

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Application # | |
|---------------|--|

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY PLAN

Mail original and two copies to:

**California Department of Education
Specialized Programs Division
1430 N Street, Suite 4309
Sacramento, California 95814-5901**

Initial Plan Postmarked no later than June 1, 2003

LEA Plan Information:

Name of Local Education Agency (LEA): Oakdale Joint Unified School District

County/District Code: 50-75564

Dates of Plan Duration: **July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2008 (to be reviewed annually/revised as needed)**

Date of local governing board approval: May 12, 2003

Revision Approved: **January 10, 2005/January 22, 2007/February 9, 2009/February 28, 2011**

District Superintendent: Fred Rich

Address: 168 South Third Avenue

City: Oakdale

Zip code: 95361

Phone: (209) 848-4884

Fax: (209) 847-0155

Signatures (Signatures must be original. Please use blue ink.)

The superintendent and governing board of the LEA submitting the application sign on behalf of all participants included in the preparation of the plan.

Fred Rich

Printed or typed name of Superintendent

Date

Signature of Superintendent

Rick W. Jones

Printed or typed name of Board President

Date

Signature of Board President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I – Background and Overview

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <i>Background of the LEA Plan</i> | <i>4-5</i> |
| <i>Descriptions of the Consolidated Application, the Local Educational Agency Plan, the Single Plan for Student Achievement, and the Categorical Program Monitoring Process.....</i> | <i>5</i> |
| <i>Development Process for the LEA Plan.....</i> | <i>6-9</i> |
| <i>Federal and State Programs Checklist.....</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>District Budget for Federal and State Programs.....</i> | <i>11-12</i> |

Part II – The Plan

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>District Profile.....</i> | <i>13</i> |
| <i>Needs Assessments.....</i> | <i>14-24</i> |
| <i>Academic Achievement</i> | |
| <i>Professional Development and Hiring</i> | |
| <i>School Safety</i> | |
| <i>Local Measures of Student Performance.....</i> | <i>25</i> |
| <i>Performance Goals 1 and 2: ELA and Math.....</i> | <i>26-37</i> |
| <i>Performance Goal 2: English Learners and Immigrant Students (Includes IPA Plan)</i> | <i>38-58</i> |
| <i>Performance Goal 3: HQ Teachers.....</i> | <i>59-63</i> |
| <i>Performance Goal : Safe and Drug Free</i> | <i>64-82</i> |
| <i>Performance Goal : Graduation Rate.....</i> | <i>83</i> |
| <i>Additional Mandatory Title I Descriptions.....</i> | <i>84-102</i> |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Part III – Assurances and Attachments

Assurances.....85-92

Signature Page.....93

Appendix

Appendix A: California’s NCLB Performance Goals and Performance Indicators....94-95

Appendix B: Links to Data Web sites.....96

Appendix C: Science-Based Programs.....97-99

Appendix D: Research-based Activities.....100

Appendix E: Promising or Favorable Programs.....101-102

Background

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 embodies four key principles:

- stronger accountability for results;
- greater flexibility and local control for states, school districts, and schools in the use of federal funds
- enhanced parental choice for parents of children from disadvantaged backgrounds, and
- a focus on what works, emphasizing teaching methods that have been demonstrated to be effective.

(Text of the legislation can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/fr/>.)

In May 2002, California's State Board of Education (SBE) demonstrated the state's commitment to the development of an accountability system to achieve the goals of NCLB by adopting five **Performance Goals**:

- 1. All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics, by 2013-2014.**
- 2. All limited-English-proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- 3. By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- 4. All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.**
- 5. All students will graduate from high school.**

In addition, 12 performance indicators linked to those goals were adopted (see Appendix A), as specified by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). Performance targets, developed for each indicator, were adopted by the SBE in May 2003.

Collectively, NCLB's goals, along with the performance indicators and targets, constitute California's framework for ESEA accountability. This framework provides the basis for the state's improvement efforts, informing policy decisions by SBE, and implementation efforts by CDE to fully realize the system envisioned by NCLB. It also provides a basis for coordination with California's Legislature and the Governor's Office.

Since 1995, California has been building an educational system consisting of five major components:

- rigorous academic standards
- standards-aligned instructional materials
- standards-based professional development

- standards-aligned assessment
- an accountability structure that measures school effectiveness in light of student achievement.

As a result, California is well positioned to implement the tenets of NCLB.

State and federally funded initiatives aimed at improving student achievement must complement each other and work in tandem in order to have the greatest impact. In California, the state and federal consolidated applications, competitive grants, the state accountability system, the Categorical Program Monitoring process, **local educational agency plans**, professional development opportunities, and technical assistance all are moving toward a level of alignment and streamlining. The result of this consolidation will be to provide a cohesive, comprehensive, and focused effort for supporting and improving the state's lowest-performing schools and appropriate reporting mechanisms.

Descriptions of the Consolidated Application, the Local Education Agency Plan, and the Categorical Program Monitoring

In order to meet legislative requirements for specific state and federal programs and funding, California currently employs four major processes: the Consolidated State Application, the Local Educational Agency Plan, the school-level Single Plan for Student Achievement, and Categorical Program Monitoring. **California is moving toward more closely coordinating and streamlining these processes to eliminate redundancies and make them less labor intensive for LEA's, while continuing to fulfill all requirements outlined in state and federal law.**

Below is a brief description of the ways in which these various processes currently are used in California.

The Consolidated Application (ConApp)

The Consolidated Application is the *fiscal* mechanism used by the California Department of Education to distribute categorical funds from various state and federal programs to county offices, school districts, and charter schools throughout California. Annually, in June, each LEA submits Part I of the Consolidated Application to document participation in these programs and provide assurances that the district will comply with the legal requirements of each program. Program entitlements are determined by formulas contained in the laws that created the programs.

Part II of the Consolidated Application is submitted in the fall of each year; it contains the district entitlements for each funded program. Out of each state and federal program entitlement, districts allocate funds for indirect costs of administration, for programs operated by the district office, and for programs operated at schools.

The Single Plan for Student Achievement (School Plan)

State law requires that school-level plans for programs funded through the Consolidated Application be consolidated in a *Single Plan for Student Achievement (Education Code Section 64001)*, developed by schoolsite councils with the advice of any applicable school advisory committees. LEA's allocate NCLB funds to schools through the Consolidated Application for Title I, Part A, Title III (Limited English Proficient), and Title V (Innovative Programs/Parental Choice). LEA's may elect to allocate other funds to schools for inclusion in school plans. The content of the school plan includes school goals, activities, and expenditures for improving the academic performance of students to the proficient level and above. The plan delineates the actions that are required for program implementation and serves as the school's guide in evaluating progress toward meeting the goals.

The Local Educational Agency Plan (LEA Plan)

The approval of a Local Educational Agency Plan by the local school board and State Board of Education is a requirement for receiving federal funding subgrants for NCLB programs. The LEA Plan includes specific descriptions and assurances as outlined in the provisions included in NCLB. In essence, LEA Plans describe the actions that LEAs will take to ensure that they meet certain ***programmatic*** requirements, including student academic services designed to increase student achievement and performance, coordination of services, needs assessments, consultations, school choice, supplemental services, services to homeless students, and others as required. In addition, LEA Plans summarize assessment data, school goals and activities from the *Single Plans for Student Achievement* developed by the LEA's schools.

Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM)

State and federal law require CDE to monitor the implementation of categorical programs operated by local educational agencies. This state-level oversight is accomplished in part by conducting on-site reviews of eighteen such programs implemented by local schools and districts. Categorical Program Monitoring is conducted for each district once every four years by state staff and local administrators trained to review one or more of these programs. The purpose of the review is to verify ***compliance*** with requirements of each categorical program, and to ensure that program funds are spent to increase student achievement and performance.

Development Process for the LEA Plan

LEAs must develop a single, coordinated, and comprehensive Plan that describes the educational services for all students that can be used to guide implementation of federal and state-funded programs, the allocation of resources, and reporting requirements. The development of such a plan involves a continuous cycle of assessment, parent and community involvement, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The duration of the Plan should be five years. The Plan should be periodically reviewed and updated as needed, but at least once each year.

In developing the Plan, the LEA will review its demographics, test results, performance, and resources. Given that the majority of such information is readily available in the School Accountability Report Card (SARC), the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) performance results, the Academic Performance Index (API) results, and other data sources, the LEA will find the data easy to access via the Internet. (See Appendix B for links to each of the web sites containing student and staff demographic information, SARC, STAR, and API data.) **The LEA is expected to gather and review its own information from these resources and use it to inform the planning process.**

The LEA Plan can serve as a summary of all existing state and federal programs and establish a focus for raising the academic performance of all student groups to achieve state academic standards. In the context of this plan, improvements in instruction, professional development, course offerings, and counseling and prevention programs are means of achieving specific academic and support services goals for all groups of students, including identified underperforming student groups. **Federal law requires that school site administrators, teachers and parents from the LEA (which includes direct-funded charter schools) must be consulted in the planning, development, and revision of the LEA Plan.**

The LEA Plan can be completed using the following recommended steps for plan development.

Step One: Measure the Effectiveness of Current Improvement Strategies

Analyze Student Performance

Conduct a comprehensive data analysis of student achievement, including multiple measures of student performance. Identify all relevant assessments and apply thoughtful analyses of current educational practices to establish benchmarks aimed at raising academic performance for all students, especially identified student groups.

Tables of data for your schools and district are available online:

- API Reports - <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap>
- Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) data - <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr>
- LEA Accountability Reports of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English learners - <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/acct.asp>
- AYP Reports – <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay>

Analyze Current Educational Practices, Professional Development, Staffing, and Parental Involvement

Identify, review, and analyze data and related information on factors such as educational practices, parent and community involvement, professional development, support services, and resources that have an impact on student learning.

Over the past several years, CDE has developed several self-assessment tools that schools and districts can use to evaluate these factors and others needed to support academic student achievement:

- The Academic Program Survey (APS) – school-level survey of status of implementation of the nine essential program components
- District Assistance Survey (DAS) – district-level survey of status of implementation of nine essential program components
- Least Restrictive Environment Assessment – to examine educational practices for students with disabilities
- English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA) – to improve outcomes for English Learners

These tools can be found in the Virtual Library on the CDE web site at

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/improvtools.asp>.

(See Part II, Needs Assessment, for further details.)

Step Two: Seek Input from Staff, Advisory Committees, and Community Members

Seek the input of teachers, administrators, councils, committees, and community members (e.g., school site council; school health council; committees for Limited English Proficient, state compensatory education, gifted and talented education, special education, etc.) The most effective plans are those supported by the entire LEA community. The integration of existing program plans, such as Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program, High Priority Schools Grant Program, Alternative Education Programs, Focus on Learning: Secondary School Accreditation, and others does not eliminate any program requirements. The combined process must include the requirements of every program involved.

Step Three: Develop or Revise Performance Goals

Using the five NCLB performance goals and indicators (see Appendix A), develop local performance targets that are: a) derived from school and student subgroup performance data and analysis of related, scientifically based educational practices; b) attainable in the period specified in this Plan and consistent with statewide targets for all students and subgroups; c) specific to the participants (i.e., students, teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals); and d) measurable.

Step Four: Revise Improvement Strategies and Expenditures

For **district-operated** programs, identify the participants, expected performance gains, and means of evaluating gains. Indicate specific improvements and practical monitoring of their implementation and effectiveness. For **school-operated programs**, summarize those same elements from approved *Single Plans for Student Achievement*.

Identify available resources. Aside from fiscal resources available through federal and state funding, programmatic resources are available on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov>. The Consolidated Application provides funding for **district-operated programs** (including reservations from Title I for various purposes, Title II, Title IV, and Tobacco-Use Prevention) as well as for **school-operated programs** (including Title I, Parts A and D, Title III, Title V, School Improvement, Economic Impact Aid, and 10th Grade Counseling).

Step Five: Local Governing Board Approval

The LEA Plan must be approved by the local governing board prior to submittal to CDE. Ensure that all required signatures are affixed. All subsequent amendments should be approved by the local governing board and kept on file with the original LEA Plan.

Step Six: Monitor Implementation

To verify achievement of performance targets, monitor areas such as: a) assignment and training of highly qualified staff; b) identification of participants; c) implementation of services; d) provision of materials and equipment; e) initial and ongoing assessment of performance; and f) progress made toward establishing a safe learning environment.

The analysis of data (student, school-wide, support services, professional development) is part of the ongoing program monitoring and evaluation. When results are *not* as expected, it may be helpful to consider the following: a) How are performance targets and activities based on student performance and factual assessment of current educational practice? b) How educationally sound is the plan to help reach the targets? c) How timely and effectively is the plan being implemented? d) If the plan has not been implemented as written, what were the obstacles to implementation?

You may use the checklist on the next page to indicate planning steps as they are completed.

FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS CHECKLIST

Check (√) all applicable programs operated by the LEA. In the “other” category, list any additional programs that are reflected in this Plan.

| Federal Programs | | State Programs | |
|------------------|---|----------------|--|
| X | Title I, Part A | X | EIA – State Compensatory Education |
| | Title I, Part B, Even Start | X | EIA – Limited English Proficient |
| | Title I, Part C, Migrant Education | X | State Migrant Education |
| | Title I, Part D, Neglected/Delinquent | X | School Improvement |
| X | Title II, Part A, Subpart 2, Improving Teacher Quality | | Child Development Programs |
| X | Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology | | Educational Equity |
| X | Title III, Limited English Proficient | X | Gifted and Talented Education |
| X | Title III, Immigrants | X | ASES |
| | Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities | | Tobacco Use Prevention Education (Prop 99) |
| | Title V, Part A, Innovative Programs – Parental Choice | | Immediate Intervention/ Under performing Schools Program |
| | Adult Education | X | School Safety and Violence Prevention Act (AB1113, AB 658) |
| | Career Technical Education | X | Tenth Grade Counseling |
| | McKinney-Vento Homeless Education | | Healthy Start |
| X | IDEA, Special Education | | Dropout Prevention and Recovery Act: School Based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program (SB 65) |
| | 21 st Century Community Learning Centers | | Other (describe): CBET (Community Based English Tutoring) |
| | Other (describe): | | Other (describe): ELAP (English Language Acquisition Program) |
| | Other (describe): | X | Other (describe): Competitive 9-12 TUPE |

DISTRICT BUDGET FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS – 2010-2011

Please complete the following table with information for your district.

2010/11 FUNDING GENERAL FUND ONLY

| Program | Oakdale Jr High | | | East Stan HS | | | Oakdale High School | | | Valley Oak | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------|---------------|---------|---------------------|---------------|---------|------------|---------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---|--------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|
| | Salaries | Discretionary | Reserve | Salaries | Discretionary | Reserve | Salaries | Discretionary | Reserve | Salaries | Discretionary | Reserve | | | | | | | | | | |
| U | 0000-General Ed Discretionary | 38,806 | | | 5,331 | | | 86,878 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| n | 0000-Operations & Grounds Discr | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| r | 0032-MAA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e | 0042-Tech Reserve & Replacement | 491 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| s | 0063-After School Grants & Fit For TF | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| t | 0072-Donations, Drive to Survive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i | 0075-WAMU Grant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f | 0600-9th Grade CSR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i | 0605-Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c | 0608-Community Based Engl Tutoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| t | 0609-ROP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e | 0610-Adult Ed | | 43,632 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| r | 0611-School Safety | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i | 0612-Arts & Music | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f | 0613-CAHSEE Intensive Instr | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i | 0613-Hourly Programs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c | 0614-Suppl School Counselors | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| t | 0618-GATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e | 0617-Instr Materials Funding RP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d | 0621-IPAR/Mentor Teacher | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0625-Prof Dev Math & Reading | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0631-Pupil Retention BG | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0634-Professional Dev BG | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0635-Targeted Instr Impv BG | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0636-School & Lib Impv BG | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1100-Lottery | | 42,564 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1300-K-3 CSR | 1,503,589 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3010-Title I | 116,369 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F | 3011-Title I ARRA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e | 3200-SFSF ARRA | 48,204 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d | 3310-IDEA | 49,223 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e | 3313-IDEA ARRA Basic | 11,882 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e | 3319-IDEA Preschool | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| r | 3324-IDEA Preschool | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a | 3550-Perkins | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i | 3710-Title VI Safe & Drug Free | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4035-Title II Impvy Teacher Qlty | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4045-Title II EETT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4201-Title III Immigrant Ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4203-LEP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S | 6070-ASES | 97,963 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| t | 6286-ELAP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a | 6300-Inst Mat Lottery | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| t | 6500-Special Ed | 249,937 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e | 6506-Special Ed CAHSEE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7010-Agricultural Voc Ed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7090-Economic Impact Aid | 45,088 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7230-Home To School Transp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 9076-TUPE Consortium | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 9119-BTSA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 9210-ROP Lottery | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals: | | | | | | | | | | | 2,124,082 | 189,745 | 19,486 | 694,061 | 25,975 | 0 | 74,126 | 227,008 | 43,827 | 1,601,679 | 4,087 | 29,098 |

**2010/11 FUNDING
GENERAL FUND ONLY**

| Program | Cloverland | | | Fair Oaks | | | Magnolia | | | Sierra View | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Discretionary | Reserve | Salaries | Discretionary | Reserve | Salaries | Discretionary | Reserve | Salaries | Discretionary | Reserve |
| 0000-General Ed Discretionary | 10,163 | | | 16,038 | | | 12,327 | | | 14,362 | |
| 0000-Operations & Grounds Discr | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0032-MAA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0042-Teach Reserve & Replacement | 128 | | | 18 | | | 679 | | | 250 | |
| 0063-After School Grants & Fit For TF | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0072-Donations, Drive to Survive | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0075-WAMU Grant | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0600-9th Grade CSR | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0605-Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0608-Community Based Engl Tutoring | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0609-ROP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0610-Adult Ed | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0611-School Safety | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0612-Arts & Music | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0613-CAHSEE Intensive Instr | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0613-Hourly Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0614-Suppl School Counselors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0616-GATE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0617-Instr Materials Funding RP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0621-PAR/Mentor Teacher | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0625-Prof Dev-Math & Reading | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0631-Pupil Retention BG | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0634-Professional Dev BG | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0635-Targeted Instr Impv BG | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0636-School & Lib Impv BG | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1100-Lottery | 4,500 | | 1,165,125 | 4,500 | | 1,701,452 | 4,500 | | 1,094,070 | 4,500 | |
| 1300-K-3 CSR | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3010-Title I | 36,215 | | 87,715 | 120,637 | | 21,154 | 47,898 | | 81,701 | 29,141 | |
| 3011-Title I ARRA | 32,946 | | 43,144 | 1,379 | | 36,733 | 35,527 | | 96,818 | 37,494 | |
| 3200-SFSF ARRA | | | 114,208 | | | 41,740 | | | 109,327 | | |
| 3310-IDEA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3313-IDEA ARRA Basic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3319-IDEA ARRA Preschool | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3324-IDEA Preschool | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3550-Perkins | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3710-Title VI Safe & Drug Free | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4035-Title II Improv Teacher Qlty | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4045-Title II EETT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4201-Title III Immigrant Ed | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4203-LEP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6010-ASIES | 35,104 | | 78,218 | 35,720 | | 78,169 | 36,074 | | 76,370 | | |
| 6286-ELAP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6300-Inst Mat Lottery | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6500-Special Ed | | | 252,562 | | | 175,703 | | | 259,952 | | |
| 6506-Special Ed CAHSEE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7010-Agricultural Voc Ed | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7090-Economic Impact/Aid | 14,372 | 31,694 | 37,866 | 6,322 | 42,085 | 41,251 | 10,102 | 22,374 | 45,555 | 33,240 | 39,767 |
| 7230-Home To School Transp | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9076-TUPE Consortium | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9119-BTSA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9210-ROP Lottery | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals: | 133,418 | 31,694 | 1,798,838 | 184,631 | 42,085 | 2,144,782 | 147,107 | 22,374 | 1,829,640 | 118,997 | 39,767 |

In the space below, please provide a brief narrative description of your district. Include your district's vision/mission statement and any additional information about the make-up of your district in order to provide background and a rationale for the descriptions included in the LEA Plan.

Oakdale Joint Unified School District Profile

Mission: Oakdale Joint Unified School District creates an environment where all students, staff, parents, and communities work together to ensure students have the skills and abilities to function productively as contributing members of our society. OJUSD encourages the lifelong pursuit of excellence to secure a brighter future for us all.

The Oakdale Joint Unified School District began operation on July 1, 1998. It now has a student enrollment of approximately 5300 students. Schools in the district include Fair Oaks Elementary, Magnolia elementary, Cloverland Elementary, Sierra View Elementary, Oakdale Junior High, and Oakdale High School. The district also has Alternative Education programs including East Stanislaus continuation High School, Valley Oak High School (an independent study program), and Oakdale Charter High School.

Oakdale Joint Unified School District is proud of its schools and their tradition of excellence. The district is considered the top performing unified district in Stanislaus County. The district's API is 787. All four elementary schools have achieved an API of 800 or higher. Oakdale Junior High's API is 761 and Oakdale High's API is 792.

The district includes a dedicated staff comprised of 248 classified staff and 270 certificated staff (including administrators).

Parent involvement and community support for the schools in Oakdale is outstanding. The Oakdale Education Foundation annually raises approximately \$100,000 to enhance school programs. Teachers and other staff apply for grants to support projects and purchases of materials that could not otherwise be afforded. OEF has been instrumental in continuing to expand technology in classrooms during tight fiscal years.

