

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

**Lincoln Middle School**

CDS Code:  
0161119-6090054

Date of this revision: May 15, 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: Michael Hans

Telephone Number: 510-748-4038

Address: 1250 Fernside Blvd. Alameda, CA 94501

E-mail address: mhans@alameda.k12.ca.us

Alameda Unified School District

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

## Table of Contents

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE #</b>
LCAP Goals	<b>2</b>
Data Analysis in relation to LCAP goals	<b>3-8</b>
Theory of Action	<b>9</b>
SARC 2013-2014 (available on district website)	<b>9</b>
Record of Agreements	<b>10-12</b>
Budget	<b>13</b>
Categorical Funding	<b>14</b>
School Site Council Membership	<b>15</b>
School Site Council Questions	<b>16</b>
Recommendations and Assurances	<b>17</b>
Appendix A: Special Education	<b>18</b>
Data Appendix	<b>19</b>

## 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:*

- *What trends are observable in your site's data?*
- *For areas where growth is observable, to what do you attribute the growth?*
- *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?*
- *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.**

<b>AUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-16 Districtwide Goal 1</b>							
<b>Major Goals</b>	<b>Areas of Need</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Metrics</b>	<b>14-15</b>	<b>Targets</b>		
					<b>15-16</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>17-18</b>
<b>Eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time</b>	<b>Improve attendance</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>Basic Attendance Rates:</b> % of students attending school 96% of the year (Source: Aeries)	75.5%	76%	76.5%	77%
		<b>1.2</b>	<b>Chronic Absenteeism:</b> % of students with 3 or more unexcused absences (Source: Aeries)	19.7%	19.2%	18.7%	18.2%
	<b>Decrease class time missed due to discipline</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>Suspension Rate:</b> % of students suspended per year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students</li> <li>SED</li> <li>ELD</li> <li>AA</li> <li>Spec Ed</li> </ul> (Source: Aeries)	2.78%	2.53%	2.28%	2.05%
				4%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%
				1.63%	1.58%	1.53%	1.48%
				7%	6.5%	6%	5.5%
				8%	7.5%	7.0%	6.5%
		<b>1.4</b>	<b>Expulsion Rate:</b> % of students expelled per year (Source: Aeries)	0.1%	0.075%	0.050%	.025%
	<b>Improve Completion rates</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>Middle School Drop-out Rate:</b> % of students in given cohort not completing 8 <sup>th</sup> grade (Source: Data Quest)	0.63%	0.62%	0.61%	0.60%
		<b>1.6</b>	<b>High School Drop-out Rate:</b> % of students in 9 <sup>th</sup> grade cohort not finishing 12 <sup>th</sup> grade (Source: Data Quest)	8.6%	8.1%	7.6%	7.1%
		<b>1.7</b>	<b>High School Graduation Rate:</b> % of students in 9 <sup>th</sup> 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

*Analysis: LMS is consistently above an 80% attendance rate. In 2014-1015 we averaged an 83.5% rate. We still strive to achieve the goal of an 96% attendance rate. In our effort to reach this goal we are focused on parent education around attendance. We are also implementing PBIS strategies that would reward students for their improved attendance*

**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

*Analysis: Our 2015 suspension rate is at .8% which is lower than the district average of 1.3%. Lincoln's suspension rates have dropped every year for the past three years, falling from 3.5% in 2013 to 2.8% in 2014. We have focused as an entire staff on a reduction of exclusionary discipline and the data supports that our efforts are successful. The school's expulsion rate has been at 0.0% every year for the past three years.*

**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

*Analysis: Again Lincoln's rates are at 0%. Looking at the data of Alameda High School which is the main destination for Lincoln students the rates have dropped from 6.3% in 11-12 to 2.5% in 12-13. This could be attributed to work that AHS is doing with their at-risk students, but I believe Lincoln is also sending AHS students who are better prepared for the rigors of a comprehensive high school.*

