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

Franklin School

CDS Code:
01611196090039

Date of this revision: March 25, 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: Jo Fetterly

Telephone Number: 510-748-4004

Address: 1433 San Antonio Avenue, Alameda, CA 94501
E-mail address: jfetterly@alameda.k12.ca.us

Alameda Unified School District

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

Table of Contents

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

LCAP goals are evident in Franklin School's mission. Franklin is a partnership of school, home and community committed to providing effective instruction and quality programs which recognize individual differences, develop respect for self and others and celebrate the accomplishments of all students. We are dedicated to maintaining high academic and behavior standards. We strive to have students discover and achieve their personal best. We promote Lifelong Guidelines and use Lifeskill learning to create a safe learning community at our school.

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="8">AUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-16 Districtwide
Goal 1</th></tr>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Major Goals</th><th rowspan="2">Areas of Need</th><th rowspan="2">Ref.</th><th rowspan="2">Metrics</th><th rowspan="2">14-15</th><th colspan="3">Targets</th></tr>
<tr><th>15-16</th><th>16-17</th><th>17-18</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="7">Eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time</td><td rowspan="2">Improve attendance</td><td>1.1</td><td>**Basic Attendance Rates:**
% of students attending school 96% of the year
(Source: Aeries)</td><td>75.5%</td><td>76%</td><td>76.5%</td><td>77%</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.2</td><td>**Chronic Absenteeism:**
% of students with 3 or more unexcused absences
(Source: Aeries)</td><td>19.7%</td><td>19.2%</td><td>18.7%</td><td>18.2%</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">**Decrease class time missed due to discipline**</td><td>1.3</td><td>**Suspension Rate:**
% of students suspended per year
• All Students
• SED
• ELD
• AA
• Spec Ed
(Source: Aeries)</td><td>2.78%
4%
1.63%
7%
8%</td><td>2.53%
3.5%
1.58%
6.5%
7.5%</td><td>2.28%
3.0%
1.53%
6%
7.0%</td><td>2.05%
2.5%
1.48%
5.5%
6.5%</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.4</td><td>**Expulsion Rate:**
% of students expelled per year
(Source: Aeries)</td><td>0.1%</td><td>0.075%</td><td>0.050%</td><td>.025%</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">**Improve Completion rates**</td><td>1.5</td><td>**Middle School Drop-out Rate:**
% of students in given cohort not completing 8th grade
(Source: Data Quest)</td><td>0.63%</td><td>0.62%</td><td>0.61%</td><td>0.60%</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.6</td><td>**High School Drop-out Rate:**
% of students in 9th grade cohort not finishing 12th grade
(Source: Data Quest)</td><td>8.6%</td><td>8.1%</td><td>7.6%</td><td>7.1%</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.7</td><td>**High School Graduation Rate:**
% of students in 9th grade cohort completing all graduation requirements
(Source: Data Quest)</td><td>86%</td><td>86.5%</td><td>87%</td><td>87.5%</td></tr>
</table>

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

Attendance is critical for the success of all children. As a school, we work with families to ensure they understand the importance of consistent on-time attendance and how it relates to academic, social and emotional success. We use district policies and procedures (SART, SARB) to support and enforce on-time daily attendance. Franklin School has an attendance rate of 74.1% of students attending 96% of the time with an average of 2.66% per month of students identified as truant from August through April 2015. The August-December 2014 data shows a truancy rate of 4.2% or 14 students as

truant. Franklin has had almost the same attendance rate for the 3 years with slight dips and rises: 75.9%, 75.3%, and 74.1% (August through December). This period shows Franklin at .6% less than the district overall for the same time period. The sub group data shows that all groups were at or above 74.1% except African American (54.5%) and Hispanic/Latino (62.7%) students. Efforts to improve overall data while targeting these two groups will be a Franklin focus. Additionally, we will investigate the causes for truancy and attempt to mitigate those causes. **FOCUS:** *African American and Hispanic/Latino students*

Site efforts and strategies to improve attendance:
School handbook
Newsletter articles about attendance
Announcements at Morning Assemblies
PTA, ELAC and SSC meetings
SST and IEP discussions
Office/Attendance counsel for families
Student awards/incentives
Student services support (calls, home visitations, letters, SART/SARB)
Education regarding district travel and independent study policies.
School wide graphic depiction of attendance data as it evolves.

