# School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) Template 

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

| School Name | County-District-School (CDS) Code | Schoolsite Council (SSC) Approval Date | Local Board Approval Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gibson Elementary School | 57727100000000 | 5-17-21 | June 3, 2021 |

## 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 school 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. 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

Gibson's School Site Council meets at least 5 times per year, and reviews: the school's data, the progress made on goals within the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA), as well as participate in the needs assessment process, and develop and approve the annual School Plan.

Formal needs assessments were conducted with multiple stakeholder groups at Gibson including ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee), SSC (School Site Council), Site Leadership Team, staff, and two focus groups with students in grades 3-6. Each meeting included an in-depth review of the most recent California School Dashboard data for Gibson students' academic performance, attendance, reclassification rate, and suspension rate. Additionally, informal needs assessments occurred on a frequent basis through conversations with administration, parents, staff and students.

Student input was gathered through a survey focused on Math, of which 109 students responded. Student focus groups were created, with a balanced representation of student groups. Sixteen of students participated in the focus group process. Student focus groups completed a needs assessment by reviewing survey, academic, and local data. Students identified word problems, basic math facts, and engagement as areas of concern. Students then provided an analysis of causes, and collaborated to provide recommendations to improve outcomes for students. As a follow up, student focus groups met again on May 5, 2021, reviewed the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA), reviewed their suggestions, and provided feedback on the strategies chosen for implementation.

Additional needs assessments were conducted. On March 16th, a team of 8 Gibson staff members conducted an in-depth review of Gibson students' performance data. The following areas of need were identified: reading skills in primary grades, hands on math activities with an emphasis on problem-solving, math nights and resources for families, reducing chronic absenteeismm, small group math training for teachers and student practice, increase use of math manipulatives, math fact fluency, common math academic vocabulary, and a culture of speaking about math and ourselves in a positive manner. and proposed actions and strategies to support these needs.

Needs assessment meetings were also held with ELAC on December 8, 2020, January 12, 2021, and February 9, 2021. A needs assessment meeting was held with SSC on April 19, 2021. Improving upon social-emotional learning, physical and emotional safety, and afterschool intervention and supports were recommended by ELAC in order to move the school forward. School Site Council recommended collaborating with other WJUSD schools that have seen significant improvement in math scores in recent years, involving parents through virtual and in-person math workshops, sending home letters to parents from the adopted math workbooks, increasing after school club and class opportunities, and funding and hosting of reading and math interventions.

ELAC and staff reviewed the SPSA on April 13, 2021, and provided additional feedback. School site council reviewed the plan, considered recommendations and feedback from all groups, and finalized/approved the SPSA on May 10, 2021.

## 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 |  |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 19-20 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 19-20 |
| American Indian | 0.50\% | 0.98\% | 1.67\% | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| African American | 1.84\% | 1.17\% | 1.46\% | 11 | 6 | 7 |
| Asian | 3.85\% | 4.31\% | 2.72\% | 23 | 22 | 13 |
| Filipino | 0.17\% | \% | 0.42\% | 1 |  | 2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 62.31\% | 63.41\% | 64.85\% | 372 | 324 | 310 |
| Pacific Islander | \% | \% | 0\% |  |  | 0 |
| White | 27.81\% | 26.22\% | 24.69\% | 166 | 134 | 118 |
| Multiple/No Response | 1.17\% | 1.76\% | 2.09\% | 7 | 9 | 10 |
|  | Total Enrollment |  |  | 597 | 511 | 478 |

## Student Enrollment

 Enrollment By Grade Level| Grade | Student Enrollment by Grade Level |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $19-20$ |
| Kindergarten | 101 | 83 | 84 |
| Grade 1 | 79 | 56 | 58 |
| Grade 2 | 71 | 71 | 53 |
| Grade3 | 85 | 67 | 72 |
| Grade 4 | 79 | 86 | 68 |
| Grade 5 | 84 | 68 | 75 |
| Grade 6 | 98 | 80 | 68 |
| Total Enrollment | 597 | 511 | 478 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Student enrollment has been declining steadily since the 2017-2018 school year.
2. Student enrollment in the multiple ethnicity/no response subgroup has increased, as well as the percentage of students reporting in the American Indian and Hispanic/Latino ethnicity subgroups.
3. Student enrollment in the white subgroup continues to decline by $1-2 \%$ each school year.

## School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment
English Learner (EL) Enrollment

| English Learner (EL) Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Number of Students |  | Percent of Students |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 0}$ |
| English Learners | 151 | 123 | 98 | $\mathbf{2 5 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 5} \%$ |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) | 42 | 50 | 51 | $7.0 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) | 18 | 23 | 21 | $11.8 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Just as school wide enrollment has declined, so has the number and percentage of English Learners enrolled at Gibson.
2. Percentage of Fluent English Proficient students increased, though only slightly.
3. Percentage of Reclassified Fluent English Proficient students increased, surpassing the state average (according to Dataquest).

## 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 Enrolled Students |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 73 | 80 | 58 | 70 | 78 | 57 | 70 | 78 | 57 | 95.9 | 97.5 | 98.3 |
| Grade 4 | 78 | 75 | 77 | 75 | 71 | 77 | 75 | 71 | 77 | 96.2 | 94.7 | 100 |
| Grade 5 | 86 | 81 | 63 | 81 | 80 | 62 | 81 | 80 | 62 | 94.2 | 98.8 | 98.4 |
| Grade 6 | 84 | 95 | 77 | 81 | 93 | 77 | 81 | 93 | 77 | 96.4 | 97.9 | 100 |
| All | 321 | 331 | 275 | 307 | 322 | 273 | 307 | 322 | 273 | 95.6 | 97.3 | 99.3 |

