## School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) Template

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

| County-District-School <br> (CDS) Code | Schoolsite Council <br> (SSC) Approval Date | Local Board Approval <br> Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lee Middle School | 57727100000000 | $5 / 18 / 21$ |

## 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
Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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 (Every Student Succeeds Act) 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. The process consisted of a comprehensive needs assessment with all community stakeholders. The stakeholders involved included English Learner Advisory Committee, School Site Council, Staff, Teachers, Students, Site Administration, and District Office Administration. The process consisted of analysis of various data points from the California Dashboard, and local site level indicators. Stakeholders held dialogue around the data and provided feedback in terms of the root causes, and next steps (action items) moving forward.
- 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.
This ATSI plan meets state and ESSA requirements:
- In partnership with stakeholders (including the principal and other school leaders, teachers, and parents) the school developed and will implement a school-level ATSI plan to improve student outcomes for each subgroup of students that was the subject of identification.
- The ATSI plan was informed by all state indicators, including student performance against state-determined long-term goals (Goal, Identified Need, Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes, Annual Review and Update, as applicable)
- The ATSI plan includes evidence-based interventions.

Additionally, the ATSI plan identified resource inequities, which included a review of LEA(Local Education Agency)- and school-level budgeting, which is addressed through implementation of its ATSI plan .

## 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

Lee Middle School's 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 participates in the needs assessment process, and develops and approves the annual School Plan.

Formal needs assessments were conducted with multiple stakeholder groups at Lee Middle School including ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee), School Site Council, staff, and and with students. Each meeting included an in-depth review of the most recent California School Dashboard data for Lee Middle School students' academic performance, attendance, reclassification rate, and suspension rate. Groups also reviewed site-based data such as grades, attendance, student surveys, etc. 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 Academic Achievement and School Climate, of which 276 students responded. Student focus groups were created, with a balanced representation of student groups. 120 students participated in the focus group process. Student focus groups completed a needs assessment by reviewing survey, academic, and local data. Students identified Academic Achievement as an area 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 in early April, 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 2nd a team of Lee Middle School staff conducted an in -depth review of Lee Middle School students' performance data, identified Academic Achievement as an area of need, and proposed actions and strategies to support these needs. Areas of concern included increased numbers of D/F grades during Distance Learning, and low achievement in ELA (English Language Arts) and Math on the CA Dashboard as well as on district assessments.

Needs assessment meetings were also held with ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee on March 31st and with School Site Council on February 25th and March 25th. In all meetings, student Academic Achievement was identified as the primary need in addition to Social Emotional Support and School Climate and Culture work.

ELAC and staff reviewed the SPSA on April 21st, and provided additional feedback. School site council reviewed the plan on April 21st, considered recommendations and feedback from all groups, and finalized/ approved the SPSA on May 20th.

## Resource Inequities

Briefly identify and describe any resource inequities identified as a result of the required needs assessment, as applicable.
Lee Middle School, with the support of WJUSD's Educational Services department, is just beginning to explore resource allocations and inequities. As a team, we are working to identify areas of inequities as a first step of this process.

## 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 | 0.60\% | 0.61\% | 0.63\% | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| African American | 1.80\% | 0.92\% | 1.25\% | 12 | 6 | 8 |
| Asian | 3.60\% | 3.52\% | 2.19\% | 24 | 23 | 14 |
| Filipino | 0.15\% | 0.46\% | 0.16\% | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 71.17\% | 72.32\% | 71.16\% | 474 | 473 | 454 |
| Pacific Islander | 0.75\% | 0.61\% | 0.63\% | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| White | 20.27\% | 20.03\% | 21\% | 135 | 131 | 134 |
| Multiple/No Response | 0.30\% | 0.31\% | 1.57\% | 2 | 2 | 9 |
|  | Total Enrollment |  |  | 666 | 654 | 638 |

## Student Enrollment Enrollment By Grade Level

| Grade |  | Student Enrollment by Grade Level |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Students |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 0}$ |  |
| Grade 7 | 329 | 321 | 324 |  |
| Grade 8 | 337 | 333 | 314 |  |
| Total Enrollment | 666 | 654 | 638 |  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Our overall student enrollment for the last 3 years from 2017-18 to 2019-20 has dropped from 666 to 638 students. Families continue to pursue open enrollment in an effort to position their students to attend their high school of choice.
2. Demographic groups have remained relatively consistent. Our Hispanic/Latino population continues to be our largest demographic group with over $70 \%$ of our students belonging to this demographic with White students being our second largest demographic group.
3. The number of 7 th and 8 th grade students has remained relatively consistent over the past 3 years. Cohorts are relatively stable. The largest drop by among number of 8th Grade students from 18-19 to 19-20.

## 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 | 105 | 95 | 86 | $15.8 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) | 270 | 267 | 253 | $40.5 \%$ | $40.8 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ |
| Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) | 35 | 11 | 33 | $34.0 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $34.7 \%$ |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Our total population of English Learners (EL) has slightly declined over the last 3 years (by $2.3 \%$ overall) for an average of $14.6 \%$.
2. Our total population of fluent English proficient students has also slightly declined over the last 3 years (by less than $1 \%$ overall) for an average of $40.3 \%$.
3. Our total population of reclassified fluent English proficient students rebounded after a large decrease in the 18-19 school year for a 3-year average of 26.4\% of students reclassified.

