

Form D: School Site Council Membership

Education Code Section 64001(g) requires that the SPSA be reviewed and updated at least annually, including proposed expenditures of funds allocated to the through the Consolidated Application, by the school site council. The current make-up of the school site council is as follows:¹

Names of Members	Principal	Classroom Teacher	Other School Staff	Parent or Community Member	Secondary Student
Derek Brothers	X				
Brian de la Mora					9th
Benjy Egel					8th
Eliana Jolkovsky					7th
Pat King (00)		X			
Francesca Wright (06)				X	
Nora Brazil (07)				X	
Kathy Russell (06)		X			
Jeanne Reeve (07)		X			
Kristen Street (07)		X			
Cheryl Ozga (06)			X		
Georgene Fritz (alt. 07)		X			
Phyllis Bramson-Paul (07)				X	
Alette Farrell (alt 07)				X	
Numbers of members of each category	1	4	1	4	3

¹ 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.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION DATA

2007 – 2008

Source: Cruncher

Please indicate number of students by grade

Categories	7	8	9
Total Enrollment (9/26/07)	268	215	225
SIP Program participants	268	215	225
ESEA Title I Targeted Assistance	57	61	42
English Learners	19	22	15
EL Students also Title I	11	18	11
GATE students (Intellectually)	114	99	99
Resource Program	16	14	9
Socioeconomic Disadvantage	35	45	28
S.E.D. with CELDT	22	23	16

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. (prior year)

State Programs	Allocation
<input type="checkbox"/> California School Age Families Education <u>Purpose:</u> Assist expectant and parenting students succeed in school.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education <u>Purpose:</u> Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program <u>Purpose:</u> Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners	\$ 27,604 (\$28, 500)
<input type="checkbox"/> High Priority Schools Grant Program <u>Purpose:</u> Assist schools in meeting academic growth targets.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform <u>Purpose:</u> Train classroom personnel to improve student performance.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Peer Assistance and Review <u>Purpose:</u> Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Pupil Retention Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Prevent students from dropping out of school.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Improve library and other school programs.	\$ 0 (\$34,440)
<input type="checkbox"/> School Safety and Violence Prevention Act <u>Purpose:</u> Increase school safety.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Tobacco-Use Prevention Education <u>Purpose:</u> Eliminate tobacco use among students.	\$
Other State or Local funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcel Tax – instructional supplies 	\$14,960 (\$ 14,000)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Davis Schools Foundation • Davis School Arts Foundation • IIP After school intervention – varies with attendance 	\$ 6,000 same \$ varies
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school	\$ 42,564

Federal Programs under No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	Allocation
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Neglected <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement instruction for children abandoned, abused, or neglected who have been placed in an institution	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part D: Delinquent <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement instruction for delinquent youth	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program <u>Purpose:</u> Upgrade eligible schools in high poverty areas	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program <u>Purpose:</u> Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency	\$ 91,961 (\$ 114,898)
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Program Improvement <u>Purpose:</u> Assist Title I schools that have failed to meet NCLB AYP.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting <u>Purpose:</u> Improve the number of highly qualified teachers & principals	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology <u>Purpose:</u> Support professional development and the use of technology	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement language instruction to help limited-English-proficient (LEP) students attain English proficiency and meet standards	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV, Part A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities <u>Purpose:</u> Support learning environments that promote achievement	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title V: Innovative Programs <u>Purpose:</u> Support educational improvement, library, media, and at-risk students	\$ 0 (\$ 1057)
<input type="checkbox"/> Title VI, Part B: Rural Education Achievement <u>Purpose:</u> Provide flexibility in the use of NCLB funds to eligible LEAs	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Federal Funds (list and describe) Federal Class Size Reduction Grant for Reading (.4 FTE)	\$26,853 (\$ 25,000)
Total amount of federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$ 118,814
	\$ 161, 378

Form E: Recommendations and Assurances

The school site council recommends this school plan and proposed expenditures to the district governing board for approval and assures the board of the following:

1. The school site council is correctly constituted and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.
2. The school site council reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the school plan requiring board approval.
3. The school site council sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan (**Check those that apply**):

School Advisory Committee for State Compensatory Education Programs

English Learner Advisory Committee

Community Advisory Committee for Special Education Programs

Gifted and Talented Education Program Advisory Committee

Other (*list*)

4. The school site council reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this *Single Plan for Student Achievement* and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the LEA Plan.
5. This school plan 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.
6. This school plan was adopted by the school site council at a public meeting on 12/17/07.

Attested:

Derek Brothers
Typed name of school principal

Signature of school principal

Date

Francesca Wright
Typed name of SSC chairperson

Signature of SSC chairperson

Date

Holmes Junior High School

MISSION STATEMENT

The parents, students, faculty and support staff at Holmes Junior High School are committed to the achievement of excellence in academics and all other curricular and co-curricular pursuits. They are also committed to the cultivation of individual abilities and talents in a supportive environment where respect for individual and group differences and for the rights of others guide behavior.

