

**HESPERIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT'S**

**PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT HISTORY**

**AS OF JANUARY, 2013**

**CREATED BY**

**VALERIE TURPEN, COORDINATOR**

**CURRICULUM AND CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS**



## Table of Contents

Program Improvement (PI) Information .....	4
Sanctions Placed on PI Schools .....	5
Program Improvement Status by Year .....	11
2000 Joshua Circle Entered Program Improvement – 1st Identification .....	12
Significant Strategies Joshua Circle used to exit Program Improvement (2002-03):.....	13
Program Improvement – District .....	15
Significant Strategies the District is using to exit Program Improvement:.....	18
Program Improvement – Cottonwood Elementary School.....	21
Significant Strategies Cottonwood is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	22
Program Improvement – Joshua Circle Elementary School – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Identification.....	24
Significant Strategies Joshua Circle is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	25
Program Improvement – Lime Street Elementary School .....	27
Significant Strategies Lime Street is using to exit Program Improvement:.....	28
Program Improvement – Topaz Preparatory Academy .....	31
Significant Strategies Topaz is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	32
Program Improvement – Carmel Elementary School.....	35
Significant Strategies Carmel used to exit Program Improvement: .....	36
Program Improvement – Eucalyptus Elementary School.....	37
Significant Strategies Eucalyptus is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	38
Program Improvement – Hollyvale Elementary School.....	41
Significant Strategies Hollyvale is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	42
Program Improvement – Mesquite Trails Elementary School .....	44
Significant Strategies Mesquite Trails is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	45
Program Improvement – Juniper Elementary School.....	47
Significant Strategies Juniper is using to exit Program Improvement:.....	48
Program Improvement – Kingston Elementary School.....	49
Significant Strategies Kingston is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	50
Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – 1st Identification.....	51
Significant Strategies Maple used to exit Program Improvement (2007-08): .....	52
Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Identification .....	52
Significant Strategies Maple is using to exit Program Improvement: .....	53
Program Improvement – Mesa Grande Elementary School.....	54
Significant Strategies Mesa Grande is using to exit Program Improvement:.....	54
Program Improvement – Mission Crest Elementary School .....	58
Significant Strategies Mission Crest is using to exit Program Improvement:.....	59

Program Improvement – Cypress School of the Arts .....61  
Significant Strategies Cypress School of the Arts is using to exit Program Improvement: .....61  
Program Improvement – Krystal School of Science, Math & Technology .....64  
Significant Strategies Krystal School of Science, Math & Technology is using to stay out of Program Improvement: ..64  
Program Improvement – Hesperia Junior High School.....66  
Significant Strategies Hesperia Junior High School is using to stay out of Program Improvement: .....66

## Program Improvement (PI) Information

**Definition:** The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires all states to implement statewide accountability systems based on challenging state standards in reading and mathematics, annual testing for all students in grades three through eight, and annual statewide progress objectives ensuring that all groups of students reach proficiency within 12 years. Assessment results are disaggregated by socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, disability, and limited English proficiency to ensure that no group is left behind. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) toward statewide proficiency goals are subject to improvement and corrective action measures. In California, PI is the formal designation for Title I funded schools and LEAs that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years. Once in PI, a school or LEA that fails to make AYP will advance further in PI status.

### Criteria:

#### **Entering PI:**

**Title I School** – A Title I school will be identified for PI when, for each of two consecutive years, the school does not make AYP in the same content area (English-language arts (ELA) or mathematics schoolwide or for any numerically significant subgroup, or on the same indicator Academic Performance Index (API) or high school graduation rate schoolwide.

**Title I LEA** – A Title I LEA will be identified for PI when, for each of two consecutive years, the LEA does not make AYP in the same content area (ELA or math) LEA-wide or for any numerically significant subgroup, and does not meet AYP criteria in the same content area in each grade span (grades two through five, grades six through eight, and grade ten), or does not make AYP on the same indicator (API or graduation rate) LEA-wide.

#### **Advancing in PI:**

A school or LEA that was in PI and does not make AYP for the current year will advance to the next level for PI for the following year and be required to immediately implement the applicable ESEA requirements.

#### **Maintaining PI Status:**

A school or LEA that was in PI and makes AYP in the current year will not advance in PI, but will maintain the same PI status for the following year. This school or LEA will be required to continue implementing the applicable ESEA requirements.

#### **Exiting from PI:**

A school or LEA that makes AYP for two consecutive years will exit from PI at the end of the current year.

## Sanctions Placed on PI Schools

### **Mandatory Public School Choice – Year 1+**

NCLB requires that all students enrolled in schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring be given the opportunity to attend another public school in the LEA, with transportation provided by the LEA. All students enrolled in a Title I school identified as a PI school are eligible to transfer. Parents must be notified as soon as possible of the school's status. If more than one non-Program Improvement school is available, parents must be given the opportunity to choose.

The schools that were eligible for Public School Choice for 2012-13 are Carmel, Cottonwood, Cypress, Eucalyptus, Hesperia Community Day, Hollyvale, Joshua Circle, Juniper, Kingston, Lime Street, Maple, Mesa Grande, Mesquite Trails, Mission Crest and Topaz. There were 10,178 students eligible to transfer to another school but only 94 actually transferred.

### **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) – Year 2+**

If a school fails to make AYP by the end of the first full school year after being identified for improvement, the LEA must arrange for the provision of SES for eligible students who attend that school. This is in addition to continuing to provide technical assistance and school choice. The services include tutoring and other supplemental academic enrichment services that are in addition to the instruction provided outside of the regular school day. The services must be of high quality, research-based and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children on the state assessments. They must be designed to help students attain proficiency in meeting the state's academic achievement standards.

### **Who is eligible to receive SES?**

Unlike school choice, which is available to all students enrolled in an identified school, supplemental services are only available to eligible students. A student is eligible to receive services if the child is approved to participate in the Free and Reduced Priced Meal (FRPM) program.

### **How are providers selected for approval by the CDE?**

Organizations submit an application to the CDE to become an SES provider, as defined in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Title I, Part A, Section 1116(e). Those who meet the quality requirements specified under the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 for the SES program are recommended to and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE). CDE is responsible for approving possible providers. Approval is granted based on the following:

- 1) A demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving student academic achievement in the subjects relevant to the state's content and achievement standards.
- 2) Documentation that the instructional strategies used by the provider are high quality based upon research and designed to increase student achievement.
- 3) Assurance that services are consistent with the instructional program of the LEA and with the state academic content and achievement standards.
- 4) Assurance by the provider that services provided are secular, neutral and non-ideological.

- 5) Evidence that the provider is financially sound.
- 6) Assurance by the provider that it will provide services consistent with applicable federal, state, and local health, safety and civil rights laws.

The LEA has access to the approved providers and those in particular that state they want to provide services to the district. A letter of intent to participate is sent to the potential providers and then a mandatory meeting is scheduled to review the contract and the specific requirements of the district. Sixty providers returned the letter of intent to participate but only 31 completed all the required paperwork and 28 providers serviced students.

### **What role does the district play in SES?**

An LEA must:

- Notify parents about the availability of services, at least annually [Section 1116(e) (2) (A)].
- Help parents choose a provider, if requested [Section 1116(e) (2) (B)].
- Determine which students should receive services if not all students can be served [Section 1116(e) (2) (C)]. HUSD selects SES participants based on their previous year's California Standards Test (CST) scores. Students with proficiency levels in ELA, math, or both at basic, below basic and far below basic were selected for the SES program. We had additional space and allowed all second grade applicants to participate in the SES program. Additionally, 40 first grade students were selected to participate at random using a lottery system. Currently, 747 eligible students are on a waiting list.
- Enter into an agreement with a provider selected by parents of an eligible student [Section 1116(e) (3)].
- Assist the SEA in identifying potential providers within the LEA [Section 1116(e) (4) (A)].
- Protect the privacy of students who receive SES [Section 1116(e) (2) (D)].

Parents are notified of their option to participate and given information regarding the providers that have signed the contract. To help in the parents' selection of a provider, we also offer them the opportunity to meet the contracted providers at a Provider fair. After the parents have chosen their provider, names are given to the provider to begin the process. A pre-assessment is given and then a student learning plan (SLP) is developed with the parent. It is signed by the parent, provider, and a district representative before services can begin.

### **May a LEA set a deadline by which parents must request SES?**

Yes, a LEA may establish a reasonable deadline by which parents must request services. To ensure that parents can make informed decisions about requesting SES and selecting a provider, a LEA should make certain that parents have sufficient time, information, and opportunity to make these decisions. A LEA may allow a rolling enrollment for services, taking care that eligible students are served and priorities are respected. A rolling enrollment process would accommodate students who are newly enrolled at the beginning of or during the school year. Whatever procedures a LEA uses, it must ensure it meets all demand for SES from eligible students, consistent with the LEAs obligation to spend an amount equal to 20 percent of its Title I allocation for choice-related transportation and SES.

Beginning in 2009-2010, a LEA must provide, at a minimum, two separate enrollment windows as required under Section 200.48(d) (2).

### **How much must a local educational agency spend on SES?**

A LEA must spend the equivalent of between five and fifteen percent of its Title I allocation (or as much as twenty percent, if it does not have any demand for choice-related transportation) on SES, with the precise amount dependent on the relative demand for choice-related transportation and SES.

The schools eligible for SES in 2012-13 are Cottonwood, Eucalyptus, Hesperia Community Day, Hollyvale, Joshua Circle, Juniper, Kingston, Lime Street, Maple, Mesa Grande, Mesquite Trails, Mission Crest, and Topaz. There were a total of 6,500 eligible students. Out of those students, 878 students are participating. The amount per student as determined by CDE is \$910.85.

### **Corrective Action – Year 3**

NCLB describes six potential corrective actions, at least one of which must be taken. The LEA may take additional actions that are not on the list but **must** take at least one of the following actions:

- Replace the school staff who are relevant to the failure to make AYP;
- Institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional that is based on scientifically based research;
- Significantly decrease management authority at the school level;
- Appoint one or more outside expert to advise the school on revising and implementing its school plan;
- Extend the length of the school year or school day; or
- Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

The Educational Services division worked with the content coaches to develop an Effective Model of Instruction for the schools to follow in order to meet the last action. The plan involves mandating a specific amount of time to English Language Development (ELD), English/language arts/ and math using specific materials and strategies. The strategies are all strategies that staffs have been previously trained on but are not necessarily implementing. The schools that are in Corrective Action for 2012-13 are Cottonwood (frozen), Eucalyptus, Hollyvale, and Topaz.

### **Restructuring – Year 4 & 5**

A school is identified for restructuring if it does not make AYP after year 3, the local corrective action year. Restructuring means that the LEA must take intensive and far-reaching interventions to revamp completely the operation and governance of the school.

Restructuring:

- Promises to improve student achievement based on improving AYP targets
- Makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in school staffing and governance to improve student achievement
- Includes the analysis and implementation of appropriate program design which is critical to the success of the year 5 restructuring plan.
- It's a two-step process

- The LEA must prepare the restructuring plan and prepare for implementation if the school did not meet AYP after the corrective action year.

#### **School Requirements – Year 4**

- Review, revise and monitor the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and implement corrective actions.
- Collaborate with LEA to improve student achievement.

#### **Local Educational Agency (LEA) Requirements – Year 4**

Continue:

- School Choice
- Supplemental Educational Services (SES)
- Fiscal set aside of 20% to fund choice, transportation and supplemental educational services

Required Actions

- Notify parents of the supplemental educational services that are available to eligible children
- Continue to ensure that supplemental educational services are available to eligible students
- Prepare a plan to implement an alternative governance system for the school
- Notify parents about school improvements and their involvement in the process.
- Must provide parents and teachers an opportunity to comment before developing the plan.
- Parents and teachers must be included in plan development.
- The restructuring plan should address the deficiencies in the entire system that serves the school.
- LEA assistance, both fiscal and technical, needs to address the gaps and deficiencies in the school program

#### **Implementation of LEA Alternative Governance Arrangements**

The restructuring plan prepared by the LEA must include one of the following alternative governance arrangements for the school:

- Option 1: Close the school and reopen it as a charter.
  - Option 2: Replace all or most of the staff (may include the principal) who are relevant to the failure to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).
  - Option 3: Enter into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the public school.
  - Option 4: Implement any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement. Fundamental reforms might include significant changes in school staffing and governance to improve student achievement and make AYP.
- The LEA should choose the option that best addresses the needs of the students.
  - Each option leverages a significant shift in the school governance structure.
  - Restructuring should improve the ability of all children to achieve annual academic performance targets.