Oakdale High School is accredited through the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The primary ethnicities represented in the district are White (64%), Hispanic (30%). No other ethnicities represented exceed 2%.

41.3% of the student population receives free or reduced lunch.

17% of the student population are English Learners. This percentage includes students reclassified as English Proficient but not having yet demonstrated Proficient/Advanced proficiency on the ELA portion of the CST for 3 years.

Approximately 10% of the student population qualifies for Special Education.

Extended learning time is provided in the elementary ASPIRE program available at all elementary sites and at the OASIS program provided at Oakdale Junior High School. Both programs are supported by state ASES funding.

The current Superintendent is retiring at the end of the 2010-2011 school year. A search for the new superintendent will be completed in April 2011.

Needs Assessment

The passage of NCLB imposes a number of significant new requirements on LEAs as conditions for funding provided at the state and local levels. Among these are reporting requirements designed to facilitate accountability for improving student academic performance, teacher quality, and school safety. As such, a needs assessment to determine strengths and weaknesses in these area must be conducted. In determining specific areas of need to be addressed in the Plan, the LEA should review its demographics, test results, and resources. The majority of such information is readily available.

Student Academic Performance Assessment

The Student Academic Performance Assessment should include a focus on the academic areas highlighted in California's Performance Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 including:

- *Statewide standards assessment, and accountability*
- *Local assessments and accountability*
- *Coordination and integration of federal and state educational programs*
- *The LEA academic action plan.*

OJUSD Monitoring Achievement of Statewide Standards Assessments, and Accountability

August – December each year :

- District completes a comprehensive analysis of the STAR test scores Provides supports to sites in setting measurable SPSA goals and identifying effective activities to include in site SPSA action plans.
- Provides a Secondary Summit allowing departments to set goals and prepare to monitor identified subgroups throughout the school year
- Submits revised SPSAs by December of each year
- Reviews/revises as necessary and submits any revision of the LEA Plan to the local Board by February of any year during which the plan was reviewed with revision.

The District Accountability Worksheet and the District ELA and Math Data Analysis with Key Findings and LEA Action Plan Recommendations follow on the next pages.

Oakdale Joint Unified School District District Accountability Worksheet

| Accountability Measure | District Spring 2010 Score | Goal for Spring 2011 | Will current achievement meet the Spring 2010 Goal? | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|------------|-------|
| | | | No ✓ | Possibly ✓ | Yes ✓ |
| District API | 794 | Growth of at least 1 point OR Minimum API Score of 710 | ✓ | | |
| AYP (ELA) □ LEA- wide | 60.3% | 67% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (ELA) ▪ Hispanic | 47.8% | 67% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (ELA) □ Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 48.3% | 67% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (ELA) □ English Learners | 38.6% | 67.3% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (ELA) □ Students with Disabilities | 37.3% | 67.3% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (Math) □ LEA- wide | 57.2% | 67.3% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (Math) ○ Hispanic | 46.3% | 67.3% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (Math) □ Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 47.9 | 67.3% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (Math) □ English Learners | 42.9% | 67.3% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |
| AYP (Math) □ Students with Disabilities | 42.3% | 67.3% Proficient/Advanced | | | ✓ |

The District Accountability Worksheet identified that LEA-wide achievement and all numerically significant subgroups should be addressed in the LEA Action Plan. The following analysis guides the district to strategically identify specific sites, grades, or departments as a focus for LEA Plan Activities.

**Oakdale Joint Unified School District
DISTRICT ELA Program Data Analysis**

| AYP | Spring 2010 ELA GOAL | Spring 2010 ELA Achievement | Was spring 2010 ELA goal met? |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| ELA AYP % Part. | 95% | 99% | Yes |
| ELA AYP % Prof/Adv | 56% | 60.3% | Yes |
| AYP | Spring 2011 ELA GOAL | Spring 2010 ELA Achievement | Would prev. achievement meet 2011 goal? |
| ELA AYP % Part. | 95% | 99% | Yes |
| ELA AYP % Prof/Adv | 67% | 60.3% | No |

TABLE #1 AYP Subgroup Achievement

| Subgroup | Spring 10 Goal | Spring 10 Achievement | Was 2010 ELA Goal met? | Spring 11 Goal | Gap |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| LEA Wide | 56% | 60.3% | Yes | 67% | -6.7% |
| Hispanic | 56% | 60.3% | No | 67% | -19.2% |
| White | 56% | 60.3% | Yes | 67% | -1.2% |
| Socio-Eco Dis | 56% | 60.3% | No | 67% | -18.7% |
| EL | 56% | 60.3% | No | 67% | -28.4% |
| Stu with Dis | 56% | 60.3% | No | 67% | -29.7% |

TABLE #2 Hispanic Subgroup Achievement

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Gap |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Cloverland | 50.5% | 47.1% | 56% | 67.6% | -11.6% |
| Fair Oaks | 40.8% | 46.6% | 46.8% | 67.6% | -20.8% |
| Magnolia | 36.5% | 40.5% | 41.3% | 67.6% | -26.3% |
| Sierra View | 41.2% | 42.8% | 55.9% | 67.6% | -11.7% |
| Oakdale Junior High | 37.9% | 39.6% | 44.8% | 67.6% | -22.8% |
| Oakdale High | 43.2% | 36.9% | 44.3% | 66.7% | -22.4% |

TABLE #3 Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup Achievement

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Gap |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Cloverland | 54% | 48.3% | 55.2% | 67.6% | -12.4% |
| Fair Oaks | 41.3% | 45.8% | 46.3% | 67.6% | -21.3% |
| Magnolia | 33.3% | 43.3% | 46.4% | 67.6% | -21.2% |
| Sierra View | 38.4% | 41.6% | 53.1% | 67.6% | -14.5% |
| Oakdale Junior High | 39.6% | 41.7% | 44.4% | 67.6% | -23.2% |
| Oakdale High | 40.4% | 42.5% | 47.7% | 66.7% | -19% |

TABLE #4 English Learner Subgroup

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Gap |
|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Cloverland | 41.2% | 38.8% | 50% | 67.6% | -17.6% |
| Fair Oaks | 34.2% | 43.2% | 49% | 67.6% | -18.6% |
| Magnolia | 19.7% | 33.2% | 33.3% | 67.6% | -34.3% |
| Sierra View | 38.7% | 38% | 51.7% | 67.6% | -15.9% |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Oakdale Junior High | 33.1% | 27.3% | 23.8% | 67.6% | -43.8% |
| Oakdale High | 38.2% | 14% | 19.2% | 66.7% | -47.5% |

TABLE #5 Students with Disabilities Subgroup

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Gap |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Cloverland | 45.9% | 54% | 55.8% | 67.6% | -11.8% |
| Fair Oaks | 34.6% | 28.6% | 44.7% | 67.6% | -22.9% |
| Magnolia | 23.4% | 47.2% | 44.2% | 67.6% | -23.4% |
| Sierra View | 46.9% | 38.2% | 42.2% | 67.6% | -25.4% |
| Oakdale Junior High | 20.8% | 29.4% | 26.5% | 67.6% | -41.1% |
| Oakdale High | 6.5% | 9.1% | 15.8% | 66.7% | -50.9% |

TABLE #6 STAR ELA Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time

Name of Subgroup: HISPANIC

| STAR Testing | Hisp % Pro/Adv | LEA Wide % Pro/Adv | GAP |
|--------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| Spring 2004 | 30.3% | 47.2% | - 16.9% |
| Spring 2005 | 33.2% | 49% | - 15.8% |
| Spring 2006 | 36.1% | 52.4% | - 16.3% |
| Spring 2007 | 38% | 52.2% | -14.2% |
| Spring 2008 | 40.5% | 53.5% | -13% |
| Spring 2009 | 41.9% | 57.9% | -16% |
| Spring 2010 | 47.8% | 60.3% | -12.5% |

TABLE #7 STAR ELA Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time

Name of Subgroup: SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

| STAR Testing | Socio % Pro/Adv | LEA wide% Pro/Adv | GAP |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------|
| Spring 2004 | 32.5% | 47.2% | - 14.7% |
| Spring 2005 | 34.8% | 49% | - 14.2% |
| Spring 2006 | 37.4% | 52.4% | - 15.% |
| Spring 2007 | 38.5% | 52.2% | -13.7% |
| Spring 2008 | 40.4% | 53.5% | -13.1% |
| Spring 2009 | 43.5% | 57.9% | -14.4% |
| Spring 2010 | 48.3% | 60.3% | -12% |

TABLE #8 STAR ELA Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time**Name of Subgroup: ENGLISH LEARNERS**

| STAR Testing | EL % Pro/Adv | LEA wide% Pro/Adv | GAP |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------|---------|
| Spring 2004 | 17.9% | 47.2% | - 29.3% |
| Spring 2005 | 19.2% | 49% | -29.8% |
| Spring 2006 | 25.9% | 52.4% | - 26.5% |
| Spring 2007 | 29.7% | 52.2% | -22.5% |
| Spring 2008 | 34.3% | 53.5% | -19.2% |
| Spring 2009 | 33.1% | 57.9% | - 24.8% |
| Spring 2010 | 38.6% | 60.3% | -21.7% |

TABLE #9 STAR ELA Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time**Name of Subgroup: STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**

| STAR Testing | SWD % Pro/Adv | Schoolwide% Pro/Adv | GAP |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------|---------|
| Spring 2004 | 11.9% | 49% | -35.3% |
| Spring 2005 | 17.4% | 49% | - 31.6% |
| Spring 2006 | 23.1% | 52.4% | -29.3% |
| Spring 2007 | 17.8% | 52.2% | -34.4% |
| Spring 2008 | 26.4% | 53.5% | -27.1% |
| Spring 2009 | 34.7% | 57.9% | -23.2% |
| Spring 2010 | 37.3% | 60.3% | -23% |

TABLE #10 LEA Wide/Grade Level Scoring Proficient/Advanced on the ELA CST - overtime

| Grade | Spring 2007 | Spring 2008 | Spring 2009 | Spring 2010 |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| LEA Wide | 52.2% | 53.5% | 57.9% | 60.3% |
| 2nd Grade | 49% | 43% | 56% | 52% |
| 3rd Grade | 47% | 40% | 47% | 55% |
| 4th Grade | 62% | 65% | 68% | 69% |
| 5th Grade | 52% | 56% | 60% | 65% |
| 6th Grade | 57% | 53% | 66% | 66% |
| 7th Grade | 47% | 54% | 53% | 60% |
| 8th Grade | 49% | 50% | 56% | 56% |
| 9th Grade | 53% | 58% | 60% | 65% |
| 10th Grade | 49% | 46% | 49% | 54% |
| 11th Grade | 34% | 38% | 39% | 39% |

TABLE #11 LEA Wide/Elementary Sites Scoring Proficient/Advanced on the ELA CST by grade level

| Grade | Cloverland 09/10 | Fair Oaks 09/10 | Magnolia 09/10 | Sierra View 09/10 |
|-----------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| 2nd Grade | 55% | 50% | 44% | 61% |
| 3rd Grade | 50% | 57% | 55% | 57% |
| 4th Grade | 70% | 63% | 58% | 71% |
| 5th Grade | 72% | 66% | 58% | 65% |
| 6th Grade | 70% | 71% | 60% | 66% |

TABLE #12 LEA Wide/Grade Level Scoring Far Below/Below on the ELA CST - overtime

| Grade | Spring 2007 | Spring 2008 | Spring 2009 | Spring 2010 |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| LEA Wide | | | | |
| 2nd Grade | 23% | 21% | 17% | 19% |
| 3rd Grade | 20% | 23% | 20% | 15% |
| 4th Grade | 10% | 7% | 8% | 11% |
| 5th Grade | 18% | 12% | 10% | 11% |
| 6th Grade | 14% | 15% | 10% | 6% |
| 7th Grade | 25% | 20% | 18% | 14% |
| 8th Grade | 24% | 23% | 18% | 18% |
| 9th Grade | 19% | 15% | 14% | 16% |
| 10th Grade | 25% | 27% | 22% | 19% |
| 11th Grade | 40% | 30% | 34% | 32% |

Key Findings in English Language Arts**Overall Achievement**

- District spring 2010 achievement in ELA would not meet spring 2011 AYP.

Subgroup Achievement

- All numerically significant subgroup gaps decreased between spring 2009 and spring 2010.
- Spring 2010 achievement of all numerically significant subgroups will not meet the spring 2011 AYP goals.
- The subgroups with the largest gaps are the English Learner and Students with Disabilities Subgroup
- EL and SWD achievement is lowest at Oakdale High School
- Socio-Economically Disadvantages Subgroup Achievement is lowest at Oakdale Junior High School.

Subgroup Achievement Over Time

- Cloverland demonstrated the smallest gap for the Hispanic and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Subgroups.
- Magnolia
- Cloverland and Magnolia demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the Socio-Econ subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- Cloverland demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the EL subgroup between 2008 and 2010.

Grade Level Achievement

- All grade levels increased or maintained the % Pro/Adv between spring 2009 and spring 2010 except for second grade which decreased by 4%.
- All grade levels decreased or maintained the % FBB/BB between spring 2009 and spring 2010 except for second, fourth, fifth, and 9th.

Algebra Achievement

- 79% of 7th grade students enrolled in Algebra scored Pro/Adv.
- 29% of 8th grade students enrolled in Algebra scored Pro/Adv.

Geometry Achievement

- 81% of students enrolled in Geometry in 8th grade scored Pro/Adv.
- 80% of students enrolled in Geometry in 9th grade scored Pro/Adv.

Recommended Steps for LEA Action Plan

- District expectations for measurable Site Plan Goals and monitoring of subgroup achievement toward Site Plan Goals via benchmark testing are communicated.

- District level conversations regarding benchmark achievement are taking place.
- District expectations for instructional norms currently do not exist.
- A common language describing effective instructional norms does not exist.
- Site walk throughs are currently limited to instructional leadership of each site and regular visits of district administration.
- No agreed upon instructional protocol currently exists. Feedback to sites following visits might be more effective with the implementation of a district-wide protocol.
- District-offered staff development is varied.
- A district-wide staff development plan supporting general excellence in instruction does not exist.
- Overall, both school-wide and subgroup achievement are lower at the junior high and high school than the elementary sites.
 - LEA Action Plan Resources should focus on secondary sites
 - Leadership team should investigate instructional strategies and intervention placement and implementation at sites demonstrating overall highest achievement: Cloverland and Sierra View

**Oakdale Joint Unified School District
DISTRICT Math Program Data Analysis**

| AYP | Spring 2011 GOAL | Spring 2010 Achievement | Will spring 10 math achievement meet spring 11 AYP goal? |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Math AYP % Part. | 95% | 99% | Yes |
| Math AYP % Prof/Adv | 68.5% | 57.2% | No |

- District spring 2010 achievement in Math would not meet spring 2011 AYP.

TABLE #1 Spring 2010 STAR Math Subgroup – Spring 2011 Goal/Gap Analysis

| Subgroup | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 2011 Goal | GAP |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------|
| Hispanic | 46.3% | 67.3% | -21% |
| Socio-economically Disadvantaged | 47.9% | 67.3% | -19.4% |
| English Learners | 42.9% | 67.3% | 24.4% |
| Students with Disabilities | 42.3% | 67.3% | 25% |
| White | 62.1% | 67.3% | 5% |

- All numerically significant subgroup achievement for math in spring 2010 will not meet spring 2011 AYP.

TABLE #2 Hispanic Subgroup Achievement: % Pro/Adv

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Growth 08-10 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Cloverland | 46.2% | 46.2% | 62.4% | 68.5% | 16.2% |
| Fair Oaks | 46.9% | 47.9% | 52.6% | 68.5% | 5.7% |
| Magnolia | 47.4% | 52.2% | 52.5% | 68.5% | 5.1% |
| Sierra View | 61.5% | 57.8% | 62% | 68.5% | .5% |
| Oakdale Junior High | 26.8% | 23.4% | 20.7% | 68.5% | -6.1% |
| Oakdale High | 39.8% | 46.6% | 46.6% | 66.1% | 6.8% |

- Cloverland demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the Hispanic subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- The OJHS Hispanic subgroup dropped 6.1% in math between 2008 and 2010.

TABLE #3 Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup Achievement: % Pro/Adv

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Growth 08-10 |
|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Cloverland | 50.3% | 48.6% | 63.5% | 68.5% | 13.2% |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fair Oaks | 46.2% | 51.9% | 52.5% | 68.5% | 6.3% |
| Magnolia | 42.5% | 56.9% | 55.8% | 68.5% | 13.3% |
| Sierra View | 59.9% | 58.4% | 60.1% | 68.5% | .2% |
| Oakdale Junior High | 28.2% | 25.9% | 22.7% | 68.5% | -5.5% |
| Oakdale High | 42.2% | 46.7% | 45.9% | 66.1% | 3.7% |

- Cloverland and Magnolia demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the Socio-Econ subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- The OJHS Socio Econ subgroup dropped 5.5% in math between 2008 and 2010.

TABLE #4 English Learner Subgroup Achievement: % Pro/Adv

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Growth 08-10 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Cloverland | 37% | 38.8% | 59.7% | 68.5% | 22.7% |
| Fair Oaks | 46.6% | 47.7% | 53.1% | 68.5% | 6.5% |
| Magnolia | 31.1% | 49.1% | 43.4% | 68.5% | 12.3% |
| Sierra View | 55.9% | 56.2% | 59.5% | 68.5% | 3.6% |
| Oakdale Junior High | 27.8% | 18.6% | 15.9% | 68.5% | -11.9% |
| Oakdale High | 32.7% | 26% | 30.8% | 66.1% | -11.9% |

- Cloverland demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the EL subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- The OJHS and OHS EL subgroups each dropped 11.9% in math between 2008 and 2010.

TABLE #5 Students with Disabilities Subgroup Achievement: % Pro/Adv

| Site | Spring 08 Achievement | Spring 09 Achievement | Spring 10 Achievement | Spring 11 Goal | Growth 08-10 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Cloverland | 55.8% | 62.9% | 67.5% | 68.5% | 11.7% |
| Fair Oaks | 34.6% | 41% | 48.9% | 68.5% | 14.3% |
| Magnolia | 28.3% | 43.2% | 46.3% | 68.5% | 18% |
| Sierra View | 56.3% | 54.5% | 67.2% | 68.5% | 10.9% |
| Oakdale Junior High | 16.9% | 19.2% | 18.8% | 68.5% | 1.9% |
| Oakdale High | 8.7% | 9.4% | 15.8% | 66.1% | 7.1% |

- Fair Oaks and Magnolia demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the SWD subgroup between 2008 and 2010.

TABLE #6 STAR Math Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time

| Name of Subgroup: HISPANIC | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------|
| STAR Testing | % Pro/Adv | LEA wide% Pro/Adv | GAP |
| Spring 2003 | 36.5% | 48.1% | -11.6% |
| Spring 2004 | 33.4% | 47% | -13.6% |
| Spring 2005 | 34.9% | 47% | -12.1% |
| Spring 2006 | 38.7% | 51.7% | -13% |
| Spring 2007 | 43.3% | 53.6% | -10.3% |
| Spring 2008 | 42.9% | 53.5% | -10.6% |
| Spring 2009 | 43.6% | 56.2% | -12.6% |
| Spring 2010 | 46.3% | 57.2% | -10.9% |

TABLE #7 STAR Math Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time

| Name of Subgroup: SOCIOECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------------|--------|
| STAR Testing | % Pro/Adv | LEA wide% Pro/Adv | GAP |
| Spring 2003 | 35.7% | 48.1% | -12.4% |

| | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|---------|
| Spring 2004 | 33.2% | 47% | -13.8% |
| Spring 2005 | 33.2% | 47% | -13.8% |
| Spring 2006 | 39% | 51.7% | -12.7% |
| Spring 2007 | 42.7% | 53.6% | -10.9% |
| Spring 2008 | 42.9% | 54.5% | -11.60% |
| Spring 2009 | 46.1% | 56.2% | -10.1% |
| Spring 2010 | 47.9% | 57.2% | -9.3% |

TABLE #8 STAR Math Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time

Name of Subgroup: ENGLISH LEARNERS

| STAR Testing | % Pro/Adv | LEA wide% Pro/Adv | GAP |
|--------------|-----------|-------------------|---------|
| Spring 2003 | 31.2% | 48.1% | -16.9% |
| Spring 2004 | 26% | 47% | -21% |
| Spring 2005 | 25.2% | 47% | -21.8% |
| Spring 2006 | 30.5% | 51.7% | - 21.2% |
| Spring 2007 | 35.6% | 53.6% | - 18% |
| Spring 2008 | 38.9% | 54.5% | -15.60% |
| Spring 2009 | 38.9% | 56.2% | -17.3% |
| Spring 2010 | 42.9% | 57.2% | 14.3% |

TABLE #9 STAR Math Subgroup Gap Analysis Over Time

Name of Subgroup: STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

| STAR Testing | % Pro/Adv | LEA wide% Pro/Adv | GAP |
|--------------|-----------|-------------------|---------|
| Spring 2003 | 8.8% | 48.1% | -39.3% |
| Spring 2004 | 16.4% | 47% | -30.6% |
| Spring 2005 | 20.6% | 47% | -26.4% |
| Spring 2006 | 24.1% | 51.7% | -27.6% |
| Spring 2007 | 19.2% | 53.6% | -34.4% |
| Spring 2008 | 28.3% | 54.5% | -26.20% |
| Spring 2009 | 39.1% | 56.2% | -17.1% |
| Spring 2010 | 42.3% | 57.2% | 14.9% |

TABLE #10 Grade 2-6 Scoring Proficient/Advanced on the CST – over time: % Pro/Adv

| Grade | Spring 2007 | Spring 2008 | Spring 2009 | Spring 2010 |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 2nd Grade | 61% | 53% | 69% | 66% |
| 3rd Grade | 59% | 64% | 63% | 72% |
| 4th Grade | 68% | 73% | 75% | 68% |
| 5th Grade | 54% | 57% | 65% | 73% |
| 6th Grade | 52% | 51% | 56% | 60% |
| 7 TH Grade | 31% | 37% | 32% | 31% |

- District wide achievement in Math was 29% lower in 7th grade than in 6th grade. This was the largest achievement gap between grade levels demonstrated in spring 2010.

