

# The Single Plan for Student Achievement

## PIUTE MOUNTAIN SCHOOL

15-63388  
CDS Code

Date of this revision: May 1, 2014

The *Single Plan for Student Achievement* (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index. California *Education Code* sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program Improvement into the *Single Plan for Student Achievement*.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person: Kathleen S. Hansen

Position: Superintendent/Principal

Telephone Number: 661 867-2301

Address: 12400 Caliente Creek Road, Caliente, CA 93518

E-mail Address: [khansen@calienteschooldistrict.org](mailto:khansen@calienteschooldistrict.org)

Caliente Union School District

Table 1: Academic Performance Index

API	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX (API) DATA BY GROUPS																	
	All Students																	
	Base	Growth	Difference	Base	Growth	Difference	Base	Growth	Difference	Base	Growth	Difference	Base	Growth	Difference	Base	Growth	Difference
2010-2011	678	5	36															
2011-2012	714	5	-14															
2012-2013	729	5	28															

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. All students have increased in Piute Mountain’s overall API score in the last 3 years.
2. We need to continue to grow.
3. Inconsistencies in student population/student enrollment have made tracking data difficult in obtaining validity.
4. No “significant” subgroups are noted.
5. SED is largest sub group, but still less than 50 in population.

Table 2: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																							
	All Students																							
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Participation Rate	100	87	100																					
Percent At or Above Proficient	41.8	52.5	53.3																					
AYP Target	67.6	78.4	89.2																					
Met AYP Criteria	yes	yes	Yes																					

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. The overall percentage of students at proficient or above is showing a steady increase.
2. The AYP target is steadily increasing.
3. The data shows a 7.8% increase over last 3 years.
4. Evaluate SBE adopted RLA materials
  - a) Are we able to use program with fidelity because of combination classrooms and decreased paraprofessionals?

Table 3: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																										
	All Students																										
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3			
Participation Rate	100.	91	100																								
Percent At or Above Proficient	27.3	30.1	24.1																								
AYP Target	68.5	78.4	89.2																								
Met AYP Criteria	yes	Yes	Yes																								

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. 7.7% decrease over the last 3 years
2. Adopted SBE core curriculum

Table 9: Multi-Purpose Form

Academic, Demographic, Grade Span, or Program Area: Population

Level Achieved	DATA BY Core Subjects																							
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
RLA	334	358	351																					
Math	310	312	335																					
Population Tested	61	51	50																					

Conclusions indicated by the data:

- 1. Smaller sample = less valid data
- 2. Adopted new math curriculum
- 3. Decrease in students tested

## Summary of Student Achievement and Demographic Data Analysis

1. Scoring lower in math than RLA
2. We need SBE adopted core curriculum in math
3. We need to implement a Rtl model to differentiate instruction for students that are basic or below on the CST.
4. PLC – All teachers need more time to collaborate and analysis students' work and assessments. These PLC meetings shall be bi-monthly and focused.
5. Year-long pacing calendar – District needs a comprehensive year long pacing guide. If you don't know where you are going you won't know when you arrive.
6. Bench marks – We do not want to rely on yearly data from the CST therefore we will set up quarterly bench marks to be used as formative assessments so that we can target intensive and strategic students.
7. Smaller samples mean less valid data. ADA has decrease over the past three years from 77 valid scores to 61.

### Conclusions:

After analyzing and disaggregating data for the last three years, we have concluded Piute Mountain School has shown a slight increase in the content area of mathematics. RLA showed a steady growth and then experienced a loss for the 2009 - 2010 year. We met RLA AYP criteria for 2007 - 2008, 2008 – 2009, and then did not meet the criteria 2009 – 2010 year. Math, however, met criteria 2007-2008 and then did not meet AYP 2008 – 2009, and 2009 – 2010 year. Caliente Union School District had received a waiver for math adoption, 2008. June 2010 Caliente School District purchased SBE adopted, K – 6<sup>th</sup> HSP California Math and 7<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> Holt Rhinehart California Math textbooks. The district has implemented an Rtl model, PLC bi-monthly meetings, and benchmarks.

As stated in the summary of conclusions, AYP scores for math had slightly increased but the textbooks were antiquated and no longer SBE adopted, therefore district adopted new math curriculum, June 2010. Declining enrollment plays a significant challenge in overall validity of data scores.

## SCHOOL HISTORY

The Caliente Union School District was formed effective July 1, 1962. It covers a large, sparsely populated territory which includes the foothills, canyons, and southern slopes of two of Kern County's highest peaks, Breckenridge Mountain and Piute Peak. The Caliente and Twin Oaks school districts joined due to a declining enrollment in both schools. There was 100 percent signup in both communities asking for unionization and the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of the union.

In 1980, under the direction of Bob Wilson, plans for a school in the Twin Oaks/Walker Basin area were started. A school was needed in the area to avoid the long trip over the mountain to Caliente.

The architectural firm of Biggar, Frapwell, Ghezzi and Cartnal of Bakersfield was retained to design the school. The school was burrowed out of the hillside to take advantage of the earth's constant temperature of 50 degrees. Windows face due south and a low overhang allows only the winter sun's warming rays into the classrooms. A cross-ventilation system and light are provided by a "periscope" which also exhausts hot air on one side and introduces fresh air through vents on the other side. This underground design is extremely energy efficient.

The school, when viewed from the road, almost disappears into the landscape. The concrete structure is earthquake-safe, fireproof and almost "student-proof", the architects claim.

The Piute Mountain School is nestled in the Piute Mountains area of the Sierra Nevada Mountains near the Tehachapi Mountains with an elevation of approximately 3,000 feet. The area enjoys four distinct seasons.

The Piute Mountain School opened in the fall of 1984 serving 78 students in grades kindergarten through eight drawing from an area of approximately 250 square miles.

Currently, the Piute Mountain School has approximately 53 Kindergarten through eighth grade students. The average class size is 15 and the school has 4 regular education teachers and 1 RSP teacher. Our school operates on a single track year round calendar. Piute Mountain School is rural and a one-hour drive to the nearest town.

