,136	S	63.7
Female	220,247	S	61.4
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	383,221	S	31.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,226	S	23
Asian or Pacific Islander	53,274	S	60.5
<i>Asian</i>	37,864	S	67.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,149	S	22
Black or African American	22,156	S	14.9
Hispanic or Latino	194,465	S	19.4
White	100,728	S	43.4
Two or more races	9,032	S	43.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	31,026	S	4.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	33,305	S	6.0
Economically disadvantaged students	206,274	S	20.3
Migratory students	3,458	S	13.6
Male	191,846	S	31.8
Female	191,375	S	31.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 Math Field Test.

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	384,580	S	58.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,269	S	53
Asian or Pacific Islander	53,091	S	76.6
<i>Asian</i>	37,676	S	78.7
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,164	S	51
Black or African American	22,273	S	42.1
Hispanic or Latino	195,100	S	49.4
White	101,386	S	70.7
Two or more races	9,128	S	71.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	31,328	S	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32,818	S	9.1
Economically disadvantaged students	206,810	S	48.2
Migratory students	3,439	S	35.2
Male	192,325	S	53.7
Female	192,255	S	64.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. California does not have performance data for California Alternate Assessment 2015 RLA Field Test.

## 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	426,190	S	53.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,507	S	51
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,703	S	73.5
<i>Asian</i>	39,807	S	76.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	2,274	S	44
Black or African American	25,013	S	36.6
Hispanic or Latino	219,435	S	41.2
White	111,366	S	71.7
Two or more races	10,425	S	69.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	39,674	S	27.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46,903	S	12.0
Economically disadvantaged students	234,857	S	40.8
Migratory students	3,980	S	27.2
Male	216,876	S	55.8
Female	209,314	S	51.9

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The science assessment counts differ from those in Math and RLA because the science test is given to grade 10 students while the Math and RLA tests are given to grade 11 students. In the past all students were grade 10.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
Schools	9,963	8,800	88.33
Districts	1,002	780	77.84

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator <sup>3</sup> based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
Schools			
Districts			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

<sup>3</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2014-15. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools	6,457	5,841	90.46
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	5,486	4,984	90.85
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	971	857	88.26

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator <sup>4</sup> based on data for SY 2014-15. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

<sup>4</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15
865	701	81.04

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>5</sup> based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

<sup>5</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	519
Extension of the school year or school day	59
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	30
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	21
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	160
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	111
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	24
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	13
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	395
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other reported major restructuring of school activities included, but were not limited to:

- Establishment and Implementation of Professional Learning Communities
- Initiating targeted professional development for instructional staff and administrators, including professional development related to the Common Core State Standards
- Implementation of standards-based, standards-aligned core curriculum, including Common Core State Standards, and researched-based intervention strategies
- Revision of the instructional master schedule to increase instruction and intervention time and allow for professional development activities

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Beginning in 2003, the state Legislature appropriated a portion of the Title I, Part A set aside for local educational agencies (LEAs) at-risk of Program Improvement (PI), in PI, or in corrective action to use to improve student achievement. LEAs include districts and county offices of education. LEAs must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in order to avoid PI status. AYP is aggregated at the LEA level and disaggregated by numerically significant student groups. California LEAs advance in improvement status largely based upon the performance of English learners (EL), students with disabilities and students not meeting grade-level requirements.

California Education Code (EC) Section 52055.57(a) requires the State Educational Agency (SEA) to identify and notify LEAs that are at risk of being identified for PI within two years, providing them with research-based criteria to conduct a voluntary self-assessment. Available state assessment tools include: the Academic Program Survey, (APS) designed to help a school analyze the extent to which it is providing a coherent instructional program to support improved student achievement; the District Assistance Survey, designed to guide LEAs and their technical assistance providers in supporting school-level improvement around areas assessed in the APS; the English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment, which serves as a district-level tool for LEAs to analyze outcomes and program services for English learners (ELs); and, the Inventory of Services and Support for Students with Disabilities, which is designed to gain a deeper understanding of the learning needs of students with disabilities. These assessments are available at the California Department of Education State Program Assessment Tools Web page. LEAs are provided with technical assistance on the use of these tools through webinars and webcasts, as well as through the Regional System of District and School Support (RSDSS), which is one component of the Statewide System of School Support.

On March 7, 2014, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) approved California's testing waiver for certain statutory and regulatory requirements of Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended. Specifically, a one-year waiver was granted that allows flexibility in making AYP determinations for schools and LEAs participating in the Smarter Balanced assessment field test. The CDE did not produce a 2014 AYP report for elementary and middle schools and elementary and unified school districts. Therefore, the PI status for these schools and districts did not change. Schools did not enter or exit PI. However, schools and districts continued to implement the PI requirements associated with their current PI status.

