

Chico Unified School District
LOCAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN ADDENDUM

Developed June, 2008

Revised in Conjunction with Technical Assistance Provider BCOE 2009-10

Revised January-September, 2011

LEA Plan and Plan Addendum History:

The Chico Unified School District's Local Educational Agency (LEA) plan was written in 2003 and formally revised through LEA Plan Addendums in 2005 and 2008. In an effort to bring coherence to the district's plan for reform and provide an umbrella for Program Improvement, the Chico Unified School District (CUSD) implemented Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) district wide in 2007-08. As noted in our 2008 LEA Plan Addendum, we believe that PLCs provide the foundation for building and supporting a coherent, standards-based instructional program for all students by keenly focusing staff on student learning. PLCs also provide a solid foundation for professional development by unifying our work and focusing it around four central questions:

1. What do we want students to learn?
2. How will we know when they've learned it?
3. How will we respond if they don't learn it?
4. How will we further challenge students when they do learn it?

Implementation of Recommendations by Technical Assistance Provider:

During 2009-10, the Butte County Office of Education (BCOE) provided the CUSD with technical assistance in implementing our plan. **BCOE recommendations have been incorporated into this most current LEAP Addendum revision, and are identified in *italic text*.** From 2009 through the present, we have continued to implement the revised plan. With assistance from BCOE, we also evaluated our progress by administering the assessments and state instruments described in the following section. This current Addendum combines the major steps of our 2008 Addendum with the recommendations from BCOE into a single document, along with additional modifications in response to needs identified in the assessments and state instruments. Key actions are identified in black, and are supported by one or more specific steps. To help us better monitor this plan, we have color-coded the specific steps supporting each action as follows:

Green: item / activity is complete

Blue: item / activity is in progress

Red: item / activity is not begun

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

Analysis of Data to Determine Fundamental Teaching and Learning Needs:

From 2008 to the present, Chico Unified School District has continued to analyze student performance annually using data from the Academic Performance Index (API), Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), Standardized Testing and Accountability Reporting (STAR), and Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for English Learners (AMAOs). Teachers individually and at the site and PLC levels have also continued to analyze data on common and benchmark assessments. With assistance from Butte County Office of Education, we administered state instruments based on the Essential Program Components (EPCs). These included the Inventory of Services and Supports (ISS), and the Academic Program Survey (APS) at each school site in the spring, 2011. Data from these assessments and collaboration with stakeholders has enabled us to revise performance goals and to refine instructional and program strategies to improve overall student learning and address specific student needs. Data charts and tables are at the end of this Addendum; key learning needs extrapolated from this data are summarized below.

Academic Performance Index (API):

Performance on the Academic Performance Index continues to increase across the district, but for some schools and subgroups the increase is less pronounced. In particular, white students tend to attain the highest scores at all schools, while Hispanics, students with disabilities, English learners, and economically disadvantaged students score lower. In addition, our program improvement schools (especially elementary) have traditionally scored below our non-PI schools in overall API as well as in meeting API growth targets. However, over the past three years that trend has begun to change, as the chart below indicates:

API Progress Since 2008 LEA Plan Addendum

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Schools reporting API scores	20	20	20*
% of all schools making all growth targets	25%	30%	50%
% of elementary schools making growth targets	25%	33%	63.5%
% of non-alternative secondary schools making targets	40%	40%	50%
Number of PI schools	7	10	10
% of PI schools making all growth targets	14%	22%	55%
Number of schools with API 800 or above	9	7	11
% of schools with API 800 or above	45%	35%	55%

***2011 was the first year that Inspire School of Arts and Sciences had API scores. However, no 2011 scores were available for Citrus. Note on CDE website:**
Growth API is not reported for [Citrus] because there was a decrease of more than 20 percent of students continuously enrolled from the 2010 Base API to the 2011 Growth API or the LEA reported a potential data error in this area. CDE will publish the API for this school in February 2012, to reflect demographic data corrections made in September and October 2011.

While a growing percentage of schools have overall API scores of 800 or above, and an increasing number of schools (including Program Improvement schools) are meeting all growth targets school-wide and for all subgroups, half our schools are in Program Improvement, and 45% are still not making growth targets either school wide or for all subgroups.

Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for English Learners (AMAOs):

Progress for English learners is assessed annually by three Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs):

- 1) The percentage of students **making annual progress** in learning English (showing increased performance on the CELDT, even if they do not attain the level of “proficient,”), AND
- 2) The percentage of students who **attain the level of “proficient”** on the CELDT; AND
- 3) The percentage of students who **score proficient or above on content standards tests (CSTs)** in English language arts and mathematics.

Based on the results of an **English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA)** administered in 2008, the district employed three ELD coaches to provide intensive grammar-based professional development and coaching for classroom teachers in ways to make instruction more comprehensible for English learners, In addition, two itinerant ELD support teachers are provided at various schools for additional targeted supplemental support. An EL Task Force meets monthly to monitor progress toward the district’s Title III plan. While these interventions enabled increasing percentages of English learners to make progress on AMAOs, 2010-11 data shows that ELs are still not attaining AMAOs in all three areas, and thus have not met AMAO criteria. English learners did meet the ELA proficiency level on AMAO 3 for the first time this year, but missed the proficiency level in math, as well as missing the bar in AMAOs 1 (annual progress in English) and 2 (English proficiency).

Inventory of Student Supports and Services (ISS)

On May 10, 2011, the CUSD ISS Data Analysis Review Team completed a thorough analysis of findings from the ISS. In collaboration with the BCOE Program Improvement Technical Assistance Team Special Education Staff, the CUSD special education task force wrote a comprehensive ISS summary report showing areas of strength and areas for growth aligned with each DAIT standard (please see separate ISS Summary Report). The Review Team noted that, while the district is making progress in improving achievement for students with disabilities, several key needs remain. These include:

- Ensuring access to and instruction in the adopted core curriculum for all students
- Providing training in how to appropriately use assessment information to improve the design and delivery of instruction to students with Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs).
- Producing a differentiated checklist for all special education teachers to use when verifying the quality and compliance of IEPs prior to Affirm/ Attest in the Special Education Information System (SEIS).
- Providing training via the ELD coaches in ELD instructional and assessment practices: specifically, writing IEP goals to the CELDT level, and including CELDT goals on the IEP.

