

UCLA

Black Youth

Title

Beyond the Schoolhouse: Overcoming Challenges & Expanding Opportunity for Black Children in Los Angeles County

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/46j6j6qx>

Authors

Noguera, Pedro

Bishop, Joseph P.

Howard, Tyrone C.

et al.

Publication Date

2019-10-09

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/46j6j6qx#supplemental>

Peer reviewed

BEYOND THE SCHOOLHOUSE

POLICY REPORT

Overcoming Challenges & Expanding Opportunity
for Black Youth in LA County



CTS | UCLA

BMI
UCLA'S
BLACK MALE INSTITUTE

transformschoools.ucla.edu/beyond-the-schoolhouse

Acknowledgements

The authors thank CTS and Black Male Institute colleagues Edwin Rivera, Earl Edwards, Aline Soares, Jamelia Harris, Julio Alicea, Kacy Martin, Casey Wong and Nancy Giang for their significant contributions to the research. We are grateful for the generous support of the Hewlett Foundation, The California Endowment, the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, the County of Los Angeles, Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas and the Stuart Foundation for their investment in this project and the work of CTS. This policy brief benefited from the insights and expertise of Emily Williams and Porsha Copper of the office of Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas. We thank them for the care and attention they gave the report.

Recommended Citation:

Noguera, P., Bishop, J. Howard, T & Johnson, S. (2019). *Beyond the Schoolhouse: Overcoming Challenges & Expanding Opportunities for Black Youth in Los Angeles County*. Center for the Transformation of Schools, Black Male Institute, Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles.

Table of Contents


Introduction.....	1
Findings.....	9
Recommendations.....	11
Conclusion.....	14
Appendix A: Data Related to Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and Other Relevant Health & Experimental Data.....	15
Appendix B: Key Data Related to Poverty & Out-of-School Factors.....	17
Appendix C: Interactive Map Data Description.....	18

Introduction

Since the 2001 enactment of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), considerable attention has been paid to the persistence of racial disparities in academic achievement. However, despite a series of reform initiatives, many children throughout the United States continue to under-perform on standardized assessments, and the effort to close the so-called achievement gap remains a national challenge. This is particularly true for many Black students, who with few exceptions, continue to perform at lower levels on most measures of academic achievement and attainment. While the issue has been the subject of several national studies and reports, viable evidenced-based solutions to the problem continue to elude educators and policymakers.


In California, despite the state’s growing commitment to equity, Black children consistently lag behind their peers on standardized assessments and graduation rates. This is also the case in Los Angeles County (Figures 1, 2 and 3), the large metropolitan area that is the subject of this report. Black students in LA County are overrepresented among those who are under-prepared for college (Figure 4), who are subject to punitive forms of discipline (Figure 5), and who are chronically absent from school (Figure 6). Moreover, a disproportionate number of Black students in LA County attend schools that the state has identified as “low-performing” (See Maps) and they are also more likely to be enrolled in schools where critical resources (e.g. school counselors, nurses, social workers, highly qualified teachers, etc.) are in short supply.

Figure 1: SBAC English Scores by Ethnicity for Los Angeles 2018




42% of Black students have not met the standard on the SBAC for English.

Figure 2: SBAC Math Scores by Ethnicity for Los Angeles 2018




54% of Black students have not met the standard on the SBAC for Math.

Figure 3: 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate by Ethnicity for Los Angeles 2017-2018




75% of Black students in LA County graduate in four years.

Figure 4: 4-Year Cohort Graduates Meeting UC/CSU Requirements by Ethnicity for Los Angeles 2017-2018




Black students have the lowest college eligibility rates.

Figure 5: Suspension Rates for Students in Los Angeles by Race and Ethnicity 2017-2018




Black students have the highest suspension rates. Rates are highest for youth in foster care, students experiencing homelessness and students with disabilities.