TABLE #11 Algebra Achievement Over Time: % Pro/Adv

| Grade | %Pro/Adv Spring 2009 | % Pro/Adv Spring 2010 | Stanislaus % of enrollment | Stanislaus % Pro/Adv |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 7 th Grade | 79% (58) | 78% (63) | | |
| 8 th Grade | 25% (285) | 29% (245) | | |
| 9 th Grade | 39% (262) | 38% (301) | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|--|
| 10 th Grade | 13% (171) | 25% (126) | | |
| 11 th Grade | 12% (106) | 12% (82) | | |

- 79% of 7th grade students enrolled in Algebra scored Pro/Adv.
- 29% of 8th grade students enrolled in Algebra scored Pro/Adv.

TABLE #12 Enrollment in Algebra over Time

| GRADE | Spring 2008 | Spring 2009 | Spring 2010 |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 8 th Grade | 42.1% | 72.3% | 56.6% |
| 9 th Grade | 49.1% | 56.6% | 65.9% |

TABLE #13 Geometry Achievement: % Pro/Adv

| Grade | Spring 2008 | Spring 2009 | Spring 2010 | 08-10 Growth |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| 8 th | 76% (8.2) | 51% (22) | 81% (32) | 55 |
| 9 th | 53% (14.3) | 27% (34.3) | 80% (74) | 27% |
| 10 th | 18% (25.1) | 15% (18.5) | 25% (144) | 7% |
| 11 th | 33% | 37% | 23% (61) | -10% |

- 81% of students enrolled in Geometry in 8th grade scored Pro/Adv.
- 80% of students enrolled in Geometry in 9th grade scored Pro/Adv.

TABLE #14 LEA Wide/Elementary Sites Scoring Proficient/Advanced on the Math CST by grade level

| Grade | Cloverland | Fair Oaks | Magnolia | Sierra View |
|-----------|------------|-----------|----------|-------------|
| 2nd Grade | 70% | 64% | 59% | 71% |
| 3rd Grade | 70% | 68% | 73% | 78% |
| 4th Grade | 70% | 59% | 66% | 80% |
| 5th Grade | 41% | 70% | 70% | 71% |
| 6th Grade | 71% | 67% | 53% | 64% |
| Overall | 70% | 65.8% | 63.9% | 72.5% |

- 3 of 4 elementary schools had between 64 and 71% of 6th grade students scoring Pro/Adv
- Sierra View had the highest % of sixth grade students scoring Pro/Adv. (72.5%)

Key Findings in Mathematics

Overall Achievement

- District spring 2010 achievement in Math would not meet spring 2011 AYP.

Subgroups met Spring 2008 AYP

- All numerically significant subgroup achievement for math in spring 2010 will not meet spring 2011 AYP.

Subgroup Achievement Over Time

- Cloverland demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the Hispanic subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- Cloverland and Magnolia demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the Socio-Econ subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- Cloverland demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the EL subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- Fair Oaks and Magnolia demonstrated the strongest growth in math for the SWD subgroup between 2008 and 2010.
- The OJHS Hispanic subgroup dropped 6.1% in math between 2008 and 2010.
- The OJHS Socio Econ subgroup dropped 5.5% in math between 2008 and 2010.
- The OJHS and OHS EL subgroups each dropped 11.9% in math between 2008 and 2010.

Grade Level Achievement

- District wide achievement in Math was 29% lower in 7th grade than in 6th grade. This was the largest achievement gap between grade levels demonstrated in spring 2010.

Algebra Achievement

- 78% of 7th grade students enrolled in Algebra scored Pro/Adv.
- 29% of 8th grade students enrolled in Algebra scored Pro/Adv.

Geometry Achievement

- 81% of students enrolled in Geometry in 8th grade scored Pro/Adv.
- 80% of students enrolled in Geometry in 9th grade scored Pro/Adv.
- The majority of students took the end of course STAR test for Geometry in 10th grade. 25% scored Pro/Adv.

Recommended LEA Action Plan Steps

- District expectations for measurable Site Plan Goals and monitoring of subgroup achievement toward Site Plan Goals via benchmark testing are communicated.
- District level conversations regarding benchmark achievement are taking place.
- District expectations for instructional norms currently do not exist.
- A common language describing effective instructional norms does not exist.
- Site walk throughs are currently limited to instructional leadership of each site and regular visits of district administration.
- No agreed upon instructional protocol currently exists. Feedback to sites following visits might be more effective with the implementation of a district-wide protocol.
- District-offered staff development is varied.
- Placement procedures for both strategic and intensive math interventions should be standardized throughout the district reflecting current best practices.
- Additional academic pathways supporting initial success in Algebra and beyond should be developed.
- A district-wide staff development plan supporting general excellence in instruction does not exist.
- Overall, both school-wide and subgroup achievement are lower at the junior high and high school than the elementary sites.
 - LEA Action Plan Resources should focus on secondary sites
- Leadership team should investigate instructional strategies and intervention placement and implementation at sites demonstrating overall highest achievement

Local Measures of Student Performance - other than State Level Assessments

Per NCLB Section 1112 regarding Local Educational Agency Plans, each LEA must provide the following descriptions in its Plan:

A description of high-quality student academic assessments, if any, that are in addition to the academic assessments described in the State Plan under section 1111(b) (3), that the local educational agency and schools served under this part will use to:

- a) determine the success of students in meeting the State student academic achievement standards and provide information to teachers, parents, and students on the progress being made toward meeting student academic achievement standards;
- b) assist in diagnosis, teaching, and learning in the classroom in ways that best enable low-achieving students to meet State student achievement academic standards and do well in the local curriculum;
- c) determine what revisions are needed to projects under this part so that such children meet the State student academic achievement standards; and
- d) identify effectively students who may be at risk for reading failure or who are having difficulty reading, through the use of screening, diagnostic, and classroom-based instructional reading assessments.

If the LEA uses such assessments in addition to State Academic assessments, please provide a succinct description below, and indicate grade levels and students served with such assessments.

Also, please describe any other indicators that will be used in addition to the academic indicators described in Section 1111 for the uses described in that Section.

OJUSD: Local Measures of Student Performance

Local measures of student performance for the Oakdale Joint Unified School District include:

- Report card grades (K-12)
- Benchmark assessments aligned to state content standards (K-12)

Current Benchmark Assessments are aligned to State Content Standards and are now administered at the end of each trimesters 1 and 2 in grades K-6 and quarterly in grades 7-12. Benchmark Assessments are scanned in to EduSoft at each school site making class, school, and district data reports immediately accessible.

Site principals and their leadership teams monitor benchmark achievement to measure progress toward Site Plan Goals.

Ongoing revision of the teacher-generated benchmark system may indicate the need to investigate publisher created benchmark tests.

Site input indicates that the use of data to inform instruction is not systemic throughout the district.

RECOMMENDATIONS for LEA Plan:

- Investigate publisher created benchmark system to replace the current teacher-created benchmark system.
- Additional training in the use of data to inform instruction should take place for instructional leaders.
- Principal reports at the district level including both benchmark achievement toward Site Plan Goals but how each site is using data to inform instruction.

Performance Goal 1

All students will reach high standards, at a minimum, attaining proficiency or better in English Language Arts and Mathematics, by 2013-2014.

| Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in English Language Arts and Mathematics. | Persons Involved/ Timeline | Related Expenditures | Annual Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>1: Alignment of instruction with content standards: OJUSD updates it's Strategic Plan Annually to direct district personnel and resources supporting the district goal to increase the % of students Proficient/Advanced in English Language Arts.</p> <p>Supporting the implementation of core curriculum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Core Framework training b) Piloting teachers select core curriculum c) Admin/teachers receive core curriculum training d) Grade levels/departments develop aligned benchmark assessments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework Training provided to administrators and identified teacher leaders. • Admin/Teacher leaders provide relevant framework training to staff • Admin select teachers to participate in district coordinated pilot team. • District arranges for selected pilot materials to be delivered to sites and publishers review materials. • Piloting teachers gain input from all grade level/department staff to preferred curriculum. • Piloting teachers select district adoption under the direction of the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction • Curriculum adopted by Board and purchased • Administrative team under the direction of the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction develops training schedule to ensure adequate training prior to implementation • District grade level teams develop | <p>Framework purchases and Staff Dev</p> <p>Staff Dev Planning - subs</p> <p>Pilot Teacher Training Curriculum</p> <p>Staff Dev Curriculum Training Subs providing release time</p> <p>Purchase curriculum</p> <p>Training modules and Subs</p> <p>Staff Dev and subs</p> | <p>\$2000</p> <p>\$2000</p> <p>\$2500</p> <p>\$250</p> <p>\$250</p> <p>\$250</p> <p>\$400,000 - \$700,000</p> <p>\$25,000</p> <p>\$5000</p> | <p>Title I , Title II</p> <p>Title II and Staff Dev</p> <p>Title II</p> <p>Title II</p> <p>Title II</p> <p>Staff Development</p> <p>IMF and Lottery</p> <p>Title II and Staff Dev</p> <p>Title II and Staff Dev</p> |

| Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in Reading and Mathematics | Persons Involved/ Timeline | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| | pacing calendars and aligned benchmark assessments prior to end of the first quarter/trimester of curriculum implementation. | | | |
| <p>2. Implementation of effective instructional strategies.</p> <p>Supporting effective instructional strategies in classrooms necessitate an ongoing and systemic system of support in place at each school site. OJUSD supports the development of each site’s Single Plan for Student Achievement describing this ongoing and systemic system through the District’s Annual Site Plan Revision Workshop Process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) District ELA and Mathematics Data Analysis is shared with all site admin.. b) Sites complete data analysis and needs analysis c) Sites report on previous year’s SPSA achievement d) Sites revise SPSAs e) District Panel reviews proposed SPSAs f) Site Admin./Advisory Councils inform revision of LEA Plan needed to support SPSAs g) SPSAs/LEA Plan go forward for Board Approval. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of Categorical Programs completes the District ELA and Mathematics Data Analysis by end of August. • District ELA and Mathematics Needs Analysis is presented to Site Admin by end of September • Sites report on previous year’s SPSA achievement and present site ELA and Mathematics Data Analysis to District Panel by end of October • Sites identify Site Plan Revision Team to review data analysis, complete needs analysis, and revise SPSA by end of November • Completed SPSAs are reviewed by District Panel by end of November • SPSAs go forward for Board Approval by end of December • SSCs/ELACS are trained to oversee implementation of SPSA by end of January | <p>Sub release time for Site Plan Revision Teams</p> <p>SSC/ELAC Training Materials</p> <p>SSC/ELAC Training of Trainers</p> | <p>\$5000</p> <p>\$500</p> <p>\$1000</p> | <p>Title II</p> <p>Staff Development Title I/SIP</p> <p>Title I/SIP</p> |

| Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in Reading and Mathematics | Persons Involved/ Timeline | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>3. Extended Learning Time</p> <p>ELEMENTARY: 3 of 4 OJUSD elementary schools receive ASES funding to provide After School Programs. The remaining elementary school provides extended learning time academic intervention only. Latchkey care is available at all four elementary sites via a partnership with the City of Oakdale.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Multi funded 6 hour ASP Managers work under the direction of their principal to oversee the implementation of the ASES funded After School Programs. The District Director of Categorical Programs provides coordination and technical support to site After School Programs. The OJUSD Elementary ASP Plan describes services related to all areas of required ASES compliance. Site SPSAs describe spending. ASP Managers are included in the SPSA Revision Teams. ASP Managers under the direction of their principals monitor effectiveness of the academic intervention by student and by program. <p>OAKDALE JUNIOR HIGH: OJHS receives ASES funding. Homework support and academic intervention are delivered by certificated staff. Multi funded 6 hour ASP Managers work under the direction of their principal to oversee the implementation of the ASES funded After School</p> | <p>ELEMENTARY and JUNIOR HIGH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Latchkey services are available for all students every school day until 6 pm.. Students on free/reduced lunch pay a lesser fee. Site Principals/Vice Principals identify students needing extended learning time academic intervention by the end of August. These students are invited to attend ASP at no cost. Students wishing to attend at no cost but not identified initially are placed on a waiting list until a spot opens up. Site Principals identify intervention curriculum to be offered and teachers to provide instruction by end of August. Formal academic intervention begins in September. ASP Managers/teachers in charge working under the direction of site principals/vice principals tag ASP students and select the academic intervention they are receiving in AERIES. At the end of each trimester District ASP Managers report on the percent of students improving their report card grades and percentages of increase on Benchmark Assessment. <p>JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site Principals/Vice Principals identify students scoring Below Basic and Far | <p>ASP Manager Salaries, teachers, and classified staff salaries are included in SPSAs</p> <p>Intervention Programs included in core adoptions</p> <p>Sub time release for selection/training in intervention programs</p> <p>CAHSEE Remediation materials/training</p> | <p>\$60,000</p> <p>\$1000</p> <p>\$4000</p> | <p>ASES and Hourly funding</p> <p>IMF /Lottery</p> <p>Title I/Title II Staff Development</p> <p>CAHSEE Funding</p> |

| Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in Reading and Mathematics | Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in Reading and Mathem | Description of Spe Education Practice | Description of Education Prac | Description of Sp Education Practic |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>4. Increased access to technology: The District Technology Plan describes specific activities supporting an increased access to technology. Activities accessing funding reflected in the LEA Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ongoing implementation/evaluation/revision of District Technology Plan. b. Certificated and Classified Technology Mentors – support the generation of report cards, data to inform instruction, educational software and the integration of technology supporting student learning. c. Annual renewal of AERIES d. Annual renewal of Edusoft e. Annual renewal of educational software not reflected in SPSAs. f. Annual survey to assess classified/certificated/administrative technology needs – including related staff development. g. Integration of survey input into District Technology Action Plan. h. Ongoing replacement/addition of computers with the goal of no computer being more than 5 years old. i. Annual identification of sites still lacking smart boards, document cameras, Senteo systems. First priority for purchase to be given to sites with student groups most at-risk. j. Annual SPSA Revision team input generates list of technology related staff development needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly meetings with District Technology Director and Technician, certificated and classified Technology Mentors, and identified administration are coordinated by the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction to monitor/advise upon/review and revise each year’s District Technology Action Plan. • Certificated and Classified Technology Mentors work under the direction of the Site Principals. District requests for support will be channeled through Site Principals. • Annual Administration of Survey by February each year. • Annual staff development supporting technology access to include but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AERIES 2. Edusoft 3. LARS 4. Smartboards 5. Senteo Systems 6. Newly installed educational software | <p>Tech Plan and resource materials</p> <p>Stipends</p> <p>On-line</p> <p>Conference costs and subs</p> <p>Computers, software, technology such as Smartboards</p> | <p>\$500</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>No cost</p> <p>\$15,000</p> <p>\$200,000</p> | <p>EETT</p> <p>General Fund</p> <p>EETT/Title I and II/Gen Fund Gen Fund/OEF/ EETT</p> |

| Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in Reading and Mathematics | Persons Involved/ Timeline/evidence | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| <p>7. Auxiliary services for students and parents (including transition from preschool, elementary, and middle school).</p> <p>District will provide administrative/technical support to existing auxiliary services for students and parents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link Crew (HS) and WEB (JH) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7th grade and 9th grade orientation - ongoing 7th grade/9th grade activities • Kindergarten Readiness Academy • CBET • Program Specific Parent Nights delineated in annual action plans • Math/Reading Nights • College/Career Nights • Counseling <p>District will investigate support of existing services and expanding services to parents which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Accelerated Reader lists on site websites • Parent Connect • Expanded notification for Kindergarten Registration • Expanded Parent Resources on websites <p>Pre-School to Kindergarten: The district invites local pre-schools to an annual</p> | <p>Director of Categorical Programs will provide coordination of the following programs as indicated: Link Crew: Link Crew representation on district Action Team. Web: Web representation on district Action Team. KRA: Secure KRA staff, facility, recruitment process, securing of materials, and coordinated development of action plan. CBET: Program implementation and evaluation overseen by DELAC (parents) and EL Committee (Site Staff)</p> <p>Assistant Superintendent will provide coordination of the following programs via regularly scheduled Principals Meetings: Math/Reading Nights: College/Career Nights: Accelerated Reader Connect Ed Kindergarten Registration Parent Resources on website</p> | <p>Program and software</p> | <p>\$30,000</p> | <p>Title 1, EETT, SIP</p> |

| meeting that reviews recommended incoming | | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in Reading and Mathematics | Persons Involved/ Timeline/evidence | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
| <p>8. Monitoring program effectiveness:</p> <p>District will monitor implementation of LEA Plan by assigning each goal to the listed entity as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Goal 1: Reading and Mathematics: ELA and Math Continuum Committees ▪ Goal 2: Highly Effective Teacher: Human Resources Department ▪ Goal 3: English Learners and Immigrant Students: EL Committee and DELAC ▪ Goal 4: Safe and Drug Free Schools: Action Team ▪ Goal 5: High School Site Council <p>District will monitor effectiveness of the LEA Plan's implementation in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District/Site analysis of STAR Data ▪ Quarterly reports on District Benchmark Testing ▪ Designated agenda items at each of the advisory council meetings responsible for overseeing the implementation of Goals 1-5. <p>District will support LEA Plan Revision by:</p> | <p>District Administrative Team Member responsible for overseeing the advisory councils are as follows:</p> <p>Goal 1: Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction</p> <p>Goal 2: Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources</p> <p>Goal 3: Director of Categorical Programs</p> <p>Goal 4: Director of Categorical Programs</p> <p>Goal 5: High School Principal</p> <p>Under the guidance of the Director of Categorical Programs at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ September Principal's Meeting ▪ October Tuning Protocol Sessions | <p>EL Subcommittee Meetings</p> <p>Safe and Drug Free Meetings (Action Team)</p> | | <p>Title III</p> <p>Title IV</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Data Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presentation of District-wide ELA, Math, and Subgroup Data Analysis ▪ Support in completion of site specific ELA, Math, and Subgroup Data Analysis ▪ Provision of Tuning Protocol Powerpoint Template <p>Tuning Protocol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site Plan Revision Teams report prior year's Site Plan Goal achievement during their scheduled Tuning Protocol to: district administration and visiting administration. Input from the panel is used to inform Site Plan Revision. <p>Site Plan Revision Workshop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site Plan Revision Team completes the revision of the plan ▪ Principals present Site Plan to panel during Principal's Meeting ▪ Panel advises upon any further revision needed <p>Completion/Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site Plans are submitted to Governing Board for approval. ▪ Implementation of plan begins <p>Budget Revision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final revisions are made to the Site Plan/Lea Plan budgets pending release of final allocation amounts. <p>Monitoring via Benchmark Assessments</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ November Site Plan Revision Workshop ▪ December Board Meeting ▪ January revision of budget and submission of revised site budget pages to the governing board ▪ January/March/April Principal's Meetings: Site Principals report to Superintendent's Panel | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Principals report on quarterly benchmark achievement related to Site Plan Goals ▪ Administrators responsible for LEA Plan Goals report on implementation of LEA Action Plan | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Description of Specific Actions to Improve Education Practice in Reading and Mathematics | Persons Involved/ Timeline/evidence | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
| <p>9. Targeting services and programs to lowest-performing student groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment is conducted in order to identify at-risk students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ STAR ■ CELDT ■ GATE Assessment: Raven’s, OLSAT, etc. ■ CAHSEE ▪ Technical support in creation of at-risk student monitoring lists ▪ Scheduled Site Visits by assigned administration target instruction, intervention, and achievement of at-risk students related to Site Plan Goals ▪ Staff Development supporting intervention needed to students identified as at-risk via Site Plan needs analysis | <p>Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction supports site administration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ STAR ▪ CAHSEE <p>Coordinator of Categorical Programs supports sites administration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CELDT ▪ GATE Assessment <p>Site Visits/Program Review conducted quarterly:</p> <p>Goal 1: Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction</p> <p>Goal 2: Deputy Superintendent</p> <p>Goal 3: Coordinator of Categorical Programs</p> <p>Goal 4: Coordinator of Categorical Programs</p> <p>Goal 5: High School Principal</p> | <p>Pre-id, ordering, printing manuals, etc.</p> | <p>\$60,000</p> | <p>CAHSEE Gen Fund Testing</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|---|
| <p>10. Any additional services tied to student academic needs:</p> <p>Support Staff (including teachers and paraprofessionals) are used to support student learning and reinforce daily teaching for students needing additional support.</p> | <p>Assistant Superintendent to Curriculum and Instruction with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Principals • Business Office <p>Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Worksheets to Business Office by June • LEA Plan and Site Plan budget pages generated by Con Ap II by Jan | <p>Salary and Benefits</p> | | <p>Title I Title II EIA SIP</p> |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|---|

Performance Goal 2

All limited-English-proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

The OJUSD English Learner Subgroup met AYP goals for participation rate and % proficient or advanced in both English Language Arts and Math during 2005-2006. The ELA AYP goal for the 2007-2008 school year will be 33.4% pro/adv. The Math goal for the 2007-2008 school year will be 32.2% pro/adv.