## **PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION**

**The Governing Board believes that public education is of fundamental importance to a free society and to the continued development of democratic values, individual liberty and an appreciation for cultural diversity in society. In order for education to succeed, there must be an ongoing partnership between parents/guardians, students, educators, and the community.**

**Within this framework, the purpose of the district is to provide the guidance and resources necessary to ensure an environment conducive to learning. However, it is important to emphasize that the goal of our educational system is not to supplant parental responsibilities throughout the learning process. Rather, it is the policy of the Board to foster parental participation in order that an educational climate is created which reinforces and fosters the positive and healthy development of the child.**

**The Board accepts as its primary responsibility the educational welfare of every child. The Board's first goal must be to provide each student with the basic skills necessary to participate and function effectively in society. These skills include, but are not limited to: Reading, writing, mathematical computation, verbal communication, motor skill development, decision-making and self-esteem. In addition, the Board is committed to the goal of achieving academic excellence through a program of instruction, which offers each child an opportunity to develop to the maximum of his/her individual capabilities.**

### **Mission Statement**

**To provide an excellent social and academic education for students of the Caliente Union School District that lead to lifelong learning while providing a safe and friendly environment that involves community partnership and working harmoniously assisting staff, students and guardians.**

### **Goals**

**Support Education by:**

**➤ Allocating Funds Towards**

- 1. Tools that will help staff and students exceed the state adopted standard.**
- 2. A safe and friendly environment.**
- 3. Representing and being accountable to the Caliente Union School District community for the proper management of District funds and Board Policies.**



## **Analysis of Current Instructional Practice Planning Guide**

The following statements are adapted from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title I, Part A and the California Essential Program Components (EPCs). These statements may be used to discuss and develop findings that characterize the instructional program at this school for students:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

## **Standards, Assessment, and Accountability**

### **1. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement**

- State and Local Assessments currently used at Piute Mountain School include but are not limited to:
  - California Standards Test (CST) given annually
  - Curriculum embedded benchmark assessments in RLA and Math given quarterly
  - Harcourt Math and Holt Algebra chapter/unit tests given monthly
  - Houghton Mifflin Language Arts and Holt English Language Arts chapter/unit tests given monthly
  - Accelerated Reader Quizzes given regularly

Piute Mountain teachers are beginning to use the results of state and local assessments to identify and plan targeted instruction for student academic needs. Teachers meet on a bi-weekly basis to address Response to Intervention groups and small group instruction. Evidence of this is documented in lesson plans and PLC agendas. The PLC time is to provide teachers with collaborative time to identify areas of weaknesses and to plan for strategic instruction.

### **2. Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction**

- Piute Mountain School uses assessments provided by district adopted curriculum in Houghton Mifflin and Holt English Language Arts and Harcourt and Holt for Mathematics and Algebra. Teachers will analyze results during bi-weekly PLC meetings. Information gathered during these meetings will be used to modify and regroup instruction to meet the instructional needs of students in small instructional groups within each classroom. The RTI teacher and a group of parent volunteers provide additional intensive intervention.

## **Staffing and Professional Development**

### **3. Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff**

- For the 2010-2011 school year, 100% of certificated staff teaching at Piute Mountain School are highly qualified.

### **4. Principals' AB 75/430 training on State Board of Education adopted instructional materials**

- N/A

**5. Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development in AB 472**

- This year 100% of all General Education Teachers at Piute Mountain School are fully credentialed. The Special Education Teacher will be fully credentialed by July 2011. All Teachers and Administration will complete a publisher provided Ab466 Mathematics training in their assigned grade level. The need for additional training will be determined by monthly Status of the Class meetings.

**6. Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance and professional needs**

- Professional Development at Piute Mountain School is based on student and teacher need. These needs are determined by recommendations from administration and county support staff. We currently have a Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) teacher and an Rtl advisor on campus available for instructional coaching in RLA and math. A County Program Specialist coaches teachers on behavior and classroom management. Future Professional Development needs will be determined by monthly Status of the Class meetings and biweekly PLC collaborations.

**7. Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches)**

- The PAR/Rtl advisor will provide ongoing instructional assistance and support for all teachers in RLA and Math. This assistance will include peer coaching, modeling lessons, and providing staff development. The Administration also makes regular classroom visits to monitor lesson content, pacing and instructional delivery.

**8. Monthly teacher collaboration by grade level (\*K-8)**

- All teachers meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss and collaborate on standards-based instruction, assessment requirements, targeted instruction and intervention needs. Also, PLC meetings immediately following benchmark assessments are used to analyze data, set goals, and set up intervention instruction cycles. These PLC meetings are organized so all teachers K-8 meet collaboratively to have vertical articulation.

**Teaching and Learning**

**9. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards**

During a 1.45 hour block of protected time, grade level standards are taught using district adopted standards based curriculum for RLA. In, 2011 – 2012, district will increase allotted time for RLA to state time guidelines. There are also specific times allotted for other content areas such as Mathematics, Science, History, and P.E. The district has created bimonthly PLC meetings that target district wide usage of benchmark data and analysis, checking over pacing guides, aligning curriculum to content standards, and monitoring Rtl student progress. ‘Status of the Class’ meetings will be held with principal and each teacher twice a quarter.

**10. Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for ELA and mathematics (K-8)**

Piute Mountain School has a daily instructional minutes schedule in place that specifies the minutes allotted for each subject area. We will design, maintain and monitor an instructional day schedule including board approved minutes for standards – based instruction in RLA and Math. We will comply with and monitor teachers’ daily implementation of instructional

time, lesson plans and 'Status of Class' for the current SBE adopted, standards – based core programs through bi – weekly classroom walk – through visits and observations by principal.

