

Claremont Colleges Scholarship @ Claremont

Scripps Senior Theses

Scripps Student Scholarship

2016

No Child Left Behind Leaves Behind English Language Learners

Daniela A. Canas Baena
Scripps College

Recommended Citation

Canas Baena, Daniela A., "No Child Left Behind Leaves Behind English Language Learners" (2016). *Scripps Senior Theses*. Paper 740. http://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/740

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Scripps Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scripps Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

**NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND LEAVES
BEHIND ENGLISH LANGUAGE
LEARNERS**

by

DANIELA A. CANAS BAENA

**SUBMITTED TO SCRIPPS COLLEGE IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS**

**NANCY NEIMAN AURBACH
MARINA PEREZ DE MENDIOLA**

DECEMBER 18, 2015

Introduction

English Language Learners (ELL) are the fastest growing student population in the United States. According to the US Department of Education (2006), by 2025, 25% of students in the US will be ELLs. In 2013 ELL students in California alone constituted 22.8%¹ of all students enrolled in public schools. Even in states like Mississippi where ELL student populations have traditionally been small (.5% in 2002) have tripled in size within the span of ten years.² Even if ELL student populations remain concentrated in certain states, this student population is continuously growing across the country.

The last two educational reform policies, Goals 2000 implemented in 1996 and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) implemented in 2001, specifically targeted ELL students. Goals 2000 was enacted to eliminate the “gap in high school graduation rates between American students from minority backgrounds and their nonminority counterparts.”³ Its policy successor, NCLB, aimed to address and close the observed achievement gap “between high- and low- performing students, especially the achievement gaps between minority and nonminority students, and between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged peers” as well as meet “the educational needs of low-achieving children in our Nation’s highest-poverty schools, limited English proficient children, migratory children, children with disabilities, Indian children, neglected or delinquent children, and young children in need of reading assistance.”⁴ To ensure that academic standards were met and that the achievement gap became smaller, NCLB also set

¹ Facts about English Learners in California - CalEdFacts. (15, September 21). Retrieved December 8, 2015

² U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "Local Education Agency Universe Survey," 2002-03 through 2012-13.

³ Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Pub. L. No. 103-227. H.R. 1804. Stat. 102 (1994).

⁴ No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).

accountability measures, stating that “states that do not meet their performance objectives for LEP students could lose up to ten percent of the administrative portion of their funding for all ESEA state administered formula grant programs.”⁵

In 2013, seventeen years after the original national mathematics gap between 12th grade ELL students and their Non-ELL student counterparts was observed, the gap widened by 11%⁶. In 2013, the observed reading gap between ELL and Non-ELL students nationwide increased by 6% since the original reading gap was observed in 1998⁷. In 2015, there is a 37.3%⁸ gap between the ELL students that pass the mathematics portion of the CAHSEE on their first try and their White Non-ELL counterparts. There is a 50.1%⁹ gap between the ELL students that pass the English section of the CAHSEE on the first attempt and White Non-ELL students. Despite that Goals 2000 and NCLB claimed that they would minimize the gap, over the last ten years, the gap has widened. The policies themselves are responsible for widening the gap by rushing English language acquisition, encouraging a teaching to the test strategy, and promoting High School Exit Exams.

Since the implementation of Goals 2000, the national assessment data provided by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has been useful in comparing ELL students and Non-ELL students across states and across the Core subjects established by Goals

⁵ Bush, G. W., & Department of Education, W. S. (2001). *No Child Left Behind*.

⁶ U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1996, 2000, 2005, 2009, and 2013 Mathematics Assessments.

⁷ IBID

⁸ Center on Education Policy (2010). *California State Profile: California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)*. Pg. 8

⁹ IBID pg. 7

2000. NAEP is “the largest nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subjects” and tracks the achievement scores of 4th, 8th, and 12th grade student subgroups. The assessment scores gathered from NAEP’s Main National Data Explorer (MNDE) show a representative sample of 12th grade ELL students (classified by their school) compared to a representative sample of 12th grade Non-ELL students from across US public high schools from the years 2000-2013. I chose to focus on 12th grade students because I wanted to narrow down the ELL population to high school students because those are the students who take High School Exit Exams as well. Although all grades and subject areas specified by Goals 2000 and NCLB are assessed, I chose to focus on the national Reading (2002 -2013) and Mathematics (2000-2013) assessment statistics, because English and Math are the fundamental skills needed for every other subject assessment test taken by students. The subject tests were measured on a composite scale and the achievement levels were measured cumulatively.

