# 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 <br> (CDS) Code |
| :--- | :---: |
| Woodland Senior High <br> School | 57727105738802 |

Schoolsite Council Local Board Approval (SSC) Approval Date
May 17, 2021

Date
May 27, 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 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 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

Woodland High 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 Woodland High School including ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee), School Site Council, staff, and students. Each meeting included an in-depth review of the most recent California School Dashboard data for Woodland High School 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 "Student Engagement", of which 315 students responded. Student focus groups were created, with a balanced representation of student groups. Twenty four students participated in the focus group process. Student focus groups completed a needs assessment by reviewing survey, academic, and local data. Students identified "Student Engagement" 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 on April 19, 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 April 14, 2021, a team of staff conducted an in depth review of 1287 students' performance data, identified "Student Engagement" as an area of need, and proposed actions and strategies to support these needs.

Needs assessment meetings were also held with ELAC on April 27, 2021, and with School Site Council groups on April 29, 2021. Both groups agreed "Student Engagement" was an appropriate and needed area of focus.

ELAC and staff reviewed the SPSA on May 15, 2021, and provided additional feedback. School site council reviewed the plan on May 17, 2021, considered recommendations and feedback from all groups, and finalized/approved the SPSA on May 17. 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 | 0.78\% | 0.6\% | 0.84\% | 10 | 8 | 11 |
| African American | 1.25\% | 1.28\% | 1.15\% | 16 | 17 | 15 |
| Asian | 3.27\% | 3.17\% | 2.75\% | 42 | 42 | 36 |
| Filipino | 0.23\% | 0.23\% | 0.31\% | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 68.64\% | 71.4\% | 71.6\% | 882 | 946 | 938 |
| Pacific Islander | 0.31\% | 0.6\% | 0.53\% | 4 | 8 | 7 |
| White | 22.96\% | 20.3\% | 20.38\% | 295 | 269 | 267 |
| Multiple/No Response | 1.17\% | 0.83\% | 2.14\% | 15 | 11 | 4 |
|  | Total Enrollment |  |  | 1285 | 1,325 | 1,310 |

## Student Enrollment

 Enrollment By Grade Level| Grade |  | Student Enrollment by Grade Level |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{3 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 0}$ |  |
|  | 323 | 347 | 356 |  |
| Grade 9 | 339 | 311 | 332 |  |
| Grade 10 | 324 | 324 | 316 |  |
| Grade 11 | 285 | 343 | 306 |  |
| Grade 12 | 1,285 | 1,325 | 1,310 |  |
| Total Enrollment |  |  |  |  |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The percentage of students identifying as Latino/ Hispanic at 71.6-up . 2 percent from last year. Continues incremental trend of increase.
2. Enrollment over the last three years has been fairly consistent with a slight decrease in 2019-2020.
3. WHS continues to have a diverse population with no major fluctuations in any subgroup.

## 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 | 127 | 145 | 123 | $9.9 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) | 547 | 582 | 600 | $\mathbf{4 2 . 6} \%$ | $43.9 \%$ | $45.8 \%$ |
| Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) | 17 | 17 | 16 | $12.5 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The percent of English Language Learners has held between 9.5 to about 11 percent over the last three years.
2. The number of Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students has fluctuated between 11 to about 13.5 percent over the last three years but remains approximately the same in number of students.
3. The number of FEP students has steadily increased by about three percent over the last three years.

## 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 11 | 295 | 316 | 301 | 282 | 304 | 287 | 281 | 304 | 285 | 95.6 | 96.2 | 95.3 |
| All | 295 | 316 | 301 | 282 | 304 | 287 | 281 | 304 | 285 | 95.6 | 96.2 | 95.3 |

*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 11 | 2577. | 2571. | 2589. | 14.95 | 18.75 | 16.49 | 37.37 | 27.63 | 41.40 | 28.83 | 30.26 | 25.26 | 18.86 | 23.36 | 16.84 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 14.95 | 18.75 | 16.49 | 37.37 | 27.63 | 41.40 | 28.83 | 30.26 | 25.26 | 18.86 | 23.36 | 16.84 |


| 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 11 | 23.13 | 23.68 | 22.46 | 53.38 | 48.36 | 56.84 | 23.49 | 27.96 | 20.70 |
| All Grades | 23.13 | 23.68 | 22.46 | 53.38 | 48.36 | 56.84 | 23.49 | 27.96 | 20.70 |


| Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 11 | 24.56 | 25.33 | 26.67 | 51.96 | 45.07 | 56.14 | 23.49 | 29.61 | 17.19 |
| All Grades | 24.56 | 25.33 | 26.67 | 51.96 | 45.07 | 56.14 | 23.49 | 29.61 | 17.19 |


| 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 11 | 16.37 | 15.46 | 15.79 | 66.90 | 67.11 | 70.18 | 16.73 | 17.43 | 14.04 |
| All Grades | 16.37 | 15.46 | 15.79 | 66.90 | 67.11 | 70.18 | 16.73 | 17.43 | 14.04 |


| Research/Inquiry <br> Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 11 | 24.56 | 25.99 | 27.72 | 53.02 | 49.67 | 55.09 | 22.42 | 24.34 | 17.19 |
| All Grades | 24.56 | 25.99 | 27.72 | 53.02 | 49.67 | 55.09 | 22.42 | 24.34 | 17.19 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. In 2018-19 overall achievement was at it highest with $57.89 \%$ of students meeting or exceeding standards. Continued investment into the PLC (Professional Learning Community) Data Inquiry process should be explored to continue upward trend.
2. Students in the "standard not met" category was the lowest in 2018-19 over the last three years at $16.84 \%$. Losee PD series on literacy in 2018-'19 school year a likely contributor to increased performance.
3. Percent above standard in writing and research/inquiry steadily increasing- listening is lowest domain.

## 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 11 | 295 | 316 | 301 | 283 | 303 | 287 | 283 | 302 | 287 | 95.9 | 95.9 | 95.3 |
| All | 295 | 316 | 301 | 283 | 303 | 287 | 283 | 302 | 287 | 95.9 | 95.9 | 95.3 |

*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 11 | 2535. | 2522. | 2523. | 3.89 | 4.97 | 4.88 | 16.61 | 13.25 | 10.10 | 24.73 | 22.52 | 26.13 | 54.77 | 59.27 | 58.89 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3.89 | 4.97 | 4.88 | 16.61 | 13.25 | 10.10 | 24.73 | 22.52 | 26.13 | 54.77 | 59.27 | 58.89 |


| Concepts \& Procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 11 | 8.48 | 9.60 | 7.34 | 26.50 | 22.52 | 22.03 | 65.02 | 67.88 | 70.63 |
| All Grades | 8.48 | 9.60 | 7.34 | 26.50 | 22.52 | 22.03 | 65.02 | 67.88 | 70.63 |

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 11 | 6.01 | 7.95 | 8.04 | 41.34 | 41.39 | 45.45 | 52.65 | 50.66 | 46.50 |
| All Grades | 6.01 | 7.95 | 8.04 | 41.34 | 41.39 | 45.45 | 52.65 | 50.66 | 46.50 |


| Communicating Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 11 | 10.25 | 7.62 | 5.59 | 56.18 | 50.00 | 55.94 | 33.57 | 42.38 | 38.46 |
| All Grades | 10.25 | 7.62 | 5.59 | 56.18 | 50.00 | 55.94 | 33.57 | 42.38 | 38.46 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Only $14.98 \%$ of students are scoring above or meeting standard. Math proficiency remains WHS area of greatest need- high turnover in this department and continued need for development of effective instructional strateies are major contributors.
2. The percentage above or meeting standard is at a the lowest in a three-year decline in 2018-'19. Items for increased tutoring opportunities written into SPSA.
3. "Communicating reasoning" is strongest area of meeting or exceeding standard.

## 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 9 | 1496.3 | 1488.7 | 1505.4 | 1492.8 | 1486.7 | 1484.3 | 32 | 43 |
| Grade 10 | 1490.0 | 1482.1 | 1480.1 | 1466.3 | 1499.4 | 1497.4 | 32 | 26 |
| Grade 11 | 1524.1 | 1490.3 | 1515.2 | 1473.7 | 1532.5 | 1506.5 | 31 | 27 |
| Grade 12 | * | 1498.6 | * | 1483.5 | * | 1513.2 | * | 27 |
| All Grades |  |  |  |  |  |  | 105 | 123 |


| 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 |
| 9 | * | 0.00 | * | 25.58 | * | 46.51 | * | 27.91 | 32 | 43 |
| 10 | * | 11.54 | * | 23.08 | * | 15.38 | 37.50 | 50.00 | 32 | 26 |
| 11 | * | 3.70 | 38.71 | 18.52 | * | 40.74 | * | 37.04 | 31 | 27 |
| 12 |  | 3.70 | * | 29.63 | * | 33.33 | * | 33.33 | * | 27 |
| All Grades | 17.14 | 4.07 | 29.52 | 24.39 | 25.71 | 35.77 | 27.62 | 35.77 | 105 | 123 |