## 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 7 | 323 | 319 | 301 | 313 | 314 | 294 | 312 | 314 | 294 | 96.9 | 98.4 | 97.7 |
| Grade 8 | 295 | 322 | 321 | 287 | 311 | 320 | 287 | 310 | 317 | 97.3 | 96.6 | 99.7 |
| All | 618 | 641 | 622 | 600 | 625 | 614 | 599 | 624 | 611 | 97.1 | 97.5 | 98.7 |

* 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 7 | 2504. | 2512. | 2503. | 4.49 | 8.92 | 5.10 | 25.64 | 25.16 | 26.53 | 33.01 | 28.66 | 29.93 | 36.86 | 37.26 | 38.44 |
| Grade 8 | 2523. | 2519. | 2523. | 4.88 | 5.81 | 5.05 | 27.53 | 27.74 | 28.08 | 32.75 | 28.71 | 32.18 | 34.84 | 37.74 | 34.70 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4.67 | 7.37 | 5.07 | 26.54 | 26.44 | 27.33 | 32.89 | 28.69 | 31.10 | 35.89 | 37.50 | 36.50 |


| 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 7 | 10.58 | 15.92 | 9.28 | 50.32 | 41.72 | 46.39 | 39.10 | 42.36 | 44.33 |
| Grade 8 | 11.50 | 12.26 | 12.70 | 49.83 | 42.58 | 44.44 | 38.68 | 45.16 | 42.86 |
| All Grades | 11.02 | 14.10 | 11.06 | 50.08 | 42.15 | 45.38 | 38.90 | 43.75 | 43.56 |


| Writing <br> Producing clear and purposeful writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 7 | 9.62 | 15.29 | 10.27 | 53.21 | 46.18 | 54.45 | 37.18 | 38.54 | 35.27 |
| Grade 8 | 9.82 | 13.23 | 9.21 | 51.58 | 45.16 | 57.78 | 38.60 | 41.61 | 33.02 |
| All Grades | 9.72 | 14.26 | 9.72 | 52.43 | 45.67 | 56.18 | 37.86 | 40.06 | 34.10 |


| Listening <br> Demonstrating effective communication skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 7 | 7.05 | 8.28 | 7.53 | 61.86 | 62.74 | 66.78 | 31.09 | 28.98 | 25.68 |
| Grade 8 | 7.67 | 11.29 | 7.94 | 70.03 | 61.29 | 68.89 | 22.30 | 27.42 | 23.17 |
| All Grades | 7.35 | 9.78 | 7.74 | 65.78 | 62.02 | 67.87 | 26.88 | 28.21 | 24.38 |


| Research/Inquiry <br> 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 7 | 11.54 | 17.83 | 14.78 | 55.45 | 52.23 | 50.17 | 33.01 | 29.94 | 35.05 |
| Grade 8 | 14.63 | 14.84 | 15.87 | 51.22 | 50.00 | 49.52 | 34.15 | 35.16 | 34.60 |
| All Grades | 13.02 | 16.35 | 15.35 | 53.42 | 51.12 | 49.83 | 33.56 | 32.53 | 34.82 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Lee Middle School has continued to increase percentage of students tested each year with $98.7 \%$ tested in 201819.
2. Student achievement remains relatively flat across all areas over the past 3 years in English Language Arts (ELA), for both 7th and 8th grades. There was a slight increase in ELA proficiency in percentage of students in the "standards met" and "standards nearly met" categories from 17-18 to 18-19.
3. Lee Middle School continues to see a large portion of students (36.5\%) not meeting standards in ELA, with $31.1 \%$ nearly meeting and $32.4 \%$ meeting or exceeding standards. This would indicate a need to develop intensive interventions for students in the area of ELA who are below standard as well as full implementation of the newly adopted curriculum and Tier 1 intervention for all 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 7 | 323 | 319 | 301 | 313 | 309 | 291 | 312 | 309 | 291 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 96.7 |
| Grade 8 | 295 | 322 | 321 | 283 | 309 | 315 | 282 | 309 | 315 | 95.9 | 96 | 98.1 |
| All | 618 | 641 | 622 | 596 | 618 | 606 | 594 | 618 | 606 | 96.4 | 96.4 | 97.4 |

*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 7 | 2492. | 2489. | 2491. | 6.41 | 8.41 | 7.90 | 14.10 | 15.21 | 13.75 | 33.33 | 26.54 | 31.96 | 46.15 | 49.84 | 46.39 |
| Grade 8 | 2522. | 2523. | 2501. | 9.57 | 10.03 | 10.79 | 20.57 | 19.42 | 12.70 | 26.60 | 29.77 | 25.08 | 43.26 | 40.78 | 51.43 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 7.91 | 9.22 | 9.41 | 17.17 | 17.31 | 13.20 | 30.13 | 28.16 | 28.38 | 44.78 | 45.31 | 49.01 |


| Concepts \& Procedures <br> Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 7 | 12.50 | 13.59 | 11.15 | 29.17 | 28.48 | 32.40 | 58.33 | 57.93 | 56.45 |
| Grade 8 | 15.96 | 19.81 | 13.27 | 39.01 | 35.39 | 29.13 | 45.04 | 44.81 | 57.61 |
| All Grades | 14.14 | 16.69 | 12.25 | 33.84 | 31.93 | 30.70 | 52.02 | 51.38 | 57.05 |