The CDE did continue to make AYP determinations for any high schools serving only grades nine through twelve and high school districts based on achievement results from the grade ten California High School Exit Exam and California Alternate Performance Assessment. The AYP was used to identify PI status for these high schools and high school districts. When an LEA is identified for PI, it must notify parents of its status; convene a district-level team of teachers, parents, and school and district administrators to analyze achievement data for all students; conduct a comprehensive assessment of needs using the tools identified above; and revise its LEA Plan, identifying key action steps for improvement. LEAs must also offer school choice. LEAs are provided with technical assistance in the development and implementation of LEA Plans through CDE webinars and webcasts, ongoing telephone and e-mail support with CDE staff, and RSDSS support.

Districts are directed to reserve no less than ten percent of their Title I, Part A allocation for high quality professional development. LEAs in PI Year 2 must notify parents of the LEAs PI status, reserve at least ten percent of the LEA Title I allocation for professional development, and continue implementing the revised LEA Plan developed in Year 1. LEAs must also offer school choice and supplemental educational services (SES). LEAs continue to receive technical assistance via RSDSS. An LEA that advances to Year 3 corrective action is subject to additional Title I accountability requirements. In addition to parent notification, school choice and SES, the LEA is subject to one or more sanctions as required by federal law. In addition, each LEA with PI schools receives fiscal resources from the federal set-aside as specified in California EC Section 52055.57(c).

As of December, 2015, 428 LEAs have advanced to Program Improvement Year 3. At present, 331 LEAs in corrective action have been assigned to "institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including participation in professional development for relevant staff, with special attention to the needs of high priority students." High priority students have been defined in California as ELs, students with disabilities, and students not meeting grade-level standards. In November 2013, due to the changes occurring in the state of California with Common Core and the Smarter Balanced Assessments, the California State Board of Education (SBE) changed the assigned corrective action. Eighty seven LEAs have been assigned to "continue to reserve an amount equal to 10 percent of its Title I allocation to provide professional development for teachers and administrators to strengthen the academic achievement of the LEA's students determined to be in greatest need of assistance." Note: Six California Office to Reform Education (CORE) districts, though identified for program improvement, are not subject to PI requirements due to the approval of their own waiver from ED.

During the 2014-15 school year, four LEAs were assigned a fiscal trustee or administrator due to the existence of an emergency loan from the State to the LEA.

Each corrective action LEA is differentiated based upon an index of the pervasiveness and severity of academic achievement problems (see California EC Section 52055.57(c)). Selected LEAs with low index values may be assigned to work with a District Assistance and Intervention Team (DAIT) or other technical assistance provider, whose responsibilities are to:

- Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment
- Make recommendations for improvement (based on the results of the needs assessment)
- Assist the LEA in revising its LEA Plan to document steps to implement the assigned corrective action
- Support the LEA in implementing the revised LEA Plan

If assigned, LEAs shall incorporate the recommendations of the DAIT or other technical assistance provider in their revised LEA Plan unless exempted by the SEA. Due to the higher academic achievement of LEAs that were assigned corrective action, the last two cohorts of corrective action LEAs have not been assigned any DAITs; though they have been required to access technical assistance and have been provided with fiscal resources to access technical resources to implement the assigned corrective action.

The SEA may review the performance and progress of any LEA in corrective action at any time. In addition, California EC Section 52055.57(d) (5) (e) states any LEA that fails to exit improvement within three years shall appear before the California SBE, who may, upon hearing testimony from the LEA, assign an alternative corrective action.

To accomplish this requirement in an efficient logistical manner, corrective action LEAs are required to complete an annual end-of-year evidence of progress report on their implementation of strategies and tasks to improve the academic achievement of their students, which is then reported to the California SBE.



