



# CALIFORNIA (CA) REPORT CARD

## LAWS

The state of California **does not mandate identifying or serving** gifted students. There is **no funding** for gifted programs.

## ACCESS

Opportunity to Be Identified as Gifted	Grade or Rank	Notes and Explanation
<b>Access to Identification Rank</b>	<b>D</b> 29th	67.78% of students attend a school that identifies students with gifts and talents Rank among 50 states and DC in access
<b>Equity of Access Between Title I and Non-Title I Schools Rank</b>	<b>F</b> 20th	Students in Title I schools are identified at 69% of the rate of those in Non-Title I schools (8.81% vs. 12.71% yields a ratio 0.69 between Title I and Non-Title I schools) Rank among 50 states and DC in equity between Non-Title I and Title I schools
<b>Equity of Access by Race</b>	<b>F</b> <b>A</b> <b>A</b> <b>A</b>	0.77 AIAN 1.01 Black 1.03 Latinx 0.99 NHPI The ratio of race access to general access in schools that identify indicates whether students proportionally attend schools that identify. Ratios close to or greater than 1.00 means good access, so underrepresentation is not a function of lack of access.

## EQUITY

Underserved Groups (in schools that identify)	Category	Statewide Grade—RI	City Grade—RI	Suburb Grade—RI	Town Grade—RI	Rural Grade—RI
<b>AIAN Equity</b> (n=18,810)	Overall	<b>F</b> -0.72	<b>C</b> -0.85	<b>F</b> -0.73	<b>F</b> -0.78	<b>F</b> -0.52
	Non-Title I	<b>F</b> -0.65	<b>F</b> -0.75	<b>F</b> -0.63	<b>F</b> -0.73	<b>F</b> -0.50
Substantial population	Title I	<b>F</b> -0.77	<b>C</b> -0.89	<b>D</b> -0.81	<b>D</b> -0.80	<b>F</b> -0.56
<b>Black Equity</b> (n=246,570)	Overall	<b>F</b> -0.59	<b>F</b> -0.59	<b>F</b> -0.56	<b>F</b> -0.46	<b>F</b> -0.61
	Non-Title I	<b>F</b> -0.56	<b>F</b> -0.57	<b>F</b> -0.55	<b>F</b> -0.55	<b>F</b> -0.47
	Title I	<b>F</b> -0.62	<b>F</b> -0.62	<b>F</b> -0.60	<b>F</b> -0.43	<b>F</b> -0.71
<b>Latinx Equity</b> (n=2,325,467)	Overall	<b>F</b> -0.74	<b>F</b> -0.74	<b>F</b> -0.73	<b>D</b> -0.80	<b>F</b> -0.76
	Non-Title I	<b>F</b> -0.66	<b>F</b> -0.65	<b>F</b> -0.67	<b>F</b> -0.53	<b>F</b> -0.71
	Title I	<b>D</b> -0.81	<b>D</b> -0.80	<b>D</b> -0.83	<b>D</b> -0.84	<b>D</b> -0.80
<b>NHPI Equity</b> (n=26,597)	Overall	<b>C</b> -0.86	<b>C</b> -0.85	<b>D</b> -0.82	<b>F</b> -0.79	<b>A</b> -1.03
	Non-Title I	<b>F</b> -0.71	<b>F</b> -0.73	<b>F</b> -0.65	<b>B</b> -0.94	<b>A</b> -1.31
Substantial population	Title I	<b>B</b> -0.94	<b>B</b> -0.91	<b>A</b> -0.95	<b>F</b> -0.75	<b>F</b> -0.74

## MISSINGNESS

### Students Missing From Gifted Education Identification: 39% at the Lower Boundary. Grade: Fail. Rank: 29

California identified 424,890 students as gifted in 2016. Statewide, the number of missing students in schools that do not identify and in schools that underidentify ranges from 274,119 to 401,139, (39% to 49%) with most of these missing students coming from Title I schools, schools that do not identify, and from underserved populations. For example, 14,676 Black children are identified, with 21,797 to 31,704 (60% to 68%) missing. These numbers are detailed in Table 7 in the accompanying state report.

## SUMMARY

### Key Findings and Recommendations

California has steadily declined in access to identification since 2000 to its present level of 68% of students attending a school where students are identified with gifts and talents. Additional inequities exist between Title I and Non-Title I schools, with Title I schools identifying 31% fewer students. Proportionally fewer AIAN students attend schools where identification takes place than students from other racial groups, so together with Black and Latinx students they are underrepresented. Reform is needed in California regarding policy and procedures, leadership, and guidance to ensure access and equity to gifted education services for all children in California.

