

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

**Wood Middle School**

CDS Code: 060177000057

---

Date of this revision: March 3, 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: Cammie Harris

Telephone Number: 510-748-4015

Address: 420 Grand Street, Alameda, CA 94501

E-mail address: [charris@alameda.k12.ca.us](mailto:charris@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>3-10</b>
Theory of Action and SARC (Available on District Website)	<b>11</b>
Record of Agreements	<b>12-15</b>
Budget	<b>16</b>
Categorical Funding	<b>17</b>
School Site Council Membership	<b>18</b>
School Site Council Questions	<b>19</b>
Recommendations and Assurances	<b>20</b>
Appendix A: Special Education	<b>21</b>
Appendix B: Title 1 Schoolwide Plan	<b>22</b>
Data Appendix	<b>29</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?**
  - *Only 71% of our students attend school 96% of the time. The only subgroup that surpasses the District's target of 76.5% is the Pacific Islanders, Filipinos, Asians and EL students. The significant subgroups with the lowest attendance are Special Ed at 58.7% and African American at 55.8%. Thirty seven percent of our students were truant, (having three or more unexcused absences) in 2014 which is well above the District's target of 18.7%.*
  - **For areas where growth is observable, to what do you attribute the growth?**
  - *Our suspension rate has continually decreased from 10.9% in 2013, 5.7% in 2014 and 3.5% to date. The staff's commitment to look through their equity lens and the school utilizing positive behavior intervention strategies.*
  - *Sixty-nine percent of the eighth grade students were proficient or advanced on the Science CST assessment in 2014. Our growth in Science is due to our Service Learning Waste Reduction and Ocean Guardian program. We have teachers that collaborate each week on science curriculum and we offer a hands-on/brains-on approach in science.*
  - **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?**
  - *According to sign-in sheets and parent surveys, many of the parents of our unduplicated students aren't attending school functions and simply uninvolved in the school process. Our Instructional Leadership Team and Full Service School Community Committee are submitting surveys to find out why parents are uninvolved. Our initial plan is to take the results of the survey and construct a strategic plan to support all families. We are going to deliberately seek out parents from the historically low performing groups and provide ongoing parent meetings to ask their needs, provide parent networking and full service support. We plan to work with the Alameda Family Services, Asian Health and other mental health agencies to collaborate and assist families in need.*

- ***For all students and unduplicated students, what actions will you take to sustain current growth and address gaps in achievement?***

All staff will work together during staff meetings, and during Wednesday collaboration times to review the progress of students. Grade level and department teams will examine research and implement research based strategies and conduct a cycle of inquiry. Questions teams will discuss are:

What do we want students to learn?

How will we know when they have learned it?

What will we do when students are not achieving?

Wood staff will actively participate in ensuring that ALL students achieve, committing to constant examination of data and practices, and functioning as a community (not as silos) so that all students will benefit from a choreographed program of planning, best-practices instruction, assessment, intervention and enrichment. This sort of comprehensive, school-wide, frontal approach to ensure academic achievement for all underlies all PLC-led schools and accounts for many of them receiving United States Department of Education Blue Ribbon Awards for raising student achievement in schools with true heterogeneity in terms of socio-economic status, race and former academic performance levels.

It is the intent of the faculty of Wood Middle School to provide a safe and nurturing environment where the academic, social-emotional and physical needs of a child are supported. This will be done through school wide implementation of AUSD adopted Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS), systemic Response to Intervention (RTI) and mentorship through an Academic-Social Advisory taught by all credentialed faculty.

All students will be members of small learning communities where teachers will collaborate to create meaningful, and aligned content in a balanced academic program. Wood Middle School in partnership with AUSD and HTA will begin developing a plan for a Full Service Community School to be phased in over the next five years.

Staff will participate in training to implement a 6<sup>th</sup> Grade orientation and mentoring program led by representative 8<sup>th</sup> grade students. This program will help facilitate and ease the transition to middle school. In response to the high mobility rate at WMS, a systematic approach to welcoming and assimilating students who enroll throughout the school year will be implemented and monitored through the advisory course.

All teachers and administrators will continue to participate in ongoing professional development. Teachers and administrators are being trained in Integrated Learning by Alameda County of Education. Course A must be completed by June of 2015. All three courses must be completed by June of 2017.

Teachers and administrators will continue to utilize the strategies provide in the the RtI training provided in 2014. The team will train new teachers and para-educators on differentiation and ensure Tier 1 interventions are implemented in all courses. Training to build all staff's capacity to deliver lessons in whole and small group instruction, with clearly articulated learning objectives, and using gradual release model will be ongoing. Teachers will utilize a variety of teaching strategies, including SIM, IBD and multiple methods and modify assignments and assessments.

Administrators and teachers will continue being trained on Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS).

Strategic Instructional Model –Site SIM professional developer will continue to collaborate with District SIM Coach on plans for site implementation of strategies. This will include teachers embedding, supporting and integrating strategies.

