ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SINGLE PLAN FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT 2015-16

Alameda Science & Technology Institute

CDS Code: 01611190106401

Date of this revision: April 24, 2015

This is a plan of actions to be taken to raise the academic performance of students and improve the school's educational program. For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved, please contact the following person:

Principal: Tracy Corbally

Telephone Number: 510 748 4021

Address: 555 Atlantic Avenue, Alameda CA 94501 E-mail address: tcorbally@alameda.k12.ca.us

Alameda Unified School District

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

Table of Contents

ITEM	PAGE #
LCAP Goals	
	2
Theory of Action	
	8
Data Analysis in relation to LCAP goals	
	9
SARC 2013-2014 (available on district website)	
	13
Record of Agreements	
	14
Budget	40
	18
Categorical Funding	10
Cabaal Sita Carratil Mancharabin	19
School Site Council Membership	20
School Site Council Questions	20
School Site Council Questions	21
Recommendations and Assurances	21
Recommendations and Assurances	22
Appendix A: Special Education	22
Appendix A. Special Education	23
Data Appendix	25
Data Appendix	24

LCAP Goals

• Goal #1 (Site and Districtwide)

Student Engagement: eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time.

• Goal #2 (Site and Districtwide)

Improved Academic Performance for ALL: Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s).

• Goal #3 (Site and Districtwide)

Family Engagement: support parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocates for student success

• Goal #4 (Districtwide Only)

Basic Services: Ensure that ALL students have access to the required basic services

Data Analysis in relation to LCAP Goals

- Guiding questions for each LCAP Goal area:
 - O What trends are observable in your site's data?
 - o For areas where growth is observable, to what do you attribute the growth?
 - o For areas where growth is not observable or large gaps remain, what obstacles have you identified and what additional data might you need to increase your understanding?
 - o For all students and unduplicated students, what actions will you take to sustain current growth and address gaps in achievement?

Goal #1: Eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time.

AUSD :	Local Con	trol a	nd Accountability Plan (LCAP)	2015- 1	l6 Dist	trictwi	ide		
Major	Areas of	Dof	Goal 1	14.15	Targets				
Goals	Need	Ref.	Metrics	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18		
	Improve	1.1	Basic Attendance Rates: % of students attending school 96% of the year (Source: Aeries)	75.5%	76%	76.5%	77%		
	attendance	1.2	Chronic Absenteeism: % of students with 3 or more unexcused absences (Source: Aeries)	19.7%	19.2%	18.7%	18.2%		
Eliminate barriers to student success and maximize	Decrease class time missed due to discipline	1.3	Suspension Rate: % of students suspended per year • All Students • SED • ELD • AA • Spec Ed (Source: Aeries) Expulsion Rate: % of students expelled per year	2.78% 4% 1.63% 7% 8%	2.53% 3.5% 1.58% 6.5% 7.5%	2.28% 3.0% 1.53% 6% 7.0%	2.05% 2.5% 1.48% 5.5% 6.5%		
learning time		1.5	(Source: Aeries) Middle School Drop-out Rate: % of students in given cohort not completing 8 th grade (Source: Data Quest)	0.63%	0.62%	0.61%	0.60%		
	Improve Completio n rates	1.6	High School Drop-out Rate: % of students in 9 th grade cohort not finishing 12 th grade (Source: Data Quest)	8.6%	8.1%	7.6%	7.1%		
		1.7	High School Graduation Rate: % of students in 9 th grade cohort completing all graduation requirements (Source: Data Quest)	86%	86.5%	87%	87.5%		

Need: Improve attendance rates to maximize learning time

Metrics: % of students attending school at least 96% of time, % of students identified as truant

Table 1.1: Total and disaggregated attendance data for school and districtwide

Table 1.2: Total and disaggregated truancy data for school and districtwide

Need: Decrease interruptions of learning by suspension and expulsion

Metrics: % of students suspended and expelled

Table 1.3: Total and disaggregated suspension data for school and districtwide

Table 1.4: Total and disaggregated expulsion data for school and districtwide

Need: Improve rates of completion at Middle and High School

Metrics: % of students dropping out of middle school/high school and high school graduation rate

Table 1.5: Total and disaggregated middle school drop-out rate data for school and districtwide

Table 1.6: Total and disaggregated high school drop-out rate data for school and districtwide

Table 1.6: Total and disaggregated high school graduation rate data for school and districtwide

Goal 2: Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s)

AUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-16 Districtwide Goal 2

Maian Carla	A C NI J	D - £	M-4	14.15	Targets				
Major Goals	Areas of Need	Ref.	Metrics	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18		
		2.1	State Achievement Test: % of students demonstrating proficiency (Level 3 or 4) on California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in ELA and Math (Source: CAASPP)	Baseline	3% Increase	3% Increase	3% Increase		
	Improve	2.2	Local Assessment: % of students demonstrating proficiency by end of 1st grade on Early Literacy Survey (ELS) (Source: EADMS Data Management System)	85%	89%	90%	92%		
Support all students in	Student Achievement on both Statewide and Local Assessments	2.3	Local Assessment: % of students demonstrating proficiency on Local ELA, Writing, and Math Benchmarks (Source: EADMS Data Management System)	N/A	Baseline	TBD	TBD		
		2.4	Academic Performance Index: Schoolwide and District API performance (Source: Data Quest)	N/A	Baseline	TBD	TBD		
becoming college and work ready and demonstrating		2.5	Career Pathway Completion: % of students completing Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway (Source: CALPADS)	NE W	Baseline	TBD	TBD		
measured annual growth relative to their individual		2.6	EL Reclassification Rate: % of English Learners reclassifying to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) (Source: Local Data)	17%	17.5%	18%	18.5%		
performance level(s)	Improve English Learner (EL) Achievement	2.7	Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 1: % of students meeting annual California English Language Development Test (CEDLT) growth target (Source: Title III Accountability Report)	73%	74%	75%	76%		
		2.8	Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 2: % of students demonstrating proficiency on CELDT (Source: Title III Accountability Report)	(-5) 47% (5+) 78%	(-5) 48% (5+) 79%	(-5) 49% (5+) 80%	(-5) 50% (5+) 81%		
	Increase College and Career Readiness	2.9	a-g Completion: % of graduating seniors completing UC 'a-g' requirements All SED ELD AA Hispanic Special Ed (Source: CALPADS)	48% 42% 2.9% 14% 22% 9.5%	50% 44% 4% 16% 24% 10%	51% 47% 7% 19% 27% 12%	52% 50% 10% 22% 30% 14%		

		2.10	Early Assessment Program (EAP): % of 11 th grade students demonstrating college readiness on EAP in Math and English Standard Exceeded Standard Met Standard Nearly Met Standard Not Met (Source: California State University ets.org)	Baseline	+1% +1% +1% -3%	+1% +1% +1% -3%	+1% +1% +1% -3%
Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth		2.11	Advanced Placement (AP) Exam Pass Rate: % of AP Exams taken with a score of 3 or more All SED ELD AA Hispanic Spec Ed (Source: College Board)	69%	70%	71%	72%
relative to their individual performance level(s)		2.12	College-level coursework: % of students enrolling in an AP or college course All SED AA Latino Spec Ed ELD (Source: Aeries)	36% 15.1% 6.6% 8.3% 3.5% 7.4%	36.5% 16% 7.5% 9% 3.8% 9%	37% 18% 10% 12% 4.3% 12%	37.5% 20% 15% 17% 4.8% 15%
	Implementation of State	2.13	English Learner Access to Common Core State Standards (CCSS): % of ELs accessing CCSS state standards in setting with English-only peers (Source: Local Enrollment Data)	86%	96%	100%	100%
	Standards for English Learners	2.14	English Language Development (ELD) Standard Implementation: % of ELs receiving appropriate designated ELD instruction aligned to ELD Standards (Source: Local Enrollment Data)	50%	60%	80%	100%

Need: Improve student achievement on both state and local assessments

Metrics: % of student demonstrating proficiency on state achievement tests, Early Literacy Survey, Math Benchmarks, school API, career pathway completion

- Table 2.1: Total and disaggregated California Assessment of Student Progress and Performance (CAASPP) proficiency data for school and districtwide
- Table 2.2: Total and disaggregated Early Literacy Survey (ELS) proficiency by end of 1st grade for school and districtwide
- Table 2.3: Total and disaggregated Math Benchmark performance for school and districtwide
- Table 2.4: Total and disaggregated API/AYP data for school and districtwide
- Table 2.5: Total and disaggregated career pathway completion for school and districtwide

Need: Increase rate of English language acquisition by English Learners (ELs)

Metrics: % of ELs reclassifying to Fluent English Proficiency (FEP), meeting annual California English Language Development Test (CELDT) target, and demonstrating proficiency on CELDT

Table 2.6: Total and disaggregated EL reclassification data for school and districtwide

Table 2.7: Total and disaggregated CELDT growth target achievement data for school and districtwide

Table 2.8: Total and disaggregated CELDT proficiency data for school and districtwide

Need: Increase performance on indicators of college and career readiness

Metrics: % of seniors completing UC 'a-g' requirements, 11th grade proficiency on Early Assessment Program (EAP), Advanced Placement Exam pass rate, students enrolling in AP/college course

Table 2.9: Total and disaggregated UC 'a-g' completion data for school and districtwide

Table 2.10: Total and disaggregated EAP data for school and districtwide

Table 2.11: Total and disaggregated AP Exam pass rate data for school and districtwide

Table 2.12: Total and disaggregated AP/College course enrollment data for school and districtwide

Need: Implementation of State Standards for English Learners (ELs)

Metrics: % of ELs accessing CCSS in setting with English-only peers and receiving appropriate designated ELD instruction aligned to ELD standards

Table 2.13: Total and disaggregated ELA and Math course enrollment data for ELs - school and districtwide

Table 2.14: Total and disaggregated ELD enrollment data for ELs – school and districtwide

Goal #3: Support parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocates for student success

AUSD I	Local Contro	l and A	ccountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-	16 Disti	rictwide	e Goal	3		
Major Goals	Areas of	Ref.	Metrics	14-15	Targets				
Need Need		Kei.	Wietrics	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18		
Support parent/ guardian development as knowledgeable	Efforts to seek input from Parents/ Guardians	3.1	Seeking Input: % of parents/guardians that feel informed about their student's progress in school as reported on parent/guardian survey (Source: LCAP Parent Survey)	93%	93.5%	94%	94.5%		
partners and effective advocates for student success	Promotion of Parent/ Guardian Participation	3.2	Participation: % of parents/guardians attending non-mandatory educational school events (Source: LCAP Parent Survey)	54%	57%	60%	63%		

Need: Improve home to school communication and overall parent/guardian awareness of student progress

Metric: % of parents/guardians reporting that they feel informed about student progress

Table 3.1: Total and disaggregated parent survey data for school and districtwide

Need: Increase parent/guardian participation in educational events

Metric: % of students whose parent/guardian attends 2+ non-mandatory educational events Table 3.2: Total and disaggregated P/G participation survey data for school and districtwide

Theory of Action

If:

- we eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time
- focus on measured growth for every student relative to their individual performance level(s)
- support all students in becoming college and work ready
- support parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocated for student success and
- provide students with access to the required basic services

Then:

• we will close the access and achievement gaps for our English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, and other significant student groups where such gaps exist

This TOA is the minimum requirement to align your SPSA with the LCAP. You may add a site-specific "if" statement or a second site-specific TOA. This is not required.