Oakdale Joint Unified School District failed to meet Title III AMAO 3 for the second year. The district was notified of this status in fall 2010. The ELLSA was completed and the district developed an IPA to address this area of under-achievement. That plan follows.

Title III LEA Improvement Plan Addendum Oakdale Joint Unified School District

Directions: Address the topic matter requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow as much space as required for narrative responses under each item.

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

A. Analysis of data and problems found.

AMAO 1: Percent of ELs Making Annual Progress in Learning English

The Oakdale Joint Unified School District met AMAO 1 district-wide.

- 09-10 achievement of 55.4% ELs making annual progress in learning English would marginally meet the 10-11 target of 54.6%.
- The percent of ELs meeting AMAO 1 (progressing in English language proficiency) increased district-wide between the 06-07 and 08-09 school years.
- The percent of ELs meeting AMAO 1 decreased district-wide between 08-09 and 09-10 by 2.7%.
- School level data indicates that the school showing the highest percentage of students progressing in English language proficiency in 09-10 was Fair Oaks Elementary School (64%) followed by Oakdale Junior High School (58.6%).
- The school site showing the lowest % of students meeting AMAO 1 (progressing in English language proficiency) was Magnolia Elementary 50.6%.
- ELs meeting their growth target for 09-10 for increasing in English Proficiency in the Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, and Early Advanced/Advanced: Not English Proficient are all marginally below the state average growth except the Early Advanced/Advanced: Not proficient which demonstrated an 11.4% gap.

- By far, the most numerically significant group is the Intermediate group containing a population of 216 English Learners. Although the gap between district achievement for Intermediate ELs and state achievement is only .6%, this group is almost twice the size of any other group defined by CELDT Level achievement.

EL Achievement on CAHSEE

- 56% of ELs passed the CAHSEE in ELA, only 4% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for ELA/CAHSEE was 85% and the % Proficient or above was 60%.
- 63% of ELs passed the CAHSEE in Math, only 19% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for Math/CAHSEE was 87% and the % Proficient or above was 56%
- 93% of RFEP passed the CAHSEE in ELA, 50% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for ELA/CAHSEE was 85% and the % Proficient or above was 60%.
- 91% of RFEP passed the CAHSEE in Math, 52% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for Math/CAHSEE was 87% and the % Proficient or above was 56%
- Although the % of the RFEP population passing CAHSEE exceeds district-wide achievement, the % of RFEP scoring Proficient on the CAHSEE is 10% lower than the district-wide achievement rate in ELA and 4% lower in Math.

AMAO 2: Percent of English Learners attaining the English Proficient Level on the CELDT

Oakdale Joint Unified School District met AMAO 2 district-wide for both the cohort of students in a language instruction educational program less than 5 years and for ELs in a language instruction educational program more than five years.

- 09-10 achievement of Cohort 1 (20.7% attaining English Proficient Level on the CELDT who have been in a program less than 5 years) would meet the 10-11 target of 18.7%.
- 09-10 achievement of Cohort 2 (43.2% attaining English Proficient Level on the CELDT who have been in a program more than 5 years) would meet but not exceed the 10-11 target of 43.2%.
- 58% of ELs in the district program for 4 or more years scored Intermediate or below on the CELDT. This % is only marginally lower than the percentage of ELs in US schools for 4 or more years scoring Intermediate or below on the CELDT (56.3%).
- About 50% of ELs who have been in US 6 years or more scored at Intermediate or below on the CELDT.

Students attaining English Proficient Level on the CELDT demonstrated the following level of achievement on the CSTs:

ELA

- 89.9% are at Basic or Above
- 53.9% are at Proficient/Advanced
- 11% (12 students) are Below or Far Below Basic - 11 out of 12 of the students are in 7th or 8th grade.
- More students in grades 2nd-4th are scoring at Proficient or above.

MATH

- 80% are at Basic or above
- 53% are at Proficient/Advanced.
- 20% are Below or Far Below Basic.
- 15 out of 23 (65%) of the students Below Basic or Far Below Basic are in 7th and 8th grades.
- 4 8th grade ELs at Proficient on the CELDT were enrolled in Algebra and 12 were enrolled in 8th Grade General Math. All 4 ELs in Algebra scored at Below Basic on the Algebra CST. No ELs enrolled in 8th grade General Math scored at Proficient or Advanced.

- More students in grades 2nd-5th are scoring at Proficient or above.

AMAO 3: Adequate Yearly Progress in ELA and Math for English Learner Subgroup

The Oakdale Joint Unified School District has not met AMAO 3 (in ELA or Math) for two consecutive years, 2008-09 and 2009-10.

- Average % Pro/Adv in ELA for the four elementary sites was 45.75%.
- Average % Pro/Adv in ELA for Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School was 21.5%
- Average % Pro/Adv in Math for the four elementary sites was 53.9%.
- Average % Pro/Adv in Math for Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School was 23.35%.
- Three out of the four elementary sites are closing the EL achievement gap over time in both ELA and Math. Magnolia Elementary continued to close the EL achievement gap in ELA between the 2009 and 2010 school year, but the EL achievement gap in Math increased 5.7%.
- Oakdale Junior High School EL % Pro/Adv decreased from 27.3% to 23.8% in ELA between spring 2009 and spring 2010 and from 18.6% to 15.9% Pro/Adv in Math between spring 2009 and spring 2010.

The most numerically significant population included in AMAO 3 as defined by proficiency level on the CELDT are Intermediate level English Learners.

- 52% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic on the ELA CST
- Over 50% of Intermediate ELs in grades 7th-8th are scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic
- 76% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic or above on the ELA CST. Of that 76%, 91% are in grades 2-6.
- 31% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic on the Math CST.
- 80% of Intermediate ELs in 8th grade are scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic in General Math.
- 73% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic or above on the Math CST. Of that 73%, 88% are in grades 2-6.
- Only 1 Intermediate EL was enrolled in Algebra as an 8th grader.
- The 15 Intermediate ELs enrolled in 8th grade General Math all scored Basic or below.

Summary:

- ELs at the elementary level score substantially higher on the CST in both ELA and Math than ELs at the secondary level.
- Current district-wide EL achievement in progressing in the attainment of English (AMAO 1) would marginally meet the spring 2011 target. Fair Oaks AMAO 1 achievement of 70% was significantly higher than any other site. The largest group in the AMAO 1 cohort are students currently at Intermediate but the most significant gap between district and state achievement lies with the Early Advanced/Advanced: Not proficient which demonstrated an 11.4% gap.
- District achievement for AMAO 2 (attainment of English Proficient level on the CELDT) not only met the 09-10 target but would meet and exceed the 10-11 target for cohort 1 and meet/but not exceed the target for cohort 2.
- There is a significant gap between the Pass and Proficient rates of ELs and the district-wide population.
- 4% ELs scored Proficient on the ELA CAHSEE exam
- 19% ELs scored Proficient on the Math CAHSEE exam
- Although RFEP Pass rates on the CAHSEE exceed the district Pass rates, the RFEP Proficient rates do not.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Plan

The STRENGTHS of the Title III LEA Plan include: 1. Analysis of AYP, API, AMAOs, CSTs, CAHSEE, CELDT data provides both a thorough district and site analysis of EL needs. 2. Technical assistance supporting the use of Benchmark data to monitor EL progress during the school year is provided to all sites. 3. Strong DELAC participation informing the development of parent involvement opportunities supporting EL academic achievement. 3. ASES funding at four sites providing extended learning time opportunities for ELs in after school programs. 4. Read 180 available at all sites to provide

ELD for ELs at levels 1-3. Initial Read 180 training was substantial and is now ongoing. 5. Lexia, and Rosetta Stone available at all sites to provide intervention for ELs. 6. Consistent and appropriate identification, placement, and reclassification process in place.

WEAKNESSES of the Title III LEA Plan include: 1. The existing EL Committee model was effective in supporting structures and processes such as the identification, placement, and reclassification procedure, but has not been effective in supporting ELD/SDAIE instructional strategies at sites. 2. There is no structure currently in place to monitor and provide feedback to sites concerning the effectiveness of ELD/SDAIE strategies. 3. No coaching is currently available to support ELD and SDAIE instructional strategies. 4. Interventions currently offered in after school programs do not all have delineated placement/exit criterion. Data analysis district wide has not yet included analysis of the effectiveness of interventions being offered. Specific curriculum supporting intensive and strategic interventions in both ELA and Math are not fully in place district-wide. 5. The existing ELD Benchmark Checklists are difficult for teachers to understand and use. 6. The ELD curriculum for students not enrolled in Read 180 is not considered highly effective by teachers. 7. Professional development supporting ELD/SDAIE instruction varies in levels and quality from site to site. District-offered professional development supporting ELD/SDAIE has been limited and poorly attended. On-going systemic professional development supporting the success of English Learners is present only within the Read 180 program. 8. Although all site plans address the EL subgroup, the power of the plan and the degree of follow up in implementation has varied district-wide. 9. Current EL clustering practices at Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School may not be the most effective.

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

Although the district only failed to meet AMAO 3 in ELA and Math, current levels of achievement on AMAO 1 (meeting targets for annual goals in learning English) would only marginally meet 2010-11 targets, and a pro-active approach in addressing AMAO 2 (attaining the English proficient level on the CELDT) is desired by the district. Consequently, factors contributing to the failure to meet AMAO 3 and current achievement of AMAOs 1 and 2 will be addressed in this section and the following Action Plan.

1. Input from teachers and site administration indicate that the ELD Standards are not all easily understood by all teachers and the existing ELD Checklists are not an effective mechanism to measure ELD Standards progress.
2. Leadership team input from the ELSSA indicate that there is no existing systemic structure or practice to provide feedback to sites related to the fidelity of ELD curriculum implementation, effectiveness of ELD instruction, effectiveness of SDAIE instruction, or existing levels of English Learner engagement.
3. Input from EL Committee members has indicated that the committee's initial work of supporting identification, placement, and the reclassification process has been fully accomplished but the committee has been ineffective in supporting ELD and SDAIE instruction.
4. The weakness and inconsistency of data measuring the effectiveness of interventions being provided to ELs that are intended to increase English proficiency and/or academic achievement indicate that existing interventions may not have fully implemented scientifically based curriculum, appropriate placement procedures, delineations of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and a measurement embedded to measure student growth.
5. District level and site level data analysis indicate that elementary sites are significantly more successful in supporting the academic achievement of English Learners than secondary sites.
6. Secondary sites have adhered to clustering policies established in the initial EL Master Plan developed in 2001. Input from secondary teachers has not conveyed evidence that this strategy has been effective in meeting the needs of Beginning through Intermediate level English Learners or Early Advanced, but not yet proficient English Learners identified as being academically at-risk as measured by report card grades or deficit credits.

7. The Director of Categorical Programs serves as the District EL Director. The job description of this position has broadened to the degree that only minimal time has been spent supporting the implementation of the EL Master Plan during the past two years.

C. **Conclusion:** From the quantitative and qualitative data we reviewed and the underlying causes we identified, the leadership team at Oakdale Joint Unified School District believes that to increase the language proficiency and academic achievement of our English Learners, we must improve our system in five areas:

1. Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to sites regarding the fidelity of ELD curriculum implementation, effectiveness of ELD instruction, effectiveness of SDAIE instruction, or observed levels of English Learner engagement. Professional development would be related to needs identified in this process.
2. Review and revise as necessary the existing intervention opportunities for English Learners to ensure appropriate placement procedures, delineation of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and the existence of pre/post assessment to measure growth.
3. Develop an effective tool to measure the progress of English learners in attaining English Proficiency.
4. Re-form the EL Committee and re-designate its purpose as supporting goals 1-3 above. The committees membership would include site administration, teacher leaders, and English Learner specific support staff representing all sites.
5. Note: Although the action plan will benefit all sites district-wide primary attention and resources will be focused at Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School.

| Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement | Personnel Responsible | Timeline | Funding Source |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English-language Development (ELD). (AMAOs 1 and 2; Recommended English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA))</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to sites regarding the fidelity of ELD curriculum implementation and effectiveness of ELD instruction. ▪ Develop an effective tool to measure ongoing progress of English learners in attaining English Proficiency <p>A. ELs are appropriately placed for ELD Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ELs in levels 1-3 will complete the Read 180 diagnostic assessment in the spring of each year to determine appropriate ELD instructional placement for the following year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90 + minutes of Read 180 daily (grades 4-12) - Small group ELD Instruction and Universal Access for grades K-6 - Single period of ELD Support for grades 7-12 ▪ Site EL Coordinator will review the next year’s student placement/teacher assignment/ and identified curriculum for all ELs represented at their site prior to the end of the existing school year with the District EL Director. <p>B. ELD is provided for all English Learners daily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ELD curriculum will be inventoried at each site. Any additional materials will be identified by March each year. ▪ ELD curriculum order will be placed for following year by April of the prior year. ▪ Teachers/support staff needing training prior to implementation will be identified by April of each year. ▪ Scheduled time/location for daily ELD at elementary sites will be provided to District EL Director. ▪ District EL Director will review elementary ELD schedules and secondary ELD rosters and confirm that all English Learners are appropriately placed. <p>C. Support Effective K-12 ELD Instruction</p> | <p>Site Principals/Read 180 Teachers</p> <p>Site EL Coordinators/Principals and District EL Director</p> <p>Site EL Coordinators</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>Site EL Coordinators</p> <p>District EL Director</p> | <p>May 1-20, 2011</p> <p>June 1, 2011</p> <p>March 15, 2011</p> <p>April 15, 2011</p> <p>June 1, 2011</p> | <p>No funding Required</p> <p>Instructional Materials or Lottery: \$10,000</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop walk-through protocol based on full-implementation of identified ELD curriculum, effective ELD strategies, and evidences of EL engagement. ▪ District EL Director, Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and Teacher Leaders conduct quarterly shared walk throughs to monitor ELD implementation, instruction, and levels of EL engagement.. ▪ Site feedback based on observational evidence gathered via the protocol that is not teacher specific will be e-mailed by the District EL Director to the Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and classrooms observed within 2 days of each site visit. <p>D. Identify and/or develop an effective tool to measure the progress of English learners in attaining English Proficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee of teacher leaders representing all sites (possible sub-committee of re-formed EL Committee) reviews tools to measure progress on ELD Standards other than those currently embedded/included in the existing ELD Curriculum. ▪ Committee identifies best options for monitoring progress on the ELD Standards. ▪ All teachers providing ELD receive presentation of best options for monitoring progress on the ELD Standards and select top choice. ▪ Any materials and/or professional development needed are identified and a timeline is developed to fully implement new mechanism for monitoring ELD Standards prior to the following school year. <p>E. Identify Provide Intervention to ELs not meeting established benchmarks for progress on the ELD Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District screening process for intervention will expand to include identification of ELs not meeting established benchmarks for progress on the ELD Standards. ▪ Committee of teacher leaders representing all sites (possible sub-committee of re-formed EL Committee) identifies effective intervention appropriate for the identified needs. ▪ Full implementation of ELD Intervention for students not meeting established benchmarks for progress on the ELD Standards. | <p>EL Committee District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director/EL Committee</p> <p>District EL Director/EL Committee</p> | <p>March 25, 2011 September 2011 November 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> <p>February 16, 2011</p> <p>March 16, 2011</p> <p>April 7, 2011</p> <p>May 26, 2011</p> <p>April 7, 2011</p> <p>May 26, 2011</p> <p>January 2012</p> | <p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000</p> <p>Release time for Walk Throughs Title III: \$3200</p> <p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000 (See 2C above)</p> <p>District-wide ELD Intervention: Title III/ELAP/EIA \$27,000</p> |
| <p>3. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in English-language arts. (AMAO 3;ELSSA)</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>sites regarding the effectiveness of SDAIE instruction in English Language Arts and observed levels of English Learner engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and revise as necessary the existing intervention opportunities for English Learners in English Language Arts to ensure appropriate placement procedures, delineation of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and the existence of pre/post assessment to measure growth. <p>A. Support SDAIE instructional strategies in English Language Arts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop walk-through protocol to identify observed effective SDAIE strategies, and evidences of EL engagement. ▪ District EL Director, Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and Teacher Leaders conduct quarterly shared walk-throughs to monitor observe SDAIE methodologies supporting access to core and levels of EL engagement. ▪ NOTE: It is possible that one protocol can be developed to support ELD, ELA, and Mathematics. ▪ Site feedback based on observational evidence gathered via the protocol that is not teacher specific will be e-mailed by the District EL Director to the Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and classrooms observed within 2 days of each site visit. ▪ Site feedback will be reviewed by the EL Committee to inform the development of a Professional Development Plan. <p>B. Provide appropriate ELA Intervention to English Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirm that both strategic and intensive ELA interventions proven effective with English Learners are identified at all sites (including CAHSEE preparation and remediation) ▪ Review existing CAHSEE ELA Interventions to determine is the intervention prepares students to Pass or score Proficient ▪ Revise/expand existing CAHSEE ELA intervention opportunities as necessary to prepare students to score Proficient/Advanced ▪ Delineate the placement and exit criterion for all strategic and intensive ELA interventions. ▪ Identify the person at each site responsible to record the specific intervention, entry date, entry level, exit date, exit level within AERIES. Train them in this process. ▪ Identify ELs for placement in intensive/strategic ELA intervention. ▪ Monitor ongoing student progress on ELA Standards for students in both intensive and strategic interventions via embedded assessments and district benchmark testing. | <p>EL Committee District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director/Site EL Coordinator/Principal</p> | <p>March 25, 2011 September 2011 November 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> <p>February 16, 2011 March 16, 2011 April 7, 2011 May 26, 2011</p> <p>Upon completion of Quarter/Trimester Benchmark Testing</p> | <p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000 (<u>See 2B and 2C above</u>)</p> <p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000 (<u>See 2B and 2C and 3A above</u>)</p> <p>CAHSEE Intervention Materials: \$13,500: Designated CAHSEE funds</p> |
|---|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | | |
| <p>4. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics. (AMAO 3; ELSSA)</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to sites regarding the effectiveness of SDAIE instruction in Mathematics and observed levels of English Learner engagement. ▪ Review and revise as necessary the existing intervention opportunities for English Learners in Mathematics to ensure appropriate placement procedures, delineation of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and the existence of pre/post assessment to measure growth. <p><u>A. Develop Math Continuum Options supporting increased success in 8th Grade Algebra</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vertical team representing upper elementary, Oakdale Junior High and Oakdale High School collaborate to develop a math continuum with both strategic and intensive pathways leading to success in Algebra in 8th or 9th grade. ▪ Site administration and counselors identify English Learners for correct placement in the new math continuum. ▪ Full implementation of math continuum. <p><u>B. Support SDAIE instructional strategies in Mathematics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop walk-through protocol to identify observed effective SDAIE strategies, and evidences of EL engagement in Mathematics. ▪ District EL Director, Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and Teacher Leaders conduct quarterly shared walk throughs to observe SDAIE methodologies supporting access to core and levels of EL engagement. ▪ NOTE: It is possible that one protocol can be developed to support ELD, ELA, and Mathematics walk throughs. ▪ Site feedback based on observational evidence gathered via the protocol that is not teacher specific will be e-mailed by the District EL Director to the Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and classrooms observed within 2 days of each site visit. ▪ Site feedback will be reviewed by the EL Committee to inform the development of a Professional Development Plan. | <p>November-December 2010</p> <p>February 2011</p> <p>August 2011</p> <p>EL Committee District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> | <p>March 25, 2011 September 2011 November 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> | <p>Release Time to support development and implementation of math continuum options: Title II: \$1000</p> <p>Release time for Walk-Throughs Title III: \$3200 (<u>See 2C above</u>)</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>A. Research/implement more effective instructional setting in ELA/Math for English Learners in grades 7-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visit sites (including local sites) with high performing English Learner populations representing various instructional settings. ▪ Review instructional setting options proven effective for English Learners in ELA and Math ▪ Identify most appropriate/effective instructional setting for district English Learners – focusing on grades 7-12. ▪ Identify professional development that is ongoing and systemic to support the proposed instructional setting revision. ▪ Develop Professional Development Plan activities to support the adopted instructional setting. <p>B. Develop Professional Development Plan that supports ELD, SDAIE, and increased EL student engagement based on identified needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use developed walk-through protocol findings to identify Professional Development Activities that will support SDAIE strategies, ELD Instruction, and increased EL engagement in ELA and Mathematics. ▪ Protocol findings and teacher leader input will inform additional action steps included in the EL Professional Development Plan. | <p>EL Committee District EL Director</p> | <p>March 25, 2011 April 2011 May 2011 August 2011</p> | <p>Professional Development Activities: Title III/EIA/Title II \$15,000</p> <p>Professional Development Activities: Title III/EIA/Title II \$15,000 (See 5A above)</p> |
| <p>6. Describe parent involvement and outreach strategies to help parents become active participants in the education of their children, including coordination efforts with other ESEA programs.</p> <p>NOTE: Existing parent involvement activities are highly valued by parents of English Learners. However, tools to measure the resulting academic growth of students based on parent participation are not in place district-wide.</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review/revise as necessary parent surveys to support evaluation of parent involvement program supporting academic success of English Learners. ▪ Conduct evaluation of existing EL Parent Involvement Program. ▪ Review/revise as necessary EL Parent Involvement Program. <p>A. Expand upon existing parent involvement activities intended to support EL academic achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interpreters available for Parent Teacher Conferences ▪ Interpreters/Talk Technologies System available for all site parent meetings | <p>District Parent</p> | <p>February 2, 2011 April 6, 2011</p> | <p>Hourly rate supporting staff participation: Title I: \$1000 Adult English Literacy: Title III/ELAP/EIA: \$10,000</p> <p>Math Academy: Title III: \$4000</p> <p>Kindergarten Readiness Academy: Title III/Title I/ELAP/EIA:</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interpreters available for all site specific nights supporting Math and Literacy ▪ Adult English Literacy Classes: Levels 1, 2, and 3 (Weekly Sept – April) ▪ Math Academy for grades 2-6 (February – April: 6 weeks) ▪ Kindergarten Readiness Academy (June :3 weeks) ▪ PAK: Preschool and Kindergarten partnership supporting success in Kindergarten (January) ▪ Celebrating English Learners: a district-wide parent orientation for parents of English Learners (February) ▪ Back to School Night for Parents of English Learners ▪ Protecting Your Child from Gang Involvement ▪ Free website resources supporting ELA and Math success in homes: Math Links and Reading Links <p>C. Review and revise as necessary existing parent surveys to inform potential revision of EL Parent Involvement Plan</p> <p>D. Conduct a comprehensive evaluation of existing EL Parent Involvement Plan and revises as necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review student growth data ▪ Review parent surveys ▪ Revise EL Parent Involvement Plan ▪ Oversee implementation of revised EL Parent Involvement Plan | <p>Involvement Committee/EL Committee under the direction of the Director of Categorical Programs oversees the implementation of parent involvement activities</p> <p>District Parent Involvement Committee/EL Committee under the direction of the Director of Categorical Programs oversees the implementation of parent involvement activities</p> | <p>August 2011 September 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> <p>February 2, 2011 April 6, 2011 August 2011 September 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> | <p>\$10,000</p> <p>PAK: Title I: \$800 Celebrating English Learners: \$1000: Title III/EIA/ELAP B2S: \$500: T3 Website Development : TI/TII: \$2500 Gang Prevention: \$500: T3</p> <p>Hourly rate supporting staff participation on Parent Involvement Committee: TI: \$1000 (See 6A above)</p> |
| <p>7. If applicable, identify any changes to the Title III Immigrant Education Program.</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support parent involvement for immigrant and EL students identified as academically at-risk ▪ Monitor academic progress of immigrant and EL students identified to be academically at-risk ▪ Provide academic support to immigrant and EL students identified to be academically at-risk <p>Title III Immigrant funding with EIA funding has co-funded a position for a Bilingual Community Liaison serving grades K-12 but housed at Oakdale Junior High School</p> | <p>District Director of English Learner Programs</p> | <p>August 2010-May 2011</p> | <p>T3 Immigrant/EI A/ELAP:</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| <p>where the most significant need was identified. The position supports the home-school connection for this group of students.</p> <p>The district does not anticipate receiving Title III Immigrant funding during the 2011-2012 school year. This position has been highly valued. It is hopeful that an alternative funding source will be available.</p> | | | <p>\$25,000 annually</p> |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|