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

| Grade <br> Level | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 37.50 | 11.63 | $*$ | 46.51 | $*$ | 25.58 | $*$ | 16.28 | 32 | 43 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 37.50 | 26.92 | $*$ | 15.38 | $*$ | 15.38 | 34.38 | 42.31 | 32 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 35.48 | 3.70 | 41.94 | 29.63 | $*$ | 33.33 | $*$ | 33.33 | 31 | 27 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $*$ | 14.81 | $*$ | 37.04 | $*$ | 25.93 | $*$ | 22.22 | $*$ | 27 |
| All Grades | 34.29 | 13.82 | 29.52 | 34.15 | 14.29 | 25.20 | 21.90 | 26.83 | 105 | 123 |


| Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 56.25 | 65.12 | $*$ | 18.60 | $*$ | 16.28 | 32 | 43 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 46.88 | 42.31 | $*$ | 23.08 | 37.50 | 34.62 | 32 | 26 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 58.06 | 51.85 | $*$ | 18.52 | $*$ | 29.63 | 31 | 27 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $*$ | 48.15 | $*$ | 29.63 | $*$ | 22.22 | $*$ | 27 |  |
| All Grades | 53.33 | 53.66 | 24.76 | 21.95 | 21.90 | 24.39 | 105 | 123 |  |


| Reading Domain <br> Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $*$ | 0.00 | $*$ | 27.91 | 78.13 | 72.09 | 32 | 43 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $*$ | 3.85 | $*$ | 38.46 | 62.50 | 57.69 | 32 | 26 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ |  | 0.00 | 38.71 | 33.33 | 61.29 | 66.67 | 31 | 27 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ |  | 3.70 | $*$ | 51.85 | $*$ | 44.44 | $*$ | 27 |  |
| All Grades | $*$ | 1.63 | 26.67 | 36.59 | 69.52 | 61.79 | 105 | 123 |  |

## Writing Domain

Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students

| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $*$ | 0.00 | 46.88 | 67.44 | 34.38 | 32.56 | 32 | 43 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $*$ | 11.54 | 59.38 | 53.85 | $*$ | 34.62 | 32 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $*$ | 7.41 | 67.74 | 51.85 | $*$ | 40.74 | 31 | 27 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $*$ | 3.70 | $*$ | 70.37 | $*$ | 25.93 | $*$ | 27 |
| All Grades | 16.19 | 4.88 | 60.00 | 61.79 | 23.81 | 33.33 | 105 | 123 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall performance on the ELPAC (English Learner Proficiency Assessment for California) dipped approximately eight percent with the 9th and 10th graders and $34 \%$ in the 11th grade over the last two years. Inconsistent staffing and lack of highly trained instructors are major contributing factors. Focused hiring efforts and reassigning of sections are in progress.
2. Students classified as 4 s and 3 s decreased and increased in 2 s and 1 s in overall language. Roughly $35 \%$ of students are a level 1, $35 \%$ level $2,24 \%$ level 3 and $4 \%$ level 4.
3. Area of greatest need is in reading with the lowest percentage of students scoring "Well Developed" ( 1.62 percent) and the highest percentage of students scoring "Beginning" ( 61.79 percent).

## 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 |  |  |
| 1325 | 64.8 | English <br> Learners | Foster <br> Youth |
| 10.9 | 0.8 |  |  |

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 | 145 | 10.9 |
| Foster Youth | 10 | 0.8 |
| Homeless | 6 | 0.5 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 859 | 64.8 |
| Students with Disabilities | 186 | 14.0 |


| Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| African American | 17 | 1.3 |
| American Indian | 8 | 0.6 |
| Asian | 42 | 3.2 |
| Filipino | 3 | 0.2 |
| Hispanic | 946 | 71.4 |
| Two or More Races | 21 | 1.6 |
| Pacific Islander | 8 | 0.6 |
| White | 269 | 20.3 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. The percentage of English Learners saw a two percent increase from below ten percent to almost 11 percent.
2. In 2018-'19 there were roughly $65 \%$ of students identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged- rate has stayed the same from last year.
3. Hispanic students remain the largest total percentage of WHS's population and 71.4 percent.

## School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students



## Conclusions based on this data:

1. ELA Performance, the Graduation Rate, Suspension Rate, and College/Career indicators are all strong. ELA moved from Yellow to Green this school year. Strong student centered vision contributed in upward movement.
2. Mathematics proficiency rates remain the greatest area of need site wide.

