## Exhibit 1: Demographic Summary for California Alternate Assessment English Learners

**Number and Proportion of Students Taking the CAA Assessments**

In California, a total of 39, 885 students were eligible to be tested with the alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and 11 in both ELA and Mathematics in 2017. This is approximately 1.2% (39,885) of the total enrollment in grades 3-8 and 11 of 3,345,874 students.

Overall, 11.2 % (409,271) of the total enrollment were students with disabilities, and 9.7% of these students took the CAA assessment.

**Number and Proportion of English Learners**

The EL makeup of the population tested with the California Alternate Assessment is significantly different from that of the population tested with the Smarter Balanced Assessments.

In 2017, 13,454 of 39,885 students, or 33.7%, in the CAA eligible population were classified as English learners. This is much higher that the figure of 18.1% for the Smarter Balanced Assessments. The proportion of RFEP students in the CAA eligible population was 5.5%, much lower than the 21% found for the Smarter Balanced Assessments.

**Table 1. Number and Percentage of Students by English Language Proficiency, 2017 CAASPP ELA Assessments**

| | CAA | | SBAC | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Missing | 42 | 0.1% | 7,230 | 0.2% |
| EL | 13,454 | 33.7% | 597,612 | 18.1% |
| EO | 23,674 | 59.4% | 1,853,414 | 56.1% |
| IFEP | 505 | 1.3% | 150,920 | 4.6% |
| RFEP | 2,183 | 5.5% | 694,025 | 21.0% |
| TBD | 27 | 0.1% | 2,788 | 0.1% |
| Total | 39,885 | 100% | 3,305,989 | 100% |

**Gender and EL Status**

The gender makeup of the CAA and Smarter Balanced students are quite different. The CAA population has a higher proportion of boys (66.9%) than does the Smarter Balanced Population (51.1%). However, for the EL population the gender difference is smaller. EL students in the CAA population were 64.9% boys vs. 55.2% for Smarter Balanced.

**Economically Disadvantaged Status**

In California, economically disadvantaged students makeup 60% of the enrollment in grades 3-8 and 11. For the EL population the percentage is 87%. Overall the CAA population is 63.3% economically disadvantaged and the EL pop is 80.1%

**Exhibit 1 (continued):**
**Disability Types for EL Students on the CAA**

Overall CAA students show a different distribution of disabilities than for the SBAC assessments. Generally, the CAA population has more students with autism and intellectual disabilities than does the SBAC SWD population. The CAA also has fewer students identified with a specific learning disability or speech impairment than does the SBAC. CAA EL students are more likely to be classified as having an intellectual disability than CAA students that are not ELs, and fewer students are classified as autistic in the EL group than in the not EL group.

**Table 2. Percentage of Students by Disability Type, CAA and SBAC Assessments**

| Disability Type | CAA EL | CAA Not EL | SBAC EL | SBAC Not EL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Autism | 26.6% | 38.2% | 5.8% | 10.1% |
| Deaf-blindness | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Emotional disturbance | 0.5% | 0.9% | 1.4% | 4.6% |
| Hearing impairment | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.4% | 1.6% |
| Intellectual Disability | 43.6% | 32.8% | 1.7% | 1.1% |
| Multiple disabilities | 4.7% | 6.2% | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Orthopedic impairment | 4.5% | 5.6% | 8.9% | 16.6% |
| Other health impairment | 5.5% | 5.2% | 0.6% | 0.7% |
| Specific learning disability | 9.5% | 6.4% | 64.8% | 47.1% |
| Speech or language impairment | 2.8% | 2.4% | 14.9% | 17.5% |
| TBI Traumatic brain injury | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Visual Impairment | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 0.4% |

**Likelihood of Being Tested and Receiving a Valid Score**
There was little difference in the likelihood of an EL student receiving a valid score on the CAA compared to the Smarter Balanced assessments. For CAA students 93.6% received a valid score as compared to 95.2% of Smarter Balanced students that were classified as EL. For the CAA assessment, students not classified as EL were more likely to have an incomplete test score in ELA (25.0%) than EL students (21.1%}. Students that were not EL were more likely to be excluded from testing due to a medical condition or parent exemption (9.7% vs. 5.7%).

