The Single Plan for Student Achievement

Bidwell Junior High School
School Name

04-61424-6057129
CDS Code

Date of this revision: March 15, 2012

The *Single Plan for Student Achievement* (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index. California *Education Code* sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program Improvement into the *Single Plan for Student Achievement*.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person:	Judi Roth
Position:	Principal
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3080 ex. 125
Address:	2376 North Avenue
	Chico, CA 95926
E-mail Address:	jroth@chicousd.org

Chico Unified School District
School District

Superintendent:	Kelly Staley
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3000 ex. 149
Address:	1163 East Seventh St.
	Chico, CA 95928
E-mail Address:	kstaley@chicousd.org

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan on .

II. School Vision and Mission

School Vision and Mission

Extraordinary Education Empowers Everyone!

The vision for learning at Bidwell Junior High School is the pursuit of excellence. The attainment of this vision directly relates to Bidwell Junior High School's commitment to the school community to provide quality education and support for all students on their path towards personal, social and educational progress.

Belief #1
All students deserve a physically and emotionally safe environment.

Belief #2
Students will be challenged to a high level of performance academically and behaviorally.

Belief #3
State and district standards and course specific common assessments will guide development of curriculum, instructional strategies, student assessment, and the interventions provided to students during the instructional day schedule.

Belief #4
Staff will continue to build a culture of collaboration to improve student achievement. The work done during collaboration will be focused on asking and answering the following critical questions:
1) What do we want students to know?
2) How do we know they learned it?
3) What do we do when they struggle?
4) How do we stretch the learning for those who have shown mastery?

Belief #5
Students will be provided with support and assistance to meet their educational challenges, including the use of best educational practices that will prepare them for the future.

Belief #6
Student involvement will be enriched through co-curricular and extra-curricular activities that will provide opportunities for individual growth and acceptance of others.

Belief #7
Parent and community involvement supports student achievement.

III. School Profile

Bidwell Junior High School is a comprehensive middle school serving students in grades 7-8. Bidwell is located on the northeast side of Chico and serves students from Shasta, Nord Country School, John McManus, Neal Dow and Marigold elementary schools. The curriculum is state recommended and instruction meets the diverse needs of all students from those with identified learning disabilities, English language learners to the gifted and talented. Approximately eighty-five percent of the student body would consider themselves "college bound." The Bidwell Junior High School mission statement is "EXTRAORDINARY EDUCATION EMPOWERS EVERYONE".

Research on effective schools clearly states that the quality of the instructional delivery in the classroom has the most impact on student learning and that strong instructional leadership is essential to the improvement of instruction. Bidwell's quest to be extraordinary is guided by School Site Council. School improvement funds are allocated to support the goals outlined in our school plan. Bidwell's Instructional Leadership Team assists the administration in guiding the attainment of school goals. All teachers collaborate regularly to ask and answer the following questions as they relate to student performance:

- What do we want students to know?
- How do we know they learned it?
- How will we respond when students struggle?
- How do we extend the learning for students who have achieved mastery?

One of the most significant elements in the development and employment of effective teaching strategies by teachers is through ongoing staff development. Teachers who are able to maintain engaging, challenging courses of study "hook" students into the joy of learning as well as making their own profession one of constant growth and improvement. The corner stone of the Bidwell professional development program is teacher collaboration. Bidwell teachers meet every Wednesday from 8:00 until 9:00 to collaborate. These sessions provide time for teachers and staff to align subject area curriculum, analyze student achievement data, create strategies to help all students, and share best practices and implement new teaching strategies.

In addition, members of the Instructional Leadership Team are focusing their efforts on all the intervention programs that are offered during the school day as well as the after-school program.

IV. Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

A. Data Analysis (See Appendix A)

Bidwell Junior High has a wealth of data available to analyze student achievement in order to improve its educational program and increase student achievement. Teachers meet weekly in collaborative groups to examine results from site-developed common assessments, district-wide STAR mirror tests, and California Standards Tests. The teachers work interdependently with guidance and information provided by their peers at other school sites as well as administration at the site and district levels. Each collaborative group is working towards developing goals for improving student achievement and meet in course-alike teams at the site and district level.

The trend in Bidwell's Academic Performance Index (API) growth over the past three years has been upward. The API score for 2009 was at 788, 2010 at 795 and, finally, 2011 at 811. Table 1 in Appendix A shows the various student groups and how they performed last year. While the school showed an increase in API of 16 points, the single group that showed the most growth was the economically disadvantaged student group with an increase of 24 points. The student group of concern, due to lack of growth is the Hispanic group with a decrease in growth of 6 points.

In addition to paying close attention to the school's API scores, we must also work hard to achieve our Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). AYP measures achievement in English Language Arts (ELA) and in Math and has set performance targets for each subject.The long term goal for this program as established by NCLB is to have 100% of students proficient or above by the year 2014.

This year the ELA target is **67.6%** of students will be proficient or above. The White students were the only sub-group to meet this goal with a 69.7%. All students at or above proficiency was 62.2%.

The Math target is **68.5%** of students will be proficient or above. None of the sub-groups met this target. All students at or above proficient was 57%. See Table 4 in Appendix A.

B. Surveys

Surveys were given to all staff, all students and parents in 2011 in order to examine the educational program at Bidwell Junior High.

Teachers strongly believe in the importance to communicate with parents about their students' progress and most teachers are making an effort to communicate via email through Parent Portal and regular email.Teachers believe they work effectively with all students, including students with special needs. It is obvious from survey results as well as classroom observations that teachers are passionate about teaching. Teachers believe that in order for them to be effective, school needs to offer a threat-free environment and that parents are involved in their students' education.

Parents are generally satisfied with the level of education their students receive at Bidwell Junior High School and feel welcome at school. The parents know that teachers at Bidwell expect quality work for students and have respect for the teachers.

Students feel their teachers believe they can learn. Students feel challenged in their classes and the work they do make them think. They are concerned about not having as much choice as they would like about their education.

C. Classroom Observations

In addition to the standard, formal evaluation process, site administrators use every opportunity they have to conduct "walk-through" observations. These informal observations allow administrators to provide support to the teachers and allows students to see administrators in class rooms. The strength of teachers at Bidwell, aside from the pursuance of excellence is the training they provide to all students regarding study skills and appropriate academic behaviors in class.

Lessons are aligned with the state standards and teachers maintain a positive atmosphere in their classrooms, creating a safe environment for students to learn. SDAIE strategies are being used across the disciplines to aid second-language learners (as well as struggling learners) to increase their achievement. Teachers and other staff continue to look for ways to inspire unmotivated learners. Creative incentive strategies and parental involvement is often used to help motivate students who struggle to focus and perform in class. Teachers continually strive to include all students in the learning process.

Teachers teaching the same classes have striven to articulate their curricula to assure all students receive the same high-quality instruction. Collaboration time has been built into the week and teachers meet Wednesdays to plan lessons and create assessments together. The students benefit from the combined knowledge of all teachers within a department, rather than relying on one person. Teachers strong in one area are tasked with taking the lead for that area and sharing their expertise with their department colleagues.

D. Student Work and School Documents

School documents are created by committee and shared with staff members prior to final publication. This process allows all voices to be heard and allows teachers to share what they are doing in and out of their classrooms. Teachers share their students' work in collaborative groups, as many have adopted common assessments and assignments. The counselors work together with the teachers, parents and students to assess students' needs based on their achievement in class and develop strategies to increase students' achievement. Counselors, teachers, and administrators place students in a variety of intervention and support classes which include before, during, and after school intervention classes, the after school B.L.A.S.T program, lunch time homework completion, reading and math intervention during the school day and tutorial during the school day. This year a new program is avaiable to students duirng fourth period called, Encore, which focuses upon students identified as needing re-teaching or front loading of a concept.

E. **Analysis of Current Instructional Program (See Appendix B)**
Standards, Assessment, and Accountability
Teachers have examined the state standards for their particular discipline and collaboratively identified a set of essential standards, based on a criterion that examines the endurance, relevance, leverage, and necessity of the standard. Student mastery of the essential standards is assessed with common assessments at the site level and district-wide. Other standards are also taught, but are assessed by the teacher in his or her classroom, but not necessarily on district benchmark exams or site-wide common assessments. We are beginning the process by which teachers share the results of the common assessments and STAR mirror tests within their department and with teachers of course-alike teams in the district.

Staffing and Professional Development
100% of Bidwell's teachers meet the requirements for highly qualified staff as established by the No Child Left Behind legislation. The principal and assistant principal have both completed AB 430 (formerly AB75) training for administrators. Professional development activities for teachers are related to and occur within their collaborative groups.

Teaching and Learning
Instructional materials used by teachers at Bidwell have been adopted by the State Board of Education and are in line with the Williams legislation. All students have access to the materials. Bidwell Junior meets the required number of instructional minutes set forth by the State Board of Education. Teachers have identified a set of essential standards for the courses and have created lessons, which they share electronically, and based their common assessments on the set of standards.

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access
The Bidwell Junior instructional program has been designed to ensure all students succeed. In addition to the "regular" program, Bidwell also offers interventions and enrichment opportunities for students. Bidwell has implemented Core Power Hour, a program where students, identified by their teachers, are given time at lunch to complete work, with the assistance of counselors, volunteer parents and teachers and instructional aides. Additionally, there is a math-specific program at lunch called Math Power Hour, where students receive intensive help on their math homework. During the school day, students who are struggling readers have a reading class, in addition to their English class. An additional intervention called Tutorial/Academic Strategies is a daily study hall class for students who are failing core subjects. Students who need additional class time support are sent to the learning center where they can get small group assistance from instructional aides. Students are removed from their elective and scheduled in to Tutorial/Academic Strategies. Bidwell's after school program, BLAST, also offers an hour of homework help every day. Newly created for the current school-year is the Encore program. Students are recommended to this program by core teachers and it is offered during the school day by teachers. The targeted students are offered an instructional setting that is smaller and provides additional explanation of a concept, front loading of an upcoming new unit, and the ability to re-take a test for full credit.

Parent/Community Involvement
Parent and community involvement is an ongoing focus for Bidwell Junior. Bidwell has an active School Site Council, PTA organization, club sports program, and a Foundation made up of outside community members. Parents are encouraged to use the Parent Portal program, which allows parents to follow their students' progress on-line; currently about 2/3 of Bidwell's parents access their students grades on line. Teachers and administration contact parents to discuss successes and failures academically and behaviorally to develop strategies in tandem for the benefit of the students.

Funding
Funding is provided by the district in the form of categorical and unrestricted budgets. The School Site Council examines the categorical budgets and has the opportunity to approve or deny the proposed budgetary allocations for the different categorical programs on site.

V. Description of Barriers and Related School Goals

Barrier #1
Some students need more time and support to successfully access the curriculum. Providing targeted interventions within the school day would better serve students.

Barrier #2
Bidwell's overall API score rose from the 2008-09 score of 775 to a score of 795 in 2010. Regardless, not all student sub groups reached their API growth targets. Although Bidwell did raise its API to 811 in 2011, we can continue to improve our student achievement. Differentiated teaching and interventions need to be common place in all classrooms.

Barrier #3
While Bidwell teachers have access to state and local performance data there is emerging capacity on site to analyze and interpret this data with in the context of improving student achievement. Professional development in this area would help remove this barrier.

Barrier #4
Our current student population has a 44% rate of economically disadvantaged students. Support for learning and education needs to be increasingly provided before, during and after school since families are struggling at home.

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The School Site Council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet academic performance index and adequate yearly progress growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of students not yet meeting state standards:

SCHOOL GOAL #1
(Goals should be prioritized, measurable, and focused on identified student learning needs)
The school wide average of all numerically significant subgroups will meet or exceed AYP proficiency targets in mathematics.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students in grades 7 and 8	**Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:** An increase of 10% for all students scoring proficient or advanced on the CST
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Evidence of Effectiveness: formative assessment data, district common assessment data, HelpMath results, and student work. Attendance in intervention programs: Encore, Power Hour, and BLAST.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Site common assessments District common assessments HelpMath STAR results

SCHOOL GOAL #1				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date(38) Completion Date**	**Proposed Expenditures (39)**	**Estimated Cost**	**Funding Source**
Hire math support aide to provide school day academic support for all students including ELL students.	August 2011-May 2012	Math support aide	$40,238	Title 1
School day homework support for all students who are missing assignments, including ELL students. [Power Hour]	August 2011-May 2012	Personnel, materials, and equipment	$25,201	Title 1
Staff development and teacher collaboration to enhance teacher skills in core subject areas and better allow ELL students to access the core curriculum.	August 2011-May 2012	Release time and/or extra assignment	$2,000	Title 1
Hire a math teacher to provide re-teaching and / or front loading of instruction offered two periods per day to all students including ELL students. [Encore]	August 2011 - May 2012	Teacher support	$38,198	Title 1
Staff development, teacher release time and collaboration to develop classroom formative assessments and enhance teacher skills in this area.	August 2011-May 2012	Release time and/or extra assignment	$4,000	Title 1
Teacher use of collaboration time and release time to improve and refine instructional delivery to increase access by ELL students to the corecurriculum.	August 2011-May 2012	Substitute teachers	$6,000	Title 1
Training paraprofessionals / support staff in HelpMath and providing additional training materials and release time	April and May 2012	Training and release time	$3,500	EIA / SCE c/o
Reduction of class size for additional period of math intervention.	April 2012	Staffing one period.	$17,000	EIA / SCE c/o
Additional materials, supplies and program site visitations for observing math interventions protocols.	April and May 2012	Materials and release time	$8,000	EIA / SCE c/o
Additional materials, supplies and program site visitations for observing math interventions protocols.	April and May 2012	Materials and release time.	$8,000	**EIA/SCE**
Summer school intervention - mathematics	Summer June 2012	Teacher and materials	$8,555	Title 1 c / o
Develop algebra readiness assessment.	April 2012	Release time and materials	$550	Title 2 c / o

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #2
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
The school wide average of all numerically significant subgroups will meet or exceed AYP proficiency targets in ELA.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students grades 7 and 8	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: An increase of 10% for all students scoring proficient or advanced on the CST
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Evidence of Effectiveness: formative assessment data, district common assessments, and student work. Attendance in intervention programs: Encore, Power Hour, and BLAST.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Site common assessments District common assessments Accelerated Reader goal results STAR results

SCHOOL GOAL #2				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date Completion Date**	**Proposed Expenditures**	**Estimated Cost**	**Funding Source**
Hire ELA subject support teacher to provide school day academic support through front loading, re-teaching targeting students who are basic, below basic and far below basic. [Encore]	August 2011 - May 2012	ELA subject support teacher	$24,865 $5,135	Title 1 Title 1 c/o
Increase the ability for all students, including ELL students to read more books for AR.	August 2011 - May 2012	Purchase more books for AR	$4,262 $3,000	EIA / SCE Title 1 c/o
Release ILT for staff RTI training.	April 2012	Conference / training	$816.75 $9,000	Title 1 Title 2
Staff development and teacher collaboration to analyze data and enhance teacher skills in core subject areas	August 2011 - May 2012	Release time and/or extra assignment	$2,311 $2,331	Title 1 c / o Title 2 c / o
Staff development, teacher release time and collaboration to develop classroom formative assessment skills	August 2011 - May 2012	Release time and/or extra assignment	$2,311	Title 1 c / o
Support AR program with more licensing	January 2012	Purchase site licenses.	$3,254	EIA / SCE
Teacher use of collaboration time and release time to improve and refine instructional delivery	August 2011 - May 2012	substitute teachers	$3,350	Title 1
Schedule one period of teacher time to coordinate Reading, Accelerated Reader Program and ELD services.	August 2011 - May 2012	Teacher/Coordinator	$16,284	Title I
Hire 6 hour reading specialist Instructional Aide - ReadRight	August 2011 - May 2012	Salaries, materials & supplies	$36,241	Title I
Schedule one period of teacher time to coordinate Encore.	August 2011 - May 2012	Teacher/Coordinator	$12,580 $2,420	Title I c / o Title 1
Purchase high interest, low level reading materials to support literacy in history classes.	April 2012	Purchase reading materials	$5,477	EIA/SCE c/o
Provide staff training and materials in SDAIE methods in core curriculum to support ELL achievement.	May 2012	Training and materials.	$3,500	LEP c/o
Purchase additional Rosetta Stone licenses, head phones and microphones to increase ELL language acquisition.	April 2012	Purchase licenses	$2,600	LEP c/o
Additional materials, supplies and program site visitations for observing English interventions protocols.	April 2012	Sub and travel expense	$8,000	EIA/SCE
Summer School intervention program - English	Summer June 2012	Teacher and materials	$8,551	Title 1 c / o
Continued staff development on RTI	June 2012	Conference / training	$7,000	Title 2

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #3
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
Reduce the number of students receiving Fs on their semester report cards.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students grades 7 and 8	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: A reduction of 3% in the total number of Fs received
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: End of semester report cards	Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Number of Fs school wide via grade distribution analysis report (aeries).

