# The Single Plan for Student Achievement 

for<br>Evergreen Elementary School

49-73882-6097059
CDS Code:

Date of this revision: November 2013

The Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index. California Education Code sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program Improvement into the Single Plan for Student Achievement.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

| Contact Person: | Gaylene Rosaschi |
| :--- | :--- |
| Position: | Principal |
| Telephone Number: | (707) 588-5715 |
| Address: | 1125 Emily Avenue |
|  | Rohnert Park, CA 94928 <br> gaylene_rosaschi@crpusd.org |

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan .

## Part One: Analysis of Verifiable State Data, including the API, AYP, and the California English Language Development Test

The purpose of this section is to gather data about your school right now. You then use that information to determine goals and actions. You can include a school profile which gives background about your school and provides context for the plan.

## The School Profile

Bordered by a large neighborhood park, Evergreen Elementary School is one of six elementary schools in the CotatiRohnert Park Unified School District. Our current K-5 enrollment is 555 students. Our school population is growing in its cultural diversity providing enrichment through involvement with families from many cultures.
Students are encouraged to do their best. Life Skills are promoted, taught, and reinforced. The school climate is secure, calm, and caring. Expectations are clear and attainable. Rewards and recognitions are plentiful. Evergreen students feel safe, happy, and ready to learn. With the assistance of our many intervention programs, all children are supported academically, physically, socially, and emotionally. Evergreen Elementary School is proud of our traditions, our reputation, and our partnerships with parents, community, and businesses.

Evergreen is known for its strong community support. As a school and a family we continually strive to improve our relationships, recognizing that the effort of the whole team is needed to help every child be successful. Parents are viewed as partners and encouraged to take active roles in our school program. Every school day parents are on campus making bulletin boards, hanging posters, tutoring children, organizing fundraisers, participating in committees, and meeting formally and informally with the principal. Our close proximity to Sonoma State University offers an opportunity to benefit from a university supported after school-homework program.

School effectiveness is monitored using a variety of informational sources. Evergreen staff focuses on continuous improvement in student achievement, using multiple indicators to monitor progress toward meeting specific targeted objectives addressing student needs at all grade levels and in all subjects. The cornerstone of our accountability plan asks the question, "How are students performing on the multiple measures and how do we meet the challenge of improving student performance on those specific measures?"

Indicative of our highly professional district, teacher representatives from all schools have attended workshops and training on assessment and accountability. The Evergreen staff and principal have participated in numerous professional workshops to identify standards and implement best teaching practices that support the curriculum using data to guide instruction. Teachers use Common Core standards-aligned assessments to match curriculum being used in instruction. The direct correlation between standards and state approved curriculum materials have contributed to the increase in our API scores. Since the beginning of the state accountability reporting, Evergreen School has worked to raise student achievement.

At Evergreen, we strive to ensure the continuous growth of academic achievement for all students, to ensure a safe, secure, and disciplined teaching and learning environment, and to ensure that parents, businesses, and community members are actively engaged in the educational process.
Evergreen school is where children and learning come first. We are quite proud of our beautiful campus where high expectations for learning are maintained. We are working together to build a strong community of learners with a shared vision of empowering our students with the skills and abilities necessary for 21st century living. Students are given many support systems to assist them in achieving the rigorous state and district standards.

In the 2012-13 school year, Evergreen School adopted a Year Round calendar track. While about $1 / 3$ of the school population attends on this track, the rest of the school is on the traditional track. This program provides families with a choice in school calendar.

## Data Collection and Analysis

Review your student achievement data, and other sources of information regarding current conditions. This step is IMPORTANT! Review data with key stakeholders including teachers, Leadership Team, Site Council, ELAC, etc. Your goals and actions should be based on an analysis of student achievement data.

For the plan, provide charts of student achievement provided by Key Data Systems and Illuminate from the CST, CELDT, CAHSEE (as appropriate).

Table 1: Academic Performance Index by Student Group

| PROFICIENCY LEVEL | API GROWTH BY STUDENT GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Students |  |  | White |  |  | African-American |  |  | Asian |  |  |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Number Included | 439 | 449 | 446 | 272 | 272 | 248 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 17 | 13 |
| Growth API | 794 | 812 | 804 | 820 | 823 | 813 |  |  |  | 811 | 854 | 875 |
| Base API | 835 | 794 | 812 | 860 | 820 | 822 |  |  |  |  | 811 | 854 |
| Target | A | 5 | A | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Growth | -41 | 18 | -8 | -40 | 3 | -9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Met Target | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| PROFICIENCY LEVEL | API GROWTH BY STUDENT GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hispanic |  |  | English Learners |  |  | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  | Students with Disabilities |  |  |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Number Included | 109 | 119 | 136 | 87 | 94 | 85 | 163 | 162 | 201 | 78 | 73 | 83 |
| Growth API | 739 | 778 | 765 | 722 | 770 | 752 | 729 | 773 | 763 | 646 | 689 | 692 |
| Base API | 784 | 739 | 778 | 761 | 722 | 771 | 803 | 729 | 772 | 685 | 646 | 685 |
| Target | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | A | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Growth | -45 | 39 | -13 | -39 | 48 | -19 | -74 | 44 | -9 |  |  |  |
| Met Target | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |  |  |  |

## Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 2 - Title III Accountability (School Data)

| AMAO 1 | Annual Growth |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010-11 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ |
| Number of Annual Testers |  |  | 77 |
| Percent with Prior Year Data |  |  | $100.0 \%$ |
| Number in Cohort |  |  | 77 |
| Number Met |  |  | 36.0 |
| Percent Met | 54.6 |  | $46.8 \%$ |
| NCLB Target |  |  | 57.5 |
| Met Target |  |  | No |


| AMAO 2 | Attaining English Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |  |
|  | Years of EL instruction |  | Years of EL instruction |  | Years of EL instruction |  |
|  | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More |
| Number in Cohort |  |  |  |  | 82 | 18 |
| Number Met |  |  |  |  | 20 | -- |
| Percent Met |  |  |  |  | 24.4\% | -- |
| NCLB Target | 18.7 | 43.2 | 20.1 | 45.1 | 21.4 | 47.0 |
| Met Target |  |  |  |  | Yes | * |


| AMAO 3 | Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ |
| English-Language Arts |  |  |  |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | Yes | No |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | Yes | No |

## Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 3 - Title III Accountability (District Data)

| AMAO 1 | Annual Growth |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ |
| Number of Annual Testers | 905 | 900 | 867 |
| Percent with Prior Year Data | 99.9 | 99.2 | 100.0 |
| Number in Cohort | 904 | 893 | 867 |
| Number Met | 549 | 561 | 491 |
| Percent Met | 60.7 | 62.8 | 56.6 |
| NCLB Target | 54.6 | 56.0 | 57.5 |
| Met Target | Yes | Yes | No |


| AMAO 2 | Attaining English Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |  |
|  | Years of EL instruction |  | Years of EL instruction |  | Years of EL instruction |  |
|  | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More |
| Number in Cohort | 681 | 399 | 684 | 395 | 724 | 384 |
| Number Met | 157 | 225 | 169 | 213 | 162 | 191 |
| Percent Met | 23.1 | 56.4 | 24.7 | 53.9 | 22.4 | 49.7 |
| NCLB Target | 18.7 | 43.2 | 20.1 | 45.1 | 21.4 | 47.0 |
| Met Target | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |


| AMAO 3 | Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ |
| English-Language Arts |  |  |  |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | No | No |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | No | No |
| Met Target for AMAO 3 | No | No | No |

## Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 4: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

| AYP <br> PROFICIENCY LEVEL | ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Students |  |  | White |  |  | African-American |  |  | Asian |  |  |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 244 | 255 | 260 | 163 | 167 | 151 | -- | -- |  | 8 | 11 | 9 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 55.6 | 56.8 | 58.3 | 59.9 | 61.4 | 60.9 | -- | -- | -- | 61.5 | 64.7 | 69.2 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 |
| Met AYP Criteria | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |


| AYP <br> PROFICIENCY LEVEL | ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hispanic |  |  | English Learners |  |  | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  | Students with Disabilities |  |  |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 50 | 57 | 68 | 35 | 40 | 36 | 70 | 75 | 98 | 26 | 23 | 34 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 45.9 | 47.9 | 50.0 | 40.2 | 42.6 | 42.4 | 42.9 | 46.3 | 48.8 | 33.3 | 31.5 | 41.0 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 |
| Met AYP Criteria | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | -- | Yes |

## Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 5: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

| AYP <br> PROFICIENCY LEVEL | MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Students |  |  | White |  |  | African-American |  |  | Asian |  |  |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 247 | 277 | 278 | 171 | 176 | 160 | -- | -- |  | 8 | 13 | 11 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 56.3 | 61.7 | 62.3 | 62.9 | 64.7 | 64.5 | -- | -- | -- | 61.5 | 76.5 | 84.6 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 |
| Met AYP Criteria | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |


| AYPPROFICIENCY LEVEL | MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hispanic |  |  | English Learners |  |  | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  | Students with Disabilities |  |  |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 48 | 59 | 75 | 34 | 50 | 47 | 66 | 88 | 106 | 35 | 33 | 39 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 44.0 | 49.6 | 55.1 | 39.1 | 53.2 | 55.3 | 40.5 | 54.3 | 52.7 | 44.9 | 45.2 | 47.0 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 |
| Met AYP Criteria | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | -- | Yes |

## Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 6: California English Language Development (CELDT Annual Assessment) Data

| Grade | 2012-13 CELDT (Annual Assessment) Results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Advanced |  | Early Advanced |  | Intermediate |  | Early Intermediate |  | Beginning |  | Number Tested |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# |

## School and Student Performance Data

Table 7: California English Language Development (CELDT All Assessment) Data

| Grade | 2012-13 CELDT (All Assessment) Results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Advanced |  | Early Advanced |  | Intermediate |  | Early Intermediate |  | Beginning |  | Number Tested |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# |
| K |  |  | 1 |  | 8 |  | 7 | 35 | 4 | 20 | 20 |

## Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Plans must include analysis of school progress on the AYP and AMAOs for Title III.
You can include other district/school assessment data.
You can include student attendance and discipline data
You can include a summary of your Healthy Kids Survey
Provide a brief, written analysis based on the data you provided.
You can provide a brief summary of strengths and gaps in performance in ELA and math for the school as a whole and for any significant trends identified for grade levels or subgroups. This can be based on discussion with stakeholders regarding data analysis.
While the overall API score, and the scores of some subgroups, such as White and Asian, are over 800, we also have subgroups who are not reaching the goals we've set. All subgroups made growth last year. Our lowest subgroup is the SWD, which is only at 685 API.