Map 1: Human Development Index for LA County School Districts with 800 Black Students or More




Map 2: Exposure to Pollutants for LA County School Districts with 800 Black Students or More






Map 3: UC/CSU Readiness for LA County School Districts with 800 Black Students or More



Map 4: LA County Districts with 800 Black Students or More Heavily Disadvantaged in at Least Two Categories



🏠 = CSI Low-performing School

-  Human Development Index
-  Exposure to Pollutants
-  UC/CSU Readiness

Compton Unified, Paramount Unified, and Pomona Unified all were in the top five most-disadvantaged districts for at least two categories.


Why Focus on Black Students?

We have prepared this report to call attention to the challenges facing Black students at schools in LA County, but we do not mean to suggest that they are the only ones experiencing hardships. Though Black children are disproportionately affected by a variety of disadvantages, the data reveals that many children in LA — including Latinx, Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, LGBTQ youth, poor white children, and others — also face significant difficulties related to poverty, trauma and the failure of public institutions to respond adequately to their needs. Our hope is that through a detailed analysis of how school-based and environmental factors interact to shape the academic and developmental outcomes of Black children, we can devise strategies and solutions to address their needs and the needs of other disadvantaged children as well. By placing this information into the hands of policymakers and community activists we hope to begin to generate the *will* to bring about real change for the most vulnerable children in LA County.

The consistency of the patterns is disturbing, yet, statistics on academic achievement do not create a complete picture of what is happening to Black children in LA County. Close examination of their out-of-school experiences reveals that Black students are more likely than any other group to experience homelessness (Figure 7), to be placed in foster care (Figure 8), or to have a parent who is incarcerated (Figure 9). Furthermore, the communities where many Black children reside are also less likely to have parks and recreation facilities and are more likely to contain environmental hazards that negatively impact the health and well-being of children and their families (see Map 2).


While few would argue that adverse childhood experiences are irrelevant to academic performance, education policy has frequently ignored these issues and the social and psychological needs that accom-

Figure 6: Chronic Absenteeism Rates by Ethnicity for Los Angeles 2017-2018




Black youth have the highest rate of chronic absenteeism.

Figure 7: Enrollment Rates for Homeless Students in Los Angeles by Race and Ethnicity 2017-2018




Black students are overrepresented among students experiencing homelessness.

Figure 8: Enrollment Rates for Foster Care Students in Los Angeles by Race and Ethnicity 2017-2018



25% of children in the foster care system in LA County are Black.

Figure 9: Parental Legal Trouble or Incarceration by Race and Ethnicity for California 2013-2014



Families impacted by incarceration are more likely to be Black (18%) than any other racial ethnic group.

pany them. Although California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) prioritizes resources to schools serving the most disadvantaged students, at schools located in the poorest communities, the additional funds are insufficient to address growing needs. **Black children are also not recognized as one of the groups in need of targeted support.** In LA County and in much of California, Black students are vastly over-represented among children who experience hardships such as homelessness, but too often, they are concentrated in schools that are under-resourced, highly segregated, and lacking the supports necessary to adequately address and respond to their social and psychological needs.

Since 2001, considerable attention has been focused on efforts to reform schools and raise student achievement. However, far less attention and effort has been directed at addressing the out-of-school factors that influence a child’s development, or the economic conditions in the neighborhoods where they live. We must do both. In the longer version of

this report we reference the ways in which the **accumulation of disadvantage** (see Maps) influences the educational and developmental outcomes of Black children in LA County. Failure to recognize how poverty, health and educational performance interact has made it more difficult for education policy to have a positive impact on the needs of the most vulnerable children. To correct this oversight, we must devise solutions that are designed to counter and mitigate the effects of these disadvantages.

A longer version of our report will be released in 2020. In it we closely examine the educational performance of Black students in the fourteen school districts in LA County (Figure 10) that serve 800 Black students or more.