SCHOOL GOAL #3

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Provide support to Power Hour staff with locating students and supervision during transitions.	August 2011 to May 2012	Lunch time support supervisor	$9,729	SCE
Provide additional staff time to counselor for support and monitoring.	August 2011 to May 2012	Counselor	$30,799	Title I c/o
Provide lunch time homework support - Power Hour	August 2011 - May 2012	Materials and supplies	$6,000	Title I
Hire subject support teachers in History 8 and Science 8 to provide school day academic support for all students including ELL students. [Encore]	August 2011 - May 2012	Two teachers	$63,493	Title I c / o
Targeted Case Manager (TCM) contacts parents regarding attendance, academic, and / or economic struggles that hinder student progress towards academic success.	August 2011 - May 2012	TCM	$11,457 $1,123	Title 1 c/o Title 1
Provide ELLs an extra period of support to enable better access to the core curriculum using SDAI and Language Star methods.	August 2011 - May 2012	Extra period	$16,463	EIA / SCE
Communication with parents/guardians about student progress through the use of Parent Portal, site level conferences, mailings, and evening group meetings.	August 2011 - May 2012	Mailings, materials, printing	$2,035	Title I parent ed
Send ILT members to conference on PLC strategies with a focus on interventions improvement.	April 2012	Training workshop	$8,000	EIA / SCE
To provide instant feedback to teachers and students about common assessments to support Illuminate.	April 2012	Purchase doc cams	$15, 177	EIA / SCE
Leftover cost for doc cams.	April 2012	doc cams	$2,900	EIA / SCE c/o
Hire two limited term paraprofessionals to push in ELLs into history and science to support increased academic language acquisition.	December 2011 - May 2012	Staffing	$10,400	EIA / LEP
Hire two limited term paraprofessionals to push in ELLs into history andscience to support increased academic language acquisition.	December 2011 - May 2012	Staffing	$6,512	EIA/LEP c/o

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #4
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) Bidwell Junior High School wil improve school safety and the learning environment.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: School safety and the learning environment will be improved for all student groups and all grade levels.	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: All student groups will maintain or move up one level of achievement ; i.e. Basic to Proficient.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Classroom success, CST scores, survey results, attendance, discipline	Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Grade summaries, CST results, survey results, attendance records, discipline records.

SCHOOL GOAL #4				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date Completion Date**	**Proposed Expenditures**	**Estimated Cost**	**Funding Source**
Violence Prevention Week activites	February 2012	materials and supplies	$400	Safe schools
Anti-bullying training and assembly	September 2011	presenter fees	$1,200	Safe schools
Survaillence cameras	July 2011	installation and purcahse	$850	Safe schools
Communcations devices	June 2012	fees for devices	$150	Safe schools
Peer Mediation training	October 2011	materials, staffing, meals	$150	Safe schools
Campus supervisors supplies	February 2012	safety vests, training for radio protocol	$1,500	Safe schools
Update school safety plan	May 2012	subs, materials, training	$2,750	Safe schools

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data

Table 1: Academic Performance Index by Student Group

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	698	635	618	508	440	413	21	21	15	38	31	42
Growth API	788	795	810	808	824	837			773			823
Base API	799	775	795	822	796	824			636			750
Target	1	5	5	A	4	A						
Growth	-11	20	15	-14	28	13						
Met Target	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Economically Disadvantaged			Students with Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	108	122	117	71	72	78	311	279	285	70	79	71
Growth API	717	725	720			695	735	726	750			641
Base API	743	705	726			664	730	724	726			530
Target	5	5	5				5	5	5			
Growth	-26	20	-6				5	2	24			
Met Target	No	Yes	No				Yes	No	Yes			

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 2 - Title III Accountability (District Data)

AMAO 1	Annual Growth		
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Number of Annual Testers	1,264	1,187	1,128
Percent with Prior Year Data	97	100	99
Number in Cohort	1,226	1,183	1,121
Number Met	724	587	595
Percent Met	59.1	50	53
NCLB Target	51.6	53.1	54.6
Met Target	Yes	No	No

AMAO 2	Attaining English Proficiency				
	2008-09	2009-10		2010-11	
	All Students	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction	
		Less Than 5	More Than 5	Less Than 5	More Than 5
Number in Cohort	633	799	592	746	576
Number Met	257	97	251	110	245
Percent Met	40.6	12.1	42.4	15	43
NCLB Target	30.6	17.4	41.3	18.7	43.2
Met Target	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

AMAO 3	Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level		
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
English-Language Arts			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	No
Mathematics			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	Yes
Met Target for AMAO 3	No	No	No

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 3: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	99	99	100	100	99	100	96	100	100	97	100
Number At or Above Proficient	393	365	384	310	285	287	9	4	7	20	15	23
Percent At or Above Proficient	55.0	57.5	62.1	59.8	64.8	69.5	39.1	19.0	46.7	50.0	48.4	54.8
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	99	100	100	99	100	99	99	99	99	98	96
Number At or Above Proficient	42	50	48	16	19	24	137	114	138	21	19	35
Percent At or Above Proficient	37.8	41.0	41.0	21.3	26.4	30.8	42.5	40.9	48.4	24.1	24.1	49.3
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	No	Yes	No	--	--	--	No	No	Yes	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=46.0%), (2010=56.8%), (2011=67.6%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=44.5%), (2010=55.6%), (2011=66.7%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 4: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	99	99	99	99	100	99	100	96	100	100	97	100
Number At or Above Proficient	344	336	351	269	253	256	6	8	10	22	15	28
Percent At or Above Proficient	48.4	53.0	57.0	52.2	57.6	62.3	26.1	38.1	66.7	55.0	48.4	66.7
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	99	99	100	100	99	100	99	99	99	98	98	96
Number At or Above Proficient	36	49	41	20	22	25	127	111	129	17	20	28
Percent At or Above Proficient	32.7	40.2	35.0	26.7	30.6	32.1	39.6	39.9	45.3	19.8	25.3	39.4
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	No	Yes	No	--	--	--	Yes	No	Yes	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=47.5%), (2010=58.0%), (2011=68.5%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=43.5%), (2010=54.8%), (2011=66.1%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 5: California English Language Development (CELDT) Data

Grade	California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Results for 2010-11											
	Advanced		Early Advanced		Intermediate		Early Intermediate		Beginning		Number Tested
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
K											
1											
2											
3											
4											
5											
6											
7	1	4	12	44	9	33	4	15	1	4	27
8	2	12	5	29	9	53	1	6			17
9											
10											
11											
12											
Total	3	7	17	39	18	41	5	11	1	2	44

Appendix B - Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are adapted from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title I, Part A and the California Essential Program Components (EPC). These statements were used to discuss and develop findings that characterize the instructional program at this school for students:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Special consideration was given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs. A synopsis of the discussion is provided.

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

1. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (NCLB)

    STAR scores, CELDT scores, GATE scores, IEPs are used in making decisions regarding student placement in classes.

2. Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)

    Accelerated Reader scores are used by all of the English department members. Results from district common assessments will drive instructional choices.

Staffing and Professional Development

3. Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (NCLB)

    All teachers are NCLB qualified.

4. Principals' Assembly Bill (AB) 75 training on State Board of Education (SBE) adopted instructional materials (EPC)

    The current principal and assistant principal have completed AB75 (AB 430) training.

5. Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to AB 466 training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)

    Bidwell teachers are offered numerous opportunities for professional development. All approved professional development must tie into either student learning, CA standards, SDE approved curriculum or research based instructional strategies. Offerings include AB466 training, PLC development, Formative Assessment, CSUC Math Lesson Study, Developing Learning Targets, etc.

6. Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (NCLB)

    With the guidance of the Instructional Leadership Team, all on-site and off-site staff development opportunities are directly linked to enhancing students learning.

7. Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)

    Weekly teacher collaboration provides peer support for teachers. School wide data is discussed at staff meetings and during Instructional Leadership meetings. On-site and off-site staff present "mini" workshops at staff meetings (e.g. Enhancing Content Literacy, Developing Learning Targets). Some collaboration groups develop units, lessons and assessments that are then placed in folders on the WEB site for all to utilize. This system of dividing the workload has alleviated some of the stress teachers feel as they strive to move all students into the proficient level.

8. Teacher collaboration by grade level (EPC)

    All teachers meet weekly in course alike or department meetings.

Teaching and Learning

9. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (NCLB)

The teachers have developed or are in the process of developing a pacing guide and common assessments which are standards-based.

10. Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (EPC)

   Bidwell Junior High School adheres to the recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and math.

11. Lesson pacing schedule (EPC)

   A lesson pacing guide has been developed for all curricular areas. The teachers meet weekly to discuss lessons, common assessments and to make adjustments so that all students are receiving the same curriculum at about the same time. This is helpful for intervention and support systems that are in place as it allows all students, in the same grade, to walk into an intervention group and work on similar assignments, regardless of the teacher.

12. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (NCLB)

   As per the Williams Act, instructional materials are available for all students.

13. Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials (EPC)

   Bidwell uses all SBE-adopted and standards-aligned materials.

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

14. Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

   Teachers use SADIE strategies and strive to differentiate instruction so that the curriculum is accessible to all students. In addition, numerous teachers are using researched based teaching methods that improve student learning.

15. Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement at this school (NCLB)

   Within our school and throughout our school district, we are following the Professional Leaning Community model for school improvement. Teachers have had staff-directed training with Keeping Learning on Track materials. Bidwell staff is offering targeted interventions with improvement oversight by the Instructional Leadership Team. The staff and district teachers are using STAR mirror test results in the four core curriculum areas to identify areas where teaching and learning need improvement. As a result of the first baseline test, teachers have created SMART goals and will look at results of the goals on the second STAR mirror tests.

16. Opportunities for increased learning time (Title I SWP and PI requirement)

   Bidwell offers support during the school day and before and after school intervention/support groups for struggling students in all areas with an emphasis on reading and mathematics. In addition, work completion help is also provided at lunch time.

17. Transition from preschool to kindergarten (Title I SWP)

Involvement

18. Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (NCLB)

   Bidwell has evening events for students and families. In addition, informational nights are held, with translators available. Bidwell also has an onsite parent resource center and offers parent skills classes.

19. Strategies to increase parental involvement (Title I SWP)

   Bidwell strives to increase parent involvement with the parents of at-risk students. Bidwell holds a ceremony to celebrate the re-designation of EL students and a large parent group attended. It afforded the staff time to inform parents of the services Bidwell has in place to support students and families.

20. Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, and other school personnel in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of consolidated application programs (5 CCR 3932)

   All stake holders are involved when planning and implementing consolidated application programs.

Funding

21. Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

- Before and After School Intervention groups
- Lunch time Homework Completion program
- Reading Specialist
- Read Right aide
- Aide who helps families acquire low cost computers from Computers for Schools
- Aide to supervise tech lab to provide access for students who do not have computers

22. Fiscal support (EPC)

Chico Unified School District
BJHS
2011/2012 **ACTUALS** Categorical Budgets

Programs	'11/'12 Actual Budget		'10/'11 C/O Budget		'11/'12 Operating Budget
LEP R#7091	$ 10,400	+	$ 12,612	=	$ 23,012
SCE R#7090	$ 57,708	+	$ 33,977	=	$ 91,685
EIA Total * (Old R# 7250)	$ 68,108	+	$ 46,589	=	$ 114,697
Title I R# 3010	$ 203,500	+	$ 150,916	=	$ 354,416
Title I Parent Ed R# 3010-1010	$ 2,035	+	■■■■■■	=	$ 2,035
Title II Staff Develop R# 4035	$ 16,000	+	$ 2,881	=	$ 18,881
Safe Schools (Old R#6405) R# 0030	$ 7,000	+	$ -	=	$ 7,000
Specialized Programs (Old R#7370) R# 0370	■■■■■■	+	■■■■■■	=	■■■■■■

The Single Plan for Student Achievement

John McManus Elementary School
School Name

04-61424-6003024
CDS Code

Date of this revision: March 9, 2012

The *Single Plan for Student Achievement* (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index. California *Education Code* sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program Improvement into the *Single Plan for Student Achievement.*

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person:	Laurie DeBock
Position:	Principal
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3128
Address:	988 East Ave.
	Chico, CA 95926
E-mail Address:	ldebock@chicousd.org

Chico Unified School District
School District

Superintendent:	Kelly Staley
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3000
Address:	1163 East Seventh St.
	Chico, CA 95928
E-mail Address:	kstaley@chicousd.org

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan on .

II. School Vision and Mission

John A. McManus Elementary Mission Statement
The McManus staff collaborates to provide the instruction and support that all students need in order to learn and achieve at high levels. We believe all students can reach their full potential.

A Shared Vision of the School We Strive to Create at
McManus Elementary: 2011-2012

• Students and teachers look forward to coming to school.
• There is a climate of high expectations for student's success, and staff members communicate their high expectations to students, parents, and one another.
• We work together respectfully as a school community to obtain our goals both of social inclusion and high academic success
• Students and adults alike believe their efforts, improvements, and achievements are recognized and celebrated.
• There is a clear path and procedure to provide early interventions that is monitored on a timely basis.
• Varied enrichment opportunities are provided for students before and after school such as: music, art, sports, drama, fitness, clubs, and peer mediators.
• Our school welcomes all children and their families from our diverse Chico community.
• There is a safe and orderly environment.