**RLA:**

- Grades K: 60 minutes
- Grades 1 – 3: 2.5 hours
- Grades 4 - 6: 2.0
- Grades 6 -8: 1-2 periods

**Math:**

- K: 30 minutes
- Grades 1 – 6: 60 minutes
- Grades 6 – 8: 1 period

**11. Lesson pacing schedule (K-8) for sufficient numbers of intervention courses (K-8):**

The district will provide all grade levels with specific pacing guides for Reading Language Arts and Mathematics on a yearly basis. Pacing guides are reviewed and updated as needed at PLC collaborative meetings. These pacing guides are used to guide instruction and include a timeline to follow, the essential standards to be taught and teaching strategies to be used. Administrator monitors the implementation of pacing guide through lesson plan review and classroom observation.

**12. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups**

- Piute Mountain School provides all students with district-adopted Core Curriculum Materials.

Grade Levels	Subject	Publisher	Adoption Date
K-6	Reading/Language Arts	Houghton Mifflin	2003
K-6	Math	HSP	2010
K-8	Science	Glencoe/MacMillan/McGraw Hill	2008
6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup>	History	Glencoe/MacMillan/McGraw Hill	2006
K-5 <sup>th</sup>	History	MacMillan/McGraw Hill	2007
7 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup>	Reading/Language Arts	Holt Rhinehart	2004
7 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup>	Math	Holt Rhinehart	2010

**13. Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned materials, including intervention materials, and for high school students, access to standards-aligned core courses**

Piute Mountain School uses SBE – adopted and standards – aligned materials for Reading Language Arts and Mathematics. Teachers and Paraprofessionals also use SBE – adopted intervention materials for in – class and after school intervention for both subjects. Administration monitors the use of such materials through classroom observations and lesson plan review.

**Opportunity and Equal Educational Access**

**14. Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards**

- As defined by the state, the term under-performing is any student who tests at Basic and below on the California Standards Tests. At the school level, we further identify students by using curriculum embedded benchmark assessments. Students who are identified as needing additional help are grouped with students of similar needs and receive weekly intervention during the school day. During this intervention time, the RtI teacher teaches the intensively identified students, however, we are implementing in-class small group interventions to meet the needs of strategically identified students. The materials used during this time are the core curriculum and supplemental materials

**15. Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement at this school**

Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement implemented at this school include: standards-based curriculum, curriculum embedded assessments and PLC meetings. Teachers collaborate to analyze assessments and plan instructional intervention. Teacher are required to note standards being taught into weekly lesson plans and approved by administration.

**INVOLVEMENT**

**16. Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under performing students**

<b>Family</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Community</b>
<b>Food</b>	RTI	RTI	Kern County Bookmobile
<b>Shelter</b>	KEDS	KEDS	
<b>Time Management</b>	Kern County Mental Health	Kern County Mental Health	
<b>Quiet Study Area</b>	Homework Club / tutoring	Homework Club / tutoring	
<b>Student Planner Review</b>	Back to School Night / Open House / Parent conferences	Back to School Night / Open House / Parent conferences	

	Parent Project	Parent Project	
	Library check out	Library check out	

**17. Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, other school personnel, and students in secondary schools, in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of consolidated application programs (5 EC CCR 3932)**

Piute Mountain School Site Council is composed of principal, classroom teacher, classified staff member, parents, and community member. Voting members are elected for a 2 year term. Members are notified via phone 72 hours in advance. The school community is notified of meetings through a school notice and postings listed on calendars are visible. Piute Mountain School Site Council reviews and approves the school plan and proposed expenditures and recommends them to the District's governing board for adoption in accordance with the District's governing board policy and State laws.

**FUNDING**

**18. Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards**

- The Piute Mountain School Afterschool Program has homework club, tutoring and Response to Intervention for underperforming students. Paraprofessionals and teachers provide instruction.
- The school has time set aside each day for individual instruction in RLA using Read Naturally and AIMSWeb to provide services to under-performing students.

**19. Fiscal Support**

STATE PROGRAMS

- EIA amount: \$9,963.00
- Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular school program with the focus areas being RLA and Math.

FEDERAL PROGAMS

- Title I amount: \$22,548.00
- Upgrade the entire educational program of the school with the focus areas being RLA and Math.

- REAP amount: \$18,142.00
- The purpose of this program is to provide financial assistance to rural districts to assist them in meeting their state's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP). The school uses REAP funds to operate the Rtl program.

## Summary of Findings

### I. Summary of Findings from APS Data, Analysis of Current Educational Practice Data, and Parent and Student Input:

#### A. Strengths of academic program:

- We have highly qualified staff.
- We now have State Board of Education-adopted core instructional programs for Reading/Language Arts and Math and are used by every student every day.
- Bi-monthly PLC meetings are scheduled and provide collaboration time for all teachers. All teachers meet on a bi-monthly basis to discuss and collaborate on standards-based instruction, assessment requirements, targeted instruction and intervention needs. Also, PLC meetings immediately following benchmark assessments are used to analyze data, set goals, and set up intervention instruction cycles. These PLC meetings are organized so all teachers K-8 meet collaboratively to have vertical articulation.
- The school uses a Program Specialist to professionally develop teachers in latest behavior and classroom management techniques and strategies.
- As per school home survey, Rtl is meeting the needs of 75% of our students; the G.A.T.E. program is meeting the needs of 70%.

#### B. Areas of need in the academic program:

- The school needs to design, maintain and monitor an instructional day schedule including board-approved minutes for standards-based instruction in RLA and math.
- The school needs to explore options in SBE-adopted intensive intervention materials in RLA and Math/Algebra and time/personnel to address the needs.
- The school needs to provide more instructional assistance and support to teachers in RLA and math through coaches who work with teachers in class to deepen their knowledge about the content and instructional delivery.
- The school needs to provide each teacher with pacing schedules for RLA and Math programs to ensure content coverage.

