

Section 6: Title III Local Educational Agency Improvement Plan Addendum Sample Outline¹

Directions: Address the topic requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow as much space as required for narrative responses under each item. All Title III Year 2 LEAs must submit a copy of the IPA (in Microsoft Word format) to their Title III Regional Lead and to CDE at TIIY2@cde.ca.gov.

1. Conduct an analysis of data. Identify and describe the factors that prevented the local educational agency (LEA) from achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) (Five page maximum for this item).

The Galt High School District missed AMAO #2 for 2007-2008 and AMAO #3 for 2008-2009. The data show that large numbers of students test at both the **early advanced level on the CELDT** and at the **basic proficiency level on the CST** for language arts.

Careful review of the data from the ELSSA, CELDT, CSTs indicated the following areas of concern in EL performance:

62% 9th grade ELs scored proficient on CELDT; 80% scored basic or below on the CSTs. 26% scored BB and 5% FB.

Weaknesses:

Writing Strategies 42% correct, State Average 59%

Written and Oral Conventions 55% correct, State Average 69%

Reading Comprehension 50.52% correct, State Average 63%

49% 10th grade ELs scored proficient on the CELDT; 100% scored basic or below on the CSTs; 42% scored BB and 42% FB.

Weaknesses:

Writing Strategies: 33.39 correct, State Average 54%

Written and Oral Conventions: 43.9 correct, State Average 63%

Word Analysis and Vocabulary: 40.48 Correct, State Average 63%

54% 11th grade ELs scored proficient on the CELDT; 100% scored basic or below on the CSTs; 25% scored BB and 39% FB.

Weaknesses:

Writing Strategies 38.19% Correct, State Average 62%

Word Analysis and Vocabulary: 47.56%, State Average 71%

As ELs progress through grades their proficiency level in English may increase, but not up to the target levels, and the percentage that are able to score basic, proficient, or advanced on the CST for English Language Arts drops steadily. For example, ELs scoring FBB and BB increased from 30% to 64% from grades 9-11.

CELDT data reveal that 40.7% students of the intermediate level English Learners make the required one level of growth. Only 63 out of 118 EL students identified as early advanced or advance proficiency on the CELDT met their target.

R-FEPS scored very well on CST, with 55% of our 9th graders scoring proficient or above in ELA. Our 10th grade R-FEPS scored 40% proficient or advance, and 35% of our 11th grade ELs scored proficient or advanced.

Approximately 44.7% of the students in levels early advanced and advanced are progressing. Although the majority of our EL students are at early advanced this does not correlate with our CST scores for ELA comprehension and writing strategies.

The percentage of ELs who are able to reach English proficiency is only 14% as they reach six years of schooling in the U.S. Approximately 78 EL students (who have been in school for six years or more) are still at the early advanced level on the CELDT. In addition, 7 students who have been in U. S. schools six or more years are still at the early intermediate.

Although ELs met the AMOS for math, we looked at CST data for two consecutive years, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009:

The AYP target for math (43.5%) was met on the 2008-2009 school year with 43.7%.

20% of the 331 RFEP students tested in CST math scored proficient or above.

11% of the 169 ELs tested in CST math scored proficient or above.

Most ELs do not take a math class beyond Algebra 1. CST data shows 256 of the 500 (RFEP and ELs combined) were in Algebra 1. 137 of the 500 (RFEP and ELs combined) were in Geometry.

EL/RFEP CAHSEE data results:

60 tenth grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 28% passed the ELA.

60 tenth grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 65% passed the math.

40 eleventh grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 28% passed the ELA.

28 eleventh grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 18% passed the math.

49 twelfth grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 27% passed the ELA.

27 twelfth grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 44% passed the math.

106 tenth grade RFEP students taking the CAHSEE 83% passed the ELA.
107 tenth grade RFEP students taking the CAHSEE 85% passed the math.

20 RFEP eleventh grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 35% passed the ELA
20 RFEP eleventh grade ELs taking the CAHSEE 30% passed the math.

Students not passing the CAHSEE show that 26% (36 students) have been in U. S. schools more than five years.

