

The Single Plan for Student Achievement

for

Rancho Cotate High School

49-73882-4935482

CDS Code:

Date of this revision: October 28, 2013

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: Robert Steffen
Position: Principal
Telephone Number: 707.792.4753
Address: 5450 Snyder Lane
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
E-mail Address: robert_steffen@crpusd.org

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan .

Part One: Analysis of Verifiable State Data, including the API, AYP, and the California English Language Development Test

The purpose of this section is to gather data about your school right now. You then use that information to determine goals and actions. You can include a school profile which gives background about your school and provides context for the plan.

The School Profile

See Appendixes

Data Collection and Analysis

Review your student achievement data, and other sources of information regarding current conditions. ***This step is IMPORTANT!*** Review data with key stakeholders including teachers, Leadership Team, Site Council, ELAC, etc. Your goals and actions should be based on an analysis of student achievement data.

For the plan, **provide charts of student achievement** provided by Key Data Systems and Illuminate from the CST, CELDT, CAHSEE (as appropriate).

Table 1: Academic Performance Index by Student Group

| PROFICIENCY LEVEL | API GROWTH BY STUDENT GROUP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------------------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | All Students | | | White | | | African-American | | | Asian | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Number Included | 1,124 | 1,043 | 1,066 | 624 | 522 | 525 | 26 | 26 | 35 | 64 | 56 | 44 |
| Growth API | 718 | 733 | 735 | 740 | 765 | 767 | 661 | 659 | 687 | 724 | 769 | 741 |
| Base API | 717 | 717 | 744 | 741 | 740 | 772 | 629 | 659 | 675 | 762 | 718 | 773 |
| Target | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Growth | 1 | 16 | -9 | -1 | 25 | -5 | | | | | | |
| Met Target | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | | | | | | |

| PROFICIENCY LEVEL | API GROWTH BY STUDENT GROUP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------|------|------------------|------|------|---------------------------------|------|------|----------------------------|------|------|
| | Hispanic | | | English Learners | | | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | | | Students with Disabilities | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Number Included | 329 | 385 | 398 | 208 | 236 | 255 | 374 | 382 | 511 | 167 | 145 | 127 |
| Growth API | 674 | 685 | 700 | 611 | 621 | 631 | 651 | 676 | 690 | 540 | 529 | 556 |
| Base API | 667 | 672 | 703 | 621 | 608 | 641 | 672 | 648 | 693 | 507 | 538 | 543 |
| Target | 7 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 13 | 13 |
| Growth | 7 | 13 | -3 | -10 | 13 | -10 | -21 | 28 | -3 | 33 | -9 | 13 |
| Met Target | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |

Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 2 - Title III Accountability (School Data)

| AMAO 1 | Annual Growth | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------|---------|
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Number of Annual Testers | | | 125 |
| Percent with Prior Year Data | | | 100.0% |
| Number in Cohort | | | 125 |
| Number Met | | | 81 |
| Percent Met | | | 64.8% |
| NCLB Target | 54.6 | 56.0 | 57.5 |
| Met Target | | | Yes |

| AMAO 2 | Attaining English Proficiency | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| | 2010-11 | | 2011-12 | | 2012-13 | |
| | Years of EL instruction | | Years of EL instruction | | Years of EL instruction | |
| | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More |
| Number in Cohort | | | | | 17 | 120 |
| Number Met | | | | | -- | 67 |
| Percent Met | | | | | -- | 55.8% |
| NCLB Target | 18.7 | 43.2 | 20.1 | 45.1 | 21.4 | 47.0 |
| Met Target | | | | | * | Yes |

| AMAO 3 | Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------|---------|
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| English-Language Arts | | | |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | No | No |
| Mathematics | | | |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | Yes | No |

Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 3 - Title III Accountability (District Data)

| AMAO 1 | Annual Growth | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------|---------|
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Number of Annual Testers | 905 | 900 | 867 |
| Percent with Prior Year Data | 99.9 | 99.2 | 100.0 |
| Number in Cohort | 904 | 893 | 867 |
| Number Met | 549 | 561 | 491 |
| Percent Met | 60.7 | 62.8 | 56.6 |
| NCLB Target | 54.6 | 56.0 | 57.5 |
| Met Target | Yes | Yes | No |

| AMAO 2 | Attaining English Proficiency | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| | 2010-11 | | 2011-12 | | 2012-13 | |
| | Years of EL instruction | | Years of EL instruction | | Years of EL instruction | |
| | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More | Less Than 5 | 5 Or More |
| Number in Cohort | 681 | 399 | 684 | 395 | 724 | 384 |
| Number Met | 157 | 225 | 169 | 213 | 162 | 191 |
| Percent Met | 23.1 | 56.4 | 24.7 | 53.9 | 22.4 | 49.7 |
| NCLB Target | 18.7 | 43.2 | 20.1 | 45.1 | 21.4 | 47.0 |
| Met Target | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| AMAO 3 | Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| English-Language Arts | | | |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | No | No |
| Mathematics | | | |
| Met Participation Rate | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient or Above | No | No | No |
| Met Target for AMAO 3 | No | No | No |

Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 4: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

| AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL | ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------|------|-------|------|------|------------------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | All Students | | | White | | | African-American | | | Asian | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 96 | 97 | 98 | 95 | 97 | 98 | 100 | 84 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 100 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 212 | 215 | 199 | 131 | 142 | 99 | -- | -- | 7 | 12 | 13 | 8 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 57.8 | 56.3 | 57.0 | 67.2 | 68.6 | 68.3 | -- | -- | 63.6 | 52.2 | 56.5 | 61.5 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 |
| Met AYP Criteria | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

| AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL | ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------|------|------------------|------|------|---------------------------------|------|------|----------------------------|------|------|
| | Hispanic | | | English Learners | | | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | | | Students with Disabilities | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 98 | 97 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 98 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 94 | 97 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 52 | 47 | 73 | 22 | 15 | 24 | 56 | 51 | 80 | 22 | 11 | 12 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 44.1 | 38.8 | 44.2 | 27.2 | 19.5 | 24.2 | 41.8 | 37.2 | 44.9 | 36.1 | 26.8 | 25.5 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 | 67.6 | 78.4 | 89.2 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 88.9 |
| Met AYP Criteria | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | -- | -- |

Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 5: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

| AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL | MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------|------|-------|------|------|------------------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | All Students | | | White | | | African-American | | | Asian | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 96 | 97 | 97 | 96 | 97 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 96 | 96 | 100 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 187 | 221 | 201 | 115 | 132 | 96 | -- | 4 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 9 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 51.2 | 57.6 | 57.9 | 59.3 | 63.8 | 66.7 | -- | 33.3 | 63.6 | 47.8 | 68.2 | 69.2 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 |
| Met AYP Criteria | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

| AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL | MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------|------|------------------|------|------|---------------------------------|------|------|----------------------------|------|------|
| | Hispanic | | | English Learners | | | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | | | Students with Disabilities | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Participation Rate | 98 | 98 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 97 | 96 | 98 | 97 | 100 | 98 | 95 |
| Number At or Above Proficient | 45 | 55 | 80 | 21 | 22 | 33 | 52 | 63 | 80 | 15 | 11 | 13 |
| Percent At or Above Proficient | 38.1 | 45.1 | 48.8 | 25.9 | 28.9 | 33.3 | 39.4 | 45.0 | 45.2 | 24.2 | 25.6 | 27.7 |
| AYP Target: ES/MS | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 | 68.5 | 79.0 | 89.5 |
| AYP Target: HS | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 | 66.1 | 77.4 | 88.7 |
| Met AYP Criteria | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | -- | -- |

Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Table 6: California English Language Development (CELDT Annual Assessment) Data

| Grade | 2012-13 CELDT (Annual Assessment) Results | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|----------------|---|--------------|---|--------------------|---|-----------|---|---------------|
| | Advanced | | Early Advanced | | Intermediate | | Early Intermediate | | Beginning | | Number Tested |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |

School and Student Performance Data

Table 7: California English Language Development (CELDT All Assessment) Data

| Grade | 2012-13 CELDT (All Assessment) Results | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|----------------|----|--------------|----|--------------------|---|-----------|---|---------------|
| | Advanced | | Early Advanced | | Intermediate | | Early Intermediate | | Beginning | | Number Tested |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 9 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 31 | 26 | 54 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 48 |

Data Collection and Analysis (Continued)

Plans must include analysis of school progress on the AYP and AMAOs for Title III.

You can include other district/school assessment data.

You can include student attendance and discipline data

You can include a summary of your Healthy Kids Survey

Provide a brief, written analysis based on the data you provided.

You can provide a brief summary of ***strengths*** and ***gaps in performance in ELA and math for the school as a whole and for any significant trends identified for grade levels or subgroups***. This can be based on discussion with stakeholders regarding data analysis.

The school did not meet Academic Performance Index targets in all subgroup areas. The school wide index for all students dropped by 9 points. The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) target in English-Language Arts was met overall, including all subgroups. The White population scores 68.3% proficient or above in English-Language Arts, while the subgroups are 23% or more below that mark. The Adequate Yearly Progress target in Math was met overall, including all subgroups. The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) target in math shows our White population scoring at 66.7% proficient or above, while the subgroups are 17% or more below this mark. Our CELDT data demonstrates that 88% of our 112 English Learners that were tested qualify at the Intermediate or Early Advanced levels.

Include a brief summary analysis statement.

This statement summarizes the conclusions reached about student performance.

Our school data suggests the need to focus attention on our subgroup populations and strategically introduce methods to improve overall performance. There is a significant drop in achievement when comparing the achievement of our White population with the Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities subgroups. We have a significant percentage of English Language Learners within the Intermediate and Early Advanced bands, indicating the need to focus on these students to compare the length of time accessing specialized services with student progress. The data also demonstrates the need to evaluate overall core curriculum access to our Students with Disabilities along with appropriate support mechanisms ensuring successful access.

