

Title III LEA Improvement Plan Addendum Oakdale Joint Unified School District

Directions: Address the topic matter requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow as much space as required for narrative responses under each item.

1. Conduct an analysis of data. Identify and describe the factors that prevented the local educational agency (LEA) from achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)

A. Analysis of data and problems found.

AMAO 1: Percent of ELs Making Annual Progress in Learning English

The Oakdale Joint Unified School District met AMAO 1 district-wide.

- 09-10 achievement of 55.4% ELs making annual progress in learning English would marginally meet the 10-11 target of 54.6%.
- The percent of ELs meeting AMAO 1 (progressing in English language proficiency) increased district-wide between the 06-07 and 08-09 school years.
- The percent of ELs meeting AMAO 1 decreased district-wide between 08-09 and 09-10 by 2.7%.
- School level data indicates that the school showing the highest percentage of students progressing in English language proficiency in 09-10 was Fair Oaks Elementary School (64%) followed by Oakdale Junior High School (58.6%).
- The school site showing the lowest % of students meeting AMAO 1 (progressing in English language proficiency) was Magnolia Elementary 50.6%.
- ELs meeting their growth target for 09-10 for increasing in English Proficiency in the Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, and Early Advanced/Advanced: Not English Proficient are all marginally below the state average growth except the Early Advanced/Advanced: Not proficient which demonstrated an 11.4% gap.
- By far, the most numerically significant group is the Intermediate group containing a population of 216 English Learners. Although the gap between district achievement for Intermediate ELs and state achievement is only .6%, this group is almost twice the size of any other group defined by CELDT Level achievement.

EL Achievement on CAHSEE

- 56% of ELs passed the CAHSEE in ELA, only 4% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for ELA/CAHSEE was 85% and the % Proficient or above was 60%.
- 63% of ELs passed the CAHSEE in Math, only 19% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for Math/CAHSEE was 87% and the % Proficient or above was 56%
- 93% of RFEP passed the CAHSEE in ELA, 50% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for ELA/CAHSEE was 85% and the % Proficient or above was 60%.
- 91% of RFEP passed the CAHSEE in Math, 52% scored Proficient.
- The district's overall pass rate for Math/CAHSEE was 87% and the % Proficient or above was 56%
- Although the % of the RFEP population passing CAHSEE exceeds district-wide achievement, the % of RFEP scoring Proficient on the CAHSEE is 10% lower than the district-wide achievement rate in ELA and 4% lower in Math.

AMAO 2: Percent of English Learners attaining the English Proficient Level on the CELDT

Oakdale Joint Unified School District met AMAO 2 district-wide for both the cohort of students in a language instruction educational program less than 5 years and for ELs in a language instruction educational program more than five years.

- 09-10 achievement of Cohort 1 (20.7% attaining English Proficient Level on the CELDT who have been in a program less than 5 years) would meet the 10-11 target of 18.7%.
- 09-10 achievement of Cohort 2 (43.2% attaining English Proficient Level on the CELDT who have been in a program more than 5 years) would meet but not exceed the 10-11 target of 43.2%.
- 58% of ELs in the district program for 4 or more years scored Intermediate or below on the CELDT. This % is only marginally lower than the percentage of ELs in US schools for 4 or more years scoring Intermediate or below on the CELDT (56.3%).
- About 50% of ELs who have been in US 6 years or more scored at Intermediate or below on the CELDT.

Students attaining English Proficient Level on the CELDT demonstrated the following level of achievement on the CSTs:

ELA

- 89.9% are at Basic or Above
- 53.9% are at Proficient/Advanced
- 11% (12 students) are Below or Far Below Basic - 11 out of 12 of the students are in 7th or 8th grade.
- More students in grades 2nd-4th are scoring at Proficient or above.