III. School Profile

John McManus School is a K-6 elementary school located 76 miles north of Sacramento in the city of Chico, California. It is one of 10 elementary schools in the Chico Unified School District. McManus currently serves 570 students and has 20 classrooms. In addition to a Resource Specialist Program, the school offers a Special Day Class, a Title 1 Resource Program, Instructional Aides who support Title I students and English Language Learners and an After School ASES Program serving over 160 students.

Twenty-two percent of our students are English Learners. Seventy-three percent participate In the Free and Reduced Breakfast and Lunch Program. In 2009/10 McManus launched a 4 year Healthy Start grant providing support services for students and families. This program had a successful planning team and focuses on helping students and their families with health issues, parent education and community support services.

The Title I program utilizes many educational programs to enhance student learning by scheduling small group instruction with teachers, aides and the computer lab. Programs such as SIPPS, Rosetta Stone, Read Naturally, Soar to Success and Accelerated Reading are offered to groups during the levelized langauge arts block of time. English Learners have specific groups for the delivery of Language Star. Grade Level discussions and meetingshave been streamlined with the PLC collaborative model.

IV. Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

A. Data Analysis (See Appendix A)

Our MILT (McManus Instructional Leadership Team) meets on a bi-weekly basis to look at data and to help grade levels determine their "Next Steps". School data indicates growth in many areas but English Learners and Special Education students continue to lag behind state expectations. Through the use of Cruncher, small grade level groups are regularly assessed and given additional instruction by support staff and by instructional aides. By using current data from EduSoft on a trimester or more frequent schedule, additional students are pulled to work with our support staff. Teachers are encouraged to administer formative assessments and then disaggregate the data to restructure their levelized groups to better serve all students.

B. Surveys

In 2011 our Site in collaboration with the District Office conducted a survey with information gathered from students, parents and staff. This information has been studied by our Staff in order to gather data to improve our programs.

C. Classroom Observations

Classroom observations happen as per CUSD/CUTA contract. The principal visits each classroom frequently and often gives feedback to staff members. Grade Level Teams meet for an average of 50 minutesweekly to discuss their teaching practices and may invite team members to observe to help them improve instruction. The District provides support through math and ELD Program specialist coaching teams who work with teachers and classrooms to improve instruction.

D. Student Work and School Documents

The McManus Instructional Leadership Team (MILT) works together with the rest of the staff to focus on ELA, writing and math as areas for improvement. Student subgroups; ELD, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and SWD, are also focus groups. Teachers gather and share data in order to improve their instruction. Additionally, the new math adoption, Everyday Math, is being taught in every classroom. Classrooms now post ELA, writing and math "Learning targets" based on the Standards so that students and parents can follow progress. Grade Level Teams are focusing on their learning targets ("I can" statements) and developing formative assessments to measure student growth.

E. Analysis of Current Instructional Program (See Appendix B)

MILT, Grade Level Teams and the entire staff are working with our Title I teacher to develop interventions and enrichment for all students including a continuing focus on English Learners. Staff members participate in staff development in the area of English Learners and Special Education to support teaching and learning. Many staff members have served on District curriculum committees and Task Forces and are willing and able to lend their expertise to MILT and staff.

V. Description of Barriers and Related School Goals

There are a number of barriers in place making progress difficult for John McManus Elementary to realize its school goals. McManus has siginificantly high percentages of students in subgroups that historically underperform in areas of academic achievement. In order to address these issues, McManus Elementary has allocated siginificant manpower and attention through our Title 1 program to address the unique needs of our students, specifically English learners, SWD, and students categorized as socioeconomically disadvantaged. A student is considered socioeconomically disadvantaged if both parents did not complete high school or if the student participates in the National School Lunch Program. With district support we utilize the support of ELD and Math coaching teams to help us better reflect on how well we are meeting the needs of our students with our curriculum, instructional practices and our student academic growth monitoring. McManus will also work extensively this year with ELD consultant Kevin Clark to improve our delivery of ELD instruction. This summer, McManus offered an ELD summer language institute program for our students as well as provided intense staff development. Mr. Clark will also consult with the district ELD coaching team to provide regular coaching to the McManus staff throughout the school year.

Current Reality # 1 The proficiency target to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English Language Arts for the 2010-2011school year was 67.6. The percentage of students who scored proficient or better on the English Language Arts portion of the California Standardized Test school-wide and in each of the reportable subgroups is as follows:

School-wide 38.6%

White 46.9%

Socioeconomically Disadvantaged 34.8%

Hispanic 31.2%

English Learner 17.4%

Durrent Reality #2: The profiency target to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics for the 2010-2011 school year was 68.5%. The percentage of students who scored profieient or better on the Mathematics portion of the California Standardized Test school-wide and in each of the reportable subgroups is as follows:

School-wide 45.2%

White 49.7%

Socioeconomically Disadvantaged 43.9%

Hispanic 44%

English Learner 33.9%

Current Reality #3: Though all students have access to the high quality core curriculum, it is evident that an achievement gap and achievement deficieny exist. McManus Elementary is currently in year 8 of Program Improvement status. McManus staff continues to work collaboratively to provide the core curriculum and research-proven interventions to reduce the achievement gap and increase overall academic achievement for all students.

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The School Site Council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet academic performance index and adequate yearly progress growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of students not yet meeting state standards:

SCHOOL GOAL #1
(Goals should be prioritized, measurable, and focused on identified student learning needs) McManus Elementary will meet or exceed the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and CUSD benchmark assessments proficiency targets in English Language Arts. English learners (EL) will meet their Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: - All students taking the California Standards Test - CUSD benchmark assessments - All students enrolled K-6 - English Learners (EL) in grades K-6	**Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:** Overall, 78.4% of students enrolled in grades 2-6 will score proficient or better on the 2012 CST. 80% of all students K-6 will score proficient or better on CUSD benchmark assessments. EL students will show at least a 30% growth increase on the Language Star assessment in the Spring of 2012.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: - California Standards Test (CST) -CUSD benchmark assessments -Language Star assessment - California English Language Development Test (CELDT)	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** -Language Star Assessment results. -Grade level performance on the CA Standards Test for English Language Arts -District Benchmark Assessments by grade level - Grade level common assessments that match ELA SMART goals - Edusoft Reports by Grade level and Teacher - Report Cards

SCHOOL GOAL #1				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date**(38) **Completion Date**	**Proposed Expenditures** (39)	**Estimated Cost**	**Funding Source**
The ILT team will analyze data from: CST, STAR Mirror, CUSD Benchmarks, text-based assessments, and AR STAR to determine academic needs of students in reading comprehension, vocabulary development, and reading fluency. The ILT, in collaboration with Title 1 staff, will make recommendations for student placement in a levelized ELA time block daily. Using the PLC model teacher teams will consider recommendations made when grouping students for intervention or enrichment as needed for more refined instruction. In addition, Essential Standards and CST blue prints will guide grade level teams when making decisions regarding content to be taught in levelized blocks. The groups will be adjusted at least three times per year based on changing student needs. All students performing below proficient levels will receive Language Star instruction. ILT team will visit schools of similar demographics that have faced similar challenges but have consistently met their API and AYP exiting or staying out of PI status.	9/11-5/12	ILT stipends PLC release time teachers Cost of subs for ILT team to visit other schools.	$5,333 $2,400 $3,200	Title 1 c/o Title 1 c/o Title 1 c/o
English Language Development instruction is provided for EL students directed toward building their English Language proficiency for min 60 minutes a day 4x/week using Language Star direct instruction. Students	9/11-5/12	Title 1 teachers, parent and instructional aides	*$100,000	Title 1

SCHOOL GOAL #1

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date(38) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
are grouped by ELD proficiency levels. The EL Coaching team will model and support classroom Language Star direct instruction strategies.		to assist with small group learning using push-in and pull-out model		
		Staff Development in Language Star		
		EL Coaching team	$10,000	Title 1 c/o
		Supplemental materials	$0	District provided
			$15,902	EIA - LEP
Coordinate Accelerated Reader program to support reading practice leading to higher levels of comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary development. Access for all students to Accelerated Reading on computers.	9/11-5/12	computer Instructional aide	**$8,936	EIA - SCE
		Maintain and update computers and materials as needed	$10,000	Title 1 c/o
		Materials	$5,308	Title 1 c/o
Focused ELA staff development opportunities that focus on intervention development, instructional best practices, formative assessment, learning targets, school mission /vision, and differentiated instruction.	9/11-5/12	Staff development training	$15,000	Title II
			$4,977	Title II c/o
Read Naturally, a computer software program designed to help students build fluency, is used for grades 3-6. EL students are given access to Rosetta Stone, a scientifically-based approach to second language acquisition. Provide tech support and equipment school wide with a focus on the computer lab and Smart boards in classrooms to assist teachers to utilize 'best practices' in teaching.	9/11-5/12	computer Instructional Aide	**already noted above	EIA - SCE
		Instructional aides	*already noted above	Title 1
		Interactive whiteboard training.	$5,000	Title 1 c/o
		Supplies and upgrades	$12,000	Title 1 c/o
Provide support to new teachers to help with lesson planning, coaching, and modeling of 'best teaching practices.'	8/11-5/12	Consultant	$15,000	Title 1 c/o
Utilize supplemental materials to target growth in phonemic awareness, phonics, and sight words using SIPPS, Earobics, Sounds and letters, Making Sense of Phonics(Isabel Beck), Signs for Sounds, Leveled Readers, Zoo-Phonics.	9/11-5/12	Supplemental materials	$,15,000	EIA - SCE
		-Instructional aides	*already noted above	Title 1
Provide Extra support to academically at risk students in small group before and after school. Continue to offer intersession classes during Thanksgiving and Spring break to provide continuity of instruction for students, particularly those who are in need of extra time and support. Continue providing extended day K-program for all students thereby providing students additional exposure to academic and social skills foundational to their success in school.	9/11-5/12	Extra Assignment for classroom teachers	$9,333	Title 1 c/o
		ASP / Intersession	$0	ASES Grant
Provide field trip experiences that enhance learning and are academically focused on state standards.	9/11-5/12	Program costs and transportation	$3,844	EIA - LEP
			$6,156	EIA - SCE
Parent connection - Use school newsletter translated in 2 languages, and school website to provide information about intervention programs, testing, and tips for supporting student academically. Provide Hmong and Spanish translators as needed for parent conferences.		Parent Liaison	$2,620	Title 1 c/o
		Targeted Case Managers	$3,000	Healthy Start Grant

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #2
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
McManus Elementary will meet or exceed the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and CUSD benchmark assessments proficiency targets in mathematics.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal:	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:
- AYP proficiency targets - All students in grades 2-6 -District benchmark targets - All students K-6	79% of students enrolled in grades 2-6 will score proficient or better on the 2011 CST. 80% of all students enrolled K-6 will score proficient or better on CUSD benchmark assessments.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: - California Standards Test - CUSD benchmark assessments	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** - Grade level performance of each subgroup on the California Standards Test for Mathematics - District Benchmark Assessments by grade level - Grade level common assessments that align with SMART goals in mathematics - Report Cards

SCHOOL GOAL #2

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
The staff will provide every student with a comprehensive core curriculum and instruction that is aligned to content standards and articulated across grade levels for Mathematics.	8/11-5/12	Support materials	$8,000	Title 1 c/o
The CUSD Math Coach will model core instruction and interventions, assist teachers in developing lesson plans, co-teach and coach classroom teachers. They will continue to work with classroom teachers in building skills to differentiate instruction using Everyday Mathematics. They will also work with grade level teams to review Everyday Mathematics assessments to ensure coherence with the CUSD Essential Standards, and identify any gaps that need to be filled.	8/11-5/12	Math Coach	$0	District provided
Collaboration meetings averaging 60 minutes weekly provide opportunities to analyze data, create formative assessments, review student progress, and develop plans to support academically at risk students. Essential standards and CST blueprints will guide them in this process.	8/11-5/12	Support teachers for PLC release time	$2,400	Title I c/o
Assist grade level representatives through MILT in leading regular meetings to review student math chapter tests and performance data for the purpose of planning targeted and differentiated instruction.	8/11-5/12	McManus Instructional Leadership Team stipend	$5,333	Title 1 c/o
Maintain pacing of mathematics instructional focus calendar for Everyday Math as published by Chico Unified School District.	8/11-5/12	Math Coach	$0	District provided
Provide Extra support to academically at risk students in small group before and after school.	9/11-5/12	Extra Assignment for classroom teachers	$9,333	Title 1 c/o
Provide small group and individual instruction for students not meeting proficiency levels.	8/11-5/12	Title 1 teachers, parent and instructional aides to assist with small group learning using push-in and pull-out model	$46,764	Title1
Focused Math staff development opportunities that focus on intervention development, instructional best practices, formative assessment, learning targets, school mission /vision, and differentiated instruction.	9/11-5/12	Staff development training	$8,072	Title 1

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #3
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
Numerically significant subgroups that have historically underperformed will meet their AMOs on the 2012 CST.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal:	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:
- English learners (EL) in grades 2-6 - Socioeconomically disadvantaged students in grades 2-6 - Hispanic students in grades 2-6	While working toward meeting AYP as reported on the CST, these subgroups will increase their AMOs by %12 or more.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: API – 2011-2012 data obtained from Accountability Progress Report on Growth and Targets Met for each subgroup 2011-2012 data obtained from Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Grade level performance of each subgroup on the California Standards District Benchmark Assessments by grade level Report Cards Grade level common assessments that are aligned with SMART goals Student writing rubric scores Language Star Assessment CELDT

SCHOOL GOAL #3

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Using the PLC model, provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate to dis-aggregate data, share best practices and plan interventions.	9/11-5/12	PLC release time support teachers	*$2,400	Title 1
Focused ELA and Math staff development opportunities that focus on intervention development, instructional best practices, formative assessment, common school mission and vision. Examples are: Math Institute, Language Star Institute, Kindergarten conference, Writing project, building a common vision and mission, Leadership Matters, and staff development offered by the Butte County office of Education.	9/11-5/12	Staff development training	$20,000	Title 1
The McManus Instructional Leadership Team will support the continued implementation of a PLC at our school site. The ILT is a group of teachers elected by their peers given responsibility to make recommendations to the principal and support school programs. The CUSD ELD coaching team will work with grade level teams to expand their knowledge as to what areas to target for instruction. The ELD coaching team will share STAR Blueprints, ELD standards, CUSD ELD assessment information, etc with grade level teams as they plan instruction. Also our Math coach will assist grade level teams in the development of common assessments to monitor student progress in mathematics as well as model teaching strategies and support classroom teachers with Every Day Math. Title I teachers, instructional aides and parent aides will provide additional support for classroom teachers and students in providing research-based interventions	9/11-5/12	ILT members stipend -PLC release time teachers -ELD coaching team -Math coach -Title 1 teachers and Instructional aides -Materials Computer IA	$3,165 $2,168 *already noted $0 $0 **$92,027 $12,804 $8,000.	Title I c/o Title I Title 1 District provided District provided Title 1 EIA - LEP EIA - SCE
Students will participate in a levelized ELA intervention block 4 times a week. Students will be grouped by area of need for more refined instruction. The student grouping for the levelized blocks will be adjusted at least three times per year based on changing student needs.	9/11-5/12	Title 1 teachers, parent and instructional aides to assist with small group learning using push-in and pull-out model Materials	**already noted above $4,954 $9,826 $2,220	Title I EIA - LEP c/o EIA - SCE c/o EIA - SCE
Provide assistance with assessments, progress monitoring, and record keeping of students designated as EL learners.	9/11-5/12	Title 1 teachers Extra assignment for certificated and classified staff	**already noted above $19,609	Title 1 EIA - LEP c/o

