

What to Do with Data Webinar
October 6, 2009

Task 2

Practice Data Packet for
San Ejemplo Unified School District

DRAFT

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION PLAN

District: San Ejemplo		District Average	High Poverty Sites	Program Improvement Sites
1. Percent of courses taught by NCLB compliant teachers (HQT)		93%	93%	93%
2. Percent of teachers with full certification in subject area				
	Elementary	98%	98%	98%
	Middle School	79%	79%	79%
	High School	86%	86%	86%
3. Percent of teachers out-of-field				
	District	30%	30%	30%
	Middle School Mathematics	78%	78%	78%
	Middle School English/Language Arts	75%	75%	75%
	Middle School Science	67%	67%	67%
	Middle School Social Science	57%	57%	57%
	High School Mathematics	12%	12%	12%
	High School English/Language Arts	0%	0%	0%
	High School Science	0%	0%	0%
	High School Social Science	0%	0%	0%
4. Percent of out-of-field teachers with supplemental authorizations in subject area				
	Middle School Mathematics	43%	43%	43%
	Middle School English/Language Arts	33%	33%	33%
	Middle School Science	83%	83%	83%
	Middle School Social Science	25%	25%	25%
	High School Mathematics	50%	50%	50%
	High School English/Language Arts	100%	100%	100%
	High School Science	100%	100%	100%
	High School Social Science	100%	22%	100%
5. Middle school core teachers with Multiple Subject credentials		69%	69%	69%

District: San Ejemplo Unified School District		District	High-Poverty Sites	Program Improvement Sites
1. Number of Provisional Intern Permits (PIPs) applied for in NCLB core academic subjects		2	2	2
2. Number of PIPs in 2008-09 School Year		4	4	4
3. Number of PIPs in 2007-08 School Year		3	3	3
4. Number of current teachers with Short-Term Staff Permits (STSPs) teaching NCLB core academic subjects		1	1	1
5. Number of STSPs in 2008-09 School Year		2	2	2
6. Number of STSPs in 2007-08 School Year		1	1	1
7. Number of current teachers with waivers		0	0	0
8. Number of waivers in 2008-09 School Year		0	0	0
9. Number of waivers in 2007-08 School Year		0	0	0
10. Number of Interns		1	1	1
11. Percent of total interns in the district			100%	100%
12. Percent of new teachers that participated in an induction program (i.e.BTSA)		27%	27%	27%
13. Percent of teachers participating in Certificated Staff Mentoring Program		0%	0%	0%
14. Years of Experience				
Number of Elementary Teachers with 0-3 Years Experience		10	10	10
4-9 Years		30	30	30
10+ Years		8	8	8
Number of Middle School Teachers with 0-3 Years Experience		27	27	27
4-9 Years		5	5	5
10+ Years		7	7	7
Number of High School Teachers with 0-3 Years Experience		12	12	12
4-9 Years		23	23	23
10+ Years		38	38	38

Instructions

Complete one table for each grade-level cluster

District _____

Insert rows as needed

School Site				Teacher Retention: 2006-2007					Teacher Retention: 2007-2008					Teacher Retention: 2008-09						
Name of School Site	Percent of Poverty at Site	Program Improvement Year	Grade Level	Total number of FTE positions	Total vacancies to be filled	Resignations	Transfers	Retirements	Total number of FTE positions	Total vacancies to be filled	Resignations	Transfers	Retirements	Total number of FTE positions	Total vacancies to be filled	Resignations	Transfers	Retirements	Retention rate for 08-09 School year	Retention rate from 2007-2009
Elementary School 1	58	1	E	29	3	2	1	0	28	2	1	0	1	30	3	2	1	0	90%	91%
Elementary School 2	67	5	E	25	3	2	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	24	4	2	1	1	83%	91%
Middle School	64	2	M	39	6	4	2	0	41	17	5	8	1	40	15	4	8	2	63%	68%
High School	55	3	H	73	5	1	1	3	71	4	0	0	3	75	1	0	0	1	99%	95%

Grade Level Key:	
Elementary (encompassing grades K-6 or K-5 or combination of these grade levels)	E
Middle (encompassing grades 6-8 or 7-8)	M
High School	H
Atypical (i.e. K-8)	A

Three-year district retention rate	86%
Three-year retention rate at high-poverty schools	86%
Three-year retention rate at program improvement schools	86%