Data Analysis & Review of Goals/Progress

About the School: In its thirteenth year of operation, Alameda Science and Technology Institute (ASTI) is a relatively recent but well-established addition to the Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) and represents an investment by the district in a small, unique option for its high school students. As an Early College High School (ECHS) ASTI shares a campus with the College of Alameda and ASTI students enroll as full-time community college students during their 11th and 12th grade years; in 2014-15, there are 170 students enrolled; ASTI enrolls 50 freshmen every year. This early college experience has translated into a track record of success that includes all graduates going on to pursue further college studies. In addition to earning their high school diploma, graduates routinely pursue higher goals; of the graduating class of 2014, 88% met UC 'a-g' requirements, 33% completed an Associate of Arts (AA) degree, and 58% completed requirements for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), and earned an average of 58 college units. In the course of their studies at Peralta Community College District campuses, ASTI students have maintained an average GPA above 3.00, with many students earning honors upon graduation.

Goal #1

Action plan from 2014-15 SPSA: To work toward supporting students' socioemotional needs by providing increased opportunities for students to interact non-academically with faculty and peers; current opportunities include clubs, school wide assemblies and events such as Spirit Week, ASB and tutoring; opportunities will be enhanced by addition of Bridge support groups facilitated by Tri-High and by reorganization of clubs and committees to better support mentoring relationships between upper and lower classmen, and to train lowerclassmen to lead clubs once they become upperclassmen. Tri-High group cycles will include focus on stress/anxiety and time management; it is hoped that this will also positively impact Goal 2 by reducing test anxiety and improving students' time management skills.

Progress: In 2014-15, ASTI strengthened support for students' socioemotional needs by collaborating with Alameda Family Services to provide regular Bridge support groups facilitated by a Tri-High counselor. The first group of 7 students met weekly for 4 weeks in April-May 2014; the 2014-15 school year saw an increase to 2 groups that met for 6 weeks each with a total of 15 students involved; additionally, 4 students participated in a Tobacco Use Prevention and Education (TUPE) support group. In January 2015, ASTI discovered the Alameda Family Services referral form; between January and April 2015 the school made 6 AFS referrals, an increase from zero in 2013-14. In January 2015, at the suggestion of ASTI's COA liaison, the school established relations with mental health services at COA; this resulted in 4 referrals since January 2015. Between August 2014 and March 2015, a total of 11 ASTI students accessed individual services at Tri-High clinics—9 for mental health and 2 for medical. In collaboration with administration and staff, Student Advisory Committee developed a survey to gather qualitative and quantitative data from students, including use of time outside school, stress levels, home responsibilities, and resources available. This survey was administered in March-April 2015; data analysis will continue into 2015-16 as ASTI prepares for WASC accreditation visit in March 2016.

Action plan for 2015-16: Actions for 2015-16 include continuation of the above items. Support and Bridge groups will be provided by TUPE and Tri-High as in 2014-15; in 2016-17, Tri-High groups may increase in number as TUPE will have ended. ASTI plans to refine student support by gathering student response data for Bridge Groups and analyzing student survey response data. LCFF funds have increased over 2014-15, allowing for a 1 day per week 2nd year psych intern, who will be able to work

with individual students and with groups to develop programs to benefit ASTI students; the school psychologist will oversee this intern with input from STI counselor and administration. ASTI will continue personalized phone calls in addition to robocalls for attendance. SART and SARB will be closely linked to this goal, and include AFS, COA counseling and Bridge group referrals whenever warranted and appropriate.

Goal #2

Action plan from 2014-15 SPSA: Increase student performance by

- Increasing SAT scores for every student relative to their performance level; goals are based upon baseline average score changes for class of 2014 between 2012- 13 and 2014-15. Rationale is that the school wide SAT support was partially implemented in 2012-13 and fully implemented in 2014-15; the graduating class of 2016 will be the first to receive four years of support, and the class of 2014 received only one year. Goals based upon average growth between Junior and Senior year for class of 2014:
 - o Critical Reading goal= shall exceed 41 points growth per year
 - o Math goal= shall exceed 26 points growth per year
 - Writing goal= shall exceed 21 points growth per year
- Explicitly embedding SAT preparation across the curriculum in order to increase SAT scores so that ALL students, especially the lowest performing and those from nontraditional college bound backgrounds, improve their chances of getting into a four year college of their choice.
- Implementing early and frequent D/F analysis followed up by formal support such as SST.
- Preparing students for computer-based standardized testing under CCSS.
- Enabling teachers with best practices and strategies to bring ALL students, even the lowest performing and especially those from nontraditional college bound backgrounds, into deep and meaningful access of the CCSS and accompanying critical thought.
- Referring students to Bridge support groups as outlined in Goal #1

Progress: 2014-15 marked the third year of our SAT prep course initiative, and the first opportunity to view data for a cohort of students who had completed all three years of courses offered. The original course series was: 1 week Summer Boot Camp at the end of 10th grade, 6 week full course in spring of 11th grade, and a 1 week refresher course at the start of 12th grade. Growth was to be tracked by SAT I test score growth over the three years; however, sporadic and declining enrollment made data tracking difficult. While many students who took most or all courses showed target growth, very few students took all three courses and/or multiple SAT I tests; overall, the resultant cohorts were too small to gather meaningful data. As reasons for this, students cited schedule conflicts, a shift from SAT I to SAT Subject tests, and dissatisfaction with the course instructor in 2013-14. As a response, in 2014-15 ASTI and the course provider found a new instructor whom students prefer, and in 2015-16 will make course and data tracking changes outlined in the action plan summary below.

Staffing changes disrupted systematic embedding of SAT preparation across the curriculum. D/F analysis was replaced by "Student Focus" item on each staff meeting agenda (2x/mo); this entailed staff identification of students in need of added support (i.e. SST, parent communication, ELL support). Eleventh graders took the CAASP SBAC practice tests in March as preparation for the upcoming standardized tests. Tenth graders will take the practice tests in April-May. Some ASTI teachers attended district PD on CCSS and shared best practices. Five ASTI teachers signed up for Explore the Core; three are working on an integrated lesson plan with CC reader.

Action plan for 2015-16: In response to the results of the three-year check-in described above, ASTI will implement changes to the SAT preparation program starting 2015-16. The course series will retain the 1-week Summer Boot Camp at the end of 10th grade, which has seen strong enrollment. The 11th grade spring full course and 12th grade fall refresher course will be eliminated and replaced by a 1-week follow up to the Boot Camp in August. In order to minimize schedule conflicts for students, this course will occur after ASTI classes have started, but before COA classes commence. Since most students take the SAT I course early in 11th grade, and some shift to subject courses later in 11th grade, we anticipate higher student interest in the earlier course. Growth will be tracked by comparing PSAT predicted scores with students' real SAT I scores after completion of the two prep courses.

In 2015-16, faculty will review the system to embed SAT across curriculum, and revise as needed. "Student Focus" agenda items and grade/attendance data analysis will continue as the primary means of identifying students in need of support, Tenth and eleventh graders will take the SBAC practice tests in preparation for the assessments. 2015-16 sees an increase in LCFF Supplemental Funds, allowing for paid teacher and sub time to collaborate and perform peer observation rounds in support of transitioning UD students into the Common Core. Faculty will analyze student survey data as part of the planning process.

In 2015-16, ASTI continues with the goal of enabling teachers with best practices and strategies to bring ALL students, even the lowest performing and especially those from nontraditional college bound backgrounds, into deep and meaningful access of the CCSS and accompanying critical thought. To this end, the site has allocated the remainder of LCFF Supplemental to support teacher collaboration on lesson planning, sharing of best practices and observing colleagues and students in classes. The funds will cover compensated collaborative planning time for teachers and substitute coverage for peer observations.

Goal #3

Action plan from 2014-15 SPSA: More families will be actively engaged as partners in their students' education by the end of the 2014–2015 school year as measured by parent involvement artifacts. This will be measured in part by School Loop signups, with 62.5% of students having a parent signed up; the goal is 75%. There are currently 39 parent members of PTSA; the goal is 50. Baseline data will be captured via sign-in sheets for other activities such as those listed below:

Volunteering

SST

PTSA Membership

Chaperones

Club Advisorship/supervision

Family information nights on college, financial aid, etc.

School Loop registration

Attendance at school community events such as pasta feed, awards night, back to school, coffee chats

SSC

Progress: ASTI administration launched a School Loop parent signup campaign in Fall 2014—students were enlisted to support parents in signing up. This resulted in a decrease in the number of students without a registered parent from 69 to 18; this is equivalent to an increase from 59% to 89% of ASTI students with a registered parent on School Loop. Parent participation in School Site Council and Parent Teacher Student Association remained steady between 2013-14 and 2014-15, with 2 elected parents attending all SSC meetings (one served as Chair), and PTSA membership around 30. Parent

attendance at student centered events and one-on-one meetings is consistent—parents of involved students are more likely to attend. Alameda Education Foundation continued to fund the counselor's one-on-one meetings with every tenth grader and family. Stakeholder feedback on this —albeit informal and qualitative—is positive overall. In Fall 2014, administration commenced emailing weekly classroom announcements to parents & students; a new section for scholarships and resources was added to the announcements; informal feedback on this was positive, with one parent requesting PDF format to enable more recipients to open the documents. The district funds translation into traditional Chinese; approximately 20 school documents were translated in 2014-15, ranging from Honor Code to start of year informational documents. Two morning coffee chats were held, but attendance was sparse due to the commuter nature of our parent body.