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

The following statements characterize educational practice at Holmes Junior High School:

1. Alignment of curriculum, instruction and materials to content performance standards: For many years faculty in departments have collaborated closely on curriculum and instruction to develop student proficiency in the content standards. Essential standards have been identified for each content area and curriculum planned to support learning in these standards across disciplines. All students use standards-based materials in core academic classrooms. Math, science and foreign language departments use common end-of-course exams. Weekly collaboration time allows for teacher teams and departments to continue regular discussions about curriculum and instruction issues.
2. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups: All students have standards-based instructional materials approved by the school board to use in core content classes. The High Point program has been adopted and approved for English learners who take the English Language Development core and support classes. Other supplementary materials are used in intervention programs for low-performing students in language arts and mathematics to accelerate their learning of standards.
3. Alignment of staff development to standards, assessed student performance and professional needs: Staff development is determined by school, district

and department goals around student performance. Recent site programs have included instruction across disciplines to support essential standards and inservice/discussions about the relative balance between standards learning and work production to determine student grades.

4. Services provided by the regular program to enable under-performing students to meet standards: Under-performing students are provided a number of supports in the regular program. Most take mainstream courses with an additional support class in language arts or mathematics for pre-teaching, re-teaching or help with classwork. In addition, paraeducators support struggling students in most academic classes. Students performing below grade-level standards in mathematics take a 3-year program with teachers who loop with the students, smaller class sizes and paraeducator support. The program is designed to help them successfully complete algebra in 9th or 10th grade. Ninth graders who need extra help with algebra also take an additional Algebra Clinic class. Teachers use a variety of instructional strategies to help under-performing students gain understanding of challenging standards including the use of visuals, differentiated assignments, small group activities, repetitions, lunchtime and after-school tutorials. The after-school Homework Club with tutorial help runs three days a week, and the school library is open until 5:00 four days a week. Counselors meet regularly with students on the D/F lists and communicate with parents about their progress. The CARE team collects data about at-risk students and recommends further creative interventions including mentor programs.
5. Services provided by categorical funds to enable under-performing students to meet standards: Charts outlining the intervention programs funded through categorical funds and general funds is attached. Title I, EIA, ELAP and special education funds provide the paraeducators who help under-performing students in mainstream, English language development and special education classes. Title I funds also provide teachers for the support classes in English learning, language arts and science. School/Library Improvement Program funds provide funding for the technology personnel who work with both students and teachers. Special reading/language classes run for struggling readers in the RSP learning center and are funded through the federal CSR grant, Title I and special education funds. DATE funding supports the peer helping/WEB program that provides peer support and training for students. Title V funds library materials. The Intensive Intervention Program pays teachers who tutor in the after-school Homework Club.
6. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement. Instruction is shaped by STAR data, end-of-course assessments, and teacher assessment of student work. In addition teachers

use a variety of formative and summative assessments to monitor under-performing students in regular and intervention programs including Gates-Maginnitie reading tests, Accelerated Math and Reader, writing samples, word lists, etc. General school data is included in the school site plan and reviewed by staff. Individual teachers and support staff use the Cruncher program to review individual and group performance on standards tests.

7. Number and percentage of teachers in academic areas experiencing low student performance: Nearly all teachers have students in their classes who perform below grade level expectancies. The staff is unusually experienced and well-trained. Teachers in the self-contained GATE program experience high student intellect and standards performance but some students with low classroom achievement.

8. Family, school, district and community resources available to assist these students: Holmes Junior High enjoys a great deal of community and family support. Volunteers and interns from UCD help struggling students in many classrooms. The PTA provides resources to enhance the library collections, give scholarship support for field trips and other enrichments, and purchase technology and other equipment and materials for all students. The staff receives grants for various programs and materials. District funds also provide some FTE for learning center and at-risk programs, staff development programs for teachers, and many other supports for under-performing students.

9. School, district and community barriers to improvements in student achievement: The majority of students in Davis are high achievers both on standards tests and in classrooms. Therefore, performing below the average can be especially difficult for students in terms of self-esteem and motivation. At Holmes half of our students are in the self-contained GATE program or in very high-achieving English and math classes. At times this results in some regular education academic classes with an unusually high percentage of students with very special needs. Most of our lowest performing students have identified learning disabilities, serious emotional issues and/or language barriers. The staff constantly searches for intervention supports for these students both in and outside of the district. County mental health services and other community resources are limited and often not available to needy students. Special education resources are also stretched, and well-informed parents can sometimes direct a great deal of site and district time and resources to a small number of students pulling over-extended personnel away from other students with need.