AIAN=American Indian or Alaska Native, NHPI=Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

# CALIFORNIA DETAILED NARRATIVE REPORT

## Introduction

### 1. Laws

California does not have a mandate for gifted education nor does it provide funding. In 2014, the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) was instituted, which redistributed funding that had gone to GATE programs to district general funds. More information can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/gt/lw/>

### 2. Opportunity to Be Identified With Gifts and Talents

With no mandate to identify or serve students with gifts and talents, California ranks 29th in access to being identified with gifts and talents, with only 67.78% of its students attending 55.62% of schools that actually identify students as such in 2015–2016. In 2000, access was highest at 86.06%.

#### *Access for Students From Poverty: Non-Title I and Title I Schools*

As shown in Table 1, 10.00% of students who attend schools that identify students with gifts and talents were identified in 2015–2016. Nationally, on average, 9.57% of students are identified among schools that identify. Compared with other states, California identifies a larger percentage of students, ranking 18th among the 50 states and DC, in which percentage identified ranges from 24.37% (MD) to 0% (DC). As shown in Table 2, a closer look at this number (10.00%) by considering whether students attend a Title I or Non-Title I school reveals inequity between these school types. Each year, a greater percentage of students in Non-Title I schools are identified than in Title I schools, with a difference occurring in 2016 of 12.71% and 8.81% respectively, yielding a ratio of 0.69. This means that students in Title I schools are identified at 69% of the rate of those in Non-Title I schools.

Table 3 provides descriptive data concerning the numbers and percentage of schools with Title I status and whether or not they identify students with gifts and talents. These data help explain whether there are differences in opportunity for identification based on what type of school (Title I or Non-Title I) a student attends. In comparing schools that identify to schools that don't identify for each type of school (Non-Title I or Title I), ratios of more than 1.00 would indicate a larger percentage of schools of that type identify than do not identify;

**TABLE 1***California Students Who Have Access to Identification as Gifted and Schools That Identify Students*

Year	Total Students	Total Students in Schools That ID GT	Students ID as GT From Schools That Have GT ID	Total Schools	Total Schools That ID GT
2015–2016	6,270,605	4,249,918	424,890	10,138	5,639
		67.78%	10.00%		55.62%
2013–2014	6,249,303	4,451,325	489,802	9,883	5,868
		71.23%	11.00%		59.37%
2011–2012	6,265,682	4,746,752	516,598	9,864	6,259
		75.76%	10.88%		63.45%
2000	5,934,305	5,107,177	408,636	8,474	6,267
		86.06%	8.00%		73.96%

**TABLE 2***Number and Percentage of Students Identified With Giftedness Overall and by Title I Status, With Difference Between Non-Title I and Title I Schools in California*

Year	Total Identified GT Students	Number and % ID GT in Non-Title I Schools	Number and % ID GT in Title I Schools	Ratio of ID in Title I Schools Compared With Non-Title I Schools
2015–2016	424,890	157,246	259,125	
		12.71%	8.81%	0.69
2013–2014	489,802	187,835	297,321	
		14.05%	9.65%	0.69
2011–2012	516,598	225,467	276,847	
		13.04%	9.49%	0.73

**TABLE 3***2015–2016 Ratio of Non-Title I and Title I Schools With/Without Gifted Access With Grand Ratio of Title I Ratio to Non-Title I Ratio in California*

Year	Total Schools	Non-Title I Schools No ID # and %	Non-Title I Schools With ID # and %	Ratio Non-Title I With ID /Non-Title I No ID	Title I Schools No ID # and %	Title I Schools With ID # and %	Ratio Title I With ID / Title I No ID	Grand Ratio Title I Ratio/Non-Title I Ratio
2015–2016	10,138	736	1,472		2,808	4,043		
		7.26	14.52	2.00	27.70	39.88	1.44	0.72
2013–2014	9,883	745	1,601		2,785	4,212		
		7.54	16.20	2.15	28.18	42.62	1.51	0.70
2011–2012	9,864	1,054	2,099		1,792	3,990		
		10.69	21.28	1.99	18.17	40.45	2.23	1.12

**TABLE 4**

**2015–2016 Access to Identification as Gifted in All Schools  
and by Race With a Ratio of Race to All**

Race	Total Students	Students in Schools That ID GT		Ratio of Race to All
		N	%	
California-All	6,270,605	4,249,918	67.78%	
AIAN	36,508	18,981	51.99%	0.77
Asian	694,650	475,692	68.48%	1.01
Black	364,822	249,983	68.52%	1.01
Latinx	3,382,639	2,361,122	69.80%	1.03
NHPI	39,708	26,732	67.32%	0.99
TMR	243,199	161,300	66.32%	0.98
White	1,509,079	956,108	63.36%	0.93