- Change the governance structure in a significant manner that either diminishes school-based management and decision making or increases control, monitoring, and oversight of the school's operations and educational program by the LEA.
- Close the school and reopen it as a focus or theme school with new staff or staff skilled in the focus area (e.g., math and science, dual language, communication arts).
- Reconstitute the school into smaller autonomous learning communities (e.g., school-within-a-school model, learning academies, etc.).
- Dissolve the school and assign students to other schools in the LEA.
- Pair the school in restructuring with a higher performing school so that K-3 grades from both schools are together and 4-5 grades from both schools are together.

#### How Does the LEA Select the "Right" Alternative Governance" Option?

- The restructuring process must be substantial enough to transform and sustain change.
- Choose one or more "alternative governance" interventions that best address the identified needs of the school and school community.
- No options should be selected as an isolated quick fix (e.g., a principal change, a replacement of most or all staff, or contracting with an external education management provider).
- The LEA and school planners should consider what has occurred in the school that resulted in its being identified for restructuring.
- Make distinctions between interventions that have made some improvement in student achievement and those that did not.
- Decisions regarding restructuring interventions should be made accordingly.
- The LEA should use AYP to target the unique needs of a school's students to improve its ability to teach *all* children and achieve annual academic performance targets.

#### Other factors to consider:

- Governance changes alone will not likely produce significant changes in student performance.
- Consider staff development, curricula, instruction, use of technology, assessment, and other factors that are essential for success.
- Hiring and retaining qualified teachers and principals who are committed to restructuring can facilitate implementation.
- A principal is critical to the change process but cannot effect change without having:
  - the authority to make staffing and curricula changes.
  - the active support and involvement of school and LEA personnel, parents, teachers, business and community organizations, State education personnel, governmental agencies and others.
- Analyze the school situation by examining barriers.
- Barriers might exist internally or externally that prevent students from achieving appropriately.
- Target those barriers and create new systems to eliminate them.
- Planning for restructuring does not necessitate a "one size fits all solution"
- Develop new thinking about how to address such concerns as:
  - the professional development needs of teachers, using appropriate instructional approaches
  - effective organization and management of instruction

On What Timeline Must the LEA Restructure Its Year 5 Schools?

- The LEA must implement the restructuring plan no later than the beginning of the school year following the year in which the school was in its "planning for restructuring," year 4. The schools in Year 4 and writing a Restructuring Plan for 2012-13 are Joshua Circle and Lime Street.

Program Improvement Status by Year

School	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
Carmel											Watch	Exit	Watch	Yr 1
Cottonwood										Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Freeze
Cypress													Watch	Yr 1
Eucalyptus											Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Hesp Comm Day														Yr 1
Hesperia Junior														Watch
Hollyvale											Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Joshua Circle	Yr 1	Yr 1	Yr 1	Exit						Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4
Juniper												Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2
Kingston												Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2
Krystal														Watch
Lime Street										Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4
Maple				Watch	Yr 1	Freeze	Exit					Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2
Mesa Grande												Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2
Mesquite Trails											Watch	Yr 1	Freeze	Yr 2
Mission Crest												Watch	Yr 1	Yr 2
Topaz										Watch	Yr 1	Freeze	Yr 2	Yr 3
District					Watch	Yr 1	Yr 1	Freeze	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 3+	Yr 3+	Yr 3+	Yr 3+

Note: Areas that placed District or school into Program Improvement are in **bold** type.

### 2000 Joshua Circle Entered Program Improvement – 1st Identification – API

549

Before Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – Based on State criteria of Academic Performance Index (API) – not meeting growth target

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>API Base</u>	<u>API Growth</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Growth</u>
Schoolwide	531	549	13	18
<b>White</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
Hispanic	483	512	10	29
Socio-economic	496	519	10	23

### 2001 Joshua Circle Continues Program Improvement – API 560

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>API Base</u>	<u>API Growth</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Growth</u>
<b>Schoolwide</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>
White	582	636	10	54
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>-3</b>
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>-9</b>

### 2002 Joshua Circle Continues in Program Improvement – API 583

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>API Base</u>	<u>API Growth</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Growth</u>
Schoolwide	571	583	11	12
<b>White</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>-14</b>
Hispanic	521	557	9	36
Socio-economic	521	550	9	29

### 2003 Joshua Circle Exits Program Improvement – API 679

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>API Base</u>	<u>API Growth</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Growth</u>
Schoolwide	603	679	10	76
White	650	709	8	59
Hispanic	680	666	8	86
Socio-economic	571	660	8	89

## Significant Strategies Joshua Circle used to exit Program Improvement (2002-03):

- Placed a strong emphasis on re-teaching - The idea being that presenting the information was not enough. Teachers had to make sure students were actually learning it. They checked for understanding constantly. One of the most effective ways was through the use of personal whiteboards. Students would write their answer on it, and the teacher would have the class hold them up, providing immediate feedback. Students who were deficient in a particular standard would be grouped for re-teaching. There were several models teachers used for this, i.e., in ExCEL, during physical education one teacher would stay in and work with students, during silent reading time the teacher would have a group in the back, etc.
- Schoolwide Accelerated Reader competition – Grade levels would compete to see who got the most points (the higher the grade level, the more points they needed). Also, based on the previous year, as schoolwide point goal was set. If they reached it, there would be a big celebration right before testing. One year a helicopter landed on the field. Another year there was a carnival, etc. The school had a schoolwide theme for success i.e., from “Angels in the Outfield,” the quotation, “It could happen...” Grade level assemblies were held before the test where test success and completing goals was discussed.
- Teachers set individual goals for each student – Administrators then met with each student (CAT Chats) to follow up on their progress and to translate that goal into one that fit the test based on what they had done the previous year. They would explain the results and let them know exactly what they needed to do to get to the next level.
- Administrators met with a different grade level on a rotating schedule each week of collaboration – They would be told ahead of time what was going to be talked about based on their test scores, benchmark scores, etc. The discussion would include a discussion about the makeup of their ExCEL groups and finding out which students were ready to move. It was expected that the progress of individual students would be discussed weekly, and the teachers would have goals just like the students. Each grade level had an agenda each week and would keep minutes of their meeting so they could refer back to what had been decided. Often, grade levels would meet during lunch for additional collaboration time.
- Leadership Team met weekly and staff meetings were held weekly – Leadership was the day before the staff meeting so it could be decided, together, what needed to be presented to all teachers. Each week, the most innovative ideas observed during walk-thrus were highlighted. Teachers were encouraged and challenged. There were struggles with not making AYP and facing the English Learners (ELs) and kids living in poverty and thus, there were times of despair and tears. Video clips were used to inspire hope and stories of success to keep everyone going. The weekly *Monday Memo* was used to remind teachers of the focus for the week, reviewing what had been discussed in collaboration, Leadership and staff meeting.

- A lot of support was given to EL parents – Christina Espinoza, as the bilingual community Liaison, was invaluable. Parents felt safe to come to school. They were offered English classes, ways to help their kids with homework, Love and Logic discipline strategies (teachers were also trained in this, and it revolutionized classroom management for many teachers, making Joshua Circle a more positive place where students began taking more responsibility for their own actions) and a full time translator. They were helped to see how their commitment to learning English would be a key to their child's success.
- The teachers took full advantage of the coaching. Having many teachers trained in Cognitive Guided Instruction (CGI) and Guided Reading – It is believed by many that ongoing coaching is nothing like going to a workshop. It is teachers being able to practice and get feedback, throughout the year, that brings mastery. There is no shortcut.
- Reading Recovery follows this same model, and it was an extremely important intervention – There is no end to the research that proclaims the importance of getting first graders at grade level in reading. This success filtered through the grade levels over the years. These strategies were used throughout the primary grades to improve all students' reading skills.

Note: Areas that placed District or school into Program Improvement are in **bold** type.

### Program Improvement – District - 675

Results 2003-04 Hesperia Unified School District – Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2004-05

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> <u>(11.2)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math</u> <u>(9.6)</u>		<u>Graduation</u> <u>Rate</u>
Districtwide	32.9	yes	35.4	yes	yes
African American	20.4	yes	21.5	yes	
Hispanic	25.8	yes	30.5	yes	
White	40.2	yes	40.7	yes	
Socio-economic	25.8	yes	30.1	yes	
English Learners	15.9	no	24.2	yes	
<b>Stus with Disabilities</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>no</b>	

### Program Improvement – District - 687

Results 2004-05 Hesperia Unified School District – Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2005-06

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> <u>(23.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math</u> <u>(23.7)</u>		<u>Graduation</u> <u>Rate</u>
Districtwide	36.6	yes	39.5	yes	yes
African American	23.6	yes	23.8	yes	
Hispanic	29.0	yes	33.5	yes	
White	45.0	yes	46.7	yes	
Socio-economic	29.1	yes	33.5	yes	
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>no</b>	31.2	yes	
<b>Stus with Disabilities</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>no</b>	30.8	yes (adjusted)	

### Program Improvement – District - 691

Results 2005-06 Hesperia Unified School District – Program Improvement – **Year 1 Frozen** for 2006-07

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> <u>(23.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math</u> <u>(23.7)</u>		<u>Graduation</u> <u>Rate</u>
Districtwide	38.7	yes	40.3	yes	yes
African American	26.6	yes	26.2	yes	
Asian	60.0	yes	61.0	yes	
Hispanic	32.3	yes	36.3	yes	
White	47.4	yes	46.4	yes	
Socio-economic	30.5	yes	35.5	yes	
English Learners	25.6	yes	34.3	yes	
Stus with Disabilities	10.3	yes (adjusted)	13.3	yes (adjusted)	

### Program Improvement – District – API 700

Results 2006-07 Hesperia Unified School District – Placed in Program Improvement – Year 2 for 2007-08

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> (23.0)		<u>% Proficient Math</u> (23.7)		<u>Graduation Rate</u>
Districtwide	38.3	yes	41.4	yes	yes
African American	26.4	yes	28.5	yes	
Asian	58.8	yes	66.2	yes	
Hispanic	32.2	yes	37.1	yes	
White	48.8	yes	49.2	yes	
Socio-economic	31.6	yes	36.6	yes	
English Learners	25.8	yes	35.4	yes	
<b>Stus with Disabilities</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>no</b>	13.9	yes (adjusted)	

### Program Improvement – District – API 716

Results 2007-08 Hesperia Unified School District – Program Improvement – Year 3 for 2008-09

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> (34.0)		<u>% Proficient Math</u> (34.6)		<u>Graduation Rate</u>
Districtwide	42.1	yes	43.7	yes	<b>no</b>
<b>African American</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>no</b>	
Asian	59.5	yes	70.8	yes	
Hispanic	36.6	yes	40.1	yes	
White	53.5	yes	51.8	yes	
Socio-economic	35.1	yes	39.3	yes	
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>no</b>	37.5	yes	
<b>Stus with Disabilities</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>no</b>	

### Program Improvement – District – API 727

Results 2008-09 Hesperia Unified School District – Program Improvement – Year 3+ for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> (45.0)		<u>% Proficient Math</u> (45.5)		<u>Graduation Rate</u>
Districtwide	45.7	yes	47.3	yes	<b>no</b>
<b>African American</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>no</b>	
Asian	66.2	yes	73.2	yes	
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>40.7</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>44.1</b>	<b>no</b>	
White	55.8	yes	55.3	yes	
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>no</b>	
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>no</b>	
<b>Stus with Disabilities</b>	25.2	yes (safe harbor)	<b>24.2</b>	<b>no</b>	