In our review of the data related to the education and health of Black children in these 14 school districts and in LA County generally, we discovered a distinct and consistent tendency for the students with the greatest needs to be denied learning opportunities

Figure 10: Enrollment Rates for the 14 Los Angeles Districts by Race and Ethnicity with Highest Proportion of Black Students 2017-2018

District	Black	Latinx	Asian	White	All Other Ethnicities
Inglewood	40.1%	57.4%	0.4%	0.4%	1.5%
Compton	17.9%	79.0%	0.1%	0.5%	1.0%
Antelope Valley	17.2%	62.1%	1.3%	13.1%	6.1%
Centinela Valley	15.4%	74.4%	2.2%	2.9%	4.3%
Culver City	13.6%	37.9%	10.4%	26.4%	11.5%
Bellflower	12.8%	64.5%	4.0%	10.0%	8.5%
Long Beach	12.8%	56.8%	7.4%	13.1%	7.7%
Pasadena	12.5%	58.3%	5.0%	18.1%	5.4%
ABC Unified	8.5%	45.9%	23.9%	6.0%	15.1%
Los Angeles	8.1%	74.1%	3.7%	10.1%	3.7%
Paramount	7.7%	88.4%	0.8%	1.1%	2.0%
Pomona	4.5%	85.7%	3.4%	3.6%	2.6%
William S Hart	4.5%	37.7%	6.7%	39.5%	10.1%
Torrance	3.9%	30.2%	29.2%	21.8%	13.5%

through exclusionary discipline practices (Figure 5). We also found that students in foster care, experiencing homelessness, and in special education were most likely to be suspended from school and to have the lowest academic performance on a number of indicators (Figures 1, 2 and 4).


The patterns illustrated in the chart above are by no means unique to LA County. A 2018 report from the *Children's Defense Fund* found that throughout the nation, similar patterns are evident, not only among Black children, but among disadvantaged children from a wide variety of backgrounds.

Place Matters: The Accumulation of Disadvantage

The Black population of LA is diverse and declining (Figure 11). Despite a significant decline, LA County is home to the second largest number of Black students in the nation (second only to Cook County, Illinois). There are 109,000 Black students in LA County, more students than in all but two of the school districts in California.

It is important to note that there are a small but significant number of Black children (primarily from affluent households), who attend private or and well-resourced, racially integrated public schools. The vast majority of these students graduate from high school and enroll in four-year colleges. This report is largely not about these students. However, it should be noted that Black students who attend such schools are more likely to be eligible for admission to the UC and CSU system than their low-income peers. In this report, we focus our attention on the larger number of Black students who are concentrated in under-resourced schools in the most disadvantaged communities. Such students are overrepresented among those who lag behind their peers in their performance on standardized assessments, in completing courses needed for college, and in college graduation rates. They are also more likely to end up **structurally disenfranchised** — not working, not in school, and ensnared by the criminal justice system.

Figure 11: Enrollment for Black Students in Los Angeles 2000-2019



Enrollment of Black students in schools in LA County has declined by 42 percent over the past 20 years.

California Department of Education (2019). Retrieved at "<https://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dq census/EnrEthYears.aspx?cds=19&aggllevel=county&year=2017-18>"

We must intervene to reduce the likelihood of this occurrence.

Like Latinx students, the majority of Black students are enrolled in poor, racially isolated schools located in impoverished communities. Increasingly, many Black students attend schools where they are a minority (the majority are typically Latinx). Despite their small numbers, Black students at these schools are typically over-represented in categories associated with risk and failure.