California Standards Test

All Students English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | % Basic | | | % Below Basic | | | % Far Below Basic | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 51 | 56 | 56 | 30 | 27 | 30 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| Grade 10 | 39 | 46 | 42 | 33 | 33 | 38 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 6 |
| Grade 11 | 47 | 47 | 44 | 28 | 31 | 33 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 12 |

All Students Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | % Basic | | | % Below Basic | | | % Far Below Basic | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 & 7 Standards) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | % Basic | | | % Below Basic | | | % Far Below Basic | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 21 | 31 | 4 | 34 | 31 | 18 | 32 | 27 | 43 | 13 | 12 | 36 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | % Basic | | | % Below Basic | | | % Far Below Basic | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 46 | 40 | 30 | 33 | 26 | 23 | 16 | 29 | 37 | 4 | 5 | 11 |
| Grade 10 | 17 | 13 | 25 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 45 | 45 | 37 | 15 | 17 | 11 |
| Grade 11 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 19 | 29 | 26 | 40 | 44 | 33 | 28 | 18 | 27 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | % Basic | | | % Below Basic | | | % Far Below Basic | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 74 | 44 | 79 | 24 | 43 | 16 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Grade 10 | 46 | 20 | 32 | 26 | 48 | 27 | 24 | 28 | 33 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
| Grade 11 | 25 | 10 | 7 | 28 | 23 | 16 | 35 | 49 | 54 | 12 | 18 | 23 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | % Basic | | | % Below Basic | | | % Far Below Basic | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | 67 | 56 | 43 | 31 | 31 | 37 | 2 | 11 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Grade 11 | 26 | 27 | 20 | 47 | 26 | 40 | 22 | 34 | 28 | 5 | 14 | 12 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | % Basic | | | % Below Basic | | | % Far Below Basic | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 | 38 | 57 | 68 | 43 | 36 | 14 | 18 | 7 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

California Standards Test

**African American Students
English-Language Arts**

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | 42 | * | * | 352.3 |
| Grade 10 | * | 27 | * | * | 332.5 | * |
| Grade 11 | 21 | * | * | 308.0 | * | * |

**African American Students
Mathematics**

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 & 7 Standards) | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | | 36 | * | | 328.5 |
| Grade 10 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 11 | * | | * | * | | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | | * | | | * | |
| Grade 10 | | * | | | * | |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | * | | | * |
| Grade 11 | * | | * | * | | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 | | | | | | |

California Standards Test

Asian Students English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 45 | 67 | * | 342.5 | 384.3 | * |
| Grade 10 | 39 | 57 | 57 | 333.3 | 344.0 | 362.7 |
| Grade 11 | 33 | 33 | 55 | 339.9 | 331.1 | 337.5 |

Asian Students Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 & 7 Standards) | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 10 | 27 | * | * | 308.7 | * | * |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | | * | * | |
| Grade 10 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

California Standards Test

Hispanic/Latino Students English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 43 | 47 | 47 | 339.1 | 341.2 | 342.8 |
| Grade 10 | 28 | 34 | 28 | 317.5 | 326.4 | 324.4 |
| Grade 11 | 42 | 42 | 28 | 331.4 | 334.0 | 321.0 |

Hispanic/Latino Students Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 19 | 23 | * | 302.7 | 318.0 | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 & 7 Standards) | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 19 | 23 | * | 302.7 | 318.0 | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 39 | 35 | 22 | 340.3 | 326.0 | 310.3 |
| Grade 10 | 10 | 11 | 17 | 293.2 | 296.4 | 302.3 |
| Grade 11 | 11 | 15 | 13 | 291.1 | 299.0 | 298.1 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | 20 | * | * | 320.4 | * |
| Grade 10 | 43 | 12 | 28 | 328.8 | 306.4 | 315.4 |
| Grade 11 | 17 | 7 | 9 | 303.9 | 276.8 | 281.7 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | * | * | 13 | * | * | 323.1 |
| Grade 11 | 38 | 29 | 17 | 330.0 | 321.2 | 302.3 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

California Standards Test

White Students English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 60 | 62 | 65 | 361.5 | 363.5 | 364.5 |
| Grade 10 | 45 | 55 | 52 | 345.5 | 353.0 | 347.9 |
| Grade 11 | 50 | 52 | 53 | 347.3 | 351.9 | 348.6 |

White Students Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 313.5 | 328.1 | 283.7 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 & 7 Standards) | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 313.5 | 328.1 | 283.7 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 47 | 45 | 36 | 348.3 | 339.4 | 330.1 |
| Grade 10 | 18 | 18 | 35 | 297.3 | 295.1 | 326.3 |
| Grade 11 | 15 | 6 | 14 | 289.2 | 288.1 | 293.1 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2012-13 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 79 | 57 | 80 | 382.0 | 359.1 | 389.8 |
| Grade 10 | 50 | 25 | 39 | 343.2 | 323.1 | 325.9 |
| Grade 11 | 27 | 13 | 9 | 310.9 | 290.7 | 283.5 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | 62 | 58 | 54 | 361.1 | 360.3 | 352.1 |
| Grade 11 | 24 | 29 | 24 | 324.7 | 309.4 | 316.2 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 | 38 | 56 | 73 | 346.2 | 360.2 | 365.5 |