MATH

- 80% are at Basic or above
- 53% are at Proficient/Advanced.
- 20% are Below or Far Below Basic.
- 15 out of 23 (65%) of the students Below Basic or Far Below Basic are in 7th and 8th grades.
- 4 8th grade ELs at Proficient on the CELDT were enrolled in Algebra and 12 were enrolled in 8th Grade General Math. All 4 ELs in Algebra scored at Below Basic on the Algebra CST. No ELs enrolled in 8th grade General Math scored at Proficient or Advanced.
- More students in grades 2nd-5th are scoring at Proficient or above.

AMAO 3: Adequate Yearly Progress in ELA and Math for English Learner Subgroup

The Oakdale Joint Unified School District has not met AMAO 3 (in ELA or Math) for two consecutive years, 2008-09 and 2009-10.

- Average % Pro/Adv in ELA for the four elementary sites was 45.75%.
- Average % Pro/Adv in ELA for Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School was 21.5%
- Average % Pro/Adv in Math for the four elementary sites was 53.9%.
- Average % Pro/Adv in Math for Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School was 23.35%.
- Three out of the four elementary sites are closing the EL achievement gap over time in both ELA and Math. Magnolia Elementary continued to close the EL achievement gap in ELA between the 2009 and 2010 school year, but the EL achievement gap in Math increased 5.7%.
- Oakdale Junior High School EL % Pro/Adv decreased from 27.3% to 23.8% in ELA between spring 2009 and spring 2010 and from 18.6% to 15.9% Pro/Adv in Math between spring 2009 and spring 2010.

The most numerically significant population included in AMAO 3 as defined by proficiency level on the CELDT are Intermediate level English Learners.

- 52% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic on the ELA CST
- Over 50% of Intermediate ELs in grades 7th-8th are scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic
- 76% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic or above on the ELA CST. Of that 76%, 91% are in grades 2-6.
- 31% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic on the Math CST.

- 80% of Intermediate ELs in 8th grade are scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic in General Math.
- 73% of Intermediate ELs are scoring Basic or above on the Math CST. Of that 73%, 88% are in grades 2-6.
- Only 1 Intermediate EL was enrolled in Algebra as an 8th grader.
- The 15 Intermediate ELs enrolled in 8th grade General Math all scored Basic or below.

Summary:

- ELs at the elementary level score substantially higher on the CST in both ELA and Math than ELs at the secondary level.
- Current district-wide EL achievement in progressing in the attainment of English (AMAO 1) would marginally meet the spring 2011 target. Fair Oaks AMAO 1 achievement of 70% was significantly higher than any other site. The largest group in the AMAO 1 cohort are students currently at Intermediate but the most significant gap between district and state achievement lies with the Early Advanced/Advanced: Not proficient which demonstrated an 11.4% gap.
- District achievement for AMAO 2 (attainment of English Proficient level on the CELDT) not only met the 09-10 target but would meet and exceed the 10-11 target for cohort 1 and meet/but not exceed the target for cohort 2.
- There is a significant gap between the Pass and Proficient rates of ELs and the district-wide population.
- 4% ELs scored Proficient on the ELA CAHSEE exam
- 19% ELs scored Proficient on the Math CAHSEE exam
- Although RFEP Pass rates on the CAHSEE exceed the district Pass rates, the RFEP Proficient rates do not.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Plan

The STRENGTHS of the Title III LEA Plan include: 1. Analysis of AYP, API, AMAOs, CSTs, CAHSEE, CELDT data provides both a thorough district and site analysis of EL needs. 2. Technical assistance supporting the use of Benchmark data to monitor EL progress during the school year is provided to all sites. 3. Strong DELAC participation informing the development of parent involvement opportunities supporting EL academic achievement. 3. ASES funding at four sites providing extended learning time opportunities for ELs in after school programs. 4. Read 180 available at all sites to provide ELD for ELs at levels 1-3. Initial Read 180 training was substantial and is now ongoing. 5. Lexia, and Rosetta Stone available at all sites to provide intervention for ELs. 6. Consistent and appropriate identification, placement, and reclassification process in place.