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

Suspensions deprive children of learning opportunities. While we understand there are circumstances where suspension or expulsion would be required, every effort is given to proactively support students to learn how to participate productively and respectfully in our school community and to make good school choices. We use AUSD adopted curriculum (Caring School Community, Steps to Respect, and Protected Classes Literature Lessons) along with character education to support student citizenship, a positive school climate, skills for problem solving, and conflict resolution. Franklin school has a low suspension rate with 0 suspensions between August and December 2014. We continue to work on low rates by following the activities that have made us successful thus far:

PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support) (Tier1)
Lifeskills and Lifelong Guidelines

Conflict Managers
Behavior buddies (cross age grade level support teams)
Ability Awareness (4 years)
BOOST! (Junior coaches, K buddies)
Service Learning (Go Green Leader/Recycling Monitors), Student Council, Techsperts, Campus Clean Team)
On-site counseling (Psych) on a limited basis; short term with referrals provided
Assemblies (character education, anti-bully, multi-cultural/ability awareness)
Student Study Team, IEP, 504

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

Major Goals	Areas of Need	Ref.	Metrics	14-15	Targets		
					15-16	16-17	17-18

<div align="center">

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

</div>

Major Goals	Areas of Need	Ref.	Metrics	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s)	Improve Student Achievement on both Statewide and Local Assessments	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
		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%
		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
		2.5	**Career Pathway Completion:** % of students completing Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway (Source: CALPADS)	NEW	Baseline	TBD	TBD
	Improve English Learner (EL) Achievement	2.6	**EL Reclassification Rate:** % of English Learners reclassifying to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) (Source: Local Data)	17%	17.5%	18%	18.5%
		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%

		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%
Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s)	**Increase College and Career Readiness**	**2.10**	**Early Assessment Program (EAP):** % of 11th 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%
		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%
		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 Standards for English Learners	**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%
		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

By the end of the 2015-2016 school year, through using high-leverage research-based CCSS instructional strategies designed to find, empower and validate academic voice (IBD, UDL, RTI, Core Six, math multiple methods, Systematic ELD, BaySci), and through analyzing formative data to provide strategic differentiated learning support, all students will demonstrate increased academic performance.

The 5th grade students achieved 85.5% proficient and advanced on the spring 2014 state science tests compared to 71.4% in Spring 2013. This is a 14.1% increase overall. There are two groups that are statistically significant and the results are significantly different. The white sub group increased 11.5% moving from 81.5% to 93% proficient and advanced. The Socio Economically Deprived (SED) lost 5.6% points moving from 55.6% to 50%. The focus must be on improving the rate of academic improvement for the SED set of students. The teacher participation in BaySci leadership and professional development has in part been responsible for the increasing scores. Additionally, Franklin's 4 year investment in additional and enriched science instruction is showing positive results overall. We will continue to focus on science and the SED population through blended learning that will target the needs of each student and we will provide targeted small group instruction.
FOCUS*: SED students*

The Kindergarten and 1st grade statistics for overall reading achievement in spring of 2014 was 88.7% proficiency as compared to spring of 2013 87.9%. This is a marginal increase. If we disaggregate the ELD students from the rest of the class the disproportionate numbers tell us where improvement needs to occur in order to pull up the overall score. ELD students dropped from 66.7% to 50%. During this time we

*had a limited K-1 intervention. This year we attempted to establish a new K-1 intervention, but the contract process changed and we were unable to implement the program. We returned to the minimal program of last year. Given the 16.7% drop we plan to implement a new computer application, hire a classroom aide, and increase ELD professional development through the new district program. **FOCUS**: ELD students*