Action plan for 2015-16: 2015-16 will see continuation of grade level information nights and 10th grade conferences, as well as ASTI's traditional evening events like Awards Nights. ASTI administration and office staff will develop and implement a campaign to increase PTSA parent membership; recruitment has been performed only by PTSA to date; it is hoped that this collaboration will increase parent membership. As ASTI prepares for a WASC visitation scheduled for March 2016, a parent committee is being formed in April 2015 to collaborate with staff and students on the self-study, including a parent study.

AUSD SARCS: http://www.doc-tracking.com/screenshots/Serve/4550/

ASTI 2013-14 SARC: http://www.doc-

tracking.com/screenshots/Serve/4550/2014/AlamedaST.pdf

GOAL			NEE	ED/N	METF	RIC		ACTIONS AND SERVICES	P	TAR OPUL	GET ATIO)N		JNDI FREA		EXPENDITURE AMOUNT	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
Eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	7.7	91			SW	AUD	EL	SED	LCFF BASE	LCFF SUPP	11	(DETAIL BY FUNDING STREAM IF MULTIPLE)		
Need: Improve attendance rates to maximize learning time 1.1 Basic Attendance Rates: % of students attending school 96% of the year	X	X				X	x	MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORT VIA BRIDGE GROUPS, AFS & TRI-HIGH REFERRALS, AND COLLEGE OF ALAMEDA HEALTH SERVICES INTRODUCTIONS	X							N/A (OUTSIDE FUNDING SOURCES—AFS & PERALTA)	ADMINISTRATOR COUNSELOR TEACHERS	ADMIN/COUNSELOR REFERRAL IMPLEMENTED SRPING 2015 FORMALIZED SCHOOLWIDE REFFERAL SYSTEM FOLDED INTO PBIS FALL 2015
1.2 Chronic Absenteeism: % of students with 3 or more unexcused absences Need: Decrease interruptions of learning by suspension and expulsion 1.3 Suspension Rate:	х	Х						USE ATTENDANCE DATA TO IMPEL SCHEDULING OF STUDENT SUCCESS TEAM & SART MEETINGS	x							N/A	OFFICE MANAGER ADMINISTRATOR COUNSELOR	BEGINNING AUGUST OF 2015, OFFICE MANAGER WILL PULL & FLAG DATA WHILE COMPILING MONTHLY ATTENDANCE REPORT; DATA WILL BE SCREENED MONTHLY FOR STUDENTOF CONCERN THROUGH MAY 2016
% of students suspended per year 1.4 Expulsion Rate: % of students expelled per year Need: Improve rates of completion at			X	х				PROVIDE CLEAR EXPECTATIONS—RISE (PBIS ACRONYM), DIGITAL CITIZENSHIP, SCHOOL BEHAVIOR EXPECTATIONS	X							N/A	OFFICE MANAGER ADMINISTRATOR COUNSELOR/PBIS COORDINATOR	SPRING 2015—FINALIZE RISE ACRONYM AUGUST 2015—RISE ACRONYM EXPECTATIONS POSTED AND TAUGHT ONGOING RISE AWARDS BEGINNING
Middle and High School 1.5 Middle School Drop-out Rate: % of students in given cohort not completing 8th grade 1.6 High School Drop-out Rate:	Х	X						PBIS POSTCARDS—EVERY STUDENT RECEIVES ONE WITH POSITIVE NOTES FROM EACH TEACHER	X							PTSA APPROXIMATELY \$150 WITH POSTAGE	TEACHERS OFFICE MANAGER TEACHERS	AUGUST 2015 SPRING 2015 IMPLEMENTED AUGUST 2015 BATCHES COMPILED WEEKLY AND SPREAD OVER YEAR
% of students in 9 th grade cohort not finishing 12 th grade 1.7 High School Graduation Rate: % of students in 9 th grade cohort completing	Х	х				Х	X	2 ND YEAR PSYCH INTERN 1X/WK		Х				Х		\$3442 LCFF SUPPLEMENTAL	ADMINISTRATOR SPED/SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST	SPRING 2015—INTERVIEW & HIRE INTERN AUGUST 2015—INTERN BEGINS
all graduation requirement	X	х				х	Х	ANALYSIS OF STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS	Х							N/A	ADMINISTRATOR STUDENT LEADERS STAFF	SURVEY ADMINISTERED SPRING 2015 ANALYSIS SPRING-FALL 2015
	X	х						PERSONALIZED ATTENDANCE CALLS IN ADDITION TO ROBOCALLS; TRUANCY LETTERS SENT WITH TIMELY SART FOLLOWUP	X							N/A	OFFICE MANAGER ADMINISTRATOR	ONGOING
	X	х			х	Х	Х	SOPHOMORE COUNSELING GRADE LEVEL INFORMATION NIGHTS 2 YEAR PLAN LINKED TO MISSION & VISION	Х							N/A	COUNSELOR	ONGOING

RECORD OF AGREEMENTS: ALIGNMENT OF ACTIONS AND SERVICES TO GOALS GOAL 2: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

GOAL	NEED/METRIC	ACTIONS AND SERVICES	TARGET FUNDING EXPENDITURE POPULATION STREAM AMOUNT	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s)	2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7 2.8 2.9 2.10 2.10 2.11 2.13		SED AUDING SED COLOR STREAM IF MULTIPLE)		
Need: Improve student achievement on both state and local assessments 2.1 State Achievement Test: % of students demonstrating proficiency on California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in ELA and Math 2.2 Local Assessment: % of students demonstrating proficiency by end of 1st grade on Early Literacy Survey (ELS) 2.3 Local Assessment: % of students demonstrating proficiency	X X	TESTING READINESS—STAFFWIDE TRAINING AND TEST PRACTICE (BY/FOR TEACHERS) TO FACILITATE INTERDISCIPLINARY SUPPORT OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE THROUGH AWARENESS OF SBAC TESTING EXPECTATIONS	X N/A	ADMINISTRATOR	SEPTEMBER 2015—TEST PRACTICE FEBRUARY 2016—TEST PRACTICE WITH NEW RELEASED MATERIALS
on Math Benchmarks by end of year 2.4 Academic Performance Index: Schoolwide and District API performance 2.5 Career Pathway Completion: % of students completing Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway	x	ALL 10 TH & 11 TH GRADERS TAKE PSAT; SCORES ARE USED AS FOUNDATION OF SAT PREP COURSES DESCRIBED BELOW	X N/A	COUNSELOR	ANNUALLY IN OCTOBER
Need: Increase rate of English language acquisition by English Learners (ELs)		MEDIA STUDIES TEACHER WILL OBTAIN CTE CREDENTIAL	X N/A	MEDIA STUDIES TEACHER HUMAN RESOURCES	SUMMER 2015
 2.6 EL Reclassification Rate: % of English Learners reclassifying to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) 2.7 Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 1: % of students meeting annual California English Language 	x	A-G POSTERS CREATED BY STUDENT ADVISORY AND POSTED THROUGHOUT SCHOOL	X N/A	COUNSELOR ADVISORY	SPRING-FALL 2015
Development Test (CELDT) growth target 2.8 Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 2: % of students demonstrating proficiency on CELDT Need: Increase performance on indicators of college	X X	SOPHOMORE COUNSELING GRADE LEVEL INFORMATION NIGHTS 2-YEAR PLAN	X N/A	COUNSELOR	ONGOING
and career readiness 2.9 a-g Completion: % of graduating seniors completing UC 'a-g' requirements 2.10 Early Assessment Program (EAP): % of 11 th grade students demonstrating college readiness on EAP in Math and English *2.11 Advanced Placement (AP) Exam Pass Rate: % of AP Exams taken with a score of 3 or more 2.12 College-level coursework: % of students enrolling in an AP or college course *Since ASTI does not offer AP courses, this metric focuses instead on sat scores. As gatekeepers to college admissions, sat		TEACHER COLLABORATION & PEER OBSERVATION TIME— INTERDISCIPLINARY STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT UD STUDENTS ACCESS TO CCSS AND PERFORMANCE ON STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS AND CCSS BENCHMARKS; 25 TEACHER HOURS PLUS 3.5 SUB DAYS	X \$1383 LCFF SUPPLEMENTAL	TEACHERS	MAY 2015—FOCI REFINED FOR UD/EL/SED MAXIMUM BENEFIT AUGUST 2015—STAFF DEVELOPMENT –INTERDISPLINARY COLLABORATION SEPTEMBER 2015 –MAY 2016-CONTINUED COLLABORATION WITH CLASSROOM IMPLEMENTATION CYCLES, I.E. LESSON STUDY, FOCUS STUDENTS, EXAMINIATION OF STUDENT WORK, CRITICAL FRIENDS PROTOCOL, PEER OBSERVATIONS
scores are a key part of our mission and vision to prepare students for admission to a four year college of their choice. Growth data for the first three years has been promising. Recent		COLLEGE ESSAY WRITING WORKSHOP IN SEMINAR CLASSES AND WITH COUNSELOR	X N/A	ENGLISH TEACHER COUNSELOR	ANNUAL COMMENCES IN FALL FINISHES JANUARY
analysis has shifted our focus from cohort score growth—the groups are small and the participants change from session to session; attendance drops off as students progress through 11 th grade and some transition to subject matter tests, which we do not track to due to their specialized nature.		TEACHER COLLABORATION & PEER OBSERVATION TIME— IMPLEMENT & MAXIMIZE USE OF ELACHIEVE CONSTRUCTING MEANING; 25 TEACHER HOURS PLUS 3.5 SUB DAYS	X X \$1382 LCFF SUPPLEMENTAL	ADMINISTRATOR TEACHERS DISTRICT ELD—FOR ELACHIEVE PD & GUIDANCE	AUGUST 2015—ELACHIEVE CONSTRUCTING MEANING LEAD TEACHER IDENTIFIED SEPTEMBER—STAFF TRAINING AND COLLABORATION COMMENCES— DRIVING QUESTION—FIND AND

