# School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) 

| School Name | County-District-School <br> (CDS) Code |
| :--- | :--- |
| Dingle Elementary | 57727100000000 |
| School |  |

Schoolsite Council (SSC) Approval Date

May 7, 2019

Local Board Approval Date

June 13, 2019

## Purpose and Description

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

Briefly describe the school's plan for effectively meeting the ESSA requirements in alignment with the Local Control and Accountability Plan and other federal, state, and local programs.
The School Wide Plan meets the ESSA requirements through:
A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire schools that includes information on the academic achievement of students in relation to the challenging state academic standards, particularly the needs of those students who are failing, or are at risk of failing, to meet the challenging state academic standards.: Various stakeholders; (All staff, school leadership team, student leadership team, ELAC, and SSC) were led through a needs assessment process which included reviewing school data, identifying greatest progress, greatest needs, performance gaps, and root causes. Stakeholders were then asked to identify 3-5 primary change ideas (strategies/activities).
The school wide plan was developed to support the needs of the students in the school as identified through the comprehensive needs assessment. These include:
strategies that the school is implementing to address the school needs by providing opportunities for all students to meet the challenging state academic standards
the use of methods and instructional strategies that strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum
programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well rounded education, and strategies that address the needs of all students in the school, but particularly the needs of those students at risk of not meeting the challenging academic standards.

The school wide plan addresses parent and family engagement by conducting outreach to all parents and family members, including:
a school and family engagement policy
a school and parent compact that addresses shared responsibility for high student academic achievement, and building capacity for involvement.

## Stakeholder Involvement

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

## Involvement Process for the SPSA and Annual Review and Update

The school consulted with various stakeholder groups during the planning process for this SPSA/Annual Review and Update. A team of Dingle teachers and specialists initially met with support staff from Ed Services department on February 6, 2019 to model how to go through the needs assessment protocol using our own data. Dingle's team then shared this needs assessment process with the entire staff on February 13, 2019. On February 27, 2019 the Dingle Leadership team reviewed the needs assessment data generated by the staff and identified change ideas. Our parents were an integral part of our needs assessment process. Parents who attended the Title 1 Parent Meeting on February 13, 2019 reviewed school data and identified needs assessment around parent engagement. Additionally, during the February 5, 2019 ELAC meeting, parents drafted a needs assessment survey that went out to all of our English learner families (47\% of school population). The results were presented at the March 5, 2019 ELAC meeting, and parents identified progress and needs for Dingle English learners and families. Members of the School Site Council participated in the needs assessment process on March 19, 2019. Finally, the student leadership team participated in needs assessment on March 12, 2019.

## Resource Inequities

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

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Enrollment <br> Enrollment By Student Group

| Student Enrollment by Subgroup |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Percent of Enrollment |  |  | Number of Students |  |  |
|  | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 |
| American Indian | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.28\% | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| African American | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 1.66\% | 7 | 8 | 6 |
| Asian | 1.6\% | 2.3\% | 2.77\% | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| Filipino | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.28\% | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 81.1\% | 78.7\% | 78.12\% | 314 | 270 | 282 |
| Pacific Islander | \% | \% | 0.28\% |  |  | 1 |
| White | 14.0\% | 14.9\% | 14.68\% | 54 | 51 | 53 |
| Multiple/No Response | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.83\% | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Total Enrollment |  |  | 387 | 343 | 361 |

## Student Enrollment

 Enrollment By Grade Level| Grade | Student Enrollment by Grade Level |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ |
| Kindergarten | 89 | 78 | 89 |
| Grade 1 | 39 | 43 | 48 |
| Grade 2 | 48 | 36 | 44 |
| Grade3 | 47 | 42 | 40 |
| Grade 4 | 52 | 47 | 45 |
| Grade 5 | 51 | 47 | 47 |
| Grade 6 | 61 | 50 | 48 |
| Total Enrollment | 387 | 343 | 361 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Our TK enrollment is reflected in the Kindergarten total enrollment. During the 16-17 school year, our TK enrollment was low in both classrooms. During the 17-18 school year our TK enrollment increased by 4 students and our Kindergarten enrollment increased by 7 students.
2. Our dual immersion classrooms are at capacity, and as we continue to expand each year, we anticipate our enrollment will also increase.

## School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment
English Learner (EL) Enrollment

| English Learner (EL) Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Number of Students |  | Percent of Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ |  |  |  |
| English Learners | 194 | 166 | 171 | $50.1 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 4} \%$ | $47.4 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) | 39 | 37 | 35 | $10.1 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) | 21 | 17 | 18 | $10.9 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ |  |  |  |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Since the inception of our Dual Immersion program in 16-17, we have experienced small incremental declines in our total English learner population. This may be attributed to the required ratio of native English speakers to bilingual native Spanish speakers in a dual immersion classroom.

