

District Name: El Tejon Unified

CD Code: 15751680000000

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN ADDENDUM TEMPLATE

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, codified as No Child Left Behind (NCLB, Section 1116[c][7][A]), requires that local educational agencies (LEAs) identified for Program Improvement (PI) shall, not later than three months after being identified, develop or revise an LEA Plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, and others. Rather than completely rewriting the existing LEA Plan, we recommend using this LEA Plan Addendum template to address the items below. Type your responses in the expandable text boxes.

Prior to developing this revision, please use the State Assessment Tools, as applicable, to analyze school/district needs for improved student achievement. These tools are available on the California Department of Education (CDE) State Assessment Tools Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. Contact the District Innovation and Improvement Office at 916-319-0836 if you have any questions regarding the State Assessment Tools or completing the LEA Plan Addendum.

Please submit your completed LEA Plan Addendum by uploading the completed document into the Program Improvement Year I monitoring instrument in the California Accountability Improvement System (CAIS). Contact Janice Morrison, Education Programs Consultant, District Innovation and Improvement Office by e-mail at jamorrison@cde.ca.gov if you need technical assistance in uploading the document.

The LEA Plan Addendum **must be submitted to the CDE no later than Friday, April 4, 2014**. The LEA Plan Addendum should:

1. **Identify fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools of the LEA and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students, including a determination of why the prior LEA Plan failed to bring about increased academic achievement for all student groups.**

Please provide a summary analysis of the needs assessment used to identify student learning needs (especially the academic problems of low-achieving students). Include an analysis of why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

1. Discuss the results of the assessments used to determine the teaching and learning needs of the schools and the district.
2. Identify academic priorities.
3. Discuss why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

Needs Assessments: Development Process for El Tejon's LEA Plan

The district first facilitated the completion of the Academic Program Survey for all school sites. The district then convened a district/school leadership team (DSLTL) composed of certificated representatives and principals from each school site. The DSLTL met on two separate occasions to review outcome and process data and then to summarize the analysis of the data. After each meeting, each school's DSLTL members took information back to their respective site to review with all staff members and seek input.

Student Performance and Education Practice Analysis

The DSLT reviewed the following outcome data:

- API Reports
- Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) data
- Adequate Yearly Progress Data
- CAHSEE Assessment Data

The DSLT used the results of the Academic Program Survey to analyze the effectiveness of its instructional program. Since the district does not have a significant English Learner (EL) subgroup, and its enrollment of ELs is limited, it did not complete the ELSSA.

Assessment Data Summary

CST Data

English/language arts CSTs:

- The percentage of All Students scoring proficient or above increased from 2010-12 in grades 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11.
- The percentage of All Students scoring at the BB/FBB levels decreased from 2010-12 in grades 4, 8, 9, 10
- The percentage of All Students scoring at the BB/FBB levels increased in grades 2, 5, 6, 3, 11 and 7th grade remained the same from 2010-12.
- The percentage of students in the Hispanic subgroup scoring proficient or above increased in grades 2, 4 and decreased in grades 3, 6, 7 from 2010-12. Grades 5 and 8 had fewer than 10 Hispanic students and, therefore, did not have a Hispanic subgroup in 2012.
- The percentage of students in the Socio-economically Disadvantaged (SED) subgroup scoring proficient or above increased in grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 from 2010-12.
- The Mean Scaled Score (MSS) for All Students increased in grades 4, 5, 8 from 2010-12, and increased significantly (8 points or more) in grades 4, 8. The MSS decreased significantly in grades 2, 3.
- The MSS for the Hispanic subgroup increased significantly in grades 2, 4, 5, 8 from 2010-2012 and decreased significantly in grades 3, 6, 7.
- The MSS for the SED subgroup increased in grades 4, 6, 7, 8 and increased significantly in grades 4, 7. The MSS decreased significantly for this subgroup in grades 2, 3.

Math/Algebra CSTs:

- The percentage of All Students scoring proficient or above increased in grades 4, 5, 8 (Algebra), 11 (Algebra II).
- The percentage of All Students scoring at the BB/FBB levels decreased in grades 4, 5, 6, 8 (general math) and 11 (Algebra II).
- The percentage of All Students scoring at the BB/FBB levels increased (negative growth) in grades 2, 3, 7, 9.
- The Mean Scale Score (MSS) for All Students increased in grades 4, 5, 8 (algebra and general math), and increased significantly (8 points or more) in grades 4 and 8 (algebra). The MSS decreased significantly in grades 3, 7. The MSS for All Students decreased significantly in grades 3, 7.

- The MSS for the Hispanic subgroup increased significantly in grades 2, 4, 5 and decreased significantly in grade 7. The other grades either did not have scores for the Hispanic subgroup, or had insignificant changes from 2011 to 2012.
- The MSS for the SED subgroup increased in grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 (general math), and increased significantly in grades 4, 5, 8 (general math). The MSS for this subgroup decreased significantly in grade 3.

