

School Year: **2019-20**

School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) Template

Instructions and requirements for completing the SPSA template may be found in the SPSA Template Instructions.

School Name	County-District-School (CDS) Code	Schoolsite Council (SSC) Approval Date	Local Board Approval Date
Brandon Elementary School	42691956067110	September 16, 2019	October 16, 2019

Purpose and Description

Briefly describe the purpose of this plan (Select from Schoolwide Program, Comprehensive Support and Improvement, Targeted Support and Improvement, or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement)

Schoolwide Program

Briefly describe the school's plan for effectively meeting the ESSA requirements in alignment with the Local Control and Accountability Plan and other federal, state, and local programs.

The purpose of the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is to create a cycle of continuous improvement of student performance, and to ensure that all students succeed in reaching academic standards.

Table of Contents

- SPSA Title Page 1
- Purpose and Description..... 1
- Table of Contents..... 2
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components 3
 - Data Analysis 3
 - Surveys 3
 - Classroom Observations..... 3
 - Analysis of Current Instructional Program..... 3
- Stakeholder Involvement 6
- Resource Inequities 6
- School and Student Performance Data 7
 - Student Enrollment..... 7
 - CAASPP Results..... 9
 - ELPAC Results 13
 - Student Population..... 16
 - Overall Performance 17
 - Academic Performance 18
 - Academic Engagement..... 24
 - Conditions & Climate..... 27
- Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures..... 29
 - Goal 1..... 29
 - Goal 2..... 35
 - Goal 3..... 40
- Budget Summary 43
 - Budget Summary 43
 - Other Federal, State, and Local Funds 43
- Budgeted Funds and Expenditures in this Plan..... 44
 - Funds Budgeted to the School by Funding Source..... 44
 - Expenditures by Funding Source 44
 - Expenditures by Budget Reference 44
 - Expenditures by Budget Reference and Funding Source 44
 - Expenditures by Goal..... 44
- School Site Council Membership 46
- Recommendations and Assurances 47

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

Data Analysis

Please refer to the School and Student Performance Data section where an analysis is provided.

Surveys

This section provides a description of surveys (i.e., Student, Parent, Teacher) used during the school-year, and a summary of results from the survey(s).

Through our annual Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) input process, parents, teachers, staff, leadership, and students are invited to give input to what is working and what are areas of continued need in our schools.

Classroom Observations

This section provides a description of types and frequency of classroom observations conducted during the school-year and a summary of findings.

Site leaders regularly observe classrooms formally and informally to assess school needs and give feedback to personnel. District-wide, teachers and leaders conduct instructional rounds to observe and reflect on District trends. District leadership makes regular site visits through classrooms with principals to observe and reflect on successes and areas for improvement.

Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are derived from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 and Essential Program Components (EPCs). In conjunction with the needs assessments, these categories may be used to discuss and develop critical findings that characterize current instructional practice for numerically significant subgroups as well as individual students who are:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Discussion of each of these statements should result in succinct and focused findings based on verifiable facts. Avoid vague or general descriptions. Each successive school plan should examine the status of these findings and note progress made. Special consideration should be given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs.

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (ESEA)

State and local assessment data is available to District and site leadership and teachers/staff. Additionally, benchmark data is compiled and summarized in reports for ease of use.

Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)

All students take monthly STAR 360 Early Literacy or Reading/Math assessments. Additionally, students this year will take common formative assessments in math twice per unit, along with the summative assessments their teacher elects to use. Twice a year students take a benchmark writing assessment. Teachers may add any additional assessments they feel necessary to inform their practice. Informal observation is done regularly by teachers, staff, and site leadership.

Staffing and Professional Development

Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (ESEA)

All classroom teachers are highly qualified.

Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to instructional materials training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)

All teachers are highly qualified and continue to be professionally developed in instructional strategies and curriculum needs.

Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (ESEA)

Staff development planning is based on leadership and teacher input regarding instructional needs, as well as an analysis of student successes and areas for improvement.

Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)

New teachers are supported with the County's teacher induction program, as well as a four-part new teacher series to support the development of district-specific programs. All teachers participate in ongoing professional development at the beginning of the school year and monthly as a District. Teachers and staff focus on learning differentiated for the school site during staff meetings and PLC meetings. All teachers work with their PLC teams on a professional practice goal tied to their school plan and District LCAP over the course of the year. Additional support is available as needed, also.

Teacher collaboration by grade level (kindergarten through grade eight [K–8]) and department (grades nine through twelve) (EPC)

Teachers meet regularly in District and site professional development opportunities or staff meetings. General education teachers are provided release time embedded within the school day to meet as a grade level professional learning community. Support staff can design their schedules to accommodate meeting with their teachers, and support is in process to ensure continuity of this cross-collaboration.

Teaching and Learning

Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (ESEA)

Teachers utilize the Common Core State Standards to guide their planning. They use District adopted curriculum as the foundation for their instruction.

Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (K–8) (EPC)

Students receive their core Tier I instruction in their homeroom classroom for English Language Arts and Math. Adherence to the recommended amount of instructional minutes is reviewed annually at the beginning of the year by site leadership in a review of master schedules.

Lesson pacing schedule (K–8) and master schedule flexibility for sufficient numbers of intervention courses (EPC)

Site and District Leadership work together with teachers to ensure that all students have adequate access to Tier I core instruction during content areas. Targeted intervention and extension time also part of the daily routine.

Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (ESEA)

All students have access to District adopted materials for English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Differentiation strategies and materials are available to students as necessary.

Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials, and for high school students, access to standards-aligned core courses (EPC)

SBE-adopted core and ancillary materials are available to all students in English Language Arts/Literacy, English Language Development, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science.

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)

Teachers and staff are professionally developed to provide a high-quality program of instruction and support to all students.