SCHOOL GOAL #3

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Provide extra support to academically at risk students in small groups before and after school. Continue to offer 'Early Back' programs to serve the needs of students who require additional ELD support. Continue to offer intersession classes during Thanksgiving and Spring break to provide continuity of instruction for students, particularly those who are in need of extra time and support.	9/11-5/12	Extra Assignment for classroom teachers. ASP Staff	$9,333 $0	Title 1 ASES grant
Provide support to new teachers to help with lesson planning, coaching and modeling of 'best teaching practices.'	8/11-5/12	Consultant	$15,000	Title 1
Parent Education and Outreach programs through the Healthy Start program for parents to connect with the school and explore ways to assist students in their academic progress. Continue to hold regular ELAC meetings to encourage the involvement of the parents of English learners	9/11-5/12	Parent Classes	$3,020	Title 1 Parent Ed
Reimbursement to Title I Provide release time and extra assignment for teachers and instructional aides for Language Star professional development.	12/11-5/12	ReleaseTime Extra Assignment	$4,236	Title 1

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #4
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
By implementing a school-wide positive behavior plan (BEST to increase students active engagement and academic success, McManus will maintain a physically, emotionally and academically safe environment with a target of reducing discipline referrals and student suspensions by 10%.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students Grades K-6	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Reduce discipline referrals and student suspensions by 10%
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Tracking: -Detentions Referrals -Office Referrals -Suspensions -Counseling referrals	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Detention/office referrals Suspensions Counseling referrals Student behavior inventory completed by teachers 3 times a year

SCHOOL GOAL #4

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Maintain a school-wide behavior (BEST) management plan to insure a positive and comprehensive approach Implement instructional strategies such a character education, Tool Box, Steps to respect, and Second Step, to teach problem resolution and anger-management techniques	9/11-5/12	PIP IA Senior Guidance Counselor	$0 $0	District provided Counseling grant Counseling Grant
Assist principal with campus control and security for the purpose of increased contact time in classrooms with students and teachers.	8/11-5/12	Healthy Start Coordinator Teacher in Charge Additional playground supervision Additional before school parking lot supervision	*$41,000 $0 $10,308 $3,000	Healthy Start Grant District provided EIA - SCE Safe Schools
Hold monthly assemblies that promote good citizenship, school attendance, positive character building, and anti-bullying to increase the authentic engagement and success of all students.	9/11-5/12	Reward Assemblies	$5,000	EIA - SCE
Through the Healthy Start program we serve students, their family members, and the school community by providing physical, emotional, and intellectual support.	8/11-5/12	Healthy Start coordinator Targeted Case Managers	*already noted above $0	Healthy Start Grant Healthy Start , PAT, and ASES Grants
Ensure that every student comes to school ready to Learn and has assistance in developing strategies to become lifelong learners. Provide individual counseling services to students in need and small group and whole class behavioral improvement sessions to all students in need.	9/11-5/12	Counseling services PIP	$0 $0	Counseling grant Grant
Coordinate SBIT meetings for children at risk of failure for purpose of creating student plan for achievement.	8/11-5/12	Roving substitute	$2,000	Title I
Provide structured recess activities and implement a school wide 'anti-bullying' campaign.	9/11-5/12	Counselors	**already noted above	Counseling grant

SCHOOL GOAL #4				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date** **Completion Date**	**Proposed** **Expenditures**	**Estimated** **Cost**	**Funding** **Source**

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data

Table 1: Academic Performance Index by Student Group

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	425	437	406	201	200	176	27	24	31	39	48	53
Growth API	744	721	727	802	765	778			691			655
Base API	731	740	721	774	799	765			745			665
Target	5	5	5	5	1	5						
Growth	13	-19	6	28	-34	13						
Met Target	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes						

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Economically Disadvantaged			Students with Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	128	135	125	103	115	109	306	329	301	39	48	46
Growth API	670	662	686	636	616	628	723	703	710			642
Base API	687	669	662	641	634	616	710	721	703			597
Target	6	7	7	8	8	9	5	5	5			
Growth	-17	-7	24	-5	-18	12	13	-18	7			
Met Target	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes			

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 2 - Title III Accountability (District Data)

AMAO 1	Annual Growth		
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Number of Annual Testers	1,264	1,187	1,128
Percent with Prior Year Data	97	100	99
Number in Cohort	1,226	1,183	1,121
Number Met	724	587	595
Percent Met	59.1	50	53
NCLB Target	51.6	53.1	54.6
Met Target	Yes	No	No

AMAO 2	Attaining English Proficiency				
	2008-09	2009-10		2010-11	
		Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction	
	All Students	Less Than 5	More Than 5	Less Than 5	More Than 5
Number in Cohort	633	799	592	746	576
Number Met	257	97	251	110	245
Percent Met	40.6	12.1	42.4	15	43
NCLB Target	30.6	17.4	41.3	18.7	43.2
Met Target	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

AMAO 3	Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level		
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
English-Language Arts			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	No
Mathematics			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	Yes
Met Target for AMAO 3	No	No	No

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 3: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number At or Above Proficient	190	166	158	121	102	84	9	13	11	6	7	12
Percent At or Above Proficient	43.8	38.0	38.9	59.6	51.0	47.7	30.0	54.2	35.5	15.4	14.6	22.6
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number At or Above Proficient	38	29	39	16	12	19	128	111	106	10	12	17
Percent At or Above Proficient	29.2	21.5	31.2	15.2	10.4	17.4	41.0	33.7	35.2	20.8	25.0	37.0
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=46.0%), (2010=56.8%), (2011=67.6%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=44.5%), (2010=55.6%), (2011=66.7%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 4: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number At or Above Proficient	196	168	184	111	89	88	11	10	11	15	18	18
Percent At or Above Proficient	45.3	38.4	45.3	54.7	44.5	50.0	36.7	41.7	35.5	38.5	37.5	34.0
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number At or Above Proficient	43	37	55	34	27	37	130	116	133	15	18	21
Percent At or Above Proficient	33.1	27.4	44.0	32.4	23.5	33.9	41.8	35.3	44.2	31.3	37.5	45.7
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=47.5%), (2010=58.0%), (2011=68.5%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=43.5%), (2010=54.8%), (2011=66.1%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 5: California English Language Development (CELDT) Data

Grade	California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Results for 2010-11										
	Advanced		Early Advanced		Intermediate		Early Intermediate		Beginning		Number Tested
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
K							********	***			********
1			5	25	7	35	7	35	1	5	20
2			2	11	4	22	6	33	6	33	18
3			2	10	6	29	5	24	8	38	21
4			3	14	12	57	3	14	3	14	21
5			3	14	15	68	4	18			22
6	3	14	6	29	10	48	1	5	1	5	21
7											
8											
9											
10											
11											
12											
Total	3	2	21	17	54	44	27	22	19	15	124

Appendix B - Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are adapted from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title I, Part A and the California Essential Program Components (EPC). These statements were used to discuss and develop findings that characterize the instructional program at this school for students:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Special consideration was given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs. A synopsis of the discussion is provided.

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

1. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (NCLB)

    Grade Level Teams and the MILT meet at regularly scheduled intervals and work with the most recent data to regroup students and to select appropriate interventions for all students.

2. Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)

    The Title I teacher and aides assist teachers with the most recent data from EduSoft, Cruncher, CBM and other assessments to realign student groups or to place students new to McManus.

Staffing and Professional Development

3. Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (NCLB)

    All McManus teachers have met these qualifications.

4. Principals' Assembly Bill (AB) 75 training on State Board of Education (SBE) adopted instructional materials (EPC)

    The principal has completed the AB 75 training.

5. Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to AB 466 training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)

    The majority of teachers have attended professional development in areas that their grade level team has selected.

6. Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (NCLB)

    With the help of our CUSD curriculum directors, CUSD has offered in corporation with BCOE staff development linked to content standards and student performance.

7. Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)

    McManus has the support of the Title I Program and teachers who serve on task forces for this assistance. The school is provided certificated coaches in ELD and math by the district. Our MILT team recommends many steps to improve instruction.

8. Teacher collaboration by grade level (EPC)

    Regularly scheduled collaboration time is in place for grade level teams to meet. Additionally our Fine Arts program offers a common time for teachers if they choose to work together. On average, 2 staff meetings a month are dedicated to Grade Level PLC meetings.

Teaching and Learning

9. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (NCLB)

    CUSD Task Forces meet regularly and send updated information for staff meetings on site. McManus is proud to have representatives at these District meetings who share information with the staff during scheduled meeting time.

10. Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (EPC)

Every grade level works out a schedule that permits them to comply with recommended instructional minutes but gives them the opportunity to work with support staff during these critical times.

11. Lesson pacing schedule (EPC)

Grade levels use the recommendations from the CUSD Task Forces.

12. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (NCLB)

Under the Williamson Act these materials are available to all students and staff.

13. Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials (EPC)

Instructional funds are focused on the standards instructional materials and the appropriate intervention materials.

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

14. Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

Grade Level PLCs work together to address the needs of ALL students with the support of the Title I Program.

15. Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement at this school (NCLB)

All curriculum and supplemental materials used on a regular basis to meet the requirements of research-based educational practices.

16. Opportunities for increased learning time (Title I SWP and PI requirement)

Small groups receive additional time during core curricular time and in the supplemental afterschool programs.

17. Transition from preschool to kindergarten (Title I SWP)

NA

Involvement

18. Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (NCLB)

With the addition of the Healthy Start program many groups have volunteered time to focus on ALL students, with an emphasis on those most in need.

19. Strategies to increase parental involvement (Title I SWP)

McManus is fortunate to have an excellent Afterschool (ASES) Program where parental involvement is a requirement. Additionally the PTA presents opportunities for parents to become involved in a variety of activities. The Healthy Start Program has many parent oriented activities and assistance for parenting classes.

20. Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, and other school personnel in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of consolidated application programs (5 CCR 3932)

Site Council meets on a regular basis and takes information back to staff meetings and PTA and other parent meetings.

Funding

21. Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

Title I, ASES and Healthy Start give students in need increased opportunities for success.

22. Fiscal support (EPC)

Funding fluctuates according to the State's solvency.

Appendix C - Programs Included in this Plan

Check the box for each state and federal categorical program in which the school participates and, if applicable, enter amounts allocated. (The plan must describe the activities to be conducted at the school for each of the state and federal categorical program in which the school participates. If the school receives funding, then the plan must include the proposed expenditures.)

State Programs		Allocation
[ ]	California School Age Families Education Purpose: Assist expectant and parenting students succeed in school.	$
[X]	Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program.	$64,620
[X]	Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program Purpose: Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners	$60,175
[ ]	High Priority Schools Grant Program Purpose: Assist schools in meeting academic growth targets.	$
[ ]	Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform Purpose: Train classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum areas.	$
[ ]	Peer Assistance and Review Purpose: Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring.	$
[ ]	Pupil Retention Block Grant Purpose: Prevent students from dropping out of school.	$
[ ]	School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant Purpose: Improve library and other school programs.	$
[ ]	School Safety and Violence Prevention Act Purpose: Increase school safety.	$
[ ]	Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Purpose: Eliminate tobacco use among students.	$
[X]	List and Describe Other State or Local funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education): ARRA SFSF (Safe Schools) $3,000	$3,000
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school		$127,795

McManus
2011/2012 **ACTUALS** Categorical Budgets

Programs	'11/'12 Actual Budget		'10/'11 C/O Budget		'11/'12 Operating Budget
LEP R#7091	$ 32,550	+	$ 24,563	=	$ 57,113
SCE R#7090	$ 55,620	+	$ 9,826	=	$ 65,446
EIA Total * (Old R# 7250)	$ 88,170	+	$ 34,389	=	$ 122,559
Title I R# 3010	$ 302,000	+	$ 108,425	=	$ 410,425
Title I Parent Ed R# 3010-1010	$ 3,020	+	██████████	=	$ 3,020
Title II Staff Develop R# 4035	$ 15,000	+	$ 4,977	=	$ 19,977
Safe Schools (Old R#6405) R# 0030	$ 3,000	+	$ -	=	$ 3,000
Specialized Programs (Old R#7370) R# 0370	██████████	+	██████████	=	██████████

The Single Plan for Student Achievement

Rosedale Elementary - Two Way Immersion School
School Name

04-61424-6003081
CDS Code

Date of this revision: April 4, 2012

The *Single Plan for Student Achievement* (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index. California *Education Code* sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program Improvement into the *Single Plan for Student Achievement*.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person:	Tim Cariss
Position:	Principal
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3104
Address:	100 Oak Street
	Chico, CA 95928
E-mail Address:	tcariss@chicousd.org

Chico Unified School District
School District

Superintendent:	Kelly Staley
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3000
Address:	1163 East Seventh St.
	Chico, CA 95928
E-mail Address:	kstaley@chicousd.org

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan on .

II. School Vision and Mission

The Rosedale community is committed to providing a culture of lifelong learning for all students through dual immersion, by developing bilingualism and academic excellence in a multicultural environment.

III. School Profile

Rosedale is a Two Way Immersion Magnet K-6 school with a culturally diverse student population. This program provides students with the opportunity to become bilingual and bi-literate. This means that children will be able to speak, read and write fluently in both Spanish and English. We try to maintain a 50/50 or 33/33/33 ratio between English, Spanish, and incoming Bilingual speakers throughout our classrooms.

Currently, the school houses approximately 570 students. Teachers, staff and students respect each other and strive to develop each student's unique potential in a safe and enriched learning environment. The school has a wide ethnic variety in its student population that are inclusive of students with special needs. All classes contain students that have a dominant language other than English.

There are currently 25 teachers on staff and a full time principal. Included in the total are 22 certificated bilingual teachers teaching in the Two-Way Immersion program within our school. Also included in the total are three certificated CLAD support teachers. There are two full time and two part time Title I teachers, and a full time RSP teacher. In addition, we support student learning by the support of instructional aides and various other support staff and volunteers. We have partnered with the Chico Noon Rotary Club to bring additional one of one support for struggling students via the support of our community. Our partnership also extends to our local university where college students provide multiple hours of support to students via the guidance of the classroom teacher and the afterschool certificated coordinator.