**Holmes Jr High
Site Plan Data 2007 - 2008**

Attendance

Month	04-05	05-06	06-07
Sept	97%	97%	97%
Jan	96%	96%	95%
May	95%	96%	96%

SARB Letters

	04-05	05-06	06-07*	*
First	72	70	5	Unexc not verified by parent
Second	28	23	1	
Third	14	9	0	

Discipline

	04-05	05-06	06-07
Expulsions	1	1	0
Suspensions (leading causes)	263 days for 59 students : disruption, dress code, defiance	163 days for 63 students	126 days for 46 students: Disruption, fighting; 40% 7 th grade
Retentions	6	1	0
Citizenship: O or S	84%	85%	84%

Semester Grades – school totals

	A	B	C	D	F
First	52%	27%	13%	5%	2%
Final	53%	23%	13%	6%	3%

Holmes Junior High - 2007

Table 1a : Academic Performance by Ethnicity – Language Arts

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX (STAR) DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																				
		All Students			White			African-American			Hispanic			Asian			SED			EL		
		05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07
At or Above Proficient	#	555	560	520	372	366	345	10	13	19	33	24	28	129	140	119	42	45	43	7	12	4
	%	72%	75%	75%	78%	82%	82%	42%	46%	56%	33%	28%	33%	83%	83%	83%	33%	37%	32%	13%	16%	6%
Basic	#	128	75	95	70	39	49	7	5	8	30	23	25	18	16	12	48	16	40	23	13	25
	%	17%	10%	14%	15%	9%	12%	29%	18%	24%	31%	26%	29%	12%	9%	8%	30%	13%	30%	40%	18%	40%
Below Basic	#	38	50	50	14	21	13	3	3	3	17	14	23	3	6	11	17	28	31	8	20	26
	%	5%	7%	7%	3%	5%	3%	12%	11%	9%	17%	16%	27%	2%	4%	8%	13%	23%	23%	14%	28%	42%
Far Below Basic	#	28	38	27	9	12	13	1	4	4	16	17	9	2	4	1	13	21	18	16	17	7
	%	4%	5%	4%	2%	3%	3%	4%	14%	12%	16%	20%	11%	1%	2%	1%	10%	17%	14%	28%	24%	11%
TOTAL	#	773	746	692	480	446	420	24	28	34	98	87	85	155	169	143	128	123	132	57	71	62
	%	100	100	100%	62	60	61%	3	4	5%	13	12	12%	20	23	21%	17	16	19%	7	10	9%
Valid scores	%	97	97	98%	97	98		88	89		98	90		98	98		94	89		95	87	

Conclusions indicated by the data:	Questions or further information needed
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> EL drop in Prof Increase for Afr Amer & Hispanic 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> EL as a transient group? How much change from 06-07? Need to know what is being tested...writing scores? New vocab books starting this year – find data to compare Who in FBB & BB are not receiving services? (title I or RSP)

Source: Cruncher 2/12/2008

Holmes Junior High - 2007

Table 1b: Academic Performance by Subgroups - Math

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX (STAR) DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																				
		All Students (RSP)			White			African-American			Hispanic			Asian			SED			EL		
		05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07
At or Above Proficient	#	533	527	487 (8)	339	324	298	13	12	14	32	29	37	139	153	132	49	48	51	17	28	30
	%	69%	70%	71%	71%	72%	71%	54%	43%	41%	32%	33%	44%	90%	91%	93%	39%	39%	38%	30%	40%	48%
Basic	#	126	118	131 (9)	88	79	82	3	9	12	22	16	25	9	10	8	27	24	46	9	10	15
	%	16%	16%	19%	18%	18%	20%	12%	32%	35%	22%	18%	29%	6%	6%	6%	21%	20%	35%	16%	14%	24%
Below Basic	#	59	40	55 (10)	27	18	30	3	2	5	26	19	18	2	1	2	31	17	27	16	8	12
	%	8%	5%	8%	6%	4%	7%	12%	7%	15%	27%	22%	21%	1%	1%	1%	24%	14%	20%	28%	11%	19%
Far Below Basic	#	26	27	16 (8)	8	11	7	1	2	3	15	10	5	2	1	1	12	15	8	13	12	5
	%	3%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	7%	9%	15%	11%	6%	1%	1%	1%	9%	12%	6%	23%	17%	8%
TOTAL	#	773	712	692	480	446	420	24	28	34	98	87	85	155	169	143	128	123	132	57	71	62
	%	100	100	100%	62	63	61%	3	4	5%	13	12	12%	20	24	21%	17	17	19%	7	10	9%
Valid scores	%	96	95	98%																		

Conclusions indicated by the data:	Questions or further information needed
1. Fewer EL FBB, but increases in BB and B. 2. Increase in Hispanic Prof & Basic, decrease in FBB. 3.	1. How do RFEP kids do? Pg 28 2. How many of the low performing students are RSP? See () 3. How can we help SED students more? Do they have materials? Breakfast? 4. Attendance rate of FBB & BB kids? Already missing days...

Table 2a: Academic Performance by Grade Level

Language Arts

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		Grade: 7			Grade: 8			Grade: 9		
		05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#	190	166	170	189	182	161	176	212	208
	%	74%	78%	71%	68%	71%	75%	74%	78%	79%
Number and Percent At Basic	#	37	19	45	55	29	30	36	27	24
	%	14%	9%	19%	20%	11%	14%	15%	10%	9%
Number and Percent Below Basic	#	16	12	14	10	22	17	12	16	21
	%	6%	6%	6%	4%	9%	8%	5%	6%	8%
Number and Percent Far Below Basic	#	8	7	12	14	19	7	6	12	11
	%	3%	3%	5%	5%	7%	3%	3%	4%	4%
TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENT	#	251	204	239	268	252	215	230	267	263
	%	97%	96%	98%	97%	98%	95%	97%	98%	99

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. 7th grade decrease. "Supercore" last year due to scheduling issues may have had an effect. Watch next year.
2. Cohort increases at 9th grade.
- 3.