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 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 7 | 7.37 | 9.71 | 8.25 | 42.95 | 42.39 | 44.67 | 49.68 | 47.90 | 47.08 |
| Grade 8 | 8.87 | 9.74 | 11.86 | 38.65 | 49.03 | 37.82 | 52.48 | 41.23 | 50.32 |
| All Grades | 8.08 | 9.72 | 10.12 | 40.91 | 45.71 | 41.13 | 51.01 | 44.57 | 48.76 |


| Communicating Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\%$ 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 7 | 8.01 | 9.06 | 9.00 | 58.97 | 54.05 | 55.02 | 33.01 | 36.89 | 35.99 |
| Grade 8 | 14.54 | 13.31 | 9.62 | 50.71 | 53.25 | 50.32 | 34.75 | 33.44 | 40.06 |
| All Grades | 11.11 | 11.18 | 9.32 | 55.05 | 53.65 | 52.58 | 33.84 | 35.17 | 38.10 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Lee Middle School continues to test a high percentage of students, with $97.4 \%$ of students tested in 2018-19.
2. Math achievement has remained relatively flat over the past 3 years, with a low number of students scoring at or above standard $22.1 \%$ of all students. This would indicate a significant need in the area of math, and should drive our focus moving forward with the need to develop interventions at all tiers to improve student outcomes.
3. Students show the greatest struggle in the area of applying mathematical concepts and procedures with $57 \%$ of students scoring below standard, while communicating reasoning is the area of greatest strength with $61.9 \%$ of students scoring at or above standard in that area. This would indicate an area of focus on mathematical concepts and procedures within the math curriculum and interventions.

## 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 |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |  |
| Grade 7 | 1452.5 | 1485.8 | 1444.5 | 1480.4 | 1460.2 | 1490.6 | 46 | 40 |  |
| Grade 8 | 1475.7 | 1509.9 | 1470.1 | 1502.0 | 1480.9 | 1517.4 | 45 | 39 |  |
| All Grades |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91 | 79 |  |


| Overall Language <br> Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | 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 |
| 7 | * | 2.50 | 30.43 | 27.50 | 36.96 | 45.00 | 26.09 | 25.00 | 46 | 40 |
| 8 | * | 5.13 | 37.78 | 35.90 | 26.67 | 46.15 | * | 12.82 | 45 | 39 |
| All Grades | * | 3.80 | 34.07 | 31.65 | 31.87 | 45.57 | 24.18 | 18.99 | 91 | 79 |


| 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 |
| 7 | * | 12.50 | 36.96 | 47.50 | * | 15.00 | * | 25.00 | 46 | 40 |
| 8 | 24.44 | 10.26 | 42.22 | 43.59 | * | 30.77 | * | 15.38 | 45 | 39 |
| All Grades | 21.98 | 11.39 | 39.56 | 45.57 | 20.88 | 22.78 | 17.58 | 20.25 | 91 | 79 |


| Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $*$ | 2.50 | 52.17 | 52.50 | 32.61 | 45.00 | 46 | 40 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $*$ | 7.69 | 48.89 | 69.23 | 31.11 | 23.08 | 45 | 39 |
| All Grades | 17.58 | 5.06 | 50.55 | 60.76 | 31.87 | 34.18 | 91 | 79 |


| Percentage of StudentsSpeaking Domain <br> Bomain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 30.43 | 37.50 | 52.17 | 42.50 | $*$ | 20.00 | 46 | 40 |  |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 40.00 | 28.21 | 46.67 | 58.97 | $*$ | 12.82 | 45 | 39 |  |
| All Grades | 35.16 | 32.91 | 49.45 | 50.63 | 15.38 | 16.46 | 91 | 79 |  |


| Reading Domain <br> Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | 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 |
| 7 | * | 2.50 | * | 35.00 | 80.43 | 62.50 | 46 | 40 |
| 8 | * | 10.26 | * | 30.77 | 75.56 | 58.97 | 45 | 39 |
| All Grades | * | 6.33 | 14.29 | 32.91 | 78.02 | 60.76 | 91 | 79 |


| 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 |
| 7 | * | 0.00 | 71.74 | 75.00 | * | 25.00 | 46 | 40 |
| 8 | * | 0.00 | 75.56 | 92.31 | * | 7.69 | 45 | 39 |
| All Grades | * | 0.00 | 73.63 | 83.54 | 18.68 | 16.46 | 91 | 79 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Lee Middle School students showed an increase in all areas on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) from 2017-18 to 2018-19.
2. For overall language in 2018-19, $3.8 \%$ were at Level $4,31.65 \%$ were at Level $3,45.57 \%$ were at Level 2 , and $18.99 \%$ were at Level 1 . Compared with previous year's data, it appears students are progressing with the biggest gains in the Level 2 band.
3. Students made gains in the areas of writing and reading domains, however student achievement in the oral language, speaking, and listening domains continue to be a concern and should be an area of focus within the English Language Development (ELD) program.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Population

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

|  |
| :---: |
| Total <br> Enrollment |
| 654 |

This is the total number of students enrolled.

| Socioeconomically <br> Disadvantaged |
| :---: |
| 69.6 |

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. requiring instruction in both the English Language and in their academic courses.

This is the percent of students who are learning to communicate effectively in English, typically


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

2018-19 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group

| 2018-19 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| English Learners | 95 | 14.5 |
| Foster Youth | 4 | 0.6 |
| Homeless | 5 | 0.8 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 455 | 69.6 |
| Students with Disabilities | 106 | 16.2 |


| Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |  |
| African American | 6 | 0.9 |  |
| American Indian | 4 | 0.6 |  |
| Asian | 23 | 3.5 |  |
| Filipino | 3 | 0.5 |  |
| Hispanic | 473 | 72.3 |  |
| Two or More Races | 8 | 1.2 |  |
| Pacific Islander | 4 | 0.6 |  |
| White | 131 | 20.0 |  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Lee Middle School has $14.5 \%$ of our overall population identified as English Learners (EL). With such a large percentage of EL students, it is important to train ALL teachers in the English Languge Developement (ELD) Standards and specific strategies to help our EL students progress in English acquisition. Implementing he EL Roadmap should be a priority as well as increasing the use of EL Shadowing Strategies.
2. Lee Middle School has $16.2 \%$ of our students identified as students with disabilities (SWD). With such a large percentage of SWD, it is important to train ALL teachers in Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and differentiation strategies to ensure access to the general education curriculum, and to ensure adequate supports are in place to serve our SWD. Supporting and improving co-teaching partnerships as well as push-in paraprofessional support should continue be a focus as well as continuing developing intensive interventions in the Directed Studies classes.
3. Lee Middle School continues to have large numbers of Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) students (69.6\%) and our largest ethnic group is Hispanic at $72.3 \%$. With such large numbers, it is vital to ensure culturally relevant content and environment development as well as additional supports for our SED students both within and outside of the school day so they feel connected and represented in our school and curriculum.

