

---

---

## Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Improvement Plan Needs Assessment

**Directions:** Using the template, provide information requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow space needed for narrative responses under each item. All Title III LEAs must submit a copy of this Needs Assessment to the Title III COE Lead as part of the review process. The final version must be uploaded into CAIS as an attachment under the Needs Assessment item in the Requested Documents tab.

**1. Briefly summarize LEA's characteristics, EL linguistic and academic performance challenges, and identify and describe those key factors of the instructional program that prevented the LEA from meeting Title III AMOs.**

a. Describe the LEA's makeup including location, grade levels, and demographics.

The St. Helena Unified School district is nestled in the northern portion of Napa County with lush vineyards all around the valley. The district is comprised of 1269 total students with a total of 233 at the K-2 level, 236 at the 3-5 grades, 295 at the 6-8 level and 505 students at the high school level. With the 1269 K-12 student population, each student is known and supported on a more personalized level. The District's average class size is 20:1, a luxury found in a very few public schools in today's climate of decreasing school funding.

The diversity of interests, needs, abilities and backgrounds of students attending the schools of the St. Helena Unified School district creates a richly hued, complexly woven tapestry. During the past five years, enrollment of the white students in the district has declined to its current level of 49%. At the same time, the Hispanic student population in the district has continued to increase 1-2% each year to its current level of 51%. The balance of students presents unique challenges for the district. In partnership with parents and stakeholders in the community, school leaders in St. Helena Unified School District continue to explore new ways to help all students achieve at the highest level possible and to be college and career ready upon leaving our system.

- b. Describe findings from analyses of the CST, CAPA, CMA, CELDT, CAHSEE, state tools (e.g., ELSSA, APS), graduation (if appropriate), and other assessments used by the LEA (e.g. benchmark assessments, curriculum embedded assessments, ELSSA Supplement) to measure EL student English proficiency, academic achievement, and findings derived from other data analyses as these relate to the three AMAOs (Goals 2A, 2B, and 2C).

The data analysis in St. Helena Unified School District (SHUSD) consisted of reports furnished by KeyData Systems, the State CELDT data report and the completion and review of the ELSSA. The data component of the ELLSA was completed in February, 2014 by KeyData Systems. The ELSSA data was reviewed, analyzed and discussed. The review of the ELSSA, APS and current practices revealed the following issues.

- The SHUSD percentage of proficient or advanced scores on the CST tests for the EL subgroup has remained relatively consistent (37.9% proficient or above in ELA and 42.9% proficient or above for Math) for the past five years.
- We have a small percentage of students (6%) who linger at Beginning and Early Intermediate levels on the CELDT after 4 or more years in US schools. We have a larger percentage of students (35%) who remain at the Intermediate level on the CELDT after 4 year or more years in US schools.
- The majority of SHUSD English proficient level students score at the Basic level on the ELA CST. As students' progress through the grade levels, there is a trend of increasing numbers scoring at the Proficient level, until grades 6-8 when many of these students are reclassified. Across grade levels, we see a trend of decreasing percentages of EL students scoring at the Proficient and Advanced levels on the Math CST, as more able learners in the cohort are reclassified.
- As a total cohort, the majority of R-FEP students scored Proficient or Advanced on the ELA CST, however, in grade 8, 75% of the students scored Basic and Below Basic on the ELA CST. Additionally, at the end of middle school, 27% of these students are at the Below Basic Level in mastery of California ELA Content Standards.
- As a total cohort, 51% of R-FEP students scored Basic or below on the Math CST. Yet in grades 4-7, over half of the R-FEP students scored proficient or advanced. At grade 8, 76% of the R-FEP students took the Algebra 1 CST, with 24% scoring Proficient or above. The 76% scoring Basic or below on the Algebra 1 CST contribute to the discrepancy in student performance between grades 4-7 and 8 grade.
- For AMAO 1, 98 EL's were administered the CELDT (2013) and 97 had current CELDT scores. Of those 97 EL's, 58 had met the Annual Growth Target of 59.0% or higher.
- For AMAO 2, we had 53 students in the cohort of less than 5 years. Of those 53 students, 20 EL's attained English Proficient level (37.7%) which was above the growth target of 22.8%
- For AMAO 2, EL's in the 5 or more years cohort, we had 47 EL's attain the English Proficient level (53.2%) which is above the growth target of 49.0%
- For AMAO 3, in 12-13 we did not meet AYP for ELA and Math with our EL subgroup and had not for the year prior.
- At the first CAHSEE administration in 10<sup>th</sup> grade, 34% of the EL's passed the ELA portion and 53% passed the math portion. This indicates the need to continue to provide CAHSEE support programs at SHHS.

---

b. Describe strengths and weaknesses in the design and implementation of the EL related to goals (2A-2G and 5A) in the current LEA Plan, the prior Year 2 Title III IP, and any other appropriate documents, (e.g. the LEA's Master Plan). The program dimensions listed below are areas to consider in reviewing current plans.

- Implementation of Instructional Services and Methods (Goal 2A)

Students at the intermediate Level and above on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) are not progressing on the state assessment measures at the expected rates. All district teaching staff have appropriate certification for working with EL students, there are appropriate ELD materials and extensive training in differentiated instruction that has been provided. Similarly, standards-based core materials are available, but they are not being used with fidelity by all staff members at all sites. Currently the District uses ELA Houghton-Mifflin materials in the primary and elementary schools. At the middle school, Holt Common Core is used. SHHS uses materials that are on the approved and recommended lists of published by CDE. The math curriculum consists of "GoMath" in grades K-5, Springboard in 6-8 grades and Carnegie Learning in grades 9-12. All are aligned to the new Common Core.

The District has established benchmark assessments in ELA, these assessments are used to determine if students have mastered the essential standards in ELA and math at the elementary and middle school level. These assessments are emerging at the high school and non-existent at the primary school. There is currently no benchmarks or other local measures that assess the EL students' progress at the k-5 grades nor at the high school level. The Middle school has created benchmarks that address the ELD State standards and ELA standards for the EL learner that mirror the SBAC in question design. Additionally, there is no common assessment for placing or monitoring students in ELD beyond CELDT. Currently, the multiple measure data that is available is not being used to define placement criteria or to inform intensive or strategic interventions in the k-5 levels. In the 6-12 grades, multiple measures are reviewed to determine individual student needs related to interventions such as READ180, Math180, ELD enrichment, APEX learning and/or study skills. The District itself also lacks formative assessments and summative assessments.

The District has established sheltered and replacement courses at RLS middle and SH high school for ELA instruction. Currently, there are no sheltered or replacement courses at the high school level for EL students in mathematics. RLS middle does have the new MATH180 support class as of 2013-14 school year. On state assessments measures, students identified as R-FEP show a decline in achieved proficiency levels in middle school and high school. Additionally, the district does not have formative assessments in mathematics at this time.

### **Instructional Strategies:**

Over the past three years, the District has been in the process of completely restructuring the academic programs at the k-5 grades and high school level. The focus has been to implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model, develop quality programs for ELs and implementation of the CCSS. These changes have increased performance in many areas, however, the data indicates that refinements need to meet the needs of the ELs and provide a more integrated learning environment across subject areas if ELs are going to be successful. The District is primarily comprised of heritage Spanish speakers and heritage English speakers. In consultation with the Region IV support provider and the California World Language Project Director, the District is establishing an integrated Spanish/English program to develop higher language skills for all students and to provide more academic language for ELs.

There are targeted interventions available at all sites in the District and a variety of enrichment programs which have impacted the core instructional time particularly at the k-5 levels in the past years. There has now been core targeted instructional time set within the schedules at the k-5 levels that cannot be interrupted by other enrichment programs. Administrators would still benefit from effective use of data decision making PLC's with staff and monitoring of instructional practices in the classroom. There have been effort at the various schools to use data to inform instruction but there still lacks consistency at all 4 schools due to administrator turnover and systems not being in place for consistent gathering and reviewing site student data. The teachers and staff, given the appropriate support and direction, are quite capable and willing to make the needed instructional changes.

### **STRENGTHS:**

- There is adequate State Board of Education (SBE) adopted materials in ELA, Reading and Math K-8 and standards aligned materials at the 9-12 levels.
- There are multiple intervention services provided at the four schools in the district
- SHHS implemented an EL English/Social Studies Block and a Migrant Education program this year
- RLS Middle School has Core ELD instruction plus an ELL enrichment class to supplement needed content and skill building beyond the ELD classroom, if needed
- All sites have appropriate ELD materials for instruction and have purchased all the necessary ELD materials related to the adopted text in ELA and Math
- All teaching staff are highly qualified and wanting to improve their skill set as much as possible.

### **WEAKNESSES:**

- Consistency in instruction practices from school site to school site

- Amount of time given to ELD instruction at the lower grades
- There is no math intervention for EL's available at the K-5 grades

- **Professional Development (Goal 2D)**

While teachers are appropriately credentialed to teach ELD, implementation of research based instructional strategies for ELD is not currently being monitored and/or supported consistently at all 4 school sites. Staff are willing to implement these strategies, but have not either received updated training and/or not mentored in the application of these research based instructional strategies. Staff are continuing to receive professional development opportunities in meeting the needs of ELs through ongoing professional development with Pivot Learning Consultants. Professional development will continue to be an ongoing focus for our teaching staff in recognition that we are getting better at meeting the needs of the EL student but we still have a ways to go for consistent delivery with research-based instructional models.

**STRENGTHS:**

- All staff have the appropriate certification to serve the EL students

**WEAKNESSES:**

- Inconsistent monitoring and training of teachers on ELD instructional strategies within the classroom

- **Parent and Community Participation (Goal 2E)**

The data analysis showed that the parents of EL students are actively involved in their children's education. SHUSD has incorporated meaningful opportunities for parent feedback on specific topics at school events. There are active English language Advisory Committees (ELAC) at each school site and a District English Language Advisory Committee (DELAC) that meet on a regular basis. SHUSD has utilized the Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) in the past few years to assist the parents of EL students in supporting their children's educational achievement and knowing their rights and the common language used within the educational system. The various school sites also train our Spanish speaking parents on how to use the Student Information System (AERIES) so that they can monitor the progress of their child throughout the school year. The district will continue the practice of providing these types of service to the parents of the EL student.

**STRENGTHS:**

- Parents of EL students are very involved at the various school sites.
- There is a general feeling of acceptance and respect for all parents within the school community at all sites.

**WEAKNESSES:**

- **Parental Notification (Goal 2F)**

Parents are notified each year as written within our District English Learners Service procedural manual on CELDT scores and/or reclassification. Scores are also given to parents through mailers on State test results. Overall scores on the district ELL's are provided and reviewed at the ELAC and DELAC meetings throughout the school year as we focus on programs and services provided to our ELL population. A parent survey was administered in March in both English and Spanish that provided information that we used to inform our LCAP. Also utilizing strategies from the Family engagement Framework, parents were invited and asked to attend multiple feedback-gathering sessions. All of our parent information sent throughout the school sites is translated into Spanish.

**STRENGTHS:**

- Parents are engaged and involved in our ELAC/DELAC committees
- All written information is translated into Spanish and all oral parent trainings or workshops are also translated in Spanish.
- Parent/Teachers conferences are held at the K-5 levels for every student
- Student-led conferences are held at the 6-8 level on every student

WEAKNESSES:

- Services for Immigrant Students if the LEA receives Title III Immigrant Funds (Goal 2G)

No funding is received in this area

STRENGTHS:

WEAKNESSES:

- Increase Graduation Rates (Goal 5A)

CELDT scores show that only 53.6% of our EL students are acquiring English Proficiency to engage in the rigor of the CCSS. On the AP assessments: 40.8% of the Hispanic student population (compared to 66% of White students) in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade take one or more AP exams. Of these Hispanic students, 80% pass with a 3 or better. 100% of all students at SHHS take the ELA portion of the EAP. 35% of the students are ready for college English. Students who are still designated EL's at the 10<sup>th</sup> grade level and beyond are not passing the ELA portion of the CAHSEE. This is a very small percentage of the student population, however, by the time they reach the 12<sup>th</sup> grade level all EL students would have passed the CAHSEE and graduated with a HS diploma.

STRENGTHS:

- More students are re-designated as RFEP's by the time they get to 10<sup>th</sup> grade. Only a small percentage, under 10 students, remain as EL's beyond 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
- CAHSEE support, APEX learning, study skills and other services are provided to our EL's to help them have success at the HS level on the CAHSEE and other core classes.

WEAKNESSES

- Having students who have been in our school district longer than 5 years still designated at EL at the HS level which limits enrollment in higher level course work (AP and/or Honors classes).
- Only one third of our 10<sup>th</sup> grade ELL are proficient in ELA as shown by the CAHSEE results

C. Factors contributing to failure to meet AMAO(s):

As described above, the following factors contributed to our failure to meet AMAO 3:

- Lack of support and monitoring of implementation of research based ELD instructional strategies
- Lack of fidelity in the use of the SBE approved standards based core instructional materials
- Lack of benchmark assessments that measure an ELs progress in ELD
- Lack of support for EL students at the K-5 grades

D. Conclusions from analysis that inform program modifications

Staff and stakeholders recognize the necessity of allocating time and resources towards improving ELD for our EL students at all grade levels. Included in this allocation of resources is the need to establish the monitoring of progress in language acquisition, the implementation of differentiated instruction and the delivery of the core curriculum with fidelity in all classrooms. There is also

a need to refine the placement of EL students into intervention, sheltered, and core placement programs. Integral to the use of intervention programs is the need to monitor student's progress and make adjustments and/or exit the students as appropriate. Finally, the district needs to establish a practice of monitoring students who are re-designated as R-FEP to ensure their continued success.

**2. Describe factors contributing to the failure to meet AMAO(s).** Identify and describe factors that prevented the LEA from achieving the AMAO(s) and explain how the identified factors above were verified using the evidence gathered.

<b>AMAOs</b>	<b>FACTORS</b> (e.g., inconsistent implementation, inadequate PD, inadequate resources)	<b>EVIDENCE</b> (e.g., data analyses, classroom walk through, program evaluation, surveys)
AMAO 1	59.8% in this cohort met AMAO1-Met	Title III accountability report as of 8/5/14
AMAO 2 Cohort 1: < 5 yrs	37.7% in this cohort1 met AMAO2-Met	Title III accountability report as of 8/5/14
AMAO 2 Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs	53.2% in this cohort 2 met AMAO2-Met	Title III accountability report as of 8/5/14
AMAO 3 ELA	No information available for 13-14	
AMAO 3 Mathematics	No information available for 13-14	

**3. Write a brief description/bulleted outline of each goal below that was identified as an area of focus from the Needs Assessment; the details for these will be part of your plan.** Goal statements should be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely (i.e., SMART Goals), since they must be made actionable through strategies, actions and tasks in the Title III Improvement Plan.

- Goal 2A: (AMAO 1 Annual Progress Learning English)  
 By June 2016, the percentage of English learners learning English will remain at 59.8% or higher in order to continue to make progress in meeting state defined growth expectations as measured by CELDT
- Goal 2B: (AMAO 2 English Proficiency)  
 By June 2016, the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs fewer than 5 years attaining English language proficiency will remain at 37.7% or higher in order to continue to make progress to meet state-defined expectations for meeting CELDT criterion for English language proficiency.  
  
 By June 2016, the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs 5 or more years attaining English language proficiency will remain at 53.2% or higher in order to progress in meeting state-defined expectations for CELDT criterion for English-language proficiency.
- Goal 2C: (AMAO 3-AYP for ELs in English Language Arts)  
 By June 2016, the percentage of teachers of English learners implementing the ELD Standards in tandem with the California Common Core Standards for ELA will increase from 25% to 70% as measured by locally developed observation tools and training documentation.  
  
 By June 2016, the percentage of English learners attaining proficiency in ELA will increase from 37.9% to 50% as measured by benchmarks and other local measures, in order to continue to move towards state-defined expectations for proficiency in ELA.

Goal 2C: (AMAO 3-AYP for ELs in Mathematics)

By June 2016, the percentage of teachers of English learners implementing the ELD Standards in tandem with the California Common core Standards for Mathematics will increase from 33% to 100% as measured by locally developed observation tools.

By June 2016, the percentage of English learners attaining proficiency in Math will increase from 42.9% to 50% as measured by benchmarks and other local measures, in order to continue to move towards state-defined expectations for proficiency in Math.

Goal 2D: (High Quality Professional Development)

By June 2016, the percentage of teachers/administrators will participate in professional development focused on standards-based/standards-aligned instruction and materials, the implementation of the ELD Standards in tandem with the California common Core State Standards for ELA/Math, and the use of effective instructional strategies will increase 25% to 70% as measured by locally developed tools.

By June 2016, 80% of the SHUSD teachers will receive professional development on research-based strategies to improve English learner attainment of English language proficiency and/or achievement in Reading/language arts and/or mathematics, as determined by the LEA needs

Goal 2E: (Parent and Community Participation)

By June 2016, SHUSD will continue to improve and increase parent outreach strategies so that 100% of parents are active participants in the education of their children.

Goal 2F: (Parental Notification)

By June 2016, SHUSD will continue to provide 100% of parents of ELs with the following information regarding their children, in a language parents can understand: -identification of EL; -program placement options;-program placement notification;-English language proficiency level, as determined by CELDT results and any other local measures;-academic achievement level;- re-designation information;-graduation requirements and annual notification of their students' progress towards meeting those requirements.

Goal 2G: (Services for Immigrant Students: **must be addressed if the LEA receives Title III Immigrant Education Funds**)

Goal 5A: (Increase Graduation Rates)

Results from our analysis of CAHSEE pass rates for EL's on the ELA portion is only at 34% for 10<sup>th</sup> graders. Based on this data, our district goal is to provide additional academic Language/Literacy support to our EL learners so that we have higher than 34% pass rate for ELA in 10<sup>th</sup> grade.

4. Title III Year 4 Requirements (Section 3122[b][4][A]): Summarize how the LEA will specifically address changes in curriculum, program, and method of instruction to address the factors that prevented

# Elementary and Secondary Education Act

## Local Educational Agency Plan Goal 2

### Budget

Name of LEA: **Saint Helena Unified School District**

Fiscal Year: **2014-2015**

Total Title III Allocation: LEP \$ 27,623 Immigrant: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

LEP Administrative & Indirect Costs (2%): \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Immigrant Administrative & Indirect Costs: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

For each applicable Title III goal indicated below, indicate the key actions that will be implemented to meet each goal, the related Title III budget item, and the estimated cost for each item.

Title III Goal	Specific Title III Supplemental Key Actions (Activities) to Meet Goal	Unit (Purchase) Detail	Associated Estimated Costs for each Activity Listed
Goal 2A: AMAO 1- Annual progress Learning English			
Goal 2B: AMAO 2 - English Proficiency	Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job embedded professional development aligned to common core and instructional programs		
Goal 2C: AMAO 3 -Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English/Language Arts	Provide professional development in ELA/ELD and Literacy standards to increase our human capacity in teaching and learning of EL's		\$10,623

Goal 2C: AMAO 3 – AYP in Mathematics	Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job embedded professional development aligned to common core and instructional programs		\$12,000
Goal 2D: High Quality Professional Development	LEA and site administrators will verify that teachers attend and align ongoing, systematic professional development around EL instructional needs		
Goal 2E: Parent and Community Participation	Provide multiple vehicles to involve parents in the work of the schools within the LEA to assist in the teaching and learning of their children		\$5,000
Goal 2F: Parental Notification	Communicate with parents of EL's in the parents' primary language in a timely manner		
Goal 2G: Services for Immigrant Students (for LEAs receiving Title III, Immigrant funds)	N/A		
Goal 5A: Increase Graduation Rates	LEA and site administration will verify that EL's are making accelerated progress in ELD in order to complete HS requirements for graduation		
Total Title III Budget Estimate (Include Administration and Indirect Costs) for LEP and Immigrant Programs			LEP \$ 27, 623 IMM \$ _____

**Program Notes:**

- I. Activities must be of supplemental nature. Align activities with associated estimated costs.
- II. LEAs must expend Title III funds on activities that are required, allowable, allocable, necessary and reasonable.

III. Title III funds should supplement the level of Federal, State, and local funds, including LCFF funds.  
April 2015