California Standards Test

English Learner Students English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 296.7 | 292.6 | 306.7 |
| Grade 10 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 274.3 | 289.9 | 279.8 |
| Grade 11 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 295.7 | 281.8 | 269.8 |

English Learner Students Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 9 | 8 | * | 283.3 | 293.0 | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 & 7 Standards) | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 9 | 8 | * | 283.3 | 293.0 | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | * | 2 | * | * | 271.1 |
| Grade 10 | * | 0 | 0 | * | 284.8 | 270.6 |
| Grade 11 | 9 | * | 8 | 276.9 | * | 276.3 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | | | * | | |
| Grade 10 | | * | * | | * | * |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | * | | | * | | |
| Grade 11 | * | | * | * | | * |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 | | | | | | |

California Standards Test

Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students English-Language Arts

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level English-Language Arts | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 36 | 46 | 45 | 333.3 | 338.5 | 340.4 |
| Grade 10 | 27 | 34 | 27 | 314.8 | 325.5 | 324.9 |
| Grade 11 | 36 | 41 | 32 | 326.4 | 333.9 | 323.5 |

Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students Mathematics

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Mathematics | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 20 | 24 | 5 | 300.2 | 315.8 | 273.5 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level General Mathematics (Grades 6 & 7 Standards) | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 20 | 24 | 5 | 300.2 | 315.8 | 273.5 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra I | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | 44 | 28 | 26 | 342.5 | 320.5 | 309.6 |
| Grade 10 | 18 | 12 | 18 | 300.5 | 289.6 | 303.6 |
| Grade 11 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 273.3 | 288.5 | 300.8 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Geometry | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 9 | * | 29 | * | * | 326.3 | * |
| Grade 10 | 54 | 21 | 31 | 345.7 | 313.5 | 315.5 |
| Grade 11 | 26 | 11 | 8 | 314.3 | 282.3 | 279.5 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Algebra II | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | * | * | 26 | * | * | 336.8 |
| Grade 11 | 46 | 40 | 22 | 340.4 | 324.4 | 317.6 |

| Grade Level | Performance Data by Grade Level Summative High School Mathematics (Grades 9-11) | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| | % At or Above Proficient | | | Mean Scale Score | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Grade 10 | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 | * | * | * | * | * | * |

Part Two: Addressing the Performance Gaps

The purpose of this section is to set priorities and specific goals. Your priorities are based upon the synthesis you developed above. Your goals flow from these priorities.

Note: CA regulations state that the SPSA must address how funds will be used to "improve the academic performance of all students to the level of the performance goals, as established by the API." Also, regulations state that "The SPSA must align with the local educational agency (LEA)."

Select Priorities

Based upon analysis of data, prior school goals and district goals, set priorities or focus areas for your plan.

Based upon analysis of data, the need to focus attention on our subgroup populations and strategically introduce methods to improve overall performance. There is a significant drop in achievement when comparing the achievement of our White population with the Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities subgroups. We have a significant percentage of English Language Learners within the Intermediate and Early Advanced bands, indicating the need to focus on these students to compare the length of time accessing specialized services with student progress. The data also demonstrates the need to evaluate overall core curriculum access to our Students with Disabilities along with appropriate support mechanisms ensuring successful access.

Areas of critical need, as established by the WASC process, include the need to improve the success rate of our 9th grade and EL students. As well as increase the number of students to meet a-g CSU/UC requirements.

Write/Revise School SMART Goals

School goals flow from your priorities and should be attainable in the period specified in the plan, specific to the student participants and measurable. Goals should be listed in SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely) format but also align to the outcomes expected under the state and federal accountability model.

Part Three: Analysis of Proven or Promising Strategies

While the justification for your activities need not be written into your plan, best, evidence-based practices should be reflected in your action plan and activities you pursue. Once a goal for student achievement has been identified, the leadership team needs to determine how to reach that goal. Choose specific strategies that are likely to work and align to the district’s Local Education Agency Plan as well. Be deliberate in what strategies you choose. Consider:

- Did it work for a similar school?
- When do you expect to see results?
- Can you explain why you expect it to work?
- What will you do to ensure that it works?
- At what point will you determine it isn’t working and stop doing it?
- Identify current successful practices in the school and district by looking at data, talking to colleagues, and seeking input from such professionals as curriculum specialists.

| Resource | Web Address |
|---|---|
| Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) | http://www.ascd.org/portal/site/ascd/index.jsp/ |
| Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) | http://www.cpre.org/ |
| ED.gov | http://www.ed.gov/help/site/expsearch/index.html?src=In |
| Education Commission of the States | http://www.ecs.org/default.asp |
| Educational Resource Information Center | http://www.eric.ed.gov/ |
| Healthy Kids Resource Center | http://www.californiahealthykids.org/c/@U82gtJCqJSte6/Pages/index.html |
| Just for the Kids - California | http://www.just4kids.org/bestpractice/study_framework.cfm?sub=state&study=californiaa |
| Just for the Kids – California School Data | http://www.jftk-ca.org/ |
| National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) | http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/ |
| School Matters A Service of Standard & Poors | http://www.schoolmatters.com/ |
| What Works Clearinghouse | http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ |

Part Four: Complete Action Plans for each SMART Goal

Use the attached templates to complete your action plans.