Table 2a continued: Writing Application Scores – grade 7

Language Arts

% of Students with Scores of	06	07	
8	3%	27%	
6	28%	46%	
4	63%	23%	
2	7%	4%	

Source:: CDE 8/07

Table 2b: Academic Performance by Course

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		Grade 7			Gen Math 8			Gen Math 9			Algebra 7			Algebra 8			Algebra 9		
		05	06	07*	05	06	07	05	06	07	07*			05	06	07	05	06	07
		#																	
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#	188	170	106	31	10	16	8	2	3	64			84	94	79	28	42	31
	%	74%	83%	63%	40%	21%	36%	27%	7%	10%	98%			82%	80%	85%	50%	75%	62%
Number and Percent At Basic	#	28	18	30	20	20	16	10	7	13	1			16	18	12	21	12	14
	%	11%	9%	18%	26%	43%	36%	34%	23%	43%	2%			16%	15%	13%	38%	21%	36%
Number and Percent Below Basic	#	25	10	23	18	10	10	9	10	10	-			2	4	2	6	2	1
	%	10%	5%	14%	23%	21%	22%	31%	33%	33%	-			2%	3%	2%	11%	4%	2%
Number and Percent Far Below Basic	#	10	7	8	9	8	3	2	11	4	-			1	1	-	-	-	-
	%	11%	3%	5%	12%	17%	7%	7%	37%	13%	-			1%	1%	-	-	-	-
TOTAL # and % of Enrollment	#	251	205	167	78	48	45	29	21	30	65			103	117	93	55	56	50
	%	98%	97%	70%		19%	21%		11%	12%	27%				46%	43%		20%	19%

Conclusions indicated by the data & discussion:

1. GM8 data indicates looping was successful. Continue to monitor through Algebra.
2. GM7 decrease (lack of GATE) Harper (57%w75% enrolled); Emerson (69%w89%enr) Many are now the TM8 class. Support? Emer has clinic here, but then students lose elective and would have looped teachers for 3 classes, may be too much.
3. GM9 decrease in FBB, increase in B; low proficient. Try new intervention materials. Change in State Framework this year.
4. Which of these scores are RSP class kids? Lack of coordination with regular classroom teacher. Materials they're using?
5. Anticipate lower success in Alg9 as kids are really being pushed...we're hopeful, but wary.

Source: CDE 8/07

Table 2b: Academic Performance by Course

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		Geometry 8			Geometry 9			Algebra II, Trig		
		05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#	77	66	59	50	67	69	62	67	53
	%	95%	89%	98%	76%	71%	68%	79%	85%	78%
Number and Percent At Basic	#	4	8	1	14	24	27	15	11	12
	%	5%	11%	2%	21%	26%	26%	19%	14%	18%
Number and Percent Below Basic	#	-	-	-	-	3	6	1	1	3
	%	-	-	-	-	3%	6%	1%	1%	4%
Number and Percent Far Below Basic	#	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
	%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL # and % of Enrollment	#	81	74	60	66	94	102	78	79	68
	%		29%	28%		35%	39%		29%	26%

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. AlgTrig lower as students couldn't take Alg II at HS due to scheduling snafu. Not a problem this year.
2. Geo 9 low performance – we don't know why. CST's school wide overall as 8th graders were lower the previous year
3. Geo 8 increase.

Source: CDE 8/07

Table 3: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Met 17 of 17 criteria

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																										
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian			Hispanic			English Learners			Redesignated -Fluent English Proficient			Socioecon Disadv			Students w/Disabilities		
	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	04	05	06	04	05	06
Participat i Rate %	99	99	98	99	100	97	100	96	100	100	99	100	100	97	100	100	95	100		-		99	99	97	100	98	95
Number At or Above Proficie	375	336	309	246	228	205	8	11	9	84	76	76	21	17	13	14	22	19	49	54	39	32	30	24	20	13	10
Perc At or Above Proficie	75	78	73%	78	84	80%	47	52	45%	85	89	88%	33	37	26%	29	43	37%	80	83	71%	36	40	39%	38	33	31%
AYP Target		24	24%			Y					Y	Y									-			Y			Y
Met AYP Criteria	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		-	-	Y	Y	Y		-	-		-	-			-			-			-

Conclusions indicated by the data:/ Questions?

1. Hispanic is lowest performing group.
2. RFEP seeing success.
3. How many of the Hispanic low scores are due to language (EL)?