*All 2nd and 3rd grade students and targeted 4th and 5th grade students receive the computer program, Successmaker (SM), for math instruction. Additionally, students in grades 2-5 receive reading and comprehension targeted instruction in the Read Naturally program. Prior to this year this was a full year program. This year because of the changes in contracting we were unable to financially run the program as in the past. We have only been able to implement it for a few weeks. Franklin has managed to provide all teachers with weekly small group instructional time for half of the year while doing enriching science presentations. **FOCUS**: Provide all students below proficiency in math and/or reading with push-in small group-differentiated instruction during school hours, increased computer access through a blended learning model, increased access to SM time.*

Site Efforts and Strategies toward Academic Improvement:

Staff Development, Teacher Collaboration Day/s for xxx (ie: Bay Sci and CCSS writing)

District-trained Leadership teams, train the trainer model (see district initiatives above)

Leadership team

Faculty Meetings

Math Coaches

FOSS implementation for Hands-on Science, NGSS integration with ELA (science notebooking)

RTI Strategic Learning Groups/Platooning/tiered interventions (list)

Student Study Team and other Specialist meetings

Before/after school intervention classes

Read Naturally program

Successmaker (differentiated instruction & assessment, during day/after or before school?)

Site data analysis

Grade-level and cross-grade level study teams

Teacher collaboration (sub/release days, hourly, common prep...

Blended Learning innovation and applications

Smarty Ants K-1 instructional computer program

Routine small group instructional supports

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

*ELD students have unique language needs that require specialized instruction and supports. Resources and services are matched to the language proficiency of the students. We monitor student progress in reading, writing, listening and speaking on the CELDT. Our goal is for students to progress one CELDT level each year. We will provide training and support for teachers to deliver designated and integrated ELD instruction for all English Learners. Franklin School has 42 EL students (12%) Four (10%) students have been redesignated in the 2014-2015 school year. 90% of the EL students have remained the same during August-March period. **FOCUS:** ELD increased CELDT levels and the number of redesignations*

Site Efforts and Strategies Toward Increased Access and Academic Improvement:
Training & implementation for Systematic and designated ELD and new standards
ELD Teacher Coach
RTI Strategic Learning Groups/Platooning/tiered interventions (list)
Integrated ELD in the classroom: differentiation, scaffolding
One-on-One new comer tutoring
Early testing to determine levels
Blended learning to provide access

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

English Learners need access to grade-level core content areas. We use a variety of strategies to support cognitive functions and uses demanded by the CCSS; support productive engagement, and develop metalinguistic understanding. Professional development will be provided for all teachers to implement Systematic and Integrated ELD.

Site Efforts and Strategies:

Training & implementation for Systematic and designated ELD and new standards
ELD Teacher Coach
RTI Strategic Learning Groups/Platooning/tiered interventions (list)
Integrated ELD in the classroom: differentiation, scaffolding
One-on-One new comer tutoring
Early testing to determine levels
Blended learning to provide access

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

			AUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-16 Districtwide Goal 3					
Major Goals	**Areas of Need**	**Ref.**	**Metrics**	**14-15**	**Targets**		
					15-16	**16-17**	**17-18**
Support parent/ guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocates for student success	**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%
	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

Home-School communication is essential for creating a partnership with families to build knowledge and capacity to advocate and support student academic, emotional and social progress. We provide our families with up-to-date information through a variety of means, and we regularly inform parents of individual student progress,

involving families as active team members to monitor, support and nurture the achievement of their children.