SMART Goal 1

**Rancho Cotate High School
Plan on a Page
Student Achievement in Reading Language Arts
2013-2014**

SMART Goal:

Continue Common Core State Standards (CCSS) implementation and related professional development with the goal of having all students attain proficiency in ELA/literacy achievement level descriptors (ALDs) as measured on the CCSS aligned Smarter Balanced Assessment for the 2014-15 school year. We will focus on professional development regarding the establishment of CCSS aligned common assessments and benchmarked pacing. The goal is to improve the Smarter Balanced Assessment outcomes as well as to improve the overall academic success rates of our significant subgroups - English Learner, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities.

All significant subgroups will demonstrate adequate progress toward mastery of the Common Core State Standards as measured by Smarter Balanced assessments Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs). All significant subgroups will be able to articulate the knowledge, skills, and abilities represented in different categories of performance on the Smarter Balanced assessments, including college- and career-readiness.

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>1.01 RCHS will continue developing "professional learning communities" (PLCs), facilitated by district leadership and by the Illuminate data assessment program. In 2013-14, this PLC structure will be supported by a combination of teacher release days, by our modified weekly collaboration schedule, and by workshops scheduled by the school district outside of the regular school day.</p> | <p>Lesson design and productive group work are the specific focal points.</p> | <p>PLC team continues into 3rd year of training and sharing best practices. Site will organize school business release days to conduct in-house curricular workshops.</p> | <p>SCOE and CRPUSD Staff Development</p> |
| <p>1.02 The English department will align courses to Common Core State Standards by converting the 1997 Standards and pacing to CCSS, and link pacing to benchmark periods throughout the instructional year.</p> | <p>Following workshops in the spring and fall, 2013, 9th and 10th grade courses will have been aligned.</p> | <p>English department leadership activity. Illuminate data software and training support. School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training.</p> | <p>SCOE and CRPUSD Staff Development for release days.</p> |
| <p>1.03 The English department will develop, design, and administer common formative and summative assessments for progress monitoring and instructional collaboration at benchmark periods to ensure that instruction is aligned to the rigorous standards mastery measured by Smarter Balanced assessments.</p> | <p>Following workshops in the spring and fall, 2013, 9th and 10th grade courses will have benchmarks and common assessments drafted.</p> | <p>English department leadership activity. Illuminate data software and training. School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training.</p> | <p>Site Discretionary funding for teacher release days.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>1.04 The English department will implement benchmark assessments for each grade level course, and then complete data analysis to assess instructional strategies following each assessment.</p> | <p>Teachers meet quarterly in subject areas to analyze assessment results, address student learning, and access to the curriculum.</p> | <p>English Department leadership activity. Illuminate data software and training support. School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training.</p> | <p>SCOE & CRPUSD Staff development grant funding.</p> |
| <p>1.05 Focus instruction in all classrooms to apply SDAIE and AVID based strategies appropriately in support of all learning.</p> | <p>Improved benchmark assessment results and grade performance.</p> | <p>Site will organize school business release days to conduct in-house curricular workshops.</p> | <p>Site discretionary funding & Instructional Materials Funding.</p> |
| <p>1.06 Evaluate the master schedule to seek smaller class sizes in core supported classes targeting our significant subgroups.</p> | <p>By meeting our AYP and API goals for this subgroup, we will improve their pass rate to equal the general population of students.</p> | <p>The master schedule is built to accommodate English Learner student & SPED groupings to facilitate certificated and classified support efforts in regular college prep courses.</p> | <p>District Staffing Formula</p> |
| <p>1.07 Tier II Support for Students: Several new computer labs have been constructed and will be designated for reading supplemental support, staffed by certificated and classified personnel. The LANGUAGE! Program has been purchased to provide programmatic direction to this effort. 9th grade students who underperformed on LANGUAGE! diagnostic assessment are enrolled into an English Support class to enhance their reading and writing skills. Illuminate data and assessment diagnostic program will continue to be installed; Pre and post assessments will provide guidance for instruction and mastery learning. A blended model of virtual based curriculum (AVENTA) and direct teacher support will assist in mastery learning to ensure success in the regular English classroom and improvement on Smarter Balanced assessments.</p> | <p>Improved benchmark assessment results and grade performance.</p> | <p>Computer based support School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training.</p> | <p>District computer hardware and software support. Site Discretionary Funds to allow release time for technical assistance.</p> |

SMART Goal 2

**Rancho Cotate High School
Plan on a Page
Student Achievement in Mathematics
2013-2014**

SMART Goal:

Continue Common Core State Standards (CCSS) implementation and related professional development with the goal of having all students attain proficiency in Mathematics achievement level descriptors (ALDs) as measured on the CCSS aligned Smarter Balanced Assessment for the 2014-15 school year. We will focus on professional development regarding the establishment of CCSS aligned common assessments and benchmarked pacing. The goal is to improve the Smarter Balanced Assessment outcomes as well as to improve the overall academic success rates of our significant subgroups - English Learner, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities.