Source: CDE 9/07

Table 3 : Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) by %

Met 17 of 17 criteria

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																										
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian			Hispanic			English Learners			Redesignated - Fluent English Proficient			Socioecon Disadv			Students w/Disabilities		
	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07
Participat Rate %	99	99	98	99	99	96	98	96	100	98	99	100	100	97	100	99	95	100	-	-	-	99	97	98	98	92	94
Number At or Above Proficient	374	322	313	246	211	199	10	11	9	89	79	76	23	17	21	16	25	27	44	53	43	32	25	30	12	12	7
Percent At or Above Proficient	75	75	75%	78	78	79%	59	52	45%	92	93	92%	37	37	41%	33	49	53%	73	80	77%	43	40	38%	31	39	19%
AYP Target		27	27%		Y	Y					Y	Y											Y	Y			
Met AYP Criteria	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. White, AA & Hispanic perform poorly compared to Asian.
2. RFEP comparable to White %.
3. SED 7th and 8th are lowest performing on CST.

Source: CDE 9/07

Table 5: California English Language Development (CELDT) Data

Source: Spring 07, DOE * new scale used

EL Students by Grade	California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Results										
	Advanced		Early Advanced		Intermediate		Early Intermediate		Beginning		Number Tested
	06	07	06	07	06	07	06	07	06	07	#
7	2	10	4	7	5	4	1	2	5	0	23
8	5	5	7	6	6	1	5	0	1	3	15
9	4	2	6	8	4	12	2	4	3	0	26
Migrant (Cruncher)	1	0	5	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	6
Total	12	17	22	21	19	17	8	6	9	3	70

	EL	RFEP	IFEP	Redesignated
06	60	66	69	3
07	68	71	55	7

Conclusions indicated by the data: / Questions?
1. What is the rate of change (in/out of program) for EL students? 58 not prof in LA, 36 have EL date prior to 2003 62%. 32 not prof in Math, 27 have EL date prior to 2003. 84%
2.
3.

Table 6: Academic Performance by Grade Level

Science

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		Grade: 8			Grade: 9 Biology			Grade: 9 Earth Science		
		05	06	07	05	06	07	05	06	07
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#		180	164		140	135		38	41
	%		72%	82%		96%	90%		51%	50%
Number and Percent At Basic	#		43	20		6	15		27	20
	%		17%	10%		4%	10%		36%	25%
Number and Percent Below Basic	#		19	9			1		6	14
	%		8%	5%			1%		8%	17%
Number and Percent Far Below Basic	#		10	6					4	6
	%		4%	3%					5%	7%
TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENT	#		252	215		146	151		75	81
	%		98%	95%		53%	57%		27%	31%

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. Increase in grade 8 (possibly because prior cohort was lower group overall).
2. Two years ago, integrated science test was dismal. Better scores with course focus on Earth Sci. Still too much content for one year.
3. New adoption 7/8: very different approach in texts; both content strong; one is lab based (easy for our staff, may be harder for others).

Table 7: Academic Performance – Grade 8

Social Studies

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		Grade: 8 Soc Sci								
			06	07						
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#		160	137						
	%		64%	68%						
Number and Percent At Basic	#		46	31						
	%		18%	15%						
Number and Percent Below Basic	#		23	16						
	%		9%	8%						
Number and Percent Far Below Basic	#		22	17						
	%		9%	8%						
TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENT	#		251	201						
	%		98%	94%						

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. "Tests many obscure facts of recall; little interpretation or analysis."
 2. This year's 8th graders will be first to test in new adoption – interesting to see if change.
 3. Look for Blueprints for dept use.
- ? Other schools don't do "core"; neither does GATE; does it matter?

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

<p>SCHOOL GOAL # 1 Provide a school environment where all students feel safe, connected and motivated to succeed.</p>				
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: 7th, 8th and 9th graders</p>		<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: 5%</p>		
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Monitoring of unexcused absences/tardies, discipline referrals, at-risk student involvement in activities, feedback from student focus groups</p>		<p>Group data to be collected to measure gains: # unexcused absences/tardies, # discipline referrals, % positive responses on climate questions on student survey, # at-risk students involved in athletics, clubs, leadership.</p>		
<p>Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal * = repeated in later goals</p>	<p>Start Date Complete Date</p>	<p>Proposed Expenditure * = repeated</p>	<p>Estimated Cost</p>	<p>Funding Source</p>
<p>1. Reduce absenteeism and tardies for at-risk students through immediate follow-up with parents and students and the SART process.</p>	<p>2007-08</p>			<p>Counseling and VP</p>
<p>2. Increase student connectedness to school.</p> <p>WEB program in the fall & target struggling students later in the year.</p> <p>If possible in the master schedule reinstate 7th grade cores with 3 teachers, one group of students and a common prep.</p> <p>Work with the District Bilingual Office to improve communication with Spanish-speaking families.*</p> <p>Make school to career connections for students (Career Day, general curriculum, 9th grade goal setting & career pathways).</p> <p>Provide more opportunities for at-risk students to contribute to the school (eg. Mix-It-Up, mentoring and goal-setting groups)</p> <p>Support at-risk students in extra-curricular activities such as athletics, clubs & drama.</p> <p>Continue to offer a variety of elective choices and support participation of at-risk students in at least one elective class.</p>	<p>2007 - 08</p>	<p>.2 FTE Coordinator</p> <p>Counselor Admin. staff</p> <p>*Translator time 20 hrs</p> <p>Counselor</p> <p>Act. Director Counselor</p> <p>Counseling Athletic dir Staff</p> <p>Counseling</p>	<p>\$12,000</p> <p>NA</p> <p>\$500</p>	<p>PTA D.A.T.E. Peer Helping</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>EIA</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p>