**Score Differences**
A major difference between the CAA and the SBAC assessments is the comparative performance of EL and not EL students. For the SBAC the difference in performance is generally on the order of a half of a standard deviation or more in favor of the not EL population. For the CAA there is very little difference in the performance of EL vs. non EL students. In some grades and subjects the EL students have a higher average scale score than the non EL students. This raises important issues about the relationship between English language development and success in learning the academic curriculum for these students.

**Exhibit 1 (continued)**

**Table 3. 2017 CAA Average ELA Scale Scores for EL and not EL students**

| Grade | EL | Not EL |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 341.9 | 341.5 |
| 4 | 439.8 | 437.8 |
| 5 | 538.5 | 537.8 |
| 6 | 638.1 | 637.9 |
| 7 | 735.7 | 736.6 |
| 8 | 839.4 | 840.0 |
| 11 | 940.2 | 941.4 |

**Home Language of ELs**

Spanish 82.0%
Vietnamese 3.5%
Chinese 2.5%
Philipino 1.8%
Arabic 1.3%
Miscellaneous 1.2%
Korean 0.7%

**Exhibit 2: Descriptive Statistics from WIDA's Alt ACCESS Assessment for the Administration Years of 2015-2016 (2016) and 2016-2017 (2017)**

In 2016, 20,480 EL students participated in Alt ACCESS in grades 1-12. In 2017, that number was 21,807. Across the 2016-2017 Alt ACCESS administrations, 12,124 matched records were identified, suggesting substantial movement into or out of Alt ACCESS administrations.

The data presented here represent 38 WIDA states and/or territories.

Table 1 shows the total count of students (ACCESS + Alt ACCESS) and the proportion of students by grade participating in Alt ACCESS by year. It also displays the reported average time students has been in EL programs by grade.

**Table 1: Total WIDA Assessed Counts with Proportion Alt ACCESS Percentage by Grade and Average Time in Program for Alt ACCESS by Grade**

| Grade | Total Count 2016 | Total Count 2017 | 2016 Alt ACCESS% | 2017 Alt ACCESS% | Avg. Time in Program 2016 | Avg. Time in Program 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 259,870 | 252,022 | 0.75% | 0.84% | 1.90 | 2.14 |
| 2 | 261,418 | 257,077 | 0.79% | 0.82% | 2.64 | 1.42 |
| 3 | 235,595 | 252,254 | 0.90% | 0.90% | 3.39 | 2.19 |
| 4 | 159,690 | 163,084 | 1.32% | 1.33% | 4.11 | 2.82 |
| 5 | 122,811 | 128,125 | 1.66% | 1.63% | 4.68 | 3.54 |
| 6 | 102,738 | 107,379 | 1.75% | 1.91% | 5.13 | 4.07 |
| 7 | 99,871 | 106,371 | 1.70% | 1.64% | 5.85 | 4.47 |
| 8 | 100,729 | 104,995 | 1.52% | 1.60% | 6.27 | 4.90 |
| 9 | 121,046 | 131,695 | 1.18% | 1.12% | 6.34 | 5.60 |
| 10 | 81,535 | 92,633 | 1.47% | 1.45% | 6.49 | 5.86 |
| 11 | 59,607 | 68,203 | 1.68% | 1.70% | 7.04 | 5.68 |
| 12 | 44,821 | 48,229 | 3.39% | 3.27% | 8.05 | 6.40 |
| Total | 1,649,731 | 1,712,067 | 1.24% | 1.27% | -- | -- |

Of the 38 states/territories in the sample, an average of 1% of students participated in Alt ACCESS. The state with the lowest percentage of students participating in Alt ACCESS across years was 0.15% in 2016 and 0.17% in 2017. The state with the maximum percent participating was 2.3% across both years.