Evidence-based educational practices to raise student achievement

District and site leadership, District committees, and Teachers on Special Assignment regularly incorporate research in the development of their work and as the basis of their work with teachers and staff.

Parental Engagement

Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (ESEA)

Goleta Union School District values its partnerships with the community to serve our families. Resources are available in areas of academic, social/emotional, behavioral, after-school childcare and enrichment, and more as needed.

Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, other school personnel, and students in secondary schools, in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of ConApp programs (5 California Code of Regulations 3932)

Through our annual Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) input process, parents, teachers, staff, leadership, and students are invited to give input to what is working and what are areas of continued need in our schools. Input is solicited on core programs, as well as comprehensive supplemental services.

Funding

Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)

Additional targeted intervention and extension is made available for students who are, or were ever, an English learner. Additionally, access to additional support and summer school is available to students with academic needs.

Fiscal support (EPC)

Our site receives funds to support our needs. Additional partnerships with our parent organizations and the community complement the District support.

Stakeholder Involvement

How, when, and with whom did the school consult as part of the planning process for this SPSA/Annual Review and Update?

Involvement Process for the SPSA and Annual Review and Update

The School Site Council (SSC), which is comprised of an equal number of parents and staff, works to review input from various stakeholders in the school community including teachers, staff, parents, leadership, and community partners, along with student performance data to develop the school plan.

Resource Inequities

Briefly identify and describe any resource inequities identified as a result of the required needs assessment, as applicable.

N/A

School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment Enrollment By Student Group

Student Enrollment by Subgroup						
Student Group	Percent of Enrollment			Number of Students		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
American Indian	0.2%	0.24%	%	1	1	
African American	1.4%	1.46%	%	6	6	
Asian	7.6%	6.31%	%	34	26	
Filipino	0.5%	0.73%	%	2	3	
Hispanic/Latino	51.2%	51.46%	%	228	212	
Pacific Islander	%	%	%			
White	32.8%	34.22%	%	146	141	
Multiple/No Response	0.7%	0.97%	%	3	4	
Total Enrollment				445	412	

Student Enrollment Enrollment By Grade Level

Student Enrollment by Grade Level			
Grade	Number of Students		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Kindergarten	70	44	
Grade 1	82	67	
Grade 2	54	77	
Grade 3	57	52	
Grade 4	61	51	
Grade 5	62	65	
Grade 6	59	56	
Total Enrollment	445	412	

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Students at Brandon School are predominately Hispanic/Latino (~51%) and White (~33%).
2. There has been an increase in enrollment in the primary grades in the last years, although overall enrollment fluctuates between the low and mid-400s.

School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment English Learner (EL) Enrollment

English Learner (EL) Enrollment						
Student Group	Number of Students			Percent of Students		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
English Learners	113	95		25.4%	23.1%	
Fluent English Proficient (FEP)	38	35		8.5%	8.5%	
Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)	17	18		14.0%	15.9%	

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The percentage of English Learners at Brandon School remains steady at approximately 23%.
2. It should be noted that California changed to a different initial and annual English Learner assessment in the spring of 2018 called the English Learner Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

School and Student Performance Data

CAASPP Results English Language Arts/Literacy (All Students)

Overall Participation for All Students												
Grade Level	# of Students Enrolled			# of Students Tested			# of Students with Scores			% of Students Tested		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	56	58	52	56	57	52	56	57	52	100	98.3	100
Grade 4	61	62	53	60	62	52	60	62	52	98.4	100	98.1
Grade 5	63	60	64	63	57	64	63	57	64	100	95	100
Grade 6	67	60	55	67	60	54	67	60	54	100	100	98.2
All Grades	247	240	224	246	236	222	246	236	222	99.6	98.3	99.1

Overall Achievement for All Students															
Grade Level	Mean Scale Score			% Standard Exceeded			% Standard Met			% Standard Nearly Met			% Standard Not Met		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	2434.	2440.	2447.	32	36.84	26.92	13	17.54	28.85	36	21.05	34.62	20	24.56	9.62
Grade 4	2461.	2440.	2488.	27	11.29	40.38	17	25.81	21.15	18	24.19	17.31	38	38.71	21.15
Grade 5	2525.	2512.	2508.	27	31.58	20.31	35	21.05	42.19	16	21.05	15.63	22	26.32	21.88
Grade 6	2554.	2572.	2551.	25	28.33	27.78	33	41.67	29.63	25	23.33	29.63	16	6.67	12.96
All Grades	N/A	N/A	N/A	28	26.69	28.38	25	26.69	31.08	24	22.46	23.87	24	24.15	16.67

Reading Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts										
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard			
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	
Grade 3	27	28.07	25.00	38	42.11	61.54	36	29.82	13.46	
Grade 4	18	6.45	32.69	45	64.52	48.08	37	29.03	19.23	
Grade 5	29	33.33	25.00	46	38.60	56.25	25	28.07	18.75	
Grade 6	31	30.00	31.48	45	48.33	40.74	24	21.67	27.78	
All Grades	26	24.15	28.38	43	48.73	51.80	30	27.12	19.82	

Writing Producing clear and purposeful writing										
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard			
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	
Grade 3	29	28.07	26.92	41	43.86	53.85	30	28.07	19.23	
Grade 4	23	16.13	36.54	43	48.39	42.31	33	35.48	21.15	
Grade 5	40	42.11	32.81	41	33.33	42.19	19	24.56	25.00	
Grade 6	31	38.33	33.33	46	50.00	44.44	22	11.67	22.22	
All Grades	31	30.93	32.43	43	44.07	45.50	26	25.00	22.07	