## School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students

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


| Academic Engagement |
| :---: |
| Chronic Absenteeism |
| Red |


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

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. According to the dashboard indicator our suspension rate has improved to yellow, but is still in need of improvement. Implementation of Social-Emotional Learning Curriculum, Restorative Practices, and TraumaInformed training as part of a comprehensive Multi-Tiered System of Support will need to be prioritized.
2. According to the dashboard indicator our Math and English Language Arts (ELA) performance is in the orange and in need of improvement. Professional Learning Communities work will need to be strengthened so staff ensures ALL students learn at high levels in a data-driven systemic approach.
3. According to the dashboard indicator our chronic absenteeism measure dropped into the red and in significant need of improvement. A comprehensive attendance plan will need to be developed and implemented to impact these numbers.

## 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 | 5 | 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.

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



Students with Disabilities


Orange
109.4 points below standard

> | Increased |
| :---: |
| Significantly |
| ++17 points |
| 102 |

| African American |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data |
| Not Displayed for Privacy |
| 6 |


No Performance Color
Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy
3

| White |
| :---: |
| Orange |
| 12.1 points below standard |
| Declined -4 points |
| 118 |

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


| English Only |
| :---: |
| 38.4 points below standard |
| Declined -9.7 points |
| 272 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall, English Language Arts (ELA) performance remained relatively flat with all subgroups scoring in the orange. Overall performance remains low at 45 points below standard. Continuing to implement and further develop our Professional Learning Community practices will be important to ensure ALL students learn at high levels.
2. English Learner (EL) students saw a significant improvement of 10.1 points from previous year taking them from red to orange. Overall performance remains low at 80.6 points below standard. We need to continue identified strategies that are working and continue to develop others to support our EL students.
3. Students with Disabilities (SWD) also saw a significant improvement of 17 points from previous year taking them from red to orange. Overall performance remains low at 109 points below standard. We need to continue identified strategies that are working and continue to develop others to support our students with disabilities.

## 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 | 5 | 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.

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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 164 points below standard | 94.5 points below standard | 68.6 points below standard |
| Increased ++7.1 points | Declined -6.3 points | Declined Significantly -15.9 points |
| 51 | 165 | 269 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Math achievement overall remains low in the orange at 76.1 points below standard; a decline of 7.2 points from previous year. This indicates that math should be a primary area of focus for us this year. Our Math PLCs will need more collaborative time to analyze data and respond to student needs.
2. Our English Learner (EL) students saw an increase of 8.3 points, taking them from red to orange, however still remain very low at 110.9 points below standard. We need to continue what has accounted for our increase in this area, and continue to implement additional strategies specific to supporting our English Learners in math classes.
3. Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) saw a significant increase of 19.7 points, however still remain very low at 147.4 points below standard. We need to continue what has accounted for our increase in this area, and continue to implement additional strategies specific to supporting our students with disabilities in math classes.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance 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 |
| 45.3 making progress towards English |
| language proficiency |
| Number of EL Students: 75 |
| Performance Level: Medium |

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 | Maintained <br> ELPI Level 4 | Progressed At Least <br> One ELPI Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26.6 |  | 2.6 | 42.6 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. There are a total of 75 English Learner students at Lee Middle School. Overall performance level for English Learner (EL) students is Medium.
2. $45.3 \%$ of our English Learners are making progress toward English Language proficiency. We need to further drill down into our data to isolate why some students are progressing and others aren't and implement a plan to accelerate the progress of all English Learners.
3. $32 \%$ of our English Learners progressed one level or more, $23 \%$ maintained levels, and $20 \%$ declined one level. Renewed focus needs to be placed on English acquisition for our English Learner students. We need to continue to implement EL Shadowing strategies schoolwide to ensure our EL students have opportunities to engage in rigorous academic talk and evidence-based strategies for improvement.

## 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 |
| Performance |  |  |  |  |

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

|  | 2019 Fall Dashboard College/Career Equity Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green |

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 <br> Prepared <br> Approaching Prepared <br> Not Prepared |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prepared | Prepared |
|  | Approaching Prepared | Approaching Prepared |
| Not Prepared | Not Prepared |  |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$

## 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 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 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.

2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism for All Students/Student Group


| English Learners |
| :---: |
| Orange |
| 20 |
| Increased +10.7 |
| 100 |

## Students with Disabilities



Red
27.7

Increased +0.7

119

## 2019 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 | No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy <br> 4 | No Performance Color $\begin{gathered} 21.7 \\ \text { Increased }+13.7 \end{gathered}$ | No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| $\frac{K_{R e d}}{}$ | No Performance Color | No Performance Color | $\sum_{\text {Yellow }}^{\uparrow}$ |
| 16.2 | 27.3 | Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy | 16.3 |
| Increased Significantly +4.2 487 | 11 | $4$ | Declined -2.4 <br> 135 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall, Lee Middle School's chronic attendance increased significantly from previous year by 3.7 points for a total of 16.8 percent of students chronically absent putting us in the red category.
2. Hispanic ( $+4.2 \%$; $16.2 \%$ overall) and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged ( $+5.7 \% ; 19.8 \%$ overall) subgroups significantly increased and are in the red category. We will need to focus on these specific populations in our comprehensive attendance plan and develop strategies to target these populations.
3. English Learners, who had been in the green previously, increased by $10.7 \%$ for a total of $20 \%$. We will need to dive into the causes and develop specific additional supports and outreach to our EL families to ensure these numbers improve.