When the Social Science Research Council released the *Portrait of LA County* in 2018, we were surprised that despite its devastating depiction of the County and its deep and profound inequality, the report received little attention from the local media, and little response from policymakers. We hope a similar fate won't occur with the release of this report. We build upon the findings from the *Portrait of LA County* to show that where one lives has a significant impact upon health, the quality of schools, and the availability of economic opportunity. **To address this problem, we must target resources and interventions where they are needed most.**



Findings

1. **Place matters: Academic performance and health are highly correlated with where a child lives.** Whether or not a child has access to healthy food, parks, clean air or good health services, has a profound influence on their academic performance and the quality of schools they attend.
2. **The majority of Black students in LA County are enrolled in racially isolated (e.g. predominantly Black and Latinx students) schools located in impoverished communities.** For many years, there has been no significant effort to promote racial integration in LA County schools.
3. **Most of the schools where Black children are concentrated have limited resources** despite having high numbers of very disadvantaged students (e.g. students in foster care, students who are homeless, in special education, etc.).
4. **Key academic and school climate indicators illustrate distinct differences between Black students and students of other racial and ethnic groups.**

- Black students who graduate from high school eligible for admission to UC/CSU come from a small number of LA County high schools. With few exceptions, these schools are racially and socio-economically integrated.
- The chronic absenteeism rate for Black students in LA County is 20%, *disproportionately* higher than for all other racial/ethnic groups.
- Suspension rates for Black students in LA County have declined in recent years but at 6% it is disproportionately higher than for all other racial/ethnic groups.
- A-G college readiness rates for Black students in LA County is 45 percent, disproportionately lower than for all other racial/ethnic groups.
- Suspension rates for Black students experiencing homelessness is 6% higher than any other group of students.
- Only 55% of Black male students with a disability in Los Angeles County graduated from high school on time.
- According to the state enrollment report, 9,849 Black students enrolled in LA County schools in the 2005-2006 school year. According to the Four-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate 3,234 African American Students were UC/CSU eligible in 2017-18, or 32% of the original kindergarten cohort from 2005-2006.

5. Social, environmental and health data reveals that Black children and families are more likely to be negatively impacted by their surroundings.

- Districts that enroll the highest proportion of Black students have some of the lowest Human Development Index (HDI) scores in the County. Culver City Unified School District is an exception.
- The asthma rate for Black children in LA County is 17.3%, almost three times higher than White children (6.1%). Black children in the Antelope Valley and the corridor from South LA to the Port of LA complex have the highest asthma rates.
- 2% of children in the County had elevated levels of lead in blood (higher than 5 micrograms per deciliter of lead in the bloodstream). In South Central Los Angeles, 5.28% of children had elevated levels of lead in their blood.
- More Black families are impacted by food insecurity than any other racial and ethnic group (18%).
- Childhood hardships (e.g. incarcerated parents, homelessness, parental substance abuse, foster care placement) are disproportionately higher among Black students (12%).



Recommendations

There are several relevant factors that influence achievement patterns among Black students that are beyond the scope of this report, such as: under-resourced schools, underprepared teachers, the strength and relevance of the school curriculum, parent involvement, etc. While we acknowledge the importance of these and other issues, we have concentrated our recommendations on areas where new social policies can be adopted and local strategies that can be developed to reduce the educational, social and health disparities for Black students and families. We offer the following recommendations for the purpose of mitigating the effects of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) and to provide guidance to schools on how to intervene effectively to support Black youth. Lawmakers at each level of government have a distinct responsibility to address historic patterns of inequality, requiring greater coordination and stronger political leadership.

1. School Districts

- Adopt a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework to reduce suspensions and embrace alternative strategies to punitive discipline.
- Improve student outcomes in A-G courses through guidance and support to teachers and targeted academic support to students in need.
- Coordinate with Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) and local non-profits to ensure that schools serving “high need” populations have access to case managers, social workers, counselors, afterschool programs, mentors and other social supports.
- Develop partnerships with parents and community groups to improve access to adult mentors in districts with shortages of Black staff.

- Hire more Black teachers and administrators where they are underrepresented in schools or district. Develop “grow-your-own” models in partnership with local institutions of higher education.
- Expand access to supplemental educational opportunities including afterschool and summer academic enrichment programs.
- Prioritize system alignment Pre-K-college to improve outcomes for Black youth. There is a need for ongoing collaboration between educational practitioners, leaders, researchers, and policymakers at various levels of the educational pipeline.
- Ensure that financial resources are aligned with district equity and Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) goals. Any additional funds should be invested in areas of greatest need and in strategies that are likely to have the greatest impact on student achievement and development.