Franklin Home/School Communication:

- CAASPP Test Reports mailed home
- Report Cards three times a year
- Parent-Teacher Conferences, in the fall and as needed in the spring
- Translation available for parent meetings
- Student portfolio assessment/conferences
- Homework
- SST (Student Study Team)/IEP (Individualized Education Plans)/504/IIP (Individualized Intervention Plan) Meetings/(Behavioral Intervention Team) Meetings, weekly throughout the year
- PARI (Promotion, Acceleration, Retention, Intervention) process

- Fall Back to School and Kindergarten Information Night
- School Smarts Parent training, including language-specific School Smarts sessions
- Principal/Teacher/PTA Newsletters, weekly
- Open House in spring
- School marquee and website
- Robocalls, throughout the school year
- ELAC (English Language Advisory Council), monthly
- SSC (School Site Council), monthly
- Title 1 Annual Parent Meeting at flexible times
- School-Family Agreement
- Parental Involvement Policy
- PTA meetings/ events, monthly
- Dad's Club
- Common Core Presentations
- Climate Meetings, as needed throughout the year
- Parent Volunteers: classrooms, cafeteria, chaperones, art docent, garden/science
- ELL (English Language Learner) Parent Survey
- ELD (English Language Development) Redesignation Ceremony
- Attendance/SART and Awards, throughout the year

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

Family participation in educational events is a key factor in supporting student achievement. These community building activities empower our families with the connections, knowledge and skills to successfully navigate our educational system and to advocate for their children.

Franklin has intense parent involvement. Parents can be seen on the campus working in classrooms, chaperoning field trips, doing campus beautification, doing morning drop off, fund raising, and actively attending all events. Back-to-School night has around 95% attendance every year. School Smarts and ELAC are slowly increasing numbers each year with attendance from 10-25 people this year. The PTA monthly meeting is usually 25-30 attendees. There are multiple individual events that are well attended. **FOCUS***: Increase steady attendance at ELAC & School Smarts*
Site Efforts and Strategies:

Book Fair	*Snowflake Shoppe*
Science/Math Fair	*Assemblies*
Music Concerts	*AEF Gala*
Morning Drop Off	*Back-to-School*
Classroom Celebration	*Open House*
Ice cream/Art Social	*Walk & Roll Every Wednesday*
Auction	*Lunar Celebration*
Java with Jo	*Kinder Summer at the Park*
Volunteer Tea	*Back-to-School BBQ*
Jump-a-thon	*Walk-a-thon*
Multi Cultural Night	*ability Awareness*
Talent Show	*5th Grade Promotion*
Read-to-Feed	*Noon Time Volunteers*
Field Trips	*Class Plays/Presentations*

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 advocates for student success and
- provide students with access to the required basic services
- educate students using Common Core strategies (ie: close reading, multiple methods, student voice/discourse, compare and contrast, construct viable arguments citing evidence)
- provide access and instructional support for students and teachers to use technology and digital media strategically and capably

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.

FRANKLIN SCHOOL 2013-14 SARC

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

Franklin 2013-14 SARC: http://www.doc-tracking.com/screenshots/Serve/4550/2014/FranklinElementarySchool.pdf

RECORD OF AGREEMENTS: ALIGNMENT OF ACTIONS AND SERVICES TO GOALS
GOAL 1: STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

