

### Title III Year 4 LEA Needs Assessment

#### 1. IDENTIFY THE PROBLEM: Describe the challenge area(s) for the LEA.

- a. Provide a description of findings from the results of analysis of the CELDT, CST, CAHSEE, and other assessments and findings suggested from other state tools (e.g., ELSSA, APS) used by the LEA to measure EL student English proficiency and academic achievement.

As a group composed of ELL teachers, site principals, administrators of EL and district personnel, we reviewed the reports past and current that we had on hand. We reviewed the CST results, the CELDT results, AMAO reports, teacher reports and observations, ELL student portfolios, and final grades. We also looked at our recently completed ELSSA and APS. We also reviewed our work that was done for the Title III 2 year plan. We saw clear evidence that a large portion of our ELL students were not progressing in most academic areas at the rate we would expect. When we looked at the overall data that included the entire student body we noticed that a large segment of our ELLs (85%) that are in mainstream classes with SDAIE support are progressing at the same rate as English Only students who have academic gaps. These students are receiving the same intervention help as the at-risk English Only students and neither group is progressing. This lack of progress for both groups has led to Program Improvement status for the district. Therefore, we realized that the intervention classes and materials used in these classes were not really benefitting either group.

#### CST Results

##### At-risk, (economically disadvantaged) Below basic and Far Below:

Algebra 1	Grade 9 – 91%	Gr. 10 – 94%	Gr. 11 – 98%
World History	67%	Science 72%	Biology 71%

##### English Language Learners Below Basic and Far Below:

Algebra 1	Grade 9 – 98%	Gr. 10 – 98%	Gr. 11 – 100%
World History	Grade 89%	Science 93%	Biology 93%

Work has begun in restructuring these classes so that they will be more effective and more intensive. The scores from 2009-2010 showed that only 23% of the ELLs attained proficient or above in the ELA on the AYP. Only 26.9% of ELLs reached proficient and above on the Math portion. They did not move up much from the last two years and mirrored the progress of our at-risk students.

##### AYP percent proficient

ELA	<u>06-07</u>	<u>07-08</u>	<u>08-09</u>	<u>09-10</u>
	20%	30.7%	22.4%	23%
Math	34.6%	32.9%	33.9%	26.9%

Therefore, in this case, it is a district problem encompassing EL students and at-risk students with the intervention classes. We need to address these academic gaps with a district solution and the problem is not confined to a single site or a single group.

We also noticed in our ELSSA and APS and CAHSEE results that the ELL students were not scoring on CELDT as high as they were on other language tests that they were given. These included ELD end of unit tests, Edge Placement tests, academic core class test and district generated English placement tests. This led the group to believe that we needed to look at how we administered the CELDT test and when it was given. Teacher observation confirmed for the group that a significant portion of the students did not take the test seriously. Parent and student input also convinced us that we needed to take some one-on-one time with our students to stress the importance of the test and show that there is honor in getting a high score. We also needed more time with all our new students from our six feeder schools to find out where they are in ELA when they come to us. Then the site can define and address their needs as possible before the test. This would also allow the teachers to build a relationship with their new teachers before the teachers test them.

CAHSEE and CST and AYP confirmed what CELDT showed in the AMAO II category. We still have students who haven't moved into the proficient range after several years of language instruction. In the 5 years or more cohort, only 28% of the ELLs were proficient or above. The target was 41.3%. And again we saw the low numbers in AMAO III, not only in ELA but also in math. It is evident that these students have academic gaps as well as language difficulties. Further research of the students in this group showed us that many of them (over ¾) were in all mainstream classes with SDAIE support and did not have the close monitoring that ELD students had because of their language class and mentoring teacher. It seemed obvious to us that our monitoring was not adequate to keep these students engaged in the learning process and that parents felt that they had very few people to turn to with academic concerns.

- b. Describe strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the LEA's current Title III Year 2 Improvement Plan Addendum or Title 1 LEA Plan Addendum.