### Program Improvement – District – API 744

Results 2009-10 Hesperia Unified School District – Program Improvement – Year 3++ for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> (56.0)		<u>% Proficient Math</u> (56.4)		<u>Graduation Rate</u>
Districtwide	47.6	no	48.1	no	???
African American	34.5	no	34.6	no	
Asian	70.8	yes	74.3	yes	
Hispanic	43.1	no	44.6	no	
White	58.6	yes	56.9	yes	
Socio-economic	41.9	no	43.9	no	
English Learners	32.0	no	39.2	no	
Stus with Disabilities	25.6	no	26.3	no	

### Program Improvement – District – API 754

Results 2010-11 Hesperia Unified School District – Program Improvement – Year 3++ for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> (67.0)		<u>% Proficient Math</u> (67.3)		<u>Graduation Rate</u>
Districtwide	51.1	no	52.7	no	yes
African American	38.9	no	38.5	no	
Asian	75.2	yes	82.7	yes	
Hispanic	46.5	no	49.7	(safe harbor)	
White	62.0	no	61.3	no	
Socio-economic	45.5	no	48.9	no	
English Learners	33.4	no	43.5	no	
Stus with Disabilities	30.1	no	31.2	no	

### Program Improvement – District – API 768

Results 2011-12 Hesperia Unified School District – Program Improvement – Year 3++ for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA</u> (78.0)		<u>% Proficient Math</u> (78.2)		<u>Graduation Rate</u>
Districtwide	52.2	no	53.8	no	yes
African American	39.6	no	38.1	no	
Asian	69.1	no	76.0	yes (safe harbor)	
Hispanic	48.6	no	51.1	no	
White	62.3	no	62.4	yes	
Socio-economic	47.4	no	50.5	no	
English Learners	36.4	no	46.5	no	
Stus with Disabilities	33.8	no	33.7	no	

## Significant Strategies the District is using to exit Program Improvement:

- Hesperia Unified School District contracted with the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools (SBCSS) to be the external consultant providing support services to help the district exit Program Improvement – The district contracted with the County from September 2005 through December 2008 at a cost of \$35,000 a year. The County Team also worked with Maple Elementary School, our Program Improvement Year 1 school to help them exit Program Improvement. Services provided included:
  - Training staff on the Academic Program Survey (APS) and how to use the results to improve.
  - Collaborated with district and site administrators to establish a District/School Liaison Team (DSLTL).
  - Worked with district to write the required Local Education Agency Plan (LEAP) addendum to address the required components.
  - Conducted monitoring interviews and visits to Local Education Agency's (LEA) key schools and facilities as necessary to verify progress and identify obstacles.
  - LEA and SBCSS staff conducted classroom walk-thrus at seven schools that included a debriefing, critical discussion and shared thoughts.
- On the recommendation of SBCSS and the criteria and research on district improvement, Hesperia Unified School District hired two content coaches - This provided professional development and follow-up coaching to teachers to improve instructional strategies thus improving academic performance. In 2008, four additional coaches were hired to support the schools in the areas of reading/language arts, writing and math.
- Curriculum and Instruction (C & I) administrators “adopted” school sites – This provided monthly walk-thrus and offer support to sites. All school sites had a C & I administrator giving walk-thru support.
- Professional development – All administrators received training during management meetings on the same professional development offered to the teachers.

Even though we progressed in the Program Improvement structure, our student subgroups were, and are making growth from one year to the next. The reason we progressed was due to the increased percentage of students expected to reach proficiency.

### 2011-12 School Year:

- Hesperia Unified School District contracted with the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools (SBCSS) to be the external consultant providing support services to help the district and sites exit Program Improvement – The district contracted with the County from July 2011 through June 2012 at a cost of \$43,950 a year. The County Team also worked with all of our PI year 1-3 schools and our newest Title I school, Hesperia Junior High. Services provided included:
  - Training staff on the Academic Program Survey (APS) to review the academic program at each site.

- Worked with individual site teams to develop systemic action steps to ratchet up the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and propel attainment of AYP.
  - Met with PI Year 3 school teams to begin the restructuring process by reviewing the Look Before You Leap into Restructuring document. The leadership team and key players will analyze how the school/district governance systems (organization, policies, procedures, practices, personnel) impede or propel students' AYP.
  - LEA and SBCSS staff conducted classroom walk-thrus at thirteen schools in the Fall and Spring that included a debriefing, critical discussion and shared thoughts. The walk-thrus were focused on the action steps outlined in each SPSA to provide feedback on implementation, observe the instructional strategies being used, and establish next steps to help the schools meet academic achievement targets. LEA staff also conducted walk-thrus every month.
- Content Coaches – Five content coaches support the schools in the areas of reading/language arts, writing and math.
  - Curriculum and Instruction (C & I) administrator Walk-thrus– All PI Year 2 & 3 schools had monthly walk-thrus to focus on action steps written in the SPSA.
  - Professional development – All administrators received training during management meetings on the same professional development offered to the teachers. SB 472-like training was given to all elementary teachers in the areas of ELA and Math and to the content specific secondary teachers in ELA and Math. Sites were also given opportunities to be trained in EL strategies including SIOP and ELD instruction. Secondary sites are participating in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) trainings offered by San Bernardino County.

2012-13 School Year:

- Hesperia Unified School District again contracted with the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools (SBCSS) to be the external consultant providing support services to help the district and sites exit Program Improvement- The district contracted with the County from July 2012 through June 2013 at a cost of \$72,440 a year. The County Team also worked with all of our PI year 1-4 schools and Hesperia High School.

Services provided included:

- Training staff on the Academic Program Survey (APS) to review the academic program at each site.
- Worked with individual site teams to develop systemic action steps to ratchet up the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and propel attainment of AYP.
- Meet with PI Year 3 school teams to begin the restructuring process by reviewing the Look Before You Leap into Restructuring document. The leadership team and key players will analyze how the school/district governance systems (organization, policies, procedures, practices, personnel) impede or propel students' AYP.
- Meet with PI Year 4 school teams to begin the restructuring process by reviewing the work completed at the end of the 2011-12 school year in regards to

governance restructuring. Representatives from every grade level, Special Education, Classified staff, parents, HTA/CSEA Union Leaders, and site and district administrators analyzed how the school/district governance systems (organization, policies, procedures, practices, personnel) impede or propel students' AYP. The representatives then will meet with their respective groups, share what was discussed and give suggestions to be brought back to the team to write the restructuring plan. The plan will be written during the net team meeting and then shared with the school community. If the school goes into Year 5, the plan will then be implemented.

- LEA and SBCSS staff conducted classroom walk-thrus at sixteen schools in the Fall and Spring that included a debriefing, critical discussion and shared thoughts. The walk-thrus were focused on the action steps outlined in each SPSA to provide feedback on implementation, observe the instructional strategies being used, and establish next steps to help the schools meet academic achievement targets. LEA staff also conducted walk-thrus every month.
- Content Coaches- Five content coaches support the schools in the areas of reading/language arts, writing and math.
- Curriculum and Instruction (C & I) administrator Walk-thrus- All schools had monthly walk-thrus to focus on action steps written in the SPSA.
- Professional development- All administrators received training during management meetings on the same professional development offered to the teachers. Teachers were given opportunities to attend a variety of trainings focused on reading/language arts, components of the Effective Model of Instruction, and math. Sites were also given opportunities to be trained in EL strategies including SIOP and ELD instruction. Secondary sites are participating in year 2 of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) trainings offered by San Bernardino County and the elementary schools and a second cohort from the high schools are participating in the first year of PLC training.

## Program Improvement – Cottonwood Elementary School – API 727

Results 2007-08 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2008-09

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (35.2)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (37.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	35.3	yes	42.9	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>no</b>	40.1	yes
White	42.6	yes	48.4	yes
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>no</b>	37.7	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>no</b>	38.3	yes

## Program Improvement – Cottonwood Elementary School – API 740

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
<b>Schoolwide</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>no</b>	49.4	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>35.4</b>	<b>no</b>	45.9	yes (safe harbor)
White	52.3	yes	59.5	yes
Socio-economic	35.1	yes (safe harbor)	43.8	yes (safe harbor)
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>no</b>	43.9	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Cottonwood Elementary School – API 715

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	37.1	no	46.6	no
Hispanic	32.5	no	41.7	no
White	49.0	no	59.2	yes
Socio-economic	30.8	no	41.8	no
English Learners	27.4	no	37.6	no

## Program Improvement – Cottonwood Elementary School – API 742

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 3** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	39.1	no	56.8	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	35.8	no	54.3	yes (safe harbor)
White	51.4	yes (safe harbor)	67.1	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	32.4	no	50.9	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	28.0	no	46.7	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Cottonwood Elementary School – API 791

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 3 – Frozen** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	48.3	yes (safe harbor)	66.3	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	45.8	yes (safe harbor)	65.6	yes (safe harbor)
White	55.8	yes (safe harbor)	74.6	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	43.8	yes (safe harbor)	63.4	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	38.0	yes (safe harbor)	60.2	yes (safe harbor)

### Significant Strategies Cottonwood is using to exit Program Improvement:

- Staff reviewed the data – To determine areas of focus.
- The teachers and instructional assistants provide additional small group instruction to students below proficiency – They focus on specific skills such as, comprehension. The small groups allow for greater focus on individual student needs.
- Appropriate and adequate materials are provided by English Language Development (ELD) – Along with Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) staff development provided by the District’s English learner coach.
- Implementation of web-based program, Study Island – This program can also be used at home for additional practice.

- After school Math and Language Arts Academies – Students participate for extra re-teaching of necessary skills along with Homework Club to assist students with homework.
- Math and Reading Parent Nights – To help parents understand standards for each grade level so they can support their children.
- Implementation of Explicit Direct Instruction Strategies
- Implementation of the Effective Model of Instruction (EMI)
- Teachers working with Far Below Basic and Below Basic students in after-school tutoring
- Increased use of classroom technology (iPads, Nooks)
- Training & implementation of Professional Learning Communities

## Program Improvement – Joshua Circle Elementary School – 2<sup>nd</sup>

### Identification – API 776

Results 2007-08 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2008-09

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (35.2)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (37.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	41.6	yes	51.8	yes
Hispanic	40.1	yes	51.0	yes
White	49.0	yes	52.1	yes
Socio-economic	39.0	yes	50.7	yes
English Learners	<b>32.6</b>	<b>no</b>	46.4	yes

## Program Improvement – Joshua Circle Elementary School – API 764

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>41.0</b>	<b>no</b>	54.6	yes
Hispanic	<b>39.2</b>	<b>no</b>	55.3	yes
White	49.4	yes	53.2	yes
Socio-economic	<b>37.6</b>	<b>no</b>	53.3	yes
English Learners	<b>33.5</b>	<b>no</b>	53.0	yes

## Program Improvement – Joshua Circle Elementary School – API 763

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year2** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>42.7</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>55.7</b>	<b>no</b>
Hispanic	<b>42.2</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>56.3</b>	<b>no</b>
Socio-economic	<b>41.1</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>no</b>
English Learners	<b>34.7</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>54.2</b>	<b>no</b>

(As of 2009-10 school year, the white subgroup is no longer a significant subgroup)

## Program Improvement – Joshua Circle Elementary School – API 755

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 3** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>39.1</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>54.8</b>	<b>no</b>
Hispanic	<b>39.4</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>55.9</b>	<b>no</b>
Socio-economic	<b>37.9</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>54.1</b>	<b>no</b>
English Learners	<b>31.6</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>53.0</b>	<b>no</b>



## Program Improvement – Joshua Circle Elementary School – API 768

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 4** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	41.1	no	60.0	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	40.7	no	61.9	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	40.4	no	59.6	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	39.1	yes (safe harbor)	66.1	yes (safe harbor)

### Significant Strategies Joshua Circle is using to exit Program Improvement:

Plans and interventions in place to move Joshua Circle School out of PI status:

- "Breakfast in the Classroom Program" in place for grades K-6 to insure students have a nutritious start to their learning day.
- Increase visibility of administrators at parent drop-off before school to decrease tardies/increase time on task.
- "Bell to Bell" instruction
- Bulldog Pride school-wide incentive program to increase attendance, effort and positive behavior.
- Teacher incentives for Benchmark improvement/proficiency
- Fidelity to the district adopted textbooks for core curriculum instruction
- Special Education teacher and two assistants working with students in grades 3-6 with Soar to Success and LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention) (to improve comprehension strategies).
- Continue utilizing "Family Resource" position to enable enhanced communication with, and increased involvement of, parents in school activities.
- Re-teaching based on data from Single Assessments and other assessments
- Increase utilization of Special Education teacher in ExCEL/RTI program to allow smaller group instruction.
- "Study Island" computer program access for all students to reach from home through school website.
- Website links to help parents access state standards, released questions, and computer programs that reinforce learning
- Offer before and after school tutoring to students in addition to LEAP and FLAIR.
- Expand Project FLAIR focus to include more than just FBB students
- Teachers voluntarily tutoring students during their lunch time
- Purchase of "Daily Five" books and training on "Daily Five" strategies with Paulette Croft
- Update training of "Culture of Poverty" with Jodi Consten
- Update training of SDAIE and EL strategies with Kelly Nunes and Debra Peters.