In addition to our on site staff, faculty also includes a music instructor, four fine arts instructors, a PE/Health Specialist, PIP aide, school psychologist, licensed counselor. Our students also benefit from the support of our local community members who volunteer to be strategic tutors, and from community-based English tutors from the university.

In addition, the school employs a Speech and Language Therapist who provides one-on-one or small group services to students, two part time Bilingual/Bicultural Liaisons, and two Bilingual Targeted Case Managers who work with parents and families with our home-to-school connection and our Parents as Teachers (PAT) program with Rosedale families who have children from 0-5 years of age. A school nurse and nurse's aide provide school health services. Either the nurse or the aide is here for daily coverage. Also, a federal Head Start Program is located on the Rosedale Campus.

Rosedale has an extensive school wide Title I program. Students are grouped based on individual reading abilities and instructed by classroom teachers, support staff and trained instructional aides. Part of the program gives supplemental assistance to students in the classrooms through trained instructional aides. Intervention programs include: Reading Recovery, Guided Reading, Read Naturally and Soar to Success. For English Language Development, Rosedale uses Language Star strategies for daily levelized ELD instruction.

Rosedale has a library that is operated by a library media specialist. Classes are scheduled on a weekly basis to visit and check out books.

Students attend school daily for 280 minutes in grades 1-3 and 300 minutes in grades 4-6. There are four Kindergarten classrooms where students attend school for 260 minutes daily.

The demographic makeup of Rosedale is as follows: 60% Latino/Hispanic, 32% Caucasian, 2% African-American, 3% American Indian, and 3% with other nationalities making up the remainder.

IV. Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

A. Data Analysis (See Appendix A)

In preparation for the development of the 2011-12 school plan, our Instructional Leadership Team, and a team of teachers focusing on literacy goals conducted data analysis using the 2010-11 CST, CELDT, and District Benchmark scores.

We studied the trend for each subgroup for a three year span, using the 2008-09 as a baseline year, prior to the merging of TWI programs onto our Two Way Immersion Magnet School. Our leadership teams studied the school wide trends in CELDT and CST subcategories to identify the areas of need.

Teachers are provided with grade level meeting time two-three times per month in lieu of a staff meeting time and staff release time. The model for collaboration used is the Professional Learning Communities model. During their meeting times, teachers analyze grade level data and classroom level data to guide the focus for SMART goals in writing, English Language Arts (ELA), Spanish Language Arts (SLA), English Language Development (ELD), and/ or Math.

STAR results

- Grade level and classroom level analysis of data by subgroups (EL's, ethnicity, reclassified students, Special Education, etc) and by levels (Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic)
- Cohort analysis
- CST cluster analysis

CELDT assessments

- Present year's scores when available
- Analysis of scores across 2-3 and 4-5 years
- Reclassification of students

District Benchmarks

- Triennial district benchmarks focused on state blue print standards
- Trimester ELD assessments using Language Star assessments

Grade level assessments

- Ongoing grade level formative assessments to address academic growth or additional support needed for students not passing grade level standards.

B. Surveys
Surveys will be conducted during the 3rd trimester of the 2011-12 school year.

C. Classroom Observations
Classrooms are monitored by the formal evaluation process. Tenured teachers are evaluated every other year. Teaches that have taught in the district for 10 years or more, are NCLB compliant, and have had satisfactory evaluations are evaluated every 5 years. Temporary and probationary teachers are evaluated annually. During an evaluation year, formal observations are conducted at least twice a year in the areas of ELA, ELD, and Math. Observation forms are based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Informal observations or walkthroughs are also part of the school culture.

ELD coaches and/or consultants will work with classrooms teachers to develop lessons and units, and provide teaching and assessment to support English Language Learners and to classroom teachers.

D. Student Work and School Documents
Student work and student writing samples are collected and analyzed by grade levels during the Professional Learning Community meetings. Grade levels determine the focused SMART goals and monitor their time-lines to share and analyze student work based on the standards-based units of study.

E. Analysis of Current Instructional Program (See Appendix B)

The following areas were used to develop the instructional program at Rosedale Two Way Immersion Elementary School.

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

- Rosedale uses state, district assessments and benchmarks, and grade level developed formative assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement. Students are routinely assessed using standards-based materials which are directly related to the curriculum and/or units of study.
- The staff uses data to monitor student progress for additional support or enrichment on curriculum-embedded assessments, and to modify instruction.
- The district on-line report card focuses on key grade level standards to monitor grade level progress in trimesters during the school year. Teacher/Parent conferences are conducted at the end of the first trimester to insure that parents understand the reporting system and to discuss progress.
- As a Two Way Immersion school, we will be assessing the need to have an alternative report card for the 2012-13 school year for our site to address curricular areas and skills in two languages.

Staffing and Professional Development

- All of the classroom teachers and support teachers and staff at Rosedale meet the NCLB requirements for highly qualified staff.
- Principal has completed the requirements for the Assembly Bill (AB) 75.
- 95% of classroom teachers have been trained in Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) strategies.
- 70% of the classroom teachers have received professional development through AB 466 training.
- 60% of the classroom teachers have received training in the Step Up to Writing or state developed professional development in writing.
- School wide ELD Langauge Star strategies are used to instruct English Language Learners daily.
- Focus on Language and Math Boards.
- The focus for staff development is determined by the staff and the Instructional Leadership Team based on student needs that are geared toward content standards alignment, assessing performance, and other professional needs.
- Grade level collaboration/Professional Learning Community time is dedicated two-three times each month during staff meeting times, and during the day on a monthly basis for grade level release time.

Teaching and Learning

- Curriculum, instruction and materials are aligned to content and performance standards.

- Lesson/unit time-lines for Language Arts, Writing, Math, ELD, and Science are developed by grade level teams. Teachers have the flexibility to teach at the pace of the class and provide appropriate interventions.
- All students have the appropriate textbooks and instructional materials available to them as directed by the Williams Settlement Legislation.
- All instructional materials are state adopted and standards based.

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

- Services provided by the regular educational program are in place which enable all students to meet standards:
  - After School programs ASES/21st Century
  - Student Intervention Team
  - Response to Intervention (RtI)

- Teachers provide intervention within the instructional day for students that are at risk as needed based on classroom and formative assessments.
- Additional Support for the third trimester will include a "double dose" session administered by the teacher twice a week to give students extra support in a small group setting. A support teacher will take the majority of the class while the teacher provides small group instruction to their own class.

Parent/Community Involvement

- **Mentors In Schools**
  - One-on-one mentors are connected with students by teacher referrals. The goal is for first grade teachers to identify students who have academic and/or social difficulties and refer them as possible mentees for a *Mentor*. Mentors and students are connected in second grade. Our hope is that Mentors will continue to be connected to their mentee throughout the students' academic career, but Mentors are asked to commit for at least one year.

- **Strategic Tutoring**
  - A partnership has been created between Rosedale Two Way Immersion School and the Noon Rotary Club to involve the community as "strategic tutors" to support student learning.
  - Rosedale piloted the program in 2010-11 with 20 Rotarians to tutor 20 students identified by classroom teachers needing specific skills. The session focused on a specific skill that students need.
  - Rosedale will continue a second year with "strategic tutors" support for the 2011-12 school year with approximately 50 tutors to support students
  - Under-performing students are identified
  - An individual learning objective is identified for each student (pass a spelling test, learn to count to 100, read a book, etc)
  - A Rotarian visits the child on the school grounds for several 1 hour sessions (maximum 4) to tutor the child toward successful completion of the learning objective. The visits will be coordinated by the child's teacher to fit the tutor's schedule (visits should at least be on a once a week basis).

- Additional resources that are available to support students:
  - SSC/ELAC meetings provide information to parents.
  - Monthly PTA meetings provide an opportunity for the principal to report on student learning and activities,and elicit parent input.
  - Literacy morning and nights for students and parents.
  - Science Fair Nights
  - Parent Teacher Association is very active and critical part in student success.
  - Parent volunteers in the classroom support student learning.
  - Community Action Volunteers from California State University assist in classrooms to support student learning.
  - America Reads tutors support reading in the classrooms.
  - California Mini-Corps students support migrant students in the classroom.

Funding

- Services to students to meet standards are provided with the support of categorical funds that enable classroom teachers, support teachers, and instructional aides to focus on the needs of a few students on a daily basis.

V. Description of Barriers and Related School Goals

Barrier #1

Continue the development of a cohesive amd comprehensive program for the success of all subgroups in both English and Spanish for Two Way Immersion students.

Goal - Staff will continue work on community building, trust, focused academic goals and vision/mission for our school for student success.

Barrier #2

English language learners continue to fall below in standardized testing.

Goal - Provide at least one hour per day, 5 days a week of ELD instruction using Language Star strategies. Students will increase by one CELDT level each school year. Teachers will use the CELDT and language assessments for ELD grouping to enable ELL's to meet the academic language needs. Provide focused grammar lessons for students with support from an ELD coach trained or consultants in the second language strategies identified by our consultant, Kevin Clark.

Barrier #3

The school has incorporated a systematic approach to address the needs of target students. Teachers use strategies, including differentiated instruction and universal access time for flexible groups to support low - high students.

Goal - All grades have additional support via an instructional aide or support teacher in the areas of ELD, reading and/or Math. Teachers meet for collaboration using the Professional Learning Communities model to assess student learning and progress, and to determine teaching strategies and additional needed student support or enrichment.

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The School Site Council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet academic performance index and adequate yearly progress growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of students not yet meeting state standards:

SCHOOL GOAL #1
(Goals should be prioritized, measurable, and focused on identified student learning needs)
To improve student achievement for all students to proficiency level or above in both Language Arts, inclusive of writing, and Math with emphasis on improving our English Learner (EL) subgroup and Low Socioeconomic Status subgroup.

- Improve student achievement for all students by 10% in both Language Arts and Math, with emphasis in improving our English Learner subgroup to achieve annual measurable objectives on state assessments to levels of proficiency to 79% in Math, and 78.4% state proficiency in Language Arts.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students in grade 2nd - 6th.	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: 10% increase in the number of students scoring at the "proficient" level in language arts and 10% increase in the number of students scoring "basic" level in the language arts California State Test.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Annual STAR testing data, standards based assessments from the language arts curriculum and district benchmarks, and grade level created assessments.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Continuous data from district benchmarks and grade level created assessments.

SCHOOL GOAL #1

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date(38) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
- Certificated support teachers and instructional aides will support student learning. - Title I/Support Teacher will support instruction with English Language Development, literacy interventions and Math with grades Kinder - 6th grade - Resource Teacher (funded through special education) supports the school wide RtI model. - Reading Specialist teacher will focus primarily with Kinder - 2nd grade - Classroom aides will support primary grade teachers in small group instruction during literacy instruction. - Bilingual Parent liaison to facilitate school/parent communication regarding academic needs	August 2011 - May 2012	Staff	$188,100 $33,900 $20,000 $35,800	Title I - Actuals Title I - C/O SCE - Actuals LEP - Actuals
- Teachers document classroom and grade level interventions consistent with the Response to Intervention (RtI) model and document data of student progress or lack of. - Students continuing to struggle and who need additional support beyond classroom instruction (Tier 1) and grade level interventions (Tier 2) will be referred to the Student Intervention Team where teachers are provided with ongoing support and services to best serve the students in their classroom. - One day additional support by School Psychologist to support student learning and RtI model.	August 2011 - May 2012	- Staff - Materials and supplies - Meeting expenses. - Classroom release time for certificated staff	$36,000 $21,148 $23,516	Title I - C/O SCE - Actuals SCE - C/O

SCHOOL GOAL #1

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date(38) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
The Student Intervention Team will continue to support the needs of the students by providing teacher intervention recommendations and support in documenting strategies for future interventions or special services if needed.	August 2011 - May 2012	• Substitute teachers for Intervention meetings, trainings, and materials and supplies as needed.	$10,000	Title I - C/O
As per our school SMART goal of increasing achievement in writing, grade level teachers and support staff will provide directed writing lessons, rubrics, guidance in the writing process, and practice opportunities in writing students both in small groups and whole class instruction throughout the curriculum.	August 2011 - May 2012	• materials and supplies • meeting expenses • classroom release time for certificated staff	$10,000	Title I - C/O
Teachers will be given opportunities and encouraged to attend staff development in the following areas: • Instructional needs of second language learners • ELD strategies • Explicit Direct Instruction • ELD Language Star strategies by Kevin Clark • Targeted trainings in Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies, implementation of ELD programs, and observational tools. • Using data to identify Limited and Fluent English Proficient students not meeting standards per grade level • Math staff development • Grade level conferences such as the kinder and 1st grade yearly conference • CABE conferences focusing on Two Way Immersion Schools	August 2011 - May 2012	• materials and supplies • supplementary materials • classroom release time for certificated staff	$10,470	Title II - Actuals

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #2
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
Implement Professional Learning Committees for classroom/grade level teachers to increase student achievement and support teacher collaboration.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All Rosedale classroom teachers and all students, K-6	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Increased achievement on teacher created formative assessments and district benchmark assessments.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Academic performance on teacher created formative assessments and district benchmark assessments.	Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Student performance on teacher created formative assessments and district benchmarks.

SCHOOL GOAL #2				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Classroom and support staff teachers will be released one-two times per month while their students are receiving grade level-appropriate instruction in English Language Arts and Math by substitute credentialed teachers.	August 2011 - May 2012	• Roving Substitutes • Curriculum guides and frameworks • Materials and supplies	$7,883	Title I - C/O
Two staff meetings per month will be dedicated to PLC teams continuing grade level collaborative work.	August 2011 - May 2012	$0	$0	NA
Identify and support professional development opportunities based on PLC team needs.	August 2011- May 2012	• Substitutes • Staff development expenses • stipends and substitute costs • materials and supplies	$2,530 $4,470	Title II - Actuals Title II - C/O

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #3
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
English Learners will progress to the next proficiency level on the California English Language Development Test (CEDLT).

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students K-6	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: English Learners will make one year's growth on the CELDT.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Annual CELDT scores.	Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Annual CELDT scores

SCHOOL GOAL #3

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
All grade levels will provide one hour of daily English Language Development (ELD) instruction to English Learners using ELD standards and strategies using Language Star strategies. EL students will receive instruction targeted to their English proficiency level.	August 2011 – May 2012	N/A	N/A	
Continue the support of staff development on ELD, Professional Learning Communities, Differentiated instruction, and Language Star for best practices for instruction of English Language Learners. **See goal #1**	August 2011 – May 2012	• meeting expenses • staff	$17,749	LEP - C/O
Teachers will identify students that have failed to make annual growth targets in ELD, and those who continue to score at the Intermediate level. Teachers will utlize Language Star strategies, targeted SDAIE, ELD and EDI strategies in their daily core curriculum to increase the English proficiency levels of these students.	August 2011 – May 2012	N/A	N/A	
Teachers and grade level PLC teams will continue to develop and utilize both formative and summative assessments to assess the English proficiency progress of English Learners.	August 2011 – May 2012	N/A		
School Site Council goal is to increase community involvement. We will seek support from community groups such as Rotary and other community groups to increase the number of one-on-one Strategic Tutors.	August 2011 – May 2012	N/A	N/A	N/A

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #4
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
Increase and improve technology school wide.