Listening Demonstrating effective communication skills									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	20	24.56	15.38	75	61.40	78.85	5	14.04	5.77
Grade 4	17	9.68	23.08	60	64.52	57.69	23	25.81	19.23
Grade 5	29	19.30	12.50	56	63.16	68.75	16	17.54	18.75
Grade 6	24	35.00	20.37	70	60.00	72.22	6	5.00	7.41
All Grades	22	22.03	17.57	65	62.29	69.37	13	15.68	13.06

Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	32	29.82	32.69	46	52.63	59.62	21	17.54	7.69
Grade 4	28	17.74	34.62	40	45.16	50.00	32	37.10	15.38
Grade 5	43	31.58	31.25	46	43.86	50.00	11	24.56	18.75
Grade 6	40	46.67	37.04	54	48.33	50.00	6	5.00	12.96
All Grades	36	31.36	33.78	47	47.46	52.25	17	21.19	13.96

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Student participation in CAASPP assessments in consistently strong.
2. Overall scaled scores continue to increase slightly overall. Approximately (~28%) of students exceed the standard and (~30%) meet the standard in overall English Language Arts/Literacy achievement. Approximately (~25%) nearly meet and (~18%) do not meet the overall achievement standards in ELA. It should be noted that these percentages are approximate, as there are varied and fluctuated scores between grade levels/years.
3. The claims demonstrate that writing is an area of disparity, where a larger number of students either exceed the standard or do not meet it at all. Listening is less likely to be an area of strength (exceed standard) for most students, although few students do not meet the standard. Research/Inquiry is a claim that most students are at/near standard or exceed the standard.

School and Student Performance Data

CAASPP Results Mathematics (All Students)

Overall Participation for All Students												
Grade Level	# of Students Enrolled			# of Students Tested			# of Students with Scores			% of Students Tested		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	56	58	52	55	57	52	55	57	52	98.2	98.3	100
Grade 4	61	62	53	61	62	53	61	62	53	100	100	100
Grade 5	63	60	64	63	58	64	63	58	64	100	96.7	100
Grade 6	67	60	55	67	60	54	67	60	54	100	100	98.2
All Grades	247	240	224	246	237	223	246	237	223	99.6	98.8	99.6

Overall Achievement for All Students															
Grade Level	Mean Scale Score			% Standard Exceeded			% Standard Met			% Standard Nearly Met			% Standard Not Met		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	2457.	2462.	2454.	31	38.60	25.00	31	21.05	40.38	16	22.81	17.31	22	17.54	17.31
Grade 4	2462.	2475.	2495.	15	19.35	24.53	21	25.81	30.19	39	35.48	32.08	25	19.35	13.21
Grade 5	2509.	2509.	2525.	24	25.86	28.13	22	15.52	29.69	25	32.76	25.00	29	25.86	17.19
Grade 6	2526.	2571.	2549.	18	30.00	24.07	22	33.33	27.78	34	21.67	25.93	25	15.00	22.22
All Grades	N/A	N/A	N/A	22	28.27	25.56	24	24.05	31.84	29	28.27	25.11	25	19.41	17.49

Concepts & Procedures Applying mathematical concepts and procedures										
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard			
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	
Grade 3	40	43.86	40.38	36	26.32	36.54	24	29.82	23.08	
Grade 4	23	35.48	43.40	36	41.94	32.08	41	22.58	24.53	
Grade 5	32	32.76	37.50	29	31.03	34.38	40	36.21	28.13	
Grade 6	27	48.33	37.04	36	35.00	33.33	37	16.67	29.63	
All Grades	30	40.08	39.46	34	33.76	34.08	36	26.16	26.46	

Problem Solving & Modeling/Data Analysis Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	38	45.61	38.46	49	38.60	42.31	13	15.79	19.23
Grade 4	20	17.74	26.42	44	51.61	52.83	36	30.65	20.75
Grade 5	22	25.86	23.44	48	44.83	54.69	30	29.31	21.88
Grade 6	19	31.67	18.52	46	48.33	55.56	34	20.00	25.93
All Grades	24	29.96	26.46	47	45.99	51.57	29	24.05	21.97

Communicating Reasoning Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions									
Grade Level	% Above Standard			% At or Near Standard			% Below Standard		
	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18	15-16	16-17	17-18
Grade 3	38	43.86	42.31	44	38.60	42.31	18	17.54	15.38
Grade 4	20	30.65	26.42	43	45.16	58.49	38	24.19	15.09
Grade 5	25	27.59	26.56	44	43.10	54.69	30	29.31	18.75
Grade 6	18	41.67	25.93	61	40.00	55.56	21	18.33	18.52
All Grades	25	35.86	30.04	48	41.77	52.91	27	22.36	17.04

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Student participation in CAASPP assessments in consistently strong.
2. Overall scaled scores continue to increase slightly overall. Approximately (~27%) of students exceed the standard and (~28%) meet the standard in overall Math achievement. Approximately (~26%) nearly meet and (~18%) do not meet the overall achievement standards in Math. It should be noted that these percentages are approximate, as there are varied and fluctuated scores between grade levels/years.
3. Approximately 40% of students exceed the standard in concepts/procedures and 34% are near/meeting the standard. Another 26% are not meeting the standard. Problem solving/Data Analysis has more students in the middle majority (~48%) near/meeting the standard. Communicating reasoning is a relative strength with only about 19% not meeting the standard.