### IV. Overall Conclusions:

Piute Mountain School implements SBE-adopted core curriculum in both RLA and Math/Algebra. Bi-monthly PLC meetings are scheduled and provide collaboration time for all teachers. All teachers meet on a bi-monthly basis to discuss and collaborate on standards-based instruction, assessment requirements, targeted instruction and intervention needs. Also, PLC meetings immediately following benchmark assessments are used to analyze data, set goals, and set up intervention instruction cycles. These PLC meetings are organized so all teachers K-8 meet collaboratively to have vertical articulation. Additional instructional support is needed with PAR/Rtl advisor to model lessons and focus on instructional delivery. School will also implement an instructional day schedule following state guidelines for instructional minutes in both RLA and Math.

By following the proposed goals, Piute Mountain School is confident that we will lift out of Program Improvement and provide our students with a top notch education.

### 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 Programs	Allocation
<input type="checkbox"/> California School Age Families Education <u>Purpose:</u> Assist expectant and parenting students succeed in school.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education <u>Purpose:</u> Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program.	\$ 9963.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program <u>Purpose:</u> Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> High Priority Schools Grant Program <u>Purpose:</u> Assist schools in meeting academic growth targets.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform <u>Purpose:</u> Train classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum areas.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peer Assistance and Review <u>Purpose:</u> Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring.	\$ 2048.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Pupil Retention Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Prevent students from dropping out of school.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Improve library and other school programs.	\$ 10,026.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School Safety and Violence Prevention Act <u>Purpose:</u> Increase school safety.	\$ 7989.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Tobacco-Use Prevention Education <u>Purpose:</u> Eliminate tobacco use among students.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> List and Describe Other State or Local funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education)	\$ 3451.00 GATE 4643.00 Arts
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school	\$ 38,120.00

Federal Programs under No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	Allocation
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Neglected <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement instruction for children abandoned, abused, or neglected who have been placed in an institution	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part D: Delinquent <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement instruction for delinquent youth	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program <u>Purpose:</u> Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program <u>Purpose:</u> Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency	\$ 22,548.00
<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	\$
<input checked="" 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	\$ 5528.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology <u>Purpose:</u> Support professional development and the use of technology	\$ 318.00
<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	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV, Part A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities <u>Purpose:</u> Support learning environments that promote academic achievement	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title V: Innovative Programs <u>Purpose:</u> Support educational improvement, library, media, and at-risk students	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title VI, Part B: Rural Education Achievement <u>Purpose:</u> Provide flexibility in the use of NCLB funds to eligible LEAs	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Federal Funds (list and describe <sup>1</sup> ) R.E.A.P. Rural Education Achievement Program	\$ 18,142.00
Total amount of federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$52,173.00
Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$90,293.00

<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.



**Form D: School Site Council Membership**

*Education Code* Section 64001(g) requires that the SPSA 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 school site council is as follows:

Names of Members	Principal	Classroom Teacher	Other School Staff	Parent or Community Member	Secondary Student
Kathleen S. Hansen	x				
Tammie Wagner		x			
Jeanne Seno			x		
Mike Lopes				x	
Fritz Mayer				x	
Kerri Caffee				x	
Numbers of members of each category	1	1	1	3	

## Form E: Recommendations and Assurances

The school site council recommends this school plan and proposed 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:

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 LEA Plan.
5. This school plan is based on 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 at a public meeting on: December 13, 2010.

Attested:

Kathleen S. Hansen

Typed name of school principal

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of school principal

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Mike Lopes

Typed name of SSC chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of SSC chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



## FORM A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The school site council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered **the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet API and AYP** growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of student groups not meeting state standards:

<p>SCHOOL GOAL # 1  <b>67.6% of all 2-8 students at Piute Mountain School will meet proficient or advanced levels in RLA as measured on 2010-11 CST.</b></p>					
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal:  <b>Grades 2- 8</b></p>		<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:</p>			
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal:  <b>INDICATORS:</b>  <b>CSTs</b>  <b>Curriculum-embedded Assessments</b>  <b>Classroom assessments</b></p>		<p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:  <b>Annual API growth</b></p>			
<p>Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal            Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)</p>	<p>Start Date            Completion            Date</p>	<p>Person            Responsible</p>	<p>Proposed            Expenditures</p>	<p>Estimated            Cost</p>	<p>Funding            Source</p>
<p><b>Core Curriculum/Daily Instruction</b>  <b>1. Design, maintain and monitor an instructional day schedule including board approved minutes for standards-based instruction in RLA.</b>  <b>2. Comply with and monitor teachers' daily implementation of instructional time, lesson plans and status of class for the current SBE-adopted, standards-based core programs through bi-weekly classroom walk-through visits and observations by the principal. (APS 7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade K: 60 minutes</li> <li>• Grades 1-3: 2.5 hours</li> </ul>	<p>Jan, 2011 –            Jun, 2011</p>	<p>Teachers            Administrator</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to Curriculum, materials, technology, training</p>		<p>EIA, REAP,            Title I, Title II</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grades 4-6: 2.0</li> <li>Grades 6-8: 1-2 periods</li> </ul>					
<b>Pacing Guides</b> 1. Develop, distribute, and monitor the use of an annual district instructional/assessment pacing guide documented to be in use for each grade level (K-8). (APS 16) 2. Use state identified RLA “Key Standards” to narrow focus of standards being taught to students. 3. Organize quarterly plan of weekly standards to be taught (learning goals), assessed and monitored.	Jan, 2011 – Jun, 2011	Teachers Administrator			
4. Develop and maintain standards-based lesson plans to be authorized weekly by site administrator. Includes key standard, SGI plan, RtI and assessment.					
<b>RLA- Response to Intervention</b> 1. Identify proficiency levels of all students on 2009/2010 CST and organize focus groups (basic and below). 2. Use <u>benchmark data</u> as formative assessment to align students into groups (benchmark, strategic, intensive) in which re-teaching intervention or enrichment can take place. 3. Utilize parent and community involvement. 4. Use blueprints of CST released items to set mini-assessments to be used in focus group teaching to see if learning goals have been met at 80% proficiency rate. 5. Partnerships through PLC days to set appropriate re-teaching or enrichment activities and post assessments to check for 80% proficiency rate. (APS 35/Step16)	July, 2010 – June, 2011  July 2011 – Jun 2012	Teachers Administrator RSP	Expenditures include, but not limited to Intervention curriculum, staff, materials, technology	6,800.00	EIA, REAP, Title I, Title II