WEAKNESSES of the Title III LEA Plan include: 1. The existing EL Committee model was effective in supporting structures and processes such as the identification, placement, and reclassification procedure, but has not been effective in supporting ELD/SDAIE instructional strategies at sites. 2. There is no structure currently in place to monitor and provide feedback to sites concerning the effectiveness of ELD/SDAIE strategies. 3. No coaching is currently available to support ELD and SDAIE instructional strategies. 4. Interventions currently offered in after school programs do not all have delineated placement/exit criterion. Data analysis district wide has not yet included analysis of the effectiveness of interventions being offered. Specific curriculum supporting intensive and strategic interventions in both ELA and Math are not fully in place district-wide. 5. The existing ELD Benchmark Checklists are difficult for teachers to understand and use. 6. The ELD curriculum for students not enrolled in Read 180 is not considered highly effective by teachers. 7. Professional development supporting ELD/SDAIE instruction varies in levels and quality from site to site. District-offered professional development supporting ELD/SDAIE has been limited and poorly attended. On-going systemic professional development supporting the success of English Learners is present only within the Read 180 program. 8. Although all site plans address the EL subgroup, the power of the plan and the degree of follow up in implementation has varied district-wide. 9. Current EL clustering practices at Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School may not be the most effective.

B. Identify and describe factors contributing to failure to meet AMAO(s)

Although the district only failed to meet AMAO 3 in ELA and Math, current levels of achievement on AMAO 1 (meeting targets for annual goals in learning English) would only marginally meet 2010-11 targets, and a pro-active approach in addressing AMAO 2 (attaining the English proficient level on the CELDT) is desired by the district. Consequently, factors contributing to the failure to meet AMAO 3 and current achievement of AMAOs 1 and 2 will be addressed in this section and the following Action Plan.

1. Input from teachers and site administration indicate that the ELD Standards are not all easily understood by all teachers and the existing ELD Checklists are not an effective mechanism to measure ELD Standards progress.
 2. Leadership team input from the ELSSA indicate that there is no existing systemic structure or practice to provide feedback to sites related to the fidelity of ELD curriculum implementation, effectiveness of ELD instruction, effectiveness of SDAIE instruction, or existing levels of English Learner engagement.
 3. Input from EL Committee members has indicated that the committee's initial work of supporting identification, placement, and the reclassification process has been fully accomplished but the committee has been ineffective in supporting ELD and SDAIE instruction.
 4. The weakness and inconsistency of data measuring the effectiveness of interventions being provided to ELs that are intended to increase English proficiency and/or academic achievement indicate that existing interventions may not have fully implemented scientifically based curriculum, appropriate placement procedures, delineations of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and a measurement embedded to measure student growth.
 5. District level and site level data analysis indicate that elementary sites are significantly more successful in supporting the academic achievement of English Learners than secondary sites.
 6. Secondary sites have adhered to clustering policies established in the initial EL Master Plan developed in 2001. Input from secondary teachers has not conveyed evidence that this strategy has been effective in meeting the needs of Beginning through Intermediate level English Learners or Early Advanced, but not yet proficient English Learners identified as being academically at-risk as measured by report card grades or deficit credits.
 7. The Director of Categorical Programs serves as the District EL Director. The job description of this position has broadened to the degree that only minimal time has been spent supporting the implementation of the EL Master Plan during the past two years.
- C. **Conclusion:** From the quantitative and qualitative data we reviewed and the underlying causes we identified, the leadership team at Oakdale Joint Unified School District believes that to increase the language proficiency and academic achievement of our English Learners, we must improve our system in five areas:
1. Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to sites regarding the fidelity of ELD curriculum implementation, effectiveness of ELD instruction, effectiveness of SDAIE instruction, or observed levels of English Learner engagement. Professional development would be related to needs identified in this process.
 2. Review and revise as necessary the existing intervention opportunities for English Learners to ensure appropriate placement procedures, delineation of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and the existence of pre/post assessment to measure growth.
 3. Develop an effective tool to measure the progress of English learners in attaining English Proficiency.
 4. Re-form the EL Committee and re-designate its purpose as supporting goals 1-3 above. The committee's membership would include site administration, teacher leaders, and English Learner specific support staff representing all sites.
 5. Note: Although the action plan will benefit all sites district-wide primary attention and resources will be focused at Oakdale Junior High School and Oakdale High School.

Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement	Personnel Responsible	Timeline	Funding Source
<p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English-language Development (ELD). (AMAOs 1 and 2; Recommended English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA))</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to sites regarding the fidelity of ELD curriculum implementation and effectiveness of ELD instruction. ▪ Develop an effective tool to measure ongoing progress of English learners in attaining English Proficiency <p>A. ELs are appropriately placed for ELD Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ELs in levels 1-3 will complete the Read 180 diagnostic assessment in the spring of each year to determine appropriate ELD instructional placement for the following year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90 + minutes of Read 180 daily (grades 4-12) - Small group ELD Instruction and Universal Access for grades K-6 - Single period of ELD Support for grades 7-12 ▪ Site EL Coordinator will review the next year's student placement/teacher assignment/ and identified curriculum for all ELs represented at their site prior to the end of the existing school year with the District EL Director. <p>B. ELD is provided for all English Learners daily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ELD curriculum will be inventoried at each site. Any additional materials will be identified by March each year. ▪ ELD curriculum order will be placed for following year by April of the prior year. ▪ Teachers/support staff needing training prior to implementation will be identified by April of each year. ▪ Scheduled time/location for daily ELD at elementary sites will be provided to District EL Director. ▪ District EL Director will review elementary ELD schedules and secondary ELD rosters and confirm that all English Learners are appropriately placed. <p>C. Support Effective K-12 ELD Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop walk-through protocol based on full-implementation of identified ELD 	<p>Site Principals/Read 180 Teachers</p> <p>Site EL Coordinators/Principals and District EL Director</p> <p>Site EL Coordinators</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>Site EL Coordinators</p> <p>District EL Director</p>	<p>May 1-20, 2011</p> <p>June 1, 2011</p> <p>March 15, 2011</p> <p>April 15, 2011</p> <p>June 1, 2011</p>	<p>No funding Required</p> <p>Instructional Materials or Lottery: \$10,000</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ curriculum, effective ELD strategies, and evidences of EL engagement. ▪ District EL Director, Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and Teacher Leaders conduct quarterly shared walk throughs to monitor ELD implementation, instruction, and levels of EL engagement.. ▪ Site feedback based on observational evidence gathered via the protocol that is not teacher specific will be e-mailed by the District EL Director to the Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and classrooms observed within 2 days of each site visit. <p>D. Identify and/or develop an effective tool to measure the progress of English learners in attaining English Proficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee of teacher leaders representing all sites (possible sub-committee of re-formed EL Committee) reviews tools to measure progress on ELD Standards other than those currently embedded/included in the existing ELD Curriculum. ▪ Committee identifies best options for monitoring progress on the ELD Standards. ▪ All teachers providing ELD receive presentation of best options for monitoring progress on the ELD Standards and select top choice. ▪ Any materials and/or professional development needed are identified and a timeline is developed to fully implement new mechanism for monitoring ELD Standards prior to the following school year. <p>E. Identify Provide Intervention to ELs not meeting established benchmarks for progress on the ELD Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District screening process for intervention will expand to include identification of ELs not meeting established benchmarks for progress on the ELD Standards. ▪ Committee of teacher leaders representing all sites (possible sub-committee of re-formed EL Committee) identifies effective intervention appropriate for the identified needs. ▪ Full implementation of ELD Intervention for students not meeting established benchmarks for progress on the ELD Standards. 	<p>EL Committee District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director/EL Committee</p> <p>District EL Director/EL Committee</p>	<p>March 25, 2011 September 2011 November 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> <p>February 16, 2011</p> <p>March 16, 2011</p> <p>April 7, 2011</p> <p>May 26, 2011</p> <p>April 7, 2011</p> <p>May 26, 2011</p> <p>January 2012</p>	<p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000</p> <p>Release time for Walk Throughs Title III: \$3200</p> <p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000 (See 2C above)</p> <p>District-wide ELD Intervention: Title III/ELAP/EIA \$27,000</p>
<p>3. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in English-language arts. (AMAO 3;ELSSA)</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to sites regarding the effectiveness of SDAIE instruction in English Language Arts and observed levels of English Learner engagement. ▪ Review and revise as necessary the existing intervention 			