The national assessment statistics for Reading and Mathematics show that ELL students have scored progressively worse and that there has been an increasing gap in the scores of ELL students and their Non-ELL counterparts. In 1998, 73% of 12th grade ELL students scored below basic in national reading assessments; 24% of their Non-ELL counterparts scored below basic. That is a 49% difference. In 2013, 80% of ELL students assessed in reading scored below basic, while 25% of their Non-ELL counterparts scored below basic. This shows a 55% difference. In addition, the percentages of ELL students that have scored advanced in Reading are so minimal that they round to zero. In 1996, 76% of 12th grade ELL students scored below basic in national mathematics assessments. On that same assessment, 34% of Non-ELL students scored below basic; that is a 42% difference. In 2013, 86% of 12th grade ELL students assessed scored below

basic; 35% of their Non-ELL counterparts scored below basic; that is a 51% difference. In addition, the percentage of ELL students who have scored “basic” in Mathematics has decreased by half in the last thirteen years, and the percentage of students scoring “advanced” in Mathematics is so minimal that it rounds to zero. These scores do not simply indicate just how far behind ELL students have fallen since the implementation of NCLB, the policy that was supposed to help them achieve the same level of academic success as their native English speaking peers; these scores demonstrate that ELL students’ needs have not been addressed.

In order to meet Goal 2000’s objective to increase high school graduation to 90% and have no children left behind, ELL students need to pass the high school exit exam. Even though the NCLB policy does not require that students pass high school exit exams in order to graduate, more than half of the states in the US do ¹⁰. Because California has the highest enrollment of ELL students in the country, 24.5% ¹¹ I chose to focus on their High School Exit Exam statistics. Even though California’s High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) was established in 1999 as a response to Goals 2000, which encouraged states to create their own forms of assessment in order to make sure that all students were meeting high academic standards, it was not administered until 2004, and was not used to withhold diplomas until 2006 – when the exam content aligned with the curriculum ¹². The CAHSEE has become an obstacle for ELL students

¹⁰ Dietz, S. (2010) State High School Tests: Exit Exams and Other Assessments. Center on Education Policy.

¹¹ Ruiz Soto, Ariel G., Sarah Hooker, and Jeanne Batalova. 2015. *States and Districts with the Highest Number and Share of English Language Learners*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, pg. 2

¹² García, P. (2003). The Use of High School Exit Examinations in Four Southwestern States. *Bilingual Research Journal*, pg. 442

because, aside from their subgroup, 90% of students across all other subgroups have been able to meet the CAHSEE graduation requirement¹³.

Aside from Special Education students (for whom passing the CAHSEE is not a graduation requirement), ELL students in California are the ones who score lowest on the CAHSEE, which tests math and language arts. Only 41.6% of students pass the CAHSEE during their tenth grade year, the first year that it is offered, and 56.1% of students pass the following year. While 82.2% of ELL students pass the test by May of their Senior year in high school, they are given a total of seven times to retake the test¹⁴, so instead of demonstrating mastery of grade level competency in reading, writing, and mathematics students may be passing the test because they are able to familiarize themselves with it due to the amount of times they are taking it and the extra CAHSEE tutoring classes they have to take¹⁵. While every other subgroup of students has a CAHSEE pass rate of over 90%, which does not keep them from meeting Goal 2000's graduation objective, ELL students lag behind other subgroups by 11% - 16%. In addition, ELL students have had the lowest improvement on the percentage point change in English (2.4%) for grade 10 students from 2006 -2015, and the third lowest improvement on the percentage point change in Mathematics (5.0) – only behind the White and Asian subgroups which had scored among the highest in 2006 and thus didn't have as much room for improvement when compared to ELLs.

These statistics show that ELL students are the most vulnerable subgroup of low-achieving students and Goals 2000 and NCLB policies have ensured that they continue to be left

¹³ 2012-2-13 California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) Results. (2015, September 10).

¹⁴ CAHSEE Description - CalEd Facts. (2015, November 13).

¹⁵ García, P. (2003). The Use of High School Exit Examinations in Four Southwestern States. *Bilingual Research Journal*, pg. 433

far behind other low-achieving subgroups and nonminority students. In order for Goals 2000 and NCLB's goals concerning ELL students to be accomplished, they must have academic English fluency. Without academic English fluency, students will not score well on state or national assessment tests, and schools will be subsequently punished because federal funding will be withheld. Without the necessary resources to implement programs aimed at bridging the achievement gap, schools with greater number of ELL students will not be able to effectively work towards bridging the gap or at least continue to maintain the original gap.