School and Student Performance Data

ELPAC Results

2017-18 Summative Assessment Data Number of Students and Mean Scale Scores for All Students				
Grade Level	Overall	Oral Language	Written Language	Number of Students Tested
Grade K	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	1450.1	1470.0	1429.7	19
Grade 2	1537.8	1551.1	1523.9	20
Grade 3	1521.7	1523.7	1519.4	14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	1538.6	1547.9	1528.8	14
Grade 6	*	*	*	*
All Grades				93

Overall Language Number and Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students									
Grade Level	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Total Number of Students
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Grade K	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	19
Grade 2	13	65.00	*	*	*	*			20
Grade 3	*	*	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	*	*	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
All Grades	36	38.71	37	39.78	14	15.05	*	*	93

Oral Language Number and Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students									
Grade Level	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Total Number of Students
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Grade K	*	*			*	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	11	57.89	*	*	*	*	*	*	19
Grade 2	17	85.00	*	*	*	*			20
Grade 3	*	*	*	*					14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*			*	*	*
Grade 5	11	78.57	*	*					14
Grade 6	*	*	*	*	*	*			*
All Grades	64	68.82	19	20.43	*	*	*	*	93

Written Language Number and Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students									
Grade Level	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1		Total Number of Students
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Grade K	*	*			*	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	19
Grade 2	11	55.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	20
Grade 3	*	*	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	*	*	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
All Grades	21	22.58	27	29.03	33	35.48	12	12.90	93

Listening Domain Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students							
Grade Level	Well Developed		Somewhat/Moderately		Beginning		Total Number of Students
Grade K	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	11	57.89	*	*	*	*	19
Grade 2	18	90.00	*	*			20
Grade 3	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*			*
Grade 5	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
All Grades	55	59.14	35	37.63	*	*	93

Speaking Domain Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students							
Grade Level	Well Developed		Somewhat/Moderately		Beginning		Total Number of Students
Grade K	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	*	*	11	57.89			19
Grade 2	17	85.00	*	*			20
Grade 3	13	92.86	*	*			14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	12	85.71	*	*			14
Grade 6	*	*	*	*			*
All Grades	66	70.97	25	26.88	*	*	93

Reading Domain Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students							
Grade Level	Well Developed		Somewhat/Moderately		Beginning		Total Number of Students
Grade K	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	19
Grade 2	12	60.00	*	*	*	*	20
Grade 3			14	100.00			14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	*	*	11	78.57			14
Grade 6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
All Grades	24	25.81	51	54.84	18	19.35	93

Writing Domain Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students							
Grade Level	Well Developed		Somewhat/Moderately		Beginning		Total Number of Students
Grade K	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 1	*	*	13	68.42	*	*	19
Grade 2	*	*	11	55.00			20
Grade 3	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	*	*	*	*			14
Grade 6			*	*	*	*	*
All Grades	24	25.81	60	64.52	*	*	93

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Approximately 39% of English learner students achieved an overall score of Level 4, one criteria for reclassification.
2. Approximately 40% of English learners assessed achieved an overall score of Level 3 and 15% received an overall score of Level 2. No students received a Level 1.
3. Oral language, Listening, and Speaking are areas of strength, with ~65% achieving a Level 4 in these areas. Reading and Writing were areas of challenge, with ~25% receiving a Level 4.

School and Student Performance Data

Student Population

This section provides information about the school's student population.

2017-18 Student Population			
Total Enrollment	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	English Learners	Foster Youth
412	41.7%	23.1%	
This is the total number of students enrolled.	This is the percent of students who are eligible for free or reduced priced meals; or have parents/guardians who did not receive a high school diploma.	This is the percent of students who are learning to communicate effectively in English, typically requiring instruction in both the English Language and in their academic courses.	This is the percent of students whose well-being is the responsibility of a court.

2017-18 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group		
Student Group	Total	Percentage
English Learners	95	23.1%
Homeless	5	1.2%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	172	41.7%
Students with Disabilities	31	7.5%

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity		
Student Group	Total	Percentage
African American	6	1.5%
American Indian	1	0.2%
Asian	26	6.3%
Filipino	3	0.7%
Hispanic	212	51.5%
Two or More Races	19	4.6%
White	141	34.2%






Conclusions based on this data:

1. Approximately 42% of students are socioeconomically disadvantaged.
2. Approximately 23% of students are identified as English learners.
3. About 8% enrolled are students with disabilities.

School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

2018 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students

Academic Performance	Academic Engagement	Conditions & Climate
English Language Arts  Green	Chronic Absenteeism  Yellow	Suspension Rate  Green
Mathematics  Green		
English Learner Progress  No Performance Color		

Conclusions based on this data:

1. English Language Arts and Math overall performance is strong (green).
2. Student engagement is an area to improve by decreasing chronic absenteeism for some students.
3. Student behavior is not interfering with learning. Suspension rate is low (green).

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance English Language Arts







The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:











This section provides number of student groups in each color.



This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance for All Students/Student Group		
<p>All Students</p>  Green 13.8 points above standard Increased 6.3 points 216 students	<p>English Learners</p>  Yellow 8.1 points below standard Increased 12.8 points 71 students	<p>Foster Youth</p>  No Performance Color 0 Students
<p>Homeless</p>  No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 4 students	<p>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</p>  Yellow 15.8 points below standard Increased 17.3 points 96 students	<p>Students with Disabilities</p>  No Performance Color 89.6 points below standard Increased 10.2 points 22 students

2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance by Race/Ethnicity

African American	American Indian	Asian	Filipino
 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 2 students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 No Performance Color 15.9 points above standard Declined -6.2 points 13 students	 No Performance Color 0 Students
Hispanic	Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
 Yellow 10 points below standard Increased 18 points 117 students	 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 10 students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 Green 54.2 points above standard Declined -3.9 points 74 students

This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Data Comparisons for English Learners

Current English Learner	Reclassified English Learners	English Only
46.8 points below standard Increased 27.9 points 40 students	41.8 points above standard Increased 8.9 points 31 students	25 points above standard Maintained 1.6 points 143 students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. English learners increased their English language arts/literacy performance, although there is still more progress to be made to close the gap between all students.
2. Students identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged increased their language arts/literacy performance, although there is still more progress to be made to close the gap between all students.
3. Students with disabilities increased their language arts/literacy performance, although there is still more progress to be made to reduce the gap between SWD and all students.