<p>opportunities for English Learners in English Language Arts to ensure appropriate placement procedures, delineation of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and the existence of pre/post assessment to measure growth.</p> <p>A. Support SDAIE instructional strategies in English Language Arts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop walk-through protocol to identify observed effective SDAIE strategies, and evidences of EL engagement. ▪ District EL Director, Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and Teacher Leaders conduct quarterly shared walk-throughs to monitor observe SDAIE methodologies supporting access to core and levels of EL engagement. ▪ NOTE: It is possible that one protocol can be developed to support ELD, ELA, and Mathematics. ▪ Site feedback based on observational evidence gathered via the protocol that is not teacher specific will be e-mailed by the District EL Director to the Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and classrooms observed within 2 days of each site visit. ▪ Site feedback will be reviewed by the EL Committee to inform the development of a Professional Development Plan. <p>B. Provide appropriate ELA Intervention to English Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirm that both strategic and intensive ELA interventions proven effective with English Learners are identified at all sites (including CAHSEE preparation and remediation) ▪ Review existing CAHSEE ELA Interventions to determine is the intervention prepares students to Pass or score Proficient ▪ Revise/expand existing CAHSEE ELA intervention opportunities as necessary to prepare students to score Proficient/Advanced ▪ Delineate the placement and exit criterion for all strategic and intensive ELA interventions. ▪ Identify the person at each site responsible to record the specific intervention, entry date, entry level, exit date, exit level within AERIES. Train them in this process. ▪ Identify ELs for placement in intensive/strategic ELA intervention. ▪ Monitor ongoing student progress on ELA Standards for students in both intensive and strategic interventions via embedded assessments and district benchmark testing. 	<p>EL Committee District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director/Site EL Coordinator/Principal</p>	<p>March 25, 2011 September 2011 November 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> <p>February 16, 2011 March 16, 2011 April 7, 2011 May 26, 2011</p> <p>Upon completion of Quarter/Trimester Benchmark Testing</p>	<p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000 (<u>See 2B and 2C above</u>)</p> <p>Release time for EL Committee: Title III: \$3,000 (<u>See 2B and 2C and 3A above</u>)</p> <p>CAHSEE Intervention Materials: \$13,500: Designated CAHSEE funds</p>