5.a. AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in U.S. schools? [REQUIRED]

Length of Time in US Schools	Number Percent	Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient	Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient	Intermediate	Early Intermediate	Beginning	Total (by Time)
6 or more years	n=	141	9	171	36	23	380
	%	37%	2%	45%	9%	6%	51%
5 years	n=	32	4	71	13	8	128
	%	25%	3%	55%	10%	6%	17%
4 years	n=	10	3	69	23	8	113
	%	9%	3%	61%	20%	7%	15%
3 years or less	n=	14	10	42	29	33	128
	%	11%	8%	33%	23%	26%	17%
Total (by ELD level)	n=	197	26	353	101	72	749
	%	26%	3%	47%	13%	10%	

Discuss the progress in English acquisition that your students are demonstrating based on the time in U.S. schools.

51% of our current ELs have been in US schools for six or more years, yet only 39% of these have moved beyond intermediate. Large proportions of our EL students that are 4 or 5 years in US schools perform at intermediate. With nearly half (47%) of our ELs at intermediate, we clearly have difficulty moving these students to higher levels of English-language proficiency.

5.a. Survey Items: AMAO 2 -- CELDT Growth Targets by Time in U.S. Schools

Rationale: If students are making adequate progress learning English, they should reach English language proficiency in a reasonable amount of time (per criteria in AMAO 1 and AMAO 2). The following survey items address the program needs of long-term ELs.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following items and <u>underlined</u> word are for emphasis.)	Rating
5.a.1 The LEA develops, implements and monitors criteria for determining EL placement into and exit from intensive and strategic interventions in R/LA. (4.1)	1
5.a.2 The LEA ensures that teachers employ research-based instructional strategies within the context of the SBE adopted/approved materials in R/LA and ELD to help ELs progress through proficiency levels on the CELDT. (5.1)	2
5.a.3 The LEA <u>monitors</u> staff use of the research-based instructional strategies in R/LA and ELD designed to help ELs progress through proficiency levels on the CELDT. (8.1, 8.3)	2
5.a.4 Collaboration among all relevant staff around multiple sources of student data informs targeted professional development to meet EL instructional needs in subject area content and ELD. (8.3)	2

Table Average 1.8

Based on the data in this table, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

We need to identify ELs that are stagnating at intermediate, particularly at the secondary level (middle and high schools), and investigate the quality of ELD materials, instruction and assessment, as well as quality of access to core content instruction.

7. How are EL students at the English Proficient level on the CELDT performing on the CST (ELA and math) by grade level?

What percent of students are in each of the following performance levels: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced?

a. ELA CST Performance of District EL Students at English Proficient level on CELDT

(as percent of English proficient EL population tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n= %	0 0%	1 5%	0 0%	1 5%	1 6%	1 4%	3 15%	7 5%
Below Basic	n= %	2 11%	1 5%	1 4%	1 5%	6 33%	6 24%	5 25%	22 15%
Basic	n= %	4 21%	11 55%	6 23%	7 37%	6 33%	14 56%	7 35%	55 37%
Proficient	n= %	8 42%	6 30%	16 62%	8 42%	5 28%	3 12%	4 20%	50 34%
Advanced	n= %	5 26%	1 5%	3 12%	2 11%	0 0%	1 4%	1 5%	13 9%
Total (by grade)	n= %	19 13%	20 14%	26 18%	19 13%	18 12%	25 17%	20 14%	147

Reflect on your reclassification criteria and discuss the results you note on this table.

On CST-ELA, 20% of our CELDT-English-proficient ELs score at below and far below basic; 37% are at basic, and 43% are at proficient or advanced. Given that our district has a reclassification standard of midpoint of basic on CST-ELA, it is surprising how many of these students are still EL.

7.a. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST ELA Performance for ELs

Rationale: Many ELs reach the English proficient level on CELDT without attaining grade level academic proficiency in R/LA. These students may continue to need additional support, including interventions, to reach proficiency in R/LA. Teachers and counselors need to have and utilize detailed information about ELs in order to determine the most effective instructional services.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items.)	Consider This	Rating
7.a.1 The LEA provides teachers detailed information about their ELs including English proficiency, academic achievement data and time in U.S. schools. These data are provided in a timely fashion and inform instructional decisions. (4)		3
7.a.2 The LEA uses a variety of data including English proficiency, academic achievement and time in U.S. schools when placing students in core and intervention classes. (4.1, 6.1, 6.2)		1
7.a.3 The LEA ensures that the teaching and counseling staff closely monitor and support the academic progress of long-term ELs who are achieving below grade level performance in R/LA. (6.1, 6.2)		2

Table Average 2.0

Based on the data in Table 7a and the results of the survey items, identify questions to investigate further.