Academic Program Surveys (APS)

In spring, 2007, **Academic Program Surveys** administered to staff at each site helped schools and the district to determine the extent to which its instructional program was coherent, supported student achievement, and was aligned with the Essential Program Components (EPCs). Findings from these surveys were used to inform our 2008 LEAP Addendum, and included inconsistencies in the use of SBE-adopted instructional and intervention materials, as well as in adherence to required instructional minutes in ELA and mathematics.

The APS was administered again to all sites in spring, 2011. Results are still being aggregated and analyzed; however, preliminary findings suggest that the 2003 LEA Plan and the 2005 and 2008 Addendums are still not being fully implemented as written. For example, SBE-approved intensive interventions have been purchased, but some sites report that they do not have access to the materials. The district has developed pacing guides for the K-6 ELA series and for Everyday Mathematics, but some sites report not having or utilizing the guides. The APS data will be fully aggregated and analyzed by January, 2012. If the analysis suggests the need for revisions to this addendum, Ed Services will make them then.

Summary of Reasons the Prior LEA Plan was Not Successful:

For EL Students:

- Standards-based ELD instruction targeted to students' CELDT proficiency levels is not consistently provided across the district.
- Not all classroom teachers are proficient in accessing ELD assessment and proficiency data, and modifying instruction based on that data to ensure that students make progress toward their language proficiency goals.
- EL student progress toward AMAOs is not consistently monitored, particularly in schools with small EL populations.
- Scheduling issues (e.g., ELD and ELA interventions scheduled simultaneously) sometimes prevent English learners from receiving targeted ELA interventions
- The elementary ELD curriculum (Avenues) does not address the full range of EL English proficiency needs as effectively as we had hoped.

For Students with Disabilities:

- Not all special education students have access to instruction in the adopted core curriculum materials for English language-arts
- Not all special education teachers are proficient in appropriately using assessment information to improve the design and delivery of instruction to students with disabilities
- There is currently no IEP checklist for quality and compliance that is differentiated according to program type (RSP, SCD, SH, ED, etc.)
- While special education students take part in district wide Student Progress Assessments, these assessments mirror the CST. Thus, students who will be taking the CMA do not have the opportunity to practice that style of test.
- Not all special education teachers have received sufficient training in writing linguistically appropriate IEP goals and objectives for EL-SWDs.

For All Students:

- Curriculum, instruction and assessment are not fully aligned with content standards in all classrooms.
- More teachers are developing and giving frequent common formative assessments, but these assessments are not used consistently to monitor student achievement and improve instruction.
- Not all teacher collaborative teams are yet proficient in analyzing data from common assessments.
- While each site has identified a pyramid of interventions, APS data reveals that these interventions have not been fully implemented at non-Program Improvement schools due to funding constraints.
- An SBE-approved mathematics series has been adopted at elementary schools, but is not being implemented with 100% fidelity at all sites
- The current English language arts textbook series does not cover all state standards, but state funding issues prevented the district from purchasing a new series during the last adoption cycle.
- A number of different strategic and intensive interventions are currently used, but they are not all SBE-approved, nor are they used consistently from site to site.

Ongoing review and revision of this plan, on our own and with technical support from BCOE, has resulted in an increased level of specificity which will help us to more systematically implement and monitor all elements. We believe that this revision represents a strong working document that will enable us to continue to improve teaching and learning in the Chico Unified School District.

Please describe how you will address student learning needs, based on an analysis of data for why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
A. Fully align curriculum, instruction and assessment with content standards				
<p>1. Review and, as necessary, revise district essential standards K-12 in ELA and math, aligning them with the CST blueprints and knowledge and skills necessary for academic success.</p> <p><i>a. Mathematics coaches and high school mathematics teachers review, modify if needed, and finalize initial mathematics Essential Standards.</i></p> <p><i>b. Review and, as necessary, revise math Essential Standards annually</i></p> <p><i>c. English language arts teachers review, modify if needed, and finalize the revised ELA Essential Standards</i></p> <p><i>d. Review and, as necessary, revise ELA Essential Standards annually</i></p> <p><i>e. Distribute Essential Standards for math and ELA to principals after each revision, for them to review with faculty at each site.</i></p> <p><i>f. Principals monitor fidelity of instruction to standards.</i></p> <p><i>g. Post Essential Standards for ELA and mathematics to district web site.</i></p>	<p>JBo, MM / complete</p> <p>JBo, MM / each June</p> <p>JBo, MM / complete</p> <p>JBo, MM / each June</p> <p>JBo, MM, principals /August annually</p> <p>Principals /ongoing</p> <p>MM / complete</p>	<p>Complete; no additional cost</p> <p>Math coach salary</p> <p>Complete; no additional cost</p> <p>Sub costs</p> <p>Copy costs</p> <p>No additional cost</p> <p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p> <p>\$91,000</p> <p>--</p> <p>\$2,000 (10 teachers x 2 days)</p> <p>\$1,000</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p>	<p>--</p> <p>Title I</p> <p>--</p> <p>Title II</p> <p>Title I Title II</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p>