<p>4. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics. (AMAO 3; ELSSA)</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop an ongoing and systemic mechanism to provide feedback to sites regarding the effectiveness of SDAIE instruction in Mathematics and observed levels of English Learner engagement. ▪ Review and revise as necessary the existing intervention opportunities for English Learners in Mathematics to ensure appropriate placement procedures, delineation of achievement to initiate exit from the intervention, and the existence of pre/post assessment to measure growth. <p><u>A. Develop Math Continuum Options supporting increased success in 8th Grade Algebra</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vertical team representing upper elementary, Oakdale Junior High and Oakdale High School collaborate to develop a math continuum with both strategic and intensive pathways leading to success in Algebra in 8th or 9th grade. ▪ Site administration and counselors identify English Learners for correct placement in the new math continuum. ▪ Full implementation of math continuum. <p>B. Support SDAIE instructional strategies in Mathematics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop walk-through protocol to identify observed effective SDAIE strategies, and evidences of EL engagement in Mathematics. ▪ District EL Director, Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and Teacher Leaders conduct quarterly shared walk throughs to observe SDAIE methodologies supporting access to core and levels of EL engagement. ▪ NOTE: It is possible that one protocol can be developed to support ELD, ELA, and Mathematics walk throughs. ▪ Site feedback based on observational evidence gathered via the protocol that is not teacher specific will be e-mailed by the District EL Director to the Site EL Coordinator, Site Principal and classrooms observed within 2 days of each site visit. ▪ Site feedback will be reviewed by the EL Committee to inform the development of a Professional Development Plan. <p>B. Provide appropriate Mathematics Intervention to English Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirm that both strategic and intensive Math interventions proven effective with English Learners are identified at all sites ▪ Confirm that both strategic and intensive Math interventions proven effective with English Learners are identified at all sites (including CAHSEE 	<p>November-December 2010</p> <p>February 2011</p> <p>August 2011</p> <p>EL Committee District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director</p> <p>District EL Director/Site EL Coordinator/Principal</p>	<p>March 25, 2011 September 2011 November 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p> <p>February 16, 2011</p> <p>March 16, 2011</p> <p>April 7, 2011</p>	<p>Release Time to support development and implementation of math continuum options: Title II: \$1000</p> <p>Release time for Walk-Throughs Title III: \$3200 (<u>See 2C above</u>)</p> <p>CAHSEE Intervention Materials: \$13,500:</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>preparation and remediation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review existing CAHSEE Math Interventions to determine is the intervention prepares students to Pass or score Proficient ▪ Revise/expand existing CAHSEE Math intervention opportunities as necessary to prepare students to score Proficient/Advanced ▪ Delineate the placement and exit criterion for all strategic and intensive mathematics interventions. ▪ Identify the person at each site responsible to record the specific intervention, entry date, entry level, exit date, exit level within AERIES. Train them in this process. ▪ Identify ELs for placement in intensive/strategic math intervention. ▪ Monitor ongoing student progress on Math Standards for students in both intensive and strategic interventions via embedded assessments and district benchmark testing. 	<p>District EL Director/Site EL Coordinator/Principal</p>	<p>May 26, 2011</p> <p>Upon completion of Quarter/Trimester Benchmark Testing</p>	<p>Designated CAHSEE funds</p> <p>No cost</p>
<p>5. Describe scientifically based research professional development strategies and activities, including coordination efforts with other Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs. (ELSSA)</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify and review existing local exemplary practices/discuss replication throughout district ▪ Research/implement more effective course placement in ELA and Math in grades 7-12. ▪ A systemic Professional Development Plan will be developed to respond to needs identified via observational evidence gathered during walk-throughs: ELD curriculum implementation, effectiveness of ELD instruction, effectiveness of SDAIE instruction, and observed levels of English Learner engagement. ▪ Coaching will be provided to support ELD instruction, SDAIE instruction, and English Learner engagement. ▪ Secondary sites will be the first priority for implementation of the professional development plan and utilization of coaching resources. <p>A. Research/implement more effective instructional setting in ELA/Math for English Learners in grades 7-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visit sites (including local sites) with high performing English Learner populations representing various instructional settings. ▪ Review instructional setting options proven effective for English Learners in ELA and Math ▪ Identify most appropriate/effective instructional setting for district 	<p>EL Committee District EL Director</p>	<p>March 25, 2011</p> <p>April 2011</p> <p>May 2011</p>	<p>Professional Development Activities: Title III/EIA/Title II \$15,000</p>