Goals 2000 and No Child Left behind have developed a new timeline for language acquisition, have promoted the practice of teaching to the test rather than the understanding of content, and High School Exit Exams have led to the widening of the achievement gap between ELL students and their NonEll counterparts. In additions, the policies' narrow definition of success leads to federal sanctions that penalize schools with ELL student populations further contributing to the widening of the gap.

English Acquisition

Under NCLB, ELL students are supposed to be moved into mainstream classrooms within three year and instructed solely in English in order to meet state and federal objectives. The goal of Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students) of NCLB is to move Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to English fluency. This was to be accomplished by rewarding districts with "flexibility in using bilingual funds in exchange for effectively transitioning LEP students into English fluency and improving achievement", holding "states and school districts... accountable for making annual increases in English proficiency from the previous year", and requiring instruction of children to be solely in

English “after three consecutive years of being in school.”¹⁶ In order to obtain funding to fulfill these goals, states needed to “set performance objectives to ensure LEP children achieve English fluency within three years... and ensure that students would meet standards in core content areas, as described by Goals 2000, that are at least as rigorous as those in classes taught in English.”¹⁷

Although NCLB was implemented in 2001, it did not take into account previous research that stated the length of time it actually takes ELL students to reach academic English fluency. According to Thomas and Collier’s study, as well as other research studies (e.g., Baker, 1993; Garcia, 1994; Perez and Torres-Guzman, 1996), ELL students can reach conversational fluency in 2-3 years, but academic fluency requires 5-10 years.¹⁸ The length of time it takes has been understood to depend on whether or not an ELL student has had previous schooling in their first language and the level of schooling their parents have.¹⁹ ELL students who are schooled solely in English, especially in middle and high school, as NCLB demands, risk intellectual development because subject complexity increases²⁰ as well as what is required of them in the classroom. Unless students receive academic and cognitive support for their native language, it takes about 7-10 years for a student that has been taught solely in English to reach the 50th on the Normal Curve Equivalent NCE (US Department of Education normal curve that indicates where students fall when measuring academic achievement in assessment tests) and most ELL students do not ever score at or above 50th.²¹ Given these statistics, NCLB’s policy to place ELL in classrooms where they would receive instruction solely in English not only set schools and states up to be

¹⁶ Bush, G. W., & Department of Education, W. S. (2001). *No Child Left Behind*, pg. 16

¹⁷ IBID, pg. 17

¹⁸ Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997, December 1). *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students*, pg. 34

¹⁹ IBID, pg. 39

²⁰ IBID, pg. 44

²¹ IBID, pg. 36

punished by having funds taken away, but also set ELL students on a track that holds them back from academic success and college readiness. Because NCLB states that ELL students are to be taught solely in English after 3 years of schooling in the states, they have only been able to obtain conversational English fluency and will have a harder time understanding complex concepts in their classes across subjects and achieving higher test scores.

Teaching to the Test

Instead of helping ELL students build their academic language fluency, NCLB encourages that instructors teach to state and national assessment in order for schools to not be penalized with federal sanctions. Teaching to the test requires that teachers align the curriculum to the test and “devote class time to teaching test items and test-taking strategies”. Teaching to the test, rather than developing ELL students’ fluency and critical thinking hinders student performance in the long run, but if teaching to the test is not a priority schools will receive sanctions and teacher’s jobs will be put on the line. It is practically impossible to achieve the standards set forth by Title III of NCLB, given that the process of language acquisition was rushed and only achievement of the conversational English level was made possible, rather than the needed academic English fluency. According to Goals 2000 and NCLB, assessments have been designed to “assess native English speakers” on their “demonstrated competency”²² across subjects. Precisely because these tests were created to assess native English fluency, all tests, including math, require a higher level of English comprehension in order to understand what the question asks. Due to this, assessments have become English proficiency tests to the ELL subgroup²³ and cannot actually assess whether or not academic standards are being met. Given this, the designs of assessment tests are inherently biased against ELL students, and cannot

²² IBID pg. 523

²³ Devoe, J. J. (2007). ELL TESTING: A State of Flux. *District Administration*, 43(10), pg. 39

accurately measure what students may know or how well their grasp on the subject matter may actually be. Although policy makers aimed to have the tests keep instructors accountable of properly teaching students,²⁴ they have instead made ELL students accountable for their progress, or lack of progress, as determined by state assessments. Assessment policies have become a way to justify the need to keep ELL students locked into classrooms and courses that hinder their academic potential.