*The "\% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability

| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard |  |  | \% Standard Met |  |  | \% Standard Nearly |  |  | \% Standard Not |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 2358. | 2400. | 2404. | 7.14 | 12.82 | 17.54 | 12.86 | 20.51 | 22.81 | 21.43 | 34.62 | 24.56 | 58.57 | 32.05 | 35.09 |
| Grade 4 | 2432. | 2399. | 2449. | 16.00 | 7.04 | 20.78 | 13.33 | 15.49 | 22.08 | 26.67 | 22.54 | 24.68 | 44.00 | 54.93 | 32.47 |
| Grade 5 | 2435. | 2475. | 2468. | 7.41 | 12.50 | 14.52 | 12.35 | 26.25 | 20.97 | 25.93 | 25.00 | 22.58 | 54.32 | 36.25 | 41.94 |
| Grade 6 | 2500. | 2462. | 2508. | 4.94 | 5.38 | 11.69 | 41.98 | 19.35 | 36.36 | 20.99 | 25.81 | 24.68 | 32.10 | 49.46 | 27.27 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8.79 | 9.32 | 16.12 | 20.52 | 20.50 | 26.01 | 23.78 | 27.02 | 24.18 | 46.91 | 43.17 | 33.70 |


| Reading <br> Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 7.14 | 15.38 | 17.54 | 28.57 | 50.00 | 54.39 | 64.29 | 34.62 | 28.07 |
| Grade 4 | 14.67 | 14.08 | 22.08 | 44.00 | 45.07 | 50.65 | 41.33 | 40.85 | 27.27 |
| Grade 5 | 7.41 | 16.25 | 19.35 | 44.44 | 52.50 | 43.55 | 48.15 | 31.25 | 37.10 |
| Grade 6 | 7.41 | 7.53 | 17.11 | 59.26 | 38.71 | 38.16 | 33.33 | 53.76 | 44.74 |
| All Grades | 9.12 | 13.04 | 19.12 | 44.63 | 46.27 | 46.32 | 46.25 | 40.68 | 34.56 |


| Producing clear and purposeful writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  | \% At or Near Standard |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| Grade 3 | 8.57 | 12.82 | 7.02 | 30.00 | 42.31 | 59.65 | 61.43 | 44.87 | 33.33 |
| Grade 4 | 13.33 | 4.23 | 12.99 | 45.33 | 38.03 | 57.14 | 41.33 | 57.75 | 29.87 |
| Grade 5 | 11.11 | 13.75 | 16.13 | 34.57 | 55.00 | 38.71 | 54.32 | 31.25 | 45.16 |
| Grade 6 | 14.81 | 12.90 | 15.58 | 49.38 | 26.88 | 58.44 | 35.80 | 60.22 | 25.97 |
| All Grades | 12.05 | 11.18 | 13.19 | 40.07 | 40.06 | 53.85 | 47.88 | 48.76 | 32.97 |


| Listening |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| Grade 3 | 4.29 | 15.38 | 21.05 | 65.71 | 65.38 | 63.16 | 30.00 | 19.23 | 15.79 |
| Grade 4 | 9.33 | 8.45 | 16.88 | 52.00 | 64.79 | 61.04 | 38.67 | 26.76 | 22.08 |
| Grade 5 | 9.88 | 8.75 | 14.52 | 55.56 | 68.75 | 62.90 | 34.57 | 22.50 | 22.58 |
| Grade 6 | 3.70 | 6.45 | 9.09 | 72.84 | 62.37 | 71.43 | 23.46 | 31.18 | 19.48 |
| All Grades | 6.84 | 9.63 | 15.02 | 61.56 | 65.22 | 64.84 | 31.60 | 25.16 | 20.15 |


| Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 10.00 | 16.67 | 12.28 | 37.14 | 51.28 | 56.14 | 52.86 | 32.05 | 31.58 |
| Grade 4 | 13.33 | 5.63 | 15.79 | 60.00 | 40.85 | 52.63 | 26.67 | 53.52 | 31.58 |
| Grade 5 | 9.88 | 16.25 | 19.35 | 43.21 | 58.75 | 43.55 | 46.91 | 25.00 | 37.10 |
| Grade 6 | 20.99 | 16.13 | 20.78 | 49.38 | 41.94 | 50.65 | 29.63 | 41.94 | 28.57 |
| All Grades | 13.68 | 13.98 | 17.28 | 47.56 | 48.14 | 50.74 | 38.76 | 37.89 | 31.99 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Since 2016-17, there has been steady growth in students' reading achievement scores.
2. Percentage of all students not meeting standard has decreased in all areas of English Language Arts/(ELA) Literacy. The biggest deficit appears to be in Reading - with 34.56 of students not meeting standard.
3. It is evident that more professional development among teachers for foundational reading is necessary and explicit teaching using evidence based practices for Tier I and II are needed for students.

## 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 |  |  | \% of Enrolled Students |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 73 | 80 | 58 | 69 | 78 | 57 | 69 | 78 | 57 | 94.5 | 97.5 | 98.3 |
| Grade 4 | 78 | 75 | 77 | 77 | 72 | 76 | 77 | 72 | 76 | 98.7 | 96 | 98.7 |
| Grade 5 | 86 | 81 | 63 | 79 | 80 | 62 | 79 | 80 | 62 | 91.9 | 98.8 | 98.4 |
| Grade 6 | 84 | 95 | 77 | 81 | 95 | 77 | 81 | 95 | 77 | 96.4 | 100 | 100 |
| All | 321 | 331 | 275 | 306 | 325 | 272 | 306 | 325 | 272 | 95.3 | 98.2 | 98.9 |

