

District Name: Brea Olinda USD

CD Code: 30/66449

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN ADDENDUM TEMPLATE

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, codified as No Child Left Behind (NCLB, Section 1116[c][7][A]), requires that local educational agencies (LEAs) identified for Program Improvement (PI) shall, not later than three months after being identified, develop or revise an LEA Plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, and others. Rather than completely rewriting the existing LEA Plan, we recommend using this LEA Plan Addendum template to address the items below. Type your responses in the expandable text boxes.

Prior to developing this revision, please use the State Assessment Tools, as applicable, to analyze school/district needs for improved student achievement. These tools are available on the California Department of Education (CDE) State Assessment Tools Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. Contact the District Innovation and Improvement Office at 916-319-0836 if you have any questions regarding the State Assessment Tools or completing the LEA Plan Addendum.

Please submit your completed LEA Plan Addendum by uploading the completed document into the Program Improvement Year I monitoring instrument in the California Accountability Improvement System (CAIS). Contact Janice Morrison, Education Programs Consultant, District Innovation and Improvement Office by e-mail at jamorrison@cde.ca.gov if you need technical assistance in uploading the document.

The LEA Plan Addendum **must be submitted to the CDE no later than Friday, April 4, 2014**. The LEA Plan Addendum should:

- 1. Identify fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools of the LEA and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students, including a determination of why the prior LEA Plan failed to bring about increased academic achievement for all student groups.**

Please provide a summary analysis of the needs assessment used to identify student learning needs (especially the academic problems of low achieving students). Include an analysis of why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

1. Discuss the results of the assessments used to determine the teaching and learning needs of the schools and the district.
2. Identify academic priorities.
3. Discuss why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

A district/school liaison team (DSLTL) was formed with representatives from stakeholder groups. Data from the completion of the state assessment tools was analyzed and gap areas identified.

1. Results of Assessment Tools At the time of this update (June 2015) we do not have test data disaggregated from the new SBAC assessment. Results will be received and analyzed in August.

The district has made progress but did not meet the 2013 AYP targets as follows:

Students with Disabilities (**SWD**) (50.6% ELA and 47.4% Math)

Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (**SED**) (55.7% ELA and 57.0% Math)

English Learners (EL) (57.5% ELA)
Hispanic (60.8% ELA and 60.9% Math)
White (79.5% ELA and 77.1% Math)

Interventions vary from site to site and variety of interventions is lacking to meet specific needs.

Teachers receive CELDT data, but it is unclear if they understand the implications of the information for instruction.

There is a need for a coaching model to support ongoing professional learning and development.

As the district implements CCSS, there also needs to be an increased focus on 21st Century Skills along with increased opportunities for career technical education and multiple career pathways.

There is not consistency of implementation of SDAIE strategies for English Learners/Socioeconomically Disadvantaged/dual identified students in general education classes.

Authentic involvement and engagement of parents with EL/SED student has not been at the level needed for positive support of academic achievement.

Professional development needs to be linked to CCSS content and pedagogy, while also focusing on instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs of targeted underachieving subgroups within the context of CCSS.

Long Term English Learners (LTELs) are predominately at the Intermediate level on CELDT. Of those students at the Intermediate level of CELDT, the following percentages did NOT score proficient in ELA on the CST: 48% of Second Graders, 82.7% of Third and Fourth Graders, 82.4% of Fifth and Sixth Graders, and 83.3% of Seventh and Eighth Graders.

Although as a District the percentage of ELs attaining English Proficiency has surpassed the required target, the percentage of students attaining has decreased over the past 3 years from 60.6% to 53.5%.

There is a lack of use of ELD supplemental materials for ELs K-12.

With the transition to the LCFF funding model, the district should consider fiscal resources being reallocated toward reducing class size, CCSS professional development, and technology training.

Academic Priorities:

Meet the needs of all learners regardless of subgroup so that students are proficient in English, ELA, and Math, in accordance with the CCSS and the CELDT.

Move LTELs out of the Intermediate level and help them become proficient in English.

Reason LEA Plan was not successful:

The prior LEA Plan served its purpose until the last couple of years. Due to budget constraints, class size had to be increased dramatically and furlough days were implemented. Cutbacks affected professional development and training. Intervention plans were not consistent across the district.

2. Include specific, measurable achievement goals and targets for student groups identified as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe specific, measurable academic goals and targets for student achievement for student groups identified as not making AYP. (Refer to the CDE AYP Reports Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypreports.asp>.)

These student groups did not meet district-wide AYP targets for student achievement:

- Students with Disabilities (**SWD**) (50.6% ELA and 47.4% Math)
- Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (**SED**) (55.7% ELA and 57.0% Math)
- English Learners (**EL**) (57.5% ELA and 67.5% Math)
- Hispanic (60.8% ELA and 60.9% Math)
- White (79.5% ELA and 77.1% Math)

By June 2016, the percentage of SWD, SED students, EL students, Hispanic students, and White students meeting standards on state assessments in ELA and Math will be commensurate with the overall student population. The goal is to have no gap between significant subgroups and the overall population.

3. Incorporate research-based strategies to strengthen the core academic program for identified student groups in schools served by the LEA, including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe the specific strategies that the district will use and how those strategies will be implemented and monitored to strengthen the core academic program.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports

Develop a clearly articulated daily Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) model at every school. The MTSS programs at each school will be reviewed and revised where needed to ensure consistently applied, research-based, intervention strategies, including the consistent application of the district-wide Student Study Team (SST) process.

Linked Professional Development

Link professional development activities to the needs of the district’s targeted subgroups (Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged)

Instructional Coaches

Employ instructional coaches as a support to teachers in implementing CCSS curriculum and technology in order to increase achievement of the district’s targeted subgroups.