## School and Student Performance Data

## CAASPP Results <br> English Language Arts/Literacy (All Students)

| Overall Participation for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \# of Students Enrolled |  |  | \# of Students Tested |  |  | \# of Students with |  |  | \% of Students Tested |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 47 | 43 | 40 | 46 | 41 | 40 | 46 | 41 | 40 | 97.9 | 95.3 | 100 |
| Grade 4 | 52 | 47 | 48 | 50 | 47 | 46 | 50 | 47 | 46 | 96.2 | 100 | 95.8 |
| Grade 5 | 50 | 45 | 51 | 50 | 45 | 51 | 50 | 45 | 51 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Grade 6 | 65 | 50 | 46 | 64 | 49 | 45 | 64 | 49 | 45 | 98.5 | 98 | 97.8 |
| All Grades | 214 | 185 | 185 | 210 | 182 | 182 | 210 | 182 | 182 | 98.1 | 98.4 | 98.4 |


| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard Exceeded |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Standard } \\ \text { Met } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | \% Standard <br> Nearly Met |  |  | \% Standard Not Met |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 2375. | 2395. | 2357. | 9 | 9.76 | 2.50 | 20 | 24.39 | 12.50 | 20 | 31.71 | 35.00 | 52 | 34.15 | 50.00 |
| Grade 4 | 2403. | 2410. | 2410. | 8 | 8.51 | 10.87 | 14 | 14.89 | 15.22 | 18 | 25.53 | 19.57 | 60 | 51.06 | 54.35 |
| Grade 5 | 2435. | 2435. | 2451. | 6 | 8.89 | 9.80 | 18 | 13.33 | 15.69 | 14 | 17.78 | 29.41 | 62 | 60.00 | 45.10 |
| Grade 6 | 2474. | 2472. | 2469. | 5 | 4.08 | 4.44 | 16 | 18.37 | 24.44 | 34 | 36.73 | 26.67 | 45 | 40.82 | 44.44 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 7 | 7.69 | 7.14 | 17 | 17.58 | 17.03 | 22 | 28.02 | 27.47 | 54 | 46.70 | 48.35 |


| Reading <br> Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 16 | 17.07 | 5.00 | 31 | 53.66 | 40.00 | 53 | 29.27 | 55.00 |
| Grade 4 | 8 | 8.51 | 13.04 | 40 | 44.68 | 52.17 | 52 | 46.81 | 34.78 |
| Grade 5 | 10 | 11.11 | 9.80 | 38 | 42.22 | 37.25 | 52 | 46.67 | 52.94 |
| Grade 6 | 8 | 8.16 | 11.11 | 42 | 44.90 | 40.00 | 50 | 46.94 | 48.89 |
| All Grades | 10 | 10.99 | 9.89 | 38 | 46.15 | 42.31 | 52 | 42.86 | 47.80 |

Writing
Producing clear and purposeful writing

| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ |  |
| Grade 3 | 13 | 9.76 | 2.50 | 27 | 46.34 | 35.00 | 60 | 43.90 | 62.50 |  |
| Grade 4 | 6 | 10.64 | 4.35 | 42 | 46.81 | 41.30 | 52 | 42.55 | 54.35 |  |
| Grade 5 | 10 | 11.11 | 11.76 | 32 | 37.78 | 43.14 | 58 | 51.11 | 45.10 |  |
| Grade 6 | 8 | 8.16 | 6.67 | 36 | 40.82 | 42.22 | 56 | 51.02 | 51.11 |  |
| All Grades | 9 | 9.89 | 6.59 | 34 | 42.86 | 40.66 | 56 | 47.25 | 52.75 |  |


| Listening |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 3 | 7 | 9.76 | 5.00 | 71 | 63.41 | 50.00 | 22 | 26.83 | 45.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 | 16 | 6.38 | 10.87 | 52 | 42.55 | 63.04 | 32 | 51.06 | 26.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 5 | 6 | 8.89 | 9.80 | 64 | 44.44 | 64.71 | 30 | 46.67 | 25.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 6 | 6 | 10.20 | 11.11 | 77 | 57.14 | 57.78 | 17 | 32.65 | 31.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Grades | 9 | 8.79 | 9.34 | 67 | 51.65 | 59.34 | 25 | 39.56 | 31.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 11 | 9.76 | 5.00 | 44 | 53.66 | 47.50 | 44 | 36.59 | 47.50 |
| Grade 4 | 8 | 8.51 | 8.70 | 46 | 46.81 | 45.65 | 46 | 44.68 | 45.65 |
| Grade 5 | 14 | 4.44 | 11.76 | 52 | 42.22 | 47.06 | 34 | 53.33 | 41.18 |
| Grade 6 | 6 | 6.12 | 24.44 | 72 | 57.14 | 35.56 | 22 | 36.73 | 40.00 |
| All Grades | 10 | 7.14 | 12.64 | 55 | 50.00 | 43.96 | 35 | 42.86 | 43.41 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. 3 year SBAC ELA analysis shows that there has been minimal improvement. Data suggests that students need early and targeted intervention in foundational reading skills as well as increased opportunities for guided reading.
2. Data suggests that targeted support in writing in necessary. During the $17-18$ school year, $52.5 \%$ of students scored below standard in the sub domain of writing.
3. English learners increased performance by 3.9 points.