## Include a brief summary analysis statement.

This statement summarizes the conclusions reached about student performance.
The growth in our Hispanic and English Learner subgroups (39 and 49 points) indicate that we are being successful in moving these students toward proficiency. Also, we raised the number in our SED subgroup (up 39 points) An area we need to examine is the performance on the CST for our EL students. They are moving upward in learning English but not in acquiring CST proficiency.

## California Standards Test

All Students
English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | \% Basic |  |  | \% Below Basic |  |  | \% Far Below Basic |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 43 | 54 | 66 | 43 | 27 | 21 | 8 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| Grade 3 | 55 | 40 | 53 | 23 | 43 | 31 | 11 | 7 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 0 |
| Grade 4 | 69 | 76 | 74 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Grade 5 | 59 | 63 | 66 | 32 | 25 | 22 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| Grade 6 | 59 | 66 | 49 | 22 | 24 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

All Students
Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | \% Basic |  |  | \% Below Basic |  |  | \% Far Below Basic |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 48 | 63 | 71 | 27 | 26 | 19 | 20 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Grade 3 | 66 | 80 | 76 | 15 | 13 | 20 | 16 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Grade 4 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 20 | 14 | 18 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Grade 5 | 45 | 53 | 54 | 34 | 26 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 26 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Grade 6 | 52 | 49 | 45 | 28 | 30 | 18 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 4 | 4 | 12 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 \& 7 Standards) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | \% Basic |  |  | \% Below Basic |  |  | \% Far Below Basic |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | \% Basic |  |  | \% Below Basic |  |  | \% Far Below Basic |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | \% Basic |  |  | \% Below Basic |  |  | \% Far Below Basic |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | \% Basic |  |  | \% Below Basic |  |  | \% Far Below Basic |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | \% Basic |  |  | \% Below Basic |  |  | \% Far Below Basic |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## California Standards Test

## African American Students

## English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 3 |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Grade 4 | * |  | * | * |  | * |
| Grade 5 | * | * |  | * | * |  |
| Grade 6 |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## African American Students <br> Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 3 |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Grade 4 | * |  | * | * |  | * |
| Grade 5 | * | * |  | * | * |  |
| Grade 6 |  | * |  |  | * |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 \& 7 Standards) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## California Standards Test

## Asian Students

English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Asian Students <br> Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 \& 7 Standards) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## California Standards Test

## Hispanic/Latino Students

English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 30 | 43 | 54 | 330.3 | 342.1 | 343.9 |
| Grade 3 | 63 | 26 | 42 | 352.9 | 318.5 | 346.8 |
| Grade 4 | 64 | 76 | 59 | 368.6 | 375.6 | 349.0 |
| Grade 5 | 38 | 54 | 57 | 344.9 | 351.5 | 359.4 |
| Grade 6 | 38 | 48 | 52 | 330.6 | 349.2 | 336.7 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Hispanic/Latino Students <br> Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 35 | 47 | 64 | 330.3 | 357.4 | 367.6 |
| Grade 3 | 56 | 64 | 67 | 352.8 | 385.6 | 400.5 |
| Grade 4 | 62 | 76 | 59 | 378.2 | 379.0 | 351.0 |
| Grade 5 | 32 | 46 | 48 | 336.5 | 341.3 | 354.0 |
| Grade 6 | 35 | 26 | 48 | 325.5 | 325.7 | 329.3 |
| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 \& 7 Standards) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## California Standards Test

## White Students

English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 46 | 61 | 73 | 359.5 | 358.4 | 376.3 |
| Grade 3 | 48 | 49 | 59 | 357.9 | 354.0 | 357.8 |
| Grade 4 | 71 | 77 | 77 | 387.7 | 389.4 | 394.4 |
| Grade 5 | 72 | 65 | 74 | 372.6 | 370.5 | 377.2 |
| Grade 6 | 70 | 79 | 47 | 366.9 | 379.1 | 340.7 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

White Students Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 52 | 73 | 79 | 359.2 | 380.5 | 399.7 |
| Grade 3 | 66 | 83 | 84 | 391.4 | 422.6 | 415.6 |
| Grade 4 | 74 | 66 | 70 | 398.9 | 384.8 | 386.6 |
| Grade 5 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 370.7 | 373.2 | 380.8 |
| Grade 6 | 65 | 56 | 43 | 370.5 | 366.5 | 336.7 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 \& 7 Standards) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2012-13 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## California Standards Test