Due to this test heavy focus in which ELL students do not perform as well as their grade level peers, when they do get placed in Non-ELL courses they are often placed in remedial classes where behavioral problems take center-stage²⁵ rather than learning. Not only is the classroom environment, where ELLs are placed, not conducive to learning, but the low-achievement on state assessments creates a stigma surrounding ELL students that does not encourage teachers to challenge them, rather ELL students are greeted with a lot of institutional bureaucratic barriers that result in getting stuck in remedial classes, rather than working their way up to taking college preparatory, Honors, and AP courses. The lack of opportunities for ELL students to take advanced college preparatory courses “results in the lack of opportunity to receive academic preparation that will qualify [ELLs] for college entrance *and* the likelihood of survival and success in college”.²⁶ Because the courses in which ELL students are placed are not providing the necessary academic challenge, ELLs are continuously left behind and not building upon the academic language fluency skills required to succeed within the Goals 2000 and NCLB policies and thus not obtaining greater achievement results within the classroom nor on state

²⁴ Goertz, M., & Duffy, M. (2001). *Assessment and accountability systems in the 50 states*. pg. 9

²⁵ Kanno, Y., & Kangas, S. N. (2014). “I’m Not Going to Be, Like, for the AP”: English Language Learners’ Limited Access to Advanced College-Preparatory Courses in High School. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(5), pg. 863

²⁶ IBID, pg 874

assessments. Without a constant building of academic language fluency, students are not able to understand and grapple with more difficult concepts, will not have access to higher level (Honors and AP) courses which demand the ability to wrestle with more challenging academic standards, and will score lower on state and national assessments. Without access to these courses, their preparedness for college diminishes and they are less competitive in comparison to the rest of the college applicant pool, if they even decide to apply to college during their senior year of high school.

High School Exit Exams

The need to pass the CAHSEE in order to obtain a high school diploma serves as an added stress to ELL students, because this test holds a large majority of them back from even considering applying to colleges during the first semester of their senior year. Even though CAHSEE data is provided to state policy makers in order to inform them and prompt the creation of policies²⁷ aimed to provide additional assistance to students who do not pass the CAHSEE in their tenth grade year, policy makers work within a flawed educational policy system created by Goals 2000 and NCLB that drastically leaves behind ELL students. Due to this, the legislation policy makers create and implement may help other subgroups improve their CAHSEE passing scores, but, as the statistics demonstrate, ELL students will continue to be left behind. By testing their English proficiency in order to graduate, these students, instead of faulty policies that hinder the possibility of their academic achievement, are being held accountable and carry the consequences by not being able to graduate.

²⁷ Center on Education Policy (2010). *California State Profile: California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)*, Pg. 1

It is impossible for graduation rates to be raised to 90% across the board, as stipulated by Goals 2000, if ELL students are taking tests designed for English fluent students. The CAHSEE in itself is only hindering one subgroup of students from obtaining a high school diploma; it is leaving ELL students behind, not only educationally, but also in terms of life prospects. Because obtaining a high school diploma serves as a basic qualification to join the workforce, there are a lot of social consequences as well.²⁸ Without a high school diploma, the types of jobs available are minimized, coupled with lower incomes, and there are reduced chances of upward mobility because a person without a high school diploma is less competitive in the workforce than a person with at least a high school diploma.

Sanctions

NCLB places an emphasis on testing as a way to increase accountability for student performances by rewarding and sanctioning states and thus schools whose students do not meet the national goals.²⁹ Schools receive federal sanctions based on their Adequate Yearly Progress

Years of AYP Failure	Consequences for Schools Failing to Make AYP
1 year	School is identified as, "in need of improvement."
2 years	School remains, "in need of improvement." Schools must improve their curriculum plans and inform parents of the school's "improvement status" and allow for the option of transferring the child, and appropriate school funds to help facilitate that transfer, to a different school within the same district. This process is known as "inter-district transfer."
3 years	Districts must provide supplemental educational services to students in "failing" schools, including, "tutoring, remedial, and other academic services." Additionally, schools must improve their aforementioned "improvement plan" and are subject to the same consequences as they were after 2 years of failure.
4 years	Corrective action is taken, such as, replacing staff with higher qualified educators and an overhauling of the school or district's curriculum.
5 years	School restructuring includes, but is not limited to, replacing all staff and contracting out for "private management, state intervention, or other restructuring efforts."