Need: Implementation of State Standards for English Learners (ELs) 2.13 English Learner Access to Common Core State							BUILD UPON INTERSECTIONS BETWEEN CONSTRUCTING MEANING AND CCSS
Standards (CCSS): % of ELs accessing CCSS state standards in setting with English-only peers 2.14 English Language Development (ELD) Standard Implementation: % of ELs receiving appropriate designated ELD instruction aligned to ELD Standards		×		FOR SAT THIS YEAR, WE WILL MOVE FROM PROVISION OF PREP COURSES ONCE PER GRADE STARTING AT THE END OF TENTH TO A PROGRAM THAT PROVIDES TWO ONE-WEEK COURSES THAT BOOKEND THE SUMMER BETWEEN 10 TH AND 11 TH GRADES. WE WILL TRACK COURSE ENROLLMENT DATA TO DETERMINE STUDENT ENGAGEMENT; THIS FACTOR AFFECTS GROWTH, WHICH WE WILL ALSO TRACK.	\$8000 FUNDED BY LOCAL DONATIONS ACCOUNT	ADMINISTRATOR COUNSELOR OFFICE MANAGER CONTRACTED PARTNER—ACHIEVE LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	ONGOING—SEE NARRATIVE FOR HISTORY JUNE 2015: SOPHOMORE BOOT CAMP AUGUST 2015: JUNIOR BOOT CAMP
			X	THIS GOAL IS EMBEDDED IN ASTI'S PROGRAM, AS WE ARE A DUAL ENROLLMENT INSTITUTION IN WHICH STUDENTS MATRICULATE TOWARD A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY ENROLLING IN BOTH ASTI HIGH SCHOOL AND PERALTA COLLEGE COURSES. THIS ALSO ENABLES STUDENTS TO GO ABOVE AND BEYOND TRADITIONAL HIGH SCHOOL COURSEWORK—THEY MAY SPECIALIZE IN HIGHER LEVEL SCIENCE OR MATH CLASSES; THEY MAY EARN 1 OR MORE AA DEGREES.	N/A	ADMINSTRATOR COUNSELOR OFFICE MANAGER TEACHERS STUDENTS PARENTS PERALTA COLLEGES	ONGOING PER OUR MISSION, VISION

RECORD OF AGREEMENTS: ALIGNMENT OF ACTIONS AND SERVICES TO GOALS GOAL 3: PARENT/GUARDIAN ENGAGEMENT

GOAL	NEE	D/M	ETRIC	ACTIONS AND SERVICES	PC	TAR OPUL	_		_	NDING REAM	EXPENDITURE AMOUNT	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
Support parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners	3.1				SW	AUD	EL	SED	LCFF BASE	LCFF SUPP T1	(DETAIL BY FUNDING STREAM IF MULTIPLE)		
and effective advocates for student success Need: Improve home to school communication and	Х			SCHOOL LOOP RECRUITMENT CAMPAIGN FOCUSED ON PARENTS OF STUDENTS WITHOUT A REGISTERED PARENT—STUDENTS RECRUITED AS AMBASSADORS TO ENROLL THEIR PARENTS.	х		х				N/A	ADMINISTRATOR STUDENTS	FALL 2014—FIRST CAMPAIGN FALL 2015—SECOND YEAR WILL BE SMALLER SINCE 10 TH ,11 TH , 12 TH GRADE PARENTS WILL ROLL OVER
overall parent/guardian awareness of student	х			WEBSITE MAINTENANCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS	Х						N/A	ADMINISTRATOR COUNSELOR	ONGOING
progress 3.1 Seeking Input: % of parents/guardians that feel informed about their student's progress in school as reported on	Х			CONTINUE RECRUITMENT BY PEERS AND STUDENTS TO ENGAGE PARENTS AS VOLUNTEERS; EXAMPLES INCLUDE GARDER, SCHOOL SITE COUNCIL, ANNUAL AUCTION, CLUB CHAPERONE, FIELD TRIP CHAPERONE, EVENT JUDGES, GRANT WRITERS, AND UPCOMING WASC COMMITTEE MEMBERS	х						N/A	PARENT LEADERS ADVISORY & STUDENT LEADERS TEACHERS	ONGOING WASC COMMENCES SPRING 2015
parent/guardian survey Need: Increase parent/guardian participation in educational events 3.2 Participation: % of parents/guardians attending non-mandatory educational school	X			TRANSLATE IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS INTO TRADTIONAL/COMPLEX CHINESE—AS CANTONESE IS THE MAJORITY HOME LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT ASTI.			х				AMOUNT UNKNOWN DISTRICT FUNDS TO TRANSLATE DOCUMENTS FOR POPULATIONS WITH QUALIFYING PERCENTAGE	ADMINISTRATOR OFFICE MANAGER ELD AUSD	FALL 2014—EFFORT COMMENCED AS FUNDS BECAME AVAILABLE UNDER LCFF ONGOING THROUGH 2014-15 YEAR: TRANSLATE DOCUMENTS AS THEY ARISE WITH COURSE OF SCHOOL YEAR 2015-16: DEEPEN AND EXTEND TRANSLATION BEYOND MAJOR SCHOOLWIDE DOCUMENTS, I.E. BY ADDING GRADE LEVEL SPECIFIC PARENT INFORMATIONAL DOCUMENTS REGARDING EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL PROCEDURES
events	Х			SURVEY PARENTS ON BEST DATES/TIMES TO SCHEDULE SCHOOL EVENTS FOR MAXIMUM AVAILABILITY.	х						N/A	ADMINISTRATOR PARENT LEADERS STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE	MAY 2015—DEVELOP SURVEY WITH PARENT/STUDENT PARTNERS
	x x			INCREASED PUBLICITY FOR ANNOUNCEMENTS SHARED WEEKLY VIA SCHOOL LOOP EMAIL	х						N/A	ADMINSTRATOR PARENT LEADERS STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE OFFICE MANAGER	AUGUST 2015—AWARENESS CAMPAIGN DURING ORIENTATION AND BACK TO SCHOOL NIGHT REMINDERS DURING GRADE LEVEL INFORMATION NIGHTS
	X			PARENT PORTAL RECRUITMENT—CONTINUE TO INVESTIGATE OPTIONS TO SUPPORT ENROLLMENT OF PARENTS WITH NON-ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE; CONSIDERATIONS INCLUDE TRANSLATION OF INSTRUCTIONS AND OPEN LAB EVENINGS IN WHICH WE WILL WALK THEM THROUGH SIGN UP.			x				AMOUNT UNKNOWN DISTRICT FUNDS TO TRANSLATE DOCUMENTS FOR POPULATIONS WITH QUALIFYING PERCENTAGE	ADMINISTRATOR OFFICE MANAGER	AUGUST 2015—TRANSLATIONS PROVIDED IF AVAILABLE; LAB OPEN FOR SIGN UPS DURING BACK TO SCHOOL NIGHT SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER:
	х			PERSONALIZED PHONE CALLS & EMAILS TO INVITE PARENTS TO EVENTS	Х						N/A	OFFICE MANAGER ADVISORY STUDENTS ADMINISTRATOR	ONGOING
	x x			GRADE LEVEL INFORMATION NIGHTS PROVIDE PARENTS WITH INFORMATION ON OVERALL REQUIREMENTS; AEF-FUNDED TENTH GRADE FAMILY MEETINGS PROVIDE ONE-ON-ONE COUNSELING SUPPORT FOR TWO YEAR PLAN AND PROGRESS.	Х						N/A	COUNSELOR	ONGOING 10 TH GRADE CONFERENCES COMMENCED 2013-14

ASTI Budget Packet

Budget Sun	nmary	B3		C112	С	113	C	C114		C122		C135					C137		
Resource	Program	15-16		rtificated alaries		ssified aries	Ве	nefits	Sı	upplies	;	Services	Вι	Total Budgeted				budgeted Balance	Check
			Ob	ject 1xxx		bject xxx		bject Bxxx	Ob	ect 4xxx	0	bject 5xxx							
0001	Discretionary	\$ 29,508	\$	-	\$	455	\$	113	\$	5,200	\$	23,740	\$	29,508	\$	-	29,508		
0002	LCFF Supplemental Grant	\$ 6,240	\$	5,378	\$	-	\$	829	\$	-	\$	33	\$	6,240	\$	-	6,240		
<u>3010</u>	T1, Part A		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	0		
0002	In Lieu of Title 1	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	0		
	Innovative																		
	Grand Total	\$ 35,748	\$	5,378	\$	455	\$	942	\$	5,200	\$	23,773	\$	35,748	\$	-	35,748		
				15%		1%		3%		15%		67%							

Form 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 <u>funding</u>, then the plan must include the proposed expenditures.)

State/	Federal Programs	Allocation
	LCFF Supplemental Funding (0002)	\$6240
	Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program <u>Purpose</u> : Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	\$ 0
	Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program <u>Purpose</u> : Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency	\$0
	Title I, Part A: Program Improvement <u>Purpose</u> : Assist Title I schools that have failed to meet NCLB adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets for one or more identified student groups	\$0
	Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting <u>Purpose</u> : Improve and increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals	\$0
	Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology Purpose : Support professional development and the use of technology	\$0
	Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students <u>Purpose</u> : Supplement language instruction to help limited-English- proficient (LEP) students attain English proficiency and meet academic performance standards	\$ 0
	Title IV, Part A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities <u>Purpose</u> : Support learning environments that promote academic achievement	\$0
	Title V: Innovative Programs <u>Purpose</u> : Support educational improvement, library, media, and at-risk students	\$ 0
	Other Federal Funds (list and describe ¹)	\$ 0
	Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$6240

¹ For example, special education funds used in a School-Based Coordinated Program to serve students not identified as individuals with exceptional needs.

SCHOOL SITE COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Education Code Section 64001 requires that this plan 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:

Names of Members	Gender	Race/* Ethnicity	Primary Language	Principal	Classroom Teacher	Other School Staff	Parent or Community Member	Secondary Student
Dianne Woon	F	201	Cantonese/ English				Х	
Andrew Kopp	М	700	English				Х	
Tracy Corbally	F	700	English	Х				
Laurel McCoy	F	700	English		Х			
Zahera Ali	F	205	Gujrati/ Hindi/ English		Х			
Kathy Pengelly	F	700	English		Х			
Kelly Tan	F	201	Cantonese/ English					Х
Mindy Tran	F	201	Cantonese/ English					Х
Mit Lepcha	F	299	Nepali/Engl ish					Х
Judy Solomon		700	English			Х		
#s of members of each category	-			1	3	1	2	3

^{*}See race/ethnicity codes

It is important to accurately determine the board's policy before proceeding with the school planning process.

50% of the SSC is elected parents and community members and 50% is elected school staff.

CALIFORNIA EDUCATION CODE

Section 52012

A School Site Council shall be established at each school that participates in the school improvement program authorized by this chapter. The council shall be composed of the principal and representatives: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school; parents of pupils attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, pupils selected by pupils attending the school.

At the elementary level the council shall be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers and other school personnel; and (b) parents or other community members selected by parents.

At the secondary level the council shall be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers and other school personnel and (b) equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and pupils.