## English Learner Students

English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 41 | 44 | 43 | 338.9 | 335.3 | 340.6 |
| Grade 3 | * | 11 | 38 | * | 319.5 | 336.8 |
| Grade 4 | * | * | 50 | * | * | 335.4 |
| Grade 5 | 15 | * | * | 321.3 | * | * |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## English Learner Students <br> Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 41 | 44 | 64 | 339.7 | 346.8 | 361.1 |
| Grade 3 | * | 65 | 67 | * | 393.2 | 383.9 |
| Grade 4 | 64 | * | 58 | 353.6 | * | 353.3 |
| Grade 5 | 21 | * | * | 311.4 | * | * |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 \& 7 Standards) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## California Standards Test

## Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students

## English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 30 | 55 | 56 | 335.5 | 351.8 | 348.7 |
| Grade 3 | 37 | 30 | 38 | 333.8 | 330.3 | 334.5 |
| Grade 4 | 53 | 78 | 65 | 357.9 | 381.7 | 367.4 |
| Grade 5 | 40 | 38 | 52 | 347.3 | 344.7 | 352.0 |
| Grade 6 | 57 | 55 | 31 | 348.6 | 357.3 | 320.5 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students

 Mathematics| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 2 | 33 | 65 | 56 | 329.2 | 365.5 | 362.6 |
| Grade 3 | 48 | 70 | 69 | 339.8 | 404.2 | 386.5 |
| Grade 4 | 53 | 67 | 68 | 364.9 | 377.0 | 374.6 |
| Grade 5 | 26 | 37 | 48 | 329.4 | 341.1 | 354.0 |
| Grade 6 | 43 | 41 | 23 | 338.2 | 341.2 | 312.4 |
| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level <br> General Mathematics (Grades 6 \& 7 Standards) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% At or Above Proficient |  |  | Mean Scale Score |  |  |
|  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Part Two: Addressing the Performance Gaps

The purpose of this section is to set priorities and specific goals. Your priorities are based upon the synthesis you developed above. Your goals flow from these priorities.

Note: CA regulations state that the SPSA must address how funds will be used to "improve the academic performance of all students to the level of the performance goals, as established by the API." Also, regulations state that "The SPSA must align with the local educational agency (LEA)."

## Select Priorities

Based upon analysis of data, prior school goals and district goals, set priorities or focus areas for your plan.
Based upon analysis of data, prior school and district goals, our priorities for the coming year focus on the academic gains of our EL students and students with disabilities.

## Write/Revise School SMART Goals

School goals flow from your priorities and should be attainable in the period specified in the plan, specific to the student participants and measurable. Goals should be listed in SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely) format but also align to the outcomes expected under the state and federal accountability model.
Evergreen Students will make adequate progress for the 2013-14 calendar year: 75\% of all students will reach proficiency in Language Arts and Math., Also English Learners will reach 60\% proficiency in ELA and students with disabilities will reach $55 \%$ in ELA. In Math, English learners will reach $68 \%$ and SWD will reach $65 \%$. It is important to note that these goals were the same for 2012-13 (with the exception of the SWD goal in ELA, which was $50.0 \%$ ) and were not reached at that time. We will not have CST results to use for a measure in 2014, so we will be looking at ELA results in Dibels and Phonic Surveys. In math, we will use curriculum embedded assessments in Everyday Math to measure success.

## Part Three: Analysis of Proven or Promising Strategies

While the justification for your activities need not be written into your plan, best, evidence-based practices should be reflected in your action plan and activities you pursue. Once a goal for student achievement has been identified, the leadership team needs to determine how to reach that goal. Choose specific strategies that are likely to work and align to the district's Local Education Agency Plan as well. Be deliberate in what strategies you choose. Consider:

- Did it work for a similar school?
- When do you expect to see results?
- Can you explain why you expect it to work?
- What will you do to ensure that it works?
- At what point will you determine it isn't working and stop doing it?
- Identify current successful practices in the school and district by looking at data, talking to colleagues, and seeking input from such professionals as curriculum specialists.

| Resource | Web Address |
| :--- | :--- |
| Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) | http://www.ascd.org/portal/site/ascd/index.jsp/ |
| Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) | http://www.cpre.org/ |
| ED.gov | http://www.ed.gov/help/site/expsearch/index.html?src=In |
| Education Commission of the States | http://www.ecs.org/default.asp |
| Educational Resource Information Center | http://www.eric.ed.gov/ |
| Healthy Kids Resource Center | http://www.californiahealthykids.org/c/@U82gtJCqJSte6/Pages <br> /index.html |
| Just for the Kids - California | http://www.just4kids.org/bestpractice/study_framework.cfm?s <br> ub=state\&study=californiaa |
| Just for the Kids - California School Data | http://www.jftk-ca.org/ |
| National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) | http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/ |
| School Matters A Service of Standard \& Poors | http://www.schoolmatters.com/ |
| What Works Clearinghouse | http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ |

## Part Four: Complete Action Plans for each SMART Goal

Use the attached templates to complete your action plans.