All significant subgroups will demonstrate adequate progress toward mastery of the Common Core State Standards as measured by Smarter Balanced assessments Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs). All significant subgroups will be able to articulate the knowledge, skills, and abilities represented in different categories of performance on the Smarter Balanced assessments, including college- and career-readiness.

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>2.01 RCHS will continue developing "professional learning communities" (PLCs), facilitated by district leadership and by the Illuminate data assessment program. In 2013-14, this PLC structure will be supported by a combination of teacher release days, by our modified weekly collaboration schedule, and by workshops scheduled by the school district outside of the regular school day.</p> | <p>Lesson design and productive group work are the specific focal points.</p> | <p>PLC team continues into 3rd year of training and sharing best practices. Site will organize school business release days to conduct in-house curricular workshops.</p> | <p>SCOE and CRPUSD Staff Development for release days.</p> |
| <p>2.02 The math department will align courses to Common Core State Standards by converting the 1997 Standards and pacing to CCSS, and link pacing to benchmark periods throughout the instructional year.</p> | <p>Following the Illuminate workshops this spring and fall, the Algebra I and Geometry courses will be aligned.</p> | <p>Math department leadership activity. Illuminate data software and training support. School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training</p> | <p>SCOE and CRPUSD Staff Development for release days.</p> |
| <p>2.03 The Math department will develop, design, and administer common formative and summative assessments for progress monitoring and instructional collaboration at benchmark periods to ensure that instruction is aligned to the rigorous standards mastery measured by Smarter Balanced assessments.</p> | <p>Following the illuminate workshops this spring and fall, the Algebra I and Geometry courses will be aligned.</p> | <p>Math department leadership activity. Illuminate data software and training. School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training.</p> | <p>Site Discretionary funding for teacher release days.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>2.04 Focus instruction in all classrooms to apply SDAIE and AVID based strategies appropriately in support of all learning.</p> | <p>Teachers meet monthly in subject areas to address student learning and access to the core curriculum.</p> | <p>Math department leadership activity. Illuminate data software and training. School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training.</p> | <p>SCOE & CRPUSD Staff development grant funding.</p> |
| <p>2.05 Evaluate the master schedule to seek smaller class sizes in core supported classes targeting our significant subgroups.</p> | <p>Improved benchmark assessments and academic performance.</p> | <p>Site will organize school business release days to conduct in-house curricular workshops.</p> | <p>Site discretionary funding & Instructional Materials Funding.</p> |
| <p>2.06 Tier II Support for Students: Several new computer labs have been constructed and will be designated for math supplemental support, staffed by certificated and classified personnel. 9th grade students who underperformed on our Algebra I diagnostic assessment are enrolled into a Math Lab Support class to enhance their math skills. Illuminate data and assessment diagnostic program will continue to be installed; Pre and post assessments will provide guidance for instruction and mastery learning. A blended model of virtual based curriculum (AVENTA) and direct teacher support will assist in mastery learning to ensure success in the regular English classroom and improvement on Smarter Balanced assessments.</p> | <p>Improved benchmark assessments and academic performance.</p> | <p>Computer based support School Business Leaves to build staff time for tasks/training.</p> | <p>District computer hardware and software support. Site Discretionary Funds to allow release time for technical assistance.</p> |

SMART Goal 3

**Rancho Cotate High School
Plan on a Page
Culture and Context
2013-2014**

SMART Goal:

All students will experience a College and Career focused school culture.

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>3.00 Continue to refine our "Freshman Academy" structure in the master schedule where 9th graders are grouped together in common English and Math classes as well as a focused "selective" choice.</p> | <p>Master Schedule Design.</p> | <p>Master Schedule Development training and AERIES student information scheduler training.</p> | <p>District FTE allocation & funding for workshops.</p> |
| <p>3.01 Continue to refine the series of courses to be offered as freshmen "selectives" which provide a "theme" for the Freshman Academy as well as an introduction toward the pathway options in high school.</p> | <p>Course design, development, and deployment.</p> | <p>Site designed workshops in support of the academic and social development goals for these academies and courses.</p> | <p>District FTE allocation & site discretionary funding.</p> |
| <p>3.02 Continue to implement strategies to reach the defined "outcome goals" for the Freshman Academy structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational and Note Taking strategies will be emphasized by our freshman English and Math teachers. • Career Planning and Employment Development will be emphasized by the freshmen selective teachers, through the use of the Kuder Navigator Career inventory program. • Each Freshman Academy group of teachers will work together to provide students with a Class Presentation experience as well as to organize a Community Service project. | <p>Classroom teachers in the academy will work together to build the requisite skills identified for successful high school completion and beyond.</p> | <p>Teachers have been AVID trained; SCOE provides careers software (Kuder Navigator) and related staff training; RCHS will provide in-house workshops for teachers to develop the desired outcomes.</p> | <p>Site discretionary funding; District Carl Perkins and Title III funding; SCOE Regional Occupations Program funding.</p> |