<p>6. Implement daily RLA intervention to students identified as <i>intensive</i> in grades 4-8 using SBE-adopted Intervention Materials and following SBE-adopted timelines. <b>(APS 3, 11)</b></p> <p>a. Grades 4-6: 2.5-3.0 hours b. Grades 7-8: 2.5-3.0</p> <p>7. Implement additional instructional time within the school day for students identified for <i>strategic</i> support in RLA using the current SBE-adopted core curriculum. <b>(APS 8)</b></p> <p>a. Grades K-6: 30 minutes b. Grades 6-8: 30-45 minutes</p>					
<p><b>Benchmark Assessments</b></p> <p>1. Set school-wide, quarterly benchmark testing days on campus for students, staff and teachers to maintain a testing environment.</p> <p>2. Assess students using SBE adopted curriculum's benchmark assessments and explore blueprints and compare Houghton Mifflin RLA benchmarks results at the end of every quarter.</p> <p>3. Collect, analyze, and set goals around quarterly benchmark assessments at the PLC bi-monthly meeting immediately following assessment days using district provided data collection matrix.</p> <p>4. Use a monitoring system that provides timely data from common assessments to aide in grouping students, identifying areas of re-teaching and makes disaggregating data useful for teacher analyzing. <b>(APS 31)</b></p>	<p>July 2010 – Jun 2011</p> <p>July 2011 – Jun 2012</p>	<p>Teachers Administrator</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to specific monitoring system/program, staff, materials, technology necessary to monitor benchmarks and identifying areas of need</p>	<p>3,600.00</p>	<p>EIA, REAP, Title I, Title II</p>
<p><b>Professional Development</b></p> <p>1. Understand RTI (pyramid model) and set up appropriate focus groups for in-class small group intervention opportunities in CORE</p>	<p>July 2010 – June 2011</p>	<p>Rti Advisor, PAR, Administrator</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to specialized staff training, workshops,</p>	<p>\$5,528.00</p>	<p>Title II</p>

<p>curriculum materials.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Provide instructional assistance and ongoing support to all teachers including coaching, demonstration lessons, and onsite professional development. <b>(APS 29)</b></li> <li>3. Facilitate and support structured, bi-monthly PLC meetings for teacher to analyze, discuss and plan instruction. <b>(APS 35)</b></li> <li>4. Assist teachers with planning and preparation, teacher collaboration, student goal setting, data analysis and strategies for effective instruction and incorporate a teaching/mentoring component. <b>(APS 29)</b></li> <li>5. Principal/Admin will monitor through monthly Status of the Class meetings with individual teachers.</li> </ol>	<p>July 2011 – Jun 2012</p>		<p>printing, supplies, staff</p>		
<p><b>Parental Involvement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Parents will be provided multiple opportunities to participate in trainings or meetings to assist in helping their students achieve academically and improve home-to-school, school-to-home communication. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent – teacher conferences</li> <li>• Back to School Night</li> <li>• SSC meetings</li> <li>• School Board meetings</li> <li>• Kindergarten orientation</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>July 2010 – Jun 2011  July 2011 – Jun 2012</p>	<p>Teachers Administrator Parents</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to printing, supplies, staff</p>		

## FORM A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The school site council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet API and AYP growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of student groups not meeting state standards:

<p>SCHOOL GOAL # 2  <b>68.5% of all 2-8 students at Piute Mountain School will meet proficient or advanced levels in Mathematics as measured on 2010/2010CST.</b></p>						
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal:  <b>Grades 2- 8</b></p>			<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group:</p>			
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal:  <b>INDICATORS:</b>  <b>CSTs</b>  <b>Curriculum-embedded Assessments</b>  <b>Classroom assessments</b></p>			<p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains:  <b>Annual API growth</b></p>			
<p>Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal            Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)</p>		<p>Start Date            Completion            Date</p>	<p>Person            Responsible</p>	<p>Proposed            Expenditures</p>	<p>Estimated            Cost</p>	<p>Funding            Source</p>
<p><b>Core Curriculum/Daily Instruction</b>            1. Design, maintain and monitor an instructional day schedule including board approved minutes for standards-based instruction in Math.            2. Comply with and monitor daily implementation of instructional time for the current SBE-adopted, standards-based core programs.  <b>(APS 12)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade K: 30 minutes</li> <li>• Grades 1-6: 60 minutes</li> <li>• Grades 6-8: 1 period</li> </ul>		<p>Jan, 2011 –            Jun, 2011</p>	<p>Teachers            Administrator</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to Curriculum, materials, technology, training</p>		<p>EIA, REAP,            Title I, Title II</p>
<p><b>Pacing Guides</b></p>						



<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop, distribute, and monitor the use of an annual district instructional/assessment pacing guide documented to be in use for each grade level (K-8). (APS 17)</li> <li>2. Use state identified "Key Standards" to narrow focus of standards being taught to students.</li> <li>3. Organize quarterly plan of weekly standards to be taught (learning goals), assessed and monitored.</li> <li>4. Develop and maintain standards-based lesson plans (block plan?) to be authorized weekly by the site administrator. Includes key standard, SGI plan and assessment.</li> </ol>	<p>Jan, 2011 – Jun, 2011</p>	<p>Teachers Administrator</p>			
<p><b>Math- Response to Intervention</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify proficiency levels of all students on 2009/2010 CST and organize focus groups (basic and below).</li> <li>2. Use <u>benchmark data</u> as formative assessment to align students into groups (benchmark, strategic, intensive) in which re-teaching intervention or enrichment can take place.</li> <li>3. Use blueprints of CST released items to set mini-assessments to be used in focus group teaching to see if learning goals have been met at 80% proficiency rate.</li> <li>4. Partnerships through PLC days to set appropriate re-teaching or enrichment activities and post assessments to check for 80% proficiency rate. (APS 35/Step16)</li> <li>5. Implement daily Algebra intervention to students identified as <b>intensive</b> in grades 8 using SBE-adopted Intervention Materials and following SBE-adopted timelines (APS 6, 15)</li> </ol>	<p>July 2010 – June 2011</p> <p>July 2011 – Jun 2012</p>	<p>Teachers Administrator RSP</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to Curriculum, materials, technology, training</p>		<p>EIA, REAP, Title I, Title II</p>