School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance Mathematics







The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:











This section provides number of student groups in each color.



This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Mathematics assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2018 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance for All Students/Student Group		
<p>All Students</p>  <p>Green</p> <p>4.7 points above standard</p> <p>Maintained -1.2 points</p> <p>216 students</p>	<p>English Learners</p>  <p>Yellow</p> <p>17.5 points below standard</p> <p>Maintained 0.8 points</p> <p>71 students</p>	<p>Foster Youth</p>  <p>No Performance Color</p> <p>0 Students</p>
<p>Homeless</p>  <p>No Performance Color</p> <p>Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy</p> <p>4 students</p>	<p>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</p>  <p>Green</p> <p>24.1 points below standard</p> <p>Increased 7.6 points</p> <p>96 students</p>	<p>Students with Disabilities</p>  <p>No Performance Color</p> <p>111.5 points below standard</p> <p>Maintained -2.8 points</p> <p>22 students</p>

2018 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance by Race/Ethnicity

African American	American Indian	Asian	Filipino
 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 2 students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 No Performance Color 42.7 points above standard Increased 9.4 points 13 students	 No Performance Color 0 Students
Hispanic	Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
 Green 21 points below standard Increased 3.1 points 117 students	 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 10 students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 Green 40.1 points above standard Declined -5.1 points 74 students

This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Mathematics assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11.

2018 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Data Comparisons for English Learners

Current English Learner	Reclassified English Learners	English Only
49.8 points below standard Increased 16.9 points 40 students	24.1 points above standard Declined -6 points 31 students	17.1 points above standard Maintained -2.3 points 143 students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. English learners maintained in their Math performance. There is still more progress to be made to close the gap between all students.
2. Students identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged increased their Math performance, although there is still more progress to be made to close the gap between all students.
3. Students with disabilities maintained in their Math performance. There is still more progress to be made to reduce the gap between SWD and all students.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance English Learner Progress

This section provides a view of the percent of students performing at each level on the new English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) assessment. With the transition ELPAC, the 2018 Dashboard is unable to report a performance level (color) for this measure.

2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Results				
Number of Students	Level 4 Well Developed	Level 3 Moderately Developed	Level 2 Somewhat Developed	Level 1 Beginning Stage
93	38.7%	39.8%	15.1%	6.5%

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Approximately 39% of students achieved a Level of 4 on the ELPAC, one of the criteria for reclassification.


School and Student Performance Data

Academic Performance College/Career

The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:

Lowest Performance Red Orange Yellow Green Blue Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.



This section provides information on the percentage of high school graduates who are placed in the "Prepared" level on the College/Career Indicator.

2018 Fall Dashboard College/Career for All Students/Student Group		
All Students	English Learners	Foster Youth
Homeless	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities

2018 Fall Dashboard College/Career by Race/Ethnicity			
African American	American Indian	Asian	Filipino
Hispanic	Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White

This section provides a view of the percent of students per year that qualify as Not Prepared, Approaching Prepared, and Prepared.

2018 Fall Dashboard College/Career 3-Year Performance		
Class of 2016	Class of 2017	Class of 2018
Prepared	Prepared	Prepared
Approaching Prepared	Approaching Prepared	Approaching Prepared
Not Prepared	Not Prepared	Not Prepared

Conclusions based on this data:

- 1.


School and Student Performance Data

Academic Engagement Chronic Absenteeism







The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:











This section provides number of student groups in each color.



This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled.

2018 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism for All Students/Student Group		
<p>All Students</p>  Yellow 5.7% chronically absent Maintained 0.4% 422 students	<p>English Learners</p>  Green 5.7% chronically absent Declined 2.7% 106 students	<p>Foster Youth</p>  No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 0 students
<p>Homeless</p>  No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 5 students	<p>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</p>  Green 9.1% chronically absent Declined 1.1% 186 students	<p>Students with Disabilities</p>  Orange 7.5% chronically absent Increased 1% 40 students

2018 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity

African American	American Indian	Asian	Filipino
 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 6 students	 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 1 students	 No Performance Color 7.7% chronically absent Increased 7.7% 26 students	 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 3 students
Hispanic	Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
 Green 7.3% chronically absent Declined 1.6% 219 students	 No Performance Color 4.3% chronically absent Declined 2.8% 23 students	 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 0 students	 Green 2.8% chronically absent Maintained 0.1% 144 students

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall, chronic absenteeism an area for improvement (yellow).
2. Students identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged have a higher proportion of students with chronic absenteeism.
3. Students identified with a disability have a higher proportion of students with chronic absenteeism.

School and Student Performance Data

Academic Engagement Graduation Rate



The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:

Lowest Performance Red Orange Yellow Green Blue Highest Performance


This section provides number of student groups in each color.



This section provides information about students completing high school, which includes students who receive a standard high school diploma or complete their graduation requirements at an alternative school.



This section provides a view of the percentage of students who received a high school diploma within four years of entering ninth grade or complete their graduation requirements at an alternative school.



Conclusions based on this data:

- 1.


School and Student Performance Data

Conditions & Climate Suspension Rate







The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:











This section provides number of student groups in each color.



This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 12 who have been suspended at least once in a given school year. Students who are suspended multiple times are only counted once.