2. Cities

- Work with school districts to provide and coordinate access to resources to support Black families and children (e.g. affordable housing, ensure the safety of neighborhoods, reliability of public transportation, access to job training, and an ongoing effort to address environmental hazards).
- Adopt policies and promote strategies with the County and district officials to identify and remove unsafe community conditions that contribute to asthma, lead exposure, and other health risks.
- Encourage businesses, faith based organizations, and nonprofits to support the development of afterschool programming and community services. Offer more joint programming through recreation and park districts and explore opportunities to share staffing and resources.
- Encourage employers to work closely with schools to develop career and technical education programs in areas where job growth is likely.

3. County of Los Angeles

- Create a County-wide strategic plan to address the needs of Black children
- Work with districts to develop a strategic approach to racial and socioeconomic integration in schools.
- Solicit the expertise and perspectives of Black youth, families, community and faith-based organizations regarding their needs.
- Ensure better coordination across departments to ensure more efficient service delivery in high impact communities.
- Engage LACOE in the implementation of the Healthy Neighborhoods Plan in targeted communities and expand upon school-based health centers.

4. State Policy

- Invest in an integrated longitudinal data systems to make it possible for the state and County to track the educational progress and health of children, from birth to employment.
- Increase access to high-quality early education programs for Black students and families.
- Provide more targeted funding to augment Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) in areas where Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs), health disparities and environmental are greatest.
- Consistent with the Agenda for California, An African American Perspective:
 - a) Guarantee access to childcare for low-income families by adding 30,000 slots in 2019-20 and an additional 15,000 slots per year thereafter.
 - b) Expand the Childcare Bridge Program to meet the needs of young people in foster care and to support them in their transition to independence.
 - c) Ensure that schools serving the greatest number of students experiencing homelessness receive adequate support.
- Support more grow-your-own education preparation programs and state loan forgiveness programs to prepare a diverse, talented and sustainable teaching and leadership force across LA county.

5. Federal Policy

- Expand funding for full-service community schools to support primary health, mental health, and dental care in schools.
- Prioritize funding for Head Start to improve access for Black children and families.
- Increase federal funding to support growing special education costs and to fulfill federal obligations related to IDEA.



Conclusion


Our goal in releasing this report is to do more than simply sound an alarm and draw attention to the fact that Black children in LA County face a number of hardships and disadvantages. That has already been done by numerous studies. We know that calling attention to a problem does not guarantee that it will be addressed. Therefore, it is critical that local leaders work together to act on the findings and recommendations from this report.

We recognize that the problems we have identified are complex. However, we believe they can be ameliorated through targeted and sustained action carried out over an extended period of time. Through greater and more efficient collaboration between the various departments within the County, with the support of key stakeholders, (e.g. local school districts, the nonprofit sector, foundations and community groups), and guided by a **coherent plan of action**, we believe solutions can be devised and progress can be achieved in promoting the academic success and overall wellness of Black children in Los Angeles County.

This report can serve as a catalyst for the development of such a plan and the sustained, pragmatic and strategic action that must follow.


Appendix A: Data Related to Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and Other Relevant Health & Experimental Data

Figure 12: Basic Needs Not Met by Race and Ethnicity for California 2013-2014¹



Blacks, like Latinx students, are more likely to not have basic needs met compared to other racial/ethnic groups.

Figure 13: Family Hunger by Race and Ethnicity for California 2013-2014




¹ Estimated percentage of women with a live birth for whom before age 14 it was somewhat or very often hard for their families to pay for basic needs like food or housing, by race/ethnicity (e.g., for an estimated 27.2% of Hispanic/Latina California women with a live birth in 2013-2014, it was somewhat or very often hard for the families in which they grew up to pay for basic needs like food or housing).