## 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 |
| Performance |  |  |  |  |

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



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. $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$

## 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 |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 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


No Performance Color
Less than 11 Students - Data not displayed for privacy


| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| Red |
| 21.7 |
| Increased +4.7 |
| 120 |

2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate 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 $\square$ 4.2 <br> Increased +4.2 <br> 24 | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students Data not displayed for privacy |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| $\frac{k}{\text { Red }}$ | No Performance Color | No Performance Color |  |
| 13 | $0$ | Less than 11 Students Data not displayed for privacy | $7.4$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Increased }+0.9 \\ 491 \end{gathered}$ | 11 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Declined -8.6 } \\ 135 \end{gathered}$ |

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

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Year

| 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 13 | 11.5 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. The dashboard shows a decline of $1.5 \%$ in the suspension rate, putting Lee Middle School in the yellow overall.
2. Hispanic students ( $13 \%$ overall) and English Learners ( $15.8 \%$ overall) saw increases in suspension rates putting them into the red category while White students ( $7.4 \%$ overall) saw a decrease ( $-8.6 \%$ ) and are in the green. This gap is concerning as it shows nearly double the percentage of Hispanic and EL students suspended when compared with their white counterparts. These populations need to be carefully considered and specific plans developed to address the gap with regard to suspension. Tier 1 Restorative Classroom level training and de-escalation strategies must also be developed in addition to enhancing our Positive Behavior Intervention and Support system.
3. Students with Disabilities have the highest suspension rate overall at $21.7 \%$, and showed an increase of $4.7 \%$ overall, putting them in the red category. Additional training is needed for staff in working with our SWD with regard to suspension rates, de-escalation and developing a more restorative classroom climate.

## 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 analysis of Dashboard data, and the comprehensive needs assessment with school stakeholders, the identified need was improving ELA and Math performance overall with a specific focus on English Learner and students with disabilities and providing differentiation and universal design for learning while providing more opportunities for meaningful engagement in college and career related activities and supports.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of students receiving college credit through dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment and articulated classes(high school only). | N/A | N/A |
| Percentage of students completing UC/CSU a-g course requirements (high school only). | N/A | N/A |
| Number of pathways that result in certification in high demand, local industry sectors (high school only). | N/A | N/A |
| Number and Percent of students that complete a CTE (Career Technical Education) pathway (high school only). | N/A | N/A |
| Number of students who participate in Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA). | 145 Students participated in Visual and Performing Arts classes during the 2020-21 school year. Courses offered this school year included: Intermediate Band, Advanced Band, Mariachi, Strings, Guitar, Choir, and Art. | We anticipate this number may drop in the 2021-22 school year due to losing our art teacher in the 2020-21 school year, and overall lower enrollment in music classes for the 2021-22 school year. We will endeavor to create |


| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | additional opportunities for students to access VAPA activities to make up for these losses. |
| Number of State Seals of Biliteracy awarded to students (high school only). | N/A | N/A |
| Increase numbers of students participating in meaningful college and career experiences through participation in AVID(Advancement Via Individual Determination), CTE (Career Technical Education) courses, EAOP (Early Academic Outreach Program) and similar programs, MESA (Math, Engineering, Science, Art) classes, college and other field trips, Guest Speakers and Career Day. | Capture baseline in 2020-21 regarding participation and meaningful engagement in college/career experiences. Student participation in the following programs is: <br> CTE Career Research \& Development Course=65 AVID Program=80 AVID Excel Program=60 EAOP \& ETS(Education Testing Service)=44 MESA after school=8 Career Day=TBD Guest speakers/Virtual College/Career field trips=217 online art class=27 | Increase number of students participating in opportunities during the school day and outside of the school day in meaningful college and career experiences by $10 \%$ |
| 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 focus on Students with Disabilities, English Learners. |  |  |
| Strategy/Activity |  |  |
| 1.1.1 Provide supplies, technology and copies to support intervention and differentiation needs of students including supplemental materials to ensure every student has access to intellectually rich, culturally relevant materials and environments <br> 1.1.2 Provide high-quality professional development in evidence-based instructional strategies to support teacher capacity <br> 1.1.3 Ensure effective PLC (Professional Learning Communities) collaborative structures and time for teachers to engage in collaborative work, data inquiry cycles, and implementation of specific strategies to address the needs of our EL and SWD. <br> 1.1.4 Support Schoolwide Implementation of AVID WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, Reading) strategies to build system of rigor. <br> 1.1.5 Strengthen support to new teachers and staff members, and guest teachers. |  |  |

## 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)
32039
22023

## Source(s)

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

## Strategy/Activity 2

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All Students, with focus on Students with Disabilities, English Learners.
Strategy/Activity
Improvement Strategy 1.2: Increase the number of opportunities for student exploration of college and career options.
1.2.1 Continue to support implementation of the AVID program
1.2.2 Provide support for College and Career Awareness and real-world applications
1.2.3 Support creative efforts to provide additional opportunities for student participation in VAPA 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)
3060
16240

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.