*The "\% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard |  |  | \% Standard Met |  |  | \% Standard Nearly |  |  | \% Standard Not |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 2375. | 2387. | 2407. | 8.70 | 6.41 | 10.53 | 10.14 | 17.95 | 26.32 | 20.29 | 29.49 | 28.07 | 60.87 | 46.15 | 35.09 |
| Grade 4 | 2439. | 2411. | 2444. | 12.99 | 5.56 | 9.21 | 19.48 | 9.72 | 17.11 | 27.27 | 30.56 | 46.05 | 40.26 | 54.17 | 27.63 |
| Grade 5 | 2424. | 2462. | 2436. | 5.06 | 8.75 | 6.45 | 6.33 | 13.75 | 8.06 | 16.46 | 31.25 | 20.97 | 72.15 | 46.25 | 64.52 |
| Grade 6 | 2466. | 2443. | 2479. | 4.94 | 4.21 | 5.19 | 8.64 | 12.63 | 14.29 | 37.04 | 23.16 | 40.26 | 49.38 | 60.00 | 40.26 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 7.84 | 6.15 | 7.72 | 11.11 | 13.54 | 16.18 | 25.49 | 28.31 | 34.93 | 55.56 | 52.00 | 41.18 |


| Concepts \& Procedures         <br> Grade Level  \% Above Standard  \% At or Near Standard  \% Below Standard   $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |  |
| Grade 3 | 10.14 | 10.26 | 21.05 | 24.64 | 33.33 | 31.58 | 65.22 | 56.41 | 47.37 |
| Grade 4 | 23.38 | 8.33 | 20.00 | 25.97 | 20.83 | 30.67 | 50.65 | 70.83 | 49.33 |
| Grade 5 | 7.59 | 11.25 | 8.06 | 12.66 | 25.00 | 19.35 | 79.75 | 63.75 | 72.58 |
| Grade 6 | 6.17 | 8.42 | 10.67 | 33.33 | 23.16 | 34.67 | 60.49 | 68.42 | 54.67 |
| All Grades | 11.76 | 9.54 | 14.87 | 24.18 | 25.54 | 29.37 | 64.05 | 64.92 | 55.76 |

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 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| Grade 3 | 13.04 | 8.97 | 19.30 | 31.88 | 44.87 | 47.37 | 55.07 | 46.15 | 33.33 |
| Grade 4 | 11.69 | 6.94 | 10.67 | 40.26 | 33.33 | 42.67 | 48.05 | 59.72 | 46.67 |
| Grade 5 | 7.59 | 8.75 | 11.29 | 22.78 | 43.75 | 25.81 | 69.62 | 47.50 | 62.90 |
| Grade 6 | 6.17 | 5.26 | 7.79 | 34.57 | 32.63 | 45.45 | 59.26 | 62.11 | 46.75 |
| All Grades | 9.48 | 7.38 | 11.81 | 32.35 | 38.46 | 40.59 | 58.17 | 54.15 | 47.60 |


| Communicating Reasoning Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 8.70 | 12.82 | 15.79 | 39.13 | 53.85 | 57.89 | 52.17 | 33.33 | 26.32 |
| Grade 4 | 15.58 | 8.33 | 20.00 | 42.86 | 27.78 | 37.33 | 41.56 | 63.89 | 42.67 |
| Grade 5 | 3.80 | 6.25 | 6.45 | 26.58 | 48.75 | 33.87 | 69.62 | 45.00 | 59.68 |
| Grade 6 | 3.70 | 5.26 | 8.00 | 54.32 | 37.89 | 44.00 | 41.98 | 56.84 | 48.00 |
| All Grades | 7.84 | 8.00 | 12.64 | 40.85 | 42.15 | 42.75 | 51.31 | 49.85 | 44.61 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. The overall achievement of all students has increased in Math. Percentage of all students not meeting standards has decreased, and the percentage of all students who are at or near standard has increased.
2. The biggest deficit is concepts and procedures with $55.76 \%$ of students not meeting standards.
3. It is evident that more collaboration, analysis of student work, and evidence-based practices around Mathematics needs to occur.

## School and Student Performance Data

## ELPAC Results

| ELPAC Summative Assessment Data <br> Number of Students and Mean Scale Scores for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Overall |  | Oral Language |  | Written Language |  | Number of Students Tested |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade K | 1363.6 | 1424.8 | 1376.8 | 1438.5 | 1332.7 | 1393.0 | 25 | 21 |
| Grade 1 | 1441.0 | 1339.5 | 1447.6 | 1350.6 | 1433.8 | 1328.4 | 22 | 11 |
| Grade 2 | 1472.1 | 1448.8 | 1469.9 | 1460.8 | 1473.9 | 1436.1 | 22 | 12 |
| Grade 3 | 1484.7 | * | 1485.5 | * | 1483.5 | * | 21 | 8 |
| Grade 4 | 1506.9 | 1503.3 | 1511.1 | 1505.7 | 1502.2 | 1500.4 | 18 | 18 |
| Grade 5 | 1479.3 | 1540.8 | 1469.7 | 1547.4 | 1488.4 | 1533.5 | 11 | 18 |
| Grade 6 | 1476.5 | * | 1468.8 | * | 1483.5 | * | 15 | 8 |
| All Grades |  |  |  |  |  |  | 134 | 96 |

Overall Language
Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students

| Grade Level | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| K | * | 4.76 | * | 47.62 | * | 38.10 | * | 9.52 | 25 | 21 |
| 1 | * | 0.00 | * | 18.18 | * | 45.45 | * | 36.36 | 22 | 11 |
| 2 | * | 8.33 | * | 33.33 |  | 50.00 | * | 8.33 | 22 | 12 |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 21 | * |
| 4 | * | 27.78 | * | 33.33 | * | 22.22 | * | 16.67 | 18 | 18 |
| 5 | * | 22.22 | * | 50.00 | * | 27.78 | * | 0.00 | 11 | 18 |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 15 | * |
| All Grades | 25.37 | 12.50 | 30.60 | 37.50 | 24.63 | 34.38 | 19.40 | 15.63 | 134 | 96 |


| Oral Language <br> Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| K | * | 19.05 | * | 38.10 | * | 28.57 | * | 14.29 | 25 | 21 |
| 1 | 54.55 | 9.09 | * | 45.45 | * | 9.09 | * | 36.36 | 22 | 11 |
| 2 | * | 16.67 | * | 50.00 |  | 25.00 | * | 8.33 | 22 | 12 |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 21 | * |
| 4 | * | 33.33 | * | 44.44 |  | 11.11 | * | 11.11 | 18 | 18 |
| 5 | * | 55.56 | * | 44.44 | * | 0.00 | * | 0.00 | 11 | 18 |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 15 | * |
| All Grades | 40.30 | 26.04 | 30.60 | 42.71 | 11.19 | 15.63 | 17.91 | 15.63 | 134 | 96 |


| Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |  |
| K | 44.00 | 19.05 | $*$ | 76.19 | $*$ | 4.76 | 25 | 21 |  |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 63.64 | 9.09 | $*$ | 45.45 | $*$ | 45.45 | 22 | 11 |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 63.64 | 25.00 | $*$ | 66.67 | $*$ | 8.33 | 22 | 12 |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $*$ | $*$ | 52.38 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 21 | $*$ |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $*$ | 38.89 | 61.11 | 44.44 | $*$ | 16.67 | 18 | 18 |  |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $*$ | 11.11 | $*$ | 88.89 | $*$ | 0.00 | 11 | 18 |  |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 15 | $*$ |  |
| All Grades | 42.54 | 19.79 | 38.81 | 62.50 | 18.66 | 17.71 | 134 | 96 |  |