## School and Student Performance Data

## CAASPP Results <br> Mathematics (All Students)

| Overall Participation for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \# of Students Enrolled |  |  | \# of Students Tested |  |  | \# of Students with Scores |  |  | \% of Students Tested |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 47 | 43 | 40 | 47 | 41 | 40 | 47 | 41 | 40 | 100 | 95.3 | 100 |
| Grade 4 | 52 | 47 | 48 | 50 | 47 | 46 | 50 | 47 | 46 | 96.2 | 100 | 95.8 |
| Grade 5 | 50 | 45 | 51 | 50 | 45 | 51 | 49 | 45 | 51 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Grade 6 | 65 | 50 | 46 | 64 | 50 | 45 | 63 | 49 | 45 | 98.5 | 100 | 97.8 |
| All Grades | 214 | 185 | 185 | 211 | 183 | 182 | 209 | 182 | 182 | 98.6 | 98.9 | 98.4 |


| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard Exceeded |  |  | \% Standard Met |  |  | \% Standard Nearly Met |  |  | \% Standard Not Met |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 2391. | 2397. | 2349. | 6 | 9.76 | 0.00 | 21 | 19.51 | 10.00 | 30 | 34.15 | 27.50 | 43 | 36.59 | 62.50 |
| Grade 4 | 2414. | 2429. | 2430. | 2 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 14 | 19.15 | 23.91 | 36 | 36.17 | 39.13 | 48 | 40.43 | 32.61 |
| Grade 5 | 2439. | 2439. | 2445. | 6 | 6.67 | 5.88 | 6 | 4.44 | 11.76 | 24 | 33.33 | 29.41 | 63 | 55.56 | 52.94 |
| Grade 6 | 2448. | 2451. | 2458. | 5 | 2.04 | 4.44 | 8 | 8.16 | 11.11 | 27 | 28.57 | 35.56 | 60 | 61.22 | 48.89 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 5 | 5.49 | 3.85 | 12 | 12.64 | 14.29 | 29 | 32.97 | 32.97 | 54 | 48.90 | 48.90 |


| Concepts \& Procedures Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 15 | 14.63 | 0.00 | 40 | 41.46 | 32.50 | 45 | 43.90 | 67.50 |
| Grade 4 | 4 | 12.77 | 10.87 | 28 | 34.04 | 32.61 | 68 | 53.19 | 56.52 |
| Grade 5 | 10 | 8.89 | 5.88 | 16 | 26.67 | 27.45 | 73 | 64.44 | 66.67 |
| Grade 6 | 5 | 6.12 | 11.11 | 24 | 22.45 | 31.11 | 71 | 71.43 | 57.78 |
| All Grades | 8 | 10.44 | 7.14 | 27 | 30.77 | 30.77 | 65 | 58.79 | 62.09 |

Problem Solving \& Modeling/Data Analysis Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems

| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ |
| Grade 3 | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 14.63 | 5.00 | 40 | 46.34 | 30.00 | 49 | 39.02 | 65.00 |
| Grade 4 | 0 | 6.38 | 8.70 | 36 | 42.55 | 43.48 | 64 | 51.06 | 47.83 |
| Grade 5 | 6 | 4.44 | 1.96 | 33 | 35.56 | 35.29 | 61 | 60.00 | 62.75 |
| Grade 6 | 2 | 2.04 | 6.67 | 37 | 32.65 | 37.78 | 62 | 65.31 | 55.56 |
| All Grades | 4 | 6.59 | 5.49 | 36 | 39.01 | 36.81 | 59 | 54.40 | 57.69 |


| Communicating Reasoning Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Grade 3 | 17 | 17.07 | 5.00 | 47 | 48.78 | 35.00 | 36 | 34.15 | 60.00 |
| Grade 4 | 4 | 10.64 | 8.70 | 40 | 38.30 | 45.65 | 56 | 51.06 | 45.65 |
| Grade 5 | 2 | 2.22 | 7.84 | 35 | 37.78 | 39.22 | 63 | 60.00 | 52.94 |
| Grade 6 | 6 | 4.08 | 0.00 | 41 | 36.73 | 35.56 | 52 | 59.18 | 64.44 |
| All Grades | 7 | 8.24 | 5.49 | 41 | 40.11 | 39.01 | 52 | 51.65 | 55.49 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. In comparison to 16-17 data, last year our CAASPP Math data shows that overall, we declined by 4 points. As a school, we showed the most decline in math overall as compared to ELA.
2. Data suggests that when English learners are reclassified, they tend to continue to make progress in math. RFEP students increased by 20 points. English learners declined by 13.5 points. As a group, RFEP students out performed all other subgroups.