Overall we were able to meet the intention of our 2020-21 SPSA strategies for Goal 1 this year. Each of our strategies was implemented with as much fidelity as possible given the reality of what this year brought. The strategies in Goal 1 were all about providing the materials, technology, training and support for our students and staff which we were able to do, even though it might have looked a little different than what we thought it might when writing the SPSA. We were able to see the effectiveness of these strategies in classrooms throughout the campus as teachers implemented their new learning to benefit students and in the growth of our AVID program and overall success of our AVID students.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
Although we stuck to the intended implementation of our 2020-21 SPSA, the unique nature of this year caused some differences between the specific actions and budgeted expenditures during the 2020-21 school year. For example, we had to spend a great deal more than anticipated on technology, training and programs to equip our teachers with the knowledge and materials necessary to ensure successful implementation of remote learning. We also spent more on supplemental supplies for students than anticipated in efforts to provide our students with the materials they needed at home to access curriculum and lessons equitably. Instead of diving deeper into Universal Design for Learning (UDL) professional development with teachers, we shifted to trainings such as the Digital Learning Playbook and Simultaneous Learning Institute because the need was more immediate there and UDL strategies were embedded into those trainings. We did continue and expand on our intention to provide collaboration time to our staff, which helped them to work together to strengthen teaching during remote learning as well as reflect on data and plan next steps for students. We also met our intentions to deepen AVID implementation on our campus as many of our staff members had the opportunity to attend the Summer AVID Digital XP training and monthly workshops offered by Sacramento County Office of Education's AVID team to move AVID strategies to the digital environment. In addition, we had to spend a great deal more than anticipated in supporting new teachers and guest teachers due to the pandemic. With 1 teacher on military leave all year, and 3 out on extended maternity/paternity leave it was more costly to support those individuals and departments to ensure quality experiences for our 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.
Much of Goal 1 remains the same as we still have a need to ensure staff have access to quality professional development and effective collaborative structures to continue improving instruction. We will continue to develop our Professional Learning Community (PLC) structures as well as continue providing professional development in the areas of AVID and Universal Design for Learning schoolwide implementation. In addition, we will offer expanded college and career applications next year to ensure all students have access to the information and support they need to develop their pathway through and beyond high school.

## 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

After analysis of our local school Dashboard and local data, it was determined that the following were needed: increased student opportunities for intervention and extended learning, and a more positive school culture and climate. A more positive culture and climate would decrease chronic absenteeism and suspension rates and increase student sense of safety and connectedness.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome |
| :---: | :---: |
| Performance level on ELA and Math Academic Indicator. | CA Dashboard indicators show LMS (Lee Middle School) in the Orange category for both ELA and Math for the 2018-19 school year. <br> For 2018-19, the dashboard indicated LMS was 45.1 points below standard in ELA For 2018-19, EL students were 80.6 points below standard in ELA <br> For 2018-19, SWD were 109.4 points below standard in ELA <br> For 2018-19, the dashboard indicated LMS was 76.1 points below standard in Math For 2018-19, EL students were 110.9 points below standard in Math <br> For 2018-19, SWD were 147.4 points below standard in Math |
| Performance level on English Learner Progress Indicator | In 2018-19, 45.3\% of our English Learners were progressing towards |

## Expected Outcome

Our target for ELA and Math on CAASPP is 7 points overall, with expected accelerated growth for our EL and SWD populations of at least 5 additional points.
Due to suspension of CAASPP for the 2019-20 school year, we will also develop site-based measures in each PLC to track student attainment of essential standards.

Our target is to increase the percentage of English Learners making progress towards

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | proficiency in the English language. | proficiency in the English Language to at least 50\%. |
| Percentage of students in both the Meets and Exceeds <br> Standards level on SBAC <br> (Smarter Balanced <br> Assessment Consortium) <br> English Language Arts. | In 2018-19, 32\% of students met or exceeded the Standards on the SBAC English Language Arts test. | Our target is to increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding Standards on the SBAC English Language Arts test by 5\%. |
| Percentage of students in both the Meets and Exceeds Standards level on SBAC (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium) Math. | In 2018-19 22\% of students met or exceeded the Standards on the SBAC Math test. | Our target is to increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding Standards on the SBAC Math test by 5\%. |
| Number of students who are chronically absent | The 2019 chronic absence indicator put LMS in the Red category with $16.8 \%$ of students chronically absent. This was an increase of $3.7 \%$ from the previous year. In the 2018-19 school year 53 students were chronically absent and in the 2019-20 school year 65 students were chronically absent. | Our target is to reduce chronic absence to less than 10\% of our school population. |
| Student sense of safety and school connectedness | On the 2018-19 CHKS (California Healthy Kids Survey), 64\% of students felt safe or very safe at school <br> On the 2018-19 CHKS, 65\% of students reported feeling highly connected to school <br> Our overall SCI (School Climate Index) score for 2018-19 was 266 , representing a drop of 36 points from the previous year. | Increase percentage of students feeling safe or very safe at school to 70\% Increase percentage of students feeling highly conected to school to 70\% <br> Increase overall SCI score by 34 points to get to 300 |
| Suspension rate | Our suspension rate in 201819 was $11.5 \%$, which put LMS in the Yellow category on the dashboard. It was a decrease of $1.5 \%$ from the previous year. | Our target is to reduce the suspension rate by $3 \%$ to 8.5\%. |
| Parent/family satisfaction on Healthy Kids Survey, on key indicators | On the 2018-19 CHKS, parents responded "agree or strongly agree" to the following questions: School encourages me to be an active partner with the | Our target is to maintain this high level of parent satisfaction, and work on the areas of improving counseling supports and meeting students' social emotional needs. |


| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | school in educating my child83\% <br> School staff treats parent with respect-87\% <br> School keeps me well informed-88\% <br> School promotes Academic <br> Success for All students-87\% <br> Learning Environment is <br> supportive and inviting-92\% <br> School has adults that really care about students-92\% <br> School has high expectations for all students -74\% <br> School is a safe place for students-89\% <br> School provides quality counseling supports or students with social/emotional needs-51\% <br> School provides opportunities for meaningful student participation-79\% |  |
| Percentage of students who reach growth targets on iReady in Reading and Math (elementary only) | N/A | N/A |

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, with focus on Students with Disabilities and English Learners.