## 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 | 2 | 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 |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 81.9 points below standard |
| Increased |
| Significantly |
| ++44.4 points |
| 40 |


| 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 | No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy | No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| 0.5 points below standard | No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data | No Performance Color Less than 11 Students - Data | 26.1 points above standard |
| Increased Significantly ++16.7 points | Not Displayed for Privacy <br> 4 | Not Displayed for Privacy <br> 1 | Increased ++5.7 points 67 |

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 |
| :---: |
| 122.1 points below standard |
| Maintained -1.9 points |
| 23 |


| Reclassified English Learners |
| :---: |
| 23.1 points below standard |
| Increased |
| Significantly |
| ++58.6 points |
| 17 |


| English Only |
| :---: |
| 16.3 points above standard |
| Declined -3.6 points |
| 142 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall performance in ELA (English Language Arts) is strong with five groups increasing (All, EL(English Learners), and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and RFEPs (Reclassified Fluent English Proficient).
2. Current English Learners maintained performance while only one group, EO (English only) students, declined.
3. While overall performance increased, six groups are points below the standard ranging from .5 points below standard (Hispanic students) to 81.9 points below standard (Students with Disabilities). Additional supports and restructuring of RSP (Resource Specialist Program) in progress to address Sped (special education) needs.

## 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 | 2 | 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

| All Students |
| :---: |
| Orange |
| 101.6 points below standard |
| Maintained ++2.9 points |
| 285 |



| African American |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data |
| Not Displayed for Privacy |
| 3 |


| American Indian |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data |
| Not Displayed for Privacy |
| 3 |
|  |


No Performance Color
Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy
2

| White |
| :---: |
| Yellow |
| 67.8 points below standard |
| Increased ++10.8 points |
| 66 |

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



## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall performance in six groups increased (ELs, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), Students with Disabilities, White students, Current ELs, and RFEPs)
2. All students maintained performance along with Hispanic subgroup while EOs declined.
3. All groups are blow standard ranging from 67.8 points (White students) to 182.1 points below standard (Students with Disabilities). Same comment as previous data set for Sped student needs.

## 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 |
| 33.6 making progress towards English |
| language proficiency |
| Number of EL Students: 110 |
| Performance Level: VeryLow |

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 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23.6 | 42.7 | Maintained <br> ELPI Level 4 | Progressed At Least <br> One ELPI Level |
| 1.8 | 31.8 |  |  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. A little over one-third of students are making progress toward English language proficiency. Same comment as previous data set on ELPAC scores.
2. Almost half of students ( 44 percent) are maintaining but not progressing while about a quarter are decreasing performance (24 percent) and a little under a third are progressing (31 percent)

## School and Student Performance Data <br> Academic Performance <br> College/Career

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 College/Career Equity Report

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

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

| All Students |
| :---: |
| Green |
| 51.4 |
| Increased Significantly +14 |
| 317 |


| Homeless |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data Not |
| Displayed for Privacy |
| 0 Students |
|  |


| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data Not |
| Displayed for Privacy |
| 0 Students |
|  |


| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data Not |
| Displayed for Privacy |
| 0 Students |
|  |

2019 Fall Dashboard College/Career by Race/Ethnicity


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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37.4 Prepared | 37.4 Prepared | 51.4 Prepared |
| 20.7 Approaching Prepared | 20.7 Approaching Prepared | 18.6 Approaching Prepared |
| 41.8 Not Prepared | 41.8 Not Prepared | 30 Not Prepared |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall College an Career Readiness increased to over half of all students with six groups increasing (All, EL, Homeless, SED, Students with Disabilities, and Hispanic students).
2. White students maintained performance and no groups declined. Students with disabilities require more targeted efforts.
3. There were more students considered prepared in 2019 than 2018 by an increase of 14 percent. Correction of CALPADS data reporting error has course corrected this performance indicator.