## School and Student Performance Data

## ELPAC Results

| Number of Students and Mean Scale Scores for All Students |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Overall | Oral Language | Written Language | Number of <br> Students Tested |
| Grade K | 1421.1 | 1432.3 | 1395.0 | 45 |
| Grade 1 | 1463.1 | 1465.4 | 1460.4 | 18 |
| Grade 2 | 1471.1 | 1476.5 | 1465.0 | 21 |
| Grade 3 | 1486.5 | 1481.3 | 1491.5 | 22 |
| Grade 4 | 1500.8 | 1491.1 | 1510.3 | 13 |
| Grade 5 | 1516.4 | 1504.2 | 1528.0 | 19 |
| Grade 6 | 1521.8 | 1518.4 | 1524.5 | 16 |
| All Grades |  |  |  | 154 |


| Overall Language <br> Number and Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |
| Level | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |  |
| Grade K | 12 | 26.67 | 14 | 31.11 | 17 | 37.78 | * | * | 45 |
| Grade 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * |  |  | 18 |
| Grade 2 | * | * | 11 | 52.38 | * | * |  |  | 21 |
| Grade 3 |  |  | * | * | * | * | * | * | 22 |
| Grade 4 |  |  | * | * | * | * | * | * | 13 |
| Grade 5 | * | * | 13 | 68.42 |  |  | * | * | 19 |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 16 |
| All Grades | 35 | 22.73 | 71 | 46.10 | 37 | 24.03 | 11 | 7.14 | 154 |

Oral Language
Number and Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students

| Grade <br>  | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of <br> Students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ |  |
| Grade 1 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 45 |
| Grade 2 | $*$ | $*$ | 15 | 71.43 |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| Grade 3 | $*$ | $*$ | 11 | 50.00 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 21 |
| Grade 4 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |  |  | 22 |
| Grade 5 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 13 |
| Grade 6 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |  |  | $*$ | $*$ | 19 |
| All Grades | 58 | 37.66 | 65 | 42.21 | 21 | 13.64 | $*$ | $*$ | 16 |


| Written Language <br> Number and Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |
| Level | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |  |
| Grade K | * | * | * | * | 18 | 40.00 | 11 | 24.44 | 45 |
| Grade 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 18 |
| Grade 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 21 |
| Grade 3 |  |  | * | * | 13 | 59.09 | * | * | 22 |
| Grade 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 13 |
| Grade 5 | * | * | 11 | 57.89 | * | * | * | * | 19 |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 16 |
| All Grades | 24 | 15.58 | 45 | 29.22 | 54 | 35.06 | 31 | 20.13 | 154 |


| Listening Domain <br> Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of Students |
| Grade K | 29 | 64.44 | 13 | 28.89 | * | * | 45 |
| Grade 1 | 15 | 83.33 | * | * | * | * | 18 |
| Grade 2 | * | * | 13 | 61.90 |  |  | 21 |
| Grade 3 | * | * | 15 | 68.18 | * | * | 22 |
| Grade 4 | * | * | * | * |  |  | 13 |
| Grade 5 | * | * | 11 | 57.89 |  |  | 19 |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | 16 |
| All Grades | 78 | 50.65 | 68 | 44.16 | * | * | 154 |

## Speaking Domain

| Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of <br> Students |  |
| Grade K | $*$ | $*$ | 28 | 62.22 | $*$ | $*$ | 45 |  |
| Grade 1 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 18 |  |
| Grade 2 | $*$ | $*$ | 12 | 57.14 |  |  | 21 |  |
| Grade 3 | $*$ | $*$ | 12 | 54.55 | $*$ | $*$ | 22 |  |
| Grade 4 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 13 |  |
| Grade 5 | 15 | 78.95 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 19 |  |
| Grade 6 | 11 | 68.75 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 16 |  |
| All Grades | 62 | 40.26 | 75 | 48.70 | 17 | 11.04 | 154 |  |


| Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of <br> Students |  |
| Grade K | $*$ | $*$ | 36 | 80.00 | $*$ | $*$ | 45 |  |
| Grade 1 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 18 |  |
| Grade 2 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 21 |  |
| Grade 3 |  |  | $*$ | $*$ | 13 | 59.09 | 22 |  |
| Grade 4 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 13 |  |
| Grade 5 | $*$ | $*$ | 15 | 78.95 | $*$ | $*$ | 19 |  |
| Grade 6 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 16 |  |
| All Grades | 27 | 17.53 | 86 | 55.84 | 41 | 26.62 | 154 |  |


| Number and Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of <br> Students |
| Grade K | 18 | 40.00 | 15 | 33.33 | 12 | 26.67 | 45 |
| Grade 1 | $*$ | $*$ | 13 | 72.22 | $*$ | $*$ | 18 |
| Grade 2 | $*$ | $*$ | 17 | 80.95 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Grade 3 | $*$ | $*$ | 14 | 63.64 | $*$ | $*$ | 21 |
| Grade 4 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 22 |
| Grade 5 | $*$ | $*$ | 11 | 57.89 | $*$ | $*$ | 13 |
| Grade 6 | $*$ | $*$ | 13 | 81.25 | $*$ | $*$ | 19 |
| All Grades | 40 | 25.97 | 92 | 59.74 | 22 | 14.29 | 16 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Only $22.73 \%$ of English Learners scored level 4 on ELPAC. Based on this data and new reclassification criteria, efforts to ensure students receive both integrated and designated ELD support are essential.
2. The domains of concern were reading ( $17.53 \%$ scoring level 4 ) and writing ( $25.97 \%$ scoring level 4 ).