## SMART Goal 1

## Evergreen Elementary School Plan on a Page <br> Student Achievement in Reading Language Arts 2013-2014

## SMART Goal:

Evergreen Students will make adequate progress for the 2013-14 calendar year: $75 \%$ of all students will reach proficiency in Language Arts. Also English Learners will reach $60 \%$ proficiency in ELA and students with disabilities will reach $55 \%$ in ELA. It is important to note that these goals were the same for 2012-13 (with the exception of the SWD goal in ELA, which was $50.0 \%$ ) and were not reached at that time. We will not have CST results to use for a measure in 2014, so we will be looking at ELA results in Dibels and Phonic Surveys.

| Actions/Strategies |
| :--- |
| Teaching and Learning |
| a) Develop year-long, standards-based |
| curricular plans, aligning Common Core |
| curriculum with essential standards and |
| benchmark assessments. |
| b) Identify students who are not yet proficient |
| and develop a plan for meeting their needs. |
| Principal and teachers work together to |
| provide support; Safety Net meetings; Learning |
| Center meetings, PLC meetings |

c) Use assessment to inform instruction and provide summary data. Monthly, teachers examine student work and assessment results and plan goals for improvement.
d) Teachers use effective teaching strategies to improve student learning, for example: KAM strategies; Fetzer Writing and Comprehension strategies; Vocabulary Study; Thinking Maps; Gradual Release of Responsibility model of teaching
e) Use of technology--hardware and software support--to support teaching strategies; data management; communication; student intervention programs (Lexia, Criterion) f) Implement school wide programs and strategies to increase student learning, ie, Science Olympiad; Student Leadership; Yearbook Club; Visual Thinking Strategies g) Implement a year-round calendar track as a choice for families that want that program-shorter summer so that students retain more learning
II. Staff Development
a) Grade level PLC meetings to provide format for grade level collaboration; ex: planning lessons; creating rubrics and assessments b) Training in use and implementation of effective teaching strategies; for example, PLC's, Houghton Mifflin, SDAIE, Differentiated Instruction; Vocabulary instruction; Thinking Maps; ELD instruction; Gradual Release of Responsibility; Visual Thinking Strategies c) Training in learning the new Common Core standards, and in teaching strategies used in Common Core, such as Close Reading.
III. Opportunity and Equal Access
a) ELL assistant to assist teachers in providing intervention
b) Flexible grouping of students for targeted instruction: Walk to Read and Tier II intervention
c) Use of specialists to determine learning difficulties for students; assessments for determining learning problems
d) Each classroom has weekly access to the computer lab; programs support standards and arts
e) School wide assemblies focused on motivating students to succeed, using movement, arts or music
e) Classroom teachers to attend IEP, Safety Net and SST meetings
f) "Being there" field study experiences across the curriculum to increase student learning through meaningful life experiences. Writing prompts will sometimes be directed to these experiences.

| PLC protocols, and | Staff training in VTS, | District funding; |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | minutes; increased STAR scores; Student use of evidence based reasoning

All students have access to Language arts core curriculum and instruction; Reading and writing experiences are integrated into all other curricular areas; Decreased gap in student achievement; English Learners have 30 minutes a day of ELD instruction

Illuminate, Lexia, Dibels; use of tablets

EL Assistant 30 hours a week; Active PTA to support curricular programs, Lexia, ELD curriculum,

Measure D
funds;
Donations

EIA/LEP

PTA funds

District funds

| IV Involvement of staff, parents and <br> community: | Minutes of meetings; <br> copies of programs; <br> school site survey results | PTA; Staff | Site funds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a) Parent access to Lexia--an on-line reading |  |  |  |
| tool. |  |  |  |
| b) Home Involvement program through |  | MAA funds |  |
| Everyday Math, |  |  |  |
| grades K-5 |  |  |  |
| c) Annual Site Council analysis of student |  |  |  |
| data-participation |  |  |  |
| in site plan |  |  |  |$\quad$| Site funds, |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| donations |

## SMART Goal 2

## Evergreen Elementary School <br> Plan on a Page <br> Student Achievement in Mathematics <br> 2013-2014

## SMART Goal:

Evergreen Students will make adequate progress for the 2013-14 calendar year: 75\% of students will reach proficiency in Math. Also in Math, English learners will reach $68 \%$ and SWD will reach $65 \%$. We will not have CST results to use for a measure in 2014, so we will use curriculum embedded assessments in Everyday Math to measure success.