Speaking Domain
Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students

| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| K | $*$ | 23.81 | $*$ | 52.38 | $*$ | 23.81 | 25 | 21 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 50.00 | 0.00 | $*$ | 63.64 | $*$ | 36.36 | 22 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 54.55 | 8.33 | $*$ | 83.33 | $*$ | 8.33 | 22 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 21 | $*$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 77.78 | 44.44 | $*$ | 55.56 | $*$ | 0.00 | 18 | 18 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $*$ | 83.33 | $*$ | 16.67 | $*$ | 0.00 | 11 | 18 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 15 | $*$ |
| All Grades | 48.51 | 34.38 | 31.34 | 51.04 | 20.15 | 14.58 | 134 | 96 |


| Reading Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| K | * | 4.76 | 72.00 | 85.71 | * | 9.52 | 25 | 21 |
| 1 | * | 0.00 | * | 36.36 | * | 63.64 | 22 | 11 |
| 2 | * | 8.33 | * | 50.00 | * | 41.67 | 22 | 12 |
| 3 |  | * | 52.38 | * | * | * | 21 | * |
| 4 | * | 16.67 | 61.11 | 50.00 | * | 33.33 | 18 | 18 |
| 5 | * | 11.11 | * | 77.78 | * | 11.11 | 11 | 18 |
| 6 |  | * | * | * | 80.00 | * | 15 | * |
| All Grades | 14.18 | 7.29 | 47.76 | 61.46 | 38.06 | 31.25 | 134 | 96 |


| Writing Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| K | * | 28.57 | 44.00 | 57.14 | * | 14.29 | 25 | 21 |
| 1 | * | 9.09 | 50.00 | 45.45 | * | 45.45 | 22 | 11 |
| 2 | * | 0.00 | 59.09 | 66.67 | * | 33.33 | 22 | 12 |
| 3 | * | * | 76.19 | * | * | * | 21 | * |
| 4 | * | 22.22 | 77.78 | 72.22 | * | 5.56 | 18 | 18 |
| 5 | * | 16.67 | * | 77.78 | * | 5.56 | 11 | 18 |
| 6 |  | * | 80.00 | * | * | * | 15 | * |
| All Grades | 14.18 | 15.63 | 61.19 | 65.63 | 24.63 | 18.75 | 134 | 96 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Grades K and 5 th have the most growth in all areas of the ELPAC (English Language Proficiency Assessments for California) and overall between the 17-18 and 18-19 school years.
2. The areas of speaking, listening and writing have $80 \%$ of students scoring in the 'well-developed' and 'somewhat/moderarely' performance levels. However, only $68 \%$ of students are acheiving in those same performance bands in reading.
3. It is evident that training on best practices for integrated and designated ELD (English Language Development) instruction is needed at Gibson as well as as ongoing training on and implementation of the English Learner Roadmap, English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) framework, vocabulary and reading skills.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Population

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

| 2018-19 Student Population |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Enrollment | Socioeconomically <br> Disadvantaged |  |  |
| 511 | 64.0 | English <br> Learners | Foster <br> Youth |
| 24.1 | 2.5 |  |  |

This is the total number of students enrolled.

This is the percent of students who are eligible for free or reduced priced meals; or have parents/guardians who did not receive a high school diploma.

This is the percent of students who are learning to communicate effectively in English, typically requiring instruction in both the English Language and in their academic courses.

This is the percent of students whose well-being is the responsibility of a court.

| 2018-19 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| English Learners | 123 | 24.1 |
| Foster Youth | 13 | 2.5 |
| Homeless | 11 | 2.2 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 327 | 64.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | 74 | 14.5 |


| Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| African American | 6 | 1.2 |
| American Indian | 5 | 1.0 |
| Asian | 22 | 4.3 |
| Hispanic | 324 | 63.4 |
| Two or More Races | 11 | 2.2 |
| White | 134 | 26.2 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. A large percentage of Gibson students (more than half of the school) are socioeconomically disadvantaged and may need support from the school and community in relation to school supplies and food.
2. A large percentage (one quarter) of the school's enrollment are English Learners, with Spanish as their primary language.
3. Based on the student population, it is evident that there needs to be professional development and training around best first instruction for vulnerable populations of students. There also needs to be professional development and implementation of Trauma Informed Practices, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and relationship-building.

## School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students



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

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. It is evident that continuing work in research-based practices and strategies for English-Language Arts and Math needs to continue.
2. Continued practice of Alternative Means of Correction, Restorative Practices, and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) must continue to encourage the trend of reducing suspensions and moving from Green to Blue.
3. Increasing incentives and parent involvement are necessary to further reduce chronic absenteeism.

## 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.
2019 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Equity Report

| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green | Blue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 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.

2019 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance for All Students/Student Group



Students with Disabilities


Orange
77.2 points below standard

Increased ++3.1 points

| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| Orange |
| 77.2 points below standard |
| Increased ++3.1 points |
| 50 |



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.