## 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 | Red |  | Gellow | Highest <br> Perfformance |

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

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

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

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity

| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |

Conclusions based on this data:

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

## 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


Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

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

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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{7}{\text { Green }}$ | $\frac{7}{\text { Green }}$ | No Performance Color |
| 94.4 | 87.5 | Less than 11 Students - Data Not |
| Maintained +0.8 | Increased +1.8 | $3$ |
| 319 | 48 |  |
| Homeless | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities |
| No Performance Color | $\frac{7}{\text { Green }}$ |  |
| 92 | 94.2 | 85.7 |
| Declined -2.4 | Increased +1.2 | Increased +12.2 |
| 25 | 242 | 35 |

2019 Fall Dashboard Graduation Rate by Race/Ethnicity


| Two or More Races |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data |
| Not Displayed for Privacy |
| 6 |
|  |



| White |
| :---: |
| Orange |
| 88.2 |
| Declined -5.1 |
| 68 |

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 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 93.5 | 94.4 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Graduation rates increased in four groups (EL, SED, Students with Disabilities, and Hispanic Students).
2. All students maintained overall high graduation rate while two groups declined (Homeless and White students)
3. White student graduation rate may need attention while SED student graduation rate ( 94.2 percent is a significant achievement).

## 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 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

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 -2.6
161


Declined -1.7
923


Students with Disabilities


Yellow
7.9

Declined -1.4
202

| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Performance Color | No Performance Color |  | No Performance Color |
| 16.7 | Less than 11 Students-Data not displayed for student privacy | $0$ | Less than 11 Students Data not displayed for student privacy |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Declined }-1.5 \\ 18 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Declined }-2.2 \\ 42 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| Green | $\frac{K^{\prime}}{\operatorname{Red}}$ | No Performance Color | Orange |
| 5.4 | $10.5$ | Less than 11 Students -Data not displayed due to privacy | 6.3 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Declined -1.3 } \\ 991 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Increased }+7.7 \\ 38 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Increased }+0.5 \\ 284 \end{gathered}$ |

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

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Year

| 2017 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 6.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Suspension rate decreased for eight groups (All, EL, Foster Youth, SED, Students with Disabilities, African American, Asian, and Hispanic students). Restorative Practices trainings, and RTI (Response to Intervention) efforts have contributed to this decline over the last three years.
2. Two groups increased (Students who identify as two or more races and white students).
3. Foster Youth and African American students have the highest suspension percentage (16.7 and 17.4 percent respectively).

## 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

A little above half of WHS (Woodland High School) students are considered "College and Career" ready and among those only 51.4 percent (a little over half) complete A-G courses. While WHS has a strong number of CTE (Career Technical Education) pathways, a very small percentage of students are completers. Compared to the large number of Spanish speaking students WHS has a low amount of Seal of Biliteracy recipients (mainly due to
CAASPP (California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress) performance).

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

Metric/Indicator

Number of students receiving college credit through dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment and articulated classes (high school only).
Percentage of students completing UC/CSU a-g course requirements (high school only).

Number and Percent of students that complete a CTE (Career Technical Education) pathway (high school only).
Number of students who participate in VAPA (Visual and Performing Arts).

Baseline/Actual Outcome
Baseline: 2020-'21 Concurrent enrollment in Fall $=83$ students

2018-'19 38.13\% of students completed UC/CSU a-g course requirements/ 2019-'20 51.4\% of the students completed a-g course requirements.
WHS had 865 enrolled ( $65 \%$ of student population- 1325 total) in a CTE (Career Technical Education) class in 19-20, with 38 completer students (3\% of student population)/WHS had 1,064 students enrolled (81\% of student population-1310 total) in a CTE class in 2020'21 = 73 completer students (6\% of student population).

2019-'20 650 students who participated in one or more VAPA (Visual and Performing Arts) courses with 26.0\% Male and 26.84\% Female

## Expected Outcome

Continue concurrent enrollment numbers of between 80-90 students and complete dual enrollment coordination efforts.

Increase UC/CSU a-g course completion to 55\%.

Maintain current CTE (Career Technical Education) enrollment of over 800 students. Increase completer students to 85 students.

Maintain high current levels of VAPA participation of over 650 students including balance in gender participation- but increase participation to

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | participation. Two student groups without parity: <br> Hispanic/Latino 72.18\% of population with $37.28 \%$ participation, and Pacific Islander .57\% of population with $.32 \%$ participation. /2020-'21 673 students participating in one or more VAPA courses with 23.7 Male and $26.5 \%$ Female. Four students groups without parity: Hispanic/Latino 75.02\% of population with $14.9 \%$ participation, Asian (NonHispanic) 2.78\% of population with $1.76 \%$ participation, Pacific Islander .68\% of population with . $4 \%$ participation, Black .84\% of population with .56\% participation. | completely close parity gaps in all student groups. |
| Number of State Seals of Biliteracy awarded to students (high school only). | 2019-'20- 42 students were eligible for the seal of biliteracy/2019-'20 eligibility in progress of being determined at time of SPSA (School Plan Student Achievement) development | Increase Seal of Biliteracy to 50 eligible students. |
| Number of Pathway awards for Bilteracy (Dual Immersion schools 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

Strategy/Activity
Strategy: Provide programs and supports to increase achievement, increase College/Career "prepared" status, and advance A-G eligibility on the CA dashboard, and participation of subgroups.