## **WEAKNESSES**

One of the glaring weaknesses was the monitoring that did not take place as consistently as it should have during the school year. Each ELD student was to have their ELD/ELA portfolio checked on a regular basis and test results were to be recorded and the results were then to drive instruction and interventions. However, this was not the case in every class. EL students no longer in ELD classes were monitored even less and the report cards seemed to be the only check on these students. Although we used the current recommendation for the curriculum, workbook pages still filled many hours of instruction time. Oral interaction was sparse and rarely monitored. This needs to change. The missing piece in the first plan was the lack of attention given to the ELL students that were in the mainstream with SDAIE support. These students were also testing low in CELDT and CST's and struggling with the CAHSEE test requirement. When monitoring, we need to make sure we monitor ALL ELL students, not just ones that were still labeled a level 1-5. This means more support is needed for those just exiting the program.

## **STRENGTHS**

As we looked over the Two Year Plan written for implementation in the third year, we saw that the ideas were good ideas and would and will be a positive addition to the curriculum. Also, we had spent time talking about the configuration of the ELD classes and made sure that we were using the recommended curriculum. We did ensure that teachers mentored and curriculum was purchased that had been recommended by the state.

**IDENTIFY THE CAUSE(S):** Identify and describe the root causes of the challenge(s) or what prevented the LEA from achieving the AMAO(s). Describe how the root causes were verified.

Test results and accumulated data confirmed that the majority of our ELL's were stuck at the intermediate level, most of them born in the United States and educated in the United States school system. These students not only seemed to be stuck at a level in English development, but also displayed academic gaps in reading, writing and math. Teachers observed these gaps in the classroom. Cum folders often confirmed various school districts were attended because of movement and there were gaps in attendance. Their scores were not that much different than other at-risk students in the district whose primary language was English. It became obvious that we must make a school wide effort for intervention in math and reading that would also be the extra steps needed by our intermediate students. We must implement needed bench mark tests and utilize the scores to shape curriculum for the students in all these core academic areas. This would allow the school to monitor the students' progress in academic skills and core knowledge. The academic progress of this group had not been given as much attention as was needed to monitor student progress. The lack of academic progress in this group did not really catch the attention of the school site until state testing results (CST, AYP) came to the district. Therefore, there had not been an opportunity for the academic core teachers to address the verified needs of this group. CST and AYP results show these academic gaps for the last 4 years. Teaching English was neither the only answer nor the only need of these students.

Then there is the yearly test, CELDT, which is given every year as soon as the school year begins. Although we know we can do better with our students, we also know that our students can do better on the CELDT test. Our current students show their abilities on other language test, (CAHSEE, CST, Edge unit testing, district English placement tests, grammar inventory test and core class tests), that surpass the CELDT scores. We also are not a unified district and we do not know how well prepared our freshman are for this test. With students coming from six feeder schools, some with ELD programs and some without, we packed them into the auditorium and administered the CELDT and hoped for the best. The last three years' scores have shown us that some have not done their best and others were totally unprepared for the test.

Again, although the teachers were trained in the use of the EDGE curriculum, they often reverted back to the more comfortable teaching technique of filing out workbook pages and very little verbal practice

with immediate feedback. There is a need to have more monitoring of the classrooms by the site administration to ensure adherence to the curriculum as well as some additional training to bring the teachers' current training up to date. This training should include core academic teachers (trained in SDAIE) as well as ELD teachers.

Another issue that we have realized within the district is parental awareness and support of their child's education. Parents need to understand the importance of their role in the education process. Their engagement is a critical component, and need to be trained in how to become a participant in the educational process.

**2. IDENTIFY THE SOLUTION(S):** Describe the research-base solutions chosen specifically to solve the academic achievement and/or English language development challenge(s) identified above.

1. Creation of common benchmark tests in language, core intervention classes, and academic classes to be used to direct instruction.
2. Active monitoring of the progress of ELL students in all classes.
3. Full use of language portfolios to direct instruction.
4. Demanding reading and writing exercises that involved active face to face oral communication each class period.
5. CAHSEE intervention classes in math and ELA to be part of ELL schedules.
6. A variety of research-based strategies will be implemented to insure optimal results on summative assessments.
7. Bring in professional development for teachers and send others to EL training.
8. Utilize parents as a resource. Educate and encourage them to take a participatory role in their child's education

**Action Plan for: Hanford Joint Union High School District**

**Challenge:** To accurately record the increase in the percentage of English Learners making annual progress in English. Scores do not reflect students' ability.

**Verified Cause:** Early testing, especially of feeder school students in fall, spring reclassification of proficient students.