Family Hunger, by Race/Ethnicity (Maternal Retrospective; California Only). 2013-2014.

Info. Estimated percentage of women with a live birth who before age 14 lived in families in which they or a family member went hungry because the family could not afford enough food, by race/ethnicity (e.g., *an estimated 13.3% of Hispanic/Latina California women with a live birth in 2013-2014 had lived in families in which they or a family member went hungry because the family could not afford enough food*).

Findings: More Black families are impacted by food insecurity than any other racial and ethnic group. (18%)

Figure 14: Prevalence of Childhood Hardships by Race and Ethnicity for California 2013-2014




Prevalence of Childhood Hardships, by Race/Ethnicity (Maternal Retrospective; California Only). 2013-2014.

Info: Estimated percentage of women with a live birth who before age 14 experienced childhood hardships, by race/ethnicity (e.g., *an estimated 7.4% of Hispanic/Latina California women with a live birth in 2013-2014 experienced four or more childhood hardships*).

This indicator reports the prevalence of seven childhood hardships: (1) basic needs not met, (2) parental drinking or drug problem, (3) parental legal trouble or incarceration, (4) parental divorce or separation, (5) family hunger, (6) relocation due to problems paying rent or mortgage, (7) foster care placement.

Findings: Childhood hardships (e.g. basic needs not met, parental substance abuse, hunger) are highest of 4 or more for Black students (12%) compared to other racial and ethnic groups.

Figure 15: Percent of Children (0-17) with Asthma by Race/Ethnicity - LA County, 2015



Source: Los Angeles County Department of Public Health

Appendix B: Key Data Related to Poverty & Out-of-School Factors

Tables for Sustainable Development goals (Source: PoLA full report)

Table 1. LA County. Poverty and Hunger

	Poverty (% in households with incomes below federal poverty line)	Child Poverty (% of children in households with incomes below 200% of federal poverty line)	Snap Benefits (% of households based on race of household head)
Asian	12.1	32.5	3.0
Black	22.0	56.3	14.7
Latino	20.9	63.0	15.6
White	10.3	22.6	3.8
Women	17.8	51.2	N/A
Men	15.5	50.4	N/A

Table 2. LA County. Good Health & Well-Being

	Low Birth Weight Babies (% based on race of mother)	Life Expectancy at Birth (years)	No Health Insurance (% of total population)
Asian	6.7	87.3	7.8
Black	12.1	75.6	7.3
Latino	6.5	84.4	16.3
White	6.5	80.9	5.4
Women	N/A	84.5	9.8
Men	N/A	79.6	12.7

Table 3. LA County. Access to Justice

	Juvenile Felony Ar- rests (Ages 10-17 per 1,000 youth)	Jail (Avg daily pop. Per 100,000 adults 16 and older)	Homicide Victims (per 100,000 residents)
Asian	N/A	10.8	1.3
Black	17.5	1,009.0	26.5
Latino	2.9	272.1	5.4
White	1.7	175.5	3.3
Women	1.2	75.7	1.6
Men	5.8	479.4	10.1

Appendix C: Interactive Map Data Description

Human Development Index (HDI)²

HDI calculations can be found from the Social Science Research Council's Measure of America: Portrait of Los Angeles County (2018). The Human Development Index (HDI) is a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and have a decent standard of living. The HDI is the geometric mean of normalized indices for each of the three dimensions.

The health dimension is assessed by life expectancy at birth, the education dimension is measured by mean of years of schooling for adults aged 25 years and more and expected years of schooling for children of school entering age. The standard of living dimension is measured by gross national income per capita. The HDI uses the logarithm of income, to reflect the diminishing importance of income with increasing GNI. The scores for the three HDI dimension indices are then aggregated into a composite index using geometric mean. Refer to [Technical notes](#) for more details.

The HDI simplifies and captures only part of what human development entails. It does not reflect on inequalities, poverty, human security, empowerment, etc.