OJUSD Planned Improvement in Programs for LEP Students and Immigrants (Title III)

| (Summarize information from district-operated programs and approved school-level plans) | Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement. |
|---|---|
| <p>Activities</p> | <p>1. (Per Sec. 3116(b) of NCLB, this Plan must include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Describe the programs and activities to be developed, implemented, and administered under the subgrant; b. Describe how the LEA will use the subgrant funds to meet all annual measurable achievement objectives described in Section 3122; c. Describe how the LEA will hold elementary and secondary schools receiving funds under this subpart accountable for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ meeting the annual measurable achievement objectives described in Section 3122; ▪ making adequate yearly progress for limited-English-proficient students (Section 1111(b)(2)(B)); ▪ annually measuring the English proficiency of LEP students so that the students served develop English proficiency while meeting State Academic standards and student achievement (Section 1111(b)(1)); d. Describe how the LEA will promote parental and community participation in LEP program. |

| (Summarize information from district-operated programs and approved school-level plans) | Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement. |
|---|--|
| Activities | <p>1c. Site progress toward EL goals specified in the Site Plan and specified Site Plan Actions accomplished will be reviewed at the Principal’s Meeting by the administrative panel. A strong connection between the district and sites is accomplished by each site sending representation to the quarterly EL Committee Meetings facilitated by the Director of Categorical Programs.</p> <p>1d. The district will promote parental involvement as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - regularly scheduled DELAC Meetings which include agenda packet items that support local ELAC meetings - annual District EL Parent Involvement Action Plan developed under the advisement of DELAC - implementation of District EL Parent Involvement Action Plan monitored by DELAC - Quarterly District-wide Parent Involvement Meetings - District Parent Workshops - CBET classes - Parent Institute and other EL specific parent trainings - District-wide Parent Orientation Nights - Communications to included but not be limited to those described on p. 21 - Community Bilingual Aide to support home/school communication - District offered staff Spanish Classes supporting the home-school connection |
| | <p>2. Describe how the LEA will provide high quality language instruction based on scientifically based research (per Sec. 3115(c) . The effectiveness of the LEP programs will be determined by the increase in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English proficiency; and • Academic achievement in the core academic subjects |

| (Summarize information from district-operated programs and approved school-level plans) | | Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement. |
|---|---|---|
| Allowable Activities | <p>3. Provide high quality professional development for classroom teachers, principals, administrators, and other school or community-based personnel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. designed to improve the instruction and assessment of LEP children; b. designed to enhance the ability of teachers to understand and use curricula, assessment measures, and instruction strategies for limited-English-proficient students; c. based on scientifically based research demonstrating the effectiveness of the professional development in increasing children’s English proficiency or substantially increasing the teachers’ subject matter knowledge, teaching knowledge, and teaching skills; c. Long term effect will result in positive and lasting impact on teacher performance in the classroom. | <p>3a/b/c. Professional Development Activities will be selected in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual EL Program Data Analysis, EL Program Evaluation Questions, and site input will identify EL Program needs. - - DISTRICT: Specific professional development activities addressing those needs will be included in the District English Learner Program Action Plan (see Appendix D of EL Master Plan). - Implementation of the district’s professional development activities will be monitored by the district EL Committee. - SITE: Specific professional development activities addressing identified site needs will also be included in each site’s SPSA. - Implementation of the site’s professional development activities will be monitored by each site’s School Site Council/ELAC as well as at the review of Site Plan accomplishments conducted during Principal’s Meetings. - COORDINATION: It will be ensured that district/site professional development activities support one another via site/district communication at the Site Plan/LEA Plan Revision Workshop each year and at the quarterly EL Committee Meetings. - EVALUATION: all district offered professional development activities will include participant evaluations that will be reviewed by the EL Committee. Annual EL Program Data Analysis will be used to revise/validate professional development’s lasting impact on the EL Program. |
| | <p>4. Upgrade program objectives and effective instructional strategies.</p> | <p>The Annual Site Plan Revision Workshop process will include an EL Program Data Analysis fully addressing AYP, AMAOs, CAHSEE passage rates, and RFEP achievement. Specific and measurable goals related to English Learner achievement will be generated. Actions specified in the Site Plans must relate to the specified measurable goal.</p> <p>The Annual LEA Plan Revision process will include a District EL Program Analysis fully addressing AYP, AMAOs, GEC, CAHSEE, and RFEP achievement. Identified needs will be the focus of the annually generated District EL Action Plan.</p> <p>Quarterly EL Committee Meetings include time dedicated to ongoing evaluation of programs/activities described in the district EL Master Plan and each year’s EL Action Plan.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>5. Provide –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. tutorials and academic or vocational education for LEP students; and b. intensified instruction. | <p>Each Site’s Plan will include a goal related to EL intervention and extended learning time. The site administrator identifies specific English Learners needing intervention and works with site staff to place them in the appropriate interventions offered at that site.. Monitoring of those identified at-risk ELs will be addressed when the each Site Administrator reports on Site Plan accomplishments during Principals’ Meetings. Site Administrators will specify interventions and extended learning time opportunities for all ELs currently not making passing grades in Reading, Writing, or Math or not demonstrating mastery on district benchmark testing, failing grades, or failing to pass the CAHSEE.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| (Summarize information from district-operated programs and approved school-level plans) | Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement. | |
|---|--|---|
| Allowable Activities | <p>6. Develop and implement programs that are coordinated with other relevant programs and services.</p> | <p>Development, implementation, and coordination of programs for English Learners will be facilitated by the EL Committee composed of teachers, classified staff, and site administration under the direction of the Director of Categorical Programs. This committee will meet at least quarterly. Meetings will monitor the implementation of the current year’s District EL Action Plan as well as working to develop the upcoming year’s District EL Action Plan. The proposed District EL Action Plan will also be advised upon by DELAC.</p> <p>Coordination between site and district will be facilitated by the annual Site/LEA Plan Revision Workshop and the quarterly reviews of site and district plan accomplishments during scheduled Principal’s Meetings.</p> |
| | <p>7. Improve the English proficiency and academic achievement of LEP children.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide regular EL Subcommittee Meetings for collaboration and training of site Teacher Leaders and site Administrators. - Coaching - Provide paraprofessional training to the bilingual paraprofessionals in the district. - Provide staff development to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Use ELD Standards to inform instruction</i> <i>Individualize instruction for English Learners</i> <i>Monitor English Learner progress on the ELD Standards</i> <i>Further development and coordination of local EL Program</i> - Monitor the progress of English Learners and Reclassified students. - Provide supplemental materials for ELD. - Professional development for Director that supports the development and effective implementation of the district program for English Learners. - Train administrators to support the English Learner Programs at their sites. - Bilingual Paraprofessionals - Bilingual Community Aide |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>8. Provide community participation programs, family literacy services, and parent outreach and training activities to LEP children and their families –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To improve English language skills of LEP children; and ○ To assist parents in helping their children to improve their academic achievement and becoming active participants in the education of their children. | <p>Offer CBET Classes to the parents of English Learners each year. Parent Institute or other parent training workshops District-wide EL Parent Orientation Night(s) Action Plan developed by DELAC to increase parent involvement Bilingual Community Aide District offered Informational Parent Meetings District and site communications translated into Spanish Support site translation for meetings Survey parents regarding upcoming year’s offerings Collaborate with Familias Unidas and Migrant Education via invitations to both DELAC and EL Committee Meetings</p> |
| | <p>9. Improve the instruction of LEP children by providing for –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The acquisition or development of educational technology or instructional materials ○ Access to, and participation in, electronic networks for materials, training, and communication; and ○ Incorporation of the above resources into curricula and programs. | <p>Provide software that will accelerate the acquisition of vocabulary. Provide software that will support needed reading skills. Provide software to support identified mathematical needs. Provide computers in ELD classes to increase access for English Learners Provide training to staff responsible for facilitating the computer’s intensified instruction. Investigate other options that will supplement the existing program for English Learners.</p> |
| | <p>10. Other activities consistent with Title III.</p> | <p>Possible development of staff positions to increase parent/school connections.</p> |

Plans to Notify and Involve Parents of Limited-English-Proficient Students

| <p>Parents of Limited-English-Proficient students must be notified: The outreach efforts include holding and sending notice of opportunities for regular meetings for the purpose of formulating and responding to recommendations from parents.</p> | <p>Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement.</p> |
|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center; writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Required Activity</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEA informs the parent/s of an LEP student of each of the following (per Sec. 3302 of NCLB): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the reasons for the identification of their child as LEP and in need of placement in a language instruction educational program; b. the child’s level of English proficiency, how such level was assessed, and the status of the student’s academic achievement; c. the method of instruction used in the program in which their child is or will be, participating, and the methods of instruction used in other available, programs, including how such programs differ in content, instruction goals, and use of English and a native language in instruction; d. how the program in which their child is, or will be participating will meet the educational strengths and needs of the child; e. how such program will specifically help their child learn English, and meet age appropriate academic achievement standards for grade promotion and graduation; f. the specific exit requirements for such program, the expected rate of transition from such program into classrooms that are not tailored for limited English proficient children, and the expected rate of graduation from secondary school for such program if funds under this title are used for children in secondary schools; g. in the case of a child with a disability, how such program meets the objectives of the individualized education program of the child; | <p>1a/b/c/d/e/f/g/h: See EL Master Plan posted on district website: http://www.oakdale.k12.ca.us/docs/pdf/Curriculum/ELMasterPlan08-09.pdf (Appendix B: Parent Notification Forms)</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Parents of Limited-English-Proficient students must be notified: The outreach efforts include holding and sending notice of opportunities for regular meetings for the purpose of formulating and responding to recommendations from parents.</p> | | <p>Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement.</p> |
| <p>Required Activity</p> | <p>h. Information pertaining to parental rights that includes written guidance detailing –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the right that parents have to have their child immediately removed from such program upon their request; and ii. the options that parents have to decline to enroll their child in such program or to choose another program or method of instruction, if available; iii. the LEA assists parents in selecting among various programs and methods of instruction, if more than one program or method is offered by the LEA. | <p>EL Master Plan Appendix B</p> |
| <p>Note: Notifications must be provided to parents of students enrolled since the previous school year: not later than 30 days after the beginning of the schools year. If students enroll after the beginning of the school year, parents must be notified within two weeks of the child being placed in such a program.</p> | | <p>See EL Master Plan posted on district website: http://www.oakdale.k12.ca.us/docs/pdf/Curriculum/ELMasterPlan0809.pdf p. 23 and Flow Chart p. 36</p> |
| <p>LEA Parent Notification Failure to Make Progress If the LEA fails to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives it will inform parents of a child identified for participation in such program, or participation in such program, of such failure not later than 30 days after such failure occurs.</p> | | <p>Upon receiving the results of the AMAOs, the district will inform all parents of English Learners of the AMAO results within 30 days of the LEA’s notification – IF THE LEA DOES NOT MEET THE AMAO GOALS. In such case, the Director of Categorical Programs will work with the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction to draft and send the described notification.</p> |

Plans to Provide Services for Immigrants

| IF the LEA is receiving or planning to receive Title III Immigrant funding, complete this table (per Sec. 3115(e)). | Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement. | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| Allowable Activities | 1. Family literacy, parent outreach, and training activities designed to assist parents to become active participants in the education of their children: | Yes or No Yes | EL Committee/DELAC will oversee implementation of District EL Parent Involvement Action Plan monitored by DELAC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarterly District-wide Parent Information Meetings - Quarterly DELAC Meetings - CBET classes - Parent Institute - District-wide EL Parent Orientation Night - Communications to included but not be limited to those described on p. 21 - Community Bilingual Aide to support home/school communication |
| | 2. Support for personnel, including teacher aides who have been specifically trained, or are being trained, to provide services to immigrant children and youth: | Yes or No Yes | Quarterly EL Subcommittee Meetings include classified/certificated site liaisons who carry pertinent information back to sites. Annual Trainings include: CELDT training, Bilingual Paraprofessional Training, Play it Safe Training, assignment specific training. WRITE Institute CABE District Coordinator training |
| | 3. Provision of tutorials, mentoring, and academic or career counseling for immigrant children and youth; | Yes or No Yes | District Site Plan Revision Workshop guides sites through a thorough needs analysis. Interventions include but are not limited to: 21 st Century Learning Center After School Programs CAHSEE Prep |
| | 4. Identification and acquisition of curricular materials, educational software, and technologies to be used in the program carried out with funds: | Yes or No Yes | EL Subcommittee engages in a district wide needs analysis including STAR CST data, CELDT, and local benchmark testing. This analysis is used to identify areas of need. The committee then researches and advises upon next steps. LARS and Edusoft are the primary software programs used in data analysis. LEXIA is the primary software program used to support EL and Immigrant students. Next steps may include expanding the use of Smart Boards at the High School and updating the computer lab in the JH and HS ELD classes, additional software/materials to support EL intervention. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | 5. Basic instruction services that are directly attributable to the presence in the school district involved of immigrant children and youth, including the payment of costs of providing additional classroom supplies, costs of transportation, or such other costs as are directly attributable to such additional basic instruction services: | Yes or No Yes | Bilingual Community Aide supporting at risk students at the JH and HS. Increased hours for bilingual paraprofessionals at the elementary sites. |
| IF the LEA is receiving or planning to receive Title III Immigrant funding, complete this table (per Sec. 3115(e)). | | Description of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet this requirement. | |
| Allowable Activities | 6. Other instruction services designed to assist immigrant children and youth to achieve in elementary and secondary schools in the USA, such as programs of introduction to the educational system and civics education: | Yes or No YES | Bilingual Community Aide position to support at risk JH and HS students will act as a liaison between school and home. This staff position will also support the JH and HS ELAC meetings. |
| | 7. Activities coordinated with community-based organizations, institutions of higher education, private sector entities, or other entities with expertise in working with immigrants, to assist parents of immigrant children and youth by offering comprehensive community services: | Yes or No YES | Development, Implementation, and Coordination of programs for English Learners will be facilitated by the EL Committee composed of teachers, classified staff, and site administration under the direction of the Coordinator of Categorical Programs. This committee will meet at least quarterly. Meetings will monitor the implementation of the current year's District EL Action Plan as well as working to develop the upcoming year's District EL Action Plan. The proposed District EL Action Plan will also be advised upon by DELAC. Coordination between site and district will be facilitated by the annual Site/LEA Plan Revision Workshop and the quarterly reviews of these plans accomplished during scheduled Principal's Meetings. |

Performance Goal 3: *By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.*

Summary of Needs and Strengths for Professional Development

Based on a needs assessment of teacher data for your district, include a narrative that describes areas of needed professional development and areas where adequate professional development opportunities exist.