CAHSEE Data

- The percentage of All Students passing the ELA portion of the CAHSEE increased 18 percentage points from 2010-2012.
- The percent of All Students passing the ELA portion in 2012 was 72% and in math 75%, as compared to Kern County's passage rates of 77% in ELA and 78% in math.
- The percentage of the SED subgroup passing the ELA portion of the CAHSEE increased 29 percentage points from 2010-12.
- The percent of the SED subgroup passing the ELA portion of the CAHSEE in 2012 was 72% and in math 76% as compared to Kern County's passage rates of 72% and 73%, respectively.
- There was no ethnicity data available for comparison in 2012.
- The percentage of All Students passing the math portion of the CAHSEE increased 17 percentage points from 2010-2012.
- The percentage of the SED subgroup passing the math portion of the CAHSEE increased 33 percentage points from 2010-12.
- There was no ethnicity data available for comparison in 2012.

API Data (API growth targets are assigned at the school level only)

- The district's API for All Students increased 6 points in 2008-09, decreased 6 points in 2009-10 and increased 31 points in 2010-11.
- The district's API for the Hispanic subgroup had 0 growth in 2008-09, increased 3 points in 2008-09, and 2009-10 and increased 35 points in 2010-11.
- The district's API for the SED subgroup increased 3 points in 2008-09, decreased 22 points in 2009-10 and increased 40 points in 2010-11.
- The district's growth API for All Students in 2009-10 was 731, for Hispanics, it was 682 and for the SED subgroup, it was 665.
- The district's growth API for All students in 2010-11 was 762, for Hispanics it was 717 and for the SED subgroup, it was 705.
- Similar schools rankings were as follows based upon the 2012 base API data: Frazier Park: 1, El Tejon: 2, Frazier Mt. High School: 4.
- Although the district did not have a growth target to meet, the district's Growth API for All Students dropped 17 points from 2010-11 to 2011-12 to 746.

- All schools with the exception of Frazier Park Elementary had a loss in the API Growth from 2011 to 2012. This includes All Students and all significant subgroups. Frazier Park had a 22-point growth in its API school wide and 23 points for its SED subgroup. Pine Mt. Learning Center did not have an API for comparison.

AYP Data

- The district met 9 of 16 AYP criteria in 2012. It did not meet percent proficient targets school wide nor for any significant subgroup. It also did not meet the graduation rate of 90% for any group.
- Frazier Park Elementary made 9 of 9 AYP criteria through Safe Harbor, making AYP.
- El Tejon Elementary made 5 of 9 AYP criteria, missing percent proficient school wide and all significant subgroups.
- Frazier Mt. High School met 2 of 6 AYP criteria, missing percent proficient for all groups.
- Pine Mt. Learning Center made all 4 of 4 AYP criteria.

Academic Program Survey Summary

The APS items that were rated below 3 (substantially implemented) were:

- 1.1: Core materials in Reading/language arts (RLA).
- 1.2: Core materials in math.
- 1.3: Core intensive intervention materials for RLA.
- 1.5: Math intensive intervention materials for grades 4-7 and 8.
- 2.2: Instructional time for strategic support in RLA.
- 2.4: Instructional time for RLA intensive intervention.
- 3.1: Annual pacing guide for RLA/ELD.
- 3.2: Annual pacing guide for math.
- 5.2: Professional development for teachers in adopted RLA programs.
- 5.3: Professional development for teachers in adopted math programs.
- 6.1 and 6.2: Ongoing instructional support for teachers in RLA and math.
- 7.1 and 7.2: Student achievement monitoring systems for RLA and math.
- 8.2: Student achievement monitoring system for algebra.

Conclusions from Data and APS

- The district is experiencing inconsistent growth in student achievement.
- This was evidenced by the improvement in CST data in grades 4, and 8 and the lack of or decrease in achievement in many of the other grade levels. The percentage of students passing the CAHSEE has been consistently increasing and is on par with Kern County's passage rates while a number of grades (2, 3, 5, 6, 11) have increased in the percentage of

students scoring at the BB/FBB levels on the CSTs from 2010-12 (negative growth). The API growth scores have been inconsistent for all students and subgroups from 2010 to 2012. Also, the API growth scores have consistently been higher for the All Students group as compared to the Hispanic and SED subgroups from 2009 to 2011. Frazier Park Elementary and Pine Mt. Learning Center were the only schools to make AYP, and Frazier Park Elementary was the only school to have growth in its 2012 API.

