

Title III LEA Improvement Plan Addendum

Brawley Union High School District

1. Based on analysis using the ELSSA, identify factors that prevented the LEA from achieving the AMAOs:

A. Analysis of Data with Factors Contributing to the LEAs Failure to Meet AMAOs

AMAO 1

AMAO 1: Percent of EL Students Making Annual Progress in Learning English				
	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Target	51.5%	52.0%	48.7%	50.1%
Percent Meeting Target	71.7%	70.3%	38.5%	35.9%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	N

The BUHS District met the AMAO 1 in 2004-2005 and 2005-2006; however, student annual progress declined to 38.5% in 2006-2007 and 35.9% in 2007-2008, thus not meeting the AMAO 1 target for two consecutive years. The district attributes the decline to the administration of the CELDT, an annual assessment that is not highly promoted among English learner students and parents to maximize performance and ensure understanding of the progress measured. In 2006-2007, CDE developed a newer version of the CELDT with a revised rubric that may have impacted student scores in the district as well. In addition, the district requires a systematic approach of monitoring EL progress annually, with interventions to target students failing to demonstrate one year growth, achieving or sustaining English proficiency.

AMAO 2

AMAO 2: Percent of EL Students Attaining English Proficiency				
	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Target	30.7%	31.4%	27.2%	28.9%
Percent Meeting Target	42.9%	45.0%	17.6%	18.0%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	N

The BUHS District exceeded the AMAO 2 target in 2004-2005 and 2005-2006; however, declined to 17.6% in 2006-2007 and 18.0% in 2007-2008, thus not meeting AMAO 2 for both consecutive years. The district database contains CELDT data that is made accessible to staff (i.e., administrators, counselors, EL Support Staff), as well as teachers who are provided the proficiency levels of their students by course. The district attributes the decline in students attaining English proficiency as a result of the following: 1) district EL support staff and district/site administrators must conduct an annual study of CELDT data to determine curricular changes for EL students in the ELD and mainstream setting, 2) teachers must receive data of EL students who continue to fail to meet English proficiency, and 3) teachers must receive professional development to implement effective SDAIE strategies to meet the instructional needs of students in all courses according to proficiency levels.

AMAO 3

AMAO 3: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for EL Subgroup at the LEA Level: Percent Proficient								
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
% Proficient Target *	22.3%	20.9%	22.3%	20.9%	22.3%	20.9%	33.4%	32.2%
% Proficient or Above	25.3%	30.5%	32.0%	36.1%	18.7%	32.2%	30.9%	36.0%
Was Target Met? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

The BUHS District met the AYP participation rate and growth target for the EL subgroup in 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The district met its EL subgroup target for 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, exceeding the proficiency rate in mathematics; however, not meeting proficiency in ELA. The data indicates that EL students continue to require instructional support to further English language development skills in each domain (reading, writing, listening and speaking). Students enrolled in the ELD program receive access to ELD and ELA content standards, CAHSEE preparation, and instruction aligned to their language acquisition needs. Thus, most students enrolled in the ELD program sustain annual progress on the CELDT and CAHSEE.

EL students enrolled in the ELA program receive access to standards-based instruction through state-adopted curriculum and support courses in the 9th and 10th grade (i.e., English 1 with English Support); however, ELA courses require further alignment to ELD standards for ELs. School sites must remain cognizant of student placement in support courses, targeting EL students who fail to meet annual academic progress on CELDT, CST, and CAHSEE. Teachers of mainstream ELA courses require on-going professional development to become skilled in the identification of the students' language acquisition needs and implementation of effective SDAIE strategies to increase academic achievement.

CELDT

Prior Year CELDT Level	Number in Proficiency Level Prior Year	Percent in Proficiency Level	Number Meeting Growth Target	Percent Meeting Growth Target	State Average Meeting Growth Target**
Beginning	37	14.8%	20	54.1%	63.7%
Early Intermediate	43	17.2%	18	41.9%	62.1%
Intermediate	112	44.8%	28	25.0%	40.4%
Early Adv./ Advanced: Not English Proficient	7	2.8%	1	14.3%	51.4%
Early Adv./ Advanced: English Proficient	51	20.4%	17	33.3%	74.2%
Total	250	100.0%	84	33.6%	

NOTE: Data includes students with CELDT results for 2006-07 and 2007-08.