2019 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner | Reclassified English Learners | English Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 96.3 points below standard | 0.4 points below standard |  |
| Increased |  |  |
| Significantly |  |  |
| ++18.7 points |  |  |
| 45 |  |  |$|$| 11.7 points below standard |
| :---: | :---: |
| Increased |
| Significantly |
| ++26.5 points |
| 186 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. While all subgroups and ethnicities showed improvement, all remain below grade level (between 22 points below standard). Good first instruction is taking place and the strategies teachers are using are effective, given the continuing positive trajectory of the scores.
2. English Learners ( 96.3 points below standard) and Students with Disabilities ( 77 points below standard) remain significantly below grade level.
3. Gibson's focus needs to be on differentiation, rigor, relevance, and engagement, specifically Guided Reading and Small Group Instruction, within each classroom setting.This will be achieved through professional development, collaboration, implementation and accountability measures.

## 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.
2019 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Equity Report

| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green | Blue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2 | 3 | 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.

2019 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance for All Students/Student Group



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.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner | Reclassified English Learners | English Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 129 points below standard | 26.1 points below standard | 46.8 points below standard |
| Declined -12.3 points | Increased ++7.7 points <br> 44 | Increased Significantly ++21.8 points 185 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Though students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged and those with disabilities showed significant improvement in math, they remain below standard.
2. Math performance remains 55.3 points below standard. Gibson's focus needs to be on differentiation, rigor, relevance, and engagement within each classroom setting with an emphasis on number sense.
3. This will be achieved through professional development, collaboration, implementation and accountability measures.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance <br> English Learner Progress

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students making progress towards English language proficiency or maintaining the highest level.

2019 Fall Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator

| English Learner Progress |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 39.7 making progress towards English |
| language proficiency |
| Number of EL Students: 73 |
| Performance Level: Low |

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students who progressed at least one ELPI level, maintained ELPI level 4, maintained lower ELPI levels (i.e, levels 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H), or decreased at least one ELPI Level.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Student English Language Acquisition Results

| Decreased <br> One ELPI Level | Maintained ELPI Level 1, <br> 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46.5 | Maintained <br> ELPI Level 4 | Progressed At Least <br> One ELPI Level |
| 13.6 | 2.7 | 36.9 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. A large percentage of students are making progress towards English language proficiency.
2. It is evident that training on best practices for integrated and designated ELD instruction is needed at Gibson as well as as ongoing training on and implementation of the English Learner Roadmap (EL Roadmap) and English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) framework.
3. Gibson school needs to review further data to explore why $13.6 \%$ of students are regressing on their language acquisition and why 46.5 have not progressed.

## 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.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard College/Career Equity Report

Red
Orange
Yellow
Green
Blue

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

2019 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.

2019 Fall Dashboard College/Career 3-Year Performance

| Class of 2017 | Class of 2018 | Class of 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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.

|  | 2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Equity Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green |
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |

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.

2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism for All Students/Student Group


| Homeless |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 50 |
| Increased +20.6 |
| 14 |


| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |
| :---: |
| Yellow |
| 15.4 |
| Declined -2.4 |
| 338 |


| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| Yellow |
| 15.9 |
| Declined -1.8 |
| 88 |

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity

| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy | No Performance Color <br> 4.5 <br> Declined -3.8 <br> 22 | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| Yellow | No Performance Color | No Performance Color | Orange |
| 12.1 | 5 | Less than 11 Students - Data | 16.9 |
| Declined Significantly -4.2 $330$ | Increased +0.5 <br> 20 | $0$ | Maintained +0.1 <br> 136 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. In order to decrease chronic absenteeism, Gibson needs to focus on engaging, culturally relevant and responsive instruction.
2. In order to decrease chronic absenteeism, Gibson needs to increase student connectedness and emotional and physical safety at the school site.
3. Students with disabilities and those who are categorizes as socio-economically disadvantaged (SED) remain in yellow, indicating that those are two significant subgroups that require additional intervention and supports.

## 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.

| 2019 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.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate for All Students/Student Group

| All Students | English Learners |  | Foster Youth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Homeless | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  | Students with Disabilities |
| 2019 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.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate by Year

## 2018

Conclusions based on this data:
1.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Conditions \& Climate Suspension Rate

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


Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

|  | 2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate Equity Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green |
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |

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.

2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate for All Students/Student Group


Declined Significantly -2.9
530


Increased +3.8
16


| Foster Youth |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 0 |
| Declined -5.6 |
| 15 |


| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| Orange |
| 6.7 |
| Declined -2.2 |
| 89 |

2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Race/Ethnicity

| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Performance Color Less than 11 Students Data not displayed for privacy | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students Data not displayed for privacy | No Performance Color <br> 0 <br> Maintained 0 22 |  |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| $\underset{\text { Yellow }}{\uparrow\rangle}$ | No Performance Color |  |  |
| 3.8 | 0 |  | 0.7 |
| Declined Significantly -1.4 338 | Declined -4.3 <br> 20 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Declined -7.3 } \\ 136 \end{gathered}$ |

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

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Year

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 5.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. The data illustrates that we need to focus on reducing Gibson's suspension rate for students who are homeless and students with disabilities.
2. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) expectations for students, teaching practices, restorative practices, and alternative means of correction need to be implemented with fidelity across campus.
3. Gibson needs to improve student connectedness to school and build strong relationships peer-to-peer and staff-tostudent.

## 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

Each student will meet the skills and competencies of the graduate profile in order to be college and career ready through a rigorous, intellectually rich, and culturally relevant environment.

## Goal 1

Each student will meet the skills and competencies of the graduate profile in order to be college and career ready through a rigorous, intellectually rich, and culturally relevant environment.

## Identified Need

After an analysis of our schools' Dashboard data during the needs assessment process, and through discussion with multiple stakeholders, it became evident that students at Gibson need access to additional culturally relevant, intellectually rich opportunities within and outside of the school day.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator |
| :--- |
| Number of students who |
| participate in Visual and |
| Performing Arts (VAPA). |

Attendance rate at and positive feedback regarding a College and Career Awareness Event.

Baseline/Actual Outcome
One limited opportunity was offered in the 2019-20 school year. Virtual opportunities were offered in 2020-21 with 1-7 participants at each event (Virtual Art 2x/month; SAMI Circuit Family Night 1 x /month, STEM Night $3 x / y e a r$ )

There is currently no emphasis on College and Career Readiness at Gibson. No current activities/events, showcases, or Career Days are practiced at the site.