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

<p>SCHOOL GOAL # 2 Increase percent of classes for which at-risk students are turning in quality work and passing with a C or better.</p>				
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: 7th, 8th and 9th graders</p>		<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: 5%</p>		
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Progress reports and quarter grades</p>		<p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Final semester grades</p>		
<p>Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions * = repeated in other goals</p>	<p>Start Date Compl Date</p>	<p>Proposed Expenditure * =repeated</p>	<p>Estimated Cost</p>	<p>Funding Source</p>
<p>1. Provide targeted academic support. Provide academic support classes: 8th grade English and Science, 9th grade English, Algebra clinic and English Learner support *</p> <p>Provide targeted reading instruction English class for 7th graders *</p> <p>Special education study skills program.</p> <p>Assess EL students with passing CELDT scores who are not academically successful for learning disabilities when appropriate through study team.</p> <p>Provide intensive 3 year math curriculum for at-risk students in a smaller class size. (Goal of Algebra in 9th grade.)</p> <p>Provide paraeducator support in many academic classes. *</p> <p>Continue and improve after school homework club with accountability and access to computers.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Continued on next page</i></p>	<p>2007 - 08</p>	<p>*1.0 FTE teachers *.2 FTE Teacher SpecEd Staff SpecEd Counselor .6 FTE *4.0 FTE Paraedu Hourly teacher</p>	<p>\$15,000 \$10,000 \$12,000 \$15,000 \$40,000 \$13,000 \$50,000 \$ 7,500 \$ 3,000 \$32,000</p>	<p>Fed CSR Grant EIA Title I General Fund Special Ed General Fund Special Ed Target Ins Imp ELAP Title I State IIP funds</p>

<p>2. Provide general study skills support</p> <p>Guide students in regular use of the school planner in grades 7 & 8. Improve layout for next year.</p> <p>Refer failing students to CARE team for data collection and interventions. Team will communicate with staff and monitor success of interventions.</p> <p>Conduct meetings and follow-up process with D/F students. Develop system of counselor feedback to teachers within limits of confidentiality.</p> <p>Provide parent education meetings about how to support students at home with school success.</p> <p>Provide Spanish and other EL speaking parents with translations and personal invitations to school meetings. (increasing Korean families) *</p>	2007-8	<p>Teaching Staff</p> <p>Teaching Staff</p> <p>Counselling</p> <p>*Translator time</p>		<p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>PTA</p> <p>EIA</p>
<p>3. Begin discussion with district staff about resuming AVID program in jr. highs</p>	2007-8	Staff time	NA	General Fund

2/12/2008

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

SCHOOL GOAL # 3 Increase the percent of students performing at proficient or better in ELA/Math and passing the CAHSEE in 10th grade.				
Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: 7th, 8th and 9th graders		Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: 5%		
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Assessments in standards-based adoptions, teacher assessments		Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: CST scores		
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal * = repeated from earlier goal	Start Date Compleat Date	Proposed Expenditure * repeated	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>1. Provide access and support in grade level standards courses.</p> <p>Enroll at-risk students in general education classes with support from paraeducators.*</p> <p>Enroll at-risk students in academic support classes: 8th grade English, 9th grade English, Algebra clinic and English Learner support class. Develop effective communication system for general ed teachers to communicate with support teachers.*</p> <p>Provide targeted reading instruction English class for 7th graders *</p> <p>Create an intensive 3 year math curriculum for at-risk students in smaller classes. Design curriculum for students to successfully complete Algebra in gr 9 or 10.*</p>	2007-8	<p>*4.0 FTE</p> <p>*1.0 FTE</p> <p>* .2 FTE Teacher</p> <p>.6 FTE</p>	<p>\$50,000 \$ 7,500 \$ 3,000 \$32,000</p> <p>\$15,000 \$10,000 \$12,000</p> <p>\$15,000</p> <p>\$40,000 \$13,000</p>	<p>Special Ed Target Ins Imp ELAP Title I</p> <p>Fed CSR Grant EIA Title I</p> <p>Fed CSR Grant</p> <p>At-risk/Learning Ctr Title I</p>
2. Provide intensive English Language Development core program for beginning and intermediate English Learners. *	2007-8	*.6 FTE	\$17,000 \$13,000 * \$13,000	General Fund
3. Provide access to grade level standards through Special Education courses in study skills, reading and math.	2007-8	1.8 FTE	\$135,000	Special Ed
4. Increase counseling support for at-risk students. Work to find resources to address underlying issues such as emotional well-being, stresses at home and goal setting.	2007-8	Counseling		General Fund