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Teaching and Learning <br> a) Develop year-long, standards-based curricular plans, aligning /curriculum with Common Core essential standards and benchmark assessments. <br> b) Identify students who are not yet proficient and develop a plan for meeting their needs. Principal and teachers work together to | Student achievement data from Benchmark assessments; curriculum embedded assessments, PLC common assessments | Everyday math curriculum in grades K-5; Dreambox; | Site Funds; <br> Donations <br> TUPE funds <br> District and <br> Measure $D$ funds | provide support; Safety Net meetings

c) Use assessment to inform instruction and provide summary data. Monthly, teachers examine student work and assessment results and plan goals for improvement.
d) Teachers use effective teaching strategies to improve student learning, for example: Engagement Strategies, Vocabulary Study; Thinking Maps; Gradual Release of Responsibility model of teaching
e) Use of technology--hardware and software support--to support teaching strategies; data management; communication; student intervention programs in math and language arts
f) Implement a year round school program
II. Staff Development
a) Grade level PLC meetings to provide format for grade level collaboration; ex: planning lessons; creating rubrics and assessments b) Training in use and implementation of effective teaching strategies; for example, PLC's, Everyday Math, SDAIE, Differentiated Instruction; Vocabulary instruction; Thinking Maps; Gradual Release of Responsibility
III. Opportunity and Equal Access
a) Flexible grouping of students for targeted instruction: grade level re-grouping, etc.
b) Use of specialists to determine learning difficulties for students; assessments for determining learning problems
c) Each classroom has weekly access to the computer lab; programs support standards and arts (Dreambox)
d) School wide assemblies focused on motivating students to succeed, using movement, arts or music
e) Classroom teachers to attend IEP, Safety Net and SST meetings
f) "Being there" field study experiences across the curriculum to increase student learning through meaningful life experiences. Writing prompts will sometimes be directed to these experiences.

IV Involvement of staff, parents and community:
a) Parent access to Dreambox--an on-line math tool.
b) Home Involvement program through Everyday Math
c) Annual Site Council analysis of student data-participation in site plan

| t | PLC meeting protocols and minutes; Attendance by teachers at district and SCOE math trainings | SCOE; District training; Professional Tuesdays | District funds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| s, |  |  |  |


| All students have access | Curriculum materials; |
| :--- | :--- |
| to math core curriculum | Active parent community | and instruction; math experiences are integrated into all other curricular areas

District funds
Donations

Donations

ELAP

## SMART Goal 3

## Evergreen Elementary School <br> Plan on a Page <br> Culture and Context <br> 2013-2014

## SMART Goal:

Culture and Climate: Evergreen School will have a safe and respectful learning community, with students following classroom and school wide rules and procedures on a daily basis. Bullying incidents will decrease. This will be accomplished through a variety of effective support programs for students and parents, as measured by office referrals, detention and/or suspension data by May 2014

| Actions/Strategies |
| :--- |
| I. Teaching and Learning |
| a) Implement the Safe School plan to address |
| safts; fills, | safety needs; fire drills, earthquake simulations; emergency plan, etc.

b) Implement school-wide discipline plan--use of Lifeskills; Behavior alerts; Roars; referrals; Bobcat Bucks and prizes
c) Use varied and effective teaching strategies which include Visual, Performing Arts and Music (multiple intelligences, movement, learning styles, use of technology)
d) Teach students to have empathy for others; identify and refrain from bullying behaviors; Use of Second Step and Steps to Respect programs, etc.
e) Integrate movement and physical education into curricular areas
f) Help students to take responsibility to maintain and improve physical environment; staff teaches and models this behavior.
g) Provide incentives for improving attendance
h) Facilities and furnishing are functional and well-maintained.
i) First Days of School program--school wide theme, activities to build community , and expectations for behaviors

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II Staff development and professional collaboration <br> a) Training in Second Step and Steps to Respect <br> b) Training for teachers and support staff to assist students with behaviorial needs: autism spectrum, learning disablities, emotional needs.etc. <br> c) Inservice in instructional strategies that movitvate and support learning: differentiating curriculum, understanding learning modalities | Staff participation in training opportunities | District and site staff expertise; | District funds |
| III Opportunity and Equal Access <br> a) SST meetings <br> b) Student leadership <br> c) Art program--VTS and Meet the Masters <br> d) Dramatic presentations in classrooms, after school <br> e) School wide art show <br> f) Assemblies focused on learning behaviors <br> g) Band for 5th grade classes | All students have access to school activities and extracurricular activities; Participation by all groups; | Active parent community; Staff; | Donations District funds |


| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IV Involvement of staff, parents and community: <br> a) Annual Site Council analysis of student data-participation in site plan <br> b) Testing results and curriculum shared with parents; i.e. PTA, ELAC mtgs; Kindergarten expectations <br> c) Translation of meetings and communications into home language, when possible. <br> d) Fifth grade teachers send student reports to middle school <br> e) Fifth grade visits to middle school; middle school band concert; teacher and student visits; parent orientation <br> f) Kindergarten teachers visit local preschools <br> g) Kindergarten Orientation and Play Dates <br> h) Open House/Back to School Night <br> i) Tour of Evergreen <br> j) Family Activity Nights: Book Fair; Science Night; Movie Nights; PTA events <br> k) ELAC meetings for parents of English learners <br> I) Site Council Meetings include parents, staff and administration. <br> m) Communication with parent community through flyers, newsletters,annual calendar/handbook; progress reports, website, etc. | All students have access to school activities and extracurricular activities; Participation by all groups; Agendas and minutes from ELAC, Site Council; Clandar of school events | Active parent community; Staff; | Donations District funds |

## SMART Goal 4

## Evergreen Elementary School Plan on a Page

2013-2014
SMART Goal:

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

## SMART Goal 5

## Evergreen Elementary School Plan on a Page

2013-2014
SMART Goal:

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

## Part Five: Conduct Advisory Committee Review and Certification

School plans must be developed with the review, certification, and advice of any applicable school advisory committees. Meeting agendas and minutes should reflect the processes for stakeholder input and review the culminated in certification.