²⁸ García, P. (2003). The Use of High School Exit Examinations in Four Southwestern States. *Bilingual Research Journal*, pg. 444

²⁹ Bush, G. W., & Department of Education, W. S. (2001). *No Child Left Behind*, pg. 7

(AYP) scores and those sanctions are imposed progressively over the course of five years.³⁰

AYP is assessed through state developed Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO), which students are then tested on to measure whether or not sanctions will be applied to a school. Schools with an ELL subgroup are at a greater disadvantage than schools with other subgroup populations because of the instability of the group and the failure of standardized test scores to reflect what ELL students understand³¹ due to the lack of academic English fluency.

The ELL subgroup is continuously replenished by new ELL students, and the newly added ELL students are farther behind English acquisition than ELL students who have been in the system longer. Testing and using the scores of all ELL individuals to assess whether or not the school is making AYP is problematic because schools with ELL students will always lag behind schools without this student population and be subject to federal sanctions. It only takes one subgroup's failure of AMO³² in order for AYP to be compromised and sanctions set in place. Once more, academic English fluency becomes the primary reason for the achievement gap between ELL students and other subgroups.

Sanctions applied to schools based on failure to meet AYP do not take into consideration that the policy fails certain subgroups such as ELL students. By allowing inter-district transfers to students, it places an added pressure on schools to which students may transfer. Schools to which students may transfer may receive state penalties "for exceeding the statutory maximum class

³⁰ Sunderman G. L., Kim J.S., & Orfield G., (2005) *No Child Left Behind Meets School Realities: Lessons from the Field*. California: Corwin Press.

³¹ Mintrop, H. & Sunderman, G. L. (2009). Why high stakes accountability sounds good, but doesn't work –and why we keep on doing it anyway. Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at UCLA. Pg. 18

³² Sunderman G. L., Kim J.S., & Orfield G., (2005) *No Child Left Behind Meets School Realities: Lessons from the Field*. California: Corwin Press. Pg. 34

size,”³³ so receiving schools have no incentive to accept transfers. In addition, the policy states that students who perform lowest have priority when they request a transfer to a different school. Because ELL students are the ones who score lowest, they, in theory, would have priority when transferring. The reality is that about one percent of students actually partake in inter-district transfers, and even then, the students’ whose transfers are granted are the high achievers³⁴ because they will boost schools’ rankings. Even if ELL students were the ones being granted the inter-district transfer, the new school would most likely face sanctions when it came to testing because federal sanctions do not attempt to solve the achievement gap problem. Instead, these sanctions attempt to relocate student subgroups that hinder schools from attaining AYP and reaching AMO goals. Sanctions also require that schools provide extra academic services in order to make AYP, but only about 14% percent of students actually take advantage of the supplemental academic services.³⁵ After several years of failure to make AYP, the policy places blame on teachers and schools by requiring staff replacement and school restructuring, rather than how the NCLB policy itself continues to fail the ELL subgroup.

Conclusion

Goals 2000 and NCLB have so narrowly defined academic success that they have actually promoted failure. Acquisition of academic English proficiency has been severely rushed, and every measure of subject comprehension has become a proficiency test. Furthermore, this focus of assessing ELL students and measuring their achievement next to their Non-ELL counterparts has served to hinder their ELL students’ prospects, as well as placed potentially

³³ Weston, M. (2010). *Funding California Schools: The Revenue Limit System. Technical Appendices*. Public Policy Institute of California. pg. 19

³⁴ Mintrop, H. & Sunderman, G. L. (2009). *Why high stakes accountability sounds good, but doesn’t work –and why we keep on doing it anyway*. Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at UCLA. pg. 7

³⁵ IBID pg. 8

detrimental sanctions on their schools. NCLB has failed to bridge the achievement gap between ELL and Non-ELL students, and has actually widened it because it does not take into account that these tests and policies are inherently biased against ELLs. There need to be programs that take into account the diversity within the ELL subgroup, the natural speed at which academic fluency in second languages are acquired, and a focus other than testing must be developed to assess how ELL students are progressing academically and how critical thinking skills are being developed alongside language acquisition.