**Exhibit 2 (continued):**

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Percent of EL students Taking Alt ACCESS**

| Statistics | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|
| **Mean** | 1.04% | 1.08% |
| **STD** | 0.50% | 0.51% |
| **Min** | 0.15% | 0.17% |
| **Max** | 2.29% | 2.27% |
| **N States** | 38 | 38 |

Table three shows that slightly less than two-thirds of students taking Alt ACCESS were males.

**Table 3: Percent of EL Students by Gender Participating in Alt ACCESS by Year**

| Gender | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|
| **Female** | 36.0% | 35.3% |
| **Male** | 64.0% | 64.7% |
| **Total** | 20,252 | 21,499 |

When looking at the number of students talking Alt ACCESS by state size, smaller states tended to have relatively fewer ELs taking Alt ACCESS.

**Table 4: Average Percent Participating in Alt ACESS by State Size by Year**

| Size | State/Territory Count | Average % Taking Alt ACCESS 2016 | Average % Taking Alt ACCESS 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Small (<25,000)** | 17 | 0.95% | 0.99% |
| **Medium (<100,000)** | 15 | 1.12% | 1.17% |
| **Large (> 100,000)** | 6 | 1.10% | 1.14% |

Table 5 displays the proportion of students, with matched records in 2016 and 2017 who changed levels. In general, the majority of students stayed at the same AELPA proficiency levels they received in 2016. As EELPA level increases the proportion of students going down a level also increases.

**Table 5: Proportion of Students Changing Levels 2016-2017**

| Alt ACCESS Level | Down a Level | Staying at a Level | Moving Up 1 Level | Moving Up more than 1 Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A1** | -- | 41% | 34% | 25% |
| **A2** | 8% | 40% | 42% | 10% |
| **A3** | 11% | 54% | 29% | 7% |
| **P1** | 16% | 51% | 33% | -- |
| **P2** | 25% | 36% | -- | -- |

**Exhibit 2 (continued):**

Table 6 displays the distribution of disability types of students participating on the Alt-ACCESS in 2016-17.

**Table 6: Distribution of Disability Type on Alt ACCESS 2016-2017**

| Disability Type | Percent | Count |
|---|---|---|
| Autism Spectrum Disorder | 26.0% | 4343 |
| Deaf-blindness | 0.1% | 14 |
| Developmental Delay | 5.1% | 855 |
| Hearing Impairment, including Deafness | 0.5% | 90 |
| Intellectual Disability | 50.7% | 8470 |
| Multiple Disability | 4.8% | 808 |
| Other Health Impairment | 4.7% | 789 |
| Orthopedic Impairment | 0.8% | 137 |
| Serious Emotional Disability | 0.6% | 99 |
| Specific Learning Disability | 4.4% | 737 |
| Speech or Language Impairment | 1.5% | 248 |
| Traumatic Brain Injury | 0.5% | 83 |
| Visual Impairment, including Blindness | 0.1% | 24 |
| Missing | -- | 2378 |

**Exhibit 3: Data from NCSC Alternate Assessment Consortium States, 2014-15**

**Table 2. Frequency Table by State for ELL Status**

| State Code | Non-ELL | ELL | Missing |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 73.9 | 23.1 | 3.1 |
| B | 71.7 | 23.0 | 5.3 |
| C | 60.0 | 34.1 | 5.9 |
| D | 80.9 | 15.3 | 3.8 |
| E | 82.8 | 12.4 | 4.8 |
| F | 80.4 | 8.7 | 10.9 |
| G | 86.6 | 8.1 | 5.3 |
| H | 88.4 | 7.7 | 3.9 |
| I | 81.0 | 11.7 | 7.3 |
| J | 85.1 | 11.4 | 3.6 |
| K | 69.6 | 19.3 | 11.1 |
| L | 83.9 | 13.4 | 2.7 |
| M | 88.0 | 6.4 | 5.6 |
| N | 84.8 | 9.8 | 5.4 |
| O | 74.0 | 21.6 | 4.4 |
| ALL | 81.6 | 13.2 | 5.2 |

**Figure 2. Percentage of ELL Students by State**