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

<b>AUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-16 Districtwide Goal 2</b>							
<b>Major Goals</b>	<b>Areas of Need</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Metrics</b>	<b>14-15</b>	<b>Targets</b>		
					<b>15-16</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>17-18</b>
<b>Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s)</b>	<b>Improve Student Achievement on both Statewide and Local Assessments</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>State Achievement Test:</b> % 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
		<b>2.2</b>	<b>Local Assessment:</b> % of students demonstrating proficiency by end of 1 <sup>st</sup> grade on Early Literacy Survey (ELS) (Source: EADMS Data Management System)	85%	89%	90%	92%
		<b>2.3</b>	<b>Local Assessment:</b> % of students demonstrating proficiency on Local ELA, Writing, and Math Benchmarks (Source: EADMS Data Management System)	N/A	Baseline	TBD	TBD
		<b>2.4</b>	<b>Academic Performance Index:</b> Schoolwide and District API performance (Source: Data Quest)	N/A	Baseline	TBD	TBD
		<b>2.5</b>	<b>Career Pathway Completion:</b> % of students completing Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway (Source: CALPADS)	NE W	Baseline	TBD	TBD
	<b>Improve English Learner (EL) Achievement</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>EL Reclassification Rate:</b> % of English Learners reclassifying to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) (Source: Local Data)	17%	17.5%	18%	18.5%
		<b>2.7</b>	<b>Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 1:</b> % of students meeting annual California English Language Development Test (CEDLT) growth target (Source: Title III Accountability Report)	73%	74%	75%	76%
		<b>2.8</b>	<b>Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 2:</b> % 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%
	<b>Increase College and Career Readiness</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>a-g Completion:</b> % 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)		2.10	<b>Early Assessment Program (EAP):</b> % of 11 <sup>th</sup> 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	<b>Advanced Placement (AP) Exam Pass Rate:</b> % 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	<b>College-level coursework:</b> % 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	<b>English Learner Access to Common Core State Standards (CCSS):</b> % of ELs accessing CCSS state standards in setting with English-only peers (Source: Local Enrollment Data)	86%	96%	100%	100%
		2.14	<b>English Language Development (ELD) Standard Implementation:</b> % 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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

*Analysis: Lincoln's only CAASPP CST data is on the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Science scores. Lincoln's data is excelling with 83.3% of all our 8<sup>th</sup> graders scoring proficient or advanced. Our SED students are scoring at a lower rate of 72%, Hispanic students at a lower rate of 63%, SPED students at a lower rate of 50% and our ELD students at a lower rate of 33%. There is a performance gap at Lincoln are our intervention efforts need to be focused on narrowing that gap. The district's projected goal around Math and ELA should be met the following year as the projected rates are in the low to mid 30 percentage points. In the 2014-2015 school year our SPSA plan outlined a major revamping of our ELD program at Lincoln. LEP students were placed in grade level pure ELD support classes. LEP students were also clustered into small groups and the distributed throughout the master schedule. All of the professional development was focused on differentiated instruction and I'm confident that our ELD scores will be rising at a faster rate than our district projected goals.*

**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

*Analysis: Lincoln's reclassifying data is outstanding. While the overall ELD% of Lincoln is small at only 8% of the student body that represents 73 students. Of those 73 15% were reclassified in 2014, which is more than any other school in the entire district. Our 12 students who were reclassified represent 23% of the entire district's reclassification numbers. Our AMAO 1 and 2 targets are already being met with Lincoln score over 30% higher than the projected target rates.*

**Need: Increase performance on indicators of college and career readiness**

Metrics: % of seniors completing UC 'a-g' requirements, 11<sup>th</sup> 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

*Analysis: Lincoln ended its Sheltered program before the 2014-2015 school year. 100% of our EL's are accessing CCSS in English and Math with English-only peers. 100% of our ELs are receiving designated ELD instruction in our grade level ELD elective classes.*



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

<b>AUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-16 Districtwide Goal 3</b>							
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	<b>Seeking Input:</b> % 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	<b>Participation:</b> % 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