Inquiry by Design training and Systematic ELD training will be provided by the prospective coaches to ensure all students have access to the curriculum. In addition, all staff members will have mindset training in August to examine our own state of beliefs before we can increase the mindset and agency of students.

**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*

**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*

### 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

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

AUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) 2015-16 Districtwide Goal 2							
Major Goals	Areas of Need	Ref.	Metrics	14-15	Targets		
					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	<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
		2.2	<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%
		2.3	<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
		2.4	<b>Academic Performance Index:</b> Schoolwide and District API performance (Source: Data Quest)	N/A	Baseline	TBD	TBD
		2.5	<b>Career Pathway Completion:</b> % of students completing Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway (Source: CALPADS)	NE W	Baseline	TBD	TBD
	Improve English Learner (EL) Achievement	2.6	<b>EL Reclassification Rate:</b> % of English Learners reclassifying to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) (Source: Local Data)	17%	17.5%	18%	18.5%
		2.7	<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%

Support all students in becoming college and work ready and demonstrating measured annual growth relative to their individual performance level(s)		2.8	<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%
	Increase College and Career Readiness	2.9	<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%
		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*

**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*

**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

*Analysis*

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

Metrisc: % 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*

**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>							
<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 parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocates for student success</b>	<b>Efforts to seek input from Parents/Guardians</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<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%
	<b>Promotion of Parent/Guardian Participation</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<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*

**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*

## 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 by integrating 21<sup>st</sup> Century curriculum
- 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

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

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

**Wood 2013-14 SARC:** <http://www.doc-tracking.com/screenshots/Serve/4550/2014/WillCWoodMiddleSchool.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	X	X	X	X			ADDITIONAL COUNSELING SUPPORT – SMALL SUPPORT GROUPS, FREQUENT CHECK-INS, PERSONALIZED BEHAVIOR & ACADEMIC PLANS	X					X		\$19,838.00 .75% FUNDED BY GRANT	ADMINISTRATION AND COUNSELORS	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
	X	X	X	X	X			STUDENT SUPPORT PROVIDER – CONTACT AND FOLLOW UP FOR FAMILIES OF TRUANT STUDENTS, FREQUENT STUDENT CHECK INS. OUTREACH TO FAMILIES TO INVOLVE IN SCHOOL PROGRAMS	X						X	\$45,133.00	ADMINISTRAION AND SUPPORT PROVIDER	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
	X	X	X	X	X			ADVISORY CURRICULUM CONTENT FOCUSED ON TARGET BEHAVIORS, SCHOOL CLIMATE AND CULTURE	X								SELECT TEACHERS, COUNSELORS AND PBIS TEAM	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
	X	X	X	X	X			LEADERSHIP - ENGAGE STUDENTS IN SCHOOL CULTURE	X								LEADERSHIP TEACHER	SEPTEMBER 2015-JUNE 2016
	X	X	X	X	X			COUNSELING INTERN – PROVIDE TARGETED SUPPORT TO AT RISK YOUTH	X								COUNSELORS	SEPTEMBER 2015-MAY 2016
	X	X	X	X	X			WHERE EVERYONE BELONGS (WEB) – 6 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE AND NEW STUDENT ORIENTATION AND YEARLONG SUPPORT BY MENTOR STUDENTS	X							INNOVATIVE PROGRAM BUDGET	WEB TEACHER, COUNSELORS AND ADMINISTRATION	AUGUST 2015-SEPTEMBER 2016
	X	X	X	X	X			ATTENDANCE INCENTIVES - HIGHLY ENGAGING EVENTS THAT MOTIVATE POSTIVE ATTENDANCE	X							PTA-\$750.00	PBIS TEAM	END OF EACH TRIMESTER
	X	X	X	X	X			AWARDS ASSEMBLIES – RECOGNIZE, REWARD AND ENCOURAGE ACADEMIC ACHIEVMENT AND CITIZENSHIP	X								COUNSELORS AND ADMINSTRATION	END OF EACH TRIMESTER
	X	X	X	X	X			POSITIVE BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION SUPPORT – INCENTIVES FOR FOLLOWING THE 4 SCHOOL RULES  – TIERED SUPPORT FOR INTENSIVE STUDENTS  -PD FOR ALL STAFF TO IMPLEMENT PBIS	X							PTA- \$500.00	PBIS TEAM AND ADMINISTRATIION	AUGUST 2015-SEPTEMBER 2016
	X	X	X	X	X			PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ON CULTURAL COMPETENCY/EQUITY LENS- ENSURING CURRICULUM AND PRACTICES ARE EQUITABLE	X								INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP TEAM	SEPTEMBER 2015