<p>6. Implement daily Math intervention to students identified as <b>intensive</b> in grades 4-7 using SBE-adopted Intervention Materials and following SBE-adopted timelines. (APS 5, 15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grades 4-6: 15-30 minutes</li> <li>• Grades 6-7: 30-60 minutes</li> <li>• Grade 8: 1 hour period</li> </ul> <p>7. Implement additional instructional time within the school day for students identified for <b>strategic</b> support in Math using the current SBE-adopted core curriculum. (APS 13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grades 4-6: 15-30 minutes</li> <li>• Grades 6-7: 30-45 minutes</li> <li>• Grade 8: 30-60 minutes</li> </ul>					
<p><b>Benchmark Assessments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Set school-wide, quarterly benchmark testing days on campus for students, staff and teachers to maintain a testing environment.</li> <li>2. Assess students using SBE adopted curriculum's benchmark assessments at the end of every quarter.</li> <li>3. Collect, analyze, and set goals around quarterly benchmark assessments at the PLC bi-monthly meeting immediately following assessment days using district provided data collection matrix.</li> <li>4. Use a monitoring system that provides timely data from common assessments to aide in grouping students, identifying areas of re-teaching and makes disaggregating data useful for teacher analyzing. (APS 33)</li> <li>5. Participate in publisher provided AB472 SBE-adopted core curriculum.</li> <li>6. Understand RTI (pyramid model) and set up</li> </ol>	<p>July 2010 – June 2011</p> <p>July 2011 – Jun 2012</p>	<p>Teachers Administrator</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to specific monitoring system/program, staff, materials, technology necessary to monitor benchmarks and identifying areas of need</p>		<p>EIA, REAP, Title I, Title II</p>

<p>appropriate focus groups for in-class small group intervention opportunities in CORE curriculum materials.</p> <p>7. Provide instructional assistance and ongoing support to all teachers including coaching, demonstration lessons, and onsite professional development. (APS 30)</p> <p>8. Facilitate and support structured, bi-monthly PLC meetings for teacher to analyze, discuss and plan instruction. (APS 35)</p> <p>9. Assist teachers with planning and preparation, teacher collaboration, student goal setting, data analysis and strategies for effective instruction. (APS 30)</p> <p>10. Principal/Admin will monitor through monthly Status of the Class meetings with individual teachers.</p>					
<p><b>Parental Involvement</b></p> <p>2. Parents will be provided multiple opportunities to participate in trainings or meetings to assist in helping their students achieve academically and improve home-to-school, school-to-home communication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent – teacher conferences</li> <li>• Back to School Night</li> <li>• SSC meetings</li> <li>• School Board meetings</li> <li>• Kindergarten orientation</li> </ul>	<p>July 2010 – Jun 2011</p> <p>July 2011 – Jun 2012</p>	<p>Teachers Administrator Parents</p>	<p>Expenditures include, but not limited to printing, supplies, staff</p>		

**APPENDIX A: Table 4 STAR CST Data for Language Arts**

<b>GRADE 2</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	17	25	38	36	23	42	100	100	44	+83	+75	+6
	AA	0	0	34	0	0	33	0	0	36	0	0	+2
	Hispanic	0	0	32	50	50	35	100	100	39	+100	+100	+7
	White	25	33	51	33	33	57	100	100	55	+75	+67	+4
	SED	20	17	31	40	36	34	100	100	37	+80	+83	+6
	EL			24			28			32			+8
	SWD			15			16			16			+1
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	0	13	31	27	25	29	0	0	28	0	-13	-3
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	84	63	30	36	41	28	0	0	28	-84	-63	-2
<b>GRADE 3</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	33	33	30	14	11	34	33	30	34	0	-3	+4
	AA	0	0	23	0	0	28	0	0	26	0	0	+3
	Hispanic	100	100	21	100	50	27	67	67	26	-33	-33	+6
	White	20	20	44	0	0	49	33	33	49	+13	+13	+5
	SED	67	67	22	0	0	27	38	33	26	-31	-34	+4
	EL			10			12			13			+3
	SWD			12			18			17			+5
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	44	44	36	29	33	30	33	30	33	-11	-14	-3
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	22	22	35	58	55	35	33	40	33	+11	+18	-2

<b>GRADE 4</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	54	54	44	80	80	51	34	38	53	-20	-16	+9
	AA	0	0	37	0	0	40	0	0	46	0	0	+9
	Hispanic	100	100	35	100	100	43	100	50	46	0	-50	+11
	White	44	44	60	100	100	66	20	34	65	-24	-10	+5
	SED	38	38	35	80	80	43	0	0	45	-38	-38	+10
	EL			15			21			24			+9
	SWD			16			23			27			+11
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	31	50	32	10	10	28	17	13	26	-14	-37	-6
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	15	26	23	10	10	22	50	50	20	+35	+24	-3

<b>GRADE 5</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	54	54	37	11	11	42	30	30	47	-24	-24	+10
	AA	0	0	27	0	0	35	0	0	36			+9
	Hispanic	50	50	29	0	0	34	100	100	40	+50	+50	+11
	White	60	60	52	20	20	58	0	17	60	-60	-43	+8
	SED	29	29	29	14	14	33	20	20	39	-9	-9	+10
	EL			9			9			12			+3
	SWD			9			15			19			+10
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	31	31	37	44	44	33	40	40	30	+9	+9	-7
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	15	25	26	30	30	25	30	30	22	+15	-5	-4