Questions for site to address:

1.	Does the SSC composition meet the California Education Code (EC 52852)? If not, what is needed? Yes
2.	Does the race/ethnic/primary language composition of the SSC reflect your school population? Yes
3.	If not, how are you addressing the need to ensure that the SSC includes the voices from all stakeholder populations?
4.	If your school is required to have an English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC), how was input received from the ELAC in the development of the School Site plan? N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS AND ASSURANCES

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

- 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):
- 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)
- 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 upon 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: 4, 6, 206

Attested:

- Tracy L Corbally - Typed name of school principal Tracy してor bally

Andrew Kopp

Typed name of SSC chairperson

28...aca, a a, as, aca, p....a.p...

Signature of SSC chairperson

Date

Appendix A: Special Education

Question:

Are special education staff members providing support to general education students at your school site? If so, please provide a description of the ways in which support/services are provided

Yes. ASTI shares a resource professional with Island High School. All ASTI SPED students are mainstreamed. The RSP provides push-in and pull-out services.	

DATA APPENDIX: Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Aligned Data Revised May 2015

Alameda Unified School District Enrollment and Unduplicated Count

School	2013-14 Enrollment	SED (Number of Students)	English Learners (Number)	Unduplicated Students (Number)	Unduplicated Students (Percentage)	2014-15 Enrollment	SED (Number of Students)	English Learners (Number)	Unduplicated Students (Number)	Unduplicated Students (Percentage)
Bay Farm	561	37	89	112	20%	572	45	83	117	20%
Earhart	618	58	112	147	23.8%	622	54	114	141	22.6%
Edison	484	62	55	88	18.1%	486	58	56	86	17.6%
Franklin	311	60	41	79	25.4%	326	50	42	77	23.6%
Haight	438	244	168	284	64.8%	452	254	168	294	65%
Lum	509	168	163	252	49.5%	519	159	168	247	47.5%
Maya Lin	325	152	103	183	56.3%	321	134	85	169	52.6%
Otis	565	104	113	163	28.8%	588	100	113	161	27.3%
Paden	329	157	106	196	66.4%	316	140	106	184	58.2%
Ruby Bridges	579	406	180	451	77.9%	588	398	184	449	76.3%
Jr. Jets	184	115	40	123	66.8%	229	128	57	150	65.6%
Lincoln MS	956	181	92	234	24.5%	900	139	85	193	21.4%
Wood MS	429	248	115	285	59.6%	439	217	111	257	58.5%
AHS	1787	403	213	505	28.1%	1746	396	190	496	28%
ASTI	170	40	6	44	25.9%	170	52	9	55	32%
EHS	1038	467	189	539	51.9%	1052	446	197	520	49.4%
ISHS	172	93	27	108	62.8%	144	83	14	90	63%
AUSD	9484	2996	1812	3794	40%	9499	2854	1783	3688	38.8%

Source: CALPADS

LCAP Goal One: Student Engagement

1.1 Increase the % of students attending school 96% of the school year (173/180 days)

2015-16 Target: 76%

1.1A Students with 96% Attendance by Sub Group

	20	13	20)14	January 2015		
Group	Number of Students	Percentage of Students with 96% Attendance	Number of Students	Percentage of Students with 96% Attendance	Number of Students	Percentage of Students with 96% Attendance	
AUSD	7134	75.2%	7130	74.4%	7097	74.7%	
ELD	1499	78.9%	1371	79.7%	1384	79.3%	
SED	2358	68%	2347	70.2%	2221	69.3%	
Foster	3	100%	11	64%			
Special Ed	560	59.6%	2221	61%	570	65.4%	
AA	696	62.8%	687	62.5%	652	61.7%	
Asian	2783	88.9%	2734	86.9%	2700	86.7%	
Filipino	625	78.2%	646	76.7%	634	76.1%	
Latino	855	62.1%	931	62.4%	950	63.5%	
White	2052	71.8%	1984	71.6%	2019	73.1%	
Am In/Al Native	42	52.5%	55	55.6%	68	54.4%	
Pac Islander	78	76%	82	74.5%	69	60%	

1.1B Students With 96% Attendance by School Site

School Site	2	013	20	14	Januar	y 2015
	Number of Students	Percentage of Students with 96% Attendance	Number of Students	Percentage of Students with 96% Attendance	Number of Students	Percentage of Students with 96% Attendance
AUSD	7134	76.3%	7130	68.5%	7097	74.7%
AHS	1371	76.3%	1313	73.9%	1324	76.4%
EHS	774	70.6%	762	71.1%	744	68.5%
ASTI	148	88.1%	149	86.6%	150	86.2%
Lincoln MS	819	81.3%	784	81.2%	756	83.5%
Wood MS	415	71.7%	344	73.5%	328	71.1%
Jr. Jets		-	133	69.6%	173	74.6%
Bay Farm	438	80.7%	471	81.6%	459	79.1%
Earhart	497	82.3%	498	79.3%	512	81.7%
Edison	388	79.3%	389	78.3%	382	76.4%
Franklin	246	75.9%	250	75.3%	249	74.1%
Haight	270	60.5%	307	65.9%	321	67.2%
Lum	406	76.6%	401	74.5%	403	76.3%
Maya Lin	230	71.7%	231	67.3%	221	67.6%
Otis	452	82%	459	79.4%	481	80%
Ruby Bridges	428	64.3%	395	62.8%	383	61.9%
Paden	252	69.6%	244	70.3%	211	65.7%

Source: Aeries

1.1 Increase the % of students attending school 96% of the school year (173/180 days).

2015-16 Target: 76%

1.1C Students Attending 96% by Site and Sub Group August-December 2014

Group	Alameda High School (Number of Students)	Alameda High School (Percentage of Students)	Encinal High School (Number of Students)	Encinal High School (Percentage of Students)	ASTI (Number of Students)	ASTI (Percentage of Students)
All	1324	76.40%	744	68.5%	150	86.2%
ELD	131	77.10%	171	81.8%	7	87.5%
SED	338	76.30%	343	68.6%	57	93.4%
Foster	0	0	2	100.0%	0	NA
Special Ed	93	62%	64	56.6%	3	100%
504	29	51.80%	17	53.1%	1	50%
AA	75	66.40%	129	59.7%	6	60%
Asian	655	89.20%	221	85.0%	92	93.9%
Filipino	72	69.20%	121	75.2%	19	86.4%
Latino	144	64.90%	121	60.8%	17	85%
White	366	68%	137	64.6%	13	68.4%
Am In/Al Native	4	50%	5	25.0%	2	100%
Pac Islander	8	53.30%	9	52.9%	1	33.3%

1.1C Students Attending 96% by Site and Sub Group August-December 2014

Group	Lincoln MS (Number of Students)	Lincoln MS (Percentage of Students)	Junior Jets (Number of Students)	Junior Jets (Percentage of Students)	Wood MS (Number of Students)	Wood MS (Percentage of Students)
All	756	83.5%	173	74.6%	328	71.1%
ELD	68	93.2%	48	84.2%	92	80.7%
SED	128	84.8%	100	73.5%	164	67.5%
Foster	1	100%	0	0	1	33.3%
Special Ed	77	74.8%	18	62.1%	44	58.7%
504	16	72.7%	1	50%	8	72.7%
AA	44	73.3%	35	70%	43	55.8%
Asian	336	91.6%	43	91.5%	128	87.1%
Filipino	50	86.2%	31	83.8%	53	80.3%
Latino	74	80.4%	37	69.8%	46	59.7%
White	246	77.4%	21	65.6%	47	60.3%
Am In/Al Native	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	3	50%
Pac Islander	4	100%	4	57.1%	8	80%

Source: Aeries

1.1C Students Attending 96% by Site and Sub Group August-December 2014

Group	Bay Farm (Number of Students)	Bay Farm (Percentage of Students)	Edison (Number of Students)	Edison (Percentage of Students)	Earhart (Number of Students)	Earhart (Percentage of Students)	Franklin (Number of Students)	Franklin (Percentage of Students)
All	459	79.1%	382	76.4%	512	81.7%	249	74.1%
ELD	69	83.1%	42	77.8%	89	82.4%	35	77.8%
SED	36	66.7%	45	66.2%	50	84.7%	43	74.1%
Foster	2	66.7%	1	100%	0	NA	0	NA
Special Ed	35	77.8%	29	65.9%	42	82.4%	11	64.7%
504	16	64%	3	100%	7	77.8%	0	NA
AA	20	74.1%	13	72.2%	38	92.7%	12	54.5%
Asian	235	86.4%	81	90%	224	87.2%	48	85.7%
Filipino	14	66.7%	16	72.7%	49	84.5%	20	83.3%
Latino	54	69.2%	41	64.1%	60	65.2%	32	62.7%
White	127	77%	222	75.5%	134	79.3%	129	74.1%
Am In/Al Native	4	50%	7	77.8%	5	83.3%	6	85.7%
Pac Islander	5	55.6%	2	66.7%	2	50%	1	100%

Source: Aeries

1.1C Students Attending 96% by Site and Sub Group August-December 2014

Group	Haight (Number of Students)	Haight (Percentage of Students)	Lum (Number of Students)	Lum (Percentage of Students)	Maya Lin (Number of Students)	Maya Lin (Percentage of Students)	Otis (Number of Students)	Otis (Percentage of Students)
All	321	67.3%	403	76.5%	221	67.6%	481	80%
ELD	136	78.6%	130	77.8%	63	77.8%	95	88.8%
SED	192	69.1%	122	70.9%	93	65.5%	73	69.5%
Foster	1	25%	0	NA	1	100%	0	NA
Special Ed	16	64%	32	74.4%	33	68.8%	24	72.7%
504	2	100%	3	75%	0	0	2	28.6%
AA	45	54.2%	46	71.9%	19	47.5%	16	57.1%
Asian	122	81.9%	161	82.6%	38	74.5%	149	88.2%
Filipino	35	67.3%	39	81.3%	28	73.7%	22	73.3%
Latino	62	59.6%	56	58.3%	45	60%	72	76.6%
White	50	64.1%	95	82.6%	81	74.3%	211	79.3%
Am In/Al Native	3	75%	4	100%	6	60%	4	80%
Pac Islander	4	57.1%	2	40%	2	100%	7	87.5%