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		
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 1 <sup>st</sup> 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  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  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 11 <sup>th</sup> 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  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	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					
X		X	X		X								X	X	REPSONSE TO INTERVENTION – TRAIN ALL STAFF IN BEST PRACTICES USING CORE 6	X										INSTRUCTIIONAL LEADERSHIP TEAM	NOVEMBER 2015
X		X	X		X	X	X						X	X	PARA EDUCATORS – TRAIN PARAS TO PROVIDE TARGETED IN CLASS SUPPORT THAT ALIGNS WITH RTI & PBIS			X	X		X	X		\$10,166.00 LCFF \$32,935.00 TITLE 1	JOANNE MURPHY ADMINISTRATION	SEPTEMBER 2015	
X		X	X		X	X	X								USE OF TECHNOLOGIES ACROSS THE CURRICULUM	X										TEACHERS	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
X		X	X												.20 INTEGRATED LEARNING COACH – PROVIDES ONGOING COACHING SUPPORT AND PLANNING ACROSS DISCIPLINES	X				X				\$16,895 INNOVATIVE	ADMINISTRATIION	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016	
X		X	X												MATH INTERVENTION – PROVIDE TARGETED SUPPORT TO ALLOW ACCESS TO GRADE LEVEL CONTENT	X										MATH DEPARTMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
X			X		X										FUSION 1 AND FUSION 2 BRAIN RESEARCHED STRATEGIES FOR STUDENTS APPROACHING PROFICIENCY IN READING FLUENCY & COMPREHENSION	X				X				.2 LITERACY COACH	FUSION TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATIION	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016	
X			X		X		X						X	X	INQUIRY BY DESIGN TRAINING AND IMPLEMENTATION ALIGNS WITH COMMON CORE	X										EL AND TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATION	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
X			X		X		X	X					X	X	SIM STRATEGIES –SUPPORTS RTI IN CORE CONTENT	X										TEACHERS	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
X			X		X	X	X						X	X	SYSTEMATIC ELD PD			X								ELD COACH AND ADMINISTRATION	OCTOBER- NOVEMBER- DECEMBER
X			X		X	X	X						X	X	NEWCOMER CLASSES SUPPORTS TRANSITION			X								EL COORDINATOR AND ADMINISTRATION	AUGUST 2015- JUNE 2016
X	X		X	X	X	X	X						X	X	AFTER SCHOOL TUTORING BY WMS TEACHERS SUPPORTS RTI	X				X				\$5000 DISCRETIONARY	DEPARTMENT HEADS AND ADMIN	SEPTEMBER 2015- MAY 2016	
X			X	X									X		VISIUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS (VAPA)	X										VAPA TEACHERS AND ADMININISTRATION	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
X	X		X	X		X	X						X	X	FIELD TRIPS – PROVIDE EQUAL ACCESS AND ENRICHINMENT	X				X				\$5000.00 INNOVATIVE	GRADE LEVEL LEAD TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATION	TWO PER YEAR PER GRADE LEVEL	

	X	X		X	X		X	X					X	X	INTEGRATED LEARNING PD – ALL TEACHERS COMPLETE 90 HOURS OF TRAINING	X				X				\$4725.00 INNOVATIVE	TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATION	ALL COURSES MUST BE COMPLETED BY JUNE 2017
															ELECTIVES											
	X	X		X	X		X	X					X	X	STEAM SHOWCASES										ALL STAFF	END OF TRIMESTER ONE AND TWO
	X	X		X	X		X	X					X	X	MAKERSPACE MATERIALS	X				X				\$1500.00 INNOVATIVE	ENGINEERING TEACHER	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
	X	X		X	X		X	X					X	X	SUMMER INSTITUTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	X				X				\$3,683.00	ADMINISTRATIION AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP TEAM	AUGUST 2015
	X	X		X	X		X	X					X	X	ENGINEERING P.D. (I.E. PROJECT LEAD THE WAY) TO EXPAND MAKING INTO THE CORE CLASSROOM	X				X				\$1123.00		AUGUST 2015- SEPTEMBER 2016