GOAL	NEED/METRIC							ACTIONS AND SERVICES	TARGET POPULATION				FUNDING STREAM			EXPENDITURE AMOUNT	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
Eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7		SW	AUD	EL	SED	LCFF BASE	LCFF SUPP	T1	**(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						**PROMOTE HIGH ATTENDANCE RATE** - SCHOOL HANDBOOK, NEWSLETTERS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AWARDS	X				X			$50.00 POSTAGE (0001)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, PTA	8/15-6/16
1.2 Chronic Absenteeism: % of students with 3 or more unexcused absences	X	X						**MONITOR AND SUPPORT HIGH ATTENDANCE RATE** - PARENT CALLS/OUTREACH, LETTERS, MEETINGS, SART/SARB PROCESS	X				X			$100.00 SUPPLIES (0001)	PRINCIPAL, OFFICE STAFF, TEACHERS	8/15-6/16
Need: Decrease interruptions of learning by suspension and expulsion **1.3 Suspension Rate:** % of students suspended per year			X	X				**PROVIDE CLEAR EXPECTATIONS** - SCHOOL BEHAVIOR EXPECTATIONS/CITIZEN AGREEMENTS, DIGITAL CITIZENSHIP, ANTI-BULLY AND RECESS CONTRACTS	X							N/A	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, ALL STAFF	8/15-6/16
1.4 Expulsion Rate: % of students expelled per year **Need: Improve rates of completion at Middle and High School** **1.5 Middle School Drop-out Rate:** % of students in given cohort not completing 8th grade			X	X				**PROVIDE SAFE, INCLUSIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT & CHARACTER EDUCATION** - CARING SCHOOL COMMUNITY, STEPS TO RESPECT, AUSD PROTECTED CLASSES LITERATURE LESSONS, CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION, SCHOOL CHARACTER/LIFESKILL AWARDS	X							N/A	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, ALL STAFF	8/15-6/16
1.6 High School Drop-out Rate: % of students in 9th grade cohort not finishing 12th grade **1.7 High School Graduation Rate:** % of students in 9th grade cohort completing all graduation requirements			X	X				**BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION SUPPORT** - PBIS, BIT, ON-SITE COUNSELING, FRIENDSHIP GROUPS	X				X			DISTRICT PSYCH DISTRICT BEHAVIORIST $75.00 SUPPLIES (0001)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, PSYCH, PSYCH INTERN	8/15-6/16
			X	X				**SERVICE LEARNING & STUDENT LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES** - STUDENT COUNCIL, BOOST! LEADERSHIP, JR. COACHES, CONFLICT MANAGERS, KINDERGARTEN BUDDIES, PEACEMAKER PROGRAM, OR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PROGRAM?	X							$6300. BOOST (PTA)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, BOOST STAFF, STUDENTS	8/15-6/16
			X	X				**SCHOOL ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS** - INTERNATIONAL NIGHT, FAMILY PHOTOGRAPHY PROJECT, ABILITY AWARENESS WEEK, ANTI-BULLY ASSEMBLY, ETC.	X							PTA FUNDS	PRINCIPAL, PTA, VOLUNTEERS	8/15-6/16
								SAFETY DRILLS—FIRE, EARTHQUAKE,LOCKDOWN, ALERT WARNINGS	X							DISTRICT SHARE 911	PRINCIPAL, PTA, STAFF	8/15-6/16

RECORD OF AGREEMENTS: ALIGNMENT OF ACTIONS AND SERVICES TO GOALS

GOAL 2: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

GOAL	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.10	2.11	2.12	2.13	2.14	ACTIONS AND SERVICES	SW	AUD	EL	SED	LCFF BASE	LCFF SUPP	T1	EXPENDITURE AMOUNT (DETAIL BY FUNDING STREAM IF MULTIPLE)	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) **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 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	X	X	X		X	X	X					X	X	**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT & COLLABORATION** FOR CCSS, SYSTEMATIC ELD, MATH, IBD, BAYSCI, UDL, RTI & TECHNOLOGY	X				X			13 SUB RELEASE & HRLY $1755 (BENEFITS INC.) (0001) BLERNDED LEARNING COACH (PTA/VOLUNTEER) (DISTRICT/ INN $ PEND)	PRINCIPAL, AUSD LEADERS, SITE LEADERSHIP TEAMS, TEACHERS COACH	8/15-6/1
Need: Increase rate of English language acquisition by English Learners (ELs) **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 Development Test (CEDLT) growth target **2.8 Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 2:** % of students demonstrating proficiency on CELDT	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X	X	**READING AND MATH DIFFERENTIATION** (IE: SYSTEMATIC & INTEGRATED ELD, STRATEGIC LEARNING GROUPS)	X							CHROME BOOKS; EBOOKS;COMPUTER APPS (PTA TBD) (INN PLAN $ PEND)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, ELD COACH, READING/MATH COACHES	8/15-6/16
Need: Increase performance on indicators of college and career readiness **2.9 a-g Completion:** % of graduating seniors completing UC 'a-g' requirements **2.10 Early Assessment Program (EAP):** % of 11th 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	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X	X	**READING AND MATH INTERVENTION** (BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL))	X							TEACHER HOURLY (PTA)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS,	9/15-6/16
Need: Implementation of State Standards for English Learners (ELs) **2.13 English Learner Access to Common Core State 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	X	X	X	X		X							X	X	**COMPUTER TUTORIALS: SUCCESSMAKER** MATH K-5 **SMARTY ANTS** ELA K-1	X				X			SM DISTRICT SA $1500.(4203)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, MEDIA CENTER SPECIALIST, PARENT	7/15-6/16
	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X	X	**TECHNOLOGY (** TO SUPPORT BLENDED LEARNING MODEL)	X							COMPUTERS/SMART PROJECTORS/TECH ACCESSORY EUIPMENT (PTA TBD) (INN $ PEND) (MEASURE A APP. $3500)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, MEDIA CENTER SPECIALIST, BLENDED COACH	8/15-6/16
	X	X	X	X		X	X	X					X	X	**PROVIDE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS** FOR COMMON	X				X			BOOKS/RESOURCES $3000. (0001 & PTA)	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS	8/15-6/16