What are the reasons why 20% of CELDT-English-proficient ELs are performing below and far below basic on CST-ELA? Of the 37% that are performing at basic, how many of these are below the midpoint of basic? For those above the midpoint of basic and at proficient/advanced, what other criteria are keeping these students from being reclassified?

8. How are Reclassified-Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students performing on the CST (ELA and math) by grade level?

a. ELA CST Performance of District RFEP Students

(as percent of RFEP students tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Below Basic	n=	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
	%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	3%	3%	2%
Basic	n=	0	1	1	7	7	12	10	38
	%	0%	25%	6%	47%	29%	41%	31%	31%
Proficient	n=	1	3	4	4	11	12	16	51
	%	100%	75%	24%	27%	46%	41%	50%	42%
Advanced	n=	0	0	11	4	6	4	5	30
	%	0%	0%	65%	27%	25%	14%	16%	25%
Total (by grade)	n=	1	4	17	15	24	29	32	122
	%	1%	3%	14%	12%	20%	24%	26%	

Consider your LEA's reclassification criteria and describe your observations about performance of RFEP students in English Language Arts.

Overall, our reclassified former ELs do exceptionally well compared to other groups in the district. 67% of them score at grade level on CST-ELA, and very few (2%) score below or far below basic. However, almost one-third (31%) are scoring at basic. Given that our CST-ELA reclassification standard is midpoint of basic, it appears that a sizable proportion of these students do not continue moving forward to grade level performance.

8.a. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CST ELA Performance for RFEP Students

Rationale: Most ELs are reclassified fluent English Proficient (RFEP) before they reach proficient on the CST in English language arts. Many former ELs drop in performance after reclassification. These students may require extra support, including interventions to help them reach grade level proficiency in English language arts.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items unless otherwise specified.)	Rating
8.a.1 RFEPs are monitored for two years after reclassification for their progress in ELA. (20 USC 6841; 5 CCR 11304, Education Code 313 (d), Section 11510, Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Title III Section 3121 (a) 4)	4
8.a.2 Instructional support, including interventions, is provided as needed for RFEPs who are not yet proficient in English language arts (2.4, 2.2)	2

Table Average **3.0**

Based on the data in this table and the results of the survey items, identify one or more questions that you want to investigate further.

Who are the former ELs that remain at basic or below on CST-ELA? What specific areas of weakness do they have in ELA, and where do we need to strengthen our teaching so they reach grade level standard?

PERFORMANCE ON THE CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAM CAHSEE

9. How are EL Students performing on the CAHSEE according to the length of time they have been in the U.S. schools?

(use total ELs tested on combined 10th grade census test)

Performance of EL Students on CAHSEE	Number Percent	Number of Years in U.S. Schools				Total ELs
		0 to 3 Years	4 to 5 Years	6 or more Years	Unknown Years	
Tested in ELA	n=	5	16	33	1	55
Passed ELA	n=	3	7	13	0	23
	%	60%	44%	39%	0%	42%
Proficient ELA	n=	1	2	4	0	7
	%	20%	13%	12%	0%	13%
Tested in Math	n=	5	16	33	1	55
Passed Math	n=	2	6	12	0	20
	%	40%	38%	36%	0%	36%
Proficient Math*	n=	1	2	4	0	7
	%	20%	13%	12%	0%	13%

Describe your observations about the performance of ELs on the CAHSEE overall and by years in U.S schools.

Our long-term ELs perform most poorly on CAHSEE (only 39% pass, while only 12% are AYP proficient). A similar pattern occurs for mathematics as well. More recent-arriving ELs appear to do much better in passing ELA and mathematics sections of CAHSEE. However, all our ELs are consistently weak in achieving AYP on CAHSEE.