*Analysis: Lincoln's score of 92% of parent/guardians that feel informed is an outstanding score. Lincoln has made great efforts to involve our student's families in making them aware of not only student progress but also school events. 100% of our students are registered users of our school's website program School Loop. Of those students 90% have a registered household member. With over 67% of the Lincoln teachers making double digit website posting the majority of our parent/guardians are receiving daily if not weekly updates on classroom information. Lincoln also has publishes its own weekly newsletter which is emailed out to 90% of our families. Lincoln also has a weekly auto-phone dialer that goes out informing parents of upcoming events which is broadcasted to 100% of our student's homes.*

**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

*Analysis: The Lincoln staff and the Lincoln PTA have focused in the 2014-2015 school year to increase opportunities for parent/guardian attendance towards school events. Our school's counselor led a series of eight parent workshops. Our PTA hosted a series of day time and evening parent programs. Lincoln has had multiple evening events including family information night, math information night, a celebration of Lincoln and a variety of student performances including band, drama and poetry reading.*

## 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

### 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

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

**Lincoln Middle School 2013-14 SARC:** <http://www.doc-tracking.com/screenshots/Serve/4550/2014/LincolnMiddleSchool.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  (DETAIL BY FUNDING STREAM IF MULTIPLE)	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7		SW	AUD	EL	SED	LCFF BASE	LCFF SUPP	T1			
<b>Eliminate barriers to student success and maximize learning time</b>  <b>Need: Improve attendance rates to maximize learning time</b> <b>1.1 Basic Attendance Rates:</b> % of students attending school 96% of the year  <b>1.2 Chronic Absenteeism:</b> % of students with 3 or more unexcused absences  <b>Need: Decrease interruptions of learning by suspension and expulsion</b> <b>1.3 Suspension Rate:</b> % of students suspended per year  <b>1.4 Expulsion Rate:</b> % of students expelled per year  <b>Need: Improve rates of completion at Middle and High School</b> <b>1.5 Middle School Drop-out Rate:</b> % of students in given cohort not completing 8 <sup>th</sup> grade  <b>1.6 High School Drop-out Rate:</b> % of students in 9 <sup>th</sup> grade cohort not finishing 12 <sup>th</sup> grade  <b>1.7 High School Graduation Rate:</b> % of students in 9 <sup>th</sup> grade cohort completing all graduation requirements																		
	X							MONITOR AND DAILY ATTENDANCE AND CONDUCT WEEKLY ATTENDANCE MEETINGS. STUDENTS WITH ATTENDANCE ISSUES WILL BE IDENTIFIED AND PARENT/STUDENT MEETINGS WILL BE HELD. EDUCATE THE ENTIRE PARENT POPULATION ON THE IMPACT OF HAVING STUDENTS NOT AT SCHOOL.			93 .2 %	84 .8 %				N/A	ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL  ATTENDANCE SPECIALIST	
	X							PBIS STRATAGIES TO REWARD IMPROVED STUDENT ATTENDANCE.								N/A	PBIS TEAM	
		X						MONITOR AND DAILY ATTENDANCE AND CONDUCT WEEKLY ATTENDANCE MEETINGS. STUDENTS WITH ATTENDANCE ISSUES WILL BE IDENTIFIED AND PARENT/STUDENT MEETINGS WILL BE HELD. IF CONTINUED CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM CONTINUES THAN STUDENTS WILL BE SART AND SARB.	2. 1 %							N/A	ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL  ATTENDANCE SPECIALIST	
			X						.8 %									
				X				CONTINUE ZERO % EXPULSION									PRINCIPAL	