[Description of activities under Title II, Part A, Subpart 1, Grants to LEA]

| STRENGTHS | NEEDS |
|---|---|
| <p>District created and will maintain a data bank to assist in identifying Highly Qualified and Not Highly Qualified teachers assigned to core content classes during December 2004.</p> <p>District HOUSSE Certification process will be completed by spring 2005.</p> <p>All 3 elementary sites achieved their October 2004 target for progress toward the goal of 100 percent of all core classes taught by NCLB compliant teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p>SB1969 training was provided to 31 teachers during the 2001-2002 school year.</p> <p>CLAD training was provided to 31 teachers during the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 school years.</p> <p>SB395 training was provided to 42 teachers during the 2002-2003 school year.</p> <p>District created and will maintain a data bank to assist in identifying teachers possessing CLAD, BCLAD, SB1969, SB395 or other authorizations qualifying them to provide core content instruction to English Learners.</p> | <p>Human Resources Department will complete the HOUSSE process and then ensure that each teacher is made aware of whether they are Highly Qualified or Not Highly Qualified by the end of the 2004-2005 school year.</p> <p>Human Resources Department and Site Administrators will work with teachers deemed Not Highly Qualified to develop an action plan to achieve a Highly Qualified status by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p>By February 2005 Human Resources Department and Department of Curriculum and Instruction will collaborate to draft and distribute a letter making all teachers aware of the Williams Lawsuit Settlement and related legislation including AB3001 thus requiring teachers who serve in an assignment requiring CLAD, BCLAD, or similar authorizations to complete this credentialing requirement.</p> <p>Human Resources Department and Site Administrators will work with teachers who serve in an assignment requiring CLAD, BCLAD, or similar authorizations to resulting in appropriate authorization.</p> |

Performance Goal 3: *By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.*

Planned Improvements for Professional Development (Title II)

| Please provide a description of: | Persons Involved/ Timeline | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|--|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| <p>1. How the professional development activities are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, State assessments, and the curricula and programs tied to the standards:</p> <p>District supported Site Plan Revision Workshop to ensure that Site Plans describe professional development activities that address identified needs specified in Site Plan goals and are scientifically research based.</p> | <p>C & I Site Admin. Revision Teams Oct/Nov</p> | <p>Site Plan Revision Workshop - Subs - Lunches</p> | <p>\$3,000 \$400</p> | <p>Staff Dev./Buy Back Title II</p> |
| <p>2. How the activities will be based on a review of scientifically based research and an explanation of why the activities are expected to improve student academic achievement:</p> <p>Site Plans are reviewed by staff to support continued improvement. Staff received additional training in core areas to support programs.</p> | <p>C & I Site Admin. Site Teams</p> | <p>Substitutes & Training</p> | <p>\$20,000</p> | <p>Staff Dev./Buy Back Title II</p> |
| <p>3. How the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement and how the activities will be used as part of a broader strategy to eliminate the achievement gap that separates low-income and minority students from other students:</p> <p>District will continue to support class-size reduction in gr. 9 for Math and English Language Arts. The results of the STAR, Local Benchmark Assessments, district observation of classes and anecdotal data from students and staff will be used to establish baseline data for Spring 2003. Data gathered in Spring 2004 will be used to determine whether or not class-size reduction in gr. 9 for Math and English Language Arts is an effective use of Title II funds.</p> | <p>Supt. C & I HR HS Admin.</p> | <p>CSR</p> | <p>\$264,526</p> | <p>Title II</p> |

| Please provide a description of: | Persons Involved/ Timeline | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>4. How the LEA will coordinate professional development activities authorized under Title II, Part A, Subpart 2 with professional development activities provided through other Federal, State, and local programs:</p> <p>Professional Development options will first be presented at Superintendent’s Council. If that body believes the district should pursue this PD option, the Site Administrators will then present the PD at their sites. Formal or informal input will then be reported back to the district. Site administrator and staff input will be carefully considered before Professional Development commitments are finalized.</p> | <p>Supt. C & I HR HS Admin.</p> | | <p>\$33,661 \$19,350</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> | <p>Title I PAR BTSA</p> |
| <p>5. The professional development activities that will be made available to teachers and principals and how the LEA will ensure that professional development (which may include teacher mentoring) needs of teachers and principals will be met:</p> <p>Using multiple funds to expand the services of Curriculum Coaches throughout the district will be explored.</p> | <p>Supt. C & I HR HS Admin.</p> | | <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> | <p>BTSA PAR</p> |
| <p>6. How the LEA will integrate funds under this subpart with funds received under part D that are used for professional development to train teachers to integrate technology into curricula and instruction to improve teaching, learning, and technology literacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Train teachers to scan, score, and generate their own Benchmark Assessment Reports. - Provide workshops on programs to use in classrooms. | <p>C & I Technology Dept.</p> | <p>Training</p> | <p>\$7,000</p> | <p>Buy Back/Staff Dev.</p> |

| Please provide a description of: | Persons Involved/ Timeline | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|---|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| <p>7. How students and teachers will have increased access to technology; and how ongoing sustained professional development for teachers, administrators, and school library media personnel will be provided in the effective use of technology. (Note: A minimum of 25% of the Title II, Part D Enhancing Education through Technology funding must be spent on professional development.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our district needs scanners at each site to expedite turn around for benchmark assessments. - +3 comp in HS ELD lab - +6 comp. In JH ELD lab - Assist sites to generate a list of needed comp. Create an action plan to meet that need. - Workshops provided by CTAP. | <p>C & I Technology Dept. Site Admin.</p> | <p>Training</p> | <p>\$4,581 \$10,000</p> | <p>Title I EETT ELAP Title II Gen fund</p> |
| <p>8. How the LEA, teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school personnel, and parents have collaborated in the planning of professional development activities and in the preparation of the LEA Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All players were involved in a 2 day workshop for LEA and site planning. Input was requested and offered in all areas of the plan. - In addition, the district strategic plan process includes community input in this area. | <p>Supt. C & I Site Plan</p> | <p>Surveys</p> | <p>\$3,000</p> | <p>Gen. Fund</p> |

| Please provide a description of: | Persons Involved/ Timeline | Related Expenditures | Estimated Cost | Funding Source |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>9. How the LEA will provide training to enable teachers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teach and address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with disabilities, students with special learning needs (including students who are gifted and talented), and students with limited English proficiency; • Improve student behavior in the classroom and identify early and appropriate interventions to help all students learn; • Involve parents in their child’s education; and • Understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All teachers receive training in Differentiated Instruction. In addition, site special education staff continues to inservice on the needs of special education students. - K-12 Discipline Handbook developed and implemented. - Character Ed program development on bullying and harassment. - Parent seminars and conferences used to assist parents in supporting students. - Training during grade level staff development on using data and assessments. | <p>C & I</p> <p>Pupil Services</p> <p>Site Principal Staff</p> | <p>DI Training</p> <p>Student Handbook</p> <p>Staff Dev. Speakers & materials</p> | <p>\$10,100</p> <p>\$7,000</p> <p>\$5,000</p> | <p>Staff Dev./GATE</p> <p>Pupil Services</p> <p>Title II Buy Back General Fund</p> |
| <p>10. How the LEA will use funds under this subpart to meet the requirements of Section 1119: (See pg. 22 – “Needs” column)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete HOUSSE process. - Identify HQ/NHQ teachers. - Work with NHQ teachers to develop an action plan leading to HQ status. - Draft and distribute Williams Lawsuit Settlement to all teachers. - Work with identified teachers to develop an action plan resulting in appropriate authorization to instruct ELs. | <p>C & I</p> <p>HR</p> <p>See pg. 22</p> | <p>-Support pers. to implement HOUSSE</p> <p>-Roving sub to facilitate teacher release to develop action plans.</p> <p>-Postage</p> <p>-Possible fiscal support to implement action plans.</p> | <p>\$33,661</p> | <p>Title I</p> |

Performance Goal 4: *All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.*

Environments Conducive to Learning (Strengths and Needs):

Please provide a list of the LEA’s strengths and needs regarding how students are supported physically, socially, emotionally, intellectually, and psychologically in environments that are conducive to learning, along with the LEA’s strengths and needs regarding student barriers to learning (e.g., attendance, mobility, and behavior).

| STRENGTHS | NEEDS |
|--|--|
| <p>1) The District has a strategic plan outlining its vision for a positive school environment.</p> <p><i>By June 2011, the eighth year of the “Power of One – to Impact All” will expand to emphasize conflict resolution training and further address bullying, harassment, violence, cyber-bullying, and gangs, resulting in a decrease in discipline/safety incidents and risk behavior and an increase in school connectedness as demonstrated by CHKS and UMIRS data.</i></p> <p>2) The California Healthy Kids Survey is administered to 5th, 7th, 9th, and 11th grades during December every other year. Results are used to identify specific needs and to continue to revise and develop our comprehensive plan – “The Power of One – to Impact All”.</p> <p>3) A district wide Action Team composed of parents, teachers, students, administrators, classified staff, and community members meet quarterly during the school year to monitor implementation of “The Power of One”, review effectiveness of programs/activities, and revise action steps as necessary. The CHKS is the foundational piece of data used by this committee. Each year the team works on the development of a Power of One Action Plan for the next year while advising upon the current year’s implementation.</p> <p>3) Site liaisons attending the Action Team meetings provide/facilitate site input into decisions and support implementation of Power of One at their respective sites.</p> <p>4) The Action Team’s “Power of One” Plan is based upon current research and supports the view that emotional, psychological, and social needs of students are intrinsically related to academic achievement. This is referred to as a “Developmental Assets Based Approach” in the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan.</p> | <p>1) The foundation of “The Power of One” is the understanding that positive one on one relationships help youth to avoid risk behavior and increase positive behaviors. Embracing this within the culture of our school as well as the culture of our community will be an ongoing need.</p> <p>2) As the “Power of One- to Impact All” expands, additional funding will be necessary for its implementation, but Title IV, TUPE entitlement, and district general fund contributions will be eliminated as of 2010-2011.</p> <p>3) Minnesota Smoking Prevention Program targeted to grade 5 will replace the Caring Schools Communities Program previously servicing the grade K-5 grade span. Training will be necessary for the 2010-2011 school year.</p> <p>4) Project Alert Core replaced the Life Skills Curriculum Level A in grade 6 during 2009-2010. Support in implementation of Booster lessons during 7th grade health will be needed during 2010-2011 school year.</p> <p>5) During 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 the implementation of Toward No Drug Abuse Curriculum in grade span 9-12 has been supported by the county technical assistance provider. Implementation during 2010-2011 will fall upon the 9th grade health teachers. (Appendix C)</p> <p>6) District support of activities K-12 that decrease bullying, harassment and fear.</p> <p>7) Continue to provide Gang Prevention Education to staff and parents</p> <p>8) Continue to provide Cyber Bullying Prevention Education to students, staff and parents.</p> |

| STRENGTHS | NEEDS |
|--|--|
| <p>5) The District has a K-6 Student Conduct Code and a 7-12 Student Conduct Code that is reviewed on an annual basis and revised as necessary. This document is provided to all parents. Pertinent sections are reviewed with teachers and other staff.</p> <p>6) There is a clear set of emergency procedures described in the District’s Emergency Crisis Response Plan. The plan includes detailed procedures for conducting various drills. The plan provides a record sheet where each site’s compliance with these “drill requirements” is recorded.</p> <p>7) The District’s Student Conduct Codes clearly define expectations regarding school attendance and the consequences for absenteeism and truancy. The District has a local School Attendance Review Board that meets regularly. The District also utilizes the county’s School Attendance Review Team when necessary.</p> <p>8) The Director of Categorical Programs facilitates Action Team Meetings and ongoing revision of the Power of One while offering support to the implementation of each year’s Action Plan.</p> | <p>9) The most resistant risk behavior at all grade spans is the abuse of alcohol. The need exists to expand the prevention message beyond the school and involve all stakeholders in the community.</p> |

Environments Conducive to Learning (Activities):

Please list the activities or programs supported by all NCLB or state funded programs that the LEA will implement to support students physically, socially, emotionally, intellectually, and psychologically in environments that are conducive to learning. Include programs and strategies designed to address students' barriers to learning (e.g. attendance and behavior). Include a copy of the LEA's code of conduct or policy regarding student behavior expectations.

ACTIVITIES

- 1) The district will maintain a Power of One link on its website at www.oakdale.k12.ca.us . This link will include a Parent Resource Guide.
- 2) The district will insure that each site designates a teacher liaison to attend ongoing district Action Team meetings. Junior high and high school sites will also designate student liaisons as well.
- 3) Red Ribbon Week at all sites will increase student awareness of the negative impacts of substance abuse while building community awareness of these same issues.
- 4) At least one assembly will be offered to each school each year that supports the Developmental Assets based approach to building resiliency within our students in order to lessen risk behavior.
- 5) Developmental Assets Training will be made available to K-12 school staff.
- 6) Challenge Day or similar programs will be offered at the Junior High and High School campuses.
- 7) A smokeless tobacco prevention program will be conducted annually at the high school. JH, 5th and 6th grade students.
- 8) A cigarette cessation program will be conducted annually at the high school.
- 9) A mechanism for ongoing discussion between staff and students related to school safety will be established at the junior high and high school.
- 10) Caring Schools Communities will be implemented at grades K-6.
- 11) The annual action plan will include staff training, parenting workshops, and student activities that address gang prevention.
- 12) Play it Safe Training will be offered to K-6 staff responsible for supervising before school, recess, and lunch play that will support the elimination of bullying and harassment on the playground.
- 13) The California Healthy Kids Survey will continue to be administered to grades 5, 7, 9, and 11 every other year.
- 14) District will continue to participate in and offer trainings, workshops, professional development that directly relate to the District's Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan.
- 15) The Action Team will work to expand the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan to increase community involvement.
- 16) The Action Team will support the evaluation and re-implementation of programs described in the District's Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan.
- 17) The High School Link Crew will adopt 6th grade classrooms. Weekly visits beginning in January and ending by May will provide the vehicle for delivery of Project Alert.
- 18) The District will support implementation of Project Alert Booster Lessons during 7th grade Health.
- 19) The District will support implementation of locally developed prevention powerpoints

during 8th grade PE classes.

- 20) The annual action plan will include staff development, parenting workshops, student activities, website resources to address bullying (including cyber bullying)
- 21) High School volunteers will provide support in homework clubs and enrichment offerings in existing after school programs at elementary schools.
- 22) Administration will review the Bullying/Harassment policy with their staff and students near the beginning of each school year.
- 23) Campus Monitors will support the high school campus..
- 24) OPD will support the elementary schools and junior high with requested presentations as their funding allows.
- 25) Modesto Pregnancy Center presentations will be made available to the junior high and high school health class teachers.
- 26) The district will provide sites information regarding the availability of community resources to support prevention curriculum and school safety.

Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.

Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) and Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE)

Prevention Program Performance Indicators (4115(a)(1)(B)):

The LEA is required to establish a biennial goal for all of the performance indicators listed below. List specific performance indicators for each grade level served, and for each listed measure, as well as the date of, and results from, the baseline administration of the Healthy Kids Survey:

| Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drug Use, and Violence Prevention Performance Measures From the California Healthy Kids Survey | Most Recent Survey date: December 2006 to December 2008 | Biennial Goal (Performance Indicator) |
|--|--|---|
| The percentage of students that have ever used cigarettes will decrease biennially by: | 5 th 6 to 3% 7 th 15 to 15% | 5 th 1% 7 th 1% |
| The percentage of students that have used cigarettes within the past 30 days will decrease biennially by: | 7 th 3 to 3% 9 th 13 to 8% 11 th 18 to 18% | 7 th 1% 9 th 1% 11 th 1% |
| The percentage of students that have used marijuana will decrease biennially by: | 5 th 1 to 1% 7 th 7 to 5% | 5 th 1% 7 th 1% |
| The percentage of students that have used alcohol within the past 30 days will decrease biennially by: | 7 th 14 to 16% 9 th 28 to 28% 11 th 49 to 40% | 7 th 1% 9 th 1% 11 th 1% |
| The percentage of students that have used marijuana within the past 30 days will decrease biennially by: | 7 th 3 to 2% 9 th 15 to 12% 11 th 23 to 20% | 7 th 1% 9 th 1% 11 th 1% |

| Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drug Use, and Violence Prevention Performance Measures From the California Healthy Kids Survey | Most Recent Survey date: 12/04/01 Baseline Data | Biennial Goal (Performance Indicator) |
|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students that feel very safe at school will increase biennially by: | 5 th 45 to 52 % 7 th 18 to 22 % 9 th 16 to 16 % 11 th 11 to 25 % | 5 th 1 % 7 th 1 % 9 th 1 % 11 th 1 % |
| The percentage of students that have been afraid of being beaten up during the past 12 months will decrease biennially by: | 7 th 31 to 27 % 9 th 26 to 21 % 11 th 15 to 13 % | 7 th 1 % 9 th 1 % 11 th 1 % |
| Truancy Performance Indicator | | |
| The percentage of students who have been truant will decrease annually by 1% from the current LEA rate shown here. NOTE: Calculate the percentage in the LEA by tallying the number of students who have been classified as truant during the school year per Education Code Section 48260.5, and dividing that total by the CBEDS enrollment for the same school year. | 54.63 to % | 1% |
| Protective Factors Performance Measures from the California Healthy Kids Survey | December 2006- December 2008 | Biennial Goal (Performance Indicator) |
| The percentage of students that report high levels of caring relationships with a teacher or other adult at their school will increase biennially by: | 5 th 61- 63% 7 th 18 to 36 % 9 th 16 to 35% 11 th 11 to 40 % | 5 th 1 % 7 th 1 % 9 th 1 % 11 th 1 % |

| Protective Factors Performance Measures from the California Healthy Kids Survey | December 2004 to December 2006 | Biennial Goal (Performance Indicator) |
|---|--|---|
| The percentage of students that report high levels of high expectations from a teacher or other adult at their school will increase biennially by: | 5 th 64 to 70% 7 th 44 to 61 % 9 th 34 to 53 % 11 th 40 to 50 % | 5 th 1 % 7 th 1 % 9 th 1 % 11 th 1 % |
| The percentage of students that report high levels of opportunities for meaningful participation at their school will increase biennially by: | 5 th 17 to 12% 7 th 14 to 9% 9 th 12 to 9 % 11 th 13 to 15 % | 5 th 1 % 7 th 1 % 9 th 1 % 11 th 1 % |
| The percentage of students that report high levels of school connectedness at their school will increase biennially by: | 5 th 57 to % 7 th 29 to 36% 9 th 23 to 30 % 11 th 29 to 36% | 5 th 2 % 7 th 2 % 9 th 2 % 11 th 2 % |

Other Performance Measures

List below any other performance measures and performance indicators the LEA has adopted specific to its prevention programs (drug, violence, truancy, school safety, etc.). Specify the performance measure, the performance indicator goal, and baseline data for that indicator.

| LEA Specified Performance Measures Locally developed School Connectedness Survey Administered and results compiled by high school AP stat students | Performance Indicator Goal | Baseline Data |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------|
| N/A | | |

Science Based Programs (4115 (a)(1)(C)):

The LEA must designate and list the science-based programs (programs proven by science to effectively prevent tobacco use, alcohol use, other drug use, and violence) selected from Appendix C. From Appendix C, list the scientifically based programs the LEA will adopt and implement to serve 50 percent or more of the students in the target grade levels. Indicate below your program selections, and provide all other requested information.

| Science-Based Program Name | Program ATODV Focus | Target Grade Levels | Target Population Size | Purchase Date | Staff Training Date | Start Date |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Caring Schools Communities | ATOD | K-6-4 | 2,489 | 2002-2003 | 2003-2004 | 2003-2004 |
| Minnesota Smoking Prevention | T | 5 | 400 | 2010-2011 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 |
| TEG and TAP (Cessation) - In lieu of suspension for tobacco related issues + offered voluntarily | T | 9-12 | 30 per year | 2004-2005 | 2004-2005 | 2004-2005 |
| Olweuss Bullying Prevention | V | K-12 | 5,100 | 2003-2004 | 2003-2004 | 2003-2004 |
| LifeSkills Curriculum Level 1 | ATDV | 6th | 400 | 2005-2006 | 2005-2006 | 2005-2006 |
| LifeSkills Curriculum Level 2 | ATDV | 7th | 400 | 2006-2007 | 2006-2007 | 2006-2007 |
| LifeSkills Curriculum Level 3 | ATDV | 8th | 400 | 2007-2008 | 2007-2008 | 2007-2008 |
| Project Alert | ATD | 6 th -7 th | 800 | 2009-2010 | 2009-2010 | 2009-2010 |
| Peacemakers | V | 7-12 | 2400 | 2007-2008 | 2007-2008 | 2007-2008 |
| Towards No Drug Abuse | ATDV | 9th | 400 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2008-2009 |

Research-based Activities (4115 (a)(1)(C)):

Based on the research cited in Appendix D, check the box for each activity the LEA will implement as part of the comprehensive prevention program and provide all other requested information.

| Check | Activities | Program ATODV Focus | Target Grade Levels |
|-------|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| X | After School Programs ASES | ATODV | K-8 |
| X | Conflict Mediation/Resolution <i>Locally developed program grades K-6</i> <i>Peace Makers (7-12)</i> | V | K-12 |
| | Early Intervention and Counseling | | |
| X | Environmental Strategies <i>Campus Monitors at JH/HS</i> <i>Training K-6 recess staff</i> | ATODV | K-12 |
| X | Family and Community Collaboration <i>CSC – Homeside Activities Grade 4</i> <i>District Website</i> <i>Parent Training to increase parent involvement</i> | ATODV | K-12 |
| X | Media Literacy and Advocacy <i>PHAST Clubs 7-12</i> <i>Tobacco Prevention Presentation for 5th grade</i> | | 5-12 |
| X | Mentoring <i>High School mentors working in After School Programs</i> | ATODV | K-12 |
| X | Peer-Helping and Peer Leaders <i>Adopt a Class</i> <i>5th grade tobacco presentations by OHS</i> <i>PHAST Club members</i> <i>Spit Tobacco</i> <i>9th Grade Tobacco Education</i> | ATODV | 7-12 |
| X | Positive Alternatives Cessation Classes at HS in lieu of suspension | | |
| X | School Policies <i>District level annual review with site leaders</i> <i>Site leaders review annually with staff</i> <i>Staff reviews annually with students</i> | ATODV | K-12 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------|------|
| | <i>Focus on Cyber Bullying policy</i> | | |
| X | Service-Learning/Community Service <i>After School Programs</i> <i>S Club at high school</i> | | K-12 |
| X | Tobacco-Use Cessation <i>Spit Tobacco Program at JH/HS</i> <i>TEG and TAP via competitive 9-12 TUPE Grant</i> | T | 9-12 |
| X | Youth Development <i>Caring Schools Communities: Ways We Want Our Class to Be (Class Meetings) K-6</i> <i>Towards No Violence (6th Grade)</i> | ATODV | K-12 |
| X | Other Activities <i>Annual Assembly (K-6)</i> <i>Annual Assembly (7-8)</i> <i>Annual Assembly (9-12)</i> <i>Secrets Assembly (9th)</i> <i>Modesto Pregnancy Center presentations (7th and 9th)</i> | ATODV | K-12 |

Promising or Favorable Programs (4115 (a)(3)):

The LEA may – but is not required to – designate and list the promising or favorable programs (programs whose effectiveness is not as strongly established through scientific evidence) selected from Appendix E. From Appendix E, list the promising or favorable programs the LEA will adopt and implement to serve 50 percent or more of the students in the target grade levels. Indicate below your program selections, and provide all other requested information.

| Promising Program name | Program ATODV Focus | Target Grade Levels | Target Population Size | Purchase Date | Staff Training Date | Start Date |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------|
| N/A | | | | | | |

Waiver to Adopt Promising or Favorable Programs not listed in Appendix E:

Check the box below if the LEA will submit an application for waiver in order to include other promising or favorable programs not found in Appendix E. Programs not listed in Appendix E will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The LEA must demonstrate that the program for which a waiver is requested is legitimately innovative or demonstrates substantial likelihood of success. The CDE will provide under separate cover additional information and the forms for submitting a waiver request.

Analysis of Data for Selection of Programs and Activities (4115 (a)(1)(D)):

For each selected Appendix C programs or Appendix D activities, provide a brief narrative rationale based on the LEA’s analysis of CSS, CHKS, and CSSA data related to why the LEA selected these programs and activities for implementation.