												CORE												
X	X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	**PROVIDE BOOKS/ADITIONAL TEXT** FOR COMMON CORE (IE: LITERATURE, INFORMATIONAL TEXT, ONLINE RESOURCES)	X				X			SEE ABOVE	PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS	8/15-6/16
X	X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	**ELD COACHING** AND SUPPORT FOR SYSTEMATIC ELD IMPLEMENTATION			X					DISTRICT	PRINCIPAL, ELD COACH, TEACHERS	8/15-6/16
X	X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	**ELD AND SED IN CLASS PARAPROFESSIONAL SUPPORT**			X	X		X		IN CLASS PARA SUPPORT ($15529 INC BENEFITS.) (0002)	PRINCIPAL, ELD COACH, PARA	9/15-6/16
X	X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	**INDIVIDUALIZED INTERVENTION PLANS, STUDENT STUDY TEAM & BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION TEAM PROCESSES** FOR STRUGGLING AND AT-RISK STUDENTS	X							N/A	PRINCIPAL, PSYCH., RESOURCE SPECIALIST, TEACHERS, OTHER AUSD SPECIALISTS	8/15-6/16

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

GOAL	NEED/METRIC				ACTIONS AND SERVICES	TARGET POPULATION				FUNDING STREAM			EXPENDITURE AMOUNT (DETAIL BY FUNDING STREAM IF MULTIPLE)	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
	3.1	3.2				SW	AUD	EL	SED	LCFF BASE	LCFF SUPP	T1			
Support parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocates for student success **Need: Improve home to school communication and overall parent/guardian awareness of student progress** 3.1 Seeking Input: % of parents/guardians that feel informed about their student's progress in school as reported on parent/guardian survey **Need: Increase parent/guardian participation in educational events** 3.2 Participation: % of parents/guardians attending non-mandatory educational school events	X				**PROACTIVE COMMUNICATION** – BACK-TO-SCHOOL NIGHT, PROGRESS REPORTS, PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES, CAASPP & CELDT TEST SCORES SENT HOME, PARENT NEWSLETTERS, PHONE CALLS, EMAILS &TRANSLATORS WHEN NEEDED, KINDER ROUND UP, ENROLLMENT	X		X	X	X	X		CLERICAL SUPPORT ($680. INC BENEFITS) (0001) TRANSALATION ($256) (0002)	PRINCIPAL CLEERICAL STAFF TRANS CONSULTANT TEACHERS PARENTS	8/15-6/16
		X			**PARENT OUTREACH FOR INVOLVEMENT** – PTA, ROOM PARENTS, NEWSLETTERS & EMAILS FOR SCHOOL/CLASS EVENTS, ACTIVITIES (IE: FIELD TRIPS)	X		X	X				N/A	PRINCIPAL CLEERICAL STAFF TRANS CONSULTANT TEACHERS PARENTS	8/15-6/16
	X	X			**MEETINGS FOR INDIVIDUALIZED INTERVENTION PLANS, STUDENT STUDY TEAM & BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION TEAM PROCESSES** FOR STRUGGLING AND AT-RISK STUDENTS	X							N//A	PRINCIPAL, PSYCH., RESOURCE SPECIALIST, TEACHERS, OTHER AUSD SPECIALISTS.PARENT	8/15-6/16
	X	X			**ELAC/DELAC** TO INFORM & SUPPORT ENGLISH LEARNER FAMILIES			X			X		TRANSLATION SEE ABOVE	PRINCIPAL ELD COACH PARENTS	8/15-6/16