- Focus on "90-90-90 Schools" research with emphasis on informational writing in grades 4-6
- Continue with lunch schedule to a 'play first' model
- Classroom Attendance Competitions
- Purchase additional computers and software such as: High Stakes Math, Reading Eggspress, English in a Flash and Tumble Books for students to be able to access standards based programs
- ELL, Guided Reading, Math Strategies, LLI, Academic Vocab, Daily 5, Common Core, Words Their Way and Interactive Training for staff (Certificated and Classified).
- Addition of Bulldog Nights, a Student of the Month Awards program working in conjunction with Wood Grill Buffet to encourage kids to follow our rules rubric.
- Start "Night of the Stars" CST score recognition for students. Implemented during the 11/12 school year and we had over 80 students recognized in October 2012. The goal is to have even more students invited to Night of the Stars this year.

## Program Improvement – Lime Street Elementary School – API 761

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	46.4	yes	55.1	yes
Hispanic	42.4	yes (safe harbor)	50.2	yes
White	54.8	yes	67.2	yes
Socio-economic	42.1	yes	51.7	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>no</b>	46.6	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Lime Street Elementary School – API 743

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	40.8	no	47.3	no
Hispanic	40.9	no	46.2	no
White	42.9	no	49.2	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	37.4	no	44.4	no
English Learners	34.5	no	34.5	no

## Program Improvement – Lime Street Elementary School – API 746

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 3** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	38.9	no	54.1	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	38.0	no	54.9	yes (safe harbor)
White	44.2	no	57.7	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	35.4	no	51.3	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	31.1	no	48.9	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Lime Street Elementary School – API 765

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – Year 4 for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	41.0	no	52.5	no
Hispanic	40.8	no	51.0	no
White	37.2	no	61.7	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	38.5	no	50.8	no
English Learners	30.2	no	45.2	no

### Significant Strategies Lime Street is using to exit Program Improvement:

Lime Street Elementary is in its fourth year of Program Improvement. The Staff Council has met bi-weekly to review data, County Walk-throughs, and school programs. Based upon information gathered, the following has been implemented during the 2012/2013 school years to meet API/AYP targets and to, specifically, make Safe Harbor in English/Language Arts and Mathematics across all significant subgroups: Hispanic, White, Socio-economically Disadvantaged, and English Learners.

- Fully implement Core Instructional Programs in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and ELD (English Language Development) as identified by the district’s EMI (Effective Model of Instruction). Core instructional materials [Houghton Mifflin Reading (K-5 Reading), McDougal Littell (6 Reading), Harcourt Math (K-5 ELD Instruction), and High Point (6 ELD Instruction)] were inventoried and ordered to insure that all students would have access to the core curriculum. Grade levels met to develop Daily Schedules allocating the appropriate instruction identified on the Hesperia Unified School District’s EMI (Effective Model of Instruction). EPC 2.1, EPC 2.3, EPC 2.5
- Allocate Additional Instructional Time Beyond the Basic Core Program to Support ALL Students in Their Learning. All grade levels implement a Reteach/Enrichment period in reading and mathematics to address the specific needs of all students. Based upon weekly assessments and/or Benchmark tests, students are scaffolded at their level of ability for 1) reteaching of skills they have not mastered or 2) enrichment of grade level skills. The Reteach/Enrichment period meets the instructional time criteria for each content area (English/Language Arts – 30 minutes and Mathematics – 15 minutes, Kindergarten, 30 minutes, Grades 1-6). Additionally, ELL in grades 4, 5, and 6 that have a CLEDT 1 or 2, are pulled for additional instruction in the Learning Center, utilizing the Avenues program. EPC 2.2, EPC 2.6
- Restructure RTI Interventions (Tier III) for Intensive Students. The school restructured interventions provided for students scoring far below basic (or 2 or more years below grade level). These interventions in reading and mathematics are provided to qualifying students through The Learning Center by specialists (two special education teachers, two special education instructional assistants, and one bilingual instructional assistant) during the school day. The curriculum includes, but not limited to, SRA Numbers World McGraw Hill for mathematics and Language! Sopris West for Language Arts. EPC 2.4, EPC 2.6, EPC 2.7
- AM and PM Tutoring and Summer Intersession. AM and PM tutoring and Summer Intersession is offered in reading and mathematics for those students who are achieving below grade

level and considered a Tier II Strategic Learner. The curriculum being used during the PM program includes, but is not limited to, After School Math Club Houghton Mifflin for mathematics and Voyager Passport/Journeys for Language Arts. The curriculum during the Summer Intersession includes, but is not limited to, Summer Success for mathematics and Voyager Passport/Journeys for Language Arts. FLAIR (Fluent Language Acquisition/Intensive Reading) is offered to all English Learners that are CELDT I, 2 and 3. EL parents and preschoolers may also participate in English language development programs offered at the same time as FLAIR. We have fully implemented the ELL Read at Home program through our library. EPC 2.4, EPC 2.6, EPC 2.7

- Co-op Meetings. Teachers meet three times a year with the site administrator(s) and special education teachers to discuss all of our student progress and prescribe interventions. EPC 7.2, EPC 7.2, EPC 8.1, EPC 8.2
- ILPs: Students at risk of retention and/or performing two or more years below grade level are identified no later than the second Co-op Meeting (end of 1<sup>st</sup> Trimester) of the school year. Teachers meet with parents to develop an ILP, establishing goals in the area(s) of need. Two follow-up meetings are held with parents to discuss student progress. EPC 7.1, EPC 7.2
- Accelerated Reader. All certificated staff received an updated training (1 hours) at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year. This training was regarding the effective implementation of Accelerated Reader. K-6 students participate in this school wide program (read to, read with, independent reading) by setting goals and are held accountable. Library time is reading conferencing time. We are working to put at least two computers in every classroom. We have six computers on our library and one computer lab with 36 computers.
- Study Island. Study Island (an online, standards-based assessment, instruction, practice, and test preparation program) was purchased in January 2010. Students in Grades 2-6 attend the Computer Lab one time a week for additional practice in language arts and mathematics. Students may also access Study Island from home.
- PD 360. An online, professional development tool that was purchased in January 2010. All certificated and classified staff has access and attended training at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year to learn more about the resources available to them. Since PD 360 is web-based, it is instantly available. Topics include differentiation, minority student achievement, English language learners, classroom instruction that works, leadership, assessment, and many more. Currently, it is being used for individual staff development but may also be used in small groups (grade level teams) or with the entire staff.
- PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports). Lime Street staff is in its fourth year of implementation of PBIS, a school wide management program which focuses on a preventative rather than reactive approach to student discipline. The PBIS team, comprised of administration, teachers, and classified staff, meets regularly (at least once a month) to review student discipline data and develop action plans to address identified areas of concern (location, time of day, specific behavior). Once a month, the team communicates this information to the entire staff. Students exhibiting ongoing behavior concerns are identified and participate in intervention programs (Behavior Contracts, SMILE, PAWS (Positive Action with Support), Check and Connect, SOS (Save One Student) Mentor) according to the school's RTI (Response to Intervention) levels. During the 2011-2012 school year, Lime Street also entered into an agreement with VCSS (Victor Community Support Services) to provide small group and individual counseling in 1) anger management, 2)

social skills, and 3) absent parents. Desert Mountain SELPA Children's Services also provides individual counseling services to qualifying students on a weekly basis. EPC 6.2

- SBCSS Consultant Services. Consultants from the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools were contracted by the district to provide support services to the Lime Street staff in a variety of ways:
  - 1) Provide assistance in completing the required APS (Academic Program Survey). From this survey, the school team identified three specific areas of focus: a) review current practices and materials used during intensive ELA/ELD intervention to make certain they are aligned to the SBE-adopted programs and materials, b) review current practices and materials used during mathematics intervention to make certain they are aligned to the SBE-adopted programs and materials, and c) use HUSD content coaches to further address professional development needs and to help staff fully implement the EMI (Effective Model of instruction).
  - 2) Provide assistance in rewriting the School Plan to address areas of need. From the work completed with the SBCSS consultant, the team identified three specific areas to be included and addressed in the school plan: 1) use differentiation and ELD strategies across the curriculum on a daily basis to provide entry points and instructional activities appropriate to the needs of all learners, 2) incorporate research-based Academic Vocabulary Development across the curriculum, 3) fully implement the EMI (Effective Model of Instruction) school wide in English-Language Arts, Mathematics, and ELD instruction, and 4) use onsite capacity and structure for sharing expertise school wide and within grade levels.
  - 3) Conduct classroom walk-throughs to provide school staff with trends observed across grade levels. Suggestions offered to the school staff included: 1) use differentiation strategies across the curriculum on a daily basis to provide entry points and instructional activities appropriate to the needs of all learners, 2) post standards in classrooms (both full set and individual) for specific work posted as well as clarify content objectives at the start of every lesson, 3) check for understanding needs to occur frequently throughout the school day across all areas of the curriculum using informal and formal assessments, 4) lessons should consist of 50% teacher production (talk) and 50% student production (talk), 5) Focus Walls need to be used daily and interactively, 6) students need to be provided with opportunities to show their work in a variety of ways (CGI), and 6) use Thinking Maps at all cognitive levels (most maps observed were at the lower levels).
- Develop a Comprehensive Professional Development Plan to Address Areas of Need. Utilizing the feedback gained from school, district, and county sources, the school staff identified specific training needs and developed a schedule for the training (see attached plan). The majority of the trainings was conducted by district coaches and was followed up with content coaching. Additionally, staff meetings were restructured to focus upon training utilizing onsite expertise.

## Program Improvement – Topaz Preparatory Academy – API 740

Results 2007-08 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2008-09

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (35.2)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (37.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	42.2	yes	42.9	yes
Hispanic	39.6	yes	40.4	yes
White	48.8	yes	48.8	yes
Socio-economic	37.3	yes	39.1	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>34.2</b>	<b>no</b>	38.3	yes

## Program Improvement – Topaz Preparatory Academy – API 758

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
<b>Schoolwide</b>	<b>44.7</b>	<b>no</b>	49.6	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>no</b>
White	54.7	yes	59.4	yes
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>no</b>	44.9	yes (safe harbor)
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>no</b>

## Program Improvement – Topaz Preparatory Academy – API 785

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1-Frozen** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	50.7	yes (safe harbor)	53.2	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	47.6	yes (safe harbor)	49.3	yes (safe harbor)
White	59.1	yes	65.2	yes
Socio-economic	45.3	yes (safe harbor)	48.4	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	45.2	yes (safe harbor)	49.6	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Topaz Preparatory Academy – API 799

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	47.0	no	61.6	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	42.3	no	58.1	yes (safe harbor)
White	68.9	yes	73.0	yes
Socio-economic	43.5	no	58.8	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	36.3	no	56.1	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Topaz Preparatory Academy – API 814

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year3** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	54.0	yes (safe harbor)	59.6	no
Hispanic	48.4	yes (safe harbor)	55.9	no
White	77.4	yes	75.3	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	50.1	yes (safe harbor)	55.6	no
English Learners	40.0	yes (safe harbor)	53.8	no

### Significant Strategies Topaz is using to exit Program Improvement:

After reviewing the data and receiving input from staff, students, families, and our School Site Council the Topaz SPSA was revised to align with the California Department of Education’s nine Essential Program Components. The following items are a part of our site’s plan to exit Program Improvement:

- Instructional Learning Plans (ILPs) – Students in grades 3 – 8 will have one of two Instructional Learning Plans, depending on their proficiency level. 1) ILPs for students not meeting grade level proficiency or 2) ILPs for students needing to maintain proficient and advanced levels. ILPs will be collaboratively developed between the teacher, student, administration and parent.