1.1C Students Attending 96% by Site and Sub Group August-December 2014

Group	Paden (Number of Students)	Paden (Percentage of Students)	Ruby Bridges (Number of Students)	Ruby Bridges (Percentage of Students)	
All	211	65.7%	383	61.9%	
ELD	74	69.8%	134	70.2%	
SED	96	64.4%	254	59.5%	
Foster	96	64.4%	255	59.2%	
Special Ed	0	NA	1	25%	
504	20	69%	29	45.3%	
AA	0	NA	2	50%	
Asian	24	55.8% 87		52.7%	
Filipino	61	74.4%	106	76.3%	
Latino	29	63%	36	78.3%	
White	41	65.1%	48	41.4%	
Am In/Al Native	50	65.8%	90	75.6%	
Pac Islander	5	55.6%	6	40%	
All	1	50%	9	50%	

Source: Aeries

1.1 Decrease the % of Students with Chronic Absenteeism (% of Students with 3+ Unexcused Absences).

1.2A Sub Group Students with 3+ unexcused absences. 2015-16 Target 19.2%

Sub Group	2013 % Truant	2013 # Students	2014 % Truant	2014 # Students	2015 (Aug-Dec) % Truant	2015 (Aug-Dec) # Students
All	23.3%	2206	20.7%	1984	11.5%	1089
ELD	21.1%	400	17.4%	299	9.1%	159
SED	32.7%	1094	30.9%	991	NA	NA
Foster	100%	3	52.9%	9	NA	NA
Special Ed	34.4%	323	30.4%	279	21.8%	190
504	41.7%	463	36.9%	406	26.8%	283
AA	16%	502	14.1%	445	6%	187
Asian	23.3%	186	20%	168	9.4%	78
Filipino	32.2%	445	28.1%	419	17.2%	258
Latino	19%	544	17%	471	8.4%	231
White	30%	24	32.3%	32	20.8%	26
Am In/ Al Native	32.6%	42	33.1%	43	22.6%	26

1.2B School Site. Students with 3+unexcused absences. 2015-16 Target 19.2%

School Site	2013	2013 # Students	2014 % Truant	2014 # Students	2015 (Aug-Dec) % Truant	2015 # Students
AUSD	23.3%	2206	20.7%	1984	11.5%	1089
AHS	38.5%	692	40.3%	715	57.5%	355
EHS	74.5%	817	57.5%	616	36.7%	399
ASTI	7.1%	12	9.3%	16	3.4%	6
ISLAND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lincoln MS	10.3%	104	8.5%	82	2.1%	19
Wood MS	34.2%	198	37%	173	25.4%	117
JR. Jets	NA	NA	37.7%	72	112%	26
Bay Farm	8.8%	48	3.6%	21	1.6%	9
Earhart	.3%	2	1%	6	0	0
Edison	.8%	4	2%	10	.06%	3
Franklin	13.3%	43	7.8%	26	4.2%	14
Haight	21.3%	95	17%	79	5.7%	27
Lum	4%	21	4.6%	25	3%	16
Maya Lin	4.7%	15	2.3%	8	2.1%	7
Otis	0	0	0%	0	1.3%	8
Ruby Bridges	18.2%	121	18.6%	117	12.4%	77
Paden	9.4%	34	5.2%	18	1.9%	6

Source: Aeries

1.3 Decrease the % of student suspensions.

Student Group	Percentage of	Number of	Percentage of	Number of	Percentage of	Number of
	Students in	Students in	Students in	Students in	Students in	Students in
	Group	Group	Group	Group	Group	Group
	Suspended	Suspended	Suspended	Suspended	Suspended	Suspended
	(2013)	(2013)	(2014)	(2014)	(2015)	(2015)
All Students	4.2%	454	2.9%	290	1.3%	126
ELD	3.5%	81	1.4%	29	1.2%	22
SED	6.9%	263	4.0%	149	2.1%	65
Foster	ND	1		1	13ND	ND
Special Ed	13.6%	151	7.3%	81	3.80%	42
AA	13.1%	167	7.5%	86	4.50%	49
Asian	1.8%	56	.8%	26	1%	21
Filipino	3.8%	31	2.5%	20	.96%	8
Latino	5.1%	86	3.2%	57	1.40%	22
White	2.9%	93	1.9%	59	.75%	23
Pac Islander	10.1%	12	5.1%	6	.80%	1

Source: Data Quest

1.3D Student Suspension Rate by School Site

School Site	2013 Rate (Year End)	2013 # (Year End)	2014Rate (Year End)	2014# (Year End)	2015 Rate	2015# (Aug-Dec)
AUSD	4.1%	469	3.3%	318	1.3%	126
AHS	4.3%	80	3.1%	55	2.2%	39
EHS	7.5%	87	4.6%	49	2.6%	28
ASTI	0	0	9.3%	16	.6%	1
IS HS	11.3%	32	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lincoln MS	3.5%	35	2.8%	27	.8%	7
Wood MS	10.9%	65	5.7%	27	3.5%	16
Jr. Jets	NA	NA	14.7%	28	.9%	2
Bay Farm	.4%	2	.9%	5	.2%	1
Earhart	.7%	4	.3%	2	0	0
Edison	.4%	2	.6%	3	1.4%	7
Franklin	1.2%	4	.9%	3	0	0
Haight	1.7%	8	3.4%	16	1.9%	9
Lum	.7%	4	2.0%	11	.9%	5
Maya Lin	3.2%	11	4.7%	16	1.2%	4
Otis	.2%	1	1.9%	11	.5%	3
Ruby Bridges	3.7%	27	2.1%	13	.3%	2
Paden	5.8%	22	3.5%	12	.6%	2

Source: Aeries

1.4 Decrease the % of Student Expulsions

Target 2015-16: .075

School Site	2013 Rate (Year End)	2013 # (Year End)	2014Rate (Year End)	2014# (Year End)	2015 Rate	2015# (Aug- Dec)
AUSD	.01	4	0	0	0	0
AHS	0	1	0	0	0	0
EHS	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASTI	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS HS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lincoln MS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wood MS	.3	2	0	0	0	0
Jr. Jets	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bay Farm	0	0	0	0	0	0
Earhart	0	0	0	0	0	0
Edison	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haight	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lum	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maya Lin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ruby Bridges	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paden	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alameda County	.1%	185	.01%	129	0	0
California	.1%	8266	.1%	6611	0	0

Source: Data Quest

1.5 Decrease the rate of middle school drop outs.

2015-16 Target .62% Students.

School	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Lincoln MS	0	0	0
Jr. Jets	NA	NA	0
Wood MS	0	2	0

Source: Data Quest

1.6 Decrease the 9th Grade Cohort Drop Out Rate.

2015-16 Target: 8.1%

	-0-0 -0 1 m get											
Year	All	ELD	SED	Special Ed	AA	Latino	Asian	Am Ind/ Al Native	Pac Islander	Filipino	White	Multi
2013- 14#	70	23	45	15	-10	16	19	-10	-10	-10	15	-10
2013-14 Rate	8.6%	11.7%	11.7%	15.3%	12.2%	15.2%	6.2%	0	7.1%	8.4%	7.4%	12.5%
2012- 13#	74	29	52	-10	16	23	19	0	-10	-10	-10	-10
2012-13 Rate	8.4%	14.3%	11.5%	9.5%	16.5%	18.4%	5.9%	0	12.5%	6.5%	3.3%	22.2%
2011-12 #	81	25	56	19	26	-10	14	-10	-10	-10	23	-10
2011-12 Rate	9.2%	11.4%	9.9%	13.6%	23.6%	6.9%	4.2%	33.3%	7.1%	9.2%	9.9%	16.7%

Source: Data Quest

1.6B Decrease the 9th Grade Cohort Drop Out Rate by School Site

	AUSD	Alameda HS	Encinal HS	ASTI	Island HS
2013-14 #	70	18	19	-10	NA
2013-14 Rate	8.6%	4.2%	7.9%	0	NA
2012-13 #	74	12	27	-10	NA
2012-13 Rate	8.4%	2.5%	10.6%	0	NA
2011-12 #	81	30	27	-10	NA
2011-12 Rate	9.2%	6.3%	10.3%	33.3%	NA

Source: Data Quest

1.7 Increase the 9th Grade Cohort High School Graduation Rate

2013-14 Graduating Cohort

	AUSD	Alameda HS	Encinal HS	ASTI	Island HS
All Students	86%	92.6%	86.7%	100%	86%
Latino	76.2%	85.1%	78.6%	100%	76.2%
American Indian	*	NA	100%	NA	50%
Asian	89.3%	92.5%	83.5%	100%	89.3%
Pacific Islander	85.7%	100%	100%	NA	85.7%
Filipino	88.4%	94.7%	95.1%	NA	88.4%
African American	76.8%	100%	81.8%	100%	76.8%
White	89.1%	93.3%	89.4%	100%	89.1%

Source: Data Quest March 3, 2015

2.1 Increase the % proficient on the California Assessment of Academic Performance Progress (CAASPP) 2015-16: Establish Baseline

2.1A CAASPP CST Science: % Proficient and Advanced

Grade	All	ELD	SED	Special Ed	AA	Asian	Filipino	Latino	Pac Islander	White	Multi
Gr 5	72%	37%	35%	58%	57%	79%	71%	58%	46%	89%	87%
Gr 8	78%	44%	61%	41%	58%	83%	75%	60%	*	87%	81%
Gr10	64%	16%	50%	36%	44%	73%	70%	49%	*	79%	70%

Source: CDE

2.1B CAASPP CST Science Grade 5 New Baseline 2014-15 % Proficient and Advanced.

School	All	ELD	SED	Special Ed	AA	Asian	Filipino	Latino	Pac Islande r	White	Multi
Bay Farm	81.8%	*	*	*	*	82%	*	*	*	94%	*
Earhart	91%	*	*	*	*	97%	*	*	*	90%	*
Edison	93.7%	94%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	93%	*
Franklin	85.5%	*	50%	*	*	*	*	*	*	93%	*
Haight	58.3%	18%	47%	*	*	63%	*	43%	*	*	*
Lum	82%	82%	74%	*	*	86%	*	77%	*	85%	*
Maya Lin	39.6%	9%	35%	*	*	38%	*	*	*	*	*
Otis	76.3%	81%	63%	*	*	71%	*	*	*	87%	*
Paden	60.3%	27%	43%	*	*	67%	*	*	*	84%	*
Ruby Bridges	73.6%	45%	60%	*	82%	74%	*	36%	*	83%	*

Source: CDE

2.1B CAASPP CST Science Grade 8 New Baseline 2014-15 % Proficient and Advanced.