<p>2. Continue to implement and refine a balanced system of assessment, including school-based common assessments and district-level Student Progress Assessments.</p>	<p>JBo, JP,MM / 3x annually in 2011-12 and 2012-13</p>	<p>Sub time for annual revisions</p>	<p>\$2,000 (10 teachers x 2 days)</p>	<p>Title I, Part A Title II</p>
<p>a. <i>Develop and administer common Student Progress Assessments (SPA) to all elementary and secondary students in ELA and mathematics. Revise as needed.</i></p>	<p>Principals, teachers / 3x year</p>	<p>Teacher salaries</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>General fund</p>
<p>b. <i>PLC teams use SPA results to measure student progress toward standards.</i></p>	<p>MM / complete</p>	<p>Complete; no additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>c. <i>Post district Student Progress Assessments on district website.</i></p>	<p>JP, principals / Dec. 2011 and May 2012</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>d. <i>Collect evidence from elementary sites of the formative and summative use of Everyday Mathematics assessments</i></p>	<p>JP, principals / Dec. 2011 and May 2012</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>e. <i>Collect evidence from elementary sites of the formative and summative use of RLA assessments</i></p>	<p>JBo, MM, principals / Dec. '11 & May 2012</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>f. <i>Collect evidence from each secondary sites of the formative and summative use of math and ELA assessments</i></p>	<p>DS, JBr / 3x annually</p>	<p>Sub costs</p>	<p>\$4,000 (10 teachers x 4 days)</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>g. <i>Ensure that special education and EL teachers participate in the work done to develop, revise or adopt Student Progress Assessments and school-based common assessments.</i></p>	<p>JBo, MM / ongoing, as needed</p>	<p>Sub time</p>	<p>\$5,000 (amount will vary)</p>	<p>Title III IDEA</p>
<p>h. <i>Provide support for teachers in using assessment results both formatively (to adjust instruction as needed) and summatively (to monitor student achievement and progress).</i></p>	<p>JBo, MM / ongoing, as needed</p>	<p>Possible conference or training costs</p>	<p>\$5,000 (amount will vary)</p>	<p>Title II Part A Title I Part A</p>

3. Provide support for teachers in strategies to improve classroom instruction aligned to curriculum and standards		Costs related to items 3 a-d:	Estimated cost For 3a-d:	Funding for 3a-d:
a. Expand use of minute-by-minute classroom formative assessment strategies to monitor instruction and improve student learning.	MM, JBo / ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release time for additional collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10,000 (100 teacher days) 	Title II Part A Title I Part A
b. Develop district-wide K-12 learning targets in English Language Arts and Mathematics.	MM, JBo / ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stipends for presenters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10,000 	
c. <i>Enable teachers to access grade level and course learning targets through the district website or a similar collaborative platform.</i>	MM /ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registration and travel for conferences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$30,000 	
d. Expand use of effective literacy instructional strategies	MM, JBo / ongoing			
e. Study the feasibility of hiring elementary literacy coaches to assist teachers in implementing literacy strategies	DS, JP, JBr / March, 2012	(Possible) literacy coaches (2)	\$182,000	Title I Part A
(See section 5 for professional development related to these areas).	See section 5			
4. Provide support to administrators and teachers in collaborative data analysis				
a. <i>Principals at each site develop specific and measureable goals and objectives for student achievement, participation, growth on the API, and graduate rate district-wide and by site.</i>	Principals / August-September annually	No additional costs	--	--
b. <i>ES supports site administrators in deepening understanding of SMART goal targets and measures.</i>	JP / complete	No additional costs	--	--
c. <i>Principals support the writing of grade-level SMART goals linked to the CUSD Essential Standards, and</i>	JP, JBo, principals /	No additional costs	--	--

<i>monitor progress toward those goals.</i>	ongoing			
d. District personnel provides timely access to common assessment results to all principals and teachers	MM / after each assessment	No additional costs	--	
e. District personnel and site principals support the ongoing and regular collaborative analysis of group and individual student performance results from the CST, CMA, CAPA, CEDLT, school-based common assessments, and district Student Progress Assessments by all teachers	MM, JP, JBo, DS, JBr / at least 3 times a year	Copy costs District data analyst time	\$1,000 \$2,500	Title IIA Title III IDEA
f. District and site personnel will develop and utilize a data protocol or checklist to ensure that PLC team discussion consistently and explicitly a) focuses on subgroups and target students in danger of failing to meet grade level standards, and b) communicates student achievement results, instructional next steps, and re-testing options.	JBo, JP, principals / by April, 2012	Copy costs Possible sub costs	\$1,000 \$3,000	Title IIA Title III IDEA
g. District and principals ensure the inclusion of all teachers of EL and / or SWD students when assessment results are being discussed.	DS, JBr / ongoing	No additional costs	--	--
h. District Ed Services team and site administrators will regularly review progress toward student achievement goals	JP (K-6) / 3x/yr JBo (7-12) / 2x/year	No additional costs	--	--
i. Site administrators share grade/course level specific and measureable goals as part of report to Ed Services.	JP, MM, JBr, JBo, DS / August each year	No additional costs	--	--

B. Fully implement SBE-adopted K-8 curriculum in mathematics and ELA throughout the district

<p>1. Continue to monitor and support use of state-adopted mathematics instructional materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. K-6 (except Sierra View): <i>Everyday Math</i> b. K-6 (Sierra View): MacMillan/McGraw-Hill Math c. 7 (Algebra Readiness): McDougall-Littell d. 8 (Pre-Algebra): Holt-Course 2 e. Algebra: <i>CPM Algebra Connections</i> f. Geometry, Algebra 2: CPM 	MM / complete	Texts already purchased; no additional costs	--	--
<p>2. Continue to monitor and support use of state-adopted ELA instructional materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. K-6: Houghton-Mifflin <i>California Reading</i> b. 7-8: McDougall-Littell <i>Language Arts</i> 	JP / ongoing	No additional costs	--	--
<p>3. Pilot ELA instructional materials for possible adoption district-wide in next cycle.</p>	JP, JBr / fall 2010	Texts already purchased; no additional costs	--	--
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. MacMillan/McGraw-Hill <i>California Treasures English Language Development</i> (Chapman, K-6) 	JP, JBr / fall 2011	Texts already purchased; no additional costs	--	--
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. MacMillan/McGraw-Hill <i>California Treasures English Language Development</i> (Emma Wilson, grades 2, 5) 	JBo, JP / Feb. 2012	Sub time for text review	\$4,000 (40 days)	Title IA Title IIA General Fund
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Explore additional K-3 ELA materials for adoption 	JBr / ongoing	No additional costs	--	--
<p>4. Monitor and support use of state-adopted ELD instructional materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Avenues</i> b. <i>Inside</i> c. <i>Edge</i> 				

