

Directions: Address the topic requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow as much space as required for narrative responses under each item. All Title III Year 2 LEAs must submit a copy of the IPA (in Microsoft Word format) to their Title III Regional Lead and to CDE at TIIY2@cde.ca.gov.

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) (Five page maximum for this item).

First, we convened a Title III Planning Committee to analyze the data and determine what steps to take to assist our English Learners (ELs) in achieving Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) 3. (ELs in N-MUSD consistently meet and exceed AMAO 1 and AMAO 2.) The fourteen committee members include: Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education; Executive Director, Elementary Education; Director, English Learner Programs; Director, Program Improvement and GATE; Director, Secondary Education; Director, Assessment; Coordinator, School and Community Relations; Assessment Technician, Assessment and English Learner Departments; Teachers on Special Assignment in Elementary Education and English Learner Programs; Reading First Coach/Coordinator and Content Lead; Lead Coach, Elementary Science and Math; and Teacher on Special Assignment, Secondary Math.

Secondly, we met as a Title III Planning Committee on six (6) occasions to analyze: 1) the data from our Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs); 2A) the Performance Goals embedded in our Local Education Agency Plan (LEAP); 3) the District Assistance Survey (DAS); and 4) the English Learner Sub-Group Self-Assessment (ELSSA). Through this data analysis and needs assessment, we identified and described the factors that may have contributed to preventing our ELs from achieving AMAO 3 in English Language Arts (2007) and Mathematics (2008). Subsequently, we delineated the steps and interventions necessary to propel our ELs to proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. (Please see *Improvement Plan Addendum Outline* below.)

Throughout the process, we aspired to data-driven, data-transparent documentation focused on student needs with input from multiple stakeholders. Thus, we kept the following groups informed (name of group and numbers of persons involved follow) and elicited their comments and input throughout the process: Data Group (12), Elementary Principals (24), Secondary Principals (8), District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) (50+), site-based EL Coordinators (34), secondary counselors (18), our Superintendent, and our Board of Education (7).

Examination of the English Learner Sub-Group Self-Assessment (ELSSA) data yielded these insights as to our English Learner's progress and needs (please see attachments):

Table 1 demonstrated that our ELs far exceeded the targets in AMAO 1. AMAO 1 expects that a certain percentage of ELs grow one CELDT proficiency level each year. Even though our English Learners are doing well in AMAO 1, we are committed to a highly structured, daily, targeted ELD program with explicit instruction to guarantee future and ongoing success. See below.

Table 2 showed that our ELs far exceeded the targets in AMAO 2. AMAO 2 expects that a certain percentage of ELs become Early Advanced Overall or Advanced Overall in CELDT annually. Even though our English Learners are doing well in AMAO 2, we are committed to a highly structured, daily, targeted ELD program with explicit instruction to guarantee future and ongoing success. See below.

Table 3A demonstrated that in AMAO 3, our English Learners did meet the targeted percentage in terms of participation rate in both ELA and Math. We have achieved 99% participation rate for the last four years.

Table 3B shows that our English Learners did NOT meet the percentage proficient required in English Language Arts (2007) and Mathematics (2008). See below.

Our ELs did not achieve AMAO 3 targets because insufficient percentages of ELs were *proficient* in the curricular area:

2007:

ELA	Target =	34% proficient.	N-MUSD: 28.8%	Met target?	NO
Math	Target =	34.6% proficient.	N-MUSD: 37.4%	Met target?	YES

2008:

ELA	Target =	45% proficient.	N-MUSD: 35.5%	Met target?	YES (Safe Harbor)
Math	Target =	45.5% proficient.	N-MUSD: 42.6%	Met target?	NO

Table 4 demonstrated that in AMAO 1, our percentage of ELs meeting the growth target exceeded the state average for every subgroup.