School	All	ELD	SED	Special Ed	AA	Asian	Filipino	Latino	Pac Islander	White	Multi
Jr. Jets	64%	*	50%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Lincoln	83.3%	33%	72%	50%	72%	87%	94%	63%	*	86%	82%
Wood	69%	46%	63%	*	55%	76%	67%	59%	*	88%	*

Source: CDE

2.1B CAASPP CST Science Grade 10 New Baseline 2014-15 % Proficient and Advanced.

School	All	ELD	SED	Special Ed	AA	Asian	Filipino	Latino	Pac Islander	White	Multi
AHS	70.8%	17%	51%	38%	50%	74%	56%	49%	*	82%	*
ASTI	80.5%	79%	*	*	*	100%	*	*	*	*	*
Encinal	57.8%	12%	46%	*	42%	56%	73%	55%	*	70%	56%
Island	50%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Source: CDE

2.1B 2014 Science CST Scores

		Grade 5			Grade 8		Grade 10		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014
# Tested	633	699	689	461	490	519	698	731	622
Mean Scale Score	377.9	388.3	387.5	416.7	420.8	407.6	374.8	373	377.8
Advanced	31%	34%	34%	55%	54%	50%	36%	36%	39%
Proficient	38%	36%	42%	18%	28%	28%	29%	28%	28%
Basic	20%	21%	17%	14%	9%	15%	22%	22%	22%
Below Basic	7%	5%	5%	7%	5%	5%	6%	8%	7%
Far Below Basic	4%	4%	2%	6%	4%	2%	7%	5%	4%

2.1 CAHSEE Demographic Analysis Math Three Year Trend

Year	Site	# Tested	% Pass	% Prof	Prob/ Stats	Number Sense	Algebra Functions	Measure Geo	Alg I
2014	County 2014	9338	88%	69%	80%	80%	80%	76%	
2014	DISTRICT	745	92%	71%	80%	82%	81%	79%	75%
2013	DISTRICT	637	91%	71%	80%	81%	81%	77%	76%
2012	DISTRICT	697	90%	73%	78%	78%	82%	78%	85%
2014	Amer Ind	1	0%	0%	31 %	35%	20 %	44 %	8%
2013	Amer Ind								
2012	Amer Ind	2	50%	50%	58%	53%	58%	53%	30%
2014	Asian	230	99%	87%	86%	88%	89%	86%	87%
2013	Asian	277	97%	89%	83%	89%	86%	86%	84%
2012	Asian	266	97%	87%	83%	84%	87%	87%	83%
2014	Pac Island	9	44%	33%	64%	70%	64%	53%	55%
2013	Pac Island	6	83%	50%	68%	69%	66%	74%	57%
2012	Pac Island	10	90%	70%	68%	75%	79%	78%	63%
2014	Filipino	50	94%	80%	81 %	81%	83%	76%	80%
2013	Filipino	58	86%	55%	74%	76%	73%	70%	68%
2012	Filipino	86	88%	64%	74%	74%	78%	74%	71%
2014	Hispanic	97	79%	53%	72%	74%	72%	66%	62%
2013	Hispanic	129	80%	59%	77%	75%	76%	72%	65%
2012	Hispanic	79	70%	53%	73%	67%	75%	69%	65%
2014	AA	70	70%	30%	68%	65%	67%	59%	57%
2013	AA	74	77%	51%	71%	71%	71%	65%	60%
2012	AA	66	74%	42%	68%	67%	70%	62%	60%
2014	White	151	96%	80%	84%	85%	85%	79%	79%
2013	White	170	95%	82%	84%	84%	85%	81%	76%
2012	White	181	91%	78%	81%	80%	84%	79%	75%
2014	Multi	29	93%	88%	77%	78%	80%	75%	73%
2013	Multi	39	97%	68%	69%	74%	76%	70%	73%
2012	Multi	8	88%	63%	69%	74%	76%	70%	73%

2.1 Demographic Analysis CAHSEE Math Three Year Trend.

Year	Site	# Tested	% Pass	%Prof	ProbStats	Number	Algebra	Measure	Alg I
						Sense	Function	Geo	
2014	English Only	335	88%	67%	79%	80%	79%	74%	74%
2013	English Only	408	90%	73%	80%	81%	81%	78%	72%
2012	English Only	375	90%	73%	79%	78%	82%	77%	74%
2014	Initially Fluent	76	96%	88%	88%	86%	88%	85%	84%
2013	Initially Fluent	91	97%	86%	85%	89%	88%	86%	81%
2012	Initially Fluent	104	98%	87%	85%	84%	88%	88%	82%
2014	Re Class	132	98%	89%	89%	87%	88%	88%	86%
2013	Re Class	100	100%	91%	85%	89%	87%	86%	82%
2012	Re Class	75	97%	91%	85%	85%	87%	88%	85%
2014	EL	94	85%	48%	69%	73%	75%	67%	65%
2013	EL	116	83%	55%	68%	75%	72%	65%	68%
2012	EL	142	81%	54%	69%	71%	74%	70%	65%
2014	Low SES	226	84%	58%	75%	76%	76%	69%	68%
2013	Low SES	241	86%	65%	74%	78%	77%	73%	69%
2012	Low SES	244	84%	66%	66%	74%	75%	79%	74%
2014	High SES	404	95%	80%	84%	84%	85%	82%	81%
2013	High SES	490	94%	79%	82%	84%	84%	82%	77%
2012	High SES	434	94%	78%	81%	80%	84%	81%	77%
2014	Spec Ed	41	49%	22%	57%	60%	55%	49%	46%
2013	Spec Ed	48	48%	33%	66%	62%	61%	57%	53%
2012	Spec Ed	36	53%	17%	53%	56%	59%	49%	47%

2.1 CAHSEE Demographic Analysis Three Year Trend ELA 10TH Grade Census

		#	%	%	Word	- 1/2	/=			_
Year	Site	Tested	Pass	Prof	Analysis	Read/Comp	Lit/Resp	Writ/Strat	Write/Con	Essay
2014	County	9402	86%	65%	81%	83%	82%	77%	81%	2.6
2014	District	644	87%	67%	81%	84%	83%	78%	81%	2.6
2013	District	750	89%	70%	86%	83%	82%	77%	79%	2.7
2012	District	719	89%	69%	84%	81%	86%	76%	82%	2.6
2014	Amer Ind									
2013	Amer Ind									
2012	Amer Ind	1	0%	0%	29%	39%	55%	50%	27%	2.0
2014	Asian	228	93%	75%	84%	88%	86%	82%	84%	2.7
2013	Asian	275	90%	74%	87%	82%	83%	80%	81%	2.8
2012	Asian	267	91%	73%	83%	83%	86%	79%	84%	2.7
2014	Pac Island	10	70%	40%	67%	71%	75%	68%	69%	2.5
2013	Pac Island	7	71%	29%	80%	72%	76%	61%	61%	2.4
2012	Pac Island	11	73%	27%	78%	68%	82%	70%	62%	2.2
2014	Filipino	50	88%	70%	81%	82%	86%	80%	83%	2.7
2013	Filipino	59	85%	51%	82%	75%	75%	71%	77%	2.7
2012	Filipino	88	90%	60%	84%	79%	83%	73%	84%	2.6
2014	Hispanic	96	81%	47%	77%	80%	79%	70%	74%	2.4
2013	Hispanic	126	87%	60%	85%	81%	80%	73%	75%	2.4
2012	Hispanic	83	87%	61%	82%	78%	84%	73%	76%	2.4
2014	AA	74	74%	41%	72%	73%	72%	66%	70%	2.2
2013	AA	79	75%	54%	82%	76%	76%	69%	71%	2.3
2012	AA	70	74%	47%	89%	70%	78%	63%	73%	2.2
2014	White	157	90%	78%	83%	86%	87%	81%	85%	2.6
2013	White	172	97%	87%	90%	90%	89%	82%	83%	2.8
2012	White	191	94%	83%	90%	87%	90%	82%	86%	2.7
2014	Multi	29	93%	69%	82%	84%	83%	79%	81%	2.5
2013	Multi	32	97%	72%	84%	83%	84%	84%	82%	2.8
2012	Multi	8	88%	38%	80%	76%	88%	69%	81%	2.3

CAHSEE Demographic Analysis ELA Three Year Trend

V	Cit-	<u>#</u>	%	%	Word	Read/	Lit/	\\\\\ /C++	M/::t-/0-:-	5
Year	Site	<u>Tested</u>	Pass	Prof	Analysis	Comp	Resp	Writ/Strat	Write/Con	Essay
2014	English Only	345	87%	69%	80%	83%	84%	77%	81%	2.5
2013	English Only	412	92%	76%	88%	85%	85%	78%	80%	2.7
2012	English Only	394	91%	74%	88%	83%	87%	78%	84%	2.6
2014	Initially Fluent	77	98%	87%	87%	90%	90%	86%	88%	2.8
2013	Initially Fluent	91	98%	81%	92%	89%	87%	84%	86%	2.9
2012	Initially Fluent	106	97%	90%	89%	87%	91%	85%	89%	2.8
2014	Re Class	129	97%	82%	87%	89%	87%	86%	86%	2.8
2013	Re Class	129	100%	89%	89%	88%	88%	82%	85%	2.8
2012	Re Class	75	99%	91%	89%	87%	90%	84%	89%	2.8
2014	EL	93	68%	20%	68%	71%	69%	62%	68%	2.0
2013	EL	116	63%	20%	74%	65%	65%	65%	65%	2.2
2012	EL	143	72%	29%	69%	70%	74%	61%	70%	2.2
2014	Low SES	226	78%	49%	76%	77%	76%	69%	74%	2.4
2013	Low SES	241	80%	51%	81%	75%	76%	71%	73%	2.4
2012	Low SES	254	82%	51%	77%	75%	80%	69%	86%	2.3
2014	High SES	411	93%	77%	83%	87%	87%	83%	85%	2.7
2013	High SES	494	94%	80%	89%	86%	86%	81%	82%	2.8
2012	High SES	446	93%	80%	89%	87%	87%	83%	85%	2.7
2014	SWD	49	41%	22%	62%	60%	62%	52%	58%	1.9
2013	SWD	57	49%	25%	73%	62%	65%	55%	60%	2.1
2012	SWD	53	55%	21%	70%	60%	69%	52%	61%	1.9

2.2 Increase the % of Students Achieving Proficiency by end of 1st Grade on Early Literacy Survey 2015-16 Target 89%

Group	May 2013	May 2014	January 2015*
All	85.7%	83%	83.3%
EL	71.4%	75%	72.8%
SED	74.2%	76%	71%
African American	67%	67%	67.1%
Filipino	88%	83%	83%
Latino	82%	78%	78.9%
Asian	86.9%	85.66%	83.9%
White	91%	91%	91.3%