- There were a number of the APS items (Essential Program Components) that were found to be less than substantially implemented.
- Although Tejon School District, like many school districts in 2012, is financially challenged, many of the APS items would not require substantial, if any, funds to implement. Examples include items such as instructional time and scheduling, as well as pacing guides.
- The district has capacity for academic improvement and growth.
- The most recent similar school's rankings (1, 2, 4) indicate that the schools in the district should improve with an increased focus in the instructional program. Also, as evidenced by the high level of consistent growth in achievement in certain grade levels, the district has inherent talent and capacity for success that can be used to influence the district as a whole.

Academic Priorities

- Develop and provide a district wide Professional Development Plan throughout the district with a directive that all teachers will diligently implement into their instructional delivery.
- Increase professional collaboration throughout the school district; bank days, weekly planning meetings, training and vertical articulation among the three schools.
- All students will demonstrate consistent progress towards proficiency as assessed by Common Formative Assessments and Benchmarks Tests.

Why the plan was not successful

- LEA plan was not articulated among the staff due to frequent changes of leadership at all levels (site, district, and board).
- This lack of communication has exacerbated the implementation and monitoring of the LEA Plan.
- Significant elements of the LEA plan have yet to be implemented.

2. Include specific, measurable achievement goals and targets for student groups identified as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe specific, measurable academic goals and targets for student achievement for student groups identified as not making AYP. (Refer to the CDE AYP Reports Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypreports.asp>.)

Because we are in a transitional stage as we implement common core standards and testing, which is a three year process, we will be unable to use the conventional methods for measuring achievement; STAR testing. Therefore we will continue to use CAHSEE, fluency tests, and will focus on the development of Common Core pre-tests/post-tests, CFA's and Benchmark assessments to measure student achievement.

In school year 2014-2015, 70% of all students will score 70% or higher as determined and measured by the various school based assessments.

These assessments will determine the needs of Socio Economically Disabled and English Language Learner students in an effort to differentiate instruction as identified in number three below. All students, including SED and ELL groups are included in district wide efforts to increase student achievement.

3. Incorporate research-based strategies to strengthen the core academic program for identified student groups in schools served by the LEA, including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe the specific strategies that the district will use and how those strategies will be implemented and monitored to strengthen the core academic program.

The focus and use of research based instructional strategies has been under way during the past few years.

- Continue developing Professional Learning Communities to build a stronger emphasis on the continuous improvement model throughout the district.
- CFA's and benchmark assessments in ELA and Mathematics will be revised to fit CCSS.
- Intentionally focus on the use and instruction of academic vocabulary to include Tier 2 and 3 words to support English Language Learners and Socio-economically disadvantaged students. Students must be taught how to use more sophisticated academic language orally and in writing.
- Increase student collaboration techniques (student engagement) to further develop language skills.
- Professional development for teachers on new ELD standards, ELA/ELD Framework, and CCSS.
- Use of non-linguistic representations in the classroom as an instructional strategy to support at-risk students.
- Response to Intervention programs are in place and are being accessed by our identified SED, SWD, and ELL students. Response to Intervention will continue and expand to address academic deficiencies.

4. Specify actions to implement the identified strategies that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions to be implemented to accomplish the identified strategies and how they will be supported and monitored. (See examples of full implementation descriptions in the Academic Program Survey [APS] and the District Assistance Survey [DAS] on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspl.asp .)	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost/ Funding Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase and facilitate professional collaboration and articulation among grade levels, subject areas, and common PLC times. • Schedule changes will be made to allow time for regularly scheduled PLC meetings. • CFA's and Benchmarks in ELA and Mathematics will be developed during scheduled PLC time blocks. • Implement and monitor increased use of Tier 2 and 3 vocabulary instruction in the classroom. • Implement research based student engagement strategies to further develop language skills. • To improve instruction in the classroom, we will work towards the implementation of backwards mapping for unit planning, thinking maps as a learning strategy, and data analysis to guide instruction. • Response to Intervention will be guided by pre- and post-tests for placement and further interventions. • We will increase the frequency of RTI and enrichment-type classes by a minimum of 50% throughout the year. 	<p>District and Site Administrators: Superintendent and Principals to coordinate and implement.</p> <p>Teachers: Will work in teams to implement strategies and adjust instruction based on data.</p> <p>Site Administrator will plan for staff development in the fall prior to the first day of school and throughout the year.</p>	<p>April – Dec. 2014</p> <p>August 2014 – June 2015</p>	<p>Title 1 and Title 3 Funds \$44,000</p>

5. Provide high-quality professional development for the instructional staff that focuses on instructional improvement and supports the strategies and actions described above.