Strategy/Activity
Improvement Strategy 1: Ensure implementation of Academic RtI/MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Support) at all levels of need.
2.1.1 Continue to implement a comprehensive multi-tiered system of support for student's academic needs and accelerate learning to close gaps
2.1.2 Embed academic intervention, enrichment and support into the school day
2.1.3 Continue PD support and collaboration for quality first instruction
2.1.4 Develop system to identify, track and collect data with regard to students in need of academic intervention
2.1.5 Continue to support implementation of new Directed Studies class for RSP students
2.1.6 Expand Support for the STEM program
2.1.7 Continue to provide after-school homework support for students
2.1.8 Engage parents as partners in academic intervention/enrichment by creating a Parent Engagement Academy

## 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)
2020
10450

1000

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

## Strategy/Activity 2

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All Students with a focus on English Learners, and Students with Disabilites.
Strategy/Activity
Improvement Strategy 2: Maintain and improve positive school-wide climate \& culture with socialemotional multi-tiered system of support at all levels of need.
2.2.1 Continue support and implementation of schoolwide PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support)
2.2.2 Continue to develop and strengthen Tier 1 behavioral and social-emotional supports for students
2.2.3 Continue to develop and implement Tier $2 / 3$ behavioral and social-emotional supports for students
2.2.4 Create and implement comprehensive attendance intervention plan
2.2.5 Provide Professional Development to staff on Social-Emotional Topics to support students
2.2.6 Create a more appealing physical environment for students

## 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)
27506
4890

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.
Our strategies in this area were divided into Academic and Social-Emotional. Given the importance and need to provide Social-Emotional support to our students throughout this year, it was our main implementation focus in Goal 2. We implemented and expanded on many of our planned actions including continuing to implement a universal screener and provide Tier 2 and 3 services for students who required them in addition to implementing a Tier 1 Social Emotional Learning Curriculum. Our counselors and entire Tier 2 team worked hard to transition our systems to the online environment creating referral forms, websites with embedded support, and newsletters to keep students, parents and staff informed. Our survey data showed this was effective as a large percentage of our students, parents and staff knew what help was available and how to access it. In addition, we continued to refine and implement our Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) program, known as Lee as the Wildcat Way. The team worked hard to provide motivation and positive reinforcement in the digital environment as we switched from a paper-based system to a digital system complete with an online student store that students responded well to. Our data showed that $100 \%$ of teachers and students took part in the digital rewards program and many students in our focus groups and survey indicated they found it to be a positive experience. In addition, we were able to transition our PAWS (Preparing All Wildcats for Success) 7th grade Orientation and Mentoring program online offering a virtual orientation for our incoming 7 th graders as well as follow up events and meetings for the mentors and 7th graders to offer support throughout the year. The mentors also led our "return to school" orientations prior to reopening. We also had a much more effective attendance intervention plan this year, resulting in improved attendance rates and lower chronic absenteeism. We did, however, have to put our plans to develop a comprehensive Academic Intervention plan on hold this year with so many other areas of immediate need that required our attention. We were, however, able to partially implement a Tier 1 Academic Intervention program which is an important first step in moving to a more fully formed plan as well as continued to offer after school and evening tutoring for students in need.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
There were no major differences between the intended implementation and budgeted expenditures to meet the articulated goal for Goal 2.

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.
No major changes will be made to this goal, however a renewed focus on creating and implementing a comprehensive academic intervention/enrichment program will be present in the 2021-22 school year. Strategy 1 has been rewritten to focus on providing support both after school and during the school day as was strongly requested from our student focus groups and survey participants. We put a lot of work into our Social Emotional side of the Multi-Tiered System of

Support this year, which will allow us to put more effort into developing the Academic side in 202122.

## 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

After analysis of Dashboard data and our local school data it was determined that we have the following needs: increase the reclassification rate of ELs and show growth in the EL progress indicator, while decreasing the number of LTEL students.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reclassification rate for English Learners | In the 19-20 school year, 33 students were reclassified english proficient for a total of 34.7\% | Increase the percentage of students reclassifying by 5\% |
| English Learner Progress Indicator | The baseline set on the 201819 Dashboard is that $45.3 \%$ of English Learner students are making progress. | Increase the percent of English Learner students that are making progress by $5 \%$ for a total of more than $50 \%$ |
| Number of long term English Learners (LTEL) (middle and high school only) | In 2019-20, there were a total of 326 Ever ELs, with 67 <br> LTELs for a total of $20 \%$. | Decrease the percentage of our English Learners who are LTELS by $5 \%$ |
| School rating of EL (English Learner) Roadmap Principle 1 on the self-assessment | Our baseline rating on Principle 1 of the EL Roadmap is as follows: <br> 2 for Language and Culture as assets <br> 2 for no Single EL Profile 2.5 for school climate is affirming, inclusive and safe 1.5 for strong family and school partnerships <br> 1.5 for supporting ELs who are dually identified as SWD | Improve baseline rating on Principle 1 by .5 or more in each area |