<p>English Learners – focusing on grades 7-12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify professional development that is ongoing and systemic to support the proposed instructional setting revision. Develop Professional Development Plan activities to support the adopted instructional setting. <p>B. Develop Professional Development Plan that supports ELD, SDAIE, and increased EL student engagement based on identified needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use developed walk-through protocol findings to identify Professional Development Activities that will support SDAIE strategies, ELD Instruction, and increased EL engagement in ELA and Mathematics. Protocol findings and teacher leader input will inform additional action steps included in the EL Professional Development Plan. 		August 2011	Professional Development Activities: Title III/EIA/Title II \$15,000 (See 5A above)
<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 ESEA programs.</p> <p>NOTE: Existing parent involvement activities are highly valued by parents of English Learners. However, tools to measure the resulting academic growth of students based on parent participation are not in place district-wide.</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review/revise as necessary parent surveys to support evaluation of parent involvement program supporting academic success of English Learners. Conduct evaluation of existing EL Parent Involvement Program. Review/revise as necessary EL Parent Involvement Program. <p>A. Expand upon existing parent involvement activities intended to support EL academic achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpreters available for Parent Teacher Conferences Interpreters/Talk Technologies System available for all site parent meetings Interpreters available for all site specific nights supporting Math and Literacy Adult English Literacy Classes: Levels 1, 2, and 3 (Weekly Sept – April) Math Academy for grades 2-6 (February – April: 6 weeks) Kindergarten Readiness Academy (June :3 weeks) PAK: Preschool and Kindergarten partnership supporting success in Kindergarten (January) 	District Parent Involvement Committee/EL Committee under the direction of the Director of Categorical Programs oversees the implementation of parent involvement activities	February 2, 2011 April 6, 2011 August 2011 September 2011 February 2012 April 2012	Hourly rate supporting staff participation: Title I: \$1000 Adult English Literacy: Title III/ELAP/EIA: \$10,000 Math Academy: Title III: \$4000 Kindergarten Readiness Academy: Title III/Title I/ELAP/EIA: \$10,000 PAK: Title I: \$800 Celebrating English Learners: \$1000: Title

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Celebrating English Learners: a district-wide parent orientation for parents of English Learners (February) ▪ Back to School Night for Parents of English Learners ▪ Protecting Your Child from Gang Involvement ▪ Free website resources supporting ELA and Math success in homes: Math Links and Reading Links <p>C. Review and revise as necessary existing parent surveys to inform potential revision of EL Parent Involvement Plan</p> <p>D. Conduct a comprehensive evaluation of existing EL Parent Involvement Plan and revises as necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review student growth data ▪ Review parent surveys ▪ Revise EL Parent Involvement Plan ▪ Oversee implementation of revised EL Parent Involvement Plan 	<p>District Parent Involvement Committee/EL Committee under the direction of the Director of Categorical Programs oversees the implementation of parent involvement activities</p>	<p>February 2, 2011 April 6, 2011 August 2011 September 2011 February 2012 April 2012</p>	<p>III/EIA/ELAP B2S: \$500: T3 Website Development : TI/TII: \$2500 Gang Prevention: \$500: T3</p> <p>Hourly rate supporting staff participation on Parent Involvement Committee: TI: \$1000 (See 6A above)</p>
<p>7. If applicable, identify any changes to the Title III Immigrant Education Program.</p> <p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support parent involvement for immigrant and EL students identified as academically at-risk ▪ Monitor academic progress of immigrant and EL students identified to be academically at-risk ▪ Provide academic support to immigrant and EL students identified to be academically at-risk <p>Title III Immigrant funding with EIA funding has co-funded a position for a Bilingual Community Liaison serving grades K-12 but housed at Oakdale Junior High School where the most significant need was identified. The position supports the home-school connection for this group of students.</p> <p>The district does not anticipate receiving Title III Immigrant funding during the 2011-2012 school year. This position has been highly valued. It is hopeful that an alternative funding source will be available.</p>	<p>District Director of English Learner Programs</p>	<p>August 2010-May 2011</p>	<p>T3 Immigrant/EI A/ELAP: \$25,000 annually</p>