**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	331
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	87
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	4
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2013-14 and beginning of SY 2014-15 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2014-15 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	5	2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete	02/16/16

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.****1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2014 (SY 2014-15) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance**

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2014-15.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The California Department of Education (CDE) provided technical assistance to local educational agencies through Webinars, conference calls, and posting frequently asked questions and guidance to our CDE Web page. The CDE provides on-going technical assistance via e-mail and individual telephone calls.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2014-15 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title I schools supported by State-funded programs are implementing the nine Essential Program Components endorsed by the State Board of Education (SBE):

- 1) Instructional Program: Standards-aligned English-language arts and mathematics textbooks and SBE adopted Pre- Algebra and Algebra I textbooks
- 2) Student access to high school standards-aligned core courses (master schedule and pacing schedule)
- 3) Principals' Instructional Leadership Training
- 4) Teachers' Professional Development Opportunities
- 5) Student Achievement Monitoring System
- 6) Ongoing instructional assistance and support
- 7) Teacher/Department and subject matter collaboration
- 8) Intervention programs for students performing below grade level standards
- 9) Fiscal support

#### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	2,514,837
Applied to transfer	30,157
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	19,925
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$20,675,577

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	296

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. *How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice?* In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
---

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	2,249,687
Applied for supplemental educational services	281,649
Received supplemental educational services	163,400
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$135,983,585
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	780,930	723,914	92.70	57,016	7.30
All elementary classes	165,896	163,084	98.30	2,812	1.70
All secondary classes	615,034	560,830	91.19	54,204	8.81

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
--	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state counts elementary classes so that a full day self -contained equals one class.
--

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

**1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified**

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

<b>1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes</b>	
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	17.40
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	82.60
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<b>1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes</b>	
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.30
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	89.70
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

**NOTE:** No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that *for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles*, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	43,208	42,403	98.14
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	39,561	39,080	98.78
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	119,291	108,110	90.63
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	181,062	168,942	93.31

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	87.20	36.40
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Program	
Secondary schools	83.80	41.70
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Program	

**FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty**

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Armenian, Cantonese, Chinese, French, German, Hmong, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Armenian, Cantonese, Chinese, French, German, Hmong, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Cantonese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, Vietnamese
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Cantonese, Filipino, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Armenian, Chinese, French, Hmong, Khmer, Mandarin, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian, Vietnamese
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In California, dual language programs are also known as two-way immersion programs. We have entered the same information on both lines.

Other programs include:

- Academic Language Development
- Accelerated Reader Program
- Blended Learning
- English 3D Pilot Program
- English Language Development
- English Language Mainstream
- Extended Day English Language Development
- Florida Virtual
- Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD)
- Integrated and Designated English Language Development
- Long-term English Learner Program
- Newcomer English Learner Program
- Push-in English as a Second Language
- Renaissance Learning Reading Program
- Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI2)
- Revolution K12
- Rosetta Stone
- Scholastic Read 180
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)
- Sobrato Early Academic Language Program
- Spanish Biliteracy Program
- Spanish for Native Speakers
- STAR Reading Program
- Systematic English Language Development
- Systems 44
- Transitional English Language Mainstream
- Welcome Academies

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- o Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- o Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	1,397,841
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	1,354,691
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	1,170,464
Chinese	38,107
Vietnamese	31,959
Tagalog	19,167
Arabic	16,850

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

**1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,364,054
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	79,283
Total	1,443,337
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	S
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	33.3
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		1,329,392
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		69,350
Total		1,398,742
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		197,090

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	S	55.8	667,856	60.50
Attained proficiency	S	33.1		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are two cohorts with two targets for the "Attained Proficiency" category:  
 Total number of ELs who have been in EL program for less than 5 years = 867,751. The target number of LEAs met less than 5 years cohort is 867,751 x 24.2% = 209,996.  
 Total number of ELs who have been in EL program for 5 years or more = 452,445. The target number of LEAs met 5 years or more cohort is 452,445 x 50.9% = 230,295





**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
305,746	305,588	611,334
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
262,427	S	32.8	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
262,431	S	44.8	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
86,476	S	60.6	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			



**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
164,025	8,145	476

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note:** Section 3301(8) – The term ‘ Language instruction educational program ’ means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child’s native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

<b>Title III Teachers</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	203,284
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	24,898

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	633
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	582
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	604
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	537
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	529
Other (Explain in comment box)	142

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	647	326,660
PD provided to principals	599	33,135
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	543	59,166
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	458	77,927
PD provided to community based organization personnel	161	24,222
Total	//////////	521,110

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

California does not separate content teachers from LEP teachers. All teachers were reported on the second line.