Please describe the professional development the LEA will provide to instructional staff to address the identified strategies and actions.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost/ Funding Source (including 10% set-aside from Title I, Part A)
<p>This district is in great need of staff development opportunities. Due to lack of resources, we must be selective and creative regarding ways to deliver professional development. The following are areas we need to focus on and the methods to accomplish these tasks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District wide staff development at the beginning of the school year. Training to focus on Vocabulary Development, Classroom Management, and Data Analysis. • Weekly PLC meetings will focus on training in Common Core issues such as; development and revision of CFA's, benchmark assessments, CCSS, and research based teaching strategies. • Staff meetings will consist of short trainings on Brokers of Expertise to provide staff development to all certificated staff. • Small group trainings – roving substitutes to cover one half to a full day to allow teachers time for thinking maps, common core study sessions, vocabulary, and student engagement strategies. 	<p>Superintendent and Site Administrators</p> <p>Site Administrators and Teachers</p>	<p>April – June 2015</p> <p>August 2014 – June 2015</p>	<p>Title I Funds and General Fund (Included as part of the \$44,000 reflected in item #4)</p> <p>Substitute Costs Professional Books and Consultant Fees</p>

6. Incorporate, as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and/or during an extension of the school year.

Please describe those activities and how the LEA will incorporate them.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>The school district currently provides the following programs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive after-school athletic program (Middle and High School) • Technology/Robotics Program (Middle School and High School) • Agriculture/Future Farmers of America (High School) • Tutoring and Homework assistance (Elementary, Middle School, and High School) • After School Focus Central Enrichment Program (High School) • Boys and Girls Club (Activities; tutoring and homework assistance offered to all students) • Saturday School Program (Enrichment type activities) – for ADA recovery, this program is offered to all students • Summer School Session for Special Needs Students <p>ETUSD plans to expand these programs to increase access by all students. Furthermore plans are underway to implement additional programs that will increase opportunities for all students to participate in enrichment and intervention type programs.</p>	<p>Superintendent and Site Administrators</p> <p>Teachers and Classified Staff (Boys and Girls Club)</p>	<p>April – June 2015</p>	<p>Part of the \$44,000 reflected on item #4</p> <p>Donations from PTSO vary based on individual school needs</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$112,000</p>	<p>Title I and General</p> <p>Fund and Parent, Teacher, Student Organization, Grant</p> <p>ROP Funds</p> <p>Boys and Girls Club Program</p>

7. Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school.

Please describe parental involvement strategies and how the LEA will support them across the LEA.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All schools have Parent, Student, and Teacher Organizations, School Site Councils, and ELAC's. • We will begin a monthly open forum with the Superintendent to address any district concerns. • Increase communication efforts by providing Spanish translation on all flyers sent home; Newsletters, Home-School Connection. • Increase automated communication and more frequent updates to school websites. Working towards a goal of all teachers having a school website link. • Update district website to facilitate and increase communication between teachers and parents. • Promote parental and community involvement through various opportunities; Back to School Night, Parent Conferences, Open House, Recognition Assemblies, Science and History Fairs, and volunteer opportunities. • Each school will conduct a minimum of one Parent Education Workshop to assist parents in how to help their child at home for a total of three minimum. Provide training and awareness on the A-G requirements for high school students, so parents will know what classes students will need for graduation and higher learning. • Continue Student Assistance Team meeting format, which meets once a month with parents and teachers to address at-risk students who are failing academically, for social-emotional reasons, or absenteeism. 	Superintendent, Site Administrators, and Teachers	April – June 2015	Cost is included in item #4	Title I, Title III, and General Fund
	Classified Office Staff	April – June 2015		
	District Technology Coordinator	April – June 2015		
	Site Administrators	April – June 2015		

**LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN ADDENDUM
ASSURANCE PAGE**

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan Information:

Name of LEA: El Tejon Unified School District

County District Code: 15751680000000

Date of Local Governing Board Approval: 4/10/14

District Superintendent: Rodney Wallace

Address: 4337 Lebec Rd.

City: Lebec, CA

Zip Code: 93243

Phone: 661-248-6247

FAX: 661-248-5203

E-mail: rwallace@el-tejon.org

Signatures:

On behalf of LEAs, participants included in the preparation of this LEA Program Improvement Plan Addendum:

Rodney Wallace Rodney Wallace 4/10/14
Signature of Superintendent Printed Name of Superintendent Date

Vickie Mullen Vickie Mullen 4/10/14
Signature of Board President Printed Name of Board President Date

By submission of the local board approved LEA PI Plan Addendum (in lieu of the original signature assurance page in hard copy), the LEA certifies that the plan has been locally adopted and original signed copies of the assurances are on file in the LEA. The certification reads:

Certification: I hereby certify that all of the applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed by this LEA and that, to the best of my knowledge, information contained in this Plan is correct and complete. Legal assurances for all programs are accepted as the basic legal condition for the operation of selected projects and programs and copies of assurances are retained onsite. I certify that we accept all general and program specific