5. Provide materials-based professional development for teachers, as described in section 5	See section 5			
6. Refine and implement pacing guides K-6 in ELA and mathematics	JP / complete	Related expenses for item 5, a-e	• \$4,000 (40 days)	Title IA Title IIA EIA
a. Develop or adopt K-6 Houghton Mifflin Reading pacing guides, with CUSD standards highlighted	DS / ongoing 2011-12	• Release time for teachers working on guides	--	--
b. Support the training of special education teachers to adapt the K-6 HM reading pacing guides for students with disabilities receiving instruction outside of the general education classroom.	JP / complete	• Math coach salary (already included above)	• \$350,000	Title I
c. Develop or adopt K-6 pacing guides for Everyday Mathematics	JBr, JP / ongoing 2011-12	• EL coach salaries (4 coaches)	\$1,000	Title IID
d. Math coaches support teachers in implementing the pacing guides, and modifying as needed for students with disabilities and English learners	JBr, EL coaches / ongoing 2011-12	District tech support for web access	--	--
e. EL coaches support classroom teachers with pacing and modifications for English learners in ELA and math	Complete	Item complete; no additional cost	--	--
f. Ensure access to reading and math pacing guides by posting on the district website.	JBr, DS / complete		--	--
7. Purchase and distribute SBE-adopted intensive intervention program materials as needed.			--	--
a. 4-7 math: Wright Group / McGraw-Hill <i>Pinpoint</i>			--	--
b. 9-12 ELA: Scholastic <i>READ 180</i>			--	--

<p>c. 4-6: Portals</p> <p>8. Research, adopt, and consistently use SBE-adopted intensive intervention materials district wide.</p> <p>9. District and principals monitor adherence to instructional time requirements, and assist teachers in adjusting instructional time if necessary.</p>	<p>Ed Services, EL coaches, SpEd task force / by March, 2012</p> <p>JP, JBr, JBo, principals / ongoing</p>	<p>Release time for task force teachers</p> <p>Copy costs</p> <p>No additional costs</p>	<p>\$2,000</p> <p>\$500</p> <p>--</p>	<p>IDEA EIA Title IIA Title I A</p> <p>--</p>
<p>C. Provide support for high-priority students, including English learners, students with disabilities, and students performing below grade level</p>				
<p>1. Ensure that ELs have full access to the core curriculum in math and ELA</p> <p>a. Develop specific <u>academic achievement</u> goals and strategies for English Learners consistent with Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives.</p> <p>b. Support general ed teachers in using ELD assessment results to adjust instruction for ELs as needed</p> <p>c. Identify EL students in need of support, and place them into appropriate strategic or intensive interventions</p> <p>d. Provide on-site training and coaching on effectively working with English learners to teachers at targeted high-need elementary schools (McManus, Chapman, Parkview, Rosedale, Citrus)</p>	<p>JBr / October annually</p> <p>EL coaches / ongoing</p> <p>EL coaches, principals / ongoing</p> <p>JBr, consultant / Oct '11-June'12</p>	<p>No additional cost</p> <p>Sub time for teachers coached</p> <p>No additional cost</p> <p>Consultant</p>	<p>--</p> <p>\$4,000</p> <p>--</p> <p>\$161,000</p>	<p>--</p> <p>Title III Title IIA</p> <p>--</p> <p>Title I</p>

<p>e. Monitor EL progress toward AMAOs, and make adjustments at site and district level as necessary to ensure students meet AMAOs and make adequate yearly progress</p>	<p>Principals, EL coaches / Sept. annually</p>	<p>EL coach and principal salary already noted</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>f. Regularly report student academic progress to parents</p>	<p>JBr, teachers / each grading period</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>2. Ensure full and consistent implementation of standards-based ELD instruction across the district</p>	<p>JBr / October annually</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>a. Develop specific <u>English Language proficiency goals</u> and strategies for English Learners consistent with Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives.</p>	<p>EL Task Force / complete</p>	<p>EL coach salaries; no additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>b. <i>Develop ELD assessments to match ELD curriculum</i></p>	<p>JBr / August annually</p>	<p>District tech</p>	<p>\$500</p>	<p>Title IID</p>
<p>c. <i>Post ELD assessments on the CUSD website; revised or update as needed.</i></p>	<p>Principals / ongoing</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>d. <i>Ensure the use of ELD assessments by teachers at all school sites.</i></p>	<p>JBr, EL coaches / as scores are available</p>	<p>EL coach salaries; no additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>e. <i>Ensure that ELs are appropriately placed for ELD instruction based on CELDT scores and ELD assessments</i></p>	<p>EL coach, teachers / ongoing</p>	<p>EL coach salaries; no additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>f. Provide daily ELD instruction for ELs consistent with the state-recommended time allotments and using state-adopted core and supplemental materials</p>	<p>Site principals, EL coaches / monthly</p>	<p>EL coach salaries; no additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>g. Monitor to ensure that ELD instruction is delivered for the required number of minutes per day</p>	<p>JBr, coaches, teachers / ongoing</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>h. Regularly share EL progress in language proficiency and academic achievement with parents and teachers, in PLCs and other appropriate settings.</p>	<p>JBr, coaches, teachers / ongoing</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>