RECORD OF AGREEMENTS: ALIGNMENT OF ACTIONS AND SERVICES TO GOALS

GOAL 2: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

GOAL	NEED/METRIC														ACTIONS AND SERVICES	TARGET POPULATION				FUNDING STREAM			EXPENDITURE AMOUNT  (DETAIL BY FUNDING STREAM IF MULTIPLE)	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
	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		SW	AUD	EL	SED	LCFF BASE	LCFF SUPP	T1			
<b>Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s)</b>  <b>Need: Improve student achievement on both state and local assessments</b> <b>2.1 State Achievement Test:</b> % of students demonstrating proficiency on California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in ELA and Math <b>2.2 Local Assessment:</b> % of students demonstrating proficiency by end of 1 <sup>st</sup> grade on Early Literacy Survey (ELS) <b>2.3 Local Assessment:</b> % of students demonstrating proficiency on Math Benchmarks by end of year <b>2.4 Academic Performance Index:</b> School wide and District API performance <b>2.5 Career Pathway Completion:</b> % of students completing Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway	X														THE USE OF ONE IBD LESSON FOR EVERY CORE UNIT OF INSTRUCTION	X	X	X	X				DISTRICT	CORE TEACHERS SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
	X														USE OF RTI AND PBIS STRATEGIES										
	X														USE OF SPED TECHERS AND PARAS TO PROVIDE PUSH-IN SUPPORT IN GEN ED CLASSES	X								SPED TEACHERS SITE ADMIN	FINALIZE THE MASTER SCHEDULE IN AUGUST OF 2015
	X														USE OF AN RTI TEAM FOR THE CREATION AND IMPLMENTAION OF RTI SUPPORTS	X	X		X	X			HOURLY TIMECARD FOR RTI TEAM MEMBERS	RTI TEAM SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
	X														USE OF A DATA COORDINATOR TO DETERMIN STUDENTS WHO ARE IN NEED OF FUSION (READING INTERVENTION CLASS)	X	X		X		X		HOURLY FOR DATA CORDINATOR \$9,110	DATA CORDINATOR SITE ADMIN	FINALIZE IN AUGUST OF 2015
<b>Need: Increase rate of English language acquisition by English Learners (ELs)</b> <b>2.6 EL Reclassification Rate:</b> % of English Learners reclassifying to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) <b>2.7 Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 1:</b> % of students meeting annual California English Language Development Test (CEDLT) growth target <b>2.8 Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 2:</b> % of students demonstrating proficiency on CELDT	X														AN ACADEMIC STRATEGIES CLASS WILL BE OFFERED TO 7 <sup>TH</sup> AND 8 <sup>TH</sup> GRADERS WHO ARE STRUGGLING WITH THEIR WRITING AND EXECUTIVE FUNUNCTION SKILLS.	X	X		X				HOURLY FOR DATA CORDINATOR	DATA CORDINATOR SITE ADMIN	FINALIZE IN AUGUST OF 2015
	X	X													CCSS-ALIGNED INSTRUCTION IN ELA AND MATH	X	X	X	X					CORE AND MATH TEACHERS SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
					X										SUPPLMENTAL SUPPLIES FOR ELD SUPPORT CLASSES			X			X		\$6,720	ELD TEACHER SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
						X	X	X							USE OF A DATA COORDINATOR AND ELD TEACHER TO DETERMIN STUDENTS WHO ARE IN NEED OF ELD SUPPORT			X			X		SUBSITUTE RELEASE DAYS \$6,970	DATA CORDINATOR ELD TEACHER SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
													X		CREATION OF MASTER SCHEDULE THAT CLUSTERS EL’S THROUGHOUT THE SCHEDULE			X						DATA CORDINATOR ELD TEACHER SITE ADMIN	FINALIZE IN AUGUST OF 2015
<b>Need: Increase performance on indicators of college and career readiness</b> <b>2.9 a-g Completion:</b> % of graduating seniors completing UC ‘a-g’ requirements <b>2.10 Early Assessment Program (EAP):</b> % of 11 <sup>th</sup> grade students demonstrating college readiness on EAP in Math and English <b>2.11 Advanced Placement (AP) Exam Pass Rate:</b> % of AP Exams taken with a score of 3 or more <b>2.12 College-level coursework:</b> % of students enrolling in an AP or college course														X	CREATION OF ELD SUPPORT CLASSES FOR LEP STUDENTS			X						DATA CORDINATOR ELD TEACHER SITE ADMIN	FINALIZE IN AUGUST OF 2015
<b>Need: Implementation of State Standards for English Learners (ELs)</b> <b>2.13 English Learner Access to Common Core State Standards (CCSS):</b> % of ELs accessing CCSS state standards in setting with English-only peers <b>2.14 English Language Development (ELD) Standard Implementation:</b> % of ELs receiving appropriate designated ELD instruction aligned to ELD Standards																									