Table 5A asked us to examine the length of time that our ELs have been in U.S. Schools. We discovered that the longer that ELs are in English Learner programs, their proficiency level on the CELDT test increases. For example, 57.2% of the ELs who had been in U.S. schools for six or more years reached Early Advanced or Advanced (proficient) on the CELDT.

Table 5B gave us the opportunity to examine the length of time that our ELs have been in English Learner programs in Newport-Mesa Unified School District. As in Table 5A explained above, we discovered that the longer that ELs are in our district's English Learner programs, their proficiency level on the CELDT increases. For example, 58.7% of the ELs who had been in N-MUSD English Learner programs for six or more years reached Early Advanced or Advanced (proficient) on the CELDT.

Table 6A examined Grades 2-8 ELs at the Intermediate CELDT level and provided data about their performance on the CST ELA. The data showed that 48.5% of the CELDT Intermediate English Learners were Basic (not proficient) on CST ELA. This data informed the work concerning ELA progress on this *Improvement Plan Addendum*, because it was AMAO 3 (ELA) in 2007 where our ELs did not achieve the desired percentage proficient.

Table 6B examined Grades 2-8 ELs at the Intermediate CELDT level and provided data about their performance on the CST in Math. The data showed a much higher percentage of ELs who were able to achieve Proficient or Advanced on the CST in Math. Indeed, we were "very close" in achieving the desired percentage in math: The target was 45.5% proficient, and N-MUSD English Learners came in at 42.6% proficient. This data informed the work concerning math progress on this *Improvement Plan Addendum*, because it was AMAO 3 (Math) in 2008 where our ELs did not achieve the desired percentage proficient.

Table 7A asked us to look at examined Grades 2-8 ELs who were proficient on the CELDT and provided data about their performance on the CST ELA. The data showed that 48.5% of the English Learners proficient on the CELDT were also proficient on CST ELA. This data informed the work concerning ELA progress on this *Improvement Plan Addendum*, because it was AMAO 3 (ELA) in 2007 where our ELs did not achieve the desired percentage proficient.

Table 7B examined Grades 2-8 ELs who were proficient on the CELDT and provided data about their performance on the CST in Math. The data showed that 51% of the English Learners proficient on the CELDT were also proficient on the CST Math. This data informed the work concerning Math progress on this *Improvement Plan Addendum*, because it was AMAO 3 (Math) in 2008 where our ELs did not achieve the desired percentage proficient.

Table 8A gave us the opportunity to examine data relative to our students who have been reclassified to fluent English proficient (R-FEP). In this table, we asked how our R-FEPs are performing on CST ELA. We discovered that a high percentage (98.3%) of our R-FEPs are Basic or above on the CST ELA. The percentage of R-FEPs who are proficient is 74.8%. This data showed that our R-FEPs are doing well on the CST ELA, and we will continue to assist our R-FEPs with ongoing improvement. (We monitor the progress of all R-FEP students for 24 months after reclassification, and we employ targeted interventions for any student who is struggling.)

Table 8B gave us the opportunity to examine data relative to our students who have been reclassified to fluent English proficient (R-FEP). In this table, we asked how our R-FEPs are performing on CST in Math. As in our R-FEP data for ELA, we discovered that a very high percentage (97.4%) of our R-FEPs are Basic or above on the CST in Math. The percentage of R-FEPs who are proficient is 76.9%. This data showed that our R-FEPs are doing well on the CST in Math, and we will continue to assist our R-FEPs with ongoing improvement. (We monitor the progress of all R-FEP students for 24 months after reclassification, and we employ targeted interventions for any student who is struggling.)

Table 9 examined how the ELs are doing on the CAHSEE in both ELA and Math relative to the ELs' length of time in U.S. schools. An analysis of the data showed us that 39.2% of the ELs who had been six or more years in U.S. schools passed the CAHSEE in ELA. Similarly, 37.8% of the ELs who had been six or more years in U.S. schools passed the CAHSEE in Math. (Please note, however, that 50.2% of our 10th grade ELs who have six or more years in U.S. Schools passed the CAHSEE ELA, and 51.1% of the same group passed the CAHSEE Math.)