- Individual Support Plans (ISPs) – Any student in grades K–2 not meeting grade level proficiency will have an ISP. ISPs will be collaboratively developed between the teacher, student, administration and parent.
- Classroom Interventions – Each teacher will choose “Focus Four” students. These are students who are not reaching proficient levels, despite our usual interventions. These students will receive additional support from the teacher on a daily basis (more frequent checking for understanding, small group and one-on-one time, etc...). Teachers will increase the level of communication with their Focus Four families. Administration will also have regular “touch-base” meetings with these students and, as needed, with the parents.
- Instruction – Besides focusing on using the adopted textbooks with fidelity, support materials and instructional strategies/techniques are utilized. Scaffolded reading groups with a focus on balanced literacy are at the heart of daily direct instruction. The Daily 5 – A balanced literacy model, is used in the primary grades. Reteach opportunities are embedded in the daily schedule. District and county instructional recommendations will be reflected upon and applied as appropriate. Teachers will have the opportunity to do peer observations as they relate to research-based effective instructional practices.
- Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier II and Tier III Support is given using CDE approved resources (such as LLI and Soar to Success)
- School-wide Implementation of The Leader in Me model – This is the Seven Habits of Highly Effective People for children to support our students in developing their problem solving and decision-making skills.
- Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) – AVID and AVID Elementary will be implemented in grades 4 and up.
- Extended ELD Instruction – CELDT 1s and 2s will receive additional ELD time (over the required 30 minutes) on a daily basis.
- Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) – SDAIE strategies and techniques will be incorporated into all ELD lessons. Realia, visual representations, manipulatives, and mnemonics will support direct instruction.
- Differentiated Instruction – To better support students at all developmental levels, including identified GATE students, the district is providing training in Differentiated Instruction so our site will have two trainers of trainers. The focus is on using 21<sup>st</sup> Century skills, Common Core standards, rigor and relevance. The teachers will implement activities that promote student interaction, higher levels of critical thinking skills, and lessons designed to support the model of multiple intelligences. Upper grade and middle school teachers are offering menu items and project based learning options, based on these strategies.
- Technological Instructional Support – This instructional support is based on a student’s individual developmental level. (such as Study Island, Accelerated Math, Accelerated Reading, High Stakes Math, Khan Academy)

- Technological Support – Besides our computer lab, each classroom has computers and other technology, such as projectors, and elmos (document cameras). Many classes have student response systems. 10 classrooms have Mimio (Smart) boards. All classes have access to web based programs, such as Discovery Streaming, which provides visual representations of standards and subject content matter.
- Continuous Improvement Model – Our staff is learning and implementing the Continuous Improvement Model process school-wide: Students will keep their data and goal worksheets in Personal Data Notebooks. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely (SMART) Goals will be established and monitored by grade level, each benchmark period. Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) goal setting data graph boards will be posted in all classrooms. Both short and long term goals will be set, graphed, and monitored.
- After-school programs – EL students in need of extra support, as indicated by their CELDT scores, CSTs, and district benchmarks will be invited to attend FLAIR tutoring. Any student who is not reaching proficiency levels is encouraged to stay for after school tutoring. After school tutoring is held every day after school. Students who need extra support to have their homework completed on time may stay after school in our homework group. After school clubs offer extension activities for students who hit their academic goals.
- Cross-Age Tutoring/Reader Leaders – Reader Leaders is a book buddy program between kindergarten and first grades and Hesperia High School students. We also partner with Hesperia High School’s student leadership on special events and activities so our students will have young, positive role models.
- Professional Development – Balanced Literacy Teams (BLTs) are professional development training and support opportunities provided by the District coaches and Language Support Services personnel. Each grade level is customizing their training based on individual need of support.
- Parent Support – Classes for parents are taught four times a week to help parents learn English. The classes also teach parents how they can support their children’s educational process and academic progress at home. Parents have access to computers, books, and resources in the Parent Resource Center and in the school library. Love and Logic parenting classes may be offered. Our Parent Community Liaison will facilitate The Latino Family Literacy Project Monday nights in the Spring. Parents will attend classes once a week for 10 weeks in a row. Child care will be provided.
- Parent Community Service and Input – Parents are encouraged to do community service and actively partner with the school in the educational process. Opportunities are provided through our Parent Teach Club (PTC), School Site Council (SSC), English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC), the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) meetings, and Student Study Team (SST) meetings.
- Success Celebrations – We take time to honor and reward student growth. This is done both individually and corporately. Some of these celebrations include: Tigers’ Pride, Team 350, Leader of the Day, and the AR Store. Success breeds success!

### Program Improvement – Carmel Elementary School – API 795

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	52.3	yes	59.2	yes
Hispanic	48.0	yes	54.1	yes
White	59.8	yes	69.0	yes
Socio-economic	47.8	yes	55.9	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>no</b>	47.5	yes

### Program Improvement – Carmel Elementary School – API 818

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Exited**

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	58.3	yes	64.6	yes
Hispanic	54.6	yes (safe harbor)	58.2	yes
White	64.1	yes	75.3	yes
Socio-economic	52.4	yes (safe harbor)	59.7	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	45.6	yes (safe harbor)	54.4	yes (safe harbor)

### Program Improvement – Carmel Elementary School – API 796

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	52.8	no	63.2	no
Hispanic	48.8	no	59.1	no
White	62.7	no	71.5	yes
Socio-economic	48.2	no	60.2	no
English Learners	40.2	no	53.6	no

### Program Improvement – Carmel Elementary School – API 791

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	53.7	no	58.6	no
Hispanic	52.4	yes (safe harbor)	57.6	no
White	61.0	no	65.6	no
Socio-economic	50.1	no	55.2	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	41.7	no	26.8	no

## Significant Strategies Carmel used to exit Program Improvement:

- Instruction- By CLAD trained personnel. Continued professional development in ELD strategies.
- Exposure- To oral language development activities. Additional tutoring in the Cougar Learning Center provided by our Bilingual Assistant.
- Direct teaching- Of oral language structure. Modeling, demonstrating, and role playing. Reduce amount of teacher talk, increase amount of student interactions.
- Instruction- Use the Into English and Avenues programs that are designed to work to support English Language Development. Use of Highpoint with our 6<sup>th</sup> graders.
- Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)- Techniques incorporated into lessons.
- Use of realia, manipulatives, and pictures to support differentiated instruction. Activities designed to increase production of language. Less teacher talk, more student interactions.
- Access to core curriculum- In scaffolded groups using the EL resources supplied by the state adopted texts.
- Technology supported instruction- i.e., Study Island, Starfall, Raz Kids, and Reading A-Z.
- Parent Information- Provided through English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) meetings.
- ELD classes- For parents and FLAIR interventions for students
- Open Family Resource Center – for Spanish speaking parents to help them with strategies for working with students on homework. Also, the Family Resource Center will have computers available for parents to work on Rosetta Stone.

## Program Improvement – Eucalyptus Elementary School – API 752

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	45.1	yes (safe harbor)	<b>46.8</b>	<b>no</b>
Hispanic	43.8	yes (safe harbor)	<b>45.1</b>	<b>no</b>
White	53.7	yes	57.3	yes
Socio-economic	40.8	yes (safe harbor)	<b>41.4</b>	<b>no</b>
English Learners	35.1	yes (safe harbor)	41.1	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Eucalyptus Elementary School – API 764

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>44.7</b>	<b>no</b>	51.2	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	<b>43.6</b>	<b>no</b>	52.1	yes (safe harbor)
White	<b>51.3</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<b>no</b>
Socio-economic	<b>41.1</b>	<b>no</b>	47.9	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	<b>31.0</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>no</b>

## Program Improvement – Eucalyptus Elementary School – API 755

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>44.6</b>	<b>no</b>	56.1	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	<b>42.4</b>	<b>no</b>	58.5	yes (safe harbor)
White	<b>50.7</b>	<b>no</b>	58.9	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	<b>42.5</b>	<b>no</b>	54.3	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	37.0	yes (safe harbor)	58.0	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Eucalyptus Elementary School – API 767

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – Year 3 for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	47.1	no	55.0	no
Hispanic	45.6	yes (safe harbor)	52.2	no
White	56.3	yes (safe harbor)	67.6	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	43.3	no	51.4	no
English Learners	37.3	no	50.7	no

### Significant Strategies Eucalyptus is using to exit Program Improvement:

#### English Language Arts

Overall, Eucalyptus Elementary School's Intervention Plan is to increase schoolwide proficiency on the statewide ELA and Math assessments in order to reach Safe Harbor by June 2013. Our school's current proficiency results are as follows: (ELA) schoolwide 47.1%, Hispanic 45.6%, White 56.3%, SES d. 43.3%, ELs 37.3%; (Math) schoolwide 55%, hispanic 52.2%, white 67.6%, socio-economically disadvantaged 51.4%, ELs 50.7%. As an added focus, we are looking closely at our EL student proficiency levels and working to reach Safe Harbor in both ELA and Math.

In order to accomplish these goals and to reach Safe Harbor, we will implement the following: Students who did not reach proficiency in ELA and Math have been identified in all classrooms. Teachers have met individually with the principal to discuss last year's results during accountability meetings. Grade levels identified strengths and weaknesses from state and single assessments to determine instructional priorities during the year. Grade levels have begun to implement additional strategies using the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model to improve overall collaboration, and to build ongoing formative assessments, time to look at student learning, and the addition of regular and dynamic interventions for students not proficient on content standards. An additional twenty (20) hours of planning time has been given to teachers to better implement PLC strategies. An emphasis on literacy (especially writing) has become an additional priority school wide. The Leadership team identified writing as a school wide weakness based on test results. Write From the Beginning (WFTB) and Write For the Future (WFTF) have been re-implemented with fidelity across all grade levels. WFTB/WFTF rubrics are being used to evaluate student progress in writing. Grade levels are focusing on ensuring that students have exposure and mastery of the entire process of writing. A physical room called "The Literacy Lounge" has been created as a place for teachers to prioritize professional development in balanced literacy. An entire year's worth of training and professional development have been provided to teachers in reading (Daily 5/Café), writing (WFTB/WFTF), other literacy (Words Their Way), technology (tablet migration piloting, EasyCBM, Illuminate), and district office balanced literacy support (balanced literacy training by grade level, differentiation training (TOT model)).

### **Core Language Arts Instruction (RTI I)**

Teachers will provide core language arts instruction at all grade levels (with fidelity to state adopted textbooks). Teachers will differentiate instruction in order for all students to have access to the grade level content standards. The Baldrige Continuous Improvement Model strategies (including Plan, Do, Study, Act) will continue to be implemented at all grade levels.

### **ExCEL Instruction (RTI II)**

A second dose of language arts instruction will be provided during the school day through ExCEL/RTI using the following programs and strategies:

Guided Reading  
SOAR to Success  
Avenues (ELD curriculum)  
Arkansas Model instruction for 1st graders  
Literature circles and literature groups  
Guided Writing

### **Language Arts Assessment**

Every seven weeks, benchmark tests will be used to measure English Language Arts proficiency. CST exams will measure annual ELA proficiency.

### **Language Arts Reteaching and Tutoring**

Analysis of benchmark results will drive necessary reteaching of content standards, ExCEL scaffolding, and students being placed in after-school ASES tutoring programs (RTI II).

### **Special Education Language Arts Instruction (RTI III)**

Students unable to fully function in regular education and/or to meet grade level proficiency expectations will use the regular education Student Study Team process, and the Individualized Education Plan process to receive RTI III support and services.