The district has selected and plans to implement the following programs:

TNT – Towards No Tobacco Use:

Caring Schools Communities: The Action Team reviewed research, and decided to choose a Developmental Assets based program for the K-6 grade span. Supporting the implementation at all grades for all components is prohibitive. The Action Team decided to focus the implementation to grade 4/Homeside Activities – focusing on increased connection to school/home and supporting refusal skills.

Life Skills: Upon review the Action Team found that Life Skills was found to be effective with a demographic base comparable to Oakdale and was found to be an effective deterrent to binge drinking and other drug experimentation. Life Skills Level 1 is delivered via the Adopt a Class Program to 6th graders, Level 2 is delivered to 7th grade students in their Health Class, and Level 3 is delivered during 8th grade PE. Life Skills was replaced with Project Alert during the 2009-2010 school year.

Project Alert: Project Alert core lessons are delivered to all 6th grade students by trained high school leadership students. The Booster Lessons are delivered the following year during 7th grade Health Classes.

Conflict Resolution Training: A locally developed program is made available to elementary sites annually. Peacemakers curriculum is delivered to identified student mediators in grades 7-12.

Environmental Strategies: Campus Monitors are in place at the junior high and high school

TEG/TAP : OJUSD receives competitive TUPE competitive grant funding. A teacher site coordinator oversees the implementation of these as well as monthly activities.

Olweuss Bullying Prevention: Initially, bullying and harassment findings were higher than state and national averages. The Action Team reviewed research, and decided to choose Olweuss Bullying Prevention. This model was used to create a district Bullying Prevention Program. The program will be expanded if competitive grant funding is received. This model is the basis for training our K-6 recess staff (Appendix E).

ASES After School Programs: Upon review of the CHKS findings, one goal contained within the district's 5 year comprehensive plan was to expand existing after school programs. 3 of 4 elementary sites along with Oakdale Junior High are now ASES funded. All four elementary sites and the junior high provide latchkey services until 6 pm each night. These programs are developed by the principals. Elementary ASES funded programs are managed by 6 hour ASP Managers.

District Website: The vision of "The Power of One – to Impact All" is one of an entire community that is rich in Developmental Assets. The District website will continue to expand to provide parents a valuable resource.

Parent Training: It is the intent to survey parents annually and use that input along with advisement of the Action Team and Strategic Plan input to select parent workshop offerings each year.

Adopt a Class: The high school Leadership Class adopts 6th grade elementary classrooms. They deliver Project Alert curriculum beginning in January each year. Local surveys of 6th grade students and their teachers reflect a very high level of satisfaction and perceived impact of this program.

Spit Tobacco Program: (after the research-based model developed by Peggy Walsh out of University of San Francisco). Studies have shown that participants in this program are twice as likely to quit and sustain non-use as non-program participants. The district participated in a pilot program that was sponsored and funded by UCSF during the 2002-03 school year. Upon review of the pilot program by the Action Team, there was unanimous agreement to implement the program each semester during the required Health Class for 7th and 9th graders. Although the initial study was conducted among college level athletes, the National Institute of Health funded Dr. Walsh to expand her study to include high school age males. Given the fact that the district was allowed to keep all the materials provided by UCSF- except the consumable items – the cost to the district is relatively small. The district has since updated the presentations annually following the UCSF model.

District Staff Training: The district's need to decrease Alcohol, Drug, and Tobacco Use as well as the needs to increase school connectedness and decrease harassment will be supported through District Staff Training.

Media Literacy and Advocacy: Components of the PHAST Club in place at OHS and Project TND as well as Project Alert include lessons on this topic.

Tobacco Cessation Classes: Tobacco Cessation classes are provided via the TUPE grant. Students receiving disciplinary action may take this class in lieu of suspension. Students may also volunteer to take the class. The class is provided during the school day.

Policy Review: Site Administrators are responsible to review district policy related to bullying, harassment, and drug/alcohol with staff and students. Parents annually receive this policy in the beginning of the year packets. Annual newsletters related supporting Power of One implementation provides opportunity to participate in the Parenting Workshops being offered.

Annual Assemblies: The district provides at least one assembly per grade span at each site supporting the goals of the Power of One. Recommendations are made by the Action Team annually as funds allow. Site Administrators have final say in the assembly to be

delivered.

Evaluation and Continuous Improvement (4115 (a)(2)(A)):

Provide a description for how the LEA will conduct regular evaluations of the effectiveness of the LEA’s alcohol, tobacco, other drug use and violence prevention program. Describe how the results of the evaluation will be used to refine, improve and strengthen the program.

Data Collection Timeline:

1) The district administers the CHKS to grades 5,7,9, and 11 during December of even years in order to support the countywide administration plan.

2) After implementation of each program, input from implementers and program participants will be gathered and reviewed by the Action Team. The following program evaluation questions are used: Is the program effective as measured? Is the program being implemented as planned? If not, what are the barriers to the implementation and how can these barriers be overcome? Does the program need revision? If so, what revision? Should a different program be adopted? These Action Team discussions in conjunction with review of CHKS directly impact the revision of the LEA Plan Performance Goal 4.

Reporting Timeline: 1) The Action Team will review, analyze, and compile a report on the effectiveness of the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan by the end of March each year. 2) The report and recommended revisions to the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan and LEA Plan Performance Goal 4 will be presented to Superintendent’s Council by the end of April. 3) The report and recommended revisions to the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan will be presented to the School Board by the end of June. 4) The report and recommended revisions to the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan will be presented to sites and sites will be guided through Single Site Plan revisions that address any identified concerns by the end of November. 5) Key Findings and Program Changes/Additions will be shared with the public via newspaper reports, television coverage of the School Board Meeting, district website, and ongoing district “Power of One” newsletters.

(4115 (a)(2)(B)):

Describe the steps and timeline the LEA will use to publicly report progress toward attaining performance measures for the SDFSC and TUPE programs. Describe how the evaluation results will be made available to the public including how the public will be provided notice of the evaluation result's availability.

- 1) The Action Team will review, analyze, and compile a report on the effectiveness of the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan by the end of March.
- 2) The report and recommended revisions to the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan will be presented to the Principal's Meeting by the end of April.
- 3) The report and recommended revisions to the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan will be presented to the School Board by the end of May.
- 4) The report and recommended revisions to the Safe and Drug Free Prevention Program Plan will be presented to sites and sites will be guided through Single Site Plan revisions that address any identified concerns by the end of November.
- 5) Key Findings and Program Changes/Additions will be shared with the public via newspaper reports, television coverage of the School Board Meeting, District website, and ongoing district "Power of One" newsletters.

Mandatory Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (4114(d)(2)(E)):

Briefly describe how SDFSC funded program services will be targeted to the LEA's schools and students with the greatest need. (Section 4114 [d][3])

- The Action Team conducts a thorough needs analysis utilizing CHKS data. This along with Strategic Plan objectives identify the areas to address. An annual Power of One Action Plan is developed. This Action Plan directs district resources and spending.

Coordination of All Programs (4114 (d)(2)(A)):

Provide a detailed, but brief, explanation of how the LEA will coordinate SDFSC funded alcohol, tobacco, other drug and violence prevention programs with other federal state and local prevention programs.

Our district Action Team will include members directly responsible for the implementation of programs funded by:

- TUPE (Site TUPE Coordinators)
- SCVP Grant (Director of Categorical Programs/SCOE Consortium Liaison)
- ASES (Director of Categorical Programs)

Additionally, the following resource people/stakeholders will be encouraged to participate in collaborative prevention events such as the Drugstore Project:

- Representative from the Parks and Recreation Department
- Representative from the Family Support Network
- Representative from the local business community
- Oakdale Police Department
- Oakdale Fire Department
- County sheriff, probation, etc.
- Representative from the local ministerial association
- Site liaisons (teachers and students) from sites

Coordination of SDFSC funds and other federal, state, and local funds is aligned to the annual Action Plan and facilitated by the Director of Categorical Programs. is

Parent Involvement (4115 (a)(1)(e)):

Provide a brief, but detailed, description of the parent involvement and describe the parent notification procedures used to meet requirements under NCLB Title IV, Part A – SDFSC program.

Parents are involved in our district at many levels:

- Members of the District Action Team
- Members of the school site teams responsible for developing and revising the Single School Plan
- Volunteers to support activities supporting Safe and Drug Free Schools (as described in Site Plans or District Safe and Drug Free School Plan) and including but not limited to Red Ribbon Week, Adopt a Class, and Point Break.
- PTA/PTC
- District Parent Involvement Committee

NOTE: Parent Choice Options and Safe School Status are in place to meet the required timelines indicated by NCLB. Letters will be

mailed to every parent in the district yearly to notify them of their options.

TUPE Services for Pregnant Minors and Minor Parents (H&SC 104460):

Describe the TUPE services and referral procedures for pregnant minors and minor parents enrolled in the LEA and how they will be provided with tobacco-use prevention services. Include students participating in programs such as the California School Age Families Education (Cal-SAFE) program, the Adolescent Family Life Program (AFLP) administered through the Department of Health Services, and the Cal-Learn program administered by the Department of Social Services.

Once the district identifies pregnant minors or minor parents they are scheduled to meet with a counselor from their school. The counselor assesses what services are needed, including whether the minor uses tobacco or has family members who use tobacco products. Pregnant minors are then provided the opportunity to participate in the Tobacco Cessation Program offered in the district. The district will also work in conjunction with other community and county-based organizations and will refer the minors to the appropriate supporting organization as needed on a one by one basis. The site counselor will provide case management to the adolescent to assure that linkages are completed and follow-up is provided.

TUPE Funded Positions (Health & Safety Code 104420(b)(3)):

Provide full time equivalent (FTE) staffing configuration for all TUPE funded positions. (Health and Safety Code section 104420 [b](3))

| Position/Title | Full time equivalent |
|--|-----------------------|
| Oakdale Junior High School TUPE Coordinator | \$2000 annual stipend |
| Oakdale High School TUPE Coordinator | \$2000 annual stipend |
| | |

Performance Goal 5: *All students will graduate from high school.*

Planned Improvements: High School Graduation Rates, Dropouts, and AP

This section of the plan is intended to reflect the LEA’s efforts to reduce the percentage of students dropping out of school, and therefore, increase the percentage of students who graduate from high school. Also include a description below of the LEA’s efforts to ensure that all students have equal access to advanced placement (AP) opportunities.

| Performance Indicator | Activities/Actions | Students Served | Timeline/ Person(s) Involved | Benchmarks/ Evaluation | Funding Source |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| 5.1 (High School Graduates) | <p>A comprehensive action plan will be developed by each High School to include: All Sophomores will receive one on one guidance counseling services to evaluate their progress towards graduation and develop written career/college paths and parents will be invited to participate through a written invitation.</p> <p>Each semester counselors will review to identify students who are failing courses and develop a remedial plan if needed.</p> | <p>All 10th graders</p> <p>All Students</p> | <p>Prior to end of 3rd quarter/ ALL Counselors</p> <p>Quarterly/ All Counselors</p> | <p>100% of all 10th graders will meet with a counselor to review progress</p> <p>Counselor Logs</p> | <p>10th grade State Counseling funds and additional state counseling funding</p> <p>Counseling funds</p> |
| 5.2 (Dropouts) | <p>Each high school will develop a plan to monitor students who are in danger of dropping out. The plan will also include a follow-up process once a student stops attending school.</p> | All Students | <p>Plan to be developed during the first and second quarters / Counselors, Site Admin.</p> | <p>Presenting Plan to Supt. Council and School Site Council</p> | <p>CAHSEE and counseling funds</p> |
| 5.3 (Advanced Placement) | <p>The district currently has a comprehensive GATE plan which includes a component to identify students who qualify for Honors, Pre AP, Accelerated and AP classes. The site reviews multiple assessments to determine this eligibility.</p> | All Students | <p>Twice a year Fall/Spring Department Chairs, Teachers, Counselors, Principal and Assistant Principals</p> | <p>Sites will report annually to the PPS Coord. of all students assessed and those that have qualified</p> | <p>Site Funds, counseling, and GATE funds</p> |

Part III

Assurances and Attachments

Assurances

Signature Page

Appendix

Appendix A: California's NCLB Performance Goals and Performance Indicators

Appendix B: Links to Data Web sites

Appendix C: Science-Based Programs

Appendix D: Research-based Activities

Appendix E: Promising or Favorable Programs

ASSURANCES

To assure the LEA's eligibility for funds included in this Plan, the Superintendent must provide an original signature below attesting to compliance with all of the following statements.

GENERAL ASSURANCES

1. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications.
2. The LEA will comply with all applicable supplement not supplant and maintenance of effort requirements.
3. (a) The control of funds provided under each program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a non-profit private agency, institution, organization, or Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; (b) the public agency, non-profit private agency, institution or organization, or Indian tribe will administer the funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law.
4. The LEA will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including – (a) the enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program; and (b) the correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation.
5. The LEA will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by, or for, the State educational agency, the Secretary, or other Federal officials.
6. The LEA will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the applicant under each such program.
7. The LEA will – (a) submit such reports to the State educational agency (which shall make the reports available to the Governor) and the Secretary as the State educational agency and Secretary may require to enable the State educational agency and Secretary to perform their duties under each such program; and (b) maintain such records, provide such information, and afford such access to the records as the State educational agency (after consultation with the Governor) or the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out the State educational agency's or the Secretary's duties.
8. The LEA has consulted with teachers, school administrators, parents, and others in the development of the local consolidated application/LEA Plan to the extent required under Federal law governing each program included in the consolidated application/LEA Plan.
9. Before the application was submitted, the LEA afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the application and considered such comment.

- 9a. The LEA will provide the certification on constitutionally protected prayer that is required by section 9524.
10. The LEA will comply with the armed forces recruiter access provisions required by section 9528.

TITLE I, PART A

The LEA, hereby, assures that it will:

11. Participate, if selected, in the State National Assessment of Educational Progress in 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics carried out under section 411(b)(2) of the National Education Statistics Act of 1994.
12. If the LEA receives more than \$500,000 in Title I funds, it will allow 1% to carry out NCLB Section 1118, Parent Involvement, including promoting family literacy and parenting skills; 95% of the allocation will be distributed to schools.
13. Inform eligible schools and parents of schoolwide program authority and the ability of such schools to consolidate funds from Federal, State, and local sources.
14. Provide technical assistance and support to schoolwide programs.
15. Work in consultation with schools as the schools develop the schools' plans pursuant to section 1114 and assist schools as the schools implement such plans or undertake activities pursuant to section 1115 so that each school can make adequate yearly progress toward meeting the State student academic achievement standards.
16. Fulfill such agency's school improvement responsibilities under section 1116, including taking actions under paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 1116(b).
17. Provide services to eligible children attending private elementary schools and secondary schools in accordance with section 1120, and timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials regarding such services.
18. Take into account the experience of model programs for the educationally disadvantaged, and the findings of relevant scientifically based research indicating that services may be most effective if focused on students in the earliest grades at schools that receive funds under this part.
19. In the case of an LEA that chooses to use funds under this part to provide early childhood development services to low-income children below the age of compulsory school attendance, ensure that such services comply with the performance standards established under section 641A(a) of the Head Start Act.
20. Work in consultation with schools as the schools develop and implement their plans or activities under sections 1118 and 1119 and *California Education Code Section 64001*.
21. Comply with requirements regarding the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals and professional development.

22. Inform eligible schools of the local educational agency's authority to obtain waivers on the school's behalf under Title IX.
23. Coordinate and collaborate, to the extent feasible and necessary as determined by the local educational agency, with the State educational agency and other agencies providing services to children, youth, and families with respect to a school in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 if such a school requests assistance from the local educational agency in addressing major factors that have significantly affected student achievement at the school.
24. Ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers.
25. Use the results of the student academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3), and other measures or indicators available to the agency, to review annually the progress of each school served by the agency and receiving funds under this part to determine whether all of the schools are making the progress necessary to ensure that all students will meet the State's proficient level of achievement on the State academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) within 12 years from the baseline year described in section 1111(b)(2)(E)(ii).
26. Ensure that the results from the academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) will be provided to parents and teachers as soon as is practicably possible after the test is taken, in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language or other mode of communication that the parents can understand.
27. Assist each school served by the agency and assisted under this part in developing or identifying examples of high-quality, effective curricula consistent with section 1111(b)(8)(D) and *California Education Code Section 64001*.
28. Ensure that schools in school improvement status spend not less than ten percent of their Title I funds to provide professional development (in the area[s] of identification to teachers and principals) for each fiscal year.
29. Prepare and disseminate an annual LEA report card in accordance with section 1111(h)(2).
30. Where applicable, the applicant will comply with the comparability of services requirement under section 1120A(c). In the case of a local educational agency to which comparability applies, the applicant has established and implemented an agency-wide salary schedule; a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in teachers, administrators, and other staff; and a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in the provision of curriculum materials and instructional supplies. Documentation will be on file to demonstrate that the salary schedule and local policies result in comparability and will be updated biennially.

TITLE I, PART D – SUBPART 2

31. Where feasible, ensure that educational programs in the correctional facility are coordinated with the student's home school, particularly with respect to a student with an individualized education program under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

32. Work to ensure that the correctional facility is staffed with teachers and other qualified staffs that are trained to work with children and youth with disabilities taking into consideration the unique needs of such children and youth.
33. Ensure that the educational programs in the correctional facility are related to assisting students to meet high academic achievement standards.

TITLE II, PART A

34. The LEA, hereby, assures that:

- The LEA will target funds to schools within the jurisdiction of the local educational agency that:
(A) have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers;
(B) have the largest average class size; or
(C) are identified for school improvement under section 1116(b).
- The LEA will comply with section 9501 (regarding participation by private school children and teachers).
- The LEA has performed the required assessment of local needs for professional development and hiring, taking into account the activities that need to be conducted in order to give teachers the means, including subject matter knowledge and pedagogy skills, and to give principals the instructional leadership skills to help teachers, to provide students with the opportunity to meet California's academic content standards. This needs assessment was conducted with the involvement of teachers, including teachers participating in programs under Part A of Title I.
- The LEA will assure compliance with the requirements of professional development as defined in section 9101 (34).

TITLE II, PART D

35. The LEA has an updated, local, long-range, strategic, educational technology plan in place that includes the following:
 - Strategies for using technology to improve academic achievement and teacher effectiveness.
 - Goals aligned with challenging state standards for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement.
 - Steps the applicant will take to ensure that all students and teachers have increased access to technology and to help ensure that teachers are prepared to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.
 - Promotion of curricula and teaching strategies that integrate technology, are based on a review of relevant research, and lead to improvements in student academic achievement.
 - Ongoing, sustained professional development for teachers, principals, administrators, and school library media personnel to further the effective use of technology in the classroom or library media center.

- A description of the type and costs of technology to be acquired with Ed Tech funds, including provisions for interoperability of components.
 - A description of how the applicant will coordinate activities funded through the Ed Tech program with technology-related activities supported with funds from other sources.
 - A description of how the applicant will integrate technology into curricula and instruction, and a timeline for this integration.
 - Innovative delivery strategies – a description of how the applicant will encourage the development and use of innovative strategies for the delivery of specialized or rigorous courses and curricula through the use of technology, including distance learning technologies, particularly in areas that would not otherwise have access to such courses or curricula due to geographical distances or insufficient resources.
 - A description of how the applicant will use technology effectively to promote parental involvement and increase communication with parents.
 - Collaboration with adult literacy service providers.
 - Accountability measures – a description of the process and accountability measures that the applicant will use to evaluate the extent to which activities funded under the program are effective in integrating technology into curricula and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach, and enabling student to reach challenging state academic standards.
 - Supporting resources – a description of the supporting resources, such as services, software, other electronically delivered learning materials, and print resources that will be acquired to ensure successful and effective uses of technology.
36. The LEA must use a minimum of 25 percent of their funds to provide ongoing, sustained, and intensive high quality professional development in the integration of advanced technology into curricula and instruction and in using those technologies to create new learning environments.
37. **Any LEA that does not receive services at discount rates under section 254(h)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254(h)(5)) hereby assures the SEA** that the LEA will not use any Title II, Part D funds to purchase computers used to access the Internet, or to pay for direct costs associated with accessing the Internet, for such school unless the school, school board, local educational agency, or other authority with responsibility for administration of such school:
- has in place a policy of Internet safety for minors that includes the operation of a technology protection measure with respect to any of its computers with Internet access that protects against access through such computers to visual depictions that are obscene, child pornography, or harmful to minors; and
 - is enforcing the operation of such technology protection measure during any use of such computers by minors; and
 - has in place a policy of Internet safety that includes the operation of a technology protection measure with respect to any of its computers with Internet access that protects against access through such computers to visual depictions that are obscene or child pornography, and is enforcing the operation of such technology protection measure during any use of such computers.
 - Any LEA that does receive such discount rates hereby assures the SEA that it will have in place a policy of Internet safety for minors required by Federal or State law.