<p>3. Ensure consistent and appropriate IEP development for students to achieve academic proficiency.</p>	DS / ongoing	No additional cost	--	--	
<p>a. <i>Ensure English Learner IEPs specify how and when ELD support is to be provided.</i></p>	DS / April 2012	Technical assistance	\$2500 (5 days @ \$500/day)	Title I IDEA	
<p>b. <i>Develop differentiated IEP quality and compliance checklist differentiated by program.</i></p>	DS, principals / ongoing	No additional cost	--	--	
<p>c. Continue to use effective entry-level, progress monitoring, and summative assessments to support instruction for all students.</p>	See section 5	See section 5	--	--	
<p>d. Provide professional development to special education teachers in using assessment information to improve the design and delivery of curriculum, and in writing linguistically appropriate IEP goals for ELs (see section 5).</p>	<p>4. Develop systematic pyramid of interventions, including RtI process, to help students in general education classes access the core curriculum.</p>	DS, JBr / 2010 and ongoing	No additional cost	--	--
<p>a. Utilize SPA tests in ELA and mathematics to determine the appropriate degree of intervention students need for success.</p>	DS, JBr, teachers / May, 2012	No additional cost	--	--	
<p>b. <i>SPED and EL teachers review modifications to district SPA assessments to ensure the tests meet the unique needs of SWDs and ELs</i></p>	DS, teachers / 2011-12	No additional cost	--	--	
<p>c. <i>Identify student needs for ELA and mathematics intervention, based on assessment data</i></p>	DS / complete	No additional cost	--	--	
<p>d. <i>Select from SBE-approved Intensive Reading Interventions and EL Interventions at targeted schools.</i></p>					

<p>e. <i>Provide principals with training during EAC / SAC meetings in designing and implementing an effective intervention system. Provide refresher training annually as needed.</i></p>	DS / ongoing	Complete	--	--
<p>f. <i>Develop timeline (with site principals) for site implementation in the 2010-11 school year of SBIT and effective intervention systems. Revise annually as needed.</i></p>	DS / ongoing	No additional cost	--	--
<p>5. Develop, implement, and monitor consistent districtwide intervention programs offered as a separate, extended period class for students needing intensive intervention in ELA and math.</p>				
<p>a. <i>Inventory intervention programs (SBE-adopted and non-SBE adopted) currently being offered as separate, extended period classes for students needing intensive intervention in ELA and/or mathematics.</i></p>	DS / complete	No additional cost	--	
<p><i>i. Distribute the intensive interventions list to Title I teachers, mathematics coaches, and EL coaches to review and refine.</i></p>	DS / complete	Copy costs	\$1,000	Title I IDEA
<p><i>ii. Distribute to site principals to review with whole school staff at faculty meeting.</i></p>	DS / complete	Copy costs	\$1,000	Title I IDEA
<p><i>iii. Support principals in conducting an annual inventory of the ELA and math interventions available at their sites.</i></p>	DS / May, 2012	Materials / copies	\$500	Title I IDEA
<p>b. <i>Select from SBE-approved list of programs to be used consistently across the district for separate, extended period classes for students needing intensive intervention services.</i></p>	DS / March, 2012	No cost unless additional SBE-approved intervention purchased	Varies, depending on purchase	Title I IDEA

<p>c. Monitor site practices to ensure district-wide consistency for placing student needing intensive intervention in separate, extended period classes, as well as practices for exiting students from intensive intervention programs.</p>	DS / ongoing	No additional cost	--	--
<p><i>i. Provide guidance and training to SBIT teams on how to establish entrance and exit criteria, and monitoring student placement practices into and out of intensive intervention.</i></p>	DS / complete	Release time Copies	\$4,000	Title I IDEA
<p>6. Develop, implement, and monitor consistent districtwide intervention programs for students needing strategic intervention in ELA and math.</p>				
<p>a. Identify intervention programs currently being offered for students needing strategic intervention services in ELA and/or mathematics.</p>	JBr, DS / 2011-12	No additional cost	--	--
<p><i>b. Examine new components in the Treasures series as a means to fill the targeted needs for strategic support students.</i></p>	JBr / March, 2012	Possible release time	Varies: up to \$2,000	Title IIA
<p>c. Provide a double dose of core curriculum for struggling students</p>	JBr / 2011-12	No additional cost	--	--
<p><i>d. Encourage the use of site grade-level teams with SBIT teams to develop entrance & exit criteria for supplemental interventions</i></p>	DS, JP, JBr / August annually	No additional cost	--	--
<p>e. Monitor site practices to ensure district-wide consistency for placing students needing strategic intervention services, as well as practices for exiting students from strategic intervention programs.</p>	ES and principals / ongoing	No additional cost	--	--

2. Include specific measurable achievement goals and targets for student groups consistent with Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Please describe academic goals and targets for student achievement, participation, growth on the API, and graduation rate, if applicable. (Refer to the CDE AYP Reports Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypreports.asp>.)

Student Achievement

- a. At least 78.4% of all students demonstrate proficiency (or make Safe Harbor) in English-Language Arts on content standards tests administered annually.
- b. At least 79% of all students in every classroom demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics on content standards tests administered annually.
- c. All English Learners progress by at least one level each year (as measured by the CELDT)
- d. All special education students, regardless of instructional setting, will receive instruction that supports access to the core curriculum at grade level with appropriate accommodations

Participation

1. At least 95% of all students, including 95% of each subgroup, will participate in standardized testing that comprises AYP (CST, CMA, CAPA, and CAHSEE if applicable)

Growth on the API

1. All schools, and the district as a whole, will meet or exceed annual API growth targets.

Graduation Rate

1. At least 90% of all students will graduate from high school.

3. Incorporate scientifically based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program in schools served by the LEA.