## Expected Outcome

All 4-6 graders will have the opportunity to participate in instrumental band. All K-6 students will have an opportunity to participate in an after school VAPA class, with a minimum of 5 per grade level enrolling in the class. All teachers will produce one VAPA lesson per trimester (may be facilitated by art docent or substituted by assembly or field trip).

Students in K-2 and 3-6 will have the opportunity to explore various colleges and careers during an Awareness event on campus (1-day to 1 -week in length during the school day). Pathways, career choices, community and 4 -year colleges will be showcased.

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

All students with an emphasis on English learners and students with disabilities

## Strategy/Activity

Provide access and opportunities for students in K-6 to attend an after school VAPA course (consider child care/supervision, snack, costumes, advertising, showcase) and TK-6 will receive one VAPA lesson per trimester within the school day provided by classroom teacher or art docent (this could also be an assembly or field trip or alternative learning experience). In conjunction with community and PTA (Parent Teacher Association) partners, Gibson will host a College and Career Awareness event to take place during the school day.

Materials and supplies (art journals)
Professional development - conference or contract for VAPA
Outside contracts and extra time for teachers providing VAPA instruction
Planning and collaboration time (substitute or time sheet)
Field trips (to include transportation and tickets)
On-site learning experiences and assemblies (grade level or school-wide)
Child care/supervision
Costumes
Showcase and performance costs
Walk Through History performances for grades 4-6

## 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.

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

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2020-21

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

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
Gibson was able to provide hands-on opportunities for students to participate in visual arts opportunities and music during a virtual and hybrid school year, but not to the extent originally planned. Attendance was low at all provided opportunities, however, Gibson was able to provide a weekly virtual VAPA lesson, a hardbound art journal for every student, Walk through History performances for grades 4-6, school wide and grade level specific assemblies (Baba the Storyteller), 14 virtual art nights, and 3 STEM (Science Technology Engineering and Math) nights.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
Funding designated for on-site learning experiences and field trips were redesignated through amendments approved by School Site Council to Goal 2 totalling approximately $\$ 8,600$. Gibson was unable to host in-person opportunities, including after school performances, due to COVID-19 restrictions.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.
The needs assessment feedback was that the art journals are a quality item and if funding remains at the same level, to keep this resource. However, all stakeholders requested additional after school opportunities for students from clubs to classes. Moving forward, Gibson will not fund art journals, but will fund additional after school oppprtunities, materials, supplies, childcare and supervision associated with the clubs and classes. We will also add a college and career component in the form of an awareness event. Walk through History performances will continue for grades $4-6$. These can be viewed in Goal 1.1 of the 21-22 SPSA.

# 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

Each student's individual social-emotional and academic needs will be met through quality first instruction, enrichment, and intervention, in a safe and supportive environment.

## Goal 2

Each student's individual social-emotional and academic needs will be met through quality first instruction, enrichment, and intervention, in a safe and supportive environment.

## Identified Need

Based on a review of the California Dashboard, internal assessments and iReady during the needs assessment process with stakeholder groups, Gibson has identified the need to improve ELA and Math performance overall (with specific focus on reading, math vocabulary, number sense, fact fluency, and concepts and procedures in mathematics). Low expectations of students, lack of rigor, and inconsistent use of adopted curriculum are all factors to the low achievement scores. In addition, inconsistent use of available assessments intended to drive instruction, inability or unwillingness to collaborate with colleagues, and not utilizing instructional time effectively have also been factors.
The CHKS (California Healthy Kids Survey) and parent component of that survey echoed the lack of rigor and expectations with the classroom, and the lack of relationships directly impacted student attendance. Through the PBIS survey, students notified Gibson that they feel safest in the classroom and enjoy the PBIS digital rewards system and badging, but remain concerned about bullying. The math reflection survey for grades 3-6 indicated that students do not feel confident in math and want more practice. A focus on engaging, rigorous, culturally relevant resources with the use of supplemental curriculum and training staff to teach through a trauma informed lens will positively impact student achievement, climate and culture. Involving families in the education of their student will also be a part of this goal.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metric/Indicator
Performance level on ELA
(English Language Arts) and
Math Academic Indicator.

Performance level on English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)

Percentage of students in both the Meets and Exceeds

Baseline/Actual Outcome
As measured by SBAC, students overall are 22 points below standard in ELA (yellow on the CA dashboard) and 55.2 points below standards in Math (also yellow on the CA dashboard).
36.9\% of English Learners (EL's) progressed at least one ELPI level, showing movement toward English language proficiency.
Of the students who took the SBAC in 2019, 42\% either met

## Expected Outcome

Gibson students will show at least a 5 point increase, and decrease the distance from the standard in ELA and Math. This may continue to place Gibson in the yellow on the CA dashboard, but will show an increase to scores.
Gibson ELs will increase by $10 \%$, with a total of $47 \%$ making progress towards English language proficiency.