Activities:

- AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) program supports: College Field trips for AVID students, subs to cover classrooms during field trips/PD(Professional Development), provide a coordinator stipend, professional development for AVID elective teachers, hiring of AVID tutors to support student development, celebration expenses for AVID senior night.
- VAPA (Visual and Performing Arts) Supports: Increased parent presentations/ informational nights to recruit subgroup participation, presentations in ELD (English Language Development) classes, field trips to support opportunities for subgroup participation and enrichment.
- CTE supplemental materials: Supplemental instruction materials for CTE courses.
- AP subsidies: Support increased student participation in taking AP exams through scholarships.
- Puente program supports: College Field Trips for Puente students, subs to cover staff classrooms during field trip supervision, supplemental instructional materials, celebration expenses for Puente senior night.
- Math Department Supports: After school intervention, collaboration time for departments to review data and set goals, collaboration time for planning co-teaching with SPED 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)
32,920.00
46,000

## 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.
With the exception of field trips, AVID Support was executed to plan. Three AVID tutors were hired to provide direct support to students. VAPA, CTE, Puente all accessed funding to purchase the planned for supplies and supports. AP Subsidies used in full to support SED 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.
With the pandemic, funds allocated for field trips (including classroom subs) were minimally utilized (AVID, VAPA, and Puente all attended lower cost virtual field trips) so funds were reallocated to purchase of additional materials to address equity issues (e.g. The need for art supplies, culinary supplies, books for Puente, etc. for each student that they would normally share in person). Math department supports were not fully used as math students utilized other supports outline in other
goals in higher number. Math department collaboration around data and planning with SPED did not occur.

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.
To achieve a $5 \%$ increase in A-G completion, five student increase in CTE Completer status, subgroup participation in VAPA, and increased Seal of Biliteracy achievement- and with a possible full return in the Fall, we will reimplement the original plan and redouble our efforts with Math Department support.

## 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

Students are below the State Average in ELA and Math proficiency. Need for increased stakeholder input on important decisions. Chronic absenteeism approaching 20 percent. Below half of students surveyed feel safe or connected to the school.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator |
| :--- |
| Performance level on ELA and |
| Math Academic Indicator. |
| Performance level on English |
| Learner Progress Indicator |
| Percentage of students in both |
| the Meets and Exceeds |
| Standards level on SBAC |
| (Smarter Balanced |
| Assessment Consortium) |
| English Language Arts. |
| Percentage of students in both |
| the Meets and Exceeds |
| Standards level on SBAC |
| (Smarter Balanced |
| Assessment Consortium) Math. |
| Number of students who are |
| chronically absent |
| Student sense of safety and |
| school connectedness |

Baseline/Actual Outcome
2018-'19 WHS is Green on the dashboard for ELA (English Language Arts) and Orange for math. (No 2019-'20 Data)
33.6\% making progress towards English Language Proficiency
$57 \%$ of students met or exceeded the English Language Arts standards on the SBAC (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium)
$14.98 \%$ of students met or exceeded the Mathematics standards on the SBAC (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium) N/A

CHKS (California Healthy Kids Survey) 2019-2020 48\% of 9th graders and $43 \%$ of 11th graders feel connected to the school./2020-'21 CHKS Survey currently in progress

## Expected Outcome

Move to Blue for ELA and yellow for math

Increase performance level on English Learner Progress Indicator by one level to $35 \%$
Percentage of students meeting or exceeding English Language Arts Proficiency will increase to $60 \%$.

Percentage of students meeting or exceeding Math Proficiency will increase to 20\%.

## N/A

Increase students' feelings of connection to school to $50 \%$ across all grade levels.

Increase students' feelings of safety to $50 \%$ across all grade levels.