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			
<p><b>Support parent/guardian development as knowledgeable partners and effective advocates for student success</b></p> <p><b>Need: Improve home to school communication and overall parent/guardian awareness of student progress</b></p> <p><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</p> <p><b>Need: Increase parent/guardian participation in educational events</b></p> <p><b>3.2 Participation:</b> % of parents/guardians attending non-mandatory educational school events</p>	X	X				FULL SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOL- PARTNER WITH HEALTH AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS TO HELP SUPPORT FAMILIES		X							ADMINISTRATION AND COUNSELORS	AUGUST 2015
	X	X				PARENT WALKTHROUGHS TO PROVIDE PARENT EDUCATION, INPUT AND PARTICIPATION	X								EL COORDINATOR, PTA LIASION AND ADMINISTRATION	SEPTEMBER 2015 AND MARCH 2016
	X					SEND OUT PARENT SURVEYS IN THE BEGINNING AND THE END OF THE YEAR TO GET THEIR INPUT ON THE STATE OF THE SCHOOL	X								ADMINISTRATION	SEPTEMBER 2015 AND MAY 2016
		X				PARENT EDUCATION EVENTS TO HELP PARENTS IN VARIOUS AREAS INCLUDING COLLEGE KNOWLEDGE, NURTITION, MATH STRATEGIES, ETC.	X								PTA, ADMINISTRATION, COUNSELORS	SEPTEMBER 2015 NOVEMBER 2015 JANUARY 2016 MARCH 2016
	X	X				PARENT NEWSLETTER TO INFORM PARENTS ON HAPPENINGS AT THE SCHOOL, DISTRICT AND COMMUNITY	X								PTA AND ADMINISTRATION	BIMONTHLY FROM AUGUST 2015 TO JUNE 2016
	X	X				PARENT CONFERENCES TO INFORM PARENTS OF THEIR CHILDS ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL EMOTIIONAL PROGRESS	X								ADMINISTRATION, COUNSELORS AND TEACHERS	STRATEGIG STUDENTS IN OCTOBER 2015 AND OPEN TO ALL JANUARY 28, 2016
	X					PTA MEMBERSHIP DRIVE TO INCREASE PARENT PARTICIPATION AND SUPPORT	X								PTA AND TEACHERS	AUGUST 2015-NOVEMBER 2015
	X	X				PARENT CHAMPIONS TO HELP WITH SAFETY, NUTRITION, AND WORKING WITH OTHER FAMILIES		X							PTA AND ADMINISTRATION	SEPTEMBER 2015 TO JUNE 2016
		X				PARENT CHAPERONE RECRUITMENT TO ENSURE PARENTS ARE PROPERLY CLEARED TO HELP WITH VARIOUS EXCURSIONS AND SCHOOL EVENTS		X							ADMINISTRATION AND OFFICE STAFF	AUGUST 2015-APRIL 2016
		X				PARENT LIFESKILL SUPPORT I.E. GARDEN, COOKING	X								TEACHERS, PTA AND ADMINISTRATION	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
		X				STEAM CAREER PROGRAM TO INCORPORATE AND UTILIZE PARENTS CAREERS AND EXPERIENCE INTO OUR CURRICULUM	X								COUNSELORS, ADMINISTRATION	AUGUST 2015-JUNE 2016
	X	X				PARENT MEETINGS FOR TARGETED SUBGROUPS		X							TEACHERS, COUNSELORS AND ADMINISTRATION	OCTOBER 2015

## Wood Middle Budget Packet

Budget Summary		B3	C112	C113	C114	C122	C135	C137		
Resource	Program	15-16	Certificated Salaries	Classified Salaries	Benefits	Supplies	Services	Total Budgeted	Unbudgeted Balance	Check
			Object 1xxx	Object 2xxx	Object 3xxx	Object 4xxx	Object 5xxx			
<a href="#">0001</a>	<a href="#">Discretionary</a>	\$ 77,319	\$ -	\$ 28,560	\$ 12,914	\$ 18,045	\$ 17,800	\$ 77,319	\$ -	77,319
<a href="#">0002</a>	<a href="#">LCFF Supplemental Grant</a>	\$ 30,600	\$ 15,812	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,192	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,004	\$ 596	30,004
<a href="#">3010</a>	<a href="#">T1, Part A</a>	\$ 77,745	\$ -	\$ 54,280	\$ 23,788	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 78,068	\$ (323)	78,068
<a href="#">0002</a>	<a href="#">In Lieu of Title 1</a>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0
	<a href="#">Innovative</a>	\$ 35,710	\$ 16,895	\$ -	\$ 3,907	\$ 4,725	\$ 10,183	\$ 35,710	\$ -	35,710
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$ 221,374</b>	<b>\$ 32,707</b>	<b>\$ 89,840</b>	<b>\$ 47,801</b>	<b>\$ 22,770</b>	<b>\$ 27,983</b>	<b>\$ 221,101</b>	<b>\$ 273</b>	<b>221,101</b>
			15%	41%	22%	10%	13%			



## 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)	\$30,600.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program <u>Purpose</u> : Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	\$ 77,745.00
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title V: Innovative Programs <u>Purpose</u> : Support educational improvement, library, media, and at-risk students	\$ 35,710.00
<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	\$144,055.00

<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
Cammie Harris	F	600	Eng	x				
Katherine Crawford	F	700	Eng		x			
Judy Ganley	F	700	Eng		x			
Kai Dwyer	F	600	Eng		x			
Jenna Phillips	F	700	Eng			x		
Blanche Kim	F	201	Eng				x	
Maria Thorne	F	700	Eng				x	
John Grimaldi	M	700	Eng				x	
Michelle Jenks	F	700	Eng					x
Rashanna Turner	F	600	Eng					x
<b>#s of members of each category</b>				1	3	1	3	2

*\*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, the SSC composition does meet the CDE Code. Classroom teachers make up the majority of the school's representatives. There is parity between the site representatives and the parent and community representatives.