### **Mathematics**

Overall, Eucalyptus Elementary School's Mathematics Intervention Plan is to increase school wide proficiency on the statewide math assessment from 51% to 56% (Safe Harbor), by June 2011. As well, our goal is to increase EL math proficiency from 40.8% to 43.12% on the math component of the STAR exam (Safe Harbor).

In order to accomplish these goals and to reach Safe Harbor, we will implement the following:

#### **Core Mathematics Instruction**

Teachers will provide core mathematics instruction at all grade levels (with fidelity to state adopted textbooks). Teachers will differentiate instruction in order for all students to have access to the grade level content standards. The Baldrige Continuous Improvement Model strategies (including Plan, Do, Study, Act) will continue to be implemented at all grade levels.

#### **Mathematics Intervention (RTIII)**

Students who have not met the proficiency requirements of the math component of the CST will be identified from grades 3rd- 6th. Teachers will use a collaborative model to

plan for all students' mathematics instruction, and all students will be scaffolded into an mathematics intervention model. Students who are not proficient on weekly math assessments will receive a second "dose" of mathematics instruction using the Accelerated Math Program. A mathematics intervention teacher will work to reteach mathematics standards to all students who are not showing proficiency on a weekly basis. The intervention teacher will work with grades 1st- 6th.

**Mathematics Assessment**

Every seven weeks, benchmark tests will be used to measure mathematics proficiency. CST exams will measure annual mathematics proficiency.



## Program Improvement – Hollyvale Elementary School - 760

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	48.0	yes	52.7	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>no</b>	51.7	yes
White	63.0	yes	54.0	yes
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>40.4</b>	<b>no</b>	47.9	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>32.8</b>	<b>no</b>	48.0	yes

## Program Improvement – Hollyvale Elementary School – API 778

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	48.2	no	56.3	yes (safe harbor)
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>no</b>	54.4	yes (safe harbor)
White	63.3	yes	64.6	yes
Socio-economic	43.6	yes (safe harbor)	53.0	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	40.6	yes (safe harbor)	51.9	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Hollyvale Elementary School – API 759

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	44.1	no	50.9	no
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>no</b>	47.9	no
<b>White</b>	<b>59.7</b>	<b>no</b>	56.9	no
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>no</b>	47.9	no
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>no</b>	48.9	no

## Program Improvement – Hollyvale Elementary School – API 748

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 3** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	43.2	no	51.6	no
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>37.3</b>	<b>no</b>	48.4	no
<b>White</b>	<b>55.8</b>	<b>no</b>	61.0	yes (safe harbor)
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>no</b>	49.0	no
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>no</b>	44.6	no

## Significant Strategies Hollyvale is using to exit Program Improvement:

Hollyvale is working with San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools (SBCSS) Program Improvement Team to conduct an assessment of the instructional practices at Hollyvale. SBCSS has offered support through school/classroom visits followed by debrief sessions on practices observed. The team helped to identify common trends in instruction throughout the school and made recommendations for improvement. In addition, the PI team has offered suggestions on setting goals for the school's Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA). The school is diligently working to implement the recommendations and refine instructional practices.

### The county noted the following **recommendations for next steps to continue future program improvement:**

- The team recommends that classrooms post the Standard and daily objective in student friendly language.
- Continue to focus on student engagement activities (i.e. Peer groups, pair/share, small groups, decreasing teacher talk, increase the use of white boards, and the use of academic language etc.).
- Use sentence frames to encourage students to respond in complete sentences to teacher's questions.
- Work in collaborative groups to analyze released test questions, standards, and instructional strategies. Identify academic language to teach (using pacing guide).
- During collaborative planning use assessments to identify standards for RTI.

Hollyvale is refining the components of the District's Effective Model of Instruction (EMI). This year's focus, however, will be on developing capacity in Professional Learning Communities. A "Guiding Coalition" team will go through extensive PLC training this year and will work with staff to implement back at the school site.

Teachers have been isolated in their own classrooms and were not afforded significant time to collaborate with colleagues. This year, staff will meet in collaboration teams both on Mondays and Wednesdays. Teachers have developed a clear structure to:

1. Identify what needs to be taught
2. Develop common formative assessments and review data to see who has learned
3. Determine what they will do for those who did not learn
4. Determine what they will do to extend learning for those who did

Additionally, staff development has been planned/conducted to provide structure to collaboration, identify guaranteed viable curriculum and tools create common formative assessments and quickly disaggregate data.

In addition to the curriculum enhancements to improve classroom instruction from last year, a specific, strategic process has been developed to ensure progress monitoring for those students at risk.

The school continues to use formative assessments to guide and adjust lesson delivery. EASYCBM, Words Their Way Spelling Inventories, and DRA assessments are used regularly to track students' progress. District single assessments track student progress on state standards and provide teachers with data used to create reteaching groups.

Additional Strategies being used to exit Program Improvement:

- Ensure full implementation of Math, Language Arts, & ELD adopted curriculum.
- The school has also participated in the District's SES tutoring program.
- Tutoring/Enrichment also takes place during the LEAP after school program
- Use of approved interventions (Guided Reading/Literacy Groups/Corrective Reading)
- Identify Bubble Kids in each classroom.
- Whole class response (white boards, classroom responders, pair share)
- Develop pacing guide, focusing on essential standards
- Improve attendance (High Soaring Hawks program, classroom attendance rewards)

## Program Improvement – Mesquite Trails Elementary School – API 839

Results 2008-09 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2009-10

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (46.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (47.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	59.0	yes	71.0	yes
Hispanic	49.0	yes	64.8	yes
White	66.5	yes	78.9	yes
Socio-economic	44.5	yes (safe harbor)	62.2	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>no</b>	65.3	yes

## Program Improvement – Mesquite Trails Elementary School –API 834

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	58.7	yes	67.4	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>49.6</b>	<b>no</b>	62.6	yes
White	68.8	yes	73.9	yes
Socio-economic	48.6	yes (safe harbor)	59.3	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	43.9	yes (safe harbor)	62.6	yes

## Program Improvement – Mesquite Trails Elementary School –API 853

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1 Frozen** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	63.8	yes (safe harbor)	72.3	yes
Hispanic	56.4	yes (safe harbor)	67.8	yes (safe harbor)
White	71.4	yes	78.4	yes
Socio-economic	55.6	yes (safe harbor)	68.3	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	47.5	yes (safe harbor)	68.3	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Mesquite Trails Elementary School –API 859

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	67.2	yes (safe harbor)	<b>72.2</b>	<b>no</b>
Hispanic	65.5	yes (safe harbor)	<b>67.9</b>	<b>no</b>
White	<b>70.4</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>77.4</b>	<b>no</b>
Socio-economic	62.5	yes (safe harbor)	<b>67.7</b>	<b>no</b>
English Learners	62.4	yes (safe harbor)	<b>66.1</b>	<b>no</b>

### Significant Strategies Mesquite Trails is using to exit Program Improvement:

- Beginning-of-year and trimesterly assessments used to identify at-risk students
- Ensure availability of State Board of Education adopted intervention programs such as Soar to Success, Words Their Way, Balanced Literacy, and Read Naturally for use with identified students
- Additional small-group support for at-risk students in grades K-6 through Learning Lab
- Support for English Learners provided through 30 minutes of daily small group instruction utilizing the Avenues curriculum (with sufficient materials available for all students) and Rosetta Stone, a computer based program for building English vocabulary, as well as through the use of SIOP strategies in the classroom (all teachers trained in SIOP in 2010-2012) and classroom technology, such as computers and digital overhead projectors
- Support for students at a CELDT level 3 in reading or writing through after school vocabulary, grammar, and comprehension instruction in FLAIR in grades 1-6
- Parent Resource Room available to all parents 5 days a week, with programs and resources geared specifically to EL parents, including Rosetta Stone on the computer, English language tutorials on LeapPads, and English and Spanish resource books
- Academic goal-setting at school, grade level, classroom, and student levels, including the setting of goals, collection of data, and reflection on achievement (Baldrige).
- Weekly grade-level collaboration with data-driven discussion and instructional planning
- Monthly leadership meetings to examine data and monitor progress, and plan for school-wide instruction, assessment, procedures, and professional development in language arts, math, technology, and effective and efficient schools

- Support for principal and leadership team through yearly County planning meeting and twice-yearly walk-throughs with feedback and recommendations
- Teacher coaching in Cognitively Guided Instruction in Math through the District Coaches
- Twice-yearly parent curriculum nights to share information about state standards and strategies for helping their children succeed in school
- Weekly classroom newsletters and school website informs parents of standards and skills being addressed in class, as well as strategies for working with students at home and links to resources for use at home
- Use of AVID strategies in upper grades (4th-6th) including teaching note-taking and organizational skills, and the use of daily planners
- RTI monitoring as part of the SST/IEP process, utilizing Easy CBM, Accelerated Math, STAR Reading and Math assessments, spelling inventory, and DRA and QRI reading assessments
- Grade level PDSA meetings each trimester to analyze single assessment results, identify power standards for the upcoming benchmark, and set SMART goals
- Tutoring for students scoring Below Basic on the CST provided through district supplemental education services
- Weekly counseling services available on the school site through Desert Mountain SELPA for students who are experiencing social, emotional, or behavioral difficulties that are impacting their academics
- School-wide implementation of Professional Learning Communities model (2012-2014)

## Program Improvement – Juniper Elementary School – API 816

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	55.5	no	63.4	yes
Hispanic	52.8	no	62.0	yes
White	62.9	yes	69.5	yes
Socio-economic	52.4	no	60.9	yes
English Learners	42.1	no	56.0	no

## Program Improvement – Juniper Elementary School – API 841

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	58.4	yes (safe harbor)	68.4	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	54.1	no	66.6	yes (safe harbor)
White	72.5	yes	79.1	yes
Socio-economic	54.0	no	65.7	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	44.9	yes (safe harbor)	60.1	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Juniper Elementary School – API 864

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	64.8	yes (safe harbor)	71.7	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	62.4	yes (safe harbor)	71.9	yes (safe harbor)
White	n/a	n/a	72.2	no
Socio-economic	61.4	yes (safe harbor)	70.5	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	49.3	yes (safe harbor)	67.8	yes (safe harbor)

(As of 2011-12, the white subgroup was no longer a significant subgroup in ELA)

## **Significant Strategies Juniper is using to exit Program Improvement:**

Juniper met growth requirements in all areas with the exception of the white subgroups. In order to continue growth schoolwide and in other subgroups and to encourage growth in the white subgroup, the staff at Juniper will continue interventions that are already in place including the mentoring/adopting of students in specific categories, multiplication assessments and practice during lunchtimes, a study room established to allow students additional opportunities for reading and assistance with homework. In addition, Juniper Elementary will continue to offer morning tutoring and afterschool tutoring. An adjustment has been made with regard to the communication between tutors and teachers. A collaboration time has been established so that direct communication can take place weekly regarding the specific needs of individual students. Teachers can also communicate student needs with tutors through the identification of standards that need extra support.

More frequent formative assessments have been/are being developed in order to identify content areas in which students need additional help. As a result of these assessments and teacher observation, students are assigned to a "flex time" provided by the grade level that gives students an additional opportunity to review standards not yet mastered. More detailed assessments and record keeping will assist teachers with progress monitoring so that students get the added assistance they may need. Students will continue to be held responsible for their own academics including reading points and knowledge of multiplication facts in order to receive rewards such as recess and entertaining field trips.