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Population

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

| 2017-18 Student Population |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Enrollment | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | English Learners | Foster Youth |
| 361 | 74.0\% | 47.4\% | This is the percent of students whose well-being is the responsibility of a court. |
| This is the total number of students enrolled. | This is the percent of students who are eligible for free or reduced priced meals; or have parents/guardians who did not receive a high school diploma. | This is the percent of students who are learning to communicate effectively in English, typically requiring instruction in both the English Language and in their academic courses. |  |


| 2017-18 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| English Learners | 171 | $47.4 \%$ |
| Homeless | 10 | $2.8 \%$ |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 267 | $74.0 \%$ |
| Students with Disabilities | 36 | $10.0 \%$ |


| Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| African American | 6 | $1.7 \%$ |
| American Indian | 1 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Asian | 10 | $2.8 \%$ |
| Filipino | 1 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 282 | $78.1 \%$ |
| Two or More Races | 4 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | $0.3 \%$ |
| White | 53 | $14.7 \%$ |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Dingle has the second highest percentage of English learners in the district among elementary schools.
2. Dingle has $74 \%$ socioeconomically disadvantaged.
3. Dingle has $2.8 \%$ Homeless youth.

## School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

2018 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students

| Academic Performance |
| :---: |
| English Language Arts |
| Orange |


| Academic Engagement |
| :---: |
| Chronic Absenteeism |
| Orange |


| Conditions \& Climate |
| :---: |
| Suspension Rate |
| Orange |

English Learner Progress


No Performance Color

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Although Dingle has maintained its levels of achievement in most all areas, it is still the school with the lowest achievement, the highest socioeconomic \%, the highest homeless youth \%, the 2nd highest \% of English learners, and the highest \% of chronic absenteeism. Based on this data, and the summary of our needs assessment by all stakeholders, there is a significant need to support the social emotional needs of our students, improve student connectedness and sense of safety. Additionally, there is an urgent need to ensure that all students receive early intervention and targeted support in both reading and math.
2. Dingle declined status in Suspension Rate - from yellow to orange, with an increase in suspensions for students with special needs. Based on this data, Dingle needs to improve its MTSS (Multiple Systems of Support) at all levels to ensure that students have clear behavioral expectations and teachers have the knowledge and support to implement best first instruction that increases student engagement and sense of school connectedness.
3. Based on this data, Dingle has maintained its percentage of chronic absenteeism, which means that there is a need for a more coherent support system that includes the district homeless and attendance liaison, school counselor, school attendance clerk, and teacher.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance <br> English Language Arts

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


Green

Blue
Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

## 2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Equity Report

| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green | Blue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance for All Students/Student Group


## Students with Disabilities



No Performance Color
118.6 points below standard

Increased 5.4 points

29 students

## 2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance by Race/Ethnicity

| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 3 students | No Performance Color 0 Students | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 4 students | No Performance Color <br> 0 Students |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| Orange | No Performance Color | No Performance Color | No Performance Color |
| 65.4 points below standard | Less than 11 Students - Data | 0 Students | 8.2 points below standard |
| Maintained -1.4 points | 1 students |  | Increased 11.9 points |
| 140 students |  |  | 16 students |

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

## 2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner |
| :---: |
| 107.2 points below standard |
| Increased 3.9 points |
| 66 students |


| Reclassified English Learners |
| :---: |
| 2.7 points below standard |
| Maintained 2.5 points |
| 41 students |


| English Only |
| :---: |
| 49.4 points below standard |
| Declined -6.7 points |
| 56 students |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Based on data, there needs to be a targeted effort in supporting early interventions in foundational support in reading and writing.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance

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

$\underset{\text { Yellow }}{\text { T }}$

Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.
2018 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Equity Report

| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green | Blue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

2018 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance for All Students/Student Group


| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 133.3 points below standard |
| Increased 5.7 points |
| 29 students |



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

## 2018 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner | Reclassified English Learners | English Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121 points below standard | 20.7 points below standard | 71.7 points below standard |
| Declined - 13.5 points <br> 66 students | Increased 20 points 41 students | Declined -10.6 points <br> 56 students |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Data suggests that Dingle needs targeted and early interventions to support students with foundation math skills by addressing the 8 essential standards for math practices.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance <br> English Learner Progress

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

2018 Fall Dashboard English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Results

| Number of <br> Students | Level 4 <br> Well <br> Developed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $22.7 \%$ | Level 3 <br> Moderately <br> Developed |  |
| $46.1 \%$ | Level 2 <br> Somewhat <br> Developed | Level 1 <br> Beginning <br> Stage |
| $24 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ |  |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Based on review of ELPAC assessment and new reclassification criteria, a targeted focus must be made in increasing reading and writing achievement.
2. During the $17-18$ school year, $16(9 \%)$ of English learners (ELs) were dually identified as students with disabilities (SPED).