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

Forty percent of the representatives on the council are of color. We have one student, a parent; other staff and the principal are of a diverse background. We don't have a primary language representative.

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

We get input from the ELAC representatives and we will use the results of the parent, staff and students surveys to inform our work.

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?

We get input from the ELAC representatives and we will use the results of the parent, staff and students surveys to inform our work.

## 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: March 5, 2015

Attested:

Cammie Harris  
Typed name of school principal

Cammie Harris 4/29/15  
Signature of school principal Date

Blanche Kim  
Typed name of SSC chairperson

Blanche Kim 4-29-15  
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

Our Special education staff members are sharing the role of taking responsibility for all students. This includes students with special needs, 504 students and English language learners. During grade level collaboration, the special ed staff problem solve issues with the general ed staff that include classroom management, assessment, and instruction. When the special ed staff and the para educators provide push-in services to students, they work with all students in the class needing assistance. The staff must think of the class as “our” class. We are providing professional development and time for teams to move towards team teaching.

# **Wood Middle School**

## **Title 1 Schoolwide Plan**

### **Program Improvement Plan**

#### **COMPONENT 1: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

- The English Language Advisory Group meets regularly throughout the year and provides feedback on how their children are doing and needs still to be met.
- School Site Council meets monthly to monitor the Single School Plan, to problem solve issues that arise in the community and to provide input on possible initiatives.
- PTA also meets monthly. In these meetings issues often surface that come back to one of the advisory councils or to staff.
- Student achievement is assessed annually through multiple measures at the district level (benchmark assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and math) and state level (Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) as well as California Standards Test (CST) in science. This data is reviewed by staff and SSC. Data is presented to PTA. Next year we will have baseline data from SBAC that will inform staff how well students are moving towards Common Core State Standards (CCSS). This new information will require additional time for analysis and determining next steps.
- Grade level teams meet in Grade Level Study Teams for grade level collaboration to review student progress by looking at student work and benchmark data. Teams develop intervention plans and then monitor student progress throughout the year.
- Department meeting are held every month to review curriculum and progress of students towards standards.
- Physical fitness testing is given in grade 7. Next year we will continue to help students set goals and to provide them feedback throughout the year on progress towards the goal. We will also pretest in the winter and send that data home to families as a way to connect with parents and to get them on board with the goals we have for student fitness.

#### Needs Assessment Results:

- We piloted SBAC last year. We know that across the nation approximately 33% of students were proficient in reading and math. We did not receive results from the pilot. The ELA and math benchmarks, based on the newly implemented CCSS, provided some information to teachers but it informed the district wide system more than giving results on specific strengths and weaknesses in a class. Teachers reviewed the data and learned what they could by identifying specific standards where students needed more time or different instruction.
- An achievement gap is notably evident in language arts between Hispanic/African American and White/Asian as well as between English Learners and non-English Learners. This gap persists as seen on local assessments and student work. We will begin implementing Systematic English Language Development (ELD) this spring as teachers receive the training. During the first part of the year Title 1 and ELD staff have been providing designated ELD to students.
- Using additional resources for English Learners made it feel like we did not have enough support for literacy. We will have to see what the CELDT and SBAC scores look like in order to determine if this was the best use of resources.

#### **COMPENENT 2: SCHOOLWIDE REFORM STRATEGIES**

- Wood School has implemented a variety of structural, staffing and pedagogical changes since being designated as a PI school in 2010. Many of these efforts were implemented simultaneously, so it is difficult to assign improvements to any one change or strategy. However, Wood has had 2 years of double digit increases in API. Changes include:
- Moved to a 6-period day which increased instructional time in each subject

- Eliminated Core structure, which enabled teachers to focus on specific subject area content
- Designed an alternative 8<sup>th</sup> grade pre-algebra math course (Site administration recognized poor performing students in algebra were not successful despite being enrolled in a supplemental math intervention class., so staff revamped placement criteria for placing students in Algebra.)
- Revised curriculum of Learning Center (Staff consulted with AUSD Special Education Department and Professional Developers from University of Kansas SIM Program. WMS piloted revised program.)
- Fully implemented Inquiry by Design, which poised WMS ELA teachers to be able to transition to CCSS
- Provided lunchtime and afterschool tutoring by classroom teachers
- Practiced school wide implementation of key SIM components
- Invested in the training of an onsite SIM Professional Developer to provide coaching and training
- Provided FUSION 1 & FUSION 2 reading classes in a variety of schedule formats
- Created a counseling support team (Dwyer, Hill & Bowser) to monitor student progress, address conflicts, changed climate and provide better social-emotional support, enabling students to focus on learning in the classroom. Counselors have implemented structures for student recognition, mentoring and improving the home-school connection (i.e. parent information and training events,
- Fall 2013 Changed Site Administrator