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			
<b>Support parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocates for student success</b>  <b>Need: Improve home to school communication and overall parent/guardian awareness of student progress</b>  <b>3.1 Seeking Input:</b> % of parents/guardians that feel informed about their student’s progress in school as reported on parent/guardian survey  <b>Need: Increase parent/guardian participation in educational events</b>  <b>3.2 Participation:</b> % of parents/guardians attending non-mandatory educational school events																
	X					WEEKLY NEWSLETTER AND AUTO DIALER PHONE CALLS	X	X	X	X					SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
	X					REGISTER PARENT/GUARDIANS ON THE SCHOOL WEBSITE	X	X	X	X					SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
	X					INCREASE PTA MEMBERSHIP	X	X	X	X					PTA MEMBERSHIP OFFICER SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
	X	X				INCRESE THE AMOUNT OF ADVERTISING FOR UPCOMING ELAC MEETINGS			X		X			ELD HOURLY FOR MEETINGS	ELD TEACHER SITE ADMIN	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR
	X	X				INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF PARENT EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITES	X	X	X	X					SITE ADMIN PTA LEADERSHIP	THROUGHOUT THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR

## 2015-16 BUDGET

### Lincoln Middle Budget Packet

Budget Summary

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	Unbudgeted Balance	C137 Check
<a href="#">0001</a>	<a href="#">Discretionary LCFF Supplemental</a>	\$ 121,760	\$ 16,548	\$ 33,192	\$ 16,508	\$ 24,810	\$ 30,702	\$121,760	\$	121,760
<a href="#">0002</a>	<a href="#">Grant</a>	\$ 22,800	\$ 13,842	\$	\$ 2,238	\$ 6,720	\$	\$ 22,800	\$	22,800
<a href="#">3010</a>	<a href="#">T1, Part A</a>		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	0
<a href="#">0002</a>	<a href="#">In Lieu of Title 1 Innovative</a>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	0
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$ 144,560</b>	<b>\$ 30,390</b>	<b>\$ 33,192</b>	<b>\$ 18,746</b>	<b>\$ 31,530</b>	<b>\$ 30,702</b>	<b>\$ 144,560</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>144,560</b>

## Form C: Programs Included in this Plan

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

State/Federal Programs	Allocation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LCFF Supplemental Funding (0002)	\$22,800
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: School wide Program <u>Purpose</u> : Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program <u>Purpose</u> : Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency	\$ 0
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input type="checkbox"/> Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology <u>Purpose</u> : Support professional development and the use of technology	\$ 0
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV, Part A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities <u>Purpose</u> : Support learning environments that promote academic achievement	\$ 0
<input type="checkbox"/> Title V: Innovative Programs <u>Purpose</u> : Support educational improvement, library, media, and at-risk students	\$ 0
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Federal Funds (list and describe <sup>1</sup> )	\$ 0
Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$22,800

<sup>1</sup> 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
Kaelyn Adams	F	White	E					X
Mindi Chen Kao	F	Asian	E				X	
Amy Frary	F	White	E		X			
Michael Hans	M	White	E	X				
Jenny Hartigan	F	White	E		X			
Joan Hulihan	F	White	E			X		
Maddie Kao	F	Asian	E					X
Spencer Kao	M	Asian	E					X
Nicole Lusiani Elliott	F	White	E				X	
Suzy Oram	F	White	E		X			
Stephen Ramos	M	White	E		X			
Mridula Singh	F	Asian	E				X	
<b>#s of members of each category</b>								

*\*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?

Not based on school percentages. We need a greater diversity on our SSC but are limited by the demographics of our site teachers and staff. We need to actively promote SSC membership and target sub-groups representatives for membership.

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

We involved our ELAC parents to give input throughout the year. Members of SSC also serve on ELAC.

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?

Four ELAC meeting are held throughout the school year. At each one of the meetings there is a presentation of SSC information including: plan review, input gathering, and budget review.