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance

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

| Lowest |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Performance | Red |  | Gellow | Highest <br> Perfformance |

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

## 2018 Fall Dashboard College/Career Equity Report

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

## 2018 Fall Dashboard College/Career for All Students/Student Group



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

2018 Fall Dashboard College/Career 3-Year Performance

| Class of 2016 | Class of 2017 | Class of 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prepared | Prepared | Prepared |
| Approaching Prepared | Approaching Prepared | Approaching Prepared |
| Not Prepared | Not Prepared | Not Prepared |

Conclusions based on this data:
1.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Engagement

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

$\underset{\text { Yellow }}{\text { T }}$

Green

Blue
Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

|  | 2018 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Equity Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green |
| 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

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

2018 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism for All Students/Student Group



| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| Yellow |
| $12 \%$ chronically absent |
| Declined $7.5 \%$ |
| 50 students |

## 2018 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity

| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 9 students | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 3 students | No Performance Color 8.3\% chronically absent <br> Maintained 0\% <br> 12 students | No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 1 students |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| $\prod_{\text {Yellow }}^{\uparrow}$ | No Performance Color | No Performance Color | $\frac{F}{\text { Orange }}$ |
| $15.6 \%$ chronically absent <br> Declined 0.9\% <br> 307 students | Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 7 students | Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy 1 students | $16.9 \%$ chronically absent <br> Maintained 0.3\% <br> 59 students |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. The data suggests a need to focus on improving attendance rates. Both English learners and students with disabilities decreased rates of chronic absenteeism.
2. The data suggests a need to monitor and support our homeless subgroup (2.8\%). Although not a significant sub group numerically, our homeless population increased rate of chronic absenteeism by $16 \%$.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Engagement Graduation Rate

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

| Lowest |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Performance | Red |  | Gellow | Highest <br> Perfformance |

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

| 2018 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate Equity Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

## 2018 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate for All Students/Student Group

| All Students | English Learners |  | Foster Youth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Homeless | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  | Students with Disabilities |
| 2018 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate by Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |
| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |

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

## 2018 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate by Year

2017

Conclusions based on this data:
1.

## School and Student Performance Data <br> Conditions \& Climate Suspension Rate

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

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

|  | 2018 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate Equity Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green |
| 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

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

2018 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate for All Students/Student Group


2018 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Race/Ethnicity



No Performance Color
$8.3 \%$ suspended at least once

Increased 8.3\%
12 students


No Performance Color
Less than 11 Students - Data 1 students


No Performance Color
Less than 11 Students - Data 1 students

| White |
| :---: |
| Orange |
| $4.8 \%$ suspended at least |
| once |
| Increased $2.9 \%$ |
| 63 students |

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

## 2018 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Year

| 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.4\% suspended at least once | 1.1\% suspended at least once | 2.2\% suspended at least once |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Data suggests that improving our school's MTSS system will positively impact school connectedness and reduce suspensions. Overall, student suspensions increased by $1 \%$.
2. The data suggests that teachers supporting students with disabilities need additional professional learning and support in implementing tier 1 and tier 2 supports. Students with disabilities as a sub group increased suspensions by $5.4 \%$. When numbers are small, as there are in this group, this indicates that 4 SPED students were suspended as compared to 2 students the prior year.

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

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

## LEA/LCAP Goal

All Students will be proficient in Literacy, Numeracy, and 21st Century Skills through high quality, effective teaching and learning practices.

## Goal 1

All Students will be proficient in Literacy, Numeracy, and 21st Century Skills through high quality, effective teaching and learning practices.

## Identified Need

Based on our needs assessment process, it was identified that our school needs to improve ELA and Math performance overall for all students. A lack of relevance of curriculum, teacher planning, differentiation of curriculum, large \% reading below grade level, attendance, and social emotional needs impacting learning were identified as root causes for gaps in student achievement.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Show growth on the English <br> Language Arts and Math <br> Academic Indicator. | Students are 59.5 points below <br> standard in ELA (Orange) and <br> 77 points below standard in <br> Math (Orange). | Dingle will increase by 3 points <br> (56.5 points from the standard - <br> Yellow), and will increase by 4 <br> points in Math (73 points from <br> the standard - Yellow). |  |
| Percentage of students who <br> reach growth targets on iReady <br> (elementary schools) and | 39\% of students met the <br> Growth Target in Reading and <br> $26 \%$ met the Growth Target in | Increase \% who meet growth <br> target by 5\% for both ELA and <br> Math by second diagnostic. |  |
| NWEA (secondary schools) in <br> Reading and Math. | Math by second diagnostic. |  |  |

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

## Strategy/Activity 1

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

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

## All Students

## Strategy/Activity

Provide professional learning and collaboration opportunities to support best first instruction through differentiation across all content areas to increase student engagement and achievement.