### **Rationale for Restructuring Option**

By creating an Integrated Learning culture with a STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics) focus, WMS will increase student participation, engagement, and achievement as well as prepare students for the unknown challenges of a rapidly changing world. Integration requires collaboration, research, intentional alignment and practical application on behalf of the teachers who take on this challenge. From the students, integration demands creativity, problem solving, perseverance, collaboration and the ability to work through the rigorous demands of multiple ideas and concepts woven together to create real world, generative learning opportunities that engages their thinking and processes towards performance based learning. Integration is not simply combining two or more contents together. It is an approach to teaching which includes intentional identification of naturally aligned standards, taught authentically alongside meaningful assessments which take both content areas to a whole new level. Put together, these components set the foundation for how we will facilitate the Common Core State Standards.

Integrated Learning (IL) will be the unifying instructional approach that builds cohesion and purpose into the classroom teaching at Wood Middle School. Through the lens of IL, teachers will connect the content of STEAM to all academic subjects through projects, exploration and inquiry.

### **Integrated Learning: Culturally Responsive Pathways to Student Success**

WMS will partner with ACOE to provide Integrated Learning Training to all teachers through their integrated Learning Specialist Program (ILSP: <http://www.artiseducation.org/what-we-do/our-programs/integrated-learning-specialist-program>). This training aligns with the work of Maya Lin School and improves classroom teaching and learning across all subject areas through arts integration, performance-based assessments, and collaborative curriculum design. This successful, research-based approach builds upon Harvard's Project Zero pedagogies: Teaching for Understanding, Studio Habits of Mind, and Making Learning Visible. The training will provide teachers with skills to navigate the transition to Common Core State Standards and enable them to implement relevant curriculum across disciplines, assess what students know and can do, and to differentiate to meet the needs of every student.

### **STEAM**

When determining the best model for restructuring Wood Middle School, we considered the question: "How do we prepare our students to be successful in a world that is rapidly changing?" The careers and jobs of tomorrow do not exist today.

The answer is: by providing a STEAM education (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics). A STEAM education provides students with content knowledge, critical thinking and innovation while developing students' interests and skills for future success.

According to the California Department of Education a STEM education is a sequence of courses or program of study that prepares students, including underrepresented groups for successful employment, post-secondary education, or both that require different and more technically sophisticated skills including the application of mathematics and science skills and concepts, and to be competent, capable citizens in our technology-dependent, democratic society.

Why STEAM? STEM to STEAM is a Rhode Island School of Design led initiative to add Art and Design to the national agenda of STEM education and research in America. STEM + Art = STEAM. The goal is to foster the true innovation that comes with combining the mind of a scientist or technologist with that of an artist or designer.

1. *Science* is the study of the natural world, including the laws of nature associated with physics, chemistry, and biology and the treatment or application of facts, principles, concepts, or conventions associated with these disciplines.
2. *Technology* comprises the entire system of people and organizations, knowledge, processes, and devices that go into creating and operating technological artifacts, as well as the artifacts themselves.
3. *Engineering* is a body of knowledge about the design and creation of products and a process for solving problems. Engineering utilizes concepts in science and mathematics and technological tools.
4. *Art* is the explorative vehicle demonstrating the expression of bigger concepts of creativity, innovation, critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration, flexibility, adaptability and social and cultural skills.
5. *Mathematics* is the study of patterns and relationships among quantities, numbers, and shapes. Mathematics includes theoretical mathematics and applied mathematics.

STEAM education is an interdisciplinary approach to learning where rigorous academic concepts are coupled with real-world problem-based and performance-based lessons. At this level, STEAM education exemplifies the axiom "the whole is more than the sum of the parts."

STEAM education in the Middle Grades:

- Introduces an interdisciplinary program of study consisting of rigorous and challenging courses and aligns with Integrated Learning Frameworks.
- Continues to provide standards-based, structured inquiry-based and real world problem-based learning that interconnects STEAM-related subjects.
- Bridges and connects in-school and out-of-school learning opportunities.
- Increases student awareness of STEAM fields and occupations, especially for underrepresented populations.
- Increases student awareness of the academic requirements of STEAM fields and occupations.
- Begins student exploration of STEAM related careers, especially for underrepresented populations.

To make the transition to STEAM viable and effective, Wood Middle School staff will leverage programs that are already in place; Integrated Learning with ACOE, Service Learning Waste Reduction Project (SLWRP) with StopWaste.Org and the EPICS/Teen Techs Robotics program with Purdue University.

### **Professional Learning Community (PLC)**

The work of PLCs revolves around three key questions:

What do we want students to learn?

How will we know when they have learned it?

What will we do when students are not achieving?