9. Survey Items: AMAO 3 -- CAHSEE Mathematics and ELA Performance for ELs

Rationale: ELs are required to pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in order to be eligible to receive a high school diploma. Many ELs who have been in U.S. schools for more than 5 years do not pass the CAHSEE¹. LEAs must ensure that all ELs requiring support receive it in order to pass the CAHSEE as well as to meet the AYP performance standard. ¹ A passing score of 350 entitles students to be eligible to receive a diploma. A proficient score of 380 or higher is required to meet the AYP performance standard.

ITEMS (Note: APS citations in parenthesis following survey items.)	Rating
9.1 ELs are provided appropriate interventions and support to pass the CAHSEE. (2.1, 2.2,)	2
9.2. ELs are provided appropriate interventions and support to reach proficiency on the CAHSEE. (2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6)	2

Table Average **2.0**

San Ejemplo Unified School District APS Summary by EPC

Rating Scale: 4-Fully; 3-Substantially; 2- Partially; 1- Minimally

Essential Program Component Objectives	Elementary # 1	Elementary # 2	Middle School	High School
1. Instructional Program				
Objective 1.1 (SBE-adopted materials)	4	4	4	2
Objective 1.2 (SBE-adopted ELD materials)	1.5	3	1	1.5
Objective 1.3 (4-8 Reading Intervention programs/materials)	1.5	3	1	1
Objective 1.4 (SBE-adopted UA programs/materials)	3	1.5	3	3
Objective 1.5 (Algebra Readiness, stand alone)	NA	NA	1	1
Objective 1.5 (Grades 4-7 Math Intervention)	1.5	1.5	2	2
Objective 1.6 (Algebra Readiness, stand alone)	NA	NA	3	3
2. Instructional Time				
Objective 2.1 (Protect uninterrupted instructional minutes for ELA)	4	4	4	3
Objective 2.2 (Protected time within the schedule for strategic, and CAHSEE intervention in ELA)	4	3	3	3
Objective 2.3 (Protected time for ELD)	2	2	2	2
Objective 2.4 (Protected time for intensive reading/English language arts intervention)	1.5	2	1	1
Objective 2.5 (Protected time for mathematics)	4	4	3	3
Objective 2.7 (Protected time for intensive mathematics intervention)	4	2	2	3
3. Pacing				
Objective 3.1 (ELA pacing guide)	2	2	2	3
Objective 3.2 (Mathematics pacing guide)	2	2	2	3
4. School Administrator Instructional Leadership				
Objective 4.1 Administrators receive ELA training in SBE-adopted materials.	4	3	4	3

Essential Program Component Objectives	Elementary # 1	Elementary #2	Middle School	High School
Objective 4.2 Administrators receive mathematics training in SBE-adopted materials.	3	3	4	3
Objective 4.3 Administrators receive ongoing support to monitor and implement the EPCs.	2	2	2	2
5. Credentialed Teachers/Professional Development Opportunities				
Objective 5.1 (All classrooms are fully staffed with highly qualified teachers.)	4	4	1	3
Objective 5.2 (All teachers receive 40 hours of training in the SBE-adopted Reading/Language Arts/ELD materials based professional development.)	2	2	1	2
6. Student Achievement Monitoring System				
Objective 6.1 (On-going assessment and monitoring system for Reading/Language Arts.)	2	3	1	2
Objective 6.2 (On-going assessment and monitoring system for mathematics.)	2	3	2	2
7. Ongoing Instructional Support and Assistance for Teachers				3
Objective 7.1 (Content experts and coaches provide on-going support to teachers in reading/LA/ELD.)	3	3	2	3
Objective 7.2 (Content experts and coaches provide on-going support to teachers in mathematics.)	1	2	1	1
8. Monthly Grade Level Collaboration Meetings for Teachers facilitated by the Principal				
Objective 8.1 (Reading language arts collaboration time)	3	3	3	2
Objective 8.2 (Mathematics collaboration time)	2	1	3	4
9. Fiscal Support				
Objective 9.2 (General and categorical funds are coordinated with the mathematics EPCs.)	3	3	3	3