2018 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate for All Students/Student Group		
<p>All Students</p>  Green 0.5% suspended at least once Increased 0.3% 425 students	<p>English Learners</p>  Blue 0% suspended at least once Maintained 0% 107 students	<p>Foster Youth</p>  No Performance Color 0 Students
<p>Homeless</p>  No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not 5 students	<p>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</p>  Orange 1.1% suspended at least once Increased 1.1% 187 students	<p>Students with Disabilities</p>  Blue 0% suspended at least once Maintained 0% 40 students

2018 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Race/Ethnicity

African American	American Indian	Asian	Filipino
 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data 6 students	 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data 1 students	 No Performance Color 0% suspended at least once Maintained 0% 27 students	 No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data 3 students
Hispanic	Two or More Races	Pacific Islander	White
 Yellow 0.9% suspended at least once Increased 0.9% 221 students	 No Performance Color 0% suspended at least once Maintained 0% 23 students	 No Performance Color 0 Students	 Blue 0% suspended at least once Declined -0.7% 144 students

This section provides a view of the percentage of students who were suspended.

2018 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Year

2016	2017	2018
0% suspended at least once	0.2% suspended at least once	0.5% suspended at least once

Conclusions based on this data:

- Overall, the conditions and climate contributing to a positive learning experience are present. Few students are suspended.
- Students identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged are suspended at a higher rate than the overall group.

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal Subject

English Language Arts/Literacy

LEA/LCAP Goal

LCAP Goal 1: Demonstrate robust achievement growth for all pupils; reduce disparity in levels of achievement between student subgroups.

Goal 1

All students will demonstrate a year's growth in English Language Arts/Literacy as measured by the STAR 360 Early Literacy, STAR 360 Reading, and SBAC assessments.

Identified Need

Spring 2019 State and local (STAR 360) data indicates that while many students are having success, a significant number of students have room to improve their proficiency. Additionally, by looking at individual students' growth data, grade level PLC teams are able to better target instruction for improved outcomes.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
STAR 360 - Spring Data Early Literacy – Proficiency	Spring Early Literacy Proficiency 2019 Data Kindergarten 24% Exceeded 21% Met 24% Nearly Met 29% Not Met 2% no data First Grade 15% Exceeded 19% Met 21% Nearly Met 35% Not Met 10% no data	Increase the number of students meeting and exceeding proficiency in Early Literacy by at least 5%. Decrease the number of students not meeting proficiency to less than 15%. Minimize the number of students without data.
STAR 360 - Spring Data Early Literacy – Growth	Spring Early Literacy 2019 Growth Data Kindergarten 56% Exceeded 15% Met 29% Not Met 2% no data First Grade 46% Exceeded	100% of students will demonstrate adequate growth (at least 100 points as measured by the Star Early Literacy).

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
	13% Met 33% Not Met 10% no data	
STAR 360 - Spring Data Reading – Proficiency	Spring Reading 2019 Proficiency Data Second Grade 15% Exceeded 0% Met 7% Nearly Met 72% Not Met 4% no data Third Grade 36% Exceeded 29% Met 11% Nearly Met 20% Not Met 5% no data Fourth Grade 25% Exceeded 30% Met 25% Nearly Met 19% Not Met 2% no data Fifth Grade 26% Exceeded 30% Met 18% Nearly Met 19% Not Met 7% no data Sixth Grade 21% Exceeded 28% Met 21% Nearly Met 28% Not Met 3% no data	Increase the number of students meeting and exceeding proficiency in Reading as measured by the STAR 360 by at least 5%. Decrease the number of students not meeting proficiency to less than 15%. Minimize the number of students without data.
STAR 360 - Spring Data Reading - Growth	Spring Reading 2019 Growth Data Second Grade 15% Exceeded 19% Met 48% Not Met 4% no data Third Grade 39% Exceeded 17% Met 38% Not Met 5% no data	100% of students will demonstrate adequate growth (at least 100 points as measured by the Star Reading).

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
	Fourth Grade 32% Exceeded 9% Met 57% Not Met 2% no data Fifth Grade 32% Exceeded 16% Met 46% Not Met 7% no data Sixth Grade 35% Exceeded 12% Met 49% Not Met 4% no data	
SBAC - Spring Data Overall English Language Arts/Literacy Achievement	Spring 2019 SBAC Data Third Grade 26% Exceeded 36% Met 21% Nearly Met 17% Not Met Fourth Grade 25% Exceeded 35% Met 20% Nearly Met 20% Not Met Fifth Grade 38% Exceeded 34% Met 13% Nearly Met 15% Not Met Sixth Grade 27% Exceeded 44% Met 18% Nearly Met 11% Not Met	Increase the number of students meeting and exceeding proficiency in Reading as measured by the SBAC by at least 5%. Decrease the number of students not meeting proficiency to less than 15%.

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

Strategy/Activity 1

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

Grade level Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will meet together regularly to analyze student data and work samples, discuss best practice instructional strategies and curriculum implementation. Emphasis will be on Tier I core initial instruction, scaffolding, and differentiation within the class environment. Teachers will participate in professional development to support their skills in data analysis and knowledge of effective PLC teams.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)	Source(s)
8,190	LCAP
3,510	Title I

Strategy/Activity 2

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

Grade level PLC teams will utilize data/discussion outcomes from PLC collaborations to support development of rosters, instructional strategies, curriculum development and progress monitoring for targeted intervention/extension time. Additional support staff utilized to decrease student:staff ratio during targeted instruction for students with strategic or intensive needs.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)	Source(s)
23,753	LCAP
46,921	Title I

Strategy/Activity 3

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

Supplemental curriculum and intervention/extension materials will be acquired to systematically support targeted intervention/extension.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)	Source(s)
5,010	LCAP
1,000	Title I

Strategy/Activity 4

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

Regularly communicate with parents regarding their child's learning goals, progress, as well as seek input regarding supports needed to help with their child's success.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)	Source(s)
2,000	General Fund

Annual Review

SPSA Year Reviewed: 2018-19

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

Master scheduling and professional development supported the development of team collaboration and professional learning community work (PLCs). Grade level PLCs collaborate to analyze

student formative and summative assessments as well as discuss effective instructional strategies for all students. Additionally, PLCs worked together to determine intervention/extension needs of students and implement strategies/curriculum to serve them in differentiated target time. PLC teams are more significantly in alignment with each other, which supports uniform access to learning for all students. We expect continued improvement on State and local assessments as an outcome of these efforts.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.