Wood staff will actively participate in ensuring that ALL students achieve, committing to constant examination of data and practices, and functioning as a community (not as silos) so that all students will benefit from a choreographed program of planning, best-practices instruction, assessment, intervention and enrichment. This sort of comprehensive, school-wide, frontal approach to ensure academic achievement for all underlies all PLC-led schools and accounts for many of them receiving United States Department of Education Blue Ribbon



Awards for raising student achievement in schools with true heterogeneity in terms of socio-economic status, race and former academic performance levels.

### **Teaching and nurturing the whole child**

It is the intent of the faculty of Wood Middle School to provide a safe and nurturing environment where the academic, social-emotional and physical needs of a child are supported. This will be done through school wide implementation of AUSD adopted Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS), systemic Response to Intervention (RTI) and mentorship through an Academic-Social Advisory taught by all credentialed faculty. All students will be members of small learning communities where teachers will collaborate to create meaningful, and aligned content in a balanced academic program. Wood Middle School in partnership with AUSD and HTA will begin developing a plan for a Full Service Community School to be phased in over the next five years.

Staff will participate in training to implement a 6<sup>th</sup> Grade orientation and mentoring program led by representative 8<sup>th</sup> grade students. This program will help facilitate and ease the transition to middle school. In response to the high mobility rate at WMS, a systematic approach to welcoming and assimilating students who enroll throughout the school year will be implemented and monitored through the advisory course.

### **COMPONENT 3: INSTRUCTION BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS**

The school site, together with the district personnel office, works to ensure that teachers are highly qualified, as defined by NCLB. District office reviews teachers' credentials and files with the site managers and maintains required documentation. One hundred percent of Paden's teachers are highly qualified and have CLAD or CLAD alternative certification.

- **COMPONENT 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT T**

- Teachers and administrators will be trained in Integrated Learning by Alameda County of Education. Course A must be completed by June of 2015. All three courses must be completed by June of 2016.
- A team of teachers and administrators are receiving training on Response to Intervention. The training will be completed by June of 2014. The team will train remaining teachers and para-educators on differentiation and ensure Tier 1 interventions are implemented in all courses. Training to build all staff's capacity to deliver lessons in whole and small group instruction, with clearly articulated learning objectives, and using gradual release model will be ongoing. Teachers will utilize a variety of teaching strategies, including SIM, IBD and multiple methods and modify assignments and assessments.
- All teachers and para-educators will be active members of authentic professional learning communities. In June of 2014, PLC's will meet and complete first cycle of inquiry and end of unit culminating project-based assessment. Each month, PLCs will be released to have additional collaboration time to plan integrated lessons.
- By June of 2014, character curriculum for the advisory class aligned to the anti-bullying initiative, TUPE and Lifeskills, will be developed. All students will participate in a weekly, multi-grade level advisory to foster school community, and to support students' social and emotional development.
- Administrators and teachers will continue being trained on Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS). By August of 2014, school wide incentives, student expectation grid, and consequences will be completed. In addition, all students will be enrolled in an advisory class.
- Strategic Instructional Model –Site SIM professional developer will continue to collaborate with District SIM Coach on plans for site implementation of strategies for 2014-2015 school-year. This will include teachers embedding, supporting and integrating strategies.

- Implementation of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) continues to be the focus of the majority of professional development this year. The Instructional Leadership Team . The team also offered support monthly during a Wednesday late start day.
- Wood had a full day training on Brain Compatibility from Dr. Ken Wesson.
- Teachers worked with math coaches weekly.
- ASUD offered our school Positive Behavior and Intervention Systems (PBIS) training this Wood School has implemented a variety of structural, staffing and pedagogical changes since being designated as a PI school in 2010. Many of these efforts were implemented simultaneously, so it is difficult to assign improvements to any one change or strategy. However, Wood has had 2 years of double digit increases in API. Changes include:  
 Moved to a 6-period day which increased instructional time in each subject  
 Eliminated Core structure, which enabled teachers to focus on specific subject area content  
 Designed an alternative 8<sup>th</sup> grade pre-algebra math course (Site administration recognized poor performing students in algebra were not successful despite being enrolled in a supplemental math intervention class., so staff revamped placement criteria for placing students in Algebra.)  
 Revised curriculum of Learning Center (Staff consulted with AUSD Special Education Department and Professional Developers from University of Kansas SIM Program. WMS piloted revised program.)  
 Fully implemented Inquiry by Design, which poised WMS ELA teachers to be able to transition to CCSS  
 Provided lunchtime and afterschool tutoring by classroom teachers  
 Practiced school wide implementation of key SIM components  
 Invested in the training of an onsite SIM Professional Developer to provide coaching and training

#### **COMPONENT 5: ATTRACTING HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS**

- The school site, together with the district personnel office, actively recruits and hires teachers who are highly qualified, as defined by NCLB. One hundred percent of Paden's teachers are highly qualified and have CLAD or CLAD alternative certification.

#### **COMPONENT 6: PARENT INVOLVEMENT**

The Wood Middle School staff, PTA, School Site Council and English Learner Advisory Committee all work collaboratively to provide the following activities designed to strengthen the home-school relationship and ensure that all parent voices are heard and supported through the following activities.