	X	X			**SCHOOL SITE COUNCIL** FOR COMMUNITY-BASED SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING	X							N/A	PRINCIPA,L TEACHERS, PARENTS	9/15-6/16
		X			**GATE ADVISORY** TO PLAN AND DELIVER INSTRUCTIONAL CHALLENGE OPPORTUNITIES FOR IDENTIFIED GATE STUDENTS	X							PTA TBD	PRINCIPAL TEACHERS PARENTS	9/15-8/16
	X	X			**PARENT EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES** – SCHOOL SMARTS, PARENT UNIVERSITY,	X							SCHOOL SMART DISTRICT PTA	PRINCIPAL/TEACHERS PARENTS	9/15-8/16
		X			**FAMILY ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES** –OPEN HOUSE, MATH & SCIENCE FAIR, ART SHOW, MUSIC CONCERTS, MULTICULTURAL NIGHT, BOOK FAIRS, WALK-AND-ROLL, SPOOKTACULARL, WALK-A-THON, READ-TO-FEED, ABILITY AWARENESS	X							N/A	PRINCIPAL TEACHERS PARENTS	9/15-6/16

Franklin Elementary Budget Packet

Resource	Program	B3 15-16	C112 Certificated Salaries Object 1xxx	C113 Classified Salaries Object 2xxx	C114 Benefits Object 3xxx	C122 Supplies Object 4xxx	C135 Services Object 5xxx	Total Budgeted
0001	Discretionary	$ 30,057	$ 3,360	$ 546	$ 678	$ 13,273	$ 12,200	$ 30,057
0002	LCFF Supplemental Grant	$ 15,785	$	$ 12,500	$ 3,029	$	$ 256	$ 15,785
3010	T1, Part A		$	$	$	$	$	
0002	In Lieu of Title 1 Innovative	$	$	$	$	$	$	
	Grand Total	**$ 45,842**	**$ 3,360**	**$ 13,046**	**$ 3,707**	**$ 13,273**	**$ 12,456**	**$ 45,842**

Budget Summary

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)	$15,785.00
☐ Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program <u>Purpose</u>: Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	$
☐ 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 <u>Purpose</u>: 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	$15,785.00

---

[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
Benjamin Lundholm	M	700	English			X		
Emily Pieri	F	700	English		X			
Jodi Walovich	F	700	English		X			
Jo Fetterly	F	700	English	X				
John C. Baum	M	700	English				X	
Brenda M. White	F	700	English				X	
Megan Sweet	F	700	English				X	
Kristin Sagen	F	700	English			X		
Helmut Gehle	M	700	English				X	
Sydney Zaremba	F	700	English				x	
#s of members of each category				1	2	2	5	

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:

Does the SSC composition meet the California Education Code (EC 52852)? If not, what is needed?

YES

Does the race/ethnic/primary language composition of the SSC reflect your school population?

NO

If not, how are you addressing the need to ensure that the SSC includes the voices from all stakeholder populations?

We discuss issues, needs, ideas and proposals that come from staff meetings, ELAC, PTA and Leadership in our SSC. When recruiting nominees for parent representation, we actively sought parents from different stakeholder groups.

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?