School districts must assure that SSCs have developed and approved the SPSA for schools participating in programs funded through the ConApp process and any other school program they choose to include

## Form C: Programs Included in this Plan

Check the box for each state and federal categorical program in which the school participates and, if applicable, enter amounts allocated. (The plan must describe the activities to be conducted at the school for each of the state and federal categorical program in which the school participates. If the school receives funding, then the plan must include the proposed expenditures.)

|  | State Programs | Allocation |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| [ ] | California School Age Families Education <br> Purpose: Assist expectant and parenting students succeed in school. | $\$$ |
| [X] | Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education <br> Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program. | $\$$ |
| [X] | Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program <br> Purpose: Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners | $\$$ |
| [ ] | High Priority Schools Grant Program <br> Purpose: Assist schools in meeting academic growth targets. | $\$$ |
|  | Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform <br> [ | Purpose: Train classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum <br> areas. |

## APPENDIX

## CRPUSD LEA Plan and Title III Year IV Plan

Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District
2012-2013 Title I and Title III LEA PLAN SUMMARY

## Leadership Commitment

In order to increase achievement and retain students, we will enact evidence-based instructional strategies to support and engage all learners, implement $K$ - 12 curricula aligned to the Common Core Standards and calibrated to the rigor of state and national measures, and use formative and summative assessments for ongoing monitoring of students' growth.

Required State of California and Federal Goals:
Goals 1A \& 1B Improve Proficiency in English Language Arts and Mathematics
Goal 2A: Increase Annual Progress in Learning English
Goal 2B: Increase English Proficiency
Goal 2C: Increase Academic Proficiency of English Language Subgroup
Strategy: Implement Evidence-Based Instruction Practices

Improved consistency of target instructional practices system-wide will improve student performance, resulting in increased achievement because all students will have accesses to effective instructional practices.

| Action Steps |  | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) Development of Systemwide Instructional Practices |  |  |  |
| Site leadership teams participate in Sonoma Leadership Network (SLN) training | SLN registration for 35 participants | \$15,000.00 | Title I |
|  | Substitute costs | \$20,125.00 | Title II |
| Teacher trainers conduct training in gradual release of responsibility, active student engagement, Organizing Student Thinking and English learner support strategies. | Estimated participation $=40$ teachers per training with three days total planned for training. | \$13,800.00 | Title III |
| Sites develop agreements regarding instructional practices and conduct implementation trials that include observation and coaching to support practice | Plans to be determined. | TBD | TBD |
| (2) Alignment of Curriculum and Assessment |  |  |  |


| Align District Benchmarks and Instructional Pacing to <br> Rigor of State Standards and CSTS. | Estimated costs for 20 teachers for 2 days of substitute <br> time. | $\$ 4,600.00$ | Title I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Complete Curriculum Articulation to Ensure Consistency <br> and Coherence from Kindergarten to $122^{\text {th }}$ Grade | Estimated costs for 24 teachers for four days of <br> substitute time. | $\$ 11,040.00$ | Title II |

## Strategy: Assessment and Progress Monitoring

Grade level teams and the secondary English language arts and mathematics departments will develop, administer, and analyze common formative and summative assessments that are aligned with actual instruction to measure student skill, knowledge, and growth for purposes of progress monitoring and instructional calibration.

| Action Steps |  | Proposed <br> Expenditure | Proposed <br> Funding <br> Source |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (1) Data Analysis and Planning through Collaboration Time | Estimated costs for 25 teachers for one day of <br> substitute time. | $\$ 3,000.00$ | Title II |  |
| Provide teacher training in Illuminate system. | Estimated costs for 300 cameras at $\$ 35 /$ camera. | $\$ 10,500.00$ | Title I |  |
| Provide teachers with web cameras to enable immediate <br> data collection and reporting using the Illuminate <br> GradeCam software. |  | Estimated costs for 30 teachers with five days of <br> substitute time. | $\$ 17,250.00$ | Title I |
| Provide teachers with release time for data analysis and <br> collaborative planning. | NA |  |  |  |
| (2) Administer and Analyze Diagnostic State Tests <br> Students in grades 2-10 will participate in a CST or CAHSEE diagnostic test six weeks prior to the state testing <br> windows. Grade level teams will meet to review test data and to plan targeted instruction for students to ensure <br> proficiency. | NA |  |  |  |