There was no significant difference between the intended implementation of the budget and the expenditures.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

Our next steps will be to continue to work as Professional Learning Communities to examine our Tier I core instruction more deeply, including what we can do to differentiate and scaffold within core instruction to support the success of all students. We will continue to provide systematic targeted intervention/extension time for students. The curriculum, instructional strategies, and skills to target will be discussed during PLC time teams have together. Acquisition of common materials for targeted intervention/extension will be determined. As we analyze how students perform, we will continue to look at proficiency measures, but also will be examining their growth to measure adequate progress.

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal Subject

Mathematics

LEA/LCAP Goal

LCAP Goal 1: Demonstrate robust achievement growth for all pupils; reduce disparity in levels of achievement between student groups.

Goal 2

All students will demonstrate a year's growth in Mathematics as measured by the STAR 360 Early Literacy, STAR 360 Mathematics, and SBAC assessments.

Identified Need

Spring 2019 State and local (STAR 360) data indicates that while many students are having success, a significant number of students have room to improve their proficiency. Additionally, but looking at individual students' growth data, grade level PLC teams are able to better target instruction for improved outcomes.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
Formative Assessments in Math	Refine and administer common formative assessments in math	All students will participate in common formative assessments in math twice per unit. Teachers will use assessment information to give feedback to the student and modify instruction for success.
STAR 360 - Spring Scaled Score Math, Proficiency	Spring 2019 Data Second Grade 18% Exceeded 13% Met 24% Nearly Met 39% Not Met 6% no data Third Grade 33% Exceeded 21% Met 17% Nearly Met 21% Not Met 8% no data Fourth Grade 40% Exceeded 28% Met 6% Nearly Met	Increase the number of students meeting and exceeding proficiency in Math as measured by the STAR 360 by at least 5%. Decrease the number of students not meeting proficiency to less than 15%. Minimize the number of students without data.

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
	17% Not Met 9% no data Fifth Grade 53% Exceeded 14% Met 9% Nearly Met 18% Not Met 7% no data Sixth Grade 47% Exceeded 0% Met 28% Nearly Met 19% Not Met 6% no data	
STAR 360 - Spring Scaled Score Math, Growth	Spring 2019 Data Second Grade 22% Exceeded 36% Met 34% Not Met 6% no data Third Grade 24% Exceeded 28% Met 41% Not Met 8% no data Fourth Grade 11% Exceeded 30% Met 49% Not Met 9% no data Fifth Grade 12% Exceeded 16% Met 65% Not Met 7% no data Sixth Grade 10% Exceeded 13% Met 54% Not Met 6% no data	100% of students will demonstrate adequate growth (at least 100 points) as measured by the STAR 360 Math assessment.
SBAC - Spring Overall Math Achievement	Spring 2019 Data Third Grade 22% Exceeded 36% Met 28% Nearly Met	Increase the number of students meeting and exceeding proficiency in Math as measured by the SBAC by at least 5%. Decrease the

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
	14% Not Met Fourth Grade 18% Exceeded 46% Met 22% Nearly Met 14% Not Met Fifth Grade 42% Exceeded 8% Met 40% Nearly Met 11% Not Met Sixth Grade 26% Exceeded 41% Met 17% Nearly Met 17% Not Met	number of students not meeting proficiency to less than 15%.

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

Strategy/Activity 1

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Teams will collaborate to determine essential standards in math. They will use these identified essential math standards as the basis for Tier I core instruction, scaffolding, and differentiation in class. Essential standards will be monitored with common formative assessments. Essential standards will be communicated to special education teachers and families to support focused intervention.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)

Source(s)

No additional funds required.

Strategy/Activity 2

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

Additional materials (from adopted materials or digital resources) to support math differentiation within the classroom will be explored.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)

4,000

Source(s)

General Fund

Strategy/Activity 3

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

A Math Club to support students in extending deeper into math problem-solving will be established and implemented.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)

2,850

Source(s)

General Fund

2,850

LCAP

Annual Review

SPSA Year Reviewed: 2018-19

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) were established and regularly met to discuss student outcomes and collaboratively determine an instructional response to support student learning. Teacher teams collaborated and developed greater alignment amongst each other and in using District adopted materials. 4th-6th Grade students significantly improved student outcomes as compared to the previous year on the SBAC assessment. STAR 360 proficiency outcomes indicate several grade levels are demonstrating strong increases in overall outcomes.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.

There were no drastically material differences in proposed and actual expenditures.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

For the 2019-2020 school year, PLC teams will be utilizing common formative assessments in math to more specifically guide their instruction. They will continue progress monitor student performance with the STAR 360 math assessment, also.

Goals, Strategies, & Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

Goal Subject

English Language Development

LEA/LCAP Goal

Goal 2: Apply best practices in teaching and learning, including effective implementation of new State Standards, including mathematics, ELD/ELA and science.

Goal 3

All students, specifically including English Language Learner students, will increase their frequency and complexity of oral language production.

Identified Need

Informal observations, student performance data, and 2018-2019 instructional rounds data indicate that developing opportunities and scaffolding to produce oral language across the curriculum and throughout the school day continues to be an area of need.

Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
Teachers will self-assess three times/year the level of oral language frequency and complexity during an integrated lesson (ELA, Math, or Science)	This will occur in the first week of October.	Over the course of the school year teachers will increase the frequency and complexity of contributions by students to academic discussion during core instruction through the use of strategic structured language practices and routines.
Students will self-assess three times/year the number of times they contribute to a conversation during a lesson (ELA, Math, or Science)	This will occur in the first week of October.	Over the course of the school year students will increase the reported number of times that they productively contribute to academic discussion during core instruction through participation in structured language practices and routines.
Informal observations indicate an increased opportunity to produce language and increased scaffolding with structured language practices and routines.	Informal observations indicate that student language production and scaffolding to support language production occurs occasionally.	Informal observations will demonstrate a steady increase in the number of structured language practices and routines in use and the frequency/complexity of

Metric/Indicator	Baseline/Actual Outcome	Expected Outcome
		student oral language production.

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

Strategy/Activity 1

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

English Learners

Strategy/Activity

Students identified as English learners will participate in a grade level wide 30 minute designated English Language Development period, taught at their language level range, with lower than average student to teacher class size utilizing Wonders Designated ELD curriculum. Certificated Tutor support will reduce student:staff ratio for ELD instruction.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)	Source(s)
8,498	LCAP
9,742	Title III

Strategy/Activity 2

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All students, including subgroups, will be served by this strategy.

Strategy/Activity

During the 2019-2020 school year, teachers will use planned, structured academic conversations and routines to increase the frequency and complexity of student talk throughout the school day.

Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)	Source(s)

No additional cost to site
Budget reviewed at Site Council - See Agendas
and Minutes

Annual Review

SPSA Year Reviewed: 2018-19

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

Teachers and principal participated in instructional rounds. Feedback identified a continued need to implement structured language practices to support language usage across the curriculum throughout the school day. Students participated in Designated English Language Development at their instructional level. Additional supplemental material was made available to students with more intensive language needs.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.

There were no drastically material differences in the proposed and actual expenditures.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

Feedback from teachers and leadership indicates students increased their opportunities and ability to produce oral language throughout the school day. However, data indicates this is a continued area of need.

Budget Summary

Complete the table below. Schools may include additional information. Adjust the table as needed. The Budget Summary is required for schools funded through the ConApp, and/or that receive funds from the LEA for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).

Budget Summary

Description	Amount
Total Funds Provided to the School Through the Consolidated Application	\$61,173
Total Federal Funds Provided to the School from the LEA for CSI	\$
Total Funds Budgeted for Strategies to Meet the Goals in the SPSA	\$118,324.00

Other Federal, State, and Local Funds

List the additional Federal programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Adjust the table as needed. If the school is not operating a Title I schoolwide program this section is not applicable and may be deleted.

Federal Programs	Allocation (\$)
Title I	\$51,431.00
Title III	\$9,742.00

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: \$61,173.00

List the State and local programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Duplicate the table as needed.

State or Local Programs	Allocation (\$)
General Fund	\$8,850.00
LCAP	\$48,301.00

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: \$57,151.00

Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: \$118,324.00

Budgeted Funds and Expenditures in this Plan

The tables below are provided to help the school track expenditures as they relate to funds budgeted to the school.

Funds Budgeted to the School by Funding Source

Funding Source	Amount	Balance
LCAP	48,301	0.00
Title I	51,431	0.00
Title III	9,742	0.00

Expenditures by Funding Source

Funding Source	Amount
General Fund	8,850.00
LCAP	48,301.00
Title I	51,431.00
Title III	9,742.00

Expenditures by Budget Reference

Budget Reference	Amount
------------------	--------

Expenditures by Budget Reference and Funding Source

Budget Reference	Funding Source	Amount
	General Fund	8,850.00
	LCAP	48,301.00
	Title I	51,431.00
	Title III	9,742.00

Expenditures by Goal

Goal Number	Total Expenditures
-------------	--------------------

Goal 1	90,384.00
Goal 2	9,700.00
Goal 3	18,240.00

School Site Council Membership

California Education Code describes the required composition of the School Site Council (SSC). The SSC shall be composed of the principal and representatives of: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school; parents of pupils attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, pupils selected by pupils attending the school. The current make-up of the SSC is as follows:

- 1 School Principal
- 3 Classroom Teachers
- 1 Other School Staff
- 5 Parent or Community Members

Name of Members	Role
Julie Bolton	Principal
Leslie Hetrick	Classroom Teacher
Megan Frederick	Classroom Teacher
Krista Craig	Classroom Teacher
Mel Rodrigues	Other School Staff
Becca Wrench	Parent or Community Member
Alton Green	Parent or Community Member
Jose Rodriguez	Parent or Community Member
Karen Nylund Gibson	Parent or Community Member
Jason Henry	Parent or Community Member

At elementary schools, the school site council must be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel, and (b) parents of students attending the school or other community members. Classroom teachers must comprise a majority of persons represented under section (a). At secondary schools there must be, in addition, equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and students. Members must be selected by their peer group.

Recommendations and Assurances

The School Site Council (SSC) recommends this school plan and proposed expenditures to the district governing board for approval and assures the board of the following:

The SSC is correctly constituted and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.

The SSC reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) requiring board approval.

The SSC sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan:

Signature

Committee or Advisory Group Name

The SSC reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this SPSA and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the local educational agency plan.

This SPSA is based on a thorough analysis of student academic performance. The actions proposed herein form a sound, comprehensive, coordinated plan to reach stated school goals to improve student academic performance.

This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on .

Attested:

Principal, Julie Bolton on	<i>Julie Bolton</i>	9/16/19
SSC Chairperson, Chairperson: on	<i>KG Pearson</i>	9/16/19