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
|---|---|--|---|
| 3.03 Continue to refine our structure of "Pathway" courses centered on a curricular theme so students can select an area of interest to focus their learning experience through high school. | Courses will be aligned with curricular pathways; Guidance will be in place to assist student scheduling and 4 year planning. | Pathway Pamphlets and Cougar Tracks curriculum guide; WEBSITE training and access provided by site. | District allocation & site discretionary funding. |
| 3.04 Introduce a Senior Project course and/or internship option for students who are completing a pathway as a means of applying their learning pathway outside of the classroom. | Course design, development and deployment. Series of courses within each pathway identified as pre-requisites for the Senior Project. | Site developed workshops in curriculum development and design. School visitations to research and observe senior project activities. | District allocation & site discretionary funding. Carl Perkins and SCOE Regional Occupations Program Funding. |
| 3.05 Academic counselors will continue to collaborate with freshmen selective course teachers to refine our structure of strategies to encourage students to meet a-g CSU/UC and career readiness requirements. | Providing workshops for students and parents; resources developed for school website. The A-G requirements qualifiers will meet or exceed the statewide average of 35%. | UC - CSU - JC - Private College - Career training resources. WEBSITE training and access provided by site. | District allocation & site discretionary funding. |

SMART Goal 4

**Rancho Cotate High School
Plan on a Page**

2013-2014

SMART Goal:

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | |

SMART Goal 5

**Rancho Cotate High School
Plan on a Page**

2013-2014

SMART Goal:

| Actions/Strategies | Results Indicators | Resources | Funding Source |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | |

Part Five: Conduct Advisory Committee Review and Certification

School plans must be developed with the review, certification, and advice of any applicable school advisory committees. Meeting agendas and minutes should reflect the processes for stakeholder input and review the culminated in certification.

School districts must assure that SSCs have developed and approved the SPSA for schools participating in programs funded through the ConApp process and any other school program they choose to include

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 type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education <u>Purpose:</u> Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program. | \$ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program <u>Purpose:</u> Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners | \$109,908 |
| <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 type="checkbox"/> Peer Assistance and Review <u>Purpose:</u> Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring. | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pupil Retention Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Prevent students from dropping out of school. | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Improve library and other school programs. | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School Safety and Violence Prevention Act <u>Purpose:</u> Increase school safety. | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tobacco-Use Prevention Education <u>Purpose:</u> Eliminate tobacco use among students. | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> List and Describe Other State or Local funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education) | \$ |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school *Tier III funds are now moved to “unrestricted.”</p> | \$109,908 |

APPENDIX

CRPUSD LEA Plan and Title III Year IV Plan

Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District
2012-2013 Title I and Title III LEA PLAN SUMMARY

Leadership Commitment

In order to increase achievement and retain students, we will enact evidence-based instructional strategies to support and engage all learners, implement K-12 curricula aligned to the Common Core Standards and calibrated to the rigor of state and national measures, and use formative and summative assessments for ongoing monitoring of students' growth.

Required State of California and Federal Goals:

Goals 1A & 1B Improve Proficiency in English Language Arts and Mathematics

Goal 2A: Increase Annual Progress in Learning English

Goal 2B: Increase English Proficiency

Goal 2C: Increase Academic Proficiency of English Language Subgroup

Strategy: **Implement Evidence-Based Instruction Practices**

Improved consistency of target instructional practices system-wide will improve student performance, resulting in increased achievement because all students will have access to effective instructional practices.

| Action Steps | | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) Development of Systemwide Instructional Practices | | | |
| Site leadership teams participate in Sonoma Leadership Network (SLN) training | SLN registration for 35 participants | \$15,000.00 | Title I |
| | Substitute costs | \$20,125.00 | Title II |
| Teacher trainers conduct training in gradual release of responsibility, active student engagement, Organizing Student Thinking and English learner support strategies. | Estimated participation = 40 teachers per training with three days total planned for training. | \$13,800.00 | Title III |
| Sites develop agreements regarding instructional practices and conduct implementation trials that include observation and coaching to support practice | Plans to be determined. | TBD | TBD |
| (2) Alignment of Curriculum and Assessment | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------|----------|
| Align District Benchmarks and Instructional Pacing to Rigor of State Standards and CSTS. | Estimated costs for 20 teachers for 2 days of substitute time. | \$4,600.00 | Title I |
| Complete Curriculum Articulation to Ensure Consistency and Coherence from Kindergarten to 12 th Grade | Estimated costs for 24 teachers for four days of substitute time. | \$11,040.00 | Title II |

Strategy: Assessment and Progress Monitoring

Grade level teams and the secondary English language arts and mathematics departments will develop, administer, and analyze common formative and summative assessments that are aligned with actual instruction to measure student skill, knowledge, and growth for purposes of progress monitoring and instructional calibration.

| Action Steps | | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) Data Analysis and Planning through Collaboration Time | | | |
| Provide teacher training in Illuminate system. | Estimated costs for 25 teachers for one day of substitute time. | \$3,000.00 | Title II |
| Provide teachers with web cameras to enable immediate data collection and reporting using the Illuminate GradeCam software. | Estimated costs for 300 cameras at \$35/camera. | \$10,500.00 | Title I |
| Provide teachers with release time for data analysis and collaborative planning. | Estimated costs for 30 teachers with five days of substitute time. | \$17,250.00 | Title I |
| (2) Administer and Analyze Diagnostic State Tests | | | |
| Students in grades 2-10 will participate in a CST or CAHSEE diagnostic test six weeks prior to the state testing windows. Grade level teams will meet to review test data and to plan targeted instruction for students to ensure proficiency. | | NA | NA |