R-FEP students taking the CAHSEE are the most successful with a pass rate of 82% compared with 26%% of ELs with 6 or more years in U.S schools.

Summary: ELs who plateau at the Intermediate on the CELDT tend not to score well on the CST, at the high school level and they are also having difficulty passing CAHSEE ELA. Review of the CST data for ELs in 9th, 10th and 11th grade indicates that ELs are substantially below in the ELA state standards in Writing Strategies, Written and Oral Conventions, Word Analysis and Vocabulary. ELs who lack writing strategies and vocabulary development continue to fall behind as they progress through the grades. This gap doubles by the time they are in the 10th grade.

B. Strengths and weaknesses of current plan

The STRENGTHs of the Title II LEA Plan included the following:

Use of standards-aligned instructional materials and strategies for all core subjects.

Annual goals of AYP, API and CAHSEE monitored by all staff regarding student achievement from the CST, and the CAHSEE. All staff assess these results and adjust program accordingly through weekly collaboration and regular staff development.

Weekly collaboration time and Staff Development dedicated to developing Common Assessments and Intervention Strategies.

English Language Development expanded from one hour to two hours daily.

An English Literacy Coach continues to provide support for the implementation of newly adopted English Language Arts textbooks and supplemental materials, EDGES, Fundamentals (newcomers); Intensive English Support A, Intensive English Support B and Intensive English Support C, English 9 SADIE support and English 10 Support.

PASS program for English coursework for Migrant Education students.

Involvement of staff parents and community (including notification procedures, parent outreach, and interpretation of student assessments to parents)

Written and oral translations available in Spanish and English for parent outreach.

Hiring practices have emphasized speakers of Spanish as needed.

Meeting with all parents of feeder schools with Galt High School administration and counseling, demonstrating a 4 year plan and scheduling classes for 9th grade year.

Parent Project for parents and students has been offered in Spanish and English twice a year since 2003.

Continued involvement in AVID strategies for all students.

Afterschool tutoring programs for Language Arts and Math.

Coordination of services through regular At-Risk meetings, involving programs and specific student's cases.

A committee of certificated staff has been established to review the reclassification process. Reclassified EL students are monitored regarding CST performance and grades every six months. Data is maintained through 9th – 12th grade.

Weaknesses

Although the LEA Plan identifies the district's challenges and potential solutions, we fall short on implementing the plan in several areas. For example, we have provided staff development on a variety of topics, however, follow-up to insure that strategies are being implemented has been inconsistent due to the turnover, not only in the district staff, but also at the site level. This has made the monitoring of instructional programs an on-going challenge.

Instructional Program Implementation

Administrative "Walk Throughs" have not been consistent in the past two years.

APS staff survey indicates that although we have scheduled weekly collaboration, we need to honor the time for staff to meet, and to provide opportunities for grade level meetings. We also need to provide time to review EduSoft data.

APS staff survey indicates that funding for ELA textbook adoption was limited. The use of on-line CDs is not working as well as staff had hoped.

Instructional Strategies

Staff survey show that although many staff members are familiar with explicit and direct instruction, they do not incorporate it into their teaching.

Professional Development

APS staff survey indicates that there has been minimal staff training at the 9th and 10th grade for appropriate use of the adopted materials offered by the district.

Parent Participation

DAS survey indicates that we have not met the burden of promoting parental and community participation through monthly DELAC meetings.

Conclusion:

Although we have weekly collaboration time dedicated to developing Common Assessments and Intervention Strategies we need to be more systematic in how we use this time and provide staff with opportunities to discuss students by name and to develop strategies to better meet the instructional needs our ELs.

C. Identify and describe factors contributing to failure to meet AMAO(s)

Staff survey and principal interviews demonstrate the following:

1. ELs may have remained at the intermediate CELDT because they may not have had explicit and direct instruction for reading and writing.
2. Review of the ELSSA and the time in U.S. schools shows that that we have a large group of long-term ELs. While these students demonstrate early advanced and advanced proficiency in oral language on the CELDT, their CSTs reflect that students are performing substantially below state proficiency in writing. Inconsistent teaching strategies in explicit and direct instruction across the curriculum in core classes may be a contributing factor.
3. According to teacher responses to interview and survey questions, insufficient time to collaborate on student data continues to be a challenge in serving our ELs.
4. APS survey reflects the need to in-service English teachers across the district on how to use the new textbook adoption for Language Arts. The adopted textbooks and support materials will support ELs success in reading and writing.