- Families attend Awards ceremony each trimester, parent conferences and Showcase nights..
- PTA and SSC conduct open meetings each month. Both meetings include time for comments from the public. SSC agendas are posted 72 hours in advance.
- ELAC meets three times a year. These meetings include ample time for parents/guardians to voice concerns and ask questions as well as professional development to support parent participation in their child's education.
- Working with California PTA, we parent education nights on crucial topics related to
- We send 'Robo call messages every week, including an online parent newsletter
- Our leadership class organizes an ice cream social for entering families.
- Teachers and parents work together to support Back to School Night, Open House, Showcase, talent show, STEAM night and music/performance nights.
- Student Study Team meetings are held as needed (weekly) to engage family members as part of the team creating the most effective support systems for their children, academically and socially.
- Individual report card conferences are held each fall for families to meet with teachers and discuss their child's progress. Student led conferences are held each spring for families to witness student work and growth for the school year.

## **COMPONENT 7: TRANSITIONS**

- The counselors go out each year to the feeder elementary schools to help provide information and help with the transition.
- The 8<sup>th</sup>. grade teachers and counselors work closely with Alameda High Schools to provide academic and social data on incoming students. Staff works hard to place students in appropriate classes for 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Our leadership class provides a tour to any student that comes after the year starts and all new students re provided a big sister or brother.
- We have tours for parents and students and we invite 5<sup>th</sup>. grade classes to come to our Makers space and to experience projects and to get acclimated to the school.

## **COMPONENT 8: TEACHER DECISION-MAKING**

- Wood School is designed with grade level and department teams for on-going collaboration. Collaboration rotates between grade level, department, and teachers' choice on Wednesdays mornings during our late start schedule..
- Teachers work as a group to review and update our 'Theory of Action' for continuous improvement as documented in the Single School Plan.

## **COMPONENT 9: SAFETY NET**

Wood School has a pro-active set of components to ensure the success of all students with either academic and/or social skill deficits. The following are part of the school's safety net:

Academic: We will continue with the following:

- Incoming students are assessed in math and English language arts.
- New students with a primary language other than English are assessed on the CELDT for English Language proficiency before they enter school in the fall or shortly after their enrollment date during the year. Students are reassessed on CELDT on a yearly basis. The ELD teacher provides instruction based on students' proficiency level on the ADEPT and administers this assessment 3 times a year to monitor progress.
- An Individual Intervention Plan (IIP) is developed for every student who performs below benchmark, is at risk of retention, and scores 2.5 or lower on multiple measures. Families meet with the teacher to discuss the plan. Teachers use on-going assessments to modify lessons and provide in-class intervention (tier 1 intervention) through differentiated instruction and small group work.
- Interventions are intensive, flexible, and research based instructional programs. These programs include Fusion and Language!
- Positive study skills are taught in a variety of ways, including note taking skills, long term projects, school assignment calendars and goal setting/behavior contracts with students.

English Learners: English Learners comprise 25% of our total school population. We will continue with the following:

- Newcomer classes for students new to the country,
- Daily ELD instruction based on ADEPT proficiency levels.
- ELD para push-in and pull-out support.
- ELAC parent meetings held regularly throughout the school year.

Social: As a result of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, we know that students some students are engaged in cyberbullying, drugs and other risky behavior.

- We have a weekly advisory class that addresses the issues and that includes school wide curriculum that supports anti-bullying and character education.
- Students maintain their same advisory teacher all three years and the advisory students are multi-grade.
- Students in need of support to develop positive relationships with peers, process difficult life challenges, learn to control anger, or develop greater self-confidence are offered services from our counselors and psych interns. Referrals are based on teacher and administrative input.

- When appropriate, an individual contract is developed with the parent, student and teacher. The contract will have goals for the child and include a home/school component.
- A school resource officer is available to help students resolve conflicts and understand the consequences of their actions at and beyond school.

#### **COMPONENT 10: COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION**

- Intervention Team, created this year met several time to look at academic and social interventions across the site. Student Study Team meeting weekly as needed to discuss students' academic and social needs, developing academic and social interventions and monitoring student progress. Behavior Intervention Team meeting as needed to develop support plans for students.
- Staff provides before and/or after school tutoring for students in need.
- Programs and materials are purchased to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Teachers are encouraged to attend trainings and to collaborate for various intervention/curriculum programs.
- The principal and teachers attended RtI, PBIS and ILT training. The CCSS team attended AUSD provided training. Training is brought back to staff through monthly staff meetings designated for professional development.

## 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/Al Native	Pacific 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%
<b>Note change in mechanism of reporting (2013-14 grades 9-12 used vs. grades 11-12 only in 2012-13)</b>						
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**

<b>Language</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Total</b>
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**

<b>Language</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Total</b>
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>