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $44 \%$ of 9 th graders and $35 \%$ of 11th graders feel that the school is safe/2020-'21 CHKS Survey currently in progress |  |
| Suspension rate | In 2019-2020 5.8\% of students were suspended. 2020-2021 there is limited data. | Decrease the percentage of students suspended to less than 4\%. |
| Parent/family satisfaction on Healthy Kids Survey, on key indicators | CHKS (California Healthy Kids Survey) 2019-2020. 2020-2021 CHKS survey currently in progress. <br> "Satisfaction" not one of the surveyed items. <br> $83 \%$ of parents agree that WHS allows input and welcomes parent contributions. <br> $67 \%$ of parents agree that WHS encourages them to be an active partner with the school to educate their child. <br> $50 \%$ of parents agree that WHS actively seeks the input of parents before making important decisions. | Maintain current levels of satisfaction on input. <br> Increase "active partnership" item to $70 \%$. <br> Increase "input on important decision" item to 60\%. <br> Continue to encourage participation on the survey. |
| Percentage of students who reach growth targets on iReady in Reading and Math (elementary only) | N/A for high school | N/A for high school |

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
Strategy: Provide opportunities to enhance teacher content knowledge, student enrichment beyond the classroom, and create an environment conducive to growth and learning.

Activities:

- Professional Development surrounding literacy and conference attendance, use of technology to enhance instruction, and collaboration time to put Universal Design for Learning into practice.
- Includes support for subs, travel costs, conference registration, and release time
- Learning Center support
- Includes funding VSAs (Variable Service Agreement) to hire tutors to provide Academic Intervention and Support
- Department supplies including but not limited to consumables, furniture, classroom materials.
- Saturday School funding
- Includes Extra Duty hours to staff program and expand into Monday-Friday offering to support student intervention, make up work, and differentiation


## 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)
92,311.00
50,000

## 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.
Learning Center support and Department Supplies, all executed to plan. Difficult to assess effectiveness with lack of current data. Some off-site PD (Professional Development) accessed by staff.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
PD had to be redirected primarily towards technology with Distance Learning being the primary instructional method. Some PD on pedagogy (2 sessions: social emotional learning activities and Rigorous Discussion models). Funding from field trips diverted to supplies so that teachers could fully implement new technologies. Strong increase in frequency and teacher participation in Saturday School Intervention and an expansion to "Wednesday Workshops" especially towards the end of grading periods to respond to student demand and depressed grades data.

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.
We will be recommitting to PD that focuses on instructional strategies including on use of interactive technology, increasing rigor and relevance of curriculum, increasing interactive lessons, amongst others.

## 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

Goals were not met and progress was not made in English Learner Progress. Decreasing LTELs needs attention. Movement on rating on EL Roadmap Principal needs to be made.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator |
| :--- |
| Increase the reclassification |
| rate for English Learners. |
| Show growth on the English |
| Learner Progress Indicator. |
| Decrease the number of Long |
| Term English Learners (LTEL) |
| (middle and high school only). |
| Improve the school's rating of |
| the English Learner Roadmap |
| Principle 1 on the self |
| assessment. |

Baseline/Actual Outcome
2019-'20 11\% of WHS students are RFEP (Reclassified Fluent English Proficient)/ In 2020-'21 23.6 \% of WHS students are RFEP

2019-'20 33.6\% making progress towards English language proficiency = "Very Low" category
2019-'20 60\% of our ELs are LTELS (Long Term English Learners)/ In 2020-'21 68\% of our ELs are LTELs

Principal 1: Assets-Oriented and Needs-Responsive Schools
Self-reflection rubric
A. Language and cultures are assets (score: 3.5)
B. No single EL profile (score:
3)
C. School climate is affirming, inclusive, safe (score: 3.5)
D. Strong family and school partnership (score: 3)

## Expected Outcome

Continue to increase reclassification rate to $25 \%$.

## Increase reclassification rate

 by $5 \%$ to $38 \%$ within the "Low" category.Decrease LTEL percentage to less than $50 \%$
A. Increase to 4
B. Increase to 3.5
C. Increase to 4
D. Increase to 3.5
E. Increase to 3

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 (ELL's)

Strategy/Activity
Strategy: Provide professional development to teachers to improve instructional strategies, academic supports to increase student achievement, and opportunities for parent involvement to improve school connectedness.

Activity:

- Learning Center support
- Includes funding of VSA to provide ELLs Academic Intervention through the Learning Center
- Includes support for newcomers at Saturday School/Intervention Program(s)
- Support for ELRT (English Language Resource Team) and ELS (English Learner Specialists)/teacher collaboration
- Release time for teachers
- ELD (English Language Development) Teachers to meet with ELS once per quarter
- Supplies and materials for EL Specialists to provide whole staff Tier I PD
- ELS to model and collaborate with staff as well as provide PD on Tier I integrated ELD instructional strategies at one Faculty Meeting per semester to whole staff including TPS (Think Pair Share) 2.0 strategies, reciprocal teaching, and writing scaffolding
- EL specialist to collaborate and provide PD focused on intervention and differentiation to meet students needs by proficiency level during integrated ELD content instruction.
- ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee) support
- Including supplies to incentivize increased parent participation
- PD Support
- Supplemental materials
- Including materials and texts in primary language as bridge to learning of new language
- Parent Seminars for Non-English speaking families
- Includes, college application process, info nights, FAFSA, (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) etc.