### Program Improvement – Kingston Elementary School – API 777

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>46.3</b>	<b>no</b>	58.8	yes
Hispanic	40.3	yes (safe harbor)	<b>51.7</b>	<b>no</b>
White	53.3	no	66.7	yes
Socio-economic	<b>39.7</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>no</b>
English Learners	<b>34.3</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>47.2</b>	<b>no</b>

### Program Improvement – Kingston Elementary School – API 787

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>47.1</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>64.4</b>	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	<b>40.6</b>	<b>no</b>	61.8	yes (safe harbor)
White	55.1	yes (safe harbor)	67.6	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	43.9	yes (safe harbor)	59.7	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	<b>31.0</b>	<b>no</b>	50.9	yes (safe harbor)

### Program Improvement – Kingston Elementary School – API 797

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	<b>48.9</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>no</b>
Hispanic	44.0	yes (safe harbor)	64.1	yes (safe harbor)
White	<b>55.2</b>	<b>no</b>	68.6	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	<b>46.3</b>	<b>no</b>	62.1	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	38.2	yes (safe harbor)	63.7	yes (safe harbor)

## Significant Strategies Kingston is using to exit Program Improvement:

- School-wide scaffolding with focus on reading comprehension
- Training in the Continuous Improvement Model/Year 2 implementation
- Administrative/student STAR chats: past performance/student goals for CST 2013
- Administrator walk-through observations
- Over contract hours for Instructional Assistants/additional support/two sessions
- Data Teams collaborative model/pacing guide/blueprints/released test questions
- Academic check and connect chats/non-proficient students
- Lunchtime grade level groupings for reading and math
- LEAP after-school tutoring program
- Response to Intervention (RTI) Tier 1, 2 & 3 interventions
- Additional staff development in power teaching and critical thinking
- All school mid-trimester progress reports
- Weekly common formative grade level assessments

## Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – 1st Identification – API

717

Results 2003-04 Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2004-05

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (12.0)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (12.8)</u>	
Schoolwide	27.7	yes	40.0	yes
Hispanic	20.4	yes	33.3	yes
White	36.4	yes	51.4	yes
Socio-economic	19.2	yes	31.1	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>no</b>	21.4	yes

## Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – API 729

Results 2004-05 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2005-06

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (24.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (26.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	31.9	yes	43.6	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>no</b>	36.5	yes
White	43.1	yes	53.6	yes
Socio-economic	26.0	yes	37.8	yes
English Learners	15.4	yes (safe harbor)	36.5	yes

## Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – API 740

Results 2005-06 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1 Frozen** for 2006-07

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (24.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (26.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	37.1	yes	44.5	yes
Hispanic	30.9	yes	38.2	yes
White	48.7	yes	55.3	yes
Socio-economic	30.8	yes	38.9	yes
English Learners	27.9	yes	35.9	yes

## Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – API 748

Results 2006-07 Exited Program Improvement for 2007-08

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (24.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (26.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	40.5	yes	46.2	yes
Hispanic	35.6	yes	41.0	yes
White	53.7	yes	59.0	yes
Socio-economic	33.3	yes	39.5	yes
English Learners	33.3	yes	39.9	yes

## Significant Strategies Maple used to exit Program Improvement (2007-08):

- With support from the County Team - The nine Essential Program Components (EPCs) were shared with the leadership team who in turn shared the information with their grade level teams. As required by the California Department of Education (CDE), the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) was re-written looking at these components, reviewing data, and getting all staff input.
- Adopted textbooks were used with fidelity – An outside presenter showed the staff how to use all components of the program and focus on the standards.
- Professional development was provided by the District coaches and Language Support Services personnel – The reading/English language arts/English learner workshops helped in the staff’s efforts to teach all students more effectively.
- The County walk-thru team focused on what the data and staff determined to be important for student learning – Their continual feedback was a tremendous help.

## Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – 2<sup>nd</sup> Identification – API 778

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	48.5	no	59.1	yes
Hispanic	44.2	no	57.7	yes (safe harbor)
White	61.5	yes	65.6	yes
Socio-economic	45.5	no	55.8	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	34.1	no	49.2	no

## Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – API 771

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	48.2	no	59.3	no
Hispanic	46.1	no	56.5	no
White	56.7	no	71.2	yes
Socio-economic	45.4	no	55.7	no
English Learners	35.7	no	50.0	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Maple Elementary School – API 793

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – Year 2 for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	48.5	no	66.6	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	46.0	no	65.7	yes (safe harbor)
White	52.7	no	68.8	no
Socio-economic	42.6	no	61.6	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	47.7	yes (safe harbor)	65.1	yes (safe harbor)

### Significant Strategies Maple is using to exit Program Improvement:

- The nine Essential Program Components were reviewed by staff through Leadership team. The three significant goals of increasing ELA/Math proficiency, Special Programs, and increasing English Language proficiency continued to be focused on.
- Adopted textbooks were used with fidelity. The standards within the textbooks were reviewed by Maple’s teaching staff.
- Professional development trainings are continuing with the help of district coaches in ELA, Math, and English Language Learners. ELA trainings have included Balanced Literacy: WFTB, Guided Reading, Words Their Way, Daily 5, and core reading. Math trainings have included 10-A-Day, CGI, and core math. English Language trainings have included SIOP and GLAD strategies.
- Continued support is being given to our English Language Learners by scaffolding CELDT level students for English Language Development.
- Collaboration of staff members in the same grade continue on a weekly basis. We use data to identify and drive instruction. The use of formal and informal assessments such as CST, District Single Assessments, and teacher tests are used across grade levels.
- Our FLAIR and LEAP programs are continuing to support our English Learners and students not meeting academic proficiency levels after school.
- School Community is continuing to be supported by our staff and Parent Community Liaison representative. Our focus continues to be building relationships and support for our ELAC and parents at Maple.

## Program Improvement – Mesa Grande Elementary School – API 794

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
<b>Schoolwide</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>no</b>
Hispanic	48.2	yes (safe harbor)	56.1	yes (safe harbor)
<b>White</b>	<b>57.7</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>no</b>	54.9	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	43.7	yes (safe harbor)	54.1	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Mesa Grande Elementary School – API 785

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
<b>Schoolwide</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>60.7</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>52.3</b>	<b>no</b>
White	66.7	yes (safe harbor)	74.5	yes (safe harbor)
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>54.7</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>no</b>

## Significant Strategies Mesa Grande is using to exit Program Improvement:

- To meet this challenge, Mesa Grande's staff has put the following procedures and programs into place:
  - Continuous Improvement Model process
  - AVID Elementary into fourth through sixth grade classes
  - Improve capacity of before school and after-school tutoring programs (LEAP)
  - "Go for the Gold" incentive in all grades for combination of grades, attendance, behavior
  - Staff development training by district coaches in Words Their Way, Write from the Beginning, Mini-lessons, ELD time, Daily 5, Explicit Direct Instruction training by DataWorks
  - Student Study Team meetings reinstated
  - Teacher webpages updated regularly
  - School webpage updated daily with resources for learning
  - Resource Specialist teacher added to staff
  - Student Achievement Meetings (SAMS) to discuss each student's learning with teacher

- ELAC meetings serve as parent education opportunities
- Additional day-time hours for instructional assistant (Read Naturally and Accelerated Reader)
- Title I intervention aide
- Increase administrator walk-thru observations
- Increase use of weekly re-teaching sessions
- Student Star Chats
- Daily technology use to include Study Island
- Implement use of SIOP Instructional strategies in all classrooms
- Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier III interventions

Each program is listed with detail below:

Continuous Improvement Model - The continuous improvement model is a system to focus on individual student achievement.

- Schoolwide the model is a process to focus leadership on setting goals. The process is as follows:
  - Create a plan to meet goals
  - Put the plan into place
  - Evaluate the success and failures of the plan (regular and ongoing)
  - Acting on the evaluation to continue towards the goal
- In the classroom, the model gives teachers and students a structure to set short term goals and measure their progress as a class. The process is as follows:
  - The teacher identifies a goal for the week and presents it to the class
  - The class completes activities to accomplish goal
  - Students are assessed to determine success
  - Results are shared with class
  - The class discusses what helped and hindered the accomplishment of the goal
  - The process repeats (Cycle of Improvement)

AVID Elementary - AVID Elementary is a fourth through six grade program focusing on four key aspects essential to learning: organization, planning, note-taking, and questioning. AVID is not an additional program for teachers to teach, it is a system that is used across all subject areas. The primary cost is training the staff.

Before/After-school programs - A variety of funds are being used to hold tutoring. Underperforming students are identified by their teacher and referred to the program. English learners have priority in the program as it is heavily funded by District Title III/FLAIR funds. Major site costs are for after-school personnel.

Title I Intervention Aide - The site will have an additional instructional aide during the day to provide students with intensive small group instruction focused on remediation in language arts.

Walk-thru observations - Administration is a vital part to improving education. They give experienced input into the workings of the classroom. Observations are shared with teachers and ideas are discussed to improve classroom instruction.

Reteaching - All teachers and grade levels are required to meet regularly to plan and administer common assessments based on state standards. Teachers work collaboratively to conduct re-teaching lessons on a weekly basis (required minimum).

SLOP - The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SLOP) Model\* is a research-based and validated instructional model that has proven effective in addressing the academic needs of English learners. The SLOP Model consists of eight interrelated components: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice/Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review/Assessment. Using instructional strategies connected to each of these components, teachers are able to design and deliver lessons that address the academic and linguistic needs of English learners.

Increased Classroom Technology - To reach visual learners and ensure all students are exposed to instructional examples clearly, all rooms were fitted with document cameras, a projection system, and interactive boards. In addition, the teachers receive 6 sessions of training on implementation. Teachers have access to OnPoint Technologies Portal for interactive lessons.

Data - Staff continuously review benchmark data and refines programs to fit the needs of the students.

Effective Direct Instruction - is the focus of teacher trainings. Each teacher has a copy of the book to read, and discussions are held during staff meetings targeting the elements of effective direct instruction. The elements are also a focus during walk-through visits by administration. (Examples: Activating prior knowledge, random selection for participation, checking for understanding). DataWorks personnel presented intensive training to the staff.

Technology - in the classroom includes iPads for students' use. Students utilize iPads for individualized remediation, practice, and extension of lessons in mathematics and language arts as well as Study Island and AR

SSTs - are held each trimester to address the needs of students who are struggling with behavior or academic issues. Through this process parents are offered strategies to be used at home, and the possibility of assessment and extra services for their student.

Increase the use of the Family Resource Specialist - to develop a connection between home and school. The FRS will connect parents with resources in the community that can assist them in working with their student at home as well as encourage the parent's participation in the classroom.

Student Achievement Meetings (SAMs) - are held for the teacher and administrator to discuss the progress of each student on campus. Students are identified by the teacher as those who are proficient, those who are the Fab 5 (just below proficient), those needing RTI services, Els, SARB issues, and those needing a Student Study Team meeting.



Fab 5 - The five students from each class scoring at the top of the Basic category on the CST are identified early in the year as the 'Fab 5'. Teachers target these students for extra interventions, and knowledge of test taking strategies, that will assist them in moving up to proficient.

Reading material - an increased focus on non-fiction, informational reading materials has been implemented to better prepare students to comprehend that type of text on the CST.

Easy CBM - has been implemented as a technology tool to allow teachers to monitor progress of students throughout the year.

Project Flair - our after school tutoring program, is offered for twelve weeks during the school year to increase proficiency of students in the classroom. Project Flair targets students that have been identified during SAMs as scoring Far Below Basic or Below Basic on the CST.