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

- **Professional Learning Communities**_(Dufour, Dufour, and Eaker) The PLC model provides the fundamental structure and coherence necessary to ensure that the goals and activities we are undertaking across the district are squarely centered on student learning and continual improvement. Under this umbrella, we are implementing the following scientifically-based strategies and activities, which research supports as being the long-term actions most likely to result in continual improvement of achievement for **all** students.
- **High quality formative and summative assessment strategies** (Stiggins, Wiliam). We have trained 40 secondary school teachers and 20 elementary teachers in Dylan Wiliam’s Keeping Learning On Track, a series of day-by-day, minute-by-minute formative assessment strategies, and plan to expand the training to additional teachers K-12. These strategies allow teachers to monitor student comprehension during lessons and make real-time adjustments to instruction as needed to improve comprehension and achievement. Assessment coordinators at each high school provide support to teachers in implementing KLT and other formative assessment strategies in the classroom.
- **Vocabulary building and expository writing strategies** (Kate Kinsella, Julie Adams). Teachers at the middle and high school level have been trained in these strategies, and continue to meet to refine their implementation.
- **Teacher collaboration** (teacher learning teams—Shirley Hord; also Slavin, Bloom, Stiggins, Guskey). Teachers across the district have implemented weekly collaboration time with a focus on defining essential standards, developing and administering common assessments, and using the results to improve instruction and learning.
- **A pyramid of interventions supports the needs of all students in accessing the core curriculum, and includes both strategic and intensive interventions.** SBE-approved interventions Read 180, Pinpoint, and Portals are a part of this pyramid.
- **Scientifically based research strategies that support the needs of English learners** include explicit direct instruction of grammar, concepts, academic language, and reading comprehension strategies; guided instruction; vocabulary and language development; use of modeling, graphic organizers, and visuals. One of our K-6 schools is also a two-way immersion school.

4. Identify actions that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions and how they will be supported	Section in LEA plan supporting this action
<u>Action 1:</u> Provide a guaranteed, viable curriculum for all students	1A1, 1A2, 1A3, 1A4, pp. 609
<u>Action 2:</u> Implement pacing guides K-6 for ELA and math	1B6 (a-f) pp. 10-11
<u>Action 3:</u> Support state-mandated instructional time requirements for ELA and ELD.	1B9, p. 12 1C2 (f, g) p. 13
<u>Action 4:</u> Develop, implement and refine a balanced system of assessment	1A2 (a-h), p. 7
<u>Action 5:</u> Support collaborative data analysis	1A4 (a-i), pp. 8-9
<u>Action 6:</u> Support the acquisition of assessment literacy skills and strategies.	5A2 (a-c) p. 20 5C1 (a-c) p. 222 5C2 p. 22
<u>Action 7:</u> Develop and fully implement a pyramid of interventions to provide support for all students in accessing the guaranteed, viable curriculum	1C1 (c) p. 12 1C4 (a-f) pp. 14-15 1C5 (a-c) pp. 15-16 1C6 (a-e) p. 16

5. Address the professional development needs of the instructional staff that will support the strategies and recommendations described above.

Professional development needs were identified by the district’s Educational Services team with technical support from Butte County Office of Education. Data from the Academic Program Surveys, the Inventory of Student Services, student achievement results, and input from the Special Education Task Force and English Learner Task Force was also a key factor in identifying these needs.

Materials-based professional development in ELA and mathematics has been regularly provided for teachers and administrators in the district.

Ninety-two elementary teachers were trained through the SB 472 mathematics training in 2008-09, after the adoption of the *Everyday Math* series. The 2008 LEAP Addendum included training in SB 472 for ELA as well; however, because a new ELA series was not adopted during the most recent cycle due to budget constraints, teachers have not taken part in materials-based professional development in ELA. A total of 196 elementary teachers were trained in the ELA series currently being used (through AB 466). In addition, sixty-eight teachers received AB466 training in mathematics on the previous series. In 2008-09, sixteen teachers received English Learner Professional Development (ELPD). ELPD training is still available through the county for any teachers who wish to take it. Training for teachers who work with English learners is also provided through other providers and programs, as detailed in this Addendum.

Please explain how the LEA identified professional development needs of instructional staff and LEA plans to support professional development. (See full implementation statements in the APS and the DAS located on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp.)	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
A. To support alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment with content standards and full implementation of professional learning communities				
<p>1. Provide professional development in learning targets:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>a. Continue 'learning target' workshops focusing on math for grades K-6.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>b. Continue 'learning target' workshops for middle and high school teams that have not yet participated.</i></p> <p>2. Provide professional development in the use of minute-by-minute classroom formative assessment strategies.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>a. Embed training of classroom formative assessment strategies for special education teachers during the 2010-2011 district special education staff meetings</i></p>	<p>MM, JBo / twice annually</p> <p>Assessment coordinators-4x/year</p> <p>DS / complete</p>	<p>Expenditures for 1a and 1b:</p> <p>Assessment coordinators (2)</p> <p>Sub costs</p> <p>Copies</p> <p>--</p>	<p>Estimated cost for 1a and 1b:</p> <p>\$24,000 (2 @ .2 FTE)</p> <p>\$10,000 (100 teachers x 2 half-days)</p> <p>\$2,000</p> <p>--</p>	<p>Title IIA</p> <p>Title IIA</p> <p>Title IIA</p> <p>--</p>

<p>b. <i>Continue to review and refresh formative assessment strategies during special education staff meetings in 2011-12 annually as needed.</i></p> <p>c. <i>Create a plan to expand opportunities for elementary and secondary teachers to attend workshops in classroom formative assessment strategies in the 11-12 and 2012-13 school years.</i></p> <p>3. Provide professional development in the use of differentiated instructional strategies K-12.</p> <p>a. <i>Continue support provided by mathematics coaches to classroom teachers in building skills to differentiate instruction using Everyday Mathematics.</i></p> <p>b. <i>Continue support provided by EL coaches to classroom teachers in building skills to differentiate instruction for English learners.</i></p>	<p>DS / ongoing</p> <p>JBo / Jan. 2012</p> <p>JBr, JP, math coaches / ongoing</p> <p>JBr, EL coaches / ongoing</p>	<p>No additional cost</p> <p>Possible workshops, conference or sub costs, depending on final plan</p> <p>No cost beyond math coach salaries already noted</p> <p>No cost beyond EL coach salaries already noted</p>	<p>--</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p>	<p>--</p> <p>Title IA Title IIA</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p>
<p>B. To support full implementation of SBE-adopted K-8 curriculum in mathematics and ELA throughout the district</p>				
<p>1. <i>Identify and communicate calendar of SB 472 mathematics institutes available in 08-09 and 09-10.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Provide SB 472 training in the newly adopted mathematics curriculum in accordance with the maximum amount reimbursed by the state.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Notify teachers and administrators who have not yet completed SB 472 mathematics institute and /or practicum of the need to complete.</i></p>	<p>MM / complete</p> <p>MM / complete</p> <p>JP / Nov., 2012</p>	<p>No cost; item complete</p> <p>No cost; item complete</p> <p>No cost</p>	<p>--</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p>	<p>--</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p>

