

# Utah's Consolidated ESSA Plan Draft Amendment Recommendations 2025

## Section 1

(Note to reader: [2023 ESSA Plan](#)- page 29)

Rationale for Change: Updating long-term goals per 2023 updated exit criteria.

### A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

#### 4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))

##### iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)):

- c. English Language Proficiency. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii)) 1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Long-term goals were established based on a grade level analysis of the 2023-2024 rates for reclassifications as English proficient determined by achieving an overall proficiency level of 4.2 or greater and a 3.5 or greater in speaking as measured by performance on the state approved ELP assessment. The method of analysis used two factors to identify a trajectory toward becoming English proficient within six years: the student's age and the level of ELP at the time they entered Utah's education system. Based on Utah's EL empirical data and consultation across the SEA with feedback from selected LEAs and policy advisors, the student grouping for monitoring growth has been designated as one grade band of K-12. These long-term goals are ambitious because the analysis to determine the trajectory ranged from 2-7 years and the decision to use six years as the expected timeline for ELP was set by Utah's Data and Statistics section in consultation with the individuals over federal programs at the USBE. Measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of ELs making progress in achieving ELP are provided in Appendix A.

## Section 2

(Note to reader: [2023 ESSA Plan](#)- page 33)

Rationale for Change: Updating EL Growth tables per stakeholder feedback and new alternate ELP exit criteria being set. Removing all instances of specific reference to an ELP assessment vendor.

### A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) 4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

#### iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))

##### d. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State's definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

Utah's accountability system includes progress in achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) as an indicator across all schools in the State with at least 10 ELs consistent with the State-determined minimum n-size. Utah defines ELP as earning an overall proficiency level of 4.2 or greater and a 3.5 or greater in speaking as measured by the state approved ELP assessment, which is administered annually to all ELs in the State. This assessment measures academic language development in the domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Initial, or the baseline, ELP level and grade level at the time of entry factor into Utah's definition of making adequate progress towards ELP and moves away from the one-size-fits-all approach for determining growth targets for adequate progress. The following variables underlie Utah's model for measuring EL progress toward ELP:

- Initial ELP in the year of identification, and
- Time enrolled in Utah schools, receiving supportive instruction in English language development and grade-level content.

Based on these two variables, individual annual growth targets for determining adequate progress toward ELP are set to determine the change expected annually in each ELs composite proficiency level (comprised of speaking, listening, reading, and writing) on the annual state approved ELP assessment (Exhibit 7). All students will be placed on the Grades K-12 EL Overall Adequate Growth table initially unless the student reaches an overall proficiency of 4.2 or higher. If a student reaches the overall proficiency level of a 4.2 but does not reach the second criteria of a speaking score of 3.5 or higher to exit, then the student will have growth calculated on their speaking score (Exhibit 8). Once a student is placed on the Grades K-12 EL Speaking Adequate Growth Table, the student will not be moved back to the Grades K-12 EL Overall Adequate Growth Table. The student's growth will be determined by the Grades K-12 EL Speaking Adequate Growth Table until they reach both criteria to be considered proficient and exit EL status.

The percentage of points for a school is determined by the number of current EL students who meet or exceed their adequate progress target OR reach proficiency divided by the total number of EL students in the school. This percentage is multiplied by the 13 points possible for this indicator to determine the number of points allocated to a school (note: EL students in their first year are excluded from the calculation because they do not have a prior year score; their ELP score in their first year is needed to establish baseline):

$$\text{Points} = \left( \frac{\text{Number of ELs making adequate progress} + \text{ELs reaching proficiency}}{\text{Total number of current EL students} - \text{first year ELs}} \right) \times 13$$

Exhibit 7: Grades K-12 EL Overall Adequate Progress Targets

	Time (Years) in EL Program					
Baseline ELP Level	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.0 to 1.9	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1
2.0 to 2.9	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1
3.0 to 4.1	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1

Exhibit 8: Grades K-12 EL Speaking Adequate Growth Progress Targets (Speaking Target 3.5)

	Time (Years) since reaching Overall Composite of 4.2 or higher in EL Program		
Baseline ELP Level	1	2	3+
Current Speaking score once 4.2 Overall proficiency attained	0.3	0.2	0.1

For EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the alternate annual ELP, Utah defines ELP through one of two pathways:

- Exit by earning an overall proficiency of 5, or
- May exit, at the discretion of the LEA, in consultation with the IEP team (which must include the LEA/School ELL person), by earning an overall proficiency of 4 and an

overall proficiency of a 4 on the English Language Arts alternate state content summative assessment.