TITLE III

38. The LEA assures that it consulted with teachers, researchers, school administrators, parents, and, if appropriate, with education-related community groups, nonprofit organizations, and institutions of higher education in developing the LEA Plan.
39. The LEA will hold elementary and secondary schools accountable for increasing English language proficiency and for LEP subgroups making adequate yearly progress.
40. The LEA is complying with Section 3302 prior to, and throughout, each school year.
41. The LEA annually will assess the English proficiency of all students with limited English proficiency participating in programs funded under this part.
42. The LEA has based its proposed plan on scientifically based research on teaching limited-English-proficient students.
43. The LEA ensures that the programs will enable to speak, read, write, and comprehend the English language and meet challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
44. The LEA is not in violation of any State law, including State constitutional law, regarding the education of limited-English-proficient students, consistent with Sections 3126 and 3127.

TITLE IV, PART A

45. The LEA assures that it has developed its application through timely and meaningful consultation with State and local government representatives, representatives of schools to be served (including private schools), teachers and other staff, parents, students, community-based organizations, and others with relevant and demonstrated expertise in drug and violence prevention activities (such as medical, mental health, and law enforcement professionals).
46. The activities or programs to be funded comply with the principles of effectiveness described in section 4115(a) and foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
47. The LEA assures that funds under this subpart will be used to increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of funds under this subpart, be made available for programs and activities authorized under this subpart, and in no case supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds.
48. Drug and violence prevention programs supported under this subpart convey a clear and consistent message that acts of violence and the illegal use of drugs are wrong and harmful.
49. The LEA has, or the schools to be served have, a plan for keeping schools safe and drug-free that includes:
 - Appropriate and effective school discipline policies that prohibit disorderly conduct, the illegal possession of weapons, and the illegal use, possession, distribution, and sale of tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs by students.

- Security procedures at school and while students are on the way to and from school.
- Prevention activities that are designed to create and maintain safe, disciplined, and drug-free environments.
- A crisis management plan for responding to violent or traumatic incidents on school grounds.
- A code of conduct policy for all students that clearly states the responsibilities of students, teachers, and administrators in maintaining a classroom environment that:
 - Allows a teacher to communicate effectively with all students in the class.
 - Allows all students in the class to learn.
 - Has consequences that are fair, and developmentally appropriate.
 - Considers the student and the circumstances of the situation.
 - Is enforced accordingly.

50. The application and any waiver request under section 4115(a)(3) (to allow innovative activities or programs that demonstrate substantial likelihood of success) will be available for public review after submission of the application.

TITLE IV, PART A, SUBPART 3

51. The LEA assures that it has, in effect, a written policy providing for the suspension from school for a period of not less than one year of any student who is determined to have brought a firearm to school or who possesses a firearm at school and the referral of a student who has brought a weapon or firearm to the criminal or juvenile justice system. Such a policy may allow the Superintendent to modify such suspension requirement for a student on a case-by-case basis.

TITLE V, PART A

52. The LEA has provided, in the allocation of funds for the assistance authorized by this part and in the planning, design, and implementation of such innovative assistance programs, for systematic consultation with parents of children attending elementary schools and secondary schools in the area served by the LEA, with teachers and administrative personnel in such schools, and with such other groups involved in the implementation of this part (such as librarians, school counselors, and other pupil services personnel) as may be considered appropriate by the LEA.

53. The LEA will comply with this Part, including the provisions of section 5142 concerning the participation of children enrolled in private nonprofit schools.

54. The LEA will keep such records, and provide such information to the SEA, as may be reasonably required for fiscal audit and program evaluation.

55. The LEA will annually evaluate the programs carried out under this Part, and that evaluation:

- will be used to make decisions about appropriate changes in programs for the subsequent year;

- will describe how assistance under this part affected student academic achievement and will include, at a minimum, information and data on the use of funds, the types of services furnished, and the students served under this part; and
- will be submitted to the SEA at the time and in the manner requested by the SEA.

New LEAP Assurances

56. Uniform Management Information and Reporting System: the LEA assures that it will provide to the California Department of Education (CDE) information for the uniform management information and reporting system required by No Child Left Behind, Title IV in the format prescribed by CDE. That information will include:

- (i) truancy rates;
- (ii) the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions in elementary schools and secondary schools in the State;
- (iii) the types of curricula, programs, and services provided by the chief executive officer, the State educational agency, local educational agencies, and other recipients of funds under this subpart; and
- (iv) the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth in schools and communities. (Section 4112, General Provisions, Title IV, Part A, PL 107-110)

57. Unsafe School Choice Policy: the LEA assures that it will establish and implement a policy requiring that a student attending a persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school, as determined by the State, or who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of a public elementary school or secondary school that the student attends, be allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school. The LEA will submit on a format to be designated by CDE the information the state requires to complete annual federal reporting requirements on the number of schools that have been designated “persistently dangerous” in accordance with California State Board of Education policy. (Section 9532, General Provisions, Title IX, PL 107-110.)

Other

58. The LEA assures that a minimum of 95% of all students and a minimum number of students in each subgroup (at both the school and district levels) will participate in the state’s assessments program.

SIGNATURE PAGE

Fred Rich
Print Name of Superintendent

Signature of Superintendent

Date

APPENDIX A

On May 30, 2002, the California State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the five goals and 12 performance indicators for No Child Left Behind, as set forth in the Federal Register Notice of May 22, 2002. The SBE's adoption of the specified goals and performance indicators represents California's commitment to the development of an accountability system to achieve the goals of NCLB.

Collectively, NCLB's goals, performance indicators, and performance targets constitute California's framework for ESEA *accountability*. The framework provides the basis for the state's improvement efforts, informing policy decisions by the SBE and implementation efforts by the California Department of Education (CDE) to fully realize the system envisioned by NCLB; it also provides a basis for coordination with the State Legislature and the Governor's Office.

California's NCLB Performance Goals and Performance Indicators

Performance Goal 1: *All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics, by 2013-2014.*

- 1.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are above the proficient level in reading on the State's assessment. (These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).)
- 1.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment. (These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(C)(i).)
- 1.3 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

Performance Goal 2: *All limited-English-proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.*

- 2.1. **Performance indicator:** The percentage of limited-English-proficient Students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.
- 2.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of limited-English-proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.

- 2.3 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of limited-English-proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State’s assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

Performance Goal 3: *By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.*

- 3.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. (See definition of “professional development” in section 9101(34).)
- 3.3 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parent involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

Performance Goal 4: *All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.*

- 4.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: *All students will graduate from high school.*

- 5.1 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students who graduate from high school, with a regular diploma:
- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; and,
 - calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.
- 5.2 **Performance indicator:** The percentage of students who drop out of school:
- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; and
 - calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

APPENDIX B

Links to Data Web sites

Below is a listing of Web site links for accessing district-level data and information to be used by the LEA in developing this Plan:

- Academic Performance Index (API)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/psaa/api/index.htm>
- California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/coord/>
- California English Language Development Test (CELDT)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/celdt/celdt.html>
- California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/cahsee/eval/eval.html>
- California Standardized Test (CST)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/index.html>
- DataQuest
<http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>
- School Accountability Report Card (SARC)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ope/sarc/>
- Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/star/index.html>

APPENDIX C

Science-Based Programs

Science-based research has provided evidence of effectiveness for the following school-based prevention programs. Each of the listed programs have been identified as a research-validated, exemplary, or model program by one or more of the following agencies: The California Healthy Kids Resource Center, the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, United States Department of Education's Expert Panel, or the University of Colorado's Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. Some of these programs are also discussed in the California Department of Education's publication Getting Results. Websites where additional information can be found about each program's description, target population, and outcomes are listed below. The code in the last column of the menu provides a quick reference indicating which websites have information specific to each program.

A: < <http://www.californiahealthykids.org> > (California Healthy Kids Resource Center: Research-Validated Programs)

B: < <http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/model/overview.html> > (University of Colorado: Blueprints)

C: < http://modelprograms.samhsa.gov/model_prog.cfm > (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention: Model Programs)

D: < <http://www2.edc.org/msc/model.asp> > (United States Department of Education: Expert Panel)

E: < <http://www.gettingresults.org/> > (Getting Results)

School-Based Programs

| Intended program outcomes and target grade levels. See research for proven effectiveness | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------|---------|-------|----------|------------|---------------|
| Name | Grade | Alcohol | Tobacco | Drugs | Violence | Youth Dev. | Website |
| Across Ages | 4 to 8 | x | x | x | | x | C, |
| All Stars™ | 6 to 8 | x | x | x | | | A, C, D, E |
| ATLAS (Athletes Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids) | 9 to 12 | x | | x | | | A, B, C, D, |
| Border Binge Drinking Reduction Program | K to 12 | x | | | x | | C, |
| Child Development Project/Caring School Community | K to 6 | x | | x | x | x | A, B, C, D, E |
| Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Child Sexual Abuse | Families | | | | x | | C |
| Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Child Traumatic Stress | Families | | | | x | | C |
| Coping Power | 5 to 8 | | | x | x | | C |
| DARE To Be You | Pre-K | x | | x | x | x | A, C, |
| Early Risers Skills for Success | K to 6 | | | | x | | C, |
| East Texas Experiential Learning Center | 7 | x | x | x | x | x | C |
| Friendly PEERsuasion | 6 to 8 | x | | | | | C |
| Good Behavior Game | 1 to 6 | | | | x | | B, C |
| High/Scope Perry Preschool Project | Pre-K | | | | x | x | B, C, E |
| I Can Problem Solve | Pre-K | | | | x | | A, B, D |
| Incredible Years | K to 3 | | | | x | x | B, C, |
| Keep A Clear Mind | 4 to 6 | x | x | | | | A, C, |
| Leadership and Resiliency | 9 to 12 | | | | | x | C, |
| Botvin's LifeSkills™ Training | 6 to 8 | x | x | x | x | | A, B, C, D, E |
| Lions-Quest Skills for Adolescence | 6 to 8 | | | | | x | D, C, E |
| Minnesota Smoking Prevention Program | 6 to 10 | | x | | | | A, D, E |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|---------|-------|----------|------------|---------------|
| Olweus Bullying Prevention | K to 8 | | | | x | | B, C, E |
| Positive Action | K to 12 | x | x | x | x | x | C, D, |
| Project ACHIEVE | Pre-K to 8 | | | | x | x | A, C, E |
| Project ALERT | 6 to 8 | x | x | x | | | A, C, D, E |
| Project Northland | 6 to 8 | x | | x | | | A, B, C, D, E |
| Project PATHE | 9 to 12 | | | | | x | B, E |
| Project SUCCESS | 9 to 12 | x | x | x | | | C, |
| Project Toward No Drug Abuse (TND) | 9 to 12 | x | x | x | x | | C, |
| Project Toward No Tobacco Use (TNT) | 5 to 8 | | x | | | | A, C, D, E |
| Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) | K to 6 | | | | x | | A, B, C, D, |
| Protecting You/Protecting Me | K to 5 | x | | | | | C, |
| Quantum Opportunities | 9 to 12 | | | | | x | B, E |
| Reconnecting Youth | 9 to 12 | x | | x | x | x | A, C, E |
| Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways | 6 to 12 | | | x | x | | C, D, E |
| Rural Educational Achievement Project | 4 | | | | x | | C |
| School Violence Prevention Demonstration Program | 5 to 8 | | | | x | | C |
| Second Step | Pre-K to 8 | | | | x | | A, C, D, |
| Skills, Opportunities, and Recognition (SOAR): Seattle Social Development Project: | K to 6 | x | | | x | x | B, C, D, E |
| SMART Leaders | 9 to 12 | | | x | | | C |
| Social Competence Promotion Program for Young Adolescents (SCPP-YA) | 5 to 7 | | | x | | | C |
| Start Taking Alcohol Risks Seriously (STARS) for Families | 6 to 8 | x | | | | | C, |
| Students Managing Anger and Resolution Together (SMART) Team | 6 to 9 | | | | x | | C, D, |
| Too Good for Drugs | K to 12 | x | x | x | x | | C |
| Community and Family-based Programs | | | | | | | |
| | Intended program outcomes and target setting. See research for proven effectiveness | | | | | | |
| Name | Target Population | Alcohol | Tobacco | Drugs | Violence | Youth Dev. | Website |
| Big Brothers Big Sisters | Community | | | | | x | B, E |
| Brief Strategic Family Therapy | Families | | | x | | | B, C, |
| CASASTART | Community | | | x | x | | B, C, D, |
| Communities Mobilizing for Change | Community | x | | | | | C |
| Creating Lasting Family Connections | Families (6 to 12) | x | | x | | x | A, C, D, |
| Families And Schools Together (FAST) | Families | | | | x | | C, |
| Family Development Research Project | Families | | | | x | | C |
| Family Effectiveness Training | Families | | | | x | | C, |
| Family Matters | Families | x | x | | | | C |
| FAN (Family Advocacy Network) Club | Families | | | x | | x | C |
| Functional Family Therapy | Families | x | | x | x | | B, E |
| Home-Based Behavioral Systems Family Therapy | Families | | | | x | | C |
| Houston Parent-Child Development Program | Parents | | | | | x | C |
| Multisystemic Therapy | Parents | | | x | x | | B, C, E |
| Nurse-Family Partnership | Parents | | x | | | | B, C, |
| Parenting Wisely | Parents | | | | x | | C, |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Preparing for the Drug Free Years | Parents (4 to 7) | x | | x | | x | A, B, C, D, |
| Project Star (Students Taught Awareness and Resistance): Midwestern Prevention Project | Community | x | x | x | | | B, D, C, E |
| Schools and Families Educating Children (SAFE Children) | Families | | | | | x | C |
| Stopping Teenage Addiction to Tobacco | Community | | x | | | | C |
| Strengthening Families Program | Families (4 to 6) | x | | x | x | x | A, C, D, |

APPENDIX D

Research-based Activities (4115 (a)(1)(C)):

The LEA must designate and list the research-based activities (strategies and activities developed by the LEA to supplement the science-based programs listed above) selected from below:

| <i>Research-based Activities</i> | |
|--|---|
| Activities | <i>Research Summaries Supporting Each Activity:</i> |
| After School Programs | Getting Results Part I, page 77-78 |
| Conflict Mediation/Resolution | Getting Results Part I, page 63-65 Getting Results Part I, page 127-129 |
| Early Intervention and Counseling | Getting Results Part I, page 72 Getting Results Part I, page 100-101 Getting Results Part I, page 106-107 |
| Environmental Strategies | Getting Results Part I, page 73-75 Getting Results Part II, page 47-48 Getting Results Part II, page 76-79 Getting Results Part II, page 89-94 |
| Family and Community Collaboration | Getting Results Part I, page 104-105 Getting Results Part II, page 26-28 Getting Results Part II, page 33 |
| Media Literacy and Advocacy | Getting Results Part II, page 45 Getting Results Update 3, page 22-24 |
| Mentoring | Getting Results Part I, page 49 |
| Peer-Helping and Peer Leaders | Getting Results Part I, page 104-106 Getting Results Update 3, page 43-45 |
| Positive Alternatives | Getting Results Part I, page 79-81 Getting Results Part I, page 104-106 Getting Results Part I, page 108-109 |
| School Policies | Getting Results Part I, page 66-72 Getting Results Part II, page 22-23 |
| Service Learning/Community Service | Getting Results Part I, page 81-83 Getting Results Part II, page 46-47 |
| Student Assistance Programs | Getting Results Part I, page 89-90 |
| Tobacco-Use Cessation | Getting Results Part II, page 28 Getting Results Part II, page 42-43 Getting Results Part II, page 72-74 |
| Youth Development/Caring Schools/Caring Classrooms | Getting Results Part I, page 121-123 Getting Results Part I, page 136-137 Getting Results Part II, page 28 Getting Results Update 1 |

APPENDIX E

| Promising or Favorable Programs | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------|---------|------|----------|------------|----------|
| <p>Either the United States Department of Education's Expert Panel, the University of Colorado's Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, or the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention has identified the programs listed below as producing a consistent positive pattern of results (CSAP) or have evidence of a deterrent effect (Blueprints) but otherwise did not match all of the criteria established by these agencies to be identified as an exemplary or model program. The code in the last column of the chart provides a quick reference indicating which web sites have information specific to each program.</p> <p>A: < http://www.californiahealthykids.org > (California Healthy Kids Resource Center)</p> <p>B: < http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/model/overview.html > (University of Colorado: Blueprints)</p> <p>C: < http://modelprograms.samhsa.gov/model_prog.cfm > (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention)</p> <p>D: < http://www2.ed.gov/msc/model.asp > (United States Department of Education: Expert Panel)</p> <p>E: < http://www.gettingresults.org/ > (Getting Results)</p> | | | | | | | |
| Name | Grade, or Setting | Alcohol | Tobacco | Drug | Violence | Youth Dev. | Web site |
| Adolescent Alcohol Prevention Trial | 5 to 7 | | | x | | | C |
| Aggression Replacement Training | School | | | | x | | D |
| Aggressors, Victims, and Bystanders | 6 to 9 | | | | x | | D |
| Al'sPal's: Kids Making Healthy Choices | Pre K to 2 | | | | x | | D |
| Baby Safe (Substance Abuse Free Environment) Hawaii | Families | x | x | x | | | C |
| Basement Bums | 6 to 8 | | x | | | | A |
| Be a Star | K to 6 | | | | | x | C |
| Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement | 7 to 8 | | | x | x | | C |
| Bilingual/Bicultural Counseling and Support Services | Communities | x | | x | | | C |
| Bully Proofing Your School | K to 8 | | | | x | | B |
| CAPSLE (Creating a Peaceful School Learning Environment) | K to 5 | | | | x | | B |
| Club Hero | 6 | | | | | x | C |
| Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program (CCVYP) | School | | | | | x | B |
| Colorado Youth Leadership Project | 7 | x | | | | x | C |
| Comer School Development Program (CSDP) | School | | | | | x | B |
| Earls court Social Skills Group Program | K to 6 | | | | | x | B |
| Effective Black Parenting Program (EBPP) | Families | | | | x | | B |
| Facing History and Ourselves | 7 to 12 | | | | x | | D |
| Family Health Promotion | Families | x | x | x | | x | C |
| FAST Track | 1 to 6 | | | | x | | B |
| Get Real About Violence | K to 12 | | | | x | | C |
| Growing Healthy | K to 6 | x | x | x | | | D |
| Intensive Protective Supervision Program | Community | | | | X | | B |
| Iowa Strengthening Families Program | Family | x | | | | | B |
| Kids Intervention with Kids in School (KIKS) | 6 to 12 | x | x | x | x | x | C |
| Let Each One Teach One | Mentoring | | | | | x | D |
| Linking the Interests of Families and Teachers (LIFT) | 1 to 5 | | | | x | | B, C, D |
| Lion's Quest Working Toward Peace | 5 to 9 | | | | x | | D |
| Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program | 7 to 12 | | X | | | | C |
| Michigan Model for Comprehensive School Health Education | K to 12 | x | x | x | | | D |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Open Circle Curriculum | K to 5 | | | | x | x | D |
| Parent-Child Assistance Program (P-CAP) | Families | x | | x | | | C |
| PeaceBuilders | K to 8 | | | | x | | D |
| Peacemakers Program | 4 to 8 | | | | x | | D |
| Peer Assistance and Leadership | 9 to 12 | | | x | x | | C |
| Peer Coping Skills (PCS) | 1 to 3 | | | | x | | B |
| Peers Making Peace | K to 12 | | | | x | | D |
| Personal/Social Skills Lessons | 6 to 12 | | x | | | | A |
| Preventive Intervention | 6 to 8 | | | x | | | B |
| Preventive Treatment Program | Parents | | | x | x | | B |
| Primary Mental Health Project | Pre k to 3 | | | | | | D |
| Project Alive | K to 12 | | x | | | | A |
| Project BASIS | 6 to 8 | | | | x | x | C |
| Project Break Away | 6 to 8 | | x | x | | | C |
| Project Life | 9 to 12 | | x | | | | A |
| Project PACE | 4 | | | | | x | C |
| Project SCAT | 4 to 12 | | x | | | | A |
| Project Status | 6 to 12 | | | x | x | x | B |
| Safe Dates | School | | | | x | | B |
| Say It Straight (SIS) Training | 6 to 12 | x | | | | | D |
| School Transitional Environmental Program | 9 to 12 | | | x | x | x | B |
| Smokeless School Days | 9 to 12 | | x | | | | A |
| Social Decision Making and Problem Solving | 1 to 6 | x | | | x | | D |
| Social Decision Making and Problem Solving Program (SDM/PS) | K to 5 | | | | | x | B |
| Socio-Moral Reasoning Development Program (SMRDP) | School | | | | x | | B |
| Storytelling for Empowerment | 6 to 8 | x | | x | | | C |
| Strengthening Hawaii Families | Families | | | x | | | C |
| Strengthening the Bonds of Chicano Youth & Families | Communities | x | | x | | | C |
| Syracuse Family Development Program | Family | | | | x | | B |
| Teams-Games-Tournaments Alcohol Prevention | 10 to 12 | x | | | | | C |
| Teenage Health Teaching Modules | 6 to 12 | | x | | | | C, D |
| Teens Tackle Tobacco! - Triple T | 6 to 12 | | x | | | | A |
| The Scare Program | School | | | | x | | D |
| The Think Time Strategy | K to 9 | | | | x | | D |
| Tinkham Alternative High School | 9 to 12 | | | | | x | C |
| Tobacco-Free Generations | 8 to 12 | | x | | | | A |
| Viewpoints | 9 to 12 | | | | x | | B |
| Woodrock Youth Development Project | K to 8 | x | x | x | | x | C |
| Yale Child Welfare Project | Families | | | | x | | B |