Gibson will increase the percentage of students

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Standards level on SBAC (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium) English Language Arts. | or exceeded the standard in ELA. | meeting or exceeding the standard in English-Language Arts by 3\%. |
| Percentage of students in both the Meets and Exceeds Standards level on SBAC (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium) Math. | Of the students who took the SBAC in 2019, 23.9\% either met or exceeded the standard in ELA. | Gibson will increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard in English-Language Arts by 5\%. |
| Number of students who are chronically absent | According to the CA Dashboard, 13.1\% of students at Gibson are considered chronic absentees. According to data from attendance clerks and liaisons in the Student Services department, during the 20-21 school year, 96 students were considered chronically absent (22.6\%), a drastic increase from 19-20. | Gibson will reduce the percentage of chronic absentees to $10 \%$. Our focus in this area will be to support those identified as homeless, since 14 students in this category struggled significantly with being at school on a daily basis. |
| Student sense of safety and school connectedness | Baseline from 2019-20: Only 34 of 74 fifth graders took the survey (46\% participation). 68\% felt connected to school, while $70 \%$ felt pride in their school and $73 \%$ felt safe at school all or most of the time. | Increase participation in the CHKS (California Healthy Kids Survey) to 75\% and three key indicators to $75 \%$. |
| Suspension rate | Approx 14 (2.8\%) students were suspended at least according tot the 2019 Fall Dashboard data. | Gibson will reduce suspensions for students identified as homeless and/or as a student with a disability. |
| Parent/family satisfaction on California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS), on key indicators | No data available due to lack of participation <br> Baseline: To be determined from the 2021 data | Gibson will strive to have $50 \%$ of student's parents complete the parent/family satisfaction, with $65 \%$ of those families rating Gibson "high" on key indicators. |
| Percentage of students who reach growth targets on iReady in Reading and Math (elementary only) | Mid-year Growth Targets according to iReady Kinder: Scores unavailable in Math; 0\% met ELA growth 1st grade: 21\% met Math; 17\% met ELA growth 2nd grade: 12\% met Math; 20\% met ELA growth 3rd grade: 8\% met Math; 38\% met ELA growth | We will increase the percentage of students meeting their growth targets by $10 \%$ in both academic areas of ELA and Math by the mid-year 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)
Gibson will improve instruction and student achievement for all students, with an emphasis on English learners and students with disabilities, while continuing to focus on student connectedness, safety, and parent and community involvement.

Strategy/Activity
Gibson will improve instruction and student achievement for all students, with an emphasis on English learners and students with disabilities, while continuing to focus on student connectedness, safety, and parent and community involvement.

## Improving Instruction and Student Achievement

Materials and Supplies to support instruction, differentiation, intervention, enrichment, and professional development (includes copy machine leases, clicks, paper, library and classroom texts)
Professional development for staff - conferences, trainings, books, webinars for staff (Computer Using Educators (CUE), Sonday System, Guided Reading, Differentiation, Math coaching, etc.) Instructional technology to support classroom instruction (examples include: Peardeck, Brainpop, BoardMaker Plus)
Sub/release time for teachers and Extra Duty - Professional Learning Communities, collaboration, Academic Conferences, data analysis, assessment Educational extension activities, field trips and onsite learning experiences - may include transportation and tickets

## PBIS/Safety/Student Connectedness Materials and Supplies to support continued PBIS

 implementation (badges, lanyards, reward prizes)Printing costs and postage to support PBIS - ODR (Office Discipline Referrals), positive postcards, banners with expectations (translated into Spanish), awards related to character and PBIS expectations
Technology: SWIS (Schoo-Wide Information System) and ARS (Advanced Referral System) program
Professional development for staff related to PBIS, restorative practices, trauma informed education, inclusivity, etc. - conferences, trainings, books, webinars for staff Sub/release time for teachers - common planning time to support PBIS
Counseling and intervention books used in conjunction with other means of correction (example: Harry Gator - Hands to Self; Decibella; How Dinosaurs Stay Safe at School)

Counseling curriculum and implementation/training (SEL) Attendance incentives and monthly attendance campaigns After school supervision to increase student safety

## Community Engagement

Family and Student events (March Book Madness, Family Night (STEM, Reading, Math, SEL) Communication technology subscriptions (Smore, Canva, youcanbook.me)
Printing and Postage to support communication

## 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.

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2020-21

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

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
Academic conferences, educational extension activities, instructional technology and materials and supplies were all utilized in 20-21 in an effort to improve instruction and boost student acheivement. Students have not yet met their iReady growth tagets (assessment completed in January) but that could also be due to a modified school schedule and less direct instrucction offered from March 2020-April 2021. Gibson did a full roll out of PBIS Rewards using the digital app, website, and badging system, which received positive feedback from staff and students, and allowed Gibson to move to a paperless Check-In-Check-Out coaching model with students needing behavioral supports. Positive home communication improved with printing flyers, packets, and posititive postcards. All proposed family nights took place, though they were offered virtually and were not well-attended.

Gibson was not able to reduce the number/percentage of chronic absentees this year, and at the time of writing this plan, the CHKS data has also not come in. However, we had $98 \%$ if parents utilizing the Parent Portal and all families accessing Parent Square for communiction.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
With factors like a global pandemic at play, assessments, field trips, and professional development were not carried out as the SPSA and team intended. Funds from Goal 1 and Goal 3 were diverted to this goal in order to provide materials and supplies for at-home learning for students.

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

Our metrics and goals have been updated to reflect a larger emphasis on local versus statewide assessments, as identified in the last metric of Goal 2 with the addition of iReady benchmarks. Gibson staff plans on attending additional professional development to support the teaching and learning around mathematics, as evidenced by additional funding for PD (Professional Development) and release time/planning.

## 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

Accelerate the academic achievement and English proficiency of each English Learner through an assets oriented approach, and standards based instruction.

## Goal 3

Accelerate the academic achievement and English proficiency of each English Learner through an assets oriented approach, and standards based instruction.

## Identified Need

In reviewing the California Dashboard with our stakeholders, Gibson school identified the need to improve the language proficiency of our English Learners. A high rate of chronic absenteeism, lack of student connection to the curriculum and campus, inconsistent supports at home and at school, and language gaps were identified as the main reasons for EL's not making progress on the ELPI. A focus on improving the knowledge of staff around the needs of English Learners, providing opportunities for family involvement, and opportunities for students to see their culture and language reflected in their surroundings.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reclassification rate for English Learners (EL's) | According to Dataquest, in 2019-2020, 21 students (17.1\%) were redesignated. This is below the district and county total but above the state. | Increase the reclassification rate to $22 \%$, exceeding district and county rates. |
| English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) | $36.9 \%$ of ELs are making progress according to the ELPI. | Increase this to 45\% of English Learners are making progress. |
| School rating of EL (English Learner) Roadmap Principle 1 on the self-assessment | Baseline on Principle 1: <br> Assets-oriented and Needs Responsive Schools <br> 1.5 Language and cultures are assets <br> 2.0 No single EL profile <br> 2.5 School climate is affirming, inclusive, and safe <br> 2.0 Strong family and school partnerships <br> 2.0 Supporting ELs with disabilities | Strengthen all areas that are not yet fully developed by a measure of 0.5 |

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

## Strategy/Activity 1 <br> Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity <br> (Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

## English Learners

## Strategy/Activity

Gibson will improve instructional outcomes for English Learners by increasing opportunities for parents to be involved in their student's education, providing signage and handouts in their native language (to the greatest extent possible), collaboration, data review and differentiation, and improved teaching strategies.