- Develop and maintain a fully equipped and functioning computer lab.
- Increase classroom technology.
  - Every classroom was equipment in the 2010-11 school year with a teacher computer connected to a LCD projector and ELMOS to support visual learning.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students K-6	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: All students with increase their knowledge and skills with technology.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Student reports and work completed using technology.	Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Student reports and work completed using technology.

SCHOOL GOAL #4				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date** **Completion Date**	**Proposed** **Expenditures**	**Estimated** **Cost**	**Funding** **Source**
Technology support by staff on a monthly basis	August 2011 - May 2012	Hourly rate for staff.	$11,000	Title I - C/O
Identify technology needs, and provide technical support and training to staff. Costs included int the technology support funding above.	August 2011 - May 2012			

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #5
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
Increase parent awareness of bi-literacy, TWI education, EL needs to support student learning and provide ideas on being active in our educational programs.
Increase parent awareness for school wide safety.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All K-6 families and pre-kinder student families.	**Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:** Increase parent participation in school.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Increase in classroom support and school wide support. Increase in parent participation in PTA, ELAC, SSC, and family nights, and general family events.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** CELDT, Benchmarks and CST STAR scores

SCHOOL GOAL #5

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Parent Education in English and Spanish	August 2011 - May 2012	Support materials and supplies. Staff/consultant fees	$1,900	Title I - Actuals Parent Education
Additional Safety support to increase student and family safety.	August 2011 - May 2012	Safety materials	$3,000	Safe Schools

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data

Table 1: Academic Performance Index by Student Group

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	273	330	334	94	97	108	9	8	10	20	1	0
Growth API	730	738	792	809	861	896						
Base API	739	729	738	811	810	861						
Target	5	5	5	A	A	A						
Growth	-9	9	54	-2	51	35						
Met Target	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Economically Disadvantaged			Students with Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	139	211	197	121	153	141	211	197	184	27	14	14
Growth API	685	681	736	654	638	697	693	651	701			569
Base API	695	685	681	654	654	638	693	693	651			587
Target	5	6	6	7	7	8	5	5	7			
Growth	-10	-4	55	0	-16	59	0	-42	50			
Met Target	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes			

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 2 - Title III Accountability (District Data)

AMAO 1	Annual Growth		
	2008-09	**2009-10**	**2010-11**
Number of Annual Testers	1,264	1,187	1,128
Percent with Prior Year Data	97	100	99
Number in Cohort	1,226	1,183	1,121
Number Met	724	587	595
Percent Met	59.1	50	53
NCLB Target	51.6	53.1	54.6
Met Target	Yes	No	No

AMAO 2	Attaining English Proficiency				
	2008-09	**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	All Students	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction	
		Less Than 5	**More Than 5**	**Less Than 5**	**More Than 5**
Number in Cohort	633	799	592	746	576
Number Met	257	97	251	110	245
Percent Met	40.6	12.1	42.4	15	43
NCLB Target	30.6	17.4	41.3	18.7	43.2
Met Target	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

AMAO 3	Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level		
	2008-09	**2009-10**	**2010-11**
English-Language Arts			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	No
Mathematics			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	Yes
Met Target for AMAO 3	No	No	No

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 3: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	--
Number At or Above Proficient	101	140	164	54	69	83	--	--	--	4	--	--
Percent At or Above Proficient	36.3	42.6	49.1	56.8	71.1	76.9	--	--	--	19.0	--	--
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	100	98	100	100
Number At or Above Proficient	35	62	64	18	31	32	58	46	50	5	4	2
Percent At or Above Proficient	24.6	29.5	32.5	14.5	20.4	22.7	26.9	23.5	27.2	15.6	28.6	14.3
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=46.0%), (2010=56.8%), (2011=67.6%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=44.5%), (2010=55.6%), (2011=66.7%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 4: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	--
Number At or Above Proficient	116	134	183	49	62	84	--	--	--	10	--	--
Percent At or Above Proficient	41.7	40.6	54.8	51.6	63.9	77.8	--	--	--	47.6	--	--
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	98	100	100
Number At or Above Proficient	50	61	85	38	32	48	77	52	61	7	3	4
Percent At or Above Proficient	35.2	28.9	43.1	30.6	20.9	34.0	35.6	26.4	33.2	21.9	21.4	28.6
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=47.5%), (2010=58.0%), (2011=68.5%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=43.5%), (2010=54.8%), (2011=66.1%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 5: California English Language Development (CELDT) Data

Grade	California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Results for 2010-11										Number Tested
	Advanced		Early Advanced		Intermediate		Early Intermediate		Beginning		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
K											
1	1	2			11	27	19	46	10	24	41
2			2	9	3	14	6	27	11	50	22
3			3	10	7	24	13	45	6	21	29
4			9	31	14	48	3	10	3	10	29
5			9	45	9	45	2	10			20
6			6	29	12	57	2	10	1	5	21
7											
8											
9											
10											
11											
12											
Total	1	1	29	18	56	35	45	28	31	19	162

Appendix B - Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are adapted from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title I, Part A and the California Essential Program Components (EPC). These statements were used to discuss and develop findings that characterize the instructional program at this school for students:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Special consideration was given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs. A synopsis of the discussion is provided.

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

1. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (NCLB)

   Rosedale teachers consistently use a variety of assessments to monitor instruction and improve student achievement. These assessments include the CST annual tests, CELDT annual tests for English Language Learners, district trimester benchmark assessments, curriculum-based assessments, and formative, teacher/grade level created assessments.

2. Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)

   The data from curriculum-embedded assessments is reviewed during grade-level collaboration (Professional Learning Community, or PLC) meetings to determine student placement, progress, and to inform instruction. From the data, flexible intervention and enrichment groups are formed.

Staffing and Professional Development

3. Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (NCLB)

   All teachers are appropriately credentialed and highly qualified for their assignments according to NCLB requirements.

4. Principals' Assembly Bill (AB) 75 training on State Board of Education (SBE) adopted instructional materials (EPC)

   The principal has completed AB 75 training on SBE adopted instructional materials.

5. Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to AB 466 training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)

   Teachers have access to all staff development opportunities that are advertised and offered frequently throughout the year. Most of the school's teachers have completed the SB 472 forty (40) hours of initial professional development program that is aligned with the effective implementation of the SBE-adopted reading/language arts and mathematics programs.

6. Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (NCLB)

   Staff development decisions are aligned with school SMART goals. Either individually or within a grade level, teachers review student performance data and determine areas of professional development need.

7. Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)

   At PLC meetings, teachers collaborate and share best practices and effective teaching strategies that, using student data, have shown the greatest impact on student achievement. In addition, through district and county-offered professional development, teachers have access to content specific experts and instructional coaches. Examples of this professional development that teachers have taken advantage of are: English Learner Professional Development (ELPD), ELD Structures and Strategies, Mathematics PLC (MPLC), Formative Assessment workshops, and Autism training and whole staff trainng on Explicit Direct Instruction, and Language Star strategies.

8. Teacher collaboration by grade level (EPC)

   From August to January, the first 40 minutes of staff meetings was dedicated to teacher collaboration time. From February to May 2010, teachers are released from their classroom every week for 45 minutes to meet as a grade level team for the purpose of collaboration. In addition, one or two staff meetings per month are reserved for grade-level collaboration.

These PLC teams set learning objectives and goals, create and/or agree on appropriate formative assessments to monitor student progress on the goals, analyze data from the assessments, form intervention and enrichment groups as needed, and share effective teaching strategies.

<u>Teaching and Learning</u>

9. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (NCLB)

   Core curriculum and materials are state board adopted and align to content and performance standards. Instruction in the classrooms is standards-based, utilizing a variety of research-based instructional strategies.

10. Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (EPC)

    Instructional minutes are as follows:

    Kindergarten: Mathematics: 30 minutes   Reading/Language Arts: 60 minutes

    Grades 1-3:   Mathematics: 60-75 minutes   Reading/Language Arts: 150 minutes

    Grades 4-6:   Mathematics: 60 minutes   Reading/Language Arts: 120 minutes

11. Lesson pacing schedule (EPC)

    Lesson pacing schedules are determined by the PLC teams during collaboration and regular grade-level staff meetings. The pacing provides for the sharing of resources and forming grade-level intervention and enrichment groups on similar standards.

12. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (NCLB)

    All students at all grade levels or programs have and appropriately use on a daily basis the most recent SBE-adopted instructional materials.

13. Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials (EPC)

    Full implementation of SBE-adopted instructional materials, including intervention materials, is occurring at every grade level.

<u>Opportunity and Equal Educational Access</u>

14. Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

    Small group instruction, differentiated instruction.

15. Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement at this school (NCLB)

    Classroom teachers use the district adopted standards based curriculum in all curricular areas. In addition, teachers use research based support materials as outlined by the *Response To Intervention* (RTI) model.

16. Opportunities for increased learning time (Title I SWP and PI requirement)

    Teachers continually review student progress and determine additional educational support or enrichment opportunities for students. This is supported by the classroom teacher and/or by support staff.

17. Transition from preschool to kindergarten (Title I SWP)

    Partnerships with the School Readiness coalition. Administrator and kindergarten teacher meet yearly to plan Kindergarten readiness activities and additional strategies for preschool to kindergarten transition.

<u>Involvement</u>

18. Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (NCLB)

    Families receive letters indicating additional support for students outside of the school under the NCLB act.

19. Strategies to increase parental involvement (Title I SWP)

Family Nights will be conducted throughout the year. Areas of focus will be English and Spanish literacy, science and math.

Target case manager and bilingual liaison will provide 8 week sessions of varied parent education topics. Also, in collaboration with community agencies, we will provide parent education courses in nutrition and money management.

20. Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, and other school personnel in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of consolidated application programs (5 CCR 3932)

The planning, implementation, and evaluation of consolidated application programs involves the school's parent, community, teachers and other personnel during staff meetings, general parent education nights, School Site Council meetings, English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) meetings, Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meetings, Parent Literacy Nights, and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings.

Funding

21. Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

Teachers continually review student progress and determine additional educational support or enrichment opportunities for students. This is supported by the classroom teacher and/or by support staff.

22. Fiscal support (EPC)

Title I

Title II

EIA

Appendix C - Programs Included in this Plan

Check the box for each state and federal categorical program in which the school participates and, if applicable, enter amounts allocated. (The plan must describe the activities to be conducted at the school for each of the state and federal categorical program in which the school participates. If the school receives funding, then the plan must include the proposed expenditures.)

State Programs		Allocation
[ ]	California School Age Families Education Purpose: Assist expectant and parenting students succeed in school.	$
[ ]	Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program.	$
[X]	Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program Purpose: Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners	$120,883
[ ]	High Priority Schools Grant Program Purpose: Assist schools in meeting academic growth targets.	$
[ ]	Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform Purpose: Train classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum areas.	$
[ ]	Peer Assistance and Review Purpose: Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring.	$
[ ]	Pupil Retention Block Grant Purpose: Prevent students from dropping out of school.	$
[ ]	School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant Purpose: Improve library and other school programs.	$
[X]	School Safety and Violence Prevention Act Purpose: Increase school safety.	$3,000
[ ]	Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Purpose: Eliminate tobacco use among students.	$
[ ]	List and Describe Other State or Local funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education):	$
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school		$123,883

Chico Unified School District
Rosedale
2011/2012 **ACTUALS** Categorical Budgets

Programs	'11/'12 Actual Budget		'10/'11 C/O Budget		'11/'12 Operating Budget
LEP R#7091	$ 35,800	+	$ 17,749	=	$ 53,549
SCE R#7090	$ 41,148	+	$ 23,516	=	$ 64,664
EIA Total * (Old R# 7250)	$ 76,948	+	$ 41,265	=	$ 118,213
Title I R# 3010	$ 190,000	+	$ 109,153	=	$ 299,153
Title I Parent Ed R# 3010-1010	$ 1,900	+	▮	=	$ 1,900
Title II Staff Develop R# 4035	$ 13,000	+	$ 4,470	=	$ 17,470
Safe Schools (Old R#6405) R# 0030	$ 3,000	+	$ -	=	$ 3,000
Specialized Programs (Old R#7370) R# 0370	▮	+	▮	=	▮

Federal Programs under No Child Left Behind (NCLB)			Allocation
[ ]	Title I, Neglected Purpose: Supplement instruction for children abandoned, abused, or neglected who have been placed in an institution		$
[ ]	Title I, Part D: Delinquent Purpose: Supplement instruction for delinquent youth		$
[X]	Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program Purpose: Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas		$199,000
[ ]	Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency		$
[ ]	Title I, Part A: Program Improvement Purpose: Assist Title I schools that have failed to meet NCLB adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets for one or more identified student groups		$
[X]	Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Purpose: Improve and increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals		$17,000
[ ]	Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology Purpose: Support professional development and the use of technology		$
[ ]	Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students Purpose: Supplement language instruction to help limited-English-proficient (LEP) students attain English proficiency and meet academic performance standards		$
[ ]	Title IV, Part A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Purpose: Support learning environments that promote academic achievement		$
[ ]	Title V: Innovative Programs Purpose: Support educational improvement, library, media, and at-risk students		$
[ ]	Title VI, Part B: Rural Education Achievement Purpose: Provide flexibility in the use of NCLB funds to eligible LEAs		$
[X]	Other Federal Funds (list and describe(42) Title I - Parent Education		$1,990
Total amount of federal categorical funds allocated to this school			$

Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school	$341,873

(3) For example, special education funds used in a School-Based Coordinated Program to serve students not identified as individuals with exceptional needs.

Appendix D – 2011-12 Categorical District Services Budget

	SLIP	Title I	LEP	Title V
Allocation				
Carryover				
Indirect Costs				
Direct Costs				
Transfer to General Fund				
NCLB				
Intervention Programs				
Less Testing Team				
Plus Parent Involvement				
Schools Allocation				

2011-12 SUPPORT SERVICES DIRECT COSTS DISTRIBUTION						
Object Code	Description of Services	SIP Amount	Title I Amount	LEP Amount	Title V Amount
1302	**Director of Special Programs:** Coordinates categorical programs among sites, develops/maintains district reports/records, compiles program assessment data of common indicators, monitors program performance, prepares/maintains personnel budget data				
1912	**Curriculum Specialist:** Provides support/staff development/modeling for new teachers, resource teachers.				
2422	**Secretarial:** Processes and maintains records, originates purchase orders, provides clerical support				
2442	**Technician:** Provides network support for language arts intervention programs				
2452	**Program Analyst:** Processes purchase orders and personnel requisitions, provides financial informational support				
2432	**Warehouse Assistant:** Assists in district-wide book vendor fair, processes and orders library materials.				
2932	**Community Liaison:** Acts as liaison and translator for the Vietnamese community and the school sites.				
3000	**Employee Benefits:** Certificate and classified benefits				
4000	**Supplies:** Programming curriculum materials, office supplies, computer software				
5000	**Conferences, Mileage:** Reimbursement for professional development, program in-services/conferences, mileage, printing				
	TOTALS				

NOTE: Indirect Costs: District charges for accounting, budgets, purchase order requisitions, and services, at the state approved rate of 3% for LEP, and the federal-approved rate of 6.69% each for SLIP, Title I, and Title 5.