Appendix

English-Language Arts
Table 4: Comparison of Passing Rates for Grade Ten Students in the Classes of 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015¹

Demographic Subgroup	Class of 2006	Class of 2007	Class of 2008	Class of 2009	Class of 2010	Class of 2011	Class of 2012	Class of 2013	Class of 2014	Class of 2015 ²	Percentage Point Change 2006–2015
All Students	74.7%	76.4%	77.1%	76.6%	78.8%	79.2%	80.6%	82.4%	83.0%	83.2%	8.5
Females	79.0%	81.1%	81.6%	81.2%	82.9%	83.0%	84.4%	85.9%	86.9%	86.8%	7.6
Males	70.5%	71.9%	72.7%	72.1%	74.9%	75.6%	76.9%	79.0%	79.3%	79.8%	9.3
Black or African American	62.6%	64.5%	65.8%	65.7%	68.5%	68.9%	71.1%	72.1%	73.2%	73.0%	10.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	73.4%	73.4%	77.2%	76.1%	77.1%	77.7%	79.2%	79.4%	80.1%	79.5%	6.1
Asian	84.7%	85.8%	86.6%	86.5%	88.4%	88.8%	90.9%	90.9%	91.6%	91.1%	6.4
Filipino	87.2%	88.1%	89.0%	88.9%	89.8%	89.6%	91.7%	92.0%	92.4%	92.0%	4.8
Hispanic or Latino	61.7%	65.1%	66.4%	66.2%	70.0%	70.9%	73.3%	76.4%	77.3%	77.9%	16.2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	71.2%	75.2%	75.4%	75.6%	78.1%	77.3%	79.3%	80.7%	81.9%	81.2%	10.0
White	86.4%	89.2%	89.8%	89.4%	90.4%	90.7%	91.1%	91.5%	91.5%	91.7%	3.3
Two or More Races ³	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	82.8%	85.3%	87.9%	87.5%	— ⁴
English Learner	39.2%	42.4%	38.1%	35.9%	40.2%	40.3%	41.7%	44.2%	44.5%	41.6%	2.4
Reclassified Fluent English	86.7%	89.2%	89.3%	88.9%	91.2%	91.4%	92.5%	93.7%	93.9%	93.5%	6.8
Economically Disadvantaged	60.0%	63.2%	64.9%	64.6%	68.5%	69.7%	72.3%	75.0%	76.1%	76.6%	16.6
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	87.2%	88.2%	88.5%	88.2%	89.5%	90.2%	91.1%	92.0%	92.4%	92.7%	5.5
Special Education	30.5%	32.8%	34.6%	33.0%	35.7%	37.2%	37.3%	39.2%	39.4%	39.6%	9.1

¹ Percent passing rates equal the number of students passing the CAHSEE divided by number of students taking the CAHSEE. Students with disabilities who used modifications are excluded from these analyses.
² Subgroup data are preliminary; school districts have the opportunity to make demographic data corrections.
³ Federally mandated demographic subgroup.
⁴ Not available.

Mathematics

Table 5: Comparison of Passing Rates for Grade Ten Students in the Classes of 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015¹

Demographic Subgroup	Class of 2006	Class of 2007	Class of 2008	Class of 2009	Class of 2010	Class of 2011	Class of 2012	Class of 2013	Class of 2014	Class of 2015 ²	Percentage Point Change 2014-2015	Percentage Point Change 2006-2015
All Students	73.7%	74.0%	75.5%	75.8%	78.3%	79.8%	80.7%	82.7%	83.6%	84.1%	0.5	10.4
Females	74.4%	74.6%	76.1%	76.2%	78.6%	80.1%	81.3%	83.4%	84.6%	85.1%	0.5	10.7
Males	72.9%	73.4%	75.0%	75.5%	78.0%	79.5%	80.2%	82.0%	82.6%	83.2%	0.6	10.3
Black or African American	54.4%	54.9%	57.1%	58.4%	61.9%	64.0%	66.3%	68.4%	69.3%	70.6%	1.3	16.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	69.2%	69.4%	72.9%	72.5%	75.7%	74.8%	77.8%	77.2%	79.5%	79.3%	-0.2	10.1
Asian	91.2%	91.7%	92.1%	92.7%	94.1%	94.6%	95.0%	95.7%	96.0%	96.1%	0.1	4.9
Filipino	86.9%	86.8%	88.1%	89.0%	90.1%	91.6%	92.0%	92.7%	93.5%	93.9%	0.4	7.0
Hispanic or Latino	61.0%	62.2%	65.1%	65.7%	69.6%	72.3%	73.9%	77.1%	78.3%	79.1%	0.8	18.1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	71.2%	72.6%	73.5%	75.0%	78.9%	80.1%	79.8%	82.4%	83.6%	84.1%	0.5	12.9
White	86.8%	87.0%	87.9%	86.2%	89.3%	89.9%	90.6%	90.8%	91.2%	91.5%	0.3	4.7
Two or More Races ³	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	— ⁴	82.0%	83.5%	86.2%	86.4%	0.2	— ⁴
English Learner	49.2%	48.7%	47.6%	46.5%	50.2%	52.6%	52.2%	55.8%	55.9%	54.2%	-1.7	5.0
Reclassified Fluent English	82.8%	84.5%	85.3%	85.7%	88.6%	90.1%	90.8%	92.2%	92.9%	92.7%	-0.2	9.9
Economically Disadvantaged	60.6%	61.4%	64.3%	65.0%	69.0%	71.8%	73.5%	76.4%	77.6%	78.3%	0.7	17.7
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	85.1%	85.5%	86.2%	86.5%	88.1%	89.3%	90.1%	91.1%	91.7%	92.4%	0.7	7.3
Special Education	29.7%	30.3%	32.5%	32.3%	35.4%	38.1%	38.6%	40.1%	41.2%	42.3%	1.1	12.6