D. Conclusion: From the quantitative and qualitative data we reviewed and the underlying causes we verified, the leadership team at Galt High School District believes that in order to increase the language proficiency and academic achievement of our ELs, we must improve our system in three areas: providing all students with appropriate RLSL/ELA instruction and interventions based on the assessed needs with a focus on writing; providing district-wide professional development to focus English Learners; and increase parent outreach and communication.

Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement	Timeline	Person Responsible	Funding Sources and Estimate	Progress Reports (to be completed periodically through June 30, 2011)
<p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English-language Development (ELD). (AMAOs 1 and 2; English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA))</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EL Department Chair will provide CELDT data to instructional staff at each site 2. Teachers will identify EL students by level on class roster or student information system on Powerschool. 3. Inservice certificated staff regarding ELD strategies to use in classroom 4. Develop check list for Administrative Walkthroughs 5. Administrative Walkthroughs 6. Superintendent will meet with Administration to discuss results of observations 	<p>1/15/10 (1x per year)</p> <p>1/15/10 (2x per year)</p> <p>1/5/10-6/11 (Quarterly)</p> <p>Spring, 2010</p> <p>1/15/10-6/2011 (weekly)</p> <p>1/5/2010-6/2011 (monthly)</p>	<p>District EL Coordinator (with assistance of site teachers and principals)</p> <p>District EL Coordinator</p> <p>Site Admin -will provide training</p> <p>Superintendent/ Consultant</p> <p>Administration (Principal/Vice-Principals)</p> <p>Superintendent /Site Principal</p>	<p>No funding required</p> <p>No funding required</p> <p>No funding required</p> <p>Title 1 \$4,000</p> <p>No Funding Required</p> <p>No Funding Required</p>	
<p>3. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in reading/language arts (R/LA). (AMAO 3;ELSSA)</p>				

<p>Results of the 2009 CELDT will be analyzed by the EL Dept Chair and certificated staff. Grade level list will be generated that indicate students by EL level within each school. Results will be sent to each principal.</p>	<p>1/15/10</p>	<p>District EL Coordinator</p>	<p>No Funding required</p>	
<p>EL Students (beginning through Advance, not proficient) will be assessed on EDGE prior to placement in an ELA class. Newcomer ELs students scoring Beginning –Early Intermediate on the CELDT will be placed in either a two hour block Fundamentals class.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Students scoring at the Early Intermediate level will be placed in a two hour block English Intensive Support A b) Students scoring at the Early Intermediate-Intermediate level will be placed in a two hour block of English Intensive Support B c) Students scoring at the Intermediate – Early Advance level will be placed in a two hour block of English Intensive Support C d) EL students scoring at the Early Advanced-Advanced level will be placed in an English with Strategic Support. (Except 11th and 12th grade) 	<p>8/09-6/11 (Beginning of semester or as determined by student assessment)</p>	<p>District EL Coordinator/ Site Literacy Coach</p>	<p>No Funding required</p>	

<p>Input EDGE and new Holt textbook assessments into Edusoft. Teachers of these programs will be instructed on the scanning of tests and interpreting and printing results.</p>	<p>1/2010-6/2011 (weekly)</p>	<p>English Dept. Chair/ Administration</p>	<p>No funding required</p>	
<p>EL Department Chair, principals and English teachers will review EL reclassification criteria and identify students eligible for reclassification.</p>	<p>1/2010 and 1/2011 (1x per year)</p>	<p>EL Dept. Chair/ Vice Principal</p>	<p>No funding required</p>	
<p>Site Literacy Coach will continue to provide focus on literacy school-wide</p>	<p>1/5/2010-6/2011 (Daily)</p>	<p>Site Literacy Coach</p>	<p>No funding required</p>	
<p>Principals will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of strategies school-wide.</p>	<p>1/5/2010-6/2011 (weekly)</p>	<p>Administration (Principal/Vice-Principals)</p>	<p>No funding required</p>	
<p>Superintendent will meet with Administration to discuss results of observations</p>	<p>1/5/2010-6/2011 (monthly)</p>	<p>Superintendent /Site Principal</p>	<p>No funding required</p>	
<p>4. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics. (AMAO 3; ELSSA)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>5. Describe scientifically based research professional development strategies and activities, including coordination efforts with other Elementary and Secondary Education</p>				