Transfer to General Funds: Maximum allowable rate of 10% used to help offset ADA (regular education) deficits in time of budgeting difficulty.

Appendix E - Recommendations and Assurances (Rosedale Elementary - Two Way Immersion School)

The school site council recommends this school plan and proposed expenditures to the district governing board for approval, and assures the board of the following:

1. The school site council is correctly constituted, and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.

2. The school site council reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the school plan requiring board approval.

3. The school site council sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan *(Check those that apply)*:

    [X]   School Advisory Committee for State Compensatory Education Programs

    [ ]   English Learner Advisory Committee

    [ ]   Community Advisory Committee for Special Education Programs

    [ ]   Gifted and Talented Education Program Advisory Committee

    Other *(list)*
    Rosedale Instructional Leadership Team

4. The school site council reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this Single Plan for Student Achievement and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the Local Improvement Plan.

5. This school plan is based on a thorough analysis of student academic performance. The actions proposed herein form a sound, comprehensive, coordinated plan to reach stated school goals to improve student academic performance.

6. This school plan was adopted by the school site council on: February 29, 2012

Attested:

Tim Cariss
_____
Typed name of school principal   Signature of school principal   Date

Michelle Anderson
_____
Typed name of SSC chairperson   Signature of SSC chairperson   Date

Appendix F - Home/School Compact

It is important that families and schools work together to help students achieve high academic standards. Through a process that included teachers, families, and students, the following are agreed upon roles and responsibilities that we, as partners, will carry out to support student success in school and life.

Student Pledge:
I agree to carry out the following responsibilities to the best of my ability:
~ Come to school ready to learn and work hard.
~ Bring necessary materials, completed assignments, and homework.
~ Know and follow school and class rules.
~ Communicate regularly with my parents and teachers about school experiences so that they can help me to be successful in school.
 ~ Limit my TV watching and, instead, study or read every day after school. ~ Respect the school, classmates, staff, and families.

Parents Pledge:
I agree to carry out the following responsibilities to the best of my ability:
~ Provide a quiet time and place for homework, and monitor TV viewing.
~ Read to my child or encourage my child to read every day (20 minutes K-3, and 30 minutes for grades 4-6).
~ Ensure that my child attends school every day, gets adequate sleep, regular medical attention, and proper nutrition.
~ Regularly monitor my child's progress in school.
~ Participate at school in activities such as school decision making, volunteering, and/or attending parent-teacher conferences.
~ Communicate the importance of education and learning to my child.
~ Respect the school, staff, students, and families.

Staff Pledge:
I agree to carry out the following responsibilities to the best of my ability:
~ Teach classes through interesting and challenging lessons that promote student achievement.
 ~ Endeavor to motivate my students to learn.
~ Have high expectations, and help every child to develop a love of learning.
~ Communicate regularly with families about student progress.
~ Provide a warm, safe, and caring learning environment.
~ Provide meaningful, daily homework assignments to reinforce and extend learning (30 minutes for grades 1-3 and 60 minutes for grades 4-6).
~ Participate in professional development opportunities that improve teaching and learning and support the formation of partnerships with families and the community.
~ Actively participate in collaborative decision making and consistently work with families and my school colleagues to make schools accessible and welcoming places for families and that help each student achieve the school's high academic standards.
~ Respect the school, students, staff, and families.

Appendix G - School Site Council Membership: Rosedale Elementary - Two Way Immersion School

Education Code Section 64001 requires that the SPSA be reviewed and updated at least annually, including proposed expenditures of funds allocated to the through the Consolidated Application, by the school site council. The current make-up of the council is as follows (43):

Name of Members	Principal	Classroom Teacher	Other School Staff	Parent or Community Member	Secondary Students
Tim Cariss	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Don Collins	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Gabriella Piceno	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
David Barrios	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
Michelle Anderson	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
Leticia Kinslow	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Maria Beas	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]
Isabella Hernandez	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Rory Rottschalk	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
Jeanne Greene	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Numbers of members of each category	1	2	2	5	0

(43) At elementary schools, the school site council must be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel, and (b) parents of students attending the school or other community members. Classroom teachers must comprise a majority of persons represented under section (a). At secondary schools there must be, in addition, equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and students. Members must be selected by their peer group.

The Single Plan for Student Achievement

Fair View High School
School Name

04-61424-0431502
CDS Code

Date of this revision: April 12, 2012

The *Single Plan for Student Achievement* (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index. California *Education Code* sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program Improvement into the *Single Plan for Student Achievement*.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person:	David S. McKay
Position:	Principal
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3092
Address:	290 East Ave.
	Chico, CA 95926
E-mail Address:	dmckay@chicousd.org

Chico Unified School District
School District

Superintendent:	Kelly Staley
Telephone Number:	(530) 891-3000
Address:	1163 East Seventh St.
	Chico, CA 95928
E-mail Address:	kstaley@chicousd.org

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan on .

II. School Vision and Mission

Mission Statement

Our mission is to nurture the indivual talents and abilities of our students, promote academic competency, and develop productive citizens.

Vision Statement

Fair View is a united, committed school community driven to...
CONNECT *all* students to our positive school culture;
ACCELERATE *all* students' interpersonal and academic skills;
LAUNCH *all* students into their post-secondary goals.

III. School Profile

The majority of students who enroll in Fair View High School are referred from within the Chico Unified School District. Chico High School and Pleasant Valley High School, the district's two comprehensive high schools, refer the largest number of students to Fair View. Fewer students are referred from the Academy for Change and Oakdale Independent Study School, which are also district programs housed on the Fair View campus. Fair View also enrolls many students new to the District on a regular basis. "New to the District" students are usually behind in their progress towards graduation.

Fair View had a student capacity of 220 students prior to the 2005-06 school year. For the 2011-12 school year, the current enrollment capacity is 250 students.

The majority of the Fair View student population is enrolled for the long term with graduation or the GED in mind. A smaller percentage of students return to the comprehensive high schools. While Fair View has averaged about 100 students a year who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive school days over the past three years, we have also averaged about a 70% mobility rate over that same time frame.

Most of the students enrolled at Fair View are of White ethnicity, between 62% and 65%. Hispanic/Latino ethnicity has increased and has had an 18% to 27% range. Black/African American ethnicity has had a slight decline, and has had a range between 5% and 9%.

English has been the primary language spoken in the home of the Fair View students, 84% to 88%. Spanish is the predominate language, other than English, with a range between 10% and 16%. This number has increased over the years.

Fair View provides for the needs of the special education students with a Resource Specialist Program. Over the past three years, Fair View's special need population has been between 11% and 14%. Fair View has also seen a large increase in the amount of RSP student referrals to our program and has added an additional .4 RSP teaching position during the 2006-07 school year to address this need. RSP students at Fair View are served in a full-inclusion/push-in model. RST's and Instructional Aides provide the vast majority of academic support within the context of the general education classroom in conjunction withthe general education teacher. Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, Fair View adopted the School-Based Intervention Team (S-BIT) response when students experience difficulty mastering essential concepts. Resource students who, in the past, were scheduled in pull-out, RSP-specific classes. In the S-BIT model, all resource students are scheduled in standard classes team taught by the general education teacher and the resource teacher or instructional aid.

Fair View is committed to the continual refinement of ALL programs serving ALL students. We are committed to providing the best posiible education for ALL our students--no matter what their life circumstances may be.

IV. Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

A. Data Analysis (See Appendix A)

During the creation of this Single Plan for Student Achievement, Fair View stakeholders analyzed data from many sources. These sources included data provided by CRUNCHER, CELDT tests score, CAHSEE, CST/STAR, district benchmarks, and site-level diagnostic assessments. For the past two years, Fair View teachers have passed a contact waiver allocating collaboration time every Wednesday morning from 8:00 - 9:15. Fair View is committed to developing as a Professional Learning Community (PLC).

The following sources of data were analyzed by Fair View stakeholders:

DISTRICT PROVIDED ASSESSMENTS

- District Benchmark Assessments
- School Climate Surveys

STATE AND FEDERAL ASSESSMENTS

- CELDT
- CST/STAR
- CAHSEE
- Reclassification rates
- Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) reports

SITE AND CLASSROOM-LEVEL ASSESSMENTS

- Renaissance ELA/Math diagnostics
- School-wide common assessments
- Teacher-geneated formative assessments

B. Surveys

Surveys that were analyzed to better understand student and staff neeeds were included :Healthy Kids SurveyStudent, staff, administration, and parent climate surveys

C. Classroom Observations

The two administrators on campus are in every classroom on a daily basis. On the days that the administrative intern is on campus he also observes classes in an informal format. Teachers going through the Begining Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program also observe other teachers conducting lessons. The master teachers of the BTSA participants spend time observing the beginning teacher as part of the program. The formal observation process is as follows: permanent teachers are formally observed every other year; temporary or probationary teachers are formally observed every year.

D. Student Work and School Documents

The Student work and school documents that will be collected are as follows: 1. District Benchmark Assessments 2. Teacher classroom assessments (from ILT teachers as well as others) 3. STAR, CAHSEE, and CELDT data from the Cruncher database

E. Analysis of Current Instructional Program (See Appendix B)

A complete analysis of our current program was conducted during the 2009-10 school year. It was conducted while going

through our WASC 3-year Progress Report accreditation process.

V. Description of Barriers and Related School Goals

Barrier #1:CAHSEE ELA and Math scores have been an ongoing concern at Fair View over the past six years. There has not been a consistent approach to teaching ELA and Algebra Essential Standards across grade levels in terms of focusing on specific ELA and Algebra scoring areas. Additionally, Fair View has struggled to meet its 95% participation rate.

Goal #1:Fair View will increase the percent of graduating seniors who pass the CAHSEE to 98%. We will also increase our participation rate to 95% in 2011-12
Barrier #2:Credit completion rate is one of Fair View's ASAM Performance Indicators. Students failing classes due to poor attendance, inappropriate behavior (effectively removing them from the learning environment), or skill deficiency has been an ongoing challenge at Fair View over the past six years, based on ASAM reporting data.

Goal #2:We will increase the credit completion rate of our long-term students (enrolled for at least 90 consecutive days) to 85% in 2011-2012.

Barrier #3:Student attendance has been an ongoing concern at Fair View over the past six years. While Fair View has attempted a variety of strategies for improving attendance over the years, we have not yet been able to develop a comprehensive attendance improvement plan that produces consistent results year-in and year-out.

Goal #3:We will develop a comprehensive attendance improvement plan and increase attendance by to 85% in 2011-12.

Barrier #4:Approximately 20% of Fair View students a year served over 100 days of out-of-school suspension from 2003-2007, negatively impacting students' ability to earn credits and reducing our ADA revenues. Additionally, many students do not perceive an out-of-school suspension as "punishment" but rather a "vacation". From 2007-2009, a new in-school suspension program resulted in zero 90-day students serving out-of-school suspensions, with only ten days of out-of-school suspension served overall during those two school years. Zero students were expelled from 2007-2009, down from 13-20 a year from 2003-2007.

Goal #4:We will maintain an out-of-school suspension rate of less than 5% for 90-day students.

Barrier #5:Activities and programs promoting school-to-work and parental involvement opportunities have not been thoroughly developed at Fair View over the past six years. Significant improvments have been made in each of the past two years, however.

Goal #5:We will continue to increase the number of school to work and parental involvement activities at Fair View by coordinating with at least 30 new community partners through our Career Planning and Youth Employment Program in 2011-12.

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The School Site Council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet academic performance index and adequate yearly progress growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of students not yet meeting state standards:

SCHOOL GOAL #1
(Goals should be prioritized, measurable, and focused on identified student learning needs) Fair View will increase the percent of graduating seniors who pass the CAHSEE to 98%. We will also increase our participation rate to 95% in 2011-12.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: We will target students that scored below proficient on last year's CST test and students who have not passed either their Math or ELA CAHSEE.	**Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:** Fair View will increase the percent of students who score proficient or better on the CAHSEE by 5%.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Classroom assessments and common assessments designed in collaborative teams will be used to evaluate progress towards this goal.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Data from the CAHSEE, annual CST scores, common assessments, and classroom assessments will be needed to measure academic gains.

SCHOOL GOAL #1

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date(38) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Expand school's capacity to meet the academic needs of it's low-performing students, including students that have not yet passed their CAHSEE and/or have not scored proficient or better on their CST's, by recruiting and hiring specialized personnel.	2011-2013	1. Instructional Aid, Bilingual; 2. Guidance Counselors (1.4 FTE)	1a. $12,359 1b. $13,113 2a. $63,424 2b. $25,270	1a. Title I 1b. SCE 2a. Title I 2b. Title I C/O
We will create intervention classes for students that have not yet passed their CAHSEE and/or have not scored proficient or better on their CST's.	2011-13	1. Intervention Curriculum & Materials 2. Staffing for sections during and after regular school day	1. $10,000 2. $60,000	1. Title I C/O 2. Title I C/O
We will continue to assign a bilingual instructional aid to assist English Language Learners in accessing the core curriculum in their mainstream classes.	2011-2013	1. Instructional Aid, Bilingual	1. $12,767	1. SCE
We will create CAHSEE Intervention classes that specifically incorporate SDAIE strategies to improve overall English proficiency for English Language Learners.	2011-2013	1. Bilingual ELA Intervention Teacher (.6 FTE) 2. Curriculum and Materials 3. Relevant Professional Development	1. $55,662 2a. $5,950 2b. $395 2c. $10,000 3. $1,500	1. Title I 2a. EIA LEP 2b. EIA LEP C/O 2c. Title I C/O 3. Title II

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #2
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
We will increase the credit completion rate of our long-term students (enrolled for at least 90 consecutive days) to 85% in 2011-2012.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal:	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:
All student groups, with a focus on students failing one or more classes.	Credit completion rates will increase to 85% for our 90-day students.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: ASAM data will all be examined to determine progress toward the goal.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Analysis of the number of classes in which students failed to earn credit each session. Attendance, Behavior, and Credit-completion data will be used alongside classroom and school-wide assessment data to target reasons for students failing classes. Timely interventions will be designed and adjusted accordingly.