Individual annual growth targets for determining alternate adequate progress toward ELP are set to determine the change expected annually in each ELs composite scale score level (comprised of speaking, listening, reading, and writing) on the annual state approved alternate ELP assessment (Exhibit 9).

Students taking the state approved alternate annual ELP assessment will be considered as making adequate progress if they meet the uniform growth target of 3 scale score points each year.

Exhibit 9: Grade K-12 Alternate Uniform Growth Progress Target

<b>Growth Target for Alternative ELP assessment</b>
3 scale score points per year

### Section 3

(Note to reader: [2023 ESSA Plan](#)- page 43)

Rational for change:

- Provide consistent terminology, language, and formatting
- Adjust Resource Allocation Review (RAR) requirements
- Provide clarity on differentiation of technical assistance provided by USBE specialists based on the LEA, school, designation, and needs
- Removed sections that included dated information from 2018 and on, as needed
- Provided updates to the State School Improvement section due to recent Board Rule amendments
- Added options for schools needing more rigorous intervention

#### A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

##### 4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))

###### vi. Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))

*a. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.*

For **Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) – Low Performance**, Utah identifies any Title I school that performed in the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools according to the school's performance on the indicators in the State's accountability system for three school years, on average. The USBE made these identifications beginning in the 2018-19 school year and is continuing to identify once every three years thereafter.

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

For **CSI – Low Graduation Rate**, Utah identifies any public high school with a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of less than or equal to 66.67 percent for three school years, on average. Utah identified schools for this category beginning in the 2018-19 school year and is continuing to identify once every three years thereafter.

*c. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional Comp support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as*

*a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.*

For **CSI – Low Performing Student Groups**, Utah identifies any Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Title I schools that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria described in section A.4.viii.b within three or four years. The USBE identifies such schools no more than annually, to align with ATSI exit requirements, beginning in the school year 2024–2025, based on prior school year data.

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

See Exhibit 15 for timeline and frequency with which schools will be identified for CSI.

<b>Types of Schools</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Frequency of Identification</b>	<b>Initial Year of Identification</b>
<b>CSI - Low Performance</b>	Any Title I school performing in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools for three years, on average	Once every three years	2018-2019
<b>CSI - Low Graduation Rate</b>	Any high school in the State with a 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate at or below 66.67 percent for three years, on average	Once every three years	2018-2019
<b>CSI - Low Performing Student Groups</b>	Any Title I school with a consistently underperforming student group that does not improve within three or four years	Annually in alignment with ATSI exit	2024-2025

If a school is identified for more than one CSI designation, USBE provides support and funding for all CSI designations and the school will need to meet all exit criteria for each designation. Schools already identified for CSI will not be double identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), ATSI, Elevate, or Springboard.

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

For **TSI**, Utah identifies any school with a "consistently underperforming" student group if, for two consecutive years, any of its student groups falls below the percentage of points (cut score) associated with the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools in the State's accountability system. Student groups include economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, students who are English learners, and students by major racial and ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, White, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Hispanic or Latino, and Multi-race). Schools identified must have a total N size of 10 students who took a reportable test and were enrolled for the full academic year in each student group each year to be considered for TSI identification.

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

For **ATSI**, Utah identifies any school with a student group whose 3-year average performance is below the cut score used to identify CSI schools. The schools identified for ATSI are identified once every three years following the same cycle of identification as CSI. Schools identified must have a total N size of 10 in each year of the accountability indicator of the years used in the three-year average, and they must currently be identified as a TSI school.