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

<p>SCHOOL GOAL # 4 Improve literacy skills for low-performing students and, in particular, Spanish speaking English learners</p>				
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: 7th, 8th and 9th graders</p>		<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: 5%</p>		
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: EL progress tests through High Point program, grades for at-risk students in academic classes.</p>		<p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: CELDT and CST scores</p>		
<p>Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal * = repeated in other goals</p>	<p>Start Date Comple Date</p>	<p>Proposed Expenditure * repeated</p>	<p>Estimated Cost</p>	<p>Funding Source</p>
<p>1. Expand capacity of staff to make instruction accessible to English Learners.</p> <p>Provide staff support to increase academic success of EL students.</p> <p>Increase number of CLAD certified teachers and provide staff development in effective instructional strategies.</p>	<p>2007-8</p>			<p>District Office</p>
<p>2. Provide targeted academic support to EL students.</p> <p>Focus on reading comprehension in content areas as well as literature in English support classes for 8th and 9th.</p> <p>Focus on vocabulary development and literacy in English in the English Language Development core program for English learners. *</p> <p>Focus on content vocabulary development in subject areas.</p> <p>Provide targeted reading instruction in special 7th grade English class and 8th and 9th graders in the special education classroom. *</p>	<p>2007-8</p>	<p>.4 FTE teacher</p> <p>*.6 FTE</p> <p>*.2 FTE SpecEd</p>	<p>\$30,000</p> <p>\$17,000 \$13,000 \$13,000</p> <p>\$15,000</p>	<p>Fed CSR Grant</p> <p>At-risk Gen Fund EIA Title I</p> <p>Fed CSR Grant Spec Ed</p>
<p>3. Provide targeted homework support for EL students</p> <p>Focus on content vocabulary development in subject areas</p>	<p>2007-8</p>		<p>\$1000</p>	<p>At-risk Gen Fund</p>

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

SCHOOL GOAL # 5					
Increase technology access and literacy and library resources for all students.					
Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: 7 th , 8 th and 9 th graders		Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:			
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Inventory hardware and software at site and in classrooms serving at-risk students. Library collection analysis.		Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: % positive responses on technology question on student survey, at-risk student use of computer-aided instructional programs.			
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)		Start Date Completi Date	Propose Expenditure	Estimate Cost	Funding Source
1. Provide on-site technology specialist time to teachers.		2007-8	.2 FTE Teacher on special assign	\$18,200	SLIP
2. Maintain computer access for at-risk students in classrooms and in library.			Staff	NA	General Fund
3. Use technology to make curriculum accessible to struggling students (LCD projectors, computers, etc.) Provide equipment and teacher training.		2007-8	Hardware purchase	\$2500	Tandem Grant
4. Use/purchase software targeting literacy, basic math, typing and writing skills for special ed and support classes (Accelerated Math & Reader, Inspiration, Type to Learn, Read Naturally).		2007-8	Software purchase	\$2,000	Title I
5. Maintain and enrich library collection for all students.		2007-8	Library books	\$5,000	Title V, PTA, Davis Educational Foundation, general fund

2/12/2008

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

SCHOOL GOAL # 6 Increase the number of students successfully completing Algebra by the end of 9th grade.					
Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: <p style="text-align: center;">7th, 8th and 9th graders</p>		Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: <p style="text-align: center;">5%</p>			
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: <p style="text-align: center;">Progress reports and quarter grades</p>		Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: <p style="text-align: center;">Final semester grades CST scores for 9th graders</p>			
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal * = repeated in earlier goal		Start Date Complet Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. Loop low-performing students in smaller class sizes with the same teacher in grades 7 & 8 * <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create curriculum to target prealgebra to low-performing students and purchase materials to increase their pace. • Monitor progress and collect data about growth. 		2007-8	*.15 FTE Staff time School Coor	\$13,000 NA \$1,000	General Fund Gen Fund SLIP
2. Provide a small enrollment algebra clinic to 9 th graders needing additional support. Structure the curriculum, monitor progress and collect data about growth.		2007-8	*.2 FTE	\$12,000	General Fund

2/12/2008

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

SCHOOL GOAL # 7					
Increase % of students in cardio fitness levels that are “within or exceeds” standards of the CA Physical Fitness Test					
Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: 7 th and 9 th graders			Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: 5%		
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Student reported goal setting			Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: HFZ Percentage Report		
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)		Start Date Completi on Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimate Cost	Funding Source
1. Focus on building aerobic capacity in PE activities in grades 7, 8, 9		2006-7	Staff time	NA	General fund

% in HFZ	05	06	07	Other (5%)
Grade 7	75.9%	75.9%	80.1%	-abdominal & upper & flexibility
Grade 9	67.1%	64.8%	78.9%	+flexibility & upper body

Form B: Centralized Support for Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The school site council has analyzed the planned program improvements and has adopted the following program support goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of student groups not meeting state standards:

PROGRAM SUPPORT GOAL # 1				
Increase student access to core curriculum				
Groups participating in this goal (e.g., students, parents, teachers, administrators):		Anticipated annual growth for each group:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Classroom teachers and administrators 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increase in the numbers of teachers that have received training ○ Establish teachers' self-reported instructional effectiveness baseline 		
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal:		Group data to be collected to measure gains:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attendance sheets from trainings ○ Staff development workshop evaluations ○ Staff surveys completed midyear and end of school year 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See School Site Plan for specific measurable goals for student achievement within student subgroups. 		
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal ² Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date ³ Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<i>Unconscious Bias</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide <i>Unconscious Bias</i> training for certificated staff K-12. ▪ Provide Cognitive Inquiry Groups (CIG) that extend <i>Unconscious Bias</i> training <i>Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide district coordination of AVID program expansion in 9-12 grade ▪ Provide AVID training to teachers and administrators 7-12 grade 	August 07	Teacher Buy Back for training	\$28,420	Prof Dev Block Grant (PDBG) Title II
	Nov 07 – June 08	Materials Buy Back	\$2,000 \$12,250	School & Library Improvement Block Grant (SLIBG) / PDBG
	July 07 – June 08	District coordinator	\$50,000	EIA
	Jan – August 08	AVID Workshops	\$9,000	TIIG

² See *Appendix B: Chart of Requirements for the SPSA* for content required by each program or funding source supporting this goal.

³ List the date an action will be taken or will begin, and the date it will be completed.

<p><i>English Learners</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide <i>GLAD</i> staff development opportunities and workshop training materials for K-8 grade teachers <p><i>English Learners (continued)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Districtwide grade level articulation meetings to develop lessons ▪ Release time for teacher peer observations ▪ Develop strategies to improve achievement of EL students ▪ Buy Back Staff Development workshop ▪ All sites learn how to develop data-driven instructional strategies to support English learners & EL achievement (West Ed) ▪ Secondary school teachers attend Writing Reform Institute for Teaching Excellence (WRITE) ▪ High school teachers attend CAHSEE Writing Assessment Preparation Workshop <p><i>Special Education</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Special education training to provide Kindergarten – twelfth grade instructional support in the area of intervention training (<i>Language!</i>, <i>Read Well</i>) ▪ Train teachers to support students with sensory motor integration issues 	July 07 – June 08	GLAD trainers & materials	\$32,000	PDBG /Title II
	Jan 2008	Materials	\$2000	PDBG /Title II
	Dec 07- June 08	Substitutes	\$5000	PDBG /Title II
	Aug 07	Bonnie Bishop training	\$18,000	PDBG /Title II
	Sept 07	Bonnie Bishop Buy Back workshop	\$8000	PDBG /Title II
	Aug 07	Consultant fees Materials	\$70,000 \$13,000	Title III PDBG
	Sept 07 – June 08	Workshop fees	\$2,400	Title II
	Aug 07 – June 08	Workshop fees	\$1,000	PDBG / Title II
	Feb 07 – June 08	Consultant fees Release time	\$7,500	Title I; Title II; Instructional Materials Fund
	Aug 07	Consultant fee Buy Back	\$2000	PDBG

Form B: Centralized Support for Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The school site council has analyzed the planned program improvements and has adopted the following program support goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of student groups not meeting state standards:

PROGRAM SUPPORT GOAL # 3				
Develop standards-based curriculum (preschool, science, social studies, career technical education (CTE), and visual/performing arts (VAPA))				
Groups participating in this goal (e.g., students, parents, teachers, administrators):		Anticipated annual growth for each group:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Classroom teachers 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o N/A 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: o Attendance sheet of meetings o Curriculum scope and sequence for preschool, social studies, CTE, & VAPA o Identification of instructional materials for science 		Group data to be collected to measure gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o N/A 		
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal ⁴ Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date ⁵ Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<i>Preschool</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide release time for preschool teachers to focus on development of preschool curriculum to prepare pre-K students for kindergarten. 	Aug 07 – June 08	Release time	\$1000	Title I
<i>Science</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Science pilot training workshop / implementation workshop 	Mar 07 – Jan 09	N/A	N/A	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation of science instructional materials in recommendation to the board of Education for 	Mar 07 – Jan 09	Release time	\$8,000	Title II / SLIBG
			\$6,370	PDBG

⁴ See *Appendix B: Chart of Requirements for the SPSA* for content required by each program or funding source supporting this goal.

⁵ List the date an action will be taken or will begin, and the date it will be completed.

<p>adoptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buy Back training for implementation of science adoption materials 	Mar 07 – Jan 09	Buy Back		
	Aug 07 – Feb 08	Buy Back	\$19,600	PDBG
<i>Social Studies</i>	Aug 07 – Feb 08	Grade level articulation meetings	N/A	General Fund
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buy Back training for implementation of social studies adoption materials Review social studies adoption progress and explore best practices 	Oct 07	CTE coordinator(s) Supplies	\$14,000	CTE
<i>Career Technical Education (CTE)</i>	Aug 07 – June 08	Release time	\$2,000	Title II
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop CTE industry advisory board Develop integrated 7-12 grade CTE plan 	Dec 06 – June 08	Consultant fee	\$5,000	Arts, Music, PE BG
<i>Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA)</i>	Dec 06 – June 08	Release time	\$2,000	Arts, Music, PE BG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop articulated K-12 VAPA curriculum based on California content standards Develop K-12 VAPA plan 				