## Program Improvement – Mission Crest Elementary School – API 763

Results 2009-10 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2010-11

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	45.6	no	53.9	yes
Hispanic	42.5	no	53.4	no
White	55.6	no	60.1	yes
Socio-economic	39.8	no	48.0	no
English Learners	30.8	no	43.8	no

## Program Improvement – Mission Crest Elementary School – API 772

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (67.6)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (68.5)</u>	
Schoolwide	49.0	no	55.0	no
Hispanic	45.6	no	53.4	no
White	62.5	yes (safe harbor)	66.0	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	42.3	no	49.4	no
English Learners	36.6	yes (safe harbor)	50.3	yes (safe harbor)

## Program Improvement – Mission Crest Elementary School – API 767

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 2** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	46.0	no	52.6	no
African American	27.9	no	30.6	no
Hispanic	47.4	no	53.9	no
White	52.5	no	63.3	no
Socio-economic	42.3	no	49.4	no
English Learners	38.2	no	50.4	no

## Significant Strategies Mission Crest is using to exit Program Improvement:

To meet this challenge, Mission Crest's program improvement team along with the county team has put the following procedures and programs into place:

- Implementing the Continuous Improvement Model process school-wide in mathematics
- Implement AVID Elementary into fourth through sixth grade classes
- Improve capacity of after-school tutoring programs
- 2 instructional aides funded from categorical to work in Power Hour (EXCEL)
- Administrator walk-thru observations using observation 360 on IPADS
- PD 360 use school-wide
- Response to Intervention (Rtl) Tier III interventions
- School wide Instructional and Student Expectations

Each program is listed with detail below:

- Continuous Improvement Model - The continuous improvement model is a schoolwide system focusing on student improvement.
  - Schoolwide the model is a process to focus leadership on setting goals. The process is as follows:
    - . Create a plan to meet goals
    - . Put the plan into place
    - . Evaluate the success and failures of the plan (regular and ongoing)
    - . Acting on the evaluation to continue towards the goal
  - In the classroom, the model gives teachers and students a structure to set short term goals and measure their progress as a class. The process is as follows:
    - .The teacher identifies a goal for the week and presents it to the class
    - .The class completes activities to accomplish goal
    - .Students are assessed to determine success
    - . Results are shared with class
    - .The class discusses what helped and hindered the accomplishment of the goal
    - .The process repeats (Cycle of Improvement)
- AVID Elementary - AVID Elementary is a fourth through six grade program focusing on four key aspects essential to learning: organization, planning, note-taking, and questioning. AVID is not an additional program for teachers to teach, it is a system that is used across all subject areas. The primary cost is training the staff and the use of the AVID name.
- After school programs - A variety of funds are being used to hold sixteen weeks of after school tutoring. Underperforming students are identified by their teacher and referred to the program during ASES time.
- Intervention Aides -The site will have an additional instructional aide during the day to provide students with intensive small group instruction focused on remediation in language arts during Power Hour.

- Walk-thru observations- Administration is a vital part to improving education. They give experienced input into the workings of the classroom. Observations are shared with teachers and ideas are discussed to improve classroom instruction. Our form is electronic on an IPAD that uploads directly to the teacher after completed. Each administrator completes them with the same teachers so that true coaching can take place.
- Re-teaching - All teachers and grade levels are required to meet regularly to plan and administer common assessments based on state standards. Teachers work collaboratively to conduct re-teaching lessons on a weekly basis (required minimum).
- PD 360- this is a professional learning community built on line that gives the teachers access to professional blogs and videos. Teachers self select video topics that would assist them in the classroom. Administration does recommend selected videos from time to time and school-wide ones are pre-selected that concentrate on our school focuses.
- RtI Intervention -Students that are far below state standards may also attend classes taught by special education teachers and aides. Generally, these students are assigned to these classes through the SST process. Staff is working on following the district provided Special Education Handbook.
- Data -Staff continuously review benchmark data/PDSA data and refine programs to fit the needs of the students.
- Schoolwide instructional and student expectations - As a staff we wrote instructional expectations for both teachers and staff. These were agreed upon for administrative follow up during walk-throughs. Staff has a copy in their handbook of these. All parents have a copy on the back of their Monday News folders and are posted in our hallway.

## Program Improvement – Cypress School of the Arts – API 856

Results 2010-11 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2011-12

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (56.8)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (58.0)</u>	
<b>Schoolwide</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>no</b>	74.0	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>56.0</b>	<b>no</b>	70.0	yes
White	71.5	yes	82.1	yes
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>no</b>	71.6	yes
<b>English Learners</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>no</b>

## Program Improvement – Cypress School of the Arts – API 872

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **Year 1** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	65.2	yes (safe harbor)	77.9	yes (safe harbor)
Hispanic	63.1	yes (safe harbor)	76.3	yes (safe harbor)
<b>White</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>no</b>	78.8	yes (safe harbor)
Socio-economic	62.9	yes (safe harbor)	76.2	yes (safe harbor)
English Learners	52.2	yes (safe harbor)	69.0	yes (safe harbor)

## Significant Strategies Cypress School of the Arts is using to exit Program Improvement:

To meet this challenge, Cypress’s staff has put the following procedures and programs into place:

- AVID Elementary into fourth through sixth grade classes
- Improve capacity of before school and after-school tutoring programs
- Increase administrator walk-thru observations
- Increase use of weekly re-teaching sessions
- Student Star Chats
- Increase use of classroom technology
- Implement use of SIOP Instructional strategies in all classrooms
- Implement/ Train staff on EDI (Explicit Direct Instruction), Balanced Literacy
- Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier III interventions

Each program is listed with detail below:

- AVID Elementary – AVID Elementary is a fourth through six grade program focusing on four key aspects essential to learning: organization, planning, note-taking, and questioning. AVID is not an additional program for teachers to teach, it is a system that is used across all subject areas. The primary cost is training the staff.
- Before/After-school programs – A variety of funds are being used to hold tutoring. Underperforming students are identified by their teacher and referred to the program. English learners have priority in the program as it is heavily funded by District Title III/FLAIR funds. Major site costs are for after-school personnel.
- Walk-thru observations – Administration is a vital part to improving education. They give experienced input into the workings of the classroom. Observations are shared with teachers and ideas are discussed to improve classroom instruction.
- Re-teaching – All teachers and grade levels are required to meet regularly to plan and administer common assessments based on state standards. Teachers work collaboratively to conduct re-teaching lessons on a weekly basis (required minimum).
- SIOP – The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model\* is a research-based and validated instructional model that has proven effective in addressing the academic needs of English learners. The SIOP Model consists of eight interrelated components: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice/Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review/Assessment. Using instructional strategies connected to each of these components, teachers are able to design and deliver lessons that address the academic and linguistic needs of English learners.
- Increased Classroom Technology – To reach visual learners and ensure all students are exposed to instructional examples clearly, all rooms were fitted with document cameras, a projection system, and interactive boards. In addition, the teachers receive training on implementation. Teachers have access to OnPoint Technologies Portal for interactive lessons.
- Data – Staff continuously review benchmark data and refines programs to fit the needs of the students.

Effective Direct Instruction is the focus of teacher trainings. Each teacher has a copy of the book to read, and discussions are held during staff meetings targeting the elements of effective direct instruction. The elements are also a focus during walk-through visits by administration. (Examples: Activating prior knowledge, random selection for participation, checking for understanding).

- Technology in the classroom includes iPads for students' use. Students utilize iPads for individualized remediation, practice, and extension of lessons in mathematics and language arts. qa

- SSTs are held each trimester to address the needs of students who are struggling with behavior or academic issues. Through this process parents are offered strategies to be used at home, and the possibility of assessment and extra services for their student.
- Increase the use of the Family Resource Specialist to develop a connection between home and school. The FRS will connect parents with resources in the community that can assist them in working with their student at home as well as encourage the parent's participation in the classroom.
- An increased focus on non-fiction, informational reading materials has been implemented to better prepare students to comprehend that type of text on the CST.
- Easy CBM has been implemented as a technology tool to allow teachers to monitor progress of students throughout the year.

## Program Improvement – Krystal School of Science, Math & Technology –

API 904

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
<b>Schoolwide</b>	<b>74.9</b>	<b>no</b>	85.9	yes
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>66.2</b>	<b>no</b>	80.0	yes
White	80.6	yes	88.1	yes
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>no</b>	85.4	yes

### Significant Strategies Krystal School of Science, Math & Technology is using to stay out of Program Improvement:

During school interventions

- Increase administrator walk-thru observations
- Increase use of classroom technology
- Implement/train staff on SIOP Instructional strategies
- Increase the amount of tutoring opportunities
- Implement/train staff to become Professional Learning Communities (PLC's)

Each program is listed with detail below:

During school interventions - During the school day, our grade levels are offering, or will be offering a variety of interventions for students that do not score proficient or advanced on the grade level common assessments. These include the following:

- Leveled guided reading groups
- Re-teach tailored lessons during center time
- Small group instruction
- Leveled instruction time with partnering teachers
- Student-led tutoring groups within the classroom
- Weekly whole grade level re-teach times



Walk-thru observations - Administration is a vital part to improving education. They give experienced input into the workings of the classroom. Observations are shared with teachers and ideas are discussed to improve classroom instruction.

Increased Classroom Technology - To reach visual learners and ensure all students are exposed to instructional examples clearly, all rooms are fitted with document cameras, a projection system, and interactive whiteboards. In addition, the teachers receive training on implementation. Teachers have access to OnPoint Technologies Portal for interactive lessons.

SLOP - The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SLOP) Model\* is a research-based and validated instructional model that has proven effective in addressing academic needs of English learners. The SLOP Model consists of eight interrelated components: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice/Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review/Assessment. Using instructional strategies connected to each of these components, teachers are able to design and deliver lessons that address the academic and linguistic needs of English learners. Part of this training focuses on different methods of "checking for understanding." Teachers receive training in this model throughout the year, by trained district office personnel.

Tutoring opportunities - A variety of funds are being used to hold tutoring. Students that are not scoring at the proficient level are identified by their teacher and referred to the program. English learners who score a 1 or 2 on their overall CELDT scores have priority in the after school FLAIR program.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) - This year, we have begun training on implementing the Three Big Ideas of a PLC. We are in the process of ensuring that students learn, by creating time for necessary interventions. We are becoming a culture of collaboration, as grade level teachers share their teaching strategies, materials, questions, concerns, and results. Finally, we have a focus on results, as grade level teams create common assessments, administer these assessments, and then discuss each other's successes and struggles, as based on the assessment results.

## Program Improvement – Hesperia Junior High School – API 745

Results 2011-12 Placed in Program Improvement – **On Watch** for 2012-13

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>% Proficient ELA (78.4)</u>		<u>% Proficient Math (79.0)</u>	
Schoolwide	47.6	no	26.6	no
Hispanic	44.9	yes (safe harbor)	25.8	no
White	62.0	no	29.3	no
Socio-economic	45.3	no	26.3	no
English Learners	23.3	no	23.8	yes (safe harbor)

### Significant Strategies Hesperia Junior High School is using to stay out of Program Improvement:

During school interventions

- Increase administrator walk-thru observations
- Increase use of classroom technology
- Increase the amount of tutoring/homework help (Say no to Zeros)
- Implement Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

Each program is listed with detail below:

During school interventions - During the school day, our grade levels are offering, or will be offering a variety of interventions for students that do not score proficient or advanced on the grade level common assessments. These include the following:

- Scaffolded core courses
- “Say no to Zeros” program to address missing assignment
- Small group instruction
- Skillbuilders leveled instruction time with partnering teachers
- The High School Bound program for those with an extreme need for intervention.
- Technology which emphasizes small group learning, reteaching and checking for understanding.
- Active learning within classrooms
- Common Formative Assessments with an emphasis on using CFA data to drive re-teaching within the classroom.

- PLCs
- Increased extended learning/credit recovery opportunities.
- EASY CBM student and intervention monitoring
- Implement Read 180 for students struggling with ELA
- Implement intrinsic motivational programs like VEX Robotics
- Implement the Pick 6 program
- Implement ILPs for struggling students
- Implement FLAIR, ELAC and train staff on EL Strategies

Walk-thru observations - Administration is a vital part to improving education. They give experienced input into the workings of the classroom. Observations are shared with teachers and ideas are discussed to improve classroom instruction.

Increased Classroom Technology - To emphasize visual, small group and active learning as well as using data from multiple assessments to drive instruction and reteaching most classrooms are/will be fitted with ELMOs, a projection system, MacBooks, iPads, Mobi Tablets, Pulse clickers, AppleTVs and wireless internet. In addition, the teachers receive training on implementation of this technology.

Tutoring/Homework Help opportunities - Students that are not scoring at the proficient level are identified by their teacher and referred to teacher-led tutoring or the Say No to Zeros program. English learners who score a 1 or 2 on their overall CELDT scores have priority in the after school FLAIR program.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) - We are in the process of ensuring that students learn, by creating time for necessary interventions. We are becoming a culture of collaboration, as grade level teachers share their teaching strategies, materials, questions, concerns, and results. Finally, we have a focus on results, as grade level teams create common assessments, administer these assessments, and then discuss each other's successes and struggles, as based on the assessment results. Teachers will use the resulting CFA data to drive instruction and model re-teaching of standards identified as needing extra time.