Professional development and training such as EL Roadmap to build awareness of the needs of English Learners and their families
PD/Coaching - EL Specialist to model and collaborate with staff to implement research-Obased instructional strategies for integrated ELD (English Language Development) instruction in content areas
Latino Family Literacy Project (to include childcare, food, extra duty, translation and project coordinator)
Sub/release time for student monitoring, ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee) assessment, EL Specialist meetings, academic conferences, SSTs (Study Study Team), 504s, IEPs (Individual Education Plan), conferences and trainings
Materials and supplies to support integrated and designated ELD (English Language Development) and language acquisition
Instructional technology - Example: BrainPOP EL
Before/after school intervention specific to English Learners including staff and materials/supplies Translation Services (Punjabi, Urdu for ELAC)
Reclassification ceremony to celebrate progress and achievement
PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support) expectations, banners, postcards and flags printed in English and Spanish

## 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)
1920.00
3383.00
1032.00

## Source(s)

## Supplemental/Concentration

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

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2020-21

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

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
English Learners continue to be assessed and data has not yet become available to determine the reclassification rate or growth according to the English Language Proficiency Indicator. However, Gibson's English Language Advisory Council (ELAC) expanded this year to include a second translator for those fluent in Punjabi and Urdu. The reclassification ceremony is scheduled for early June 2021.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
Due to COVID-19 protocols and closures, Gibson was unable to host the Latino Family Literacy Project and the county did not offer further EL Roadmap implementation training. Funding designated for those strategies were moved via SPSA amendment with approval from the School Site Council to Goal 2 in order to support at-home materials and supplies.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.
Gibson plans on implementing the strategies and acitvities from the 20-21 SPSA in the 21-22 school 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

Provide meaningful engagement and leadership opportunities for youth to directly and significantly shape each student's education and school community

## Goal 4

Provide meaningful engagement and leadership opportunities for youth to directly and significantly shape each student's education and school community

## Identified Need

Through the needs assessment process, student focus and stakeholder groups identified a lack of opportunities for students to provide input and participate in opportunities that drive instruction and engagement at the school site. Gibson must provide additional opportunities through survey, open dialogue, partnerships with the community and extracurricular activities in order to increase student voice, choice, and leadership.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator |
| :--- |
| Number of partnerships with <br> the community and other <br> programs that provide students <br> with opportunities to get <br> engaged |
| Number of extracurricular <br> programs offered | | Number and percent of |
| :--- |
| students providing input to the |
| SPSA (School Plan for Student |
| Achievement) through surveys |
| Number and percent of |
| students by representative |
| demographic providing input to |
| the SPSA through focus |
| groups |

Baseline/Actual Outcome
Gibson's current and only community partner is associated with a districtwide program from the Lions and Elk Clubs, offering a reading incentive.
Gibson currently partners with Sierra Nevada Journeys, SAMI's Circuit, and CEO Kids Art for $100 \%$ virtual after school opportunities. Student Council was not hosted in 20-21 due to the pandemic.

109 (55\%) students in grades 4-6 provided input to the SPSA through survey

16 students provided input to the SPSA through focus groups in grades 3-6 ( 1 Gifted and Talented, 2 Resignated as English Proficient, 1 English

## Expected Outcome

Gibson is working to expand to 3 community partnerships, specifically with Yolo Farm to Fork.

Gibson would like to continue with Sierra Nevada Journeys but expand to offer more sports, visual and performing arts, and student-selected opportunities within and outside of the school day, for a minimum of 6 extracurricular opportunities over the course of 2021-22.
Gibson would like to increase this percentage to $90 \%$ in grades 3-6.

Gibson would like increase to 4 focus groups, 1 per grade level, with students from each significant subgroup.

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
Gibson will increase opportunities for students to develop leadership skills, contribute questions and provide input for decision-making on campus. Gibson will expand community partnerships and student driven extracurricular opportunities on campus. Staff will provide opportunities for students to collaborate and exercise autonomy within the classroom. During recess/lunch, students will have the opportunity to participate in structured or unstructured play opportunities with the support of staff members training in confict management and PBIS. Gibson will continue to employ a socialemotional learning curriculum which provides students with language and real life examples of what it means and looks like to advocate for onself.

Student Advisory Council/Leadership (training, meetings, surveys)
Annual and trimester surveys done related to decision making on campus (Academic, PBIS, Materials, Safety, Concerns)
Materials and Supplies
Extra Time and Sub Release Time
After School Class and Club Opportunities

## 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)
2244.00
1250.00

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

## 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

## Amount

\$43,024
\$92,393.00

## Other Federal, State, and Local Funds

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

## Federal Programs

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

## Allocation (\$)

\$41,992.00
\$1,032.00

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: \$43,024.00
List the State and local programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Duplicate the table as needed.

## State or Local Programs

Supplemental/Concentration

## Allocation (\$)

$\$ 49,369.00$

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: \$49,369.00
Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: \$92,393.00

## 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
0 Other School Staff- vacant but advertised. No nominations.
5 Parent or Community Members

| Name of Members | Role |
| :--- | :--- |
| JaimeAnn Hopton | Principal |
| Lorie Greenberg | Classroom Teacher |
| Sam Kynard | Classroom Teacher |
| Rachel White | Classroom Teacher |
| VACANCY | Other School Staff |
| Jenny Lillge | Parent or Community Member |
| Sonia G. Cadena | Parent or Community Member |
| Trista Kennedy | Parent or Community Member |
| Mike Barry | Parent or Community Member |
| Fabiola Junez |  |

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:


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 $5 / 17 / 2021$.
Attested:


Principal, JaimeAnn Hopton on 5/17/2021

Sam Kynard (Staff Member) on 5/17/2021