- Common professional learning and collaboration time for teachers to plan targeted instruction and intervention with grade level team.
- Provide a teacher \& counselor - (one additional day over the district allocation) to teach social skills and other enrichment activities in order to release grade level teams to collaborate for "target time" instruction.
- Provide professional learning to identify a structure to support teachers in collaboration using research based practices and evidence to guide instruction.
- Sub release time for teachers to participate in professional learning, planning, data chats, and observation.
- Materials and supplies to support differentiated instruction to support foundational skills, guided reading, content and technology integration.
- Increase student participation in garden/science aligned to Next Generation Standards (NGSS).
- Provide professional learning opportunities for teachers to integrate NGSS, Social Studies and ELD standards.
- Provide Leveled library titles to support targeted instruction and guided reading.
- Provide additional in classroom support via teacher/para/tutor to provide targeted school intervention.
- Materials and supplies for class room instruction and targeted intervention.
- Provide school wide incentives to support academic effort.
- Provide extra duty time for staff to provide on activities that increase attendance and improve academic performance.
- Increase student access to updated technology to enhance student access to core content.


## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

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

Amount(s)
66,576

20,000
3,000

## Source(s)

Title I Part A: Basic Grants Low-Income and Neglected

## Supplemental/Concentration

Site Discretionary

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

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

## LEA/LCAP Goal

All students will graduate high school and be competitively college and career ready through personalized learning.

## Goal 2

All students will graduate high school and be competitively college and career ready through personalized learning.

## Identified Need

Stakeholders identified a need to increase student engagement and access to relevant and personalized learning as well as to extracurricular activities that will best prepare them for 21 st century learning.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of students completing UC/CSU a-g course requirements (high school only) | N/A |  |
| Number of pathways that result in certification in high demand, local industry sectors (high school only) | N/A |  |
| Increase the number of students who are "Prepared" on the College/Career Indicator (high school only) | N/A |  |
| Increase opportunities for all students to have meaningful participation in the Visual and Performing Arts | Total number of students enrolled in music is $34.8 \% ; 22.7 \%$ of 5 th-6th graders. <br> Total \% of K-2 students enrolled in ExtracurricularBallet Folklorico is $31 \%$. | Increase participation in music in 5 th \& 6th grade by $5 \%$. Expand Extracurricular - Ballet Folklorico to grades 1-4 and increase by $5 \%$. |

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

[^0]
## Strategy/Activity

Provide professional learning and planning time for teachers, as well as offer extracurricular activities to integrate 21st Century Skills; (collaboration, critical thinking, creativity, communication, character, and citizenship) in relevant and engaging lessons.

- Extra duty pay for teachers/tutor/para to provide extracurricular activities targeting developing 21st century skills
- Professional learning and planning time for teachers to develop 21st century skills within their lessons and units of study.
- Materials, supplies, and technology to support extracurricular activities and to facilitate student presentations.
- Offer school wide performances and presentations to increase participation in band, folklorico, and extracurricular activities.


## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

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

Amount(s)
3,133
1,289

Source(s)

## Supplemental/Concentration

Site Discretionary

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

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

## LEA/LCAP Goal

All students will be successful through the development of targeted and coherent systems of support.

## Goal 3

All students will be successful through the development of targeted and coherent systems of support.

## Identified Need

Based on our needs assessment, all stakeholders identified a need to increase attendance, and reduce chronic absenteeism and suspensions by supporting student needs for school and personal safety and to increase school connectedness.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metric/Indicator
Decrease the number of students who are chronically absent.

Increase student sense of safety and school connectedness.

Ensure access to extended learning opportunities.

Decrease the number of Special Education Students who are suspended

Baseline/Actual Outcome
$16.8 \%$ of students who are chronically absent (Orange).

A baseline will be established this year.

A baseline will be established this year.
$7.7 \%$ of SPED students were suspended, an increase of 5.4\%.

## Expected Outcome

Decrease chronic absenteeism by 2\% (Yellow).

A baseline will be established this year.

A baseline will be established this year.

Decrease Special Education suspensions by $2 \%$.

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

## Strategy/Activity 1

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All Students and Students with Special Needs (reduce suspensions)
Strategy/Activity
Strengthen and clearly define our MTSS (Multiple Systems of Support) model in order to provide targeted tier 1 and tier 2 supports.

Provide in classroom social skills lessons by a counselor
Expand upon restorative practices as a tier 1 strategy

Implement Conflict Manager Program and provide a teacher/para hourly pay to coordinate program.
Provide Sub/release time for teachers to participate in tier 2 meeting and SST meetings.
Provide common planning time for teachers to meet to plan universal tier 1 supports, and tier 2 strategies.
Provide professional learning for social emotional and mental health support for students. Materials and Supplies to support MTSS activities and curriculum.
Provide additional counseling and mental health counseling for students.
Provide additional noon supervision to increase student safety, support conflict manager program, and to implement restorative practices.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

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

Amount(s)
30,000
4,620

Source(s)

## Supplemental/Concentration

Site Discretionary

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

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

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Improve the English proficiency and academic achievement of English Learners.