<p>Act (ESEA) programs. (ELSSA) Objective: Coordinate district-wide professional development to focus on English Learners</p> <p>Provide SIOP/SDAIE training for GJUHSD staff. The district will use one buy back day and one follow up minimum collaboration days for SIOP/SDAIE training for English, Social Studies, Science and Math teachers, paraprofessionals and school administrators.</p> <p>EL /EL District Coordinator will provide follow-up support through Dept. Chair monthly SIOP/SDAIE lessons during staff meetings</p> <p>Principals will monitor SIOP training activities and implementation of strategies. Focus of three SIOP strategies, graphic organizers, literacy focus, reciprocal teaching.</p> <p>Provide staff development on Holt Language Arts adoption during the 2010-2011 school year</p>	<p>Workshop held 1/4/2010 (follow-up Spring, 2010)</p> <p>1/5/20-6/2011 (monthly)</p> <p>1/5/2010-6/2011</p> <p>1/2010-6/2011 (Spring/Summer 2010- 3 days)</p>	<p>Dr. A. Arrellano Sacramento State University</p> <p>EL Coordinator Dept. Chair</p> <p>Administration (Principal/Vice Principal)</p> <p>Holt Publisher/ Administration</p>	<p>EIA Funds \$56, 934 (teacher salaries/consultant fee)</p> <p>No funding required</p> <p>No funding required</p> <p>Title 1-ARRA \$10, 200 (substitute costs for teacher inservice)</p>	

<p>6.Describe parental participation and outreach strategies to help parents become active participants in the education of their children, including coordination efforts with other ESEA programs.</p> <p>Objective: Provide clear and timely communication and offer relevant training to parents and community members, academic expectations, accountability requirements and support services.</p> <p>Designate a Parent Center at GHS for all parents (Room 99).</p> <p>Communicate on the progress of English Learners via newsletter to parents regarding ELD, the identification process, interventions, and exit criteria.</p> <p>Provide Parent Project workshops (3 hours per week for 10 weeks) in Spanish and in English.</p> <p>Provide information to parents of students with Disabilities, via meetings between teachers, principal and parents to ensure understanding of placement, program, IEP and special services.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for parents to participate in decision-making related to site and to district initiatives. Post schools' parent involvement policies on the District's web site in English and in Spanish (DELAC).</p>	<p>1/5/2010-on-going</p> <p>1/5/2010-ongoing (bi-monthly)</p> <p>1/5/2010-ongoing (2x pr year)</p> <p>1/5/2010-ongoing (weekly)</p> <p>1/5/2010-ongoing (monthly)</p>	<p>Administration Principal/Vice Principals</p> <p>District EL Coordinator/ Site Admin.</p> <p>District staff</p> <p>District Translator/Bilingual and Classroom Instructional Assistants</p> <p>District EL Coordinator</p>	<p>No Funding Required</p> <p>EIA \$500</p> <p>Title 1 \$12,000</p> <p>Title III/ General Fund \$19, 280</p> <p>EIA \$1,000</p>	
---	---	--	---	--

<p>Provide information for parents on homework, behavior, State Board Approved adopted materials, EL program entrance and exit criteria (ELAC).</p> <p>Conduct annual parent surveys and use the results to amend policies and practices to improve parent involvement and student achievement.</p>	<p>1/5/2010-ongoing (monthly)</p> <p>1/5/2010-ongoing (1x per year)</p>	<p>EL Department Chair</p> <p>District EL Coordinator</p>	<p>EIA \$1,000</p> <p>EIA \$1,000</p>	
<p>7. If applicable, identify any changes to the Title III Immigrant Education Program.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>