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 (EL)
Strategy/Activity
Improvement Strategy 1: Implement evidence-based instructional strategies, collaborative structures and supports to improve EL performance.
3.1.1 Provide all EL students with consistent support in addition to ELD classes
3.1.2 Provide support for implementation of AVID Excel Program
3.1.3 Provide targeted Professional Development specific to the needs of EL students

- PD/coaching- EL specialist to model and collaborate with staff to implement research based instructional strategies for integrated ELD instruction in content areas, as well provide PD
- Identify students by language proficiency. EL specialist to collaborate and provide PD focused on intervention and differentiation to meet students needs by proficiency level during content instruction
3.1.4 Provide structured collaboration time for EL PLC
3.1.5 Create and support engaging opportunities and activities that appeal to our EL population
3.1.6 Provide support to Dual Immersion program
3.1.7 Engage EL parents as partners in academic intervention/enrichment through Spanish Language Parent Academy


## 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)
3500
4240

521

## 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.
Goal 3 was implemented as intended throughout this year. We continued to provide support for our English Learners including monitoring, data chats, Intervention/Support coordination with EL

Specialist, classroom teachers and administration, ELRT (English Learner Resource Team) meetings for those EL students with more than 2 D/F grades with all stakeholders, and providing Intervention opportunities within and outside of the school day in the virtual setting. We also fully implemented our AVID Excel program providing support to our long-term English Learner students as well as providing professional development to our teachers in the areas of the ELD standards and continuing efforts and training in the area of EL Shadowing. In addition, we started a Mecha/ Brown Issues club this year for our students to participate in.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
There were only minor differences between the intended implementation and budgeted expenditures except with regard to professional development and field trip opportunities being less expensive as they transitioned to the virtual format as travel was not allowed due to COVID. In addition, we had hoped to do more with the EL Roadmap this year, however were not able to as the efforts were put into other areas.

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.
There are no major changes to this goal for 2021-22, but we will be adding a mentoring program for our English Learner students--an idea that came out of our ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee) committee. We will be utilizing the evidence-based program Check and Connect as the underlying structure for creating a program where each English Learner will have a mentor they work with to provide academic, attendance, family connection and social-emotional support. This is part of sub-strategy 3.1.1 in providing consistent support to our students.

## 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

## Student engagement and Youth Engagement

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator |
| :--- |
| Number of partnerships with |
| the community and other |
| programs that provide students |
| with opportunities to get |
| engaged |
| Number of extracurricular |
| 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 |

Baseline/Actual Outcome
Currently we have developed partnerships with the Woodland Police Department, Woodland Public Library, EAOP Program at UCDavis, ETS Program at UCDavis, Yolo Farm to Fork, and the WHS Ag Program.

In 2020-21 we offered 3 extracurricular intramural sports programs, and 6 clubs students could participate in after school. We also offer cocurricular opportunities through our Leadership and PAWS program as well as AVID and Yearbook. In 2020-21 we had 12 sections in the master schedule dedicated to these co-curricular opportunities.
In 2020-21 276 (44\%) students provided feedback to the SPSA through participation in the survey.
In 2020-21 120 (19\%) students provided feedback to the SPSA development through participation in a focus group.

## Expected Outcome

Increase the number of partnerships by at least 2 as opportunities arise.

Increase sports back to full program of 8 sports teams, and increase the number of clubs to at least 10. Expand the number of co-curricular opportunities by at least 2 .

Increase percentage of respondents to at least $50 \%$ of the student body in 2021-22 survey administration.
Meet or exceed the number of students (120+ or 20\%) participating in focus groups to

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| the SPSA through focus groups |  | provide input for SPSA development in 2021-22. |
| Number of participants in cocurricular programs and community service activities | 0\%/ No data currently available: Create a baseline for the number of students participating in co-curricular programs and community service activities during 202021 school year. | Increase baseline number by $10 \%$ in 2021-22 school 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)
All students will improve from improved instruction, but we will have a focus on English Learners and students with disabilities.

## Strategy/Activity

Improvement Strategy 1: Implement programs and strategies to develop student leadership opportunities, meaningful engagement and connection to school and the community.
4.1.1 Implement PAWS program for systemic support and involvement of incoming 7th grade students and leadership development of 8th Graders
4.1.2 Continue support for student leadership development in Leadership, PAWS, and AVID Programs
4.1.3 Implement Student Senate/RSVP program to ensure meaningful student participation and provide opportunities for student voice
4.1.4 Provide support for extra and co-curricular programs on campus to support meaningful participation and leadership development
4.1.5 Provide support for leadership development of student-athletes

## 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)
4660
4050

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

\$63,414
\$136,199.00

## 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 (\$)

\$61,893.00
\$1,521.00

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: \$63,414.00
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 (\$)
\$72,785.00

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: \$72,785.00
Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: \$136,199.00

## 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
2 Parent or Community Members
3 Secondary Students

| Name of Members | Role |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shelley Friery | Principal |
| Tiffany Radcliff | Classroom Teacher |
| Jacqueline Stewart | Classroom Teacher |
| Danielle Shifrine | Classroom Teacher |
| Ramon Aceves | Other School Staff |
| PJ Gordon | Parent or Community Member |
| Casey Raubach | Parent or Community Member |
| Metzy Solorio Vasquez | Secondary Student |
| Alisha Raiman | Secondary Student |
| Manahil Shehzad |  |

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 $5 / 18 / 21$
Attested:


| Principal, Shelley Friery | on $5 / 18 / 21$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SSC Chairperson, Manahil Shehzad | on $5 / 19 / 21$ |