## Goal 4

Improve the English proficiency and academic achievement of English Learners.

## Identified Need

We have identified a need to provide additional English language development opportunities through enrichment and intervention opportunities.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Increase the Reclassification <br> rate for English Learners. | $10.8 \%$ |
| in 20 |  |
| Show growth on the English <br> Learner Progress Indicator (CA | This <br> it is a <br> School Dashboard). |
| Decrease the number of Long |  |
| Term English Learners (middle <br> and high school only). | N/A |
| Increase the number of State <br> Seals of Biliteracy awarded to <br> students (high school only). |  |

## Expected Outcome

Increase reclassification rate by 3\%
A baseline will be established this year.

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

## Strategy/Activity 1

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

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

## English learners

## Strategy/Activity

Implement research based instructional strategies and supports to improve English learner performance and reclassification rate.

- Provide ELD intervention and enrichment
- Provide extra duty pay for teacher/para/tutor to provide additional ELD support
- Materials, curriculum, and supplies
- Provide teachers with professional learning on best practices in designated and integrated ELD strategies
- Provide Sub release time for professional collaboration
- Academic Conferences to review student data and English learner monitoring

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

Amount(s)
8,058

4,000

Source(s)
Title I Part A: Basic Grants Low-Income and Neglected
Supplemental/Concentration

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

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

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Excellence for ALL students is supported through meaningful stakeholder engagement.

## Goal 5

Excellence for ALL students is supported through meaningful stakeholder engagement.

## Identified Need

Based on stakeholder needs assessment, our school can improve upon increasing home school communication as well as sharing positive news and acknowledging student effort and achievement. Parents of English learners believe that many parents are unsure about the purpose of ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee).

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metric/Indicator
Increase participation rate of parents at
SSC/ELAC/PTA/Boosters to represent diversity of student demographics.
Increase parent/family satisfaction to "high" on Healthy Kids Survey, on key indicators

Increase use of technology tools and applications by site staff to communicate with parents about student progress.
Increase parent participation in ELAC - English learner Advisory Committee

## Baseline/Actual Outcome

A baseline will be established this year.

A baseline will be established this year.

### 12.31\% of parents have Aeries Parent Portal accounts

During the 18-19 school year, on average 10 parents attended ELAC meetings.

## Expected Outcome

SSC candidates will reflect diversity to include members from 3 of our largest subgroups (Hispanic, English Learners, and Socio-Economic Diverse).
A baseline will be established this year.
$18 \%$ of parents have Aeries Parent Portal accounts

Increase ELAC participation by $50 \%$ and increase average attendance to 15 parents

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

## Strategy/Activity 1

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity
(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

## All students and stakeholders

## Strategy/Activity

Improve parent communication and increase parent participation at school events, and parent groups (ELAC and PTA).

Provide training for parents on social emotional and mental health support and how to access services.
Provide Monthly Coffee with Principal with social/emotional topics for discussion.
Provide Parent Liaison to increase parent participation and home school communication.
Provide childcare and snacks for parents who attend parent meetings.
Provide materials and supplies to increase parent engagement in school activities and meetings. Provide hourly compensation for translation of materials and/or interpretation at school meetings.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

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

Amount(s)
10,000
824

Source(s)
Supplemental/Concentration
Title I Part A: Parent Involvement

## Budget Summary

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

## Budget Summary

Description
Total Funds Provided to the School Through the Consolidated Application
Total Federal Funds Provided to the School from the LEA for CSI
Total Funds Budgeted for Strategies to Meet the Goals in the SPSA
Other Federal, State, and Local Funds
List the additional Federal programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Adjust the table as needed. If
the school is not operating a Title I schoolwide program this section is not applicable and may be deleted.

## Federal Programs

Title I Part A: Basic Grants Low-Income and Neglected
Title I Part A: Parent Involvement

## Allocation (\$)

\$74,634.00
$\$ 824.00$

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: $\$ 75,458.00$
List the State and local programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Duplicate the table as needed.

## State or Local Programs

## Site Discretionary

Supplemental/Concentration

## Allocation (\$)

\$8,909.00
\$67,133.00

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: \$76,042.00
Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: $\$ 151,500.00$

## School Site Council Membership

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

## 1 School Principal

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

| Name of Members | Role |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ursula Ruffalo | Principal |
| Mandy Dye | Classroom Teacher |
| Kristina Cinquini | Classroom Teacher |
| Harrison Thomas | Classroom Teacher |
| Dan Flores | Other School Staff |
| Vicki Keith | Parent or Community Member |
| Ryan Meyer | Parent or Community Member |
| Allison Bright Rose | Parent or Community Member |
| Sarah Truitt | Parent or Community Member or Community Member |
| Valentina Zendejas |  |

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

## Recommendations and Assurances

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

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

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


## Committee or Advisory Group Name

## English Learner Advisory Committee

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

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

This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on May 7, 2019.


Principal, Ursula Ruffalo on May 7, 2019

SSC Chairperson, on May 7, 2019
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