Other professional development topics include:

- Academic vocabulary instruction for English learners (ELs)
- Access and equity issues for ELs
- Blended learning
- Culturally responsive practices for EL students
- District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) parent training on access to EL student information
- Effective community outreach strategies
- English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and DELAC leadership
- ELs with special needs
- English Language Arts (ELA)/English Language Development (ELD) Framework
- Integrated and Designated ELD
- Long-term ELs
- Technology integration
- Using EL data to inform and differentiate instruction

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2014-15 funds July 1, 2014, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2014, for SY 2014-15 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/14	09/26/14	87
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees**

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The California Department of Education (CDE) has adopted and implemented a revised plan to ensure Title III subgrants are made in a timely manner so that local educational agencies (LEAs) can carry out their proposed activities. Initial payments are made based on eligibility amounts, rather than waiting for the end of the application window. This year, 2015-16 funds were available on September 30, 2015. The CDE reads every LEA plan to comply with new regulations and determine that the plan is substantially approvable before releasing funds to the LEA.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youth and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1,045	1,045
LEAs with subgrants	118	118
Total	1,163	1,163
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There was a six percent decrease in the number of local educational agencies (LEA) with subgrants. This is due to the decrease in mini-subgrants allocated from county offices of education to other LEAs.		

**1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)**

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youth in the State.

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,354	513
K	14,262	9,280
1	12,853	8,071
2	12,412	7,704
3	12,461	7,713
4	11,937	7,472
5	10,976	6,765
6	10,148	6,492
7	9,708	5,898
8	9,434	5,785
9	10,530	4,650
10	10,129	4,758
11	9,766	4,243
12	10,094	4,516
Ungraded	34	34
Total	146,098	83,894

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The homeless count decreased because: 1) some local educational agencies (LEAs) began verifying a pupil's homeless status at the beginning of the school year rather than automatically rolling over the homeless pupils' records from the previous year. This review resulted in the reclassification of some homeless pupils as permanently housed; 2) the homeless status codes were moved to a new location in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), and the homeless status of existing pupils did not automatically transfer into the new location. Instead, LEAs were required to enter the homeless status of existing pupils into the new location. If the LEA did not take this action, the pupil's designation as homeless would have been lost; 3) some LEAs changed Student Information Systems (SIS), and lost homeless data as information was transferred from one SIS system to another; and 4) parent employment status changed; and 5) housing status of homeless pupils changed.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	10,695	4,581
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	126,829	73,555
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	3,107	2,746
Hotels/Motels	5,467	3,012
Total	146,098	83,894

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled**

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students enrolled during the regular school year.

<b>Special Population</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Unaccompanied homeless youth	3,300	1,608
Migratory children/youth	3,087	1,977
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,211	10,426
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	44,545	26,581

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	3,618
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6,444
K	27,975
1	26,054
2	25,829
3	25,029
4	24,019
5	22,851
6	21,233
7	19,292
8	19,531
9	16,715
10	17,377
11	15,434
12	16,479
Ungraded	1,504
Total	289,384

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Please note that some of this count might be duplicated. This data is collected via a survey that does not include a unique statewide student identifier. In addition, there are subgrants to county offices of education that provide technical assistance, professional development, and outreach to the entire county. Within those counties, there might be subgrants to school districts that also provide services to homeless children and youth.

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	3,936
Migratory children/youth	5,111
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	27,443
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	68,798

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youth.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State reading/language arts assessment and the number and percentage of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	11,409	S	21.2	6,877	S	20.7
4	10,912	S	21.6	6,672	S	20.1
5	10,019	S	26.9	6,072	S	25.6
6	9,239	S	24.4	5,743	S	25.4
7	8,750	S	25.2	5,119	S	25.6
8	8,416	S	28.2	4,977	S	27.0
High School	6,780	S	44.2	2,697	S	42

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The California Department of Education (CDE) replaced the paper -and-pencil based Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program assessments on July 1, 2013. During the 2013-14 school year the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) was field studied, and results were not used; however, in the 2014-15 school year, the SBAC and its results were used.

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	11,509	S	23.0	6,959	S	22.7
4	11,041	S	17.6	6,744	S	16.4
5	10,145	S	13.5	6,150	S	12.8
6	9,326	S	15.6	5,803	S	15.6
7	8,816	S	16.2	5,175	S	15.8
8	8,471	S	17.3	5,009	S	15.8
High School	6,775	S	17.4	2,700	S	14

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The California Department of Education (CDE) replaced the paper -and-pencil based Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program assessments on July 1, 2013. During the 2013-14 school year the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) was field studied, and results were not used; however, in the 2014-15 school year, the SBAC and its results were used.

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	10,163	S	37.6	6,167	S	35.4
6						
7						
8	8,493	S	47.5	5,005	S	43.2
High School	8,211	S	36.9	3,468	S	35.2

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The California Department of Education (CDE) replaced the paper -and-pencil based Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program assessments on July 1, 2013. During the 2013-14 school year the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) was field studied, and results were not used; however, in the 2014-15 school year, the SBAC and its results were used.