4. Specify actions to implement the identified strategies that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions to be implemented to accomplish the identified strategies and how they will be supported and monitored. (See examples of full implementation descriptions in the Academic Program Survey [APS] and the District Assistance Survey [DAS] on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost/ Funding Source
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------

page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>.)

Multi-Tiered System of Supports

a. Establish a district-wide MTSS committee to review and revise current program implementation in terms of researched-based best practices.

Admin, Ed Srvc

Sept 2015 to June 2016

No cost

b. MTSS Committee trained

Admin, Ed Srvc

Sept 2015

Title I \$5,000

c. Conduct a site-level needs assessment to determine current levels, strengths and needs of existing intervention services.

MTSS Committee

Oct 2015

Title I \$1,000

d. Replicate existing effective intervention programs that meet the criteria for MTSS (occurs during the school day).

Admin, Ed Srvc
MTSS Committee
Principals

September 2015

No cost

e. Ensure that all instructional staff at each school site have knowledge of and can articulate the MTSS program at their site.

Principals

By Fall 2015

Title I \$25,000

Linked Professional Development

a. Establish a calendar of professional development training that includes strategies for universal access to CCSS for ELs, SWDs, and SEDs, including SDAIE strategies.

Admin, Ed Srvc
Principals

Summer 2015

No cost

b. Provide professional development that gives opportunities for teachers to experience, share, and validate the value of collaboration as it applies to their work.

Admin, Ed Srvc
Principals

June 2015 – June 2016

Title I \$25,000

c. Utilize the EL Site Coordinators as stipend positions at each school site to support the ongoing professional development and collaboration between teachers in utilizing sound ELD and SDAIE strategies.

Admin, Ed Srvc
Principals
EL Coordinators

August 2015- June 2016

Title III \$9,300

<u>Instructional Coaches</u>			
a. Create job description for TOSA (Teacher on Special Assignment) Instructional Coach	Assist Supt Admin, Ed Services	May 2015	No Cost
b. Interview and hire Instructional Coaches	Assist Supt Admin, Ed Services	June 2015	Supplemental \$468,000
c. Train Instructional Coaches	Assist Supt Admin, Ed Services	August 2015	Title II and Locally Defined Amount TBD based on need
d. Coaches work in the field with teachers, creating lessons, demonstrating lessons, analyzing data, providing professional development to increase achievement of targeted students	Assist Supt Admin, Ed Services	Sept 2015- June 2016	No cost

5. Provide high-quality professional development for the instructional staff that focuses on instructional improvement and supports the strategies and actions described above.

Please describe the professional development the LEA will provide to instructional staff to address the identified strategies and actions.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost/ Funding Source (including 10% set- aside from Title I, Part A)
a. Establish a training team for CELDT. Utilize 2 teachers and 2 administrators.	Admin, Ed Srvcs	September 2015 to June 2016	No Cost
b. CELDT Trainers receive training.	CELDT Trainers Admin, Ed Srvcs	August 2015	Title II \$500
c. Provide professional development training on the content and process of CELDT testing and ELD standards for CCSS, to increase understanding of skills needed for students to move to fluency. Use	CELDT Trainers Principals Admin, Ed Srvcs	Fall 2015	Title III \$12,500

<p>Trainer of Trainers Model.</p> <p>d. Provide professional development on research-based instructional SDAIE strategies to support EL students in the acquisition of English as well as content matter. LEA staff will attend professional development opportunities provided by OCDE or other research-based providers to expand LEA's pool of resident experts in the area of best practices for EL students.</p> <p>e. Provide professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals of SWD on mental health, positive behavior support followed by collaboration time with general education colleagues to share best practices.</p> <p>f. Allocate professional development hours for district-wide collaboration by certificated staff across grade levels and subject areas to review student achievement data and share best instructional practices around CCSS and Universal Access.</p>	<p>CELDT Trainers Admin, Ed Services EL Coordinator</p> <p>Admin, SpEd Admin, Ed Srvcs Psychologists Principals</p> <p>Admin, Ed Srvcs Principals</p>	<p>August 2015 – June 2016</p> <p>August 2015 – June 2016</p> <p>August 2015 – June 2016</p>	<p>Title I Title III \$10,000</p> <p>LEA Medi-cal \$20,000</p> <p>Locally Defined \$75,000</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6. Incorporate, as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and/or during an extension of the school year.

Please describe those activities and how the LEA will incorporate them.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
a. The Extended School Year program for SWD will include intensive intervention at each student's instructional level.	Admin, SpEd	July - August 2015	\$75,000	
b. Schools receiving Title I funds will examine their student achievement data and determine how additional intervention time will be implemented, according to specific site needs.	Title I Principals Title I Teachers	May 2015- June 2016	\$13,200	Title I
c. The high school and junior high schools will study and consider options to implement intervention activities.	Secondary Management	May 2015- June 2016	No Cost	N/A
d. Existing after school tutoring and attendance recovery will continue to be utilized to assist target students.	Secondary Mgmt Principals	May 2015- June 2016	Varies	Attendance Recovery
e. Opportunities for teacher collaboration and professional development will continue during the summer.	Admin, Ed Svcs	Summer 2015	\$100,000	Title I

7. Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school.

Please describe parental involvement strategies and how the LEA will support them across the LEA.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>a. Each site will focus on creating a positive, parent-friendly school climate, using the tools provided in the CDE Family Engagement Framework. School will use the tool "How Parent-Friendly is Your School?" to assess the current environment and select additional tools and activities from the framework based on the results of the assessment.</p>	Admin, Ed Svcs	September 2015	No Cost	N/A
<p>b. Sites will monitor and track attendance and parent involvement per site</p>	Admin, Ed Svcs Principals	August 2015 – June 2106	\$2,000	Title I