**State Goal: AMAO 1** – Increasing the percentage of English learners making annual progress in learning English

<b>District SMART Goal:</b> By November 2011, the percentage of English learners advancing in their ability to learn English will increase from 46.8% to 62%, in order to move toward state-defined growth expectations as measured by CELDT.			
<b>Strategy:</b> Increase the time high school teachers have to work on test prep with students and emphasis the importance and scoring rubric with new 9 <sup>th</sup> graders from feeder schools and returning students.			
<b>Action Steps</b> (Description, Person Responsible, Start Date,	Tasks (Due Date)	Budget	Funding Source

End Date)			
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Make students more informed about the test and its importance.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Carry out CELDT test talks with all ELL students which discuss the student's overall level, high and low areas and scale scores. These talks will be one-on-one</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> ELL teachers and site administrator in charge of ELL program</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> March 30, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> on-going</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. March 30, 2011</li> <li>2. August 30, 2011</li> <li>3. January 31, 2012</li> </ol>	\$500.00	Title III
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Emphasis the importance of excelling on the CELDT test as well as becoming proficient in learning English and becoming reclassified.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Hold an awards assembly for ELL students and their families to recognize high performance on the CELDT (Levels 4 and 5) and high levels on the writing section, recognize gains on the CELDT (25 or more scale score points gain one to three levels gained, and recognition of students who have achieved reclassification.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site ELL administrators, District ELL Director, Bilingual technicians</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> May 2011 and on-going</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. January 2011 assembly for CELDT, recognition of achievement</li> <li>2. May 2011</li> </ol>	\$500.00	Title III
<p><b>Strategy:</b> Prepare the students for the test and help them to reconnect with their English after the long summer break and the teaching in other schools.</p>			
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Go over the CELDT released questions with all ELL students before the CELDT.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Students in ELD, language acquisition classes and ELL students in mainstream English classes with SDAIE support will cover mini lesson</p>	<p>Each Year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. February 1</li> <li>2. August 10</li> <li>3. September until testing in October, the cycle will continue</li> </ol>	\$500.00	Title III

<p>on the import skills that are being tested.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site Administrator in charge of ELL, ELD teachers, SDAIE teachers</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> February 1, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> on going, changing as each year's testing creates new blueprints</p>			
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Administer the test as late as possible within the testing window.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> The CELDT test will be administered to the ELL students in October in order to work with the new feeder school students, some who have not had formal ELD instruction at this point</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site personnel, bilingual technician, Director of Special Education</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> October 1</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> October 30</p>	<p>1.October 1-30 2011</p>		
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Have students test with people they know and are accountable to during school hours</p> <p><b>Description:</b> The test will be administered in smaller groups by adults (Language teachers) whom they know. This will call for the training of more staff to become involved in the CELDT testing process and proctoring.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site Administrator and Director of ELL</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> Spring 2011 – when the testing agency begins training and catching others who need to be trained during the summer months when training is held by the County Office of Education.</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> By September 2011 all who will be testing will have need certified.</p>	<p>1.Spring 2011 registration for training 2. Register for late summer training</p>	<p>0</p>	

**Action Plan for: Hanford Joint Union High School District**

**Challenge:** To speed up the time frame of ELL students to attain English proficiency and “unstick” some of the LTELs that have stayed in the intermediate range for a number of years.

**Verified Cause:** Daily curriculum that does not always include intense writing and verbal exchanges and oral practice.

**State Goal: AMAO 2 – English Language Proficiency:** An increasing percentage of English learners will attain English language proficiency annually

**District SMART Goal:** By December 2011, the percentage of English learners attaining English language proficiency will increase from, in order to move toward state-defined expectations for meeting the CELDT criterion for English-language proficiency. This includes increases in the following cohorts: By November 2011, the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs fewer than 5 years attaining English language proficiency will increase from 17.8% to 25%, in order to move towards state defined expectations for meeting the CELDT criterion for English-language proficiency. By November 2011 the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs 5 or more years attaining English Language proficiency will increase from 45% to 57%, in order to move toward state defined expectations for meeting the CELDT criterion for English-language proficiency. This increased competency in the English language should also begin to show in CST’s and CAHSEE.