¹ Percent passing rates equal the number of students passing the CAHSEE divided by number of students taking the CAHSEE. Students with disabilities who used modifications are excluded from these analyses.

² Subgroup data are preliminary; school districts have the opportunity to make demographic data corrections.

³ Federally mandated demographic subgroup.

⁴ Not available.

Percentages at or above each achievement level for reading, grade 12 by status as English Language Learner, 2 categories [LEP], year and jurisdiction: 2013, 2009, 2005, 2002, 1998, 1994, and 1992

Year	Jurisdiction	ELL						Not ELL					
		below Standard Error Basic	at or above Standard Error Basic	at or above Standard Error Proficient	at or above Standard Error Advanced	at Standard Error Basic	at Standard Error Advanced	at Standard Error Basic	at or above Standard Error Basic	at or above Standard Error Proficient	at Standard Error Advanced	at Standard Error Error	
2013	National public	80 (1.9)	20 (1.9)	2 (0.8)	#	(+) 25 (0.6)	75 (0.6)	37 (0.7)	37 (0.7)	5 (0.3)			
2009	National public	78 (2.4)	22 (2.4)	2 (0.5)	#	(+) 25 (0.6)	75 (0.6)	37 (0.9)	37 (0.9)	5 (0.3)			
2005	National public	69 (3.5)	31 (3.5)	5 (1.9)	#	(+) 27 (0.8)	73 (0.8)	35 (0.7)	35 (0.7)	4 (0.4)			
2002	National public	70 (4.0)	30 (4.0)	5 (1.9)	#	(+) 27 (0.8)	73 (0.8)	35 (0.9)	35 (0.9)	4 (0.3)			
1998	National public	73 (3.5)	27 (3.5)	8 (1.8)	#	(+) 24 (0.8)	76 (0.8)	39 (0.8)	39 (0.8)	5 (0.4)			
1998 ¹	National public	#	(+)	(+)	#	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)			
1994 ¹	National public	#	(+)	(+)	#	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)			
1992 ¹	National public	#	(+)	(+)	#	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)			

† Not applicable.

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2005, 2009 and 2013 Reading Assessments.

Percentages at or above each achievement level for mathematics, grade 12 by status as English Language Learner, 2 categories [LEP], year and jurisdiction: 2013, 2009, and 2005

Year	Jurisdiction	ELL						Not ELL											
		below Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at Standard Error	below Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at Standard Error	below Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at Standard Error							
2013	National public	86 (1.6)	14 (1.6)	3 (0.8)	#	(+)	35 (0.7)	65 (0.7)	25 (0.6)	3 (0.2)	81 (2.1)	19 (2.1)	4 (1.0)	#	(+)	36 (0.8)	64 (0.8)	25 (0.9)	3 (0.4)
2005	National public	75 (2.9)	25 (2.9)	3 (1.1)	#	(+)	40 (0.8)	60 (0.8)	22 (0.8)	2 (0.2)									

† Not applicable.
Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005, 2009 and 2013 Mathematics Assessments.