<b>GRADE 6</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	54	54	38	35	35	43	13	13	44	-41	-41	+6
	AA	0	0	28	0	0	33	0	0	39	0	0	+11
	Hispanic	50	50	30	67	67	35	0	0	37	-50	-51	+7
	White	60	60	51	30	30	56	25	25	57	-35	-35	+6
	SED	29	29	29	20	20	33	20	20	37	-9	-9	+8
	EL			8			8			7			-1
	SWD			5			11			14			+9
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	31	31	34	57	57	33	63	63	33	+32	+32	-1
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	15	15	28	7	7	25	26	26	23	-11	-9	-5

<b>GRADE 7</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	43	53	39	46	46	44	42	38	45	-1	-15	+6
	AA	0	0	27	0	0	36	0	0	37	0	0	+10
	Hispanic	75	75	31	100	100	26	50	33	38	-25	-42	+7
	White	43	60	53	36	36	59	40	14	59	-3	-46	+6
	SED	40	45	30	33	33	36	22	20	36	-18	-25	+6
	EL			7			6			7			-
	SWD			6			9			10			+4
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	29	24	28	38	0	31	42	46	29	+13	+22	+1
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	28	24	33	15	0	25	17	15	26	-11	-9	-7

<b>GRADE 8</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	64	64	36	57	59	39	44	44	44	20	20	+8
	AA	0	0	24	0	0	26	0	0	36	0	0	+12
	Hispanic	25	25	29	75	75	32	100	100	36	+75	+75	+7
	White	89	89	50	71	71	52	38	38	58	-51	-51	+8
	SED	67	67	28	60	60	30	43	43	36	-24	-24	+8
	EL			5			4			6			+1
	SWD			5			9			10			+5
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	21	21	32	36	35	32	0	0	30	-21	-21	-2
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	14	14	32	7	6	29	55	55	26	+41	+41	-6

**APPENDIX A: Table 5 STAR CST Data for Mathematics**

<b>GRADE 2</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	17	25	49	36	23	54	71	100	54	+54	+75	+5
	AA	0	0	37	0	0	41	0	0	38	0	0	+1
	Hispanic	100	100	42	50	50	47	50	50	49	-50	-50	+7
	White	25	33	61	33	33	68	75	75	66	+50	+42	+5
	SED	20	17	42	40	36	47	80	80	48	+60	+63	+6
	EL			36			42			45			+9
	SWD			21			28			27			+6
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	33	25	25	36	33	23	14	25	22	-19	0	-3
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	50	51	28	27	33	24	14	50	23	-36	-1	-5

<b>GRADE 3</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	56	56	50	28	22	55	55	50	57	+1	+6	+7
	AA	0	0	37	0	0	43	0	0	41	0	0	+4
	Hispanic	100	100	44	100	50	51	67	67	52	-33	-33	+8
	White	60	60	62	20	17	67	33	33	69	-27	-27	+7
	SED	67	67	44	17	17	50	63	55	51	-4	-12	+7
	EL			35			39			42			+7
	SWD			27			31			38			+9
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	33	33	25	29	22	22	11	10	23	-22	-23	-2
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	11	11	25	43	55	23	33	40	20	+22	+29	-5



GRADE 4		2008			2009			2010			Percent Difference		
Proficiency Level		%			%			%			2008-10		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	38	38	49	50	50	56	50	51	59	-12	-13	+10
	AA	0	0	37	0	0	43	0	0	48	0	0	+11
	Hispanic	0	0	45	100	100	52	100	50	56	+100	+50	+11
	White	50	50	59	50	50	65	40	50	64	-10	0	+5
	SED	50	50	43	40	40	51	25	20	54	-25	-30	+11
	EL			31			36			41			+10
	SWD			20			27			36			+16
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	38	38	26	30	30	23	17	0	23	-21	-38	-3
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	25	25	24	20	20	20	50	51	17	+25	+26	-7

GRADE 5		2008			2009			2010			Percent Difference		
Proficiency Level		%			%			%			2008-10		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	23	23	40	11	11	47	33	0	51	-10	+23	+11
	AA	0	0	26	0	0	37	0	0	37	0	0	+11
	Hispanic	0	0	34	0	0	41	0	0	48	0	0	+14
	White	22	22	50	20	20	57	0	0	56	+22	+22	+6
	SED	0	0	32	14	14	41	25	0	45	25	0	+13
	EL			18			21			29			+11
	SWD			13			18			21			+8
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	23	23	27	33	33	23	0	30	24	-23	+7	-3
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	53	30	34	55	55	30	50	70	25	-3	+40	-3

<b>GRADE 6</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	23	23	34	21	21	38	13	13	42	-10	-10	+8
	AA	0	0	21	0	0	28	0	0	31	0	0	+10
	Hispanic	0	0	28	33	33	33	0	0	37	0	0	+9
	White	30	30	45	20	20	48	25	25	49	-5	-5	+4
	SED	0	0	27	10	10	31	0	0	36	0	0	+9
	EL			10			11			13			+3
	SWD			6			12			15			+9
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	38	38	30	50	50	28	38	38	29	0	0	-1
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	38	38	36	29	29	33	50	50	30	+12	+12	-6

<b>GRADE 7 Math</b>		<b>2008</b>			<b>2009</b>			<b>2010</b>			<b>Percent Difference</b>		
<b>Proficiency Level</b>		<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>%</b>			<b>2008-10</b>		
		School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	31	33	34	31	31	36	8	8	42	-13	-25	+8
	AA	0	0	21	0	0	26	0	0	31	0	0	+10
	Hispanic	50	50	29	0	0	31	0	0	39	-50	-50	+10
	White	33	38	43	36	36	44	10	33	48	-23	-5	+5
	SED	22	20	27	22	22	30	0	0	36	-22	-20	+9
	EL			9			9			15			+6
	SWD			6			7			11			+5
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	23	20	30	23	38	32	75	69	30	+52	+49	-
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	46	47	36	46	15	31	17	23	28	+29	+24	-8