Note. TMR=Two or More Races

ratios close to 1.00 would indicate about the same percentage of schools identify as do not identify; and ratios less than 1.00 would indicate a smaller percentage of schools identify than do not identify. The grand ratio compares the ratio of Title I to Non-Title I, with the same indicators (Ratio > 1.00 means a larger proportional representation of schools that identify within Title I schools than Non-Title I; ratio near 1.00 means about the same in percentage of schools identifying; ratio <1.00 means a greater proportional representation of schools that identify within Non-Title I schools than Title I schools). For California in 2016, grand ratio (0.72) indicates less proportion for Title I schools that identify (1.44) when compared to Non-Title I schools that identify (2.00). These data support the conclusion that underrepresentation is a function of proportionally fewer Title I schools identifying students with gifts and talents.

#### **Access for Students by Racial Groups**

Finally, we examined access to identification by race (Table 4). To do this, we looked at the percentage of students in California in 2015–2016 who attended schools that identified students with gifts and talents, which is 67.78%, then we compared that percentage with the percentage of students from each race who attend schools that identify students with gifts and talents. If, for example, fewer students from a given race attend schools where they have the opportunity for identification, then this could explain underidentification of this group of students. A simple ratio of the percentage of students of a given race who attend schools that identify to the percentage of students overall who attend such schools provides an equity ratio. Ratios close to or greater than 1.00 indicate that the group has proportional access, in that they attend schools that identify at or greater than the rate of all students. Table 4 contains these results, with AIAN youth attending schools that identify at only 0.77 (i.e., 51.99%/67.78%) the rate of overall groups. So one reason AIAN youth in California are missing from gifted identification can be attributed to the fact that they are 23% less likely to attend schools where they have the opportunity for identification. This is especially distressing since California has the third largest AIAN student population.

**TABLE 5**

**Breakdown by Race Among All, Non-Title I, and Title I Schools,  
With Ratio of Title I/Non-Title I Identified in 2015–2016**

<b>Race</b>	<b>RI in All Schools That ID</b>	<b>RI in Non-Title I Schools That ID</b>	<b>RI in Title I Schools That ID</b>	<b>Ratio of Title I/ Non-Title I</b>
AIAN	0.72	0.65	0.77	1.18
Asian	1.93	1.64	2.02	1.23
Black	0.59	0.56	0.62	1.12
Latinx	0.74	0.66	0.81	1.23
NHPI	0.86	0.71	0.94	1.33
TMR	1.09	0.97	1.10	1.14
White	1.28	1.03	1.41	1.36

### 3. Equity Across Underserved Groups

In 2015–2016, nationally, a disparity exists between Non-Title I schools (13.46% identified) and Title I schools (7.86% identified) that identify students with gifts and talents for a ratio of 0.58, meaning Title I schools identify students at only 58% the rate of Non-Title I schools. In California, this rate is 69%. Additional disparity exists among racial groups, with Asian, TMR, and White students well-represented and AIAN, Black, Latinx, and NHPI students underrepresented. We used representation indices (RIs) to examine equity among Title I status, race, and locale for students in California.

In Table 5, RIs are reported by race and Title I status, with a ratio between Title I and Non-Title I shown to quantify the extent of well- or underrepresentation between these two settings. RIs and ratios less than 1.00 indicate underrepresentation. For the report card, as described in the methods, RIs less than 0.80 are considered failing. In California, attending a Title I school improves proportional representation for all racial groups, and especially for Latinx and NHPI whose RIs in Title I schools are passing, (0.81 vs. 0.66; 0.94 vs. 0.71, respectively). AIAN and Black students remain underrepresented in both settings (0.77 vs. 0.65; 0.62 vs. 0.56, respectively). Asian, TMR, and White students are well-represented in all settings.

Equity in different locales with Non-Title I and Title I status was examined using RIs. Table 6 contains RIs for these groups by race, with RIs less than 0.80 considered failing. Color is used in the table to indicate passing in green or failing in red. Clear patterns exist for racial groups. RIs Black youth in California are failing across all locales. Representation for Latinx youth in Title I schools in all locales is moderate, ranging from 0.80 to 0.84. The same is true for AIAN youth in Title I locations (0.80 to 0.89), with the exception of Rural locales (0.56), but failing RIs exist for AIAN in Non-Title locales. Reasonable equity exists for NHPI in City and Suburb Title I schools and in Town and Rural Non-Title schools. White, TMR, and Asian students are well-represented.