Table 10 Table 9 examined how our R-FEPs are doing on the CAHSEE in both ELA and Math relative to their length of time in U.S. schools. An analysis of the data showed us that 94.4% of the R-FEPs who had been six or more years in U.S. schools passed the CAHSEE in ELA. Similarly, 91.2% of the R-FEPs who had been six or more years in U.S. schools passed the CAHSEE in Math. Again, we learned that our R-FEPs' performance in ELA surpassed their performance in Math on the CAHSEE.

Examination of the District Assistance Survey (DAS) data yielded these insights as to our ELs' progress and needs (please see attachments):

Our strengths include:

1. district policies aligned to budget;
2. vision, mission expressed in Strategic Plan;
3. Board and Superintendent support educational reform
4. strong LEA Plan aligned with accountability requirements
5. Fiscal policies and adopted budget are aligned with LEA Plan
6. Strong two-way communication with stakeholders
7. Collection and interpretation of student achievement data
8. Coherent standards-based curriculum in instruction and assessment system
9. Consideration of needs of PI schools when appropriating budget allocations
10. Multiple opportunities for parents/family members to access school programs and staff
11. Principals with demonstrated instructional leadership skills
12. Ongoing support system for administrators
13. Monitoring of principals' performance
14. Competitive wages, salaries, and benefits to classroom personnel'
15. Ongoing support system for teachers
16. Evaluations of all certificated staff linked to implementation of standards-based curriculum, instruction and assessments;
17. System of regular data collection

Needed areas of improvement were revealed to be:

1. More intervention programs in ELA and Math based on data-informed student needs;
2. Ongoing accountability by principals to ensure that *all* teachers are accountable for student achievement;
3. Ongoing monitoring to ensure that *every* classroom is using materials and strategies with fidelity every day.

4. Ongoing training in SDAIE strategies to ELA and Math teachers to ensure that ELs are accessing the core;
5. Increased monitoring of instructional minutes and pacing plans;
6. Increased monitoring that benchmark assessments have been developed and implemented in core areas;
7. Ongoing implementation of all fiscal criteria and standards in budget development
8. Ongoing allocation and alignment of categorical and general expenditures to improvement activities
9. Ongoing parent education programs and parent involvement policies
10. Increased two-way communications with stakeholders using all available technologies available;
11. Ongoing involvement of teachers and parents in instructional program and budget decisions;
12. Provision of incentives to recruit highly qualified teachers to underperforming schools;
13. Ongoing training to all staff on how to access data retrieval and storage systems;
14. Full implementation of procedures to ensure accurate and timely scoring, storage and retrieval of student assessment data;
15. Ongoing implementation of leadership training for administrators
16. Ongoing implementation of
17. coherent professional development based on content knowledge
18. Plan to ensure that all principals and vice principals complete materials-based professional development in ELA and Math;
19. Ongoing and targeted support to teachers focused on instructional practices to improve student learning, data analysis, and benchmark assessments;
20. Ongoing professional development and support to content experts and coaches

To reach proficiency in ELA and Math while still an EL is indeed a formidable task, since reclassification is based on an EL achieving the *lower* proficiency level of Basic, not Proficient. In spite of these challenges, in our district, we strive to develop our ELs' potential on every level and hold high expectations for each student. Thus, based on our review of the data, including the District Assistance Survey (DAS) and the English Learner Sub-Group Self Assessment (ELSSA) explained above, we identified factors that may have prevented our ELs from achieving AMAO 3 in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. In order to support our English Learners, we determined that these seven factors can lead to improvement and positive growth:

1. We need to run targeted programs with full fidelity to the standards embedded in the ELA and math curricula and the instructional minutes required.
2. Through ongoing monitoring, we must strive to ensure that each EL is taught by a fully-authorized teacher, is working from standards-based, state-approved, district-adopted materials in ELA and math, and has full access to the core curriculum.
3. Teachers of ELs need to be using research-based instructional strategies that assist the EL in accessing the core concepts and vocabulary in ELA and math.
4. Each EL's progress needs to be regularly monitored via both formative and summative assessments in ELA and Math so that teachers can make necessary instructional adjustments to help the EL meet his/her academic goals.
5. ELs need flexible scheduling, whether it be in ELD "cluster groups" in elementary or in ELD class assignments in secondary. Through this flexibility, ELs can receive targeted, explicit ELD instruction based on their assessed needs.
6. Professional development opportunities in ELA and math that are standards and research-based need to be available to each teacher of ELs. Teachers will acquire skills to provide instruction that is: student-centered, explicit, targeted, and proficiency-level appropriate.
7. Data systems that provide information regarding ELs' language development progress in ELA and academic progress in math need to be readily available to and understood by each teacher teaching English Learners.

Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement	Timeline	Person(s) Responsible	Funding Sources and Estimate	Progress Reports (to be completed periodically through June 30, 2011)
<p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English Language Development (ELD). (AMAOs 1 and 2; English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA))</p> <p>Most of the strategies described below are based on the work of William Saunders at UCLA, Kate Kinsella, and Susana Dutro. Their research was presented at the Accountability Institute in Burlingame in December 2009 and will be published as part of California Department of Education's volume titled <i>Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches</i> to be released in late Fall 2009. This volume summarizes the latest research on instruction for English Learners. Contributors are recognized scholars and teacher trainers with many years of experience in the field of educational research.</p> <p>It is important that all ELD programs be based on the recommendations of strong English Learner research, including the following. N-MUSD follows these guidelines and enforces the recommended practices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELD instruction will include interactive activities among students that are carefully planned and implemented. 2. English Learners will be carefully grouped by language proficiency for ELD instruction; for other portions of the school day, they should be in mixed classrooms and not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency. 3. A separate, daily block of time is devoted to ELD instruction. 4. At least 50% of ELD instruction emphasizes 	<p>Ongoing training on use of strategies beginning in 2005 and continuing without interruption (via site trainings, district Moonlight Series, video trainings, etc.)</p> <p>This section: Support from EL Department every September to set up flexible ELD cluster groups by proficiency level; ongoing monitoring by EL Department four times/year; ongoing monitoring by EL Coordinators weekly; ongoing</p>	<p>Director, English Learner Programs; Teachers-on-Special Assignment, EL Programs; K-12 administrators; site EL Coordinators; site ELD teachers</p> <p>This section: Director, English Learner Programs; Teachers-on-Special Assignment, EL Programs; K-12 administrators; site EL Coordinators; site ELD teachers</p>	<p>General Fund, Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only: \$30,207)</p> <p>This section: General Fund, Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only: \$15,104)</p>	

<p>listening & speaking unless specific areas of need in reading and writing are targeted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. ELD instruction explicitly teaches elements of English (e.g. vocabulary, syntax, grammar, functions, and conventions). 6. ELD instruction integrates meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language. 7. ELD instruction provides students with corrective feedback on language form (grammar). 8. Teachers attend to communication and language-learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction. 9. ELD instruction emphasizes academic language as well as conversational language. <p>Further, the EL Department and site administrators monitor (via walk-throughs, checklists, and logs) that sound ELD instructional practices are implemented, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● systematic, explicit direct instruction followed by guided and independent practice; ● scaffolding techniques ● flexible groups ● incorporation of higher-level critical thinking skills ● attention to different learning styles ● lesson objectives determined by authentic benchmark assessments ● checking for understanding throughout the lesson ● closure and reflection 	<p>monitoring by principals in formal monthly visits and in weekly, informal walk-through visits.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p><u>Goals: Elementary (Grades K-6)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First describe and then monitor