Percentages at or above each achievement level for mathematics, grade 12 by status as English Language Learner, 2 categories [LEP], year and jurisdiction: 2000 and 1996

Year	Jurisdiction	ELL						Not ELL											
		below Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at Standard Error	below Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at Standard Error	below Standard Error	at or above Standard Error	at Standard Error							
1996	National public	76 (5.4)	24 (5.4)	1 (†)	#	(+)	34 (1.3)	66 (1.3)	16 (0.9)	2 (0.3)	73 (5.0)	27 (5.0)	2 (†)	#	(+)	37 (1.3)	63 (1.3)	16 (1.0)	2 (0.4)
2000 ¹	National public	#	(+)	#	(+)	#	(+)	#	(+)	#	(+)	#	(+)	#	(+)	#	(+)	#	#

† Not applicable.
Rounds to zero.
Reporting standards not met.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1996 and 2000 Mathematics Assessments.

Citations

- 2012-2013 California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) Results. (2015, September 10).
- Arias, M. B., & Morillo-Campbell, M. (2008). Promoting ELL Parental Involvement: Challenges in Contested Times. *Online Submission*.
- Bush, G. (1990, January 31). George Bush: Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union. Online by Gehrard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Retrieved October 31, 2015, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=18095>
- Bush, G. W., & Department of Education, W. S. (2001). *No Child Left Behind*.
- CAHSEE Description - CalEd Facts. (2015, November 13). Retrieved November 25, 2015, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/hs/cefcahsee.asp>
- California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). Retrieved October 31, 2015, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/hs/>
- Center on Education Policy (2010). *California State Profile: California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)*, Pg. 1
- Davies, D. (1993). Benefits and barriers to parent involvement: From Portugal to Boston to Liverpool. In N. Chavkin (Ed.), *Families and schools in a pluralistic society*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1987). Parent perceptions of school: Supportive environments for children. In H.T.Trueba (Ed), *Success or failure? Learning and the language minority student*. New York: Newbury House.
- Dietz, S. (2010, December 21) State High School Tests: Exit Exams and Other Assessments, by Center on Education Policy. Retrieved November 9, 2015, from <http://www.cep-dc.org/displayDocument.cfm?DocumentID=340>
- Department of Education, W. D. (1994). *Goals 2000: A World-Class Education for Every Child*.
- Devoe, J. J. (2007). ELL TESTING: A State of Flux. *District Administration*, 43(10), 35- 40.
- Facts about English Learners in California - CalEdFacts. (15, September 21). Retrieved December 8, 2015, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/cefelfacts.asp>
- García, P. (2003). The Use of High School Exit Examinations in Four Southwestern States. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 431-450.
- Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Pub. L. No. 103-227. H.R. 1804. Stat. 102 (1994). <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-103hr1804enr/pdf/BILLS-103hr1804enr.pdf>

- Kanno, Y., & Kangas, S. N. (2014). "I'm Not Going to Be, Like, for the AP": English Language Learners' Limited Access to Advanced College-Preparatory Courses in High School. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(5), 848-878.
- Menken, K. (2006). Teaching to the Test: How No Child Left Behind Impacts Language Policy, Curriculum, and Instruction for English Language Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 521-546. doi:10.1080/15235882.2006.10162888
- Mintrop, H. & Sunderman, G. L. (2009). Why high stakes accountability sounds good, but doesn't work –and why we keep on doing it anyway. Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at UCLA.
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education, A.V., & New Mexico Univ., A. (1994). *Summary of Goals 2000: Educate America Act*.
- National Education Goals Panel, *National Education Goals Report: Building a Nation of Learners* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992), 321-322.
- Nelson, A., & Weinbaum, E. (2006). Federal Education Policy and the States, 1945-2004: A Brief Synopsis (J. Backman, Ed.). Retrieved October 17, 2015.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1440 (2002).
<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>
- Ruiz Soto, Ariel G., Sarah Hooker, and Jeanne Batalova. 2015. *States and Districts with the Highest Number and Share of English Language Learners*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Sunderman G. L., Kim J.S., & Orfield G., (2005) *No Child Left Behind Meets School Realities: Lessons from the Field*. California: Corwin Press.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997, December 1). School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students. Retrieved October 18, 2015, from
http://www.thomasandcollier.com/assets/1997_thomas-collier97-1.pdf
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). Building partnerships to help English language learners. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/methods/english/lepfactsheet.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "Local Education Agency Universe Survey," 2002-03 through 2012-13.
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_204.20.asp
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005, 2009, and 2013 Mathematics Assessments.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1996, 2000, 2005, 2009, and 2013 Mathematics Assessments.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2005, 2009 and 2013 Reading Assessments.

Weston, M. (2010). *Funding California Schools: The Revenue Limit System. Technical Appendices*. Public Policy Institute of California.