We held an ELAC meeting on 12/16, 2/24, AND 5/27 and asked members about the needs at our school. Our ELD coordinator, who coordinates site ELAC meetings, assists in the writing of our plan.

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:

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

- **X** English Learner Advisory Committee

- **X** Community Advisory Committee for Special Education Programs

- ___ Gifted and Talented Education Program Advisory Committee

- **X** Other: PTA/ LCAP parent committee; staff leadership committe

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: _____ *3/25/2015* _____.

Attested

___Jo Fetterly_____   _signature_   3/25/2015
Typed name of school principal   Signature of school principal   Date

___John C. Baum_____   _signature_   3/25/2015
Typed name of SSC chairperson   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.

Special education staff members are an integral part of our school program.

Under the guidelines for Response to Intervention (RTI), our special education and general education teachers collaborate to support the learning needs of students who qualify for TIER 2 interventions in ELA and /or math, provided that all identified students with special needs are appropriately served. Our Specialized Academic Instruction Teacher consults with general education teachers on Universal Design for Learning instructional strategies and attends student study team meetings. This is a proactive measure for intervention to decrease the number of students referred for assessment for Special Education. Students may be guests during small group instruction with identified students. Students are identified by multiple measures, and services focus on the development of foundational skills.

APPENDIX B: GATE

Gifted And Talented Education (GATE)
School Site Plan Addendum

In Alameda Unified School District (AUSD), students are made eligible for GATE in one of the three following ways:

- Achieving 98th percentile or higher on the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) in 3rd grade.
- Achieving 98th percentile or higher on the California Standards Tests (CSTs) for two consecutive years in either English Language Arts or Math.
- Meeting both criteria listed above.

Students may also be nominated by their teacher or parent for additional GATE screening and eligibility. Those students designated as gifted will remain identified through 12th grade. Gifted students in 4th and 5th grades are clustered with other gifted students within their regular classroom community. In 6th and 7th grade students are clustered in their Language Arts Core.

The district's program for gifted learners is Differentiated Instruction, which is provided within the regular education setting. The use of Differentiated Instruction is part of California state requirements for specialized services for gifted students. Gifted students are clustered at each grade level and placed with a teacher who has received GATE certification and training.

At Franklin School all GATE students have access to a variety of learning opportunities. The core of the Gate program is the integrated differentiated instruction that teachers provide each day in the classroom to challenge and to maximize the GATE student's potential. Franklin Gate certified teachers provide lessons that encourage students to learn concepts to greater depth and complexity. The blended learning model provides additional enriched challenges for GATE students enabling them to customize the curriculum and level of rigor.

Franklin offers project based after school classes for the GATE students. For example, the current GATE project is architectural design and modeling.

Franklin offers a large menu of afterschool enrichment for all students including GATE identified students.

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

Group	2013		2014		January 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	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%

Source: Aeries

1.1B Students With 96% Attendance by School Site

School Site	2013		2014		January 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%

Source: Aeries

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%

Source: Aeries

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

Source: Aeries

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	11..2%	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 Students in Group Suspended (2013)	Number of Students in Group Suspended (2013)	Percentage of Students in Group Suspended (2014)	Number of Students in Group Suspended (2014)	Percentage of Students in Group Suspended (2015)	Number of Students in Group Suspended (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 <u>Rate</u> 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%

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

LCAP Goal Two: Student Achievement

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 Islander	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 Sense	Algebra Function	Measure Geo	Alg I
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

Year	Site	#Tested	%Pass	%Prof	Word 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

Year	Site	# Tested	% Pass	% Prof	Word Analysis	Read/ Comp	Lit/ 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	Benchmark One		Benchmark Two		Benchmark Three	
	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 Learner (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 American	2011-12	**17%**	**28%**	**18%**	**25%**
	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	2012-13 (Number of Students)	2012-13 (Percentage of Group)	2013-14 (Number of Students)	2013-14 (Percentage of Group)	2014-15 (Number of Students)	2014-15 (Percentage 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.

2014-15	99%

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**