Enviroscan³

CalEnviroScreen 3.0 uses 20 indicators covering pollution burden and population characteristics of California's approximately 8,000 census tracts taken from the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA). The CalEnviroScreen map used for the pollution burden scores uses percentiles to assign scores for health indicators in a given geographic area. Higher percentile scores indicate a higher pollution burden for that location with Los Angeles county being the measure at 100. Furthermore, the pollution burden score is made up of two components – Exposures and Environmental Effects. The numbers represented on the graph are only one number of the few for the locations surrounding the districts and can be further explored in the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 map which can be used to specify a pollution burden around a specific school. The indicators are organized in four domains including:

2 More information on Human Development Index (HDI) history, application and methodology can be found at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi>

3 More information on Enviroscan methodology can be found at <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/calenviroscreen/document/ces3newinc3.pdf>

BEYOND THE SCHOOLHOUSE

Domain	Variable
Exposure Indicators	Air Quality- Ozone
Exposure Indicators	Air Quality Particulate Matter (PM)
Exposure Indicators	Diesel Particulate Matter
Exposure Indicators	Drinking Water Contaminants
Exposure Indicators	Pesticide Use
Exposure Indicators	Toxic Releases from Facilities
Exposure Indicators	Traffic Density
Environmental Effects Indicators	Clean-up Sites
Environmental Effects Indicators	Groundwater Threats
Environmental Effects Indicators	Hazardous Waste Generators and Facilities
Environmental Effects Indicators	Impaired Waters
Environmental Effects Indicators	Solid Waste Sites and Facilities
Environmental Effects Indicators	Clean-up Sites
Environmental Effects Indicators	Groundwater Threats
Sensitive Population	Age: Children and Elderly
Sensitive Population	Asthma
Sensitive Population	Cardiovascular Disease: Heart Attack Rate
Sensitive Population	Low-Birth Weight Infants
Socioeconomic Factors	Educational Attainment
Socioeconomic Factors	Linguistic Isolation
Socioeconomic Factors	Poverty
Socioeconomic Factors	Unemployment
Socioeconomic Factors	Housing Burdened Low-Income Neighborhoods
Socioeconomic Factors	Cardiovascular Disease: Heart Attack Rate

Note: Scores for each category are first calculated by averaging their indicators' percentiles. Pollution Burden is then calculated as the average of Exposures and half-weighted Environmental Effects; Population Characteristics is calculated as the average of Sensitive Population and Socioeconomic Factors. Overall CalEnviro Screen scores are still calculated as the product of Pollution Burden and Population Characteristics scores.

UC/CSU Readiness⁴

To be considered for admission to the University of California (UC) or the California State University (CSU) system, high school students must complete all a–g courses with grades of C or higher. The a–g course sequence includes 30 semesters of UC-approved college preparatory coursework in seven subject areas, and completion indicates a high level of academic preparation. School districts must submit local coursework to the UC to obtain a–g designation, and in some subject areas (history/social studies, mathematics, and world languages), the course requirements are quite specific. The a–g course requirements are considerably more rigorous than the minimum requirements set by the state of California for a high school diploma.

Comprehensive School Improvement

CSI schools are Title I schools identified as low-performing by the state. Two subcategories of eligibility for schools within Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI):

- CSI-Low Graduation Rate Schools Non-Title I and Title I high schools with a graduation rate less than 67% averaged over two years
- CSI-Lowest Performing Schools Lowest performing 5% of Title I schools criteria based on meeting one of the following performance level color combinations on Dashboard State Indicators for “All” students:
 - All red indicators
 - All red but one indicator of any other color
 - All red and orange indicators
 - Five or more indicators where the majority are red

⁴ More information on A-G requirements and UC/CSU readiness can be found at Betts, J. R., Zau, A. C., & Bachofer, K. V. (2013). *College Readiness as a Graduation Requirement*. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.



transformschoools.ucla.edu/beyond-the-schoolhouse