## 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:

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**):
  - \_\_\_ 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: May 7, 2015.

Attested:

MICHAEL HANS  
Typed name of school principal

Michael Hans  
Signature of school principal

5/15/15  
Date

Jennifer Hartigan  
Typed name of SSC chairperson

Jennifer Hartigan  
Signature of SSC chairperson

5-15-15  
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

SPED staff members do provide support to general education students at Lincoln in a variety of ways. SPED staff conduct assessments of general education students as part of the process for determining if the student is eligible for special education. Our school's Psychologist provides counseling support for which every student is in need. We have a variety of sped teachers and paraprofessionals that provide push in support in multiple general education classes; and while in those classes the sped staff members also support any general education 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 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 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Cohort Drop Out Rate.**

**2015-16 Target: 8.1%**

Year	All	ELD	SED	Special Ed	AA	Latino	Asian	Am Ind/ AI 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 9<sup>th</sup> 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 9<sup>th</sup> 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 10<sup>TH</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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
<b>K</b>	94%	N/A	88%	N/A	87%	N/A
<b>1</b>	ND	N/A	79%	N/A	77%	N/A
<b>2</b>	87%	N/A	74%	N/A	81%	N/A
<b>3</b>	63%	N/A	65%	N/A	68%	N/A
<b>4</b>	79%	N/A	37%	N/A	30%	N/A
<b>5</b>	37%	N/A	29%	N/A	40%	N/A
<b>6</b>	56%	89%	75%	N/A	82%	N/A
<b>7</b>	82%	86%	57%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>8</b>	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%
<b>Total HS</b>	<b>3234</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>15.1%</b>
Lincoln	901	92	8%	80	13	14.1%
Wood	448	115	25%	83	11	9.5%
Jets	224	40	24%	ND	3	7.5%
<b>Total MS</b>	<b>1573</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>16.1%</b>
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%
<b>Total Elem</b>	<b>4821</b>	<b>1130</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>7.78%</b>



**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	
<b>Dist</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>1,764</b>	<b>23%</b>		<b>74</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>128</b>

**College and Career Readiness**
**2.9 Increase % of graduating seniors completing UC A-G Requirements**

Group	Year	AUSD	AHS	EHS	ASTI
<b>All</b>	2011-12	50.9%	62%	44%	68%
	2012-13	51.5%	61%	28%	100%
	2013-14	49%	61%	36%	90%
<b>African American</b>	2011-12	17%	28%	18%	25%
	2012-13	18%	20%	4%	100%
	2013-14	22%	36.8%	19%	75%
<b>Asian</b>	2011-12	68%	72%	64%	82%
	2012-13	65%	71%	39%	100%
	2013-14	59.7%	68.7%	45%	95%
<b>Latino</b>	2011-12	25%	40%	26%	25%
	2012-13	38%	33%	4%	100%
	2013-14	26%	31.7%	13.6%	87.5%
<b>Filipino</b>	2011-12	46%	39%	54%	60%
	2012-13	39%	59%	25%	100%
	2013-14	ND	ND	ND	ND
<b>White</b>	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 11<sup>th</sup> 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**

<b>Parent Survey 2013-14</b>	
<b>Elementary</b>	86%
<b>Middle</b>	88%
<b>High School</b>	95%
<b>AUSD</b>	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.**

<b>2014-15</b>	<b>98.6%</b>
----------------	--------------

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

<b>2014-15</b>	<b>98%</b>
----------------	------------

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

<b>2014-15</b>	<b>99%</b>
----------------	------------

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

<b>2014-15</b>	<b>100% Compliant</b>
----------------	---------------------------

**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	<b>410</b>
Spanish	184	50	79	<b>313</b>
Vietnamese	140	31	36	<b>207</b>
Tagalog	93	37	57	<b>187</b>
Arabic	80	12	21	<b>113</b>
Mandarin	52	5	18	<b>75</b>
Farsi	42	7	17	<b>66</b>
Mongolian	35	2	14	<b>51</b>

#### Other Languages with at Least 10 English Learners

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