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



The USBE has two additional state designations, Elevate and Springboard. The USBE invites schools that are non-Title I and who are implementing TSI and/or ATSI activities to apply to be designated as an Elevate school. Elevate schools receive technical assistance and funding to address the needs of the TSI and/or ATSI student groups. Elevate schools are selected every year except in the year Springboard schools are designated. Beginning in the 2025-2026 school year, the USBE will designate seven schools as Springboard schools. A Springboard school is a non-Title I school that, averaged over three school years is: one of the five lowest performing elementary, middle, or junior high schools statewide or one of the two lowest performing high schools statewide. Springboard schools receive technical assistance and funding to address needs to improve the school's performance. Springboard schools will be designated every four years.

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

In accordance with State law, Utah factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide assessments into the accountability system by publishing the school's participation rate on a school's report card (Utah State Code 53E-5-211). The participation rate calculated for reporting purposes includes students who do not participate in an assessment due to parent opt-out provisions prescribed in State law (Utah State Code 53G-6-803).

Utah law authorizes a parent to excuse a student from taking a statewide assessment (Utah State Code 53G-6-803). State law conflicts with the 95% achievement indicator calculation requirement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii)). Complying with this requirement means that accountability scores calculated for Federal accountability will differ from accountability scores calculated for State accountability, essentially bifurcating our accountability system for reporting purposes and school improvement identification. Specifically, Utah calculates the achievement indicator in accordance with ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii), effectively counting non-tested students more than five percent as non-proficient. The achievement indicator is one indicator within the accountability system that accounts for 25% of a high school's overall accountability score and 37% of an elementary or middle school's overall accountability score.

**viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))**

***a. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.***  
***Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.***



To exit **CSI - Low Performance**, in the third or fourth year after which the school was identified, the school will:

1. meet individualized exit criteria by reducing the gap by one-third in performance between the school's baseline performance and 55% of all points possible, (if the school is an elementary, middle school, or junior high school), and 57% of all points possible, (if the school is a high school), using the accountability indicators.  
AND
2. exceed the cut score of the lowest 5% of Title I Schools from the year they were identified.

To exit **CSI - Low Graduation Rate**, the school must have a graduation rate above 66.67 percent in either their third or fourth year of designation.

To exit **CSI – Low Performing Student Groups**, in the third or fourth year after which the school was identified, the school will:

1. meet individualized exit criteria by reducing the gap for all designated ATSI student groups by one-third between the student group(s) baseline performance and 55% of all points possible, (if the school is an elementary, middle school, or junior high school), and 57% of all points possible, (if the school is a high school), using the accountability indicators. The baseline and targets for each designated ATSI group are reset upon identification as CSI – Low Performing Student Groups.  
AND
2. exceed the cut score of the lowest 5% of Title I Schools from the year they were identified for each designated student group.

*b. Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.*

To exit **ATSI**, in the third or fourth year after which the school was identified, the school will, for each designated student group:

1. meet individualized exit criteria by reducing the gap by one-third between the ATSI student group baseline performance and 55% of all points possible, (if the school is an elementary, middle school, or junior high school), and 57% of all points possible, (if the school is a high school), using the accountability indicators.  
AND
2. exceed the cut score of the lowest 5% of Title I Schools from the year they were identified for each designated student group.

Any Title I school that does not meet the exit criteria will be identified for CSI – Low Performing Student Groups.

*c. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.*

If a school designated as CSI does not meet exit requirements, USBE intervenes by choosing the most appropriate intervention based on data:

- Adjust the currently approved strategies and plan
- Implement state-determined strategies and plan
- Restructure a district school, which may include conversion to a charter school, close the school, or state takeover
- Restructure a charter school by terminating a school's charter, close the school, or transfer operation and control of the charter school
- Other appropriate action as determined by the USBE

*d. Resource Allocation Review. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.*

USBE conducts a systematic and collaborative Resource Allocation Review (RAR) every three years with 15 LEAs that serve significant numbers or percentages of schools identified for improvement.

To inform the RARs, USBE developed a school-level expenditures report that can be used in support of school improvement. The school-level expenditures report includes school-level information on per-pupil expenditures, a breakdown of expenditures by category (e.g., instruction, administration, transportation) and average staff salaries.