**TABLE 6*****RIs by Race and Locale With Non-Title I and Title I Status***

	City	Suburb	Town	Rural
AIAN Overall (n=18,810)	0.85	0.73	0.78	0.52
AIAN Non-Title I (n=5,022)	0.75	0.63	0.73	0.50
AIAN Title I (n=13,646)	0.89	0.81	0.80	0.56
Asian Overall (n=472,430)	1.88	1.96	1.16	1.77
Asian Non-Title I (n=220,519)	1.53	1.72	0.89	1.42
Asian Title I (n=249,265)	2.03	1.94	1.24	2.15
Black Overall (n=246,570)	0.59	0.56	0.46	0.61
Black Non-Title I (n=57,753)	0.57	0.55	0.55	0.47
Black Title I (n=188,246)	0.62	0.60	0.43	0.71
Latinx Overall (n=2,325,467)	0.74	0.73	0.80	0.76
Latinx Non-Title I (n=371,769)	0.65	0.67	0.53	0.71
Latinx Title I (n=1,947,984)	0.80	0.83	0.84	0.80
NHPI Overall (n=26,597)	0.85	0.82	0.79	1.03
NHPI Non-Title I (n=8,634)	0.73	0.65	0.94	1.31
NHPI Title I (n=17,917)	0.91	0.95	0.75	0.74
TMR Overall (n=160,035)	1.08	1.12	1.04	1.03
TMR Non-Title I (n=75,167)	0.95	0.97	1.00	1.05
TMR Title I (n=83,721)	1.10	1.13	1.05	0.88
White Overall (n=947,921)	1.33	1.25	1.44	1.29
White Non-Title I (n=498,013)	1.04	1.01	1.36	1.17
White Title I (n=439,503)	1.50	1.37	1.45	1.37

Note. Passing grades are in **Green** and failing grades are in **Red**.

Note. A blank indicates there are no students in that setting from this group; a zero indicated that although there are students in this setting none are identified with gifts and talents.

Note. Overall student numbers may not equal Title I and Non-Title I student numbers because a few schools in each state did not designate Title I status.

#### 4. Students Missing From Gifted Education Identification

Missing students within the state of California are calculated using the method described in the State Report Card Methods section. As shown in Table 1, with only 67.78% of students having access to identification, and an average rate of identification of 10.00%, numerous children are missing from the state's gifted population. With 424,890 students identified in 2016, another 274,119 to 401,139 students are missing from gifted identification in California. In fact, as shown in Table 7, 60% to 68% of California's Black gifted students are missing; whereas, the percentages of missing AIAN, Latinx and NHPI youth range between 63% to 71%, 48% to 59%, and 42% to 55%, respectively. The percentage of missing Asian and White students ranges from 19% to 23% and 31% to 37%, respectively, with missingness among these two latter groups comprised primarily of students who attend schools that do not identify.

**TABLE 7****Lower and Upper Boundaries of Students by Race Missing From GT and Those Identified in 2015–2016**

	Missing Students Lower Boundary <sup>1</sup>			Missing Students Upper Boundary <sup>2</sup>			Students Identified as GT	% Missing Lower Boundary	% Missing Upper Boundary
	No ID	ID	Total	No ID	ID	Total			
CA	202,020	72,099	<b>274,119</b>	256,893	144,246	<b>401,139</b>	424,890	39.22%	48.56%
AIAN	1,752	533	<b>2,285</b>	2,228	1,048	<b>3,276</b>	1,365	62.60%	70.59%
Asian	21,891		<b>21,891</b>	27,836		<b>27,836</b>	91,772	19.26%	23.27%
Black	11,481	10,316	<b>21,797</b>	14,600	17,105	<b>31,704</b>	14,676	59.76%	68.36%
Latinx	102,127	60,869	<b>162,996</b>	129,867	124,986	<b>254,853</b>	175,187	48.20%	59.26%
NHPI	1,297	382	<b>1,679</b>	1,650	1,107	<b>2,757</b>	2,291	42.29%	54.62%
TMR	8,188		<b>8,188</b>	10,412	2,872	<b>10,412</b>	17,634	31.71%	37.12%
White	55,284		<b>55,284</b>	70,300		<b>70,300</b>	121,965	31.19%	36.56%

Note. Blank cells indicate well-representation of students in this racial category.

<sup>1</sup>10.00% of students identified with gifts and talents in schools that identify

<sup>2</sup>12.71% of students identified with gifts and talents in non-Title I schools that identify

## Summary

California has steadily declined in access to identification since 2000 to its present level of 68% of students attending a school where students are identified with gifts and talents. Additional inequities exist between Title I and Non-Title I schools, with Title I schools identifying 31% fewer students. Proportionally fewer AIAN students attend schools where identification takes place than students from other racial groups, so together with Black and Latinx students they are underrepresented. Reform is needed in California regarding policy and procedures, leadership, and guidance to ensure access and equity to gifted education services for all children in California.