4. Provide additional opportunities for professional development in mathematics.	JBo, JP / ongoing as needed	May include costs for presenters, subs	\$20,000	Title IA Title IIA
5. Provide SB 472 training in ELA curriculum as it is adopted, in accordance with the maximum amount of reimbursement provided by the state.	JP, JBo / as curriculum is adopted	Training costs	\$40,000	Title IA Title IIA
6. Notify teachers and administrators who have not yet completed SB 472 ELA institute and/or practicum of the need to complete.	JP, JBo / as curriculum is adopted	No additional cost to notify	--	--
C. To support intensive and strategic interventions for high-priority students, including English learners, students with disabilities, and students performing below grade level				
1. Provide professional development to ensure consistent and appropriate IEP development for students to achieve academic proficiency.		Related expenditures for items 1b-d	Estimated costs for items 1b-d:	Funding sources for items 1b-d:
a. <i>Embed training of standards-aligned IEPs and the implications on the design of curriculum, instruction, and assessment for SPED teachers during the 2009-10 District SPED Staff meetings.</i>	DS / 2011-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release time for additional collaboration on checklists and training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5,000 (50 release days) 	Title IA Title I IDEA EIA
b. Provide professional development for special education teachers in writing IEP goals to the CELDT level, and including CELDT goals on IEPs.	DS, JBr, ELD coaches / Jan-May 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stipends for presenters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10,000 	
c. Provide professional development for teachers in appropriately accessing and using assessment data to improve instruction to students with disabilities	DS, SpED task force / 2011-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1,000 	
d. Create checklist for IEP quality and compliance that is differentiated by program type (RSP, SDC, etc.)	DS, SpED task force / 2011-12			

<p>2. Provide professional development for classroom teachers in accessing EL assessment and proficiency data, and modifying instruction based on that data to enable ELs to attain AMAOs.</p> <p>3. Provide specific training for administrators on the implementation of English language learner programs, principles of second language acquisition, current research on English learners, and catch-up and acceleration programs and observational tools for ELD and SDAIE.</p>	<p>JBr, coaches / ongoing</p>	<p>Sub costs for teachers</p>	<p>\$15,000</p>	<p>Title III EIA Title IIA</p>
<p>a. Provide eight half-day sessions for principals at McManus, Chapman, Parkview, and Rosedale to equip them with advanced knowledge of ELD program design, language research, and in-class monitoring of language teaching</p>	<p>JBr, consultant / Oct. 2011-June 2012</p>	<p>No additional costs beyond consultant cost already noted</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>4. Identify and communicate calendar of SB 472 English Learner Professional Development (ELPD) institutes available in 09-10.</p>	<p>JBr / complete</p>	<p>Complete; no cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>5. Provide continued support for teachers to take SB 472 ELPD training.</p>	<p>JBr / ongoing</p>	<p>Will vary depending on number</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>6. Continue AB 430 administrator training in the new adoptions of mathematics and ELA.</p>	<p>MM / complete</p>	<p>Will vary depending on number</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>a. Update list of administrators who need training, and send reminders bi-monthly.</p>	<p>JBo, MM/ ongoing</p>	<p>No cost</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>7. Identify and provide training in instructional delivery strategies that renders content comprehensible to English learners and SWDs.</p>				

a. ELD coaches continue to provide professional development and coaching to teachers at PI schools	JBr, EL coaches / 2011-12	No cost beyond EL coaches already noted	--	--
b. Expand Language Star pilot—intensive grammar-based ELD professional development and coaching—to include McManus, Rosedale, and Parkview as well as Chapman	JBr, consultant / Oct. 2011-June 2012	No cost beyond consultant already noted	--	--
c. Provide training as needed to enable teachers at non-PI elementary schools to use ELARs	JBr, EL coaches / 2011-12	No cost beyond EL coaches already noted	--	--
d. Provide training as needed to enable teachers to effectively utilize ELD curriculum (Avenues, Inside, and Edge)	JBr, coaches / Nov '11-May '12	No cost beyond EL coaches already noted	--	--
8. Provide training for special education staff regarding the selection and use of evidence-based supplemental materials, interventions and strategies. Provide refresher trainings as needed.	DS / initially completed, but work is ongoing	Complete	--	--

6. English Learners

- a. **Title III Status and Title I Program Improvement (PI) Status:** An LEA that is also in Title III Year 2 should insert the Improvement Plan Addendum in the expandable space below. LEAs in Title III Year 4 are required to complete the online Action Plan and need not address Item 6.

Online action plan completed and available upon request.

- b. **Title I Program Improvement Status Only:** Include specific academic achievement and English Language Proficiency goals, targets and strategies for English Learners consistent with Goal 1 and Goal 2 of NCLB. (See Title III Accountability Report Information Guide available on the CDE Title III Accountability Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/index.asp>).

Please describe those goals and targets.

English Proficiency:

1. 56% of the district's EL students will make one year's growth each year as measured by the CELDT (AMAO 1)
2. 20.1% of the district's EL students who have been in language instruction programs for fewer than five years will attain English language proficiency as measured by the CELDT (AMAO 2).
3. 45.1% of the district's EL students who have been in language instruction programs for five years or more will attain English language proficiency as measured by the CELDT (AMAO 2).

Academic Achievement:

4. 78.4% of the district's EL students will reach the Proficient level in ELA as measured by state assessments used to determine AYP (AMAO 3).
5. 79% of the district's EL students will reach the Proficient level in ELA as measured by state assessments used to determine AYP (AMAO 3).