**Strategy:** Intensive writing program/oral exercises in all stages of language acquisition classes.

<b>Action Steps</b> (Description, Person Responsible, Start Date, End Date)	Tasks (Due Date)	Budget	Funding Source
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Each class will have a 15 minute block that will be used for intense writing combined with immediate dialogue and feedback based on academic vocabulary.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Exercises taken from the CDE book, Chapter 4, “Acquiring English Language” will be the basis of the new mini lessons written by the language staff and incorporated into the language classes.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Language teachers, site administrator for ELL and Director of ELL.</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 15, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> May 15, 2012</p>	<p>1. January 15, 2011 the department will begin work on new lessons.</p> <p>2. February 15, 2011, new mini lessons will be introduced into the lesson plans.</p> <p>3. May 15, 2011, a full year’s of lessons will be written and ready for the 2011-2012 school year.</p>	<p>\$1000.00</p>	<p>Title III</p>
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Common benchmarks to track progress of the classes and individual learners.</p>			

<p><b>Description:</b> Common benchmarks will be used and the ELL portfolios will be kept up to date. Formative testing will be used to create lesson plans to work with the weaknesses and gaps. Pre and post testing will validate the curriculum.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site administrator, ELL teachers</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 15, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> January 15, 2012</p>			
<p><b>Strategy:</b> Language Acquisition classes at both sites will rewrite the curriculums that both sites' classes reflect the district policy of intense writing and reading of fiction and non-fiction material.</p>			
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Common curriculum to be written by LAS teachers as a team. And to be implemented by March for a pilot.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> LAS curriculum will be fused together will input from the 10<sup>th</sup> grade ELA teachers as they attempt to prepare the students for CAHSEE and CST.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> LAS teachers, site administrator</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 15, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> May 15, 2011</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. January SIP day</li> <li>2. March 15, 2011</li> <li>3. May 29, 2011</li> </ol> <p>review of progress</p>		
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Professional Development for all district teachers to update their skills in how to present academic language and intensive writing and dialogue into their lessons.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Possibly utilize "Constructing Meaning" through EL Achieve</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site Principals, Director of ELL,</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> By summer 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> ongoing</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To be determined with input from the Superintendent (Either summer 2011 or a year long development program during the 2011-12 school year)</li> </ol>	<p>\$16,000.00</p> <p>\$20,000.00</p>	<p>Title III</p> <p>Title I</p>

Action Plan for: **Hanford Joint Union High School District**

**Challenge:** A significant number of ELL students fall into the below and far below basic categories in academic testing and display academic gaps.



**Verified Cause:** Monitoring of ELL students and their progress in all classes had been sporadic and ELL students who have been mainstreamed with SDAIE support receive almost no monitoring.

**State Goal: AMAO 3 – AYP for EL Subgroup (LEA level):** An increasing percentage of English learners will attain proficiency in reading/language art and in mathematics

<b>District SMART Goal:</b> ELL students’ academic success will be closely monitored by the site and relayed to parents every 6 weeks.			
<b>Strategy:</b> Monitor/mentor students having at least one EL class			
<b>Action Steps</b> (Description, Person Responsible, Start Date, End Date)	Tasks (Due Date)	Budget	Funding Source
<p><b>Action Step:</b> All ELD teachers will monitor the students’ academic success every progress report and bench mark date.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> ELD teachers will confer with mainstream academic teachers about their students’ progress in math and other academic core subjects. Portfolios will be filled out.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> ELD teachers</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 15, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> June 4, 2011</p>	<p>1. January 15, 2011</p> <p>2. March 15, 2011</p> <p>3. June 4, 2011</p>	00	
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Language Acquisition Support teachers will monitor the academic success and language success of the students on their class load.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> They will watch their attendance, get weekly progress report from their academic core teachers and conference with parents, and keep the student’s portfolio up to date as each standard is mastered.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> LAS teachers will check with their students’ teachers and watch attendance and discipline reports. Students will bring in a weekly grade/progress report</p>			

<p>to the mentor every Friday. Teachers will report their progress with each student to the site administrator at a monthly meeting.  <b>Start Date:</b> January 15, 2011  <b>End Date:</b> June 4, 2011</p>			
<p><b>Strategy:</b> Mentor ELL students who are currently in all mainstream classes with SDAIE support. These students do not have the same one-on-one attention that other ELLs have and their progress is not well monitored. Teachers will be given 3 students each to mentor during the school year.</p>			
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Put out the request for volunteers among the teaching staff who will be willing to keep track of the progress of three ELL students during the school year.  <b>Description:</b> The volunteers will go through a mini prep course (in February) given by the Assistant Principal in charge of ELL to acquaint them with what the district is trying to accomplish and the steps that will be tried to keep the students engaged in their learning and succeeding. Parents will also be included in this so that they can be active members of the team and can feel comfortable calling on the mentor when they have questions. Review of the mentoring program will be held in June and November.  <b>Person Responsible:</b> A.P. and site administrator and mentor teachers.  <b>Start Date:</b> February 1, 2011  <b>End Date:</b> November 15, 2011</p>	<p>1. February 1, 2011  2. June 4, 2011  3. November 15, 2011</p>	<p>\$500.00</p>	<p>Title III</p>

Action Plan for: **Hanford Joint Union High School District**

**Challenge:** Bringing up ELL math and ELS scores for CAHSEE and AYP

**Verified Cause:** The majority of ELL students have consistently not been able to reach proficient or advanced in ELA or Math. This shows up in the AYP and CAHSEE scores.

**State Goal: AMAO 3** – An increasing percentage will attain English language and math proficiency (2)

<b>District SMART Goal:</b> By September 2011 the percentage of English learners attaining proficiency in reading/language arts will increase from 23% to 56% and math will increase from 26.9% to 55% as measured by the CST, CMA, CAPA and/or CAHSEE in order to move toward state-defined expectations for proficiency.			
<b>Strategy:</b> Reconstructed intervention classes/Math			
<b>Action Steps</b> (Description, Person Responsible, Start Date, End Date)	Tasks (Due Date)	Budget	Funding Source
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Math intervention classes will be detached from the regular math class so that a true intense intervention plan can be instituted using techniques learned in GRA professional development.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Materials appropriate for this class will be purchased. (Measures Up)</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Math Department in conjunction with the ELL department and the site administrator</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 15, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> June 4, 2011</p>	<p>1. January 10, 2011</p> <p>2. March 15, 2011</p> <p>3. June 4, 2011</p>	\$7000.00	Title I EIA Title II Part D
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Learning Standards Plus will be used in math class as well as ELD classes as a beginning of every day to get students prepared sooner for the CAHSEE.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> The Standards Plus materials were purchased for teachers in order that they can concentrate on key areas for students every day. The materials for math are geared to Algebra 1 and the CAHSEE.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site administrator</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 15, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> June 4, 2011</p>		\$5500.00	Title I Title III
<b>Strategy:</b> Reconstruction of intervention classes/ELA			
<b>Action Step:</b> ELA intervention	1. January 10,	\$6200.00	Title I

<p>classes will e detached from the regular math class so that a true intense intervention plan can be instituted using techniques learned in SJWP professional development.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Materials appropriate for this class will be purchased. (Measures Up – epath).</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> ELA Department in conjunction with the ELL department and the site administrator</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 10, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> June 4, 2011</p>	<p>2010 2.March 15, 2011 3.June 4, 2011</p>		<p>Title II Part D Title III</p> <p>EIA</p>
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Learning Standards Plus will be used in math class as well as ELD classes as a beginning of every day to get students prepared sooner for the CAHSEE.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> The Standards Plus materials were purchased for teachers in order that they can concentrate on key areas for students every day. The materials for math are geared to Algebra 1 and the CAHSEE</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site Administrator</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> January 10, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> June 4, 2011</p>		<p>\$5400.00</p>	<p>Title III EIA</p>

**Action Plan for: Hanford Joint Union High School District**

**Challenge:** A significant number of ELL students fall into the below and far below basic categories in academic testing and display academic gaps.

**Verified Cause:** Parents need to be encouraged to take a participatory role in assisting their children’s education.

**State Goal: AMAO 1** – Increasing the percentage of English learners making annual progress in learning English and mathematics

**District SMART Goal:** By December, 2012, a training process will be researched and utilized to encourage and support EL parents to take a participatory role in assisting in their child's education.

**Strategy:** Parent participation

<b>Action Steps</b> (Description, Person Responsible, Start Date, End Date)	Tasks (Due Date)	Budget	Funding Source
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Research will be done as to finding programs available for parent involvement.</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Director of EL</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> August, 2011</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> September, 2011</p>	1. September, 2011	0	
<p><b>Action Step:</b> Implement a program for parent involvement</p> <p><b>Description:</b> The district will utilize a program that will train parents in how to be a participant in their child's education</p> <p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Site administrator,</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> March, 2012</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> ongoing</p>	Spring, 2012	\$15,000.00	Title I Title III Migrant