Source: Measures

2.3 Local Assessment

2.3 Increase the % of Students Achieving Proficiency on Math Benchmarks annually.

Grade	Benchm	ark One	Benchm	ark Two	Benchmark Three		
Grade	2013-14	2014-15	2013-14	2014-15	2013-14	2014-15	
K	94%	N/A	88%	N/A	87%	N/A	
1	ND	N/A	79%	N/A	77%	N/A	
2	87%	N/A	74%	N/A	81%	N/A	
3	63%	N/A	65%	N/A	68%	N/A	
4	79%	N/A	37%	N/A	30%	N/A	
5	37%	N/A	29%	N/A	40%	N/A	
6	56%	89%	75%	N/A	82%	N/A	
7	82%	86%	57%	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8	69%	54%	84%	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Source: Measures

2.4 Increase API Annual Performance Indicator Baseline to be Established

2.5 Increase the rate of Career Pathway Completion Baseline to be Established

2.6 Increase the % of English Learners Reclassified Annually

School Site	Enrollment Source Data Quest	ELD Enrollment Source Data Quest	% ELD Source Local Calculation Long Term English Learn (LTEL) Enrollment Source: Title III Accountability Report		# of Students Re Designated 2013-14 Source: Local Data	% pf Students Re Designated 2013-14 Source: Local Calculation
District	9628	1812	18%	543	199	10.9%
AHS	1728	213	10%	128	29	13.6%
Encinal	1172	222	19%	253	26	11.7%
ASTI	168	6	5%	6	2	33.3%
Island	166	27	12%	26	14	51.8%
Total HS	3234	468	13%	413	71	15.1%
Lincoln	901	92	8%	80	13	14.1%
Wood	448	115	25%	83	11	9.5%
Jets	224	40	24%	ND	3	7.5%
Total MS	1573	247	15%	163	40	16.1%
Bay Farm	570	89	14%	17	13	14.6%
Earhart	624	112	17%	10	9	8%
Edison	480	55	11%	1	5	9%
Franklin	330	41	13%	4	2	4.8%
Haight	488	168	34%	25	14	8.3%
Lum	514	163	32%	9	11	6.7%
Maya Lin	316	103	26%	0	7	6.7%
Otis	592	113	18%	15	2	1.76%
Paden	315	106	33%	11	10	9.4%
Ruby Bridges	592	180	31%	1	15	8.3%
Total Elem	4821	1130	23%	93	88	7.78%

2.7 Increase the % of ELD students achieving proficiency on the CELDT Test as measured by the Annual Measureable Achievement Objective (AMAO)

School Site	Target 59%			
District	75%			
AHS	72%			
EHS	71%			
ASTI	*			
IS HS	*			
Lincoln MS	87%			
Wood MS	78%			
Jr. Jets MS	77%			
Bay Farm	85%			
Earhart	81%			
Edison	73%			
Franklin				
Haight	78%			
Lum	81%			
Maya Lin	63%			
Otis	69%			
Paden	78%			
Ruby Bridges	69%			

Source: Title III Accountability Data Report CDE * Sub Group Number Low and Not Counted

2.8 Increase the % of long and short term ELD students achieving proficiency on the CELDT Test as measured by the Annual Measureable Achievement Object AMAO 2

Site	Target 22.8%	Target 49%
District	43%	73.5%
AHS	40%	66%
Encinal	25%	80%
ASTI		
Island		
Lincoln		83%
Wood	26%	72%
Jets		71%
Bay Farm	71%	NA
Earhart	52%	NA
Edison	48%	NA
Franklin	36%	NA
Haight	36%	NA
Lum	44%	NA
Maya Lin	44%	NA
Otis	48%	NA
Paden	38%	NA
Ruby Bridges	40%	NA

Source: Title III Accountability Report CDE

AUSD English Learner Data March 2015 (Reference Data)

	6-6.5 Yrs	7-7.5 Yrs	8-8.5 Yrs	9-9.5 Yrs	10-10.5 Years	11-11.5 Yrs	12-12.5 Yrs	13-13.5 Yrs	14-14+ Yrs	Total LTELs	Total ELs	% Total ELs	# To Redes	# SPED	# At Risk -5.5 Yrs
Bay Farm	6	2	1							9	81	11%	6	1	3
Earhart	1									1	112	1%		1	8
Edison	1									1	53	2%	1		8
Franklin										0	44	0%			3
Haight	2									2	168	1%			22
Lum	2									2	160	1%			14
Maya Lin										0	83	0%			15
Otis	1									1	106	1%		1	7
Paden	2									2	102	2%			10
Ruby B	1									1	186	1%			24
Jr Jets	14	18	8							40	53	75%	1	8	1
LMS	17	27	14	4						62	73	85%	15	21	6
WMS	33	21	20	2						76	111	68%	8	24	
AHS	11	6	5	21	23	17	9	4	2	98	178	55%	16	33	4
ASTI	1		1	3		1				6	9	67%	3		1
EHS	12	3	6	24	22	11	11	3		92	223	41%	20	18	2
Island			4	1	1	5	7		1	19	22	86%	4	4	
Dist	104	77	59	55	46	34	27	7	3	412	1,764	23%	74	111	128

College and Career Readiness

2.9 Increase % of graduating seniors completing UC A-G Requirements

Group	Year	AUSD	AHS	EHS	ASTI
All	2011-12	50.9%	62%	44%	68%
	2012-13	51.5%	61%	28%	100%
	2013-14	49%	61%	36%	90%
African	2011-12	17%	28%	18%	25%
American	2012-13	18%	20%	4%	100%
	2013-14	22%	36.8%	19%	75%
Asian	2011-12	68%	72%	64%	82%
	2012-13	65%	71%	39%	100%
	2013-14	59.7%	68.7%	45%	95%
Latino	2011-12	25%	40%	26%	25%
	2012-13	38%	33%	4%	100%
	2013-14	26%	31.7%	13.6%	87.5%
Filipino	2011-12	46%	39%	54%	60%
	2012-13	39%	59%	25%	100%
	2013-14	ND	ND	ND	ND
White	2011-12	60%	65%	47%	100%
	2012-13	57%	62%	40%	100%
	2013-14	56.5%	62%	40%	100%

2.10 Early Assessment Program

Increase % of 11th grade students demonstrating college readiness on EAP in Math and English.

2015-16: New baseline to be established through CAASPP

Baseline	Ready	Conditional
2014 Math	18%	49%
2014 ELA	40%	18%

2.11 Advanced Placement Exam Passing Rate

Increase % Of AP Exams Taken with a score of 3 or more.

District	Enrollment 9-12	Students Taking Exams	% Taking Exams	Number of Exams Taken	Exams 3+	% Passing with 3+
2012-13	1808 (Gr. 11-12)	893	49%	2892	1235	42.7%
Note change in mechanism of reporting (2013-14 grades 9-12 used vs. grades 11-12 only in 2012-13)						
2013-14	3555 (Gr 9-12)	829	23%	1699	1086	63.9%

2.12 Increase the % of students enrolling in an AP or college courses.

2.12A Increase the % of Grades 10-12 Students in Sub Groups Enrolled in AP College Courses.

Group	Group 2012-13 2012-13 2013-14 2013-14 2014-15 2014-15					
Стоир	(Number of	(Percentage	(Number of	(Percentage	(Number of	(Percentage
	Students)	of Group)	Students)	of Group)	Students)	of Group)
All	703/2500	28%	811/2357	34%	1004/2320	43%
EL	21/364	6%	17/312	5%	35/296	12%
SED	142/895	16%	107/808	13%	257/777	33%
Foster	1	ND	2	ND	1	ND
Special Ed	11/246	5%	4/257	2%	13/228	6%
AA	16/305	5%	14/299	6%	66/283	23%
Asian	209/1139	18%	202/1067	19%	487/1028	47%
Pac Islander	2/37	5%	4/39	10%	15/28	54%
Latino	21/365	6%	23/368	6%	91/375	24%
White	135/707	19%	97/621	16%	279/623	45%

Source: Aeries and CALPADS Enrollment Primary Status by Subgroup.

2.13 Increase the % of English Learner students with access to Common Core State Standards in classrooms with English Only peers.

Level	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Secondary	76%		
Elementary	100%		

2.14 Increase the % of English Learner students receiving appropriate Designated ELD Instruction aligned to ELD standards

2014-15	36%	Paden, Haight, HS, MS

LCAP Goal Three: Parent/Guardian Engagement

3.1 Increase the % of parents that feel informed about their child's progress in school as reported on the LCAP Parent/Guardian Survey

Parent Survey 2013-14				
Elementary	86%			
Middle	88%			
High School	95%			
AUSD	92%			

3.2 Increase % of parents attending non-mandatory school events two or more times per year as indicated on the LCAP Parent/Guardian Survey.

2015-16: Baseline to be Established

LCAP Goal Four: Basic Services

4.1 Increase the % of teachers highly qualified in subject areas.

2014-15	98.6%

4.2 Increase the % of teachers qualified to teach ELD students.

2014-15	98%

4.3 Increase the percentage of teachers appropriately assigned to subject areas as determined by credential.

|--|

4.4. Maintain status of zero complaints and 100% compliance to Williams Act.

2014-15	100%
	Compliant

4.5 Maintain status of 100% compliance on facilities rating as measured by Williams Complaints 2015-16 Target Maintain 100% Compliance

Languages of the Alameda Unified School District- Non Metric

There are 65 languages spoken by English Learners in AUSD. If we include Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students, there are 77 languages spoken in our district.

Eight Major Languages Spoken by English Learners

Language	Elementary	Middle	High	Total
Cantonese	264	55	91	410
Spanish	184	50	79	313
Vietnamese	140	31	36	207
Tagalog	93	37	57	187
Arabic	80	12	21	113
Mandarin	52	5	18	75
Farsi	42	7	17	66
Mongolian	35	2	14	51

Other Languages with at Least 10 English Learners

Language	Elementary	Middle	High	Total
Korean	22	7	3	32
Nepali	18	3	5	26
Japanese	18	-	5	23
Bosnian	14	1	7	22
Portuguese	8	2	5	15
Thai	10	1	4	15
Amharic	9	3	2	14
Punjabi	9	1	4	14
Tigrinya	10	2	2	14
German	5	-	8	13
Cambodian	4	5	3	12
French	7	2	3	12
Russian	8	-	4	12
Italian	8	1	2	11
Pashto	4	5	2s	11