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

After school and summer school learning options will be provided and targeted to students who are identified as needing additional support, although some (such as after-school language and culture classes) will provide enrichment. There will be increased coordination between intervention support and general education program.

Please describe those activities and how the LEA will incorporate them.	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. Provide academic support, enrichment, and recreation through before- and after-school programs at Citrus, Chapman, McManus, Parkview, Rosedale, Neal Dow, Bidwell, Chico Junior, Chico High, and Fair View.	JBr / ongoing	Staff salaries, instructional materials	\$500,000 per year	ASES grant 21 st Century grant
2. Principals implement, where appropriate, interventions offered outside the traditional teaching day (e.g. lunch-time Power Hour, Homework Club, Learning Center).	Principals / ongoing	Instructional materials; additional utilities costs	\$50,000 (will vary)	Title I Title IA
3. Continue to offer “ Early Back ” programs at target schools (Rosedale, Chapman, McManus, Parkview) to serve the needs of students who require additional support to be ready for the beginning of the school year.	JBr / July and August annually	Staff salaries, instructional materials, transportation and maintenance	\$150,000	Title I Title IA ASES grant
4. Continue to offer intersession classes during spring break to provide continuity of instruction for students, particularly those who are in need of extra time and support.	JBr / March annually	Staff salaries, instructional materials, transportation and maintenance	\$150,000	Title I Title IA ASES grant
5. Provide extended day kindergarten at Neal Dow, Parkview, Chapman, Citrus, and McManus.	JBr, JP / ongoing 2011-12	Salaries, materials, transportation	\$300,000	Title I Title IA 21 st Century grant
6. Expand online course offerings , to be used for credit recovery or to enable students to fit additional classes into the day a. Research online curriculum programs (spring 2011) b. Select best-fit program for our district (July 2011) c. Train pilot group of teachers in the curriculum (Sept.	JBo / 2011-12 (timeline at left)	Curriculum (E2020)	\$18,000 (20 seat licenses @ \$900 each) (will be additional costs if program expands)	Lottery Instructional Material funds

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the inventory above, develop a plan to encourage parent involvement at each site, drawing on the site's strengths and needs. This may include sharing resources (e.g., Hmong or Spanish translator) across sites. 	JBr / by May, 2012	No additional cost	--	--
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use school newsletters (electronic or hard copy) and websites to provide information about intervention programs, testing, and tips for supporting students academically. Newsletters are translated into Spanish at PI sites. 	Principals / ongoing	Copy costs Translation costs	\$3,000 \$5,000	General fund Title III
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to offer evening presentations to parents of high school students targeted to topics relevant at that grade level (PSAT, SAT, college application process, etc.) 	Principals, counselors / ongoing	No additional cost	--	--
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage all parents to use Aeries Parent Portal to stay abreast of their child's grades and performance, and to maintain communication with teachers. 	Principals, JG / ongoing	District tech support	\$2,000	Title IID
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold regular ELAC and DELAC meetings to encourage the involvement of the parents of English learners. 	JBr / Sept., Oct., Feb., May	Food and materials costs	\$2,000	Title III EIA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to provide support to parents in how to better help their students academically through the Healthy Start program at McManus, as well as through targeted case managers and parent liaisons (Parenting Partners) at Chico High, Fair View, Bidwell, Chico Junior, McManus, and Marsh. 	JBr, targeted case managers / ongoing	Food, materials, services as needed, targeted case manager salaries	\$100,000	Healthy Start grant Title I
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize School Messenger (auto-dialer) to communicate with parents. 	Principals / as needed	District tech support	\$2,000	Title IID
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to support events and activities that promote parent involvement. These include Back to School night in the fall and 	Site principals, with district	Costs will vary based on event	varies	varies

<p>open house in the spring at all sites. Additional activities vary based on the needs and interests of the parents and students at the site; a partial list includes Family Math Nights, multicultural festivals, Muffins for Mom, Donuts for Dad, and EL redesignation ceremonies.</p>	<p>support as needed</p>			
---	--------------------------	--	--	--

**LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN
ASSURANCE PAGE**

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan Information:

Name of LEA: Chico Unified School District

County District Code: 0461424

Date of Local Governing Board Approval: October 19, 2011

District Superintendent: Kelly Staley

Address: 1163 East Seventh Street

City: Chico

Zip Code: 95928

Phone: (530) 891-3000 x149

FAX: (530) 891-3220

E-mail:
kstaley@chicousd.org

Signatures:

On behalf of LEAs, participants included in the preparation of this Program Improvement LEA Plan Addendum:

	Kelly Staley	
_____ Signature of Superintendent	_____ Printed Name of Superintendent	_____ Date

	Dr. Kathleen E. Kaiser	
_____ Signature of Board President	_____ Printed Name of Board President	_____ Date

	Janet Brinson	
_____ Signature of Title III English Learner Coordinator/Director	_____ Printed Name of Title III English Learner Coordinator/Director	_____ Date

Please note that the Title III English Learner Coordinator/Director will only need to sign this Assurance if the LEA is identified for Title III Year 2 or Year 4 improvement status.

By submission of the local board approved LEA Plan Addendum (in lieu of the original signature assurance page in hard copy), the LEA certifies that the plan has been locally adopted and original signed copies of the assurances are on file in the LEA. The certification reads:

Certification: *I hereby certify that all of the applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed by this LEA and that, to the best of my knowledge, information contained in this Plan is correct and complete. Legal assurances for all programs are accepted as the basic legal condition for the operation of selected projects and programs and copies of assurances are retained onsite. I certify that we accept all general and program specific assurances for Titles I, II, and/or III as appropriate, except for those for which a waiver has been obtained. A copy of all waivers will remain on file. I certify that actual ink signatures for this LEA Plan/Plan Addendum/Action Plan are on file, including signatures of any required external providers.*