Strategy: Improve Teaching and Learning In ELD

Consistent, system-wide implementation of evidence-based ELD instructional practices, materials, and assessment will increase the achievement of English language learners.

| Action Steps | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| (1) Audit ELD Implementation | | |
| Audit English language development curriculum, schedules, and instructional practices to ensure consistency and coherence across the district. | Teacher teams to meet for horizontal and vertical articulation using substitute time. Specific plans to be determined. | TBD |
| Principals and teacher leaders will conduct walk-through observations to examine consistency of program implementation. | Teacher leaders from the ELPD and Advanced ELPD will provide training and support at their sites. Principals will guide planning and observation. | NA |
| (2) Engaged, Structured Academic Talk | | |
| Teachers will provide multiple opportunities for student conversations on academically relevant topics, structuring tasks so that ELs are engaged with native speakers for extended discussion. Structured, collaborative groups will be used. | Teacher leaders from the ELPD and Advanced ELPD will provide training and support at their sites. Principals will guide planning and observation. | NA |
| (3) Systematic Assessment of Students | | |
| Teachers will use formative and summative assessments to determine student mastery of ELD standards for purposes of progress monitoring and instructional calibration. | Progress monitoring assessments Estimated cost for purchase of ELD assessment materials and substitute time for progress monitoring. | 10,000 Title III |

Required State of California and Federal Goals:

Goal 2E: Increase Parent and Community Participation

Most of the action steps below are from the last Title III and LEA Plans and the Leadership and Learning structures implemented in the district this year. A few items were added as a result of ideas presented at the Board of Trustees Conversation Meeting on December 6, 2011.

| Action Steps | | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
|---|---|----------------------|-------------------------|
| District Marketing Model | Estimated cost to support a period of a teacher with marketing background working on special assignment to coordinate district outreach efforts and K-12 connections, using RCHS Media House and SSU support. | \$25,000 | Title I |
| Educational Summit | Estimated substitute costs for 40 teachers for four days. | \$18,400 | Title II |
| Superintendent's Council | Ongoing | NA | NA |
| Preschool Parent Education (Avance) | Program provided through Community Action Partnership at no cost to district. | NA | NA |
| Sliding Fee Preschool Program (4 year olds) | Plans to be determined through consultation with YMCA and/or SSU | NA | NA |
| HS Student Leadership and Programs to Elementary and Middle School Sites Pathways Development and Outreach Events | Plans in process – Connections calendar under development and a standing item at Administrative Council meetings | NA | NA |
| Technology Enhanced Communication | Ongoing - Website development, ABI, Etc. | TBD | TBD |
| District Translation Services | Ongoing position to support home-school communication | Varies | Varies |
| Kindergarten Intake and Orientation | Plans to be determined. | NA | NA |
| Beyond the Bell Options - Onsite child care & enrichment programs for before and after school, including HW Club | Currently researching partnership options for development. Have partnered with YMCA and Boys and Girls Club for 21 st Century Grant Application. | TBD | Parent fees & ASES |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|----|----|
| Student Led Site Visits | Students to provide interested parents with tours of their schools as part of district outreach efforts. | NA | NA |
|--------------------------------|--|----|----|

Required State of California and Federal Goals:

Goal 3: Highly Qualified Teachers

All students in the district will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

| Action Steps | | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
|--|---|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Fully Credentialed, HQ Teachers | Title II, Level C District Compliance Plan in process | TBD | Title II |

Required State of California and Federal Goals:

Goal 5 A: Increase Graduation Rates & Goal 5B Decrease Drop Out Rates

Strategy: **Academic Support Classes for Acceleration**

Students who are struggling in core English language arts or mathematics courses will receive support class to ensure they have prerequisite skills to demonstrate proficiency in each content area.

| Action Steps | | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Use Assessment Data to Identify Students | | | |
| Identify and Purchase Academic Support Curriculum | Estimated cost for the purchase of curriculum materials. | \$27,000 | Title III |
| Add 2 Academic Support Sections at RCHS | Estimated costs for the proposed sections. | \$40,000 | Not funded |
| Add 2 Academic Support Sections at LJMS | Estimated costs for the proposed sections. | \$40,000 | Not funded |

Goal 5C: Increase Enrollment in AP Classes

Strategy: Outreach and Education

Provide parent and student education and outreach to ensure familiarity with Advanced Placement program options at our high schools.

Strategy: Use Academies to Promote Advanced Study

Use emerging high school academies model to assist students, and English language learners in particular, in pursuing advanced study in fields of specific interest.

| Action Steps | | Proposed Expenditure | Proposed Funding Source |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Provide parent and student education through evening events, the middle and high school guidance programs and one-one outreach to ensure knowledge of AP offerings. | Plans to be determined. | NA | NA |
| Integrate AP in each Secondary Academy Outcomes | Plans to be determined. | NA | NA |