## Strategy: Improve Teaching and Learning In ELD

Consistent, system-wide implementation of evidence-based ELD instructional practices, materials, and assessment will increase the achievement of English language learners.
The Single Plan for Student Achievement

| Action Steps |  | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed <br> Funding <br> Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) Audit ELD Implementation |  |  |  |
| Audit English language development curriculum, schedules, and instructional practices to ensure consistency and coherence across the district. | Teacher teams to meet for horizontal and vertical articulation using substitute time. Specific plans to be determined. | TBD | TBD |
| Principals and teacher leaders will conduct walk-through observations to examine consistency of program implementation. | Teacher leaders from the ELPD and Advanced ELPD will provide training and support at their sites. Principals will guide planning and observation. | NA | NA |
| (2) Engaged, Structured Academic Talk |  |  |  |
| Teachers will provide multiple opportunities for student conversations on academically relevant topics, structuring tasks so that ELs are engaged with native speakers for extended discussion. Structured, collaborative groups will be used. | Teacher leaders from the ELPD and Advanced ELPD will provide training and support at their sites. Principals will guide planning and observation. | NA | NA |
| (3) Systematic Assessment of Students | Progress monitoring assessments |  |  |
| Teachers will use formative and summative assessments to determine student mastery of ELD standards for purposes of progress monitoring and instructional calibration. | Estimated cost for purchase of ELD assessment materials and substitute time for progress monitoring. | 10,000 | Title III |

Required State of California and Federal Goals:
Goal 2E: Increase Parent and Community Participation
Most of the action steps below are from the last Title III and LEA Plans and the Leadership and Learning structures implemented in the district this year. A few items were added as a result of ideas presented at the Board of Trustees Conversation Meeting on December 6, 2011.

| Action Steps | Estimated cost to support a period of a teacher with <br> marketing background working on special assignment to <br> coordinate district outreach efforts and K-12 <br> connections, using RCHS Media House and SSU support. |  |  |  | Proposed <br> Expenditure | Proposed <br> Funding Source |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District Marketing Model | Estimated substitute costs for 40 teachers for four days. | \$18,400 | Title I |  |  |  |
| Educational Summit | Ongoing | Program provided through Community Action <br> Partnership at no cost to district. |  |  |  |  |
| Superintendent's Council | Plans to be determined through consultation with YMCA <br> and/or SSU | NA | NA |  |  |  |
| Preschool Parent Education (Avance) | Plans in process - Connections calendar under <br> development and a standing item at Administrative <br> Council meetings | NA | NA |  |  |  |
| Sliding Fee Preschool Program (4 year olds) | Ongoing - Website development, ABI, Etc. | NA |  |  |  |  |
| HS Student Leadership and Programs to Elementary <br> and Middle School Sites Pathways Development and <br> Outreach Events | Ongoing position to support home-school <br> communication | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |
| Technology Enhanced Communication | Plans to be determined. | Varies | Varies |  |  |  |
| District Translation Services | Currently researching partnership options for <br> development. Have partnered with YMCA and Boys and <br> Girls Club for 21st Century Grant Application. | TBD | NA |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten Intake and Orientation |  <br> ASES |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br> enrichment programs for before and after school, <br> including HW Club |  | NA |  |  |  |  |


| Student Led Site Visits | Students to provide interested parents with tours of <br> their schools as part of district outreach efforts. | NA | NA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Required State of California and Federal Goals:

## Goal 3: Highly Qualified Teachers

All students in the district will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

| Action Steps | Title II, Level C District Compliance Plan in process | Proposed <br> Expenditure | Proposed <br> Funding Source |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fully Credentialed, HQ Teachers | Title II |  |  |

Required State of California and Federal Goals:
Goal 5 A: Increase Graduation Rates \& Goal 5B Decrease Drop Out Rates
Strategy: Academic Support Classes for Acceleration
Students who are struggling in core English language arts or mathematics courses will receive support class to ensure they have prerequisite skills to demonstrate proficiency in each content area.

| Action Steps |  | Proposed <br> Expenditure | Proposed <br> Funding Source |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Use Assessment Data to Identify Students | Estimated cost for the purchase of curriculum <br> materials. | $\$ 27,000$ | Title III |
| Identify and Purchase Academic Support Curriculum | Estimated costs for the proposed sections. | $\$ 40,000$ | Not funded |
| Add 2 Academic Support Sections at RCHS | Estimated costs for the proposed sections. | $\$ 40,000$ | Not funded |
| Add 2 Academic Support Sections at LJMS |  |  |  |

## Goal 5C: Increase Enrollment in AP Classes

## Strategy: Outreach and Education

Provide parent and student education and outreach to ensure familiarity with Advanced Placement program options at our high schools.

## Strategy: Use Academies to Promote Advanced Study

Use emerging high school academies model to assist students, and English language learners in particular, in pursuing advanced study in fields of specific interest.

| Action Steps | Proposed <br> Expenditure | Proposed <br> Funding Source |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Provide parent and student education through evening <br> events, the middle and high school guidance programs and <br> one-one outreach to ensure knowledge of AP offerings. | Plans to be determined. | NA | NA |
| Integrate AP in each Secondary Academy Outcomes | Plans to be determined. | NA | NA |