## 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.

## 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.
Through focused SPSA goals and support, EL Specialists and teachers were better able to support students. The ELS took advantage of the collaborative time and implemented more regular parent seminars (four throughout the year).

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
All activities went to plan except the PD for teachers put on by ELS due to limited time supplanted by district level technology PD to support Distance Learning.

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.
Better coordination between the LRC (Learning Resource Center) and the Saturday School program will need to occur to make sure the dedicate EL support person is contacted to be available for Saturday/Wednesday Intervention support programs.

## 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

## 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 <br> students providing input to the <br> SPSA (School Plan for Student <br> Achievement) through surveys |
| Number and percent of <br> students by representative <br> demographic providing input to <br> the SPSA through focus <br> groups |

Baseline/Actual Outcome
Baseline- 2020-'21-46 partnerships for students to engage in Community Service and leadership opportunities and 35 local partners offering student scholarships.
Baseline- 2020-'21- We currently field 16 sports programs as well as 17 extracurricular clubs
Baseline- 2020-21-315 responses to internal "Needs Assessment" survey (Approximately 25\% of school population)
Baseline- 2020-'21- 24 students (4 EL (16\%), 4 Low Income (16\%), 4 Low Performing (16\%), 4 SPED (16\%), 8 Demographically representative of WHS Population (32\%) in focus groups. 3 student School Site Council members.

## Expected Outcome

Maintain current number of partnerships at above 45.

Maintain current sports offerings of 16 programs as well as at least 17 extracurricular clubs.
Increase student participation on "Needs Assessment" Survey to at least $50 \%$ of population.

Maintain current focus group process and membership of 24 students (4 EL (16\%), 4 Low Income (16\%), 4 Low Performing (16\%), 4 SPED (16\%), 8 Demographically representative of WHS Population (32\%) in focus groups. 3 student School Site Council members.

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

## Strategy/Activity 1

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

## All Students

## Strategy/Activity

Provide students with programs and activities to increase school connectedness

- Link Crew, Student Government, School activities, after-school clubs, sports and programs supports
- Includes materials and supplies to run programs
- Increase recruiting of underrepresented student groups
- Experiential Field Trips for supplemental instruction to extend beyond the classroom
- Includes support for subs and transportation

Provide students regular opportunities for feedback and input

- Utilize diverse Student Focus Groups in SPSA development process
- Hold Student Advisory Council meetings on a quarterly basis to review data and give feedback
- Increase opportunities for student voice in ELAC and School Site Council
- Continue strong partnerships with community organizations
- Continue robust supports of community service programs as well as scholarship partnerships


## 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)

## 9,447.00

Source(s)

## Supplemental/Concentration

## 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.

## N/A Year One of Goal 4

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
N/A Year One of Goal 4

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.
N/A Year One of Goal 4

## 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

```
$122,713
```

\$
\$259,891.00

## 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 (\$)

\$119,769.00
\$2,944.00

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: \$122,713.00
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 (\$)

\$137,178.00

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: \$137,178.00
Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: \$259,891.00

## 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<br>4 Classroom Teachers<br>1 Other School Staff<br>3 Parent or Community Members<br>3 Secondary Students

| Name of Members | Role |
| :--- | :--- |
| Peter Lambert | Principal |
| Kristi Lopez | Parent or Community Member |
| Angelica Reyes | Parent or Community Member |
| Erik Wilson | Parent or Community Member |
| Hannah Fettig | Secondary Student |
| Michelle Godoy | Secondary Student |
| Jace Williams | Secondary Student |
| Victor Rosales | Classroom Teacher School Staff |
| Chuck Bruns | Classroom Teacher |
| Eric Dyer | Classroom Teacher |
| Sherri Jensen | Classroom Teacher |
| Anne Mapalo |  |

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

## Recommendations and Assurances

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

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

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


## Committee or Advisory Group Name

## English Learner Advisory Committee

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

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

This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on 5/17/2021.
Attested:


Principal, Peter Lambert on 5/17/2021


SSC Chairperson, Victor Rosales on $5 / 17 / 2021$