GRADE 8 Gen Math		2008			2009			2010			Percent Difference		
Proficiency Level		%			%			%			2008-10		
		School	LEA	County 7,694	School	LEA	County 6,791	School	LEA	County 5,997	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	50	50	26	33	43	23	29	29	25	-11	-11	-1
	AA	0	0	17	0	0	12	0	0	16	0	0	-1
	Hispanic	25	25	23	33	33	18	0	0	20	-25	-25	-3
	White	80	80	34	33	0	31	29	29	34	-51	-51	-
	SED	50	50	21	33	33	17	33	33	20	-17	-17	-1
	EL			10			9			8			-2
	SWD			5			5			4			-1
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	10	10	28	8	7	33	14	14	32	+4	+4	+4
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	40	40	45	58	50	44	58	58	43	+18	+18	-2

GRADE 8 Algebra		2008			2009			2010			Percent Difference		
Proficiency Level		%			%			%			2008-10		
		School	LEA	County 5,322	School	LEA	County 5,877	School	LEA	County 6,584	School	LEA	County
<b>Proficient/Advanced</b>	<b>ALL</b>	25	25	41	0	33	43			44	-25	-25	+3
	AA			28			38			32			+4
	Hispanic			35			36	100		40	+100	0	+5
	White			49			54			52			+3
	SED			34			36			39			+5
	EL			14			11			18			+4
	SWD			18			13			24			+6
<b>Basic</b>	<b>ALL</b>	75	75	31	50	33	26	100	100	26	+25	+25	-5
<b>BB/FBB</b>	<b>ALL</b>	0	0	28	50	33	31	0	0	30	0	0	+2

**APPENDIX B: Table 6 Mean Scale Score Data for Language Arts**

<b>GRADE 2</b>												
	<b>School</b>				<b>District</b>				<b>Kern County</b>			
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	274	338.1	396.9	+122.9	396.0	333.2	396.9	+27.9	334.1	336.4	341.1	7.0
<b>EL</b>									314.9	317.2	323.9	9.0
<b>SWD</b>									291.8	293.7	293.5	1.7
<b>GRADE 3</b>												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	331.8	302.6	333.4	+2.2		295.3	334.0		319.8	326.0	327.2	7.4
<b>EL</b>									293.0	294.9	298.8	5.8
<b>SWD</b>									280.0	290.2	290.2	10.2
<b>GRADE 4</b>												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	334	369.7	323.5	-10.5		369.7	323.5		342.7	350.2	353.3	10.6
<b>EL</b>									309.4	314.2	317.0	7.6
<b>SWD</b>									296.3	306.6	314.3	18.0

GRADE 5					District				Kern County			
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	350.1	317.4	332	-18.1		317.4	332		333.4	340.2	343.6	10.2
<b>EL</b>									300.9	298.7	303.7	2.8
<b>SWD</b>									287.2	291.7	300.6	13.4
<b>GRADE 6</b>												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	351	346.2	318.5	-32.5		346.2	318.5		332.6	339.2	342.5	9.9
<b>EL</b>									296.3	298.2	297.1	.8
<b>SWD</b>									279.3	291.6	294.8	15.5
<b>GRADE 7</b>												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	334.8	358.6	347.5	+12.7		358.6	347.5		333.0	339.8	340.4	7.4
<b>EL</b>									286.4	290.2	288.0	1.6
<b>SWD</b>									269.1	282.5	282.8	13.7

GRADE 8					District				Kern County			
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	370	345	335.7	-34.3		349.4	335.7		328.8	334.9	342.9	14.1
<b>EL</b>									284.9	284.6	286.8	1.9
<b>SWD</b>									267.5	281.0	282.7	15.2

**APPENDIX B: Table 7 Mean Scale Score Data for Mathematics**

<b>GRADE 2</b>												
	<b>School</b>				<b>District</b>				<b>Kern County</b>			
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Differenc e 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	296.5	341	389.9	+93.4	373.5	334.2	389.9	+16.4	350.2	356.5	363.0	12.8
<b>EL</b>									329.5	336.0	346.1	16.6
<b>SWD</b>									294.6	300.9	298.0	3.4
<b>GRADE 3</b>												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	360.6	319.7	356.7	-3.9		300.6	356.7		355.7	366.1	374.3	18.6
<b>EL</b>									326.8	332.0	343.5	16.7
<b>SWD</b>									300.1	317.5	328.5	28.4
<b>GRADE 4</b>												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	338.9	331.8	317.8	-21.1		331.8	317.8		352.2	362.7	369.8	17.6
<b>EL</b>									323.1	329.4	339.4	16.3
<b>SWD</b>									299.4	311.1	326.2	26.8

GRADE 5					District				Kern County			
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>School</b>												
<b>ALL</b>	308	283.6	282.9	-25.1		283.6	282.9		338.6	352.6	360.3	21.7
<b>EL</b>									302.2	304.0	317.8	15.6
<b>SWD</b>									280.4	289.9	299.5	19.1
GRADE 6												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	328.5	323.8	290	-38.5		323.8	290		330.6	335.8	342.4	11.8
<b>EL</b>									294.5	292.9	299.1	4.6
<b>SWD</b>									272.6	281.8	291.2	18.6
GRADE 7												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
<b>ALL</b>	310.2	312.9	329.8	+19.6		312.9	329.8		327.5	333.9	342.1	14.6
<b>EL</b>									290.1	291.3	297.8	7.7
<b>SWD</b>									270.9	277.8	283.9	13.0



GRADE 8 General Math					District				Kern County			
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
ALL	332.7	312.8	295.3	-37.4		333.9	295.3		312.5	311.7	311.9	-0.6
EL									287.8	288.4	286.6	-1.2
SWD									264.8	267.7	266.0	1.2
<b>GRADE 8 Algebra 1</b>												
	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2008-10
ALL	333.3	306	313	-20.3		321	313		341.5	343.6	346.4	4.9
EL									294.0	288.1	301.1	7.1
SWD									298.3	284.3	312.6	14.3