SCHOOL GOAL #2

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Staff will collaborate to design an Intervention Pyramid to provide timely assistance both during the regular school day and during the 21st CCLC after school program.	2010-2013	1. Relevant Professional Development	1. $10,032	1. Title II
Staff will identify and recruit our most successful students to serve as peer tutors. These peer tutors will work with student in danger of failing classes.	2011-2013	1. Curriculum and Supplies to assist Peer Tutors	1a. $10,000 1b. $868	1a. SCE C/O 1b. SCE
Establish an Intervention Center for students in danger of failing core classes.	2009-2013	1. Staffing 2. Curriculum and Materials	1. $10,000 2. $5,298	1. Title I C/O 2. Title I C/O

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #3
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) We will develop a comprehensive attendance improvement plan and increase attendance by to 85% in 2011-12.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: Students that have chronic attendance issues.	**Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:** ASAM reports will show a 5% improvement in 90-day students' attendance rate.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: The progress towards the goal can be monitored by examining attendance numbers on AERIES and A2A as well as requesting attendance data from the district office.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Cruncher and AERIES-generated attendance reports.

SCHOOL GOAL #3				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date Completion Date**	**Proposed Expenditures**	**Estimated Cost**	**Funding Source**
Identify students that are regular non-attenders in order to target them for special resources that can help them improve their attendance.	2007-2013	1. Bilingual Targeted Case Manager	1a. $21,651 1b. $20,825	1a. Title I C/O 1b. Title I
We will create more flexible options for our students to pursue their academic goals while also providing maximum opportunities for employment or extra-curricular activities that promote achievement, including the reinstatement of the Oakdale independent study school on campus.	2009-2013			

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #4
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) We will maintain an out-of-school suspension rate of less than 5% for 90-day students.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: Students that would normally spend their suspensions out of school, at home.	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Out-of-school suspension rate under 5%.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Suspension/expulsion reports from AERIES and annual ASAM reports.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Annual ASAM reports for out-of-school suspension rates.

SCHOOL GOAL #4				
Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	**Start Date Completion Date**	**Proposed Expenditures**	**Estimated Cost**	**Funding Source**
We will continue to refer students to our CAL ISS program in lieu of out of school suspensions whenever feasible. Students previously serving their suspensions at home will instead serve them at CAL ISS.	2007-2013	1. Appropriate shirts and ties to issue students as part of dress code	1. $1,000	1. Safe Schools
Purchase Tier II Strategic Intervention Instructional Materials to assist ISS students with their academic progress.	2007-2013	1. Instructional Materials	1a. $3,000 1b. $5,000	1a. Title I C/O 1b. SCE C/O
Update and maintain effective communication and school safety-relatedsupplies like radios and batteries, as well as materials for conductingscenarios and simulations designed to promote overall school safety andemergency readiness.	2007-2013	1. Radios and related supplies	1. $6,000	1. Safe Schools

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #5
(Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages)
We will continue to increase the number of school to work and parental involvement activities at Fair View by coordinating with at least 30 new community partners through our Career Planning and Youth Employment Program in 2011-12.

Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: All students, with an emphasis on juniors and seniors in good academic standing.	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Student surveys and Asset Development inventories will indicate an increase in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to gain meaningful employment.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Student surveys and Assets inventories.	**Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:** Student surveys and Assets inventories.

SCHOOL GOAL #5

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
We will establish a Career Center, staffed by our existing IA Voc Ed and a new Career Development Coordinator to assist in organizing and facilitating more student recognition nights and facilitate more career development workshops (funded by 21st CCLC funds not delineated in this SPSA).	2009-2013	1. Parent Involvement/Education Activities 2. Curriculum and Materials	1. $1,523 2. $10,000	1. Title I Parent Ed 2. Title I C/O
We will continue to expand our Construction Academy program, whichprovides relevant workforce readiness opportunities for our students.	2010-2013	1. Relevant professional development	1. $2,532	1. Title II C/O
We will continue to partner with the Boys and Girls Club of the North Valley to provide youth development, academic enrichment, and workforce readiness opportunities for our students as an extension of the regular school day.	2009-2013	1. Contract with BGC	1a. $8,596 1b. $30,000	1a. SCE C/O 1b. Title I C/O

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data

Table 1: Academic Performance Index by Student Group

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	100	94	58	58	56	34	4	3	2	0	0	0
Growth API	598	559	560	618	573	557						
Base API	590	600	559	557	620	573						
Target	D	D	12									
Growth	8	-41	1									
Met Target			No									

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Economically Disadvantaged			Students with Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Number Included	28	29	15	14	19	8	78	75	47	6	8	8
Growth API			548				587	543	537			
Base API			515			428	594	588	542			
Target												
Growth												
Met Target												

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 2 - Title III Accountability (District Data)

AMAO 1	Annual Growth		
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Number of Annual Testers	1,264	1,187	1,128
Percent with Prior Year Data	97	100	99
Number in Cohort	1,226	1,183	1,121
Number Met	724	587	595
Percent Met	59.1	50	53
NCLB Target	51.6	53.1	54.6
Met Target	Yes	No	No

AMAO 2	Attaining English Proficiency				
	2008-09	2009-10		2010-11	
	All Students	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction	
		Less Than 5	More Than 5	Less Than 5	More Than 5
Number in Cohort	633	799	592	746	576
Number Met	257	97	251	110	245
Percent Met	40.6	12.1	42.4	15	43
NCLB Target	30.6	17.4	41.3	18.7	43.2
Met Target	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

AMAO 3	Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level		
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
English-Language Arts			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	No
Mathematics			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	No	No	Yes
Met Target for AMAO 3	No	No	No

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 3: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	84	91	82	80	92	81	100	84	84	--	--	--
Number At or Above Proficient	12	14	9	6	9	6	--	--	--	--	--	--
Percent At or Above Proficient	35.3	32.6	37.5	31.6	34.6	40.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	No	Yes	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	100	93	72	100	88	100	84	91	85	100	86	80
Number At or Above Proficient	4	--	--	--	--	--	10	9	5	--	--	--
Percent At or Above Proficient	36.4	--	--	--	--	--	40.0	25.7	26.3	--	--	--
AYP Target	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**	46.0* 44.5**	56.8* 55.6**	67.6* 66.7**
Met AYP Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=46.0%), (2010=56.8%), (2011=67.6%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=44.5%), (2010=55.6%), (2011=66.7%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 4: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	83	92	79	82	92	80	100	84	67	--	--	--
Number At or Above Proficient	9	9	4	5	7	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
Percent At or Above Proficient	27.3	20.9	16.7	26.3	26.9	14.3	--	--	--	--	--	--
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	No	No	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP											
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Participation Rate	92	93	86	80	88	100	82	91	85	67	86	60
Number At or Above Proficient	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	6	3	--	--	--
Percent At or Above Proficient	--	--	--	--	--	--	25.0	17.1	15.8	--	--	--
AYP Target	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**	47.5* 43.5**	58.0* 54.8**	68.5* 66.1**
Met AYP Criteria	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2009=47.5%), (2010=58.0%), (2011=68.5%)
** = AYP Target for High Schools (2009=43.5%), (2010=54.8%), (2011=66.1%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 5: California English Language Development (CELDT) Data

| Grade | California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Results for 2010-11 | | | | | | | | | | Number Tested |
| | Advanced | | Early Advanced | | Intermediate | | Early Intermediate | | Beginning | | |
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
K											
1											
2											
3											
4											
5											
6											
7											
8											
9					********	***					********
10			2	29	3	43	2	29			7
11	1	9	5	45	3	27	1	9	1	9	11
12	1	8	5	42	5	42			1	8	12
Total	2	6	12	39	12	39	3	10	2	6	31

Appendix B - Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are adapted from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title I, Part A and the California Essential Program Components (EPC). These statements were used to discuss and develop findings that characterize the instructional program at this school for students:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Special consideration was given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs. A synopsis of the discussion is provided.

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

1. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (NCLB)

   Fair View High School uses both state and local assessments to modify classroom instruction. Teachers consistently assess students using standards based curriculum to monitor the progress of their students. Teacher-generated assessments, created in PLC Teams, along with the state STAR testing results are used to guide teaching and learning.

2. Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)

   Teachers and administration use data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and to adjust instruction to increase student achievement. PLC groups look at the available data as a formative assessment tool to improve instruction.

Staffing and Professional Development

3. Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (NCLB)

   100% of the credentialed teachers teaching at Fair View meet the requirements for highly qualified staff as set forth by the NCLB legislation.

4. Principals' Assembly Bill (AB) 75 training on State Board of Education (SBE) adopted instructional materials (EPC)

   The principal has completed the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB)75. The assistant principal will complete AB 430 training by June 1, 2010.

5. Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to AB 466 training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)

   When the district or the site adopts new instructional materials all of the teachers that will be using those materials have access to training through AB 466.

6. Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (NCLB)

   District-wide staff development plan includes access to workshops and inservices designed to build capacity for Professional Learning Communities.

7. Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)

   The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program uses experienced teachers to mentor newer teachers. The two-year program trains mentoring teachers on how to help support new teachers. Teachers that feel they need extra support or extra time are encouraged to speak with administration about their needs. PLC Teams also provide a system of support for teachers that need it.

8. Teacher collaboration by grade level (EPC)

   Teachers collaborate once a week in content area groups to review data, sequence curricula, design common assessments, set SMART Goals, and discuss any concerns they may have about teaching or learning.

Teaching and Learning

9. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (NCLB)

    All textbooks and support materials adopted by the district meet the standards-based requirements. Teachers are encouraged to join textbook adoption committees to insure that the materials are standards based, and meet the needs of our student population.

10. Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (EPC)

    Fair View adheres to the recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics. Students are continually enrolled in a math class until completion of their requirements. Students are enrolled in English for the entire time they are enrolled at Fair View.

11. Lesson pacing schedule (EPC)

    Lesson pacing for language arts is discussed and planned within the English PLC groups. Mathematics are also planned by their PLC groups. In the past, Algebra has been done on an independent study process, due to the fact that our students come to us with a wide range of skills. Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, Fair View is phasing out the independent study model and adopting the same CPM program used by the two traditional high schools.

12. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (NCLB)

    Appropriate standards-based materials are available to all teachers if needed. The school will provide any additional materials needed for teachers to better support their students.

13. Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials (EPC)

    Standards-aligned instructional materials are reviewed and adopted on a district level as part of a regular cycle. Intervention programs include Edge (for ELL's) and Connect to Algebra. Teachers and administration are currently working together to design and implement a three-tiered ELA intervention system that builds off of the state-adopted textbook and focuses on specific skill areas to move students from "Intensive" intervention, to "Strategic", up to "Benchmark" (or grade level) in the program. FVHS is exploring effective diagnostic assessments, in addition to STAR/CELDT/CAHSEE data that we can administer to students as they enter our program, increasing our ability to place them in the appropirate Tier of our ELA intervention program. This program is in the research and design stage as of the 2009-2010 school year.

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

14. Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

    The services that are provided by the regular program to support under performing students to meet standards are:
    1. Access to a reading specialist
    2. Access to a multi-cultural aid
    3. Access to child care
    4. Access to the 21st CCLC "after school program"
    5. Counseling support
    6. Targeted Title I assistance

15. Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement at this school (NCLB)

    Fair View is engaged in the continuous cycle of researched-based educational practices to improve student achievement. Teachers meet on a weekly basis to collaborate about instructional strategies, pacing and analyzing data. The data is used to modify instruction.

16. Opportunities for increased learning time (Title I SWP and PI requirement)

    Students may choose, or be placed in several opportunities to increase their learning time/access to targeted interventions and grade-level instruction, including 7th, 9th, and 9th periods (the 21ct CCLC after school program), Title I Intervention Teacher, Ful-Inclusion and Pull-out support from RST and IA-SPED, and enrollment in two Math or English courses.

17. Transition from preschool to kindergarten (Title I SWP)

    N/A

Involvement

18. Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (NCLB)

School-based interventions, described above, offer timely assistance for students not demonstrating proficiency in the core curriculum. Each year, the district notifies qualifying families of approved Supplemental Service Providers in the area. The Boys and Girls Club offers homework help as part of their after school program, which runs in conjunction with many 21st CCLC and ASES programs at elementary and secondary school sites.

19. Strategies to increase parental involvement (Title I SWP)

Some strategies that we use to increase parental involvement are the addition of a new targeted case manager, evening meetings with the guidance counselor, Title I Intervetnion Teacher, and regular communication with the after school program coordinator/assistant principal.

20. Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, and other school personnel in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of consolidated application programs (5 CCR 3932)

School Site Council meets on a regular basis to plan, implement, and evaluate consolidated application programs.

Funding
21. Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)

The resources that are available to assist under-achieving students are the targeted case manager which connects families and students to resources. The Reading specialist helps students with remediation. An ELD teacher and a multicultural aid to help the students that are struggling with their language development. The school counselor which helps the students make a plan for their education. The 21st century grant for the after school program which gives students time to get help with uncompleted work.

22. Fiscal support (EPC)

Appendix C - Programs Included in this Plan

Check the box for each state and federal categorical program in which the school <u>participates</u> and, if applicable, enter amounts allocated. (The plan must describe the activities to be conducted at the school for each of the state and federal categorical program in which the school <u>participates</u>. If the school receives funding, then the plan must include the proposed expenditures.)

State Programs		Allocation
[ ]	California School Age Families Education <u>Purpose</u>: Assist expectant and parenting students succeed in school.	$
[X]	Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education <u>Purpose</u>: Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program.	$50,344
[X]	Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program <u>Purpose</u>: Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners	$6,345
[ ]	High Priority Schools Grant Program <u>Purpose</u>: Assist schools in meeting academic growth targets.	$
[ ]	Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform <u>Purpose</u>: Train classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum areas.	$
[ ]	Peer Assistance and Review <u>Purpose</u>: Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring.	$
[ ]	Pupil Retention Block Grant <u>Purpose</u>: Prevent students from dropping out of school.	$
[ ]	School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant <u>Purpose</u>: Improve library and other school programs.	$
[X]	School Safety and Violence Prevention Act <u>Purpose</u>: Increase school safety.	$7,000
[ ]	Tobacco-Use Prevention Education <u>Purpose</u>: Eliminate tobacco use among students.	$
[ ]	List and Describe Other State or Local funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education):	$
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school		$205,101

Chico Unified School District

Fair View
2011/2012 **ACTUALS** Categorical Budgets

Programs	'11/'12 Actual Budget		'10/'11 C/O Budget		'11/'12 Operating Budget
LEP R#7091	$ 5,950	+	$ 395	=	$ 6,345
SCE R#7090	$ 26,748	+	$ 23,596	=	$ 50,344
EIA Total * (Old R# 7250)	$ 32,698	+	$ 23,992	=	$ 56,690
Title I R# 3010	$ 152,270	+	$ 187,219	=	$ 339,489
Title I Parent Ed R# 3010-1010	$ 1,523	+	■■■■	=	$ 1,523
Title II Staff Develop R# 4035	$ 9,000	+	$ 2,532	=	$ 11,532
Safe Schools (Old R#6405) R# 0030	$ 7,000	+	$ -	=	$ 7,000
Specialized Programs (Old R#7370) R# 0370	■■■■	+	■■■■	=	■■■■