Summary of San Ejemplo District DAS ratings

District Assistance Survey	All ratings are ‘partial’ on the new DAS.
1. Governance	District lacks policies for en-route assessment and interventions, including a data collection system, use of formative and summative assessments for entry and exit into strategic and intensive ELA and math interventions , and documentation of referrals for Special Education services.
2. Curriculum & Instruction	<p>District has 2007 math adoption but has not trained teachers in its use.</p> <p>District uses older 2005 ELA adoption. English language arts instruction is inconsistent and the district does not implement a consistent approach to intervention, i.e., interventions are primarily through optional after school tutoring and although some grade 6-8 classrooms have multiple texts, there is no district approach to intervention .</p> <p>English language development (ELD) programs/classes are inconsistent across the district.</p>
3. Fiscal Operations	State budget reductions have put the district at risk of FCMAT qualification but ARRA funds may stave off status for three years. District unsure how to use ARRA funds and considering professional development or additional school buses.
4. Parent and Community Involvement	There is little support for parents of English learners. However, one elementary school offers translation and interpretation, and encourages parent participation on the School Site Council.
5. Human Resources	Middle grade teachers are working out of credential area, are misassigned, or do not possess the single subject credentials for the subjects they teach.
6. Data Systems and Achievement Monitoring	Students with disabilities, African-Americans, and English learners failed to make AYP . Sites are differentially using 4-6 week curriculum embedded assessments and vary in maintaining data for use in student placement or teacher professional development.
7. Professional Development	Teachers at all levels lack training in scaffolding standards for student academic achievement. Specially designed academic instruction in English strategies (SDAIE) is used on a limited basis in two elementary schools but not elsewhere. Teachers need training in new math adoption.

Inventory of Services and Supports for Students with Disabilities

Inventory	Synthesis Statement
<p>1.1 The district leadership has articulated a clear vision, mission, and policy priorities that include high expectations for student achievement for all students, including students with disabilities.</p> <p>1.2 The district fosters a culture of collaboration at the district and school level between special and general education.</p>	Evidence reveals that there is no board process on how the district's tiered intervention, based on student achievement data includes referrals for students with disabilities.
<p>2.1 The LEA ensures that students with disabilities have access to grade level core instruction in English language arts (ELA) and Mathematics within the general education setting with appropriate supports and accommodations, based on assessed need.</p> <p>2.2 The district ensures that IEP goals and objectives are designed so that all students with disabilities can progress towards grade level standards.</p> <p>2.3 The district ensures that students with disabilities are succeeding in the grade level ELA and Math core.</p> <p>2.4 The district provides appropriate services for students with disabilities who are also English learners (EL).</p>	Evidence documents a lack of collaboration between general education and special education teachers on use of the individualized education plans (IEPs), to document student participation in the core, alternative settings and needs for English Learner (EL) support.
<p>3.1 The district has targeted fiscal resources to address the needs of students with disabilities.</p>	Budget items in LEA plans do not document allocation of Special Education services to specific programs.
<p>4.1 Parents and families of students with disabilities are afforded the same opportunities as all parents to provide and receive information regarding general and special education services.</p>	Full implementation, although parent education policies are generally not strong.
<p>5.1 The district has highly qualified special education teachers and para-educators.</p> <p>5.2 The district has assigned special education teachers to their appropriate credentialed area.</p>	Evidence reveals some teachers assigned to SWD lack special education credentials at the middle school level.
<p>6.1 The district uses data to determine the academic and behavioral needs of students with disabilities.</p> <p>6.2 The district has a data system to monitor the academic and behavioral progress of students with disabilities.</p> <p>6.3 The district has a process that provides collaboration between general and special education staff around the academic achievement of all students at each grade level.</p> <p>6.4 The district has a process to collect data regarding behavior that affects student learning (i.e., suspensions including in-house suspensions, expulsions, and discipline referrals).</p>	Evidence reflects a disproportionately high rate of suspensions for SWD resulting in a loss of instructional time. (See 2.1)

<p>7.1 Professional development for district, school site leaders, coaches, teachers, and para-educators to support students with disabilities.</p> <p>7.2 The district provides professional development to district, school site leaders, coaches, and teachers in how to support students with disabilities within the district and school site assessment continuum.</p> <p>7.3 The district provides professional development for district, school site leaders, coaches, teachers, and para-educators in how to support and integrate students with disabilities within a tiered system of academic and behavioral interventions.</p> <p>7.4 The district provides professional development for IEP teams that promotes increased student learning related to the grade level content standards</p> <p>7.5 The district provides professional development for staff on how to work with parents and families of students with disabilities to support increased student achievement.</p>	<p>Evidence reveals a need for more professional development for teachers in placing SWD in appropriate interventions to accelerate their progress, as well as implementation of strategic and intensive interventions.</p>
--	---