RARs are not limited to only the amount of financial support the LEA provides to schools in improvement status. USBE looks at additional resources such as human resources, instructional time, programs, and materials.

*e. Technical Assistance. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.*

USBE differentiates support and technical assistance provided to LEAs based on the results of the needs assessment LEAs complete to receive funding, the number of schools identified for improvement, the quality of Support and Improvement Plans, and progress monitoring data. LEAs receive additional technical assistance from experts across various USBE sections, based on the outcomes of the needs assessment.

*f. Additional Optional Action. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.*

USBE conducts differentiated monitoring activities with and provides technical assistance to LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified for CSI and not meeting exit criteria.

## Section 4

(Note to reader: [2023 ESSA Plan](#)- page 78)

Rationale for change: Alternate Entrance and Exit Criteria established. Remove all instances of specific reference to an ELP assessment vendor.

### *E. Title III, Part A, Subpart I: English Language Acquisition and Enhancement*

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

## **Entrance Procedures**

Students, new to Utah or returning to Utah after leaving, must be identified, and assessed for services within 30 days of the first day of school. Students returning to a Utah school, within the same school year, do not need to be screened if they have a Utah administrated English Language Proficiency (ELP) Screener or annual ELP assessment score from the same school year. Those students who enroll after the first month at the beginning of the school year must be assessed during the first 10 school days of enrollment. Parent(s) or guardians must be notified of placement in a language instruction education program within the 30-day window at the beginning of the year or the 10-day window thereafter, whichever applies for identification. LEAs shall keep record of all EL documentation to verify the correct process is in place. The standardized Utah Home Language Survey (HLS) is translated into 11 languages commonly spoken in Utah for the enrollment process. It is the responsibility of the LEA to provide a translated HLS if needed in any other languages.

At the time a student first enrolls, Utah uses a standard HLS<sup>16</sup> that identifies a student with a native language other than English, or who comes from an environment where a non-English language either is dominant or may have affected a student's ELP. Required questions to target the most relevant information include the following:

- What is the primary language used in the home, regardless of the language spoken by the student?
- What is the language most often spoken by the student?
- What is the language that the student first acquired?

<sup>16</sup> Office of English Language Acquisition, U.S. Department of Education, 2016. "English Learner Toolkit, Chapter 1: Tools And Resources For Identifying All English Learners." Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/english-learnertoolkit/chap1.pdf>

- What language do you prefer for school-to-home information?
- Does your family come from a refugee background?

The purpose of the HLS is to identify those students who may be potentially designated as ELs. Potential EL students, as determined by the HLS, must be assessed in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing through the State-adopted ELP screener assessment. The screener for Kindergarten students assesses only the domains of speaking and listening during the first semester of the school year. Kindergarten students who enroll during the second semester of the school year must be assessed in all four domains. The result of the assessment determines if the student is an EL and in need of specialized language and academic support services to which they are entitled. To ensure that students are not wrongly identified as potential ELs, technical assistance is provided by the USBE. Including refugee background and preferred home-to-school communication in the HLS helps LEAs determine appropriate services for EL and refugee families, but it does not trigger language screener administration.

Technical assistance to LEAs is provided by the USBE through an annual August webinar to ensure the purpose of the HLS is clearly understood by those who will administer it and those who will complete it. This survey cannot be used to confirm citizenship status or predetermine educational services. Consequently, to obtain accurate information, LEAs shall inform parents and families that the information provided by them will not be used to determine legal status or for any immigration purpose.

The standardized Utah HLS is translated into 11 languages commonly spoken in Utah for the enrollment process. It is the responsibility of the LEA to provide a translated HLS if needed in any other languages.

### **Classify (Confirm/Disconfirm) a Student as an EL**

Utah uses the initial ELP screener to confirm EL Status (students who score a composite of ELP level 1–4.9). Those who receive a composite score between 5.0 and 6.0 on an ELP screener do not qualify for English language services.

Individuals who administer the ELP screener receive training on administering and scoring the screener/assessment. The composite score of level 5.0 is used for kindergarten through twelfth grade to determine fluency.

Parents shall be notified annually by LEAs of a student's ELP status within 30 calendar days of the first day of school or within 10 school days after enrollment for students who are identified after the first month of school through a standard letter, adhering to the Federal Title III requirements, provided in the preferred language requested by the parent(s)/guardian(s) for school communication. Examples are provided in multiple

languages by the USBE on the Utah Title III website. Through this letter, parents are informed that even if their child qualifies for EL services, they have the right to decline such services. However, the school is still responsible to ensure that students learn English in every educational setting, which includes after school, summer school, or other opportunities for evidence-based interventions, which are discussed with ALS directors at quarterly meetings and in monthly webinars.

## **Exit Procedures**

In Utah, reclassification, or exit criteria, for students taking the regular annual ELP assessment is based on the following two criteria: 1) ELs receive a minimum overall composite score of 4.2 and 2) a minimum score of 3.5 in the speaking domain on the annual ELP assessment. The LEA must notify parent(s) and/or guardian(s) of student scores within three weeks of receiving initial ELP assessment results, in accordance with the Utah Testing Ethics Policy. LEAs shall notify the parent(s) and/or guardian(s) through the standard parent notification letter that the individual student has been exited from EL status and active language instruction services and will be monitored for a period of four years. The LEA shall initiate a teacher-student-parent conference, within 30 days of the LEA receiving the initial ELP scores, to discuss the necessary support for the student's ability to make continuous progress.

In Utah, reclassification, or exit criteria, for EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the alternate annual ELP assessment has two pathways. The primary pathway, in which students taking the annual alternate ELP assessment will automatically exit, is an overall composite score of 5. The secondary pathway, which will require the decision to be made by an IEP team that includes the school or LEA EL specialist, is an overall composite score of a 4 on the annual alternate ELP and an overall 4 on the English Language Arts alternate state content summative assessment. USBE provides guidance to LEA teams in how to determine if the secondary pathway to exit from EL services is appropriate for EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the annual alternate ELP assessment. The LEA must notify parent(s) and/or guardian(s) of student scores within three weeks of receiving initial alternate ELP assessment results, in accordance with the Utah Testing Ethics Policy. LEAs shall notify the parent(s) and/or guardian(s) through the standard parent notification letter that the individual student has been exited from EL status and active language instruction services and will be monitored for a period of four years. The LEA shall initiate a teacher-student-parent conference, within 30 days of the LEA receiving the initial alternate ELP scores, to discuss the necessary support for the student's ability to make continuous progress.

## **Monitoring of Reclassified EL/Exited**

After the regular and alternate annual ELP WIDA ACCESS for ELs-assessment, students who meet the exit criteria enter a four-year period of monitoring.

Monitoring ensures that former EL students are making appropriate progress with respect to acquiring English and content knowledge while in the academic educational setting.<sup>17</sup>

LEAs that serve EL students are required to establish policies and procedures to ensure that former ELs in monitoring status are provided access to equal educational opportunities offered to peers and have access to grade level content. If a former EL student in monitoring status is not progressing academically as expected and monitoring suggests a persistent language need, LEAs may re-test the student using the state approved ELP screener to see if the student must be offered additional language assistance services. In no case should re-testing of an exited, former EL student be prohibited. If the student is reentered into EL services, however, the LEA should document the reasons why and the parent's consent to active EL language services.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, 2016. "English Learner Fact Sheet." Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-el-students-201501.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> Office of English Language Acquisition, U.S. Department of Education, 2016. "English Learner Toolkit: Chapter 8; Tools and Resources for Monitoring and Exiting English Learners from EL Programs and Services." Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/english-learner-toolkit/chap8.pdf>



## Section 5

(Note to reader: [2023 ESSA Plan](#)- page 111)

Rationale for Change: Updating long-term goals per 2023 updated exit criteria.

## Appendix A

[C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency](#)

[Exhibit 30: English Language Proficiency—Percentage of ELs Reaching Proficiency](#)

Student Group	Baseline 2024	Interim Goal 2025	Interim Goal 2026	Interim Goal 2027	Interim Goal 2028	Interim Goal 2029	Interim Goal 2030
K-12	19.9%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%