A review of CELDT data for two consecutive years indicates that EL students at the Beginning level of proficiency exhibit the most annual growth, while students in other proficiency levels perform significantly below the state average. Primary areas of concern include the number of students at the Intermediate level who fail to demonstrate annual growth, and students in the proficiency level of Early Advanced/Advanced (English proficient) who are not able to sustain proficiency. The district must annually examine factors contributing to Intermediate level students not progressing in English language proficiency, considering years in U.S. schools, performance on all domains of CELDT, EL support provided in the ELA program, professional coaching in the area of ELD standards-based instruction, and monitoring

student growth. Furthermore, 65% of the district's EL students have attended U.S. schools for six or more years with the majority at the Intermediate level, and 25% of the EL students enrolled for three years or fewer with the majority at the Beginning level. The district recognizes that a significant portion of the EL population remains at the Intermediate level with no progress, when students should have surpassed the proficiency level in earlier years of their education.

CST

Analyzing the CST results of English proficient students (according to CELDT), the majority of the students in the district performed at Basic (39%) and Below Basic (35%) for ELA in 2007-2008. The district continues to display annual CST growth, yet the EL data indicates that students at proficiency require further intervention in the ELA program. Teachers of EL students must implement instructional strategies to bridge student learning from current levels of language proficiency to the high levels of content and skills embedded in the standards and curriculum. For mathematics, the district must examine the instructional program to ensure that teachers receive necessary training to apply explicit instruction of academic language for the content area (i.e., General Math, Algebra, and Geometry).

Analyzing the CST results of Intermediate students (according to CELDT), the majority of the students in the district performed at Basic (27%), Below Basic (46%), and Far Below Basic (47%) for ELA in 2007-2008. The majority of the Intermediate population attended U.S. schools for 6 years or more, and are enrolled in the core ELA program. Most students at the intermediate level may be considered *strategic* and *intensive* learners according to their course placement, and have access to standards-based instruction in one period of core ELA, accompanied by a support class (9th and 10th grade). The district must ensure that students at the Intermediate level and below receive access to a support class aligned to ELA and ELD standards. The district must also establish a system to monitor individual student growth, identify students failing to demonstrate annual progress, and to determine the intervention required in the following academic year. For mathematics, Intermediate level students performed in the levels of Basic (19%), Below Basic (53%), and Far Below Basic (24%) on the CST in 2007-2008. The data indicates that Intermediate level students are failing to access the content and skills embedded in the core math program as measured by the CST. Professional development is required to assist teachers evaluate their curriculum and instruction in each math course, to determine the language skills students require.

Analyzing the 2007-2008 CST results for Reclassified-Fluent English Proficient students in the district, the data indicates that once students achieve the R-FEP status, they demonstrate fluency in English and may exhibit higher skill levels in ELA. The majority of the R-FEP population performed at Proficient (31%) and Basic (40%) for ELA. R-FEP students are able to make the transition to the higher skill level in reading and writing, as assessed by the CST. For mathematics, R-FEP students do not make the successful transition from their individual language skills to the language of the content areas (i.e., General Math, Algebra, and Geometry). The majority of R-FEP students performed at Basic (34%) and Below Basic (39%) on the math CST. While a significant portion of EL students pass the CAHSEE math, demonstrating proficiency in the basic levels, they encounter difficulties when accessing the higher level of content and skill as measured by the CST. Teachers of mathematics must be provided with the strategies to support EL students in the acquisition process of language and vocabulary for the content area.

CAHSEE

Analyzing the performance of EL students on the 2007-2008 CAHSEE, the data indicates a passing rate of 33% with 6% meeting proficiency in ELA; whereas, for mathematics, the passing rate is 62% with 27% meeting proficiency. A significant portion of English learners do not pass the CAHSEE ELA on the first attempt. As the majority of the district's EL population performs at the Intermediate level on the CELDT, the CAHSEE also reflects a student need for acquiring skills and content knowledge assessed by standards that range between 8th and 10th grade. The ELA program embeds CAHSEE instruction into courses in 9th and 10th grade; however, the district must evaluate the program to possibly extend instructional services to specifically target EL students during a tutorial period within the school day, enrichment after school or summer session courses designed for the mainstream EL student.

Analyzing the performance of R-FEP students on the CAHSEE, the data indicates a passing rate of 95% with 58% meeting proficiency in ELA; whereas, for mathematics, the passing rate is 87% with 49% meeting proficiency. R-FEP students exhibit greater success in both areas of the CAHSEE in comparison to EL students. The R-FEP population demonstrates an ability to meet the basic skill and content level in math and English, as measured by the CAHSEE. Although R-FEP students meet the proficiency levels on CAHSEE, they continue to struggle with the higher skill and content levels assessed by CST.

B. Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current Plan

Strengths:

The district has an established ELD program with placement criteria, systematic ELD instruction, standards-based curriculum, and well defined sequence of courses that allows ELs to progress toward high school graduation.

ELD instructional strategies are implemented in the ELD program, and SDAIE strategies are incorporated in ELA support courses at the 9th and 10th grade levels.

Summer enrichment is provided to ELD students to target English language development and provide intensive CAHSEE instruction.

The academic progress of ELD students is monitored closely by teachers of the ELD program.

The district employs high-quality ELD teachers who receive on-going professional development for ELD standards-based instruction.

All district teachers receive data identifying the EL students in all courses with proficiency levels, according to the CELDT.

EL students enrolled in the core ELA and mathematics program receive access to standards-based instruction through the implementation of state-adopted curriculum. Access to the ELA core program for strategic and intensive learners is provided through support courses (i.e., English I and English I Support).

The district database contains EL information (i.e., CELDT, CAHSEE, CST) made available to administrators, counselors, resource teacher, and EL support staff. CST assessments for all students are provided to teachers with use of the Data Director Program (database).

The ELD and ELA program utilize supplementary materials to support EL students in the area of English-language arts.

The district and site provide parents with written and/or oral translations for parents in conferences, advisory meetings, assessment results, and other school events.

The Parent Advisory Committee, School Site Council, ELAC, and DELAC are utilized to facilitate parent involvement and to disseminate school and district information.

The comprehensive high school has implemented a process for utilizing CELDT, CST, and CAHSEE for student placement, and establishing core courses to better meet the needs of the EL students.

ELD and ELA core content area teachers are provided professional development in areas such as CAHSEE, Write Institute, AB 466/SB 472, 6+1 Traits for Writing, Reading Plus, and workshops provided through the Imperial County Office of Education.

Collaboration meetings are built into the annual school calendar, along with release time provided to teachers to examine curriculum, develop and analyze common assessments, and discuss the implementation of support strategies.

The district special education program addresses the needs of EL students with disabilities through the development of linguistically appropriate goals, monitor of student growth and placement in appropriate courses based on academic needs and student achievement.

The district ensures that all teachers have the proper authorization to teach EL students. All teachers providing instruction to students in reading-language arts, mathematics, and ELD have the proper authorization to provide instruction to EL students.

Weaknesses:

All classes with EL students are not provided with consistent and strategic SDAIE instruction to ensure access to state-adopted core curriculum programs.

The district has not effectively implemented a scientifically-based literacy plan for EL students.

The ELA state-adopted instructional materials do not provide sufficient support for EL students in the core curriculum program. Teachers must therefore supplement the curriculum and their instruction with EL support.

ELA and other content area teachers require on-going professional development to provide standards-based instruction to students according to language proficiency.

EL students enrolled in the ELA program for 11th and 12th grade require instructional support to master ELA/ELD standards and further language development in English.

The district requires specific instructional strategies to implement district and school-wide to serve the EL population, and to further language proficiency beyond the Intermediate level on the CELDT and low achievement on the CST and CAHSEE.

The district requires a systematic approach to monitoring the annual progress of EL students using CELDT, CAHSEE, and CST, with the data determining the changes in curricular programs based on student performance and need for intervention.

School-sites require course placement criteria for EL students in the content areas, as well as professional development in EL language proficiency levels, ELD standards, and implementation of ELD/SDAIE strategies for EL support in *all* courses.

The district requires a Title III Team to evaluate and modify the services of the English Learner program, inform staff of EL policy and methodology, provide on-going professional coaching, examine EL data and student achievement. The team receives release time for required training, planning, and conducting an on-going study of student data to inform district/site administrators and staff of the needs of the English Learner program.

School-sites require sufficient collaboration to address EL students in the classroom (i.e., analyzing assessments, student achievement, and strategies).

Parents and students require information regarding the importance of CELDT, CST, and CAHSEE. Parent must understand the implications of these results for their student's academic program.

C. Summary of Factors Contributing to the LEA's Failure to Meet AMAOs

The district will examine and improve the following areas: ELD/ELA standards-based program, provide on-going professional development for staff, implement district-wide ELD/SDAIE strategies, implement a process for EL data analysis, develop a Title III Team to evaluate and modify services of the English Learner Program, increase parent involvement through outreach activities that inform parents/guardians of the importance of state assessments and student achievement.

D. Conclusions

Through the self-analysis, the district has identified its areas in need of improvement that currently impact the achievement of English Learners. The district has started the implementation process of the Title III Improvement Plan in preparation for the 2009-2010 academic year.

Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement	Personnel Responsible	Timeline with Benchmarks	Funding Source
<p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English-language Development (ELD). (AMAOs 1 and 2; English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment [ELSSA] Section B)</p> <p>a. The district considers the CELDT, CST, CAHSEE, and SBE-adopted program assessment tools for placement of English Learners.</p> <p>b. Establish criteria for placement of students to ensure ELD instructional support (i.e., Intensive A, Transitional English I and II, English I Support and English II Support, English I Basic and Support, English 11, 12 and Tutorial Support).</p> <p>c. Establish a tutorial period at the comprehensive school site and reading period at the alternative school site for EL students according to language proficiency needs. Students will have the opportunity to access additional ELD support (i.e., Reading Plus).</p> <p>d. Continue with the implementation of the state-adopted program <u>High Point</u>, Hampton-Brown in ELD courses (or newly adopted programs), and <u>Learning the Language of Literature</u>, McDougal-Littell, in English-language arts courses.</p> <p>e. Implement academic monitoring on a 12-week schedule to identify EL students at-risk of failing English and/or math courses. Conduct academic intervention procedures (i.e., conferences, phone contact with parents, required after school tutoring, support classes) that require teachers and counselors to intervene to improve student progress.</p> <p>f. Establish a Title III English Learner team at the district level to provide EL instructional support to all teachers on an on-going basis throughout the school year.</p> <p>g. The administration team will find the ELD strategies observable in all classrooms in the district.</p>	<p>a. Counselors, Teachers, Site Administration</p> <p>b. Counselors, Title III Team, Site Administration</p> <p>c. Site Administration, Title III Team</p> <p>d. Teachers, Site Administration</p> <p>e. Teachers, Title III Team, Counselors, Site Administration</p> <p>f. District/Site Administration, Title III Team</p> <p>g. Site administration, Title III Team</p>	<p>a. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>b. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>c. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>d. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>e. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>f. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>g. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p>	<p>-Title III</p> <p>-Title III</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>-Lottery Funds -Instructional Material Funds -Unrestricted Funds</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>-Title III</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>3. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in reading/language arts. (AMAO 3;ELSSA Section B)</p>			

<p>a. Train core teachers in ELD standards and assist departments (i.e. Science, Math, Social Science, P.E., Elective Courses) in developing a plan to incorporate ELD standards into their curriculum and instruction.</p> <p>b. Train core teachers in ELD and SDAIE strategies to support English learners in the Reading-language arts program as well as provide Reading/Writing/Listening/Speaking skills across the curriculum.</p> <p>c. Identify EL students who are below basic and far below basic on the CSTs for ELA and ensure that these students have access to core curriculum with instructional support. The intervention is provided through one period of English Support (ELD, 9th and 10th grade), course leveling in 11th and 12th grade, curriculum components that provide universal access, and CAHSEE preparation.</p> <p>d. EL students participate in a tutorial period for reading intervention.</p> <p>e. Consult with other school districts who have met their AMAOs for successful strategies that can be implemented into the ELA program.</p> <p>f. Provide release time for ELD staff to articulate strategies to ELA teachers for differentiating instruction for the various EL proficiency levels.</p> <p>g. Continue with the use of WRITE Institute in the ELD program and 6+1Traits for Writing in the ELA/ELD courses. Ensure the implementation of the programs and that common assessments are observable through instruction.</p> <p>h. Teachers of the ELA/ELD program monitor EL students' academic progress through common assessments from the state adopted programs.</p>	<p>a. Site Administration, Title III Team, Teachers</p> <p>b. Site Administration, Title III Team, Teachers</p> <p>c. Site Administration, Title III Team, Teachers</p> <p>d. Site Administration, Title III Team, Teachers Counselors</p> <p>e. Site Administration, Title III Team</p> <p>f. Site Administration, Title III Team, Teachers</p> <p>g. Site Administration, Teachers</p> <p>h. Site Administration, Teachers</p>	<p>a. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>b. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>c. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>d. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>e. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>f. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>g. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>h. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p>	<p>-Impact EL Grant -Title III</p> <p>-Impact EL Grant -Title III</p> <p>-Title III</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>-Impact EL Grant -Title I -Title III</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>4. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics. (AMAO 3; ELSSA Section C) N/A</p>			
<p>5. Describe scientifically based research professional development strategies and activities, including coordination efforts with other No Child Left Behind (NCLB) programs. (ELSSA Section D)</p> <p>a. The Title III Team receives the required training to administer the CELDT to English Learners.</p> <p>b. The Title III Team is provided with scientifically based research professional development to become trainers of EL state requirements, instructional strategies, and methods to implement in the classroom across the curriculum.</p>	<p>a. Title III Team, District/Site Administration</p> <p>b. Title III Team, District/Site Administration</p>	<p>a. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>b. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p>	<p>-Unrestricted Funds -Title III</p> <p>-Impact EL Grant -Title I -Title III -EIA</p>

<p>c. Provide release time to the Title III Team to hold two meetings per semester to analyze EL data (i.e., CST, CELDT, CAHSEE) to develop common instructional strategies that provide support to English learners in all classes. The team will evaluate and modify the English Learner Program on an on-going basis.</p> <p>d. Devote time from Staff Development Days to train teachers in areas that pertain to English Learners (i.e., CELDT, EL Proficiency Levels, Course Placements, EL CAHSEE/CST data, strategies).</p>	<p>c. District/Site Administration, Title III Team</p> <p>d. District/Site Administration, Title III Team</p>	<p>c. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>d. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p>	<p>-Title III</p> <p>-Unrestricted Funds</p>
<p>6. Describe parent involvement and outreach strategies to help parents become active participants in the education of their children, including coordination efforts with other NCLB programs. (ELSSA Section E)</p> <p>a. Increase parent communication regarding state examinations (i.e., CELDT, CAHSEE, CST) via Parent Link, parent letters, meetings with counselors, ELAC/DELAC, Migrant Program, and School Site Council.</p> <p>b. Conduct parent conferences in the 9th and 10th grade for EL students prior to the administration (August/September) of the CELDT to review the current EL proficiency level and establish goals for annual growth.</p> <p>c. Conduct parent conferences in the 11th and 12th grade for EL students prior to the administration (August/September) of the CELDT to review current EL proficiency level and establish goals for annual growth.</p> <p>d. Counselors visit the EL tutorial period prior to the administration of the CELDT to inform the students of annual progress required and importance of the examination.</p> <p>e. EL students in 11th and 12th grade are targeted for intervention in addition to their placement in an English 3 or English 4 course (with support). The intervention will address language skills, reading comprehension, and writing. Intervention may be provided during tutorial, after school, or summer sessions.</p> <p>f. EL students who have not taken or passed the CAHSEE will be required to participate in a CAHSEE Summer Preparation course.</p>	<p>a. Title III Team, District/Site Administration, Counselors</p> <p>b. Title III Team, District/Site Administration, Counselors</p> <p>c. Title III Team, District/Site Administration, Counselors</p> <p>d. Counselors</p> <p>e. Title III Team, District/Site Administration, Teachers</p> <p>f. District/Site Administration, Counselors</p>	<p>a. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>b. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>c. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>d. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>e. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p> <p>f. 2009-2010 & 2010-2011</p>	<p>-Migrant Program -Title I -Title III -EIA</p> <p>-Unrestricted Funds</p> <p>Title III</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>-Title I</p> <p>-Unrestricted Funds</p>
<p>7. If applicable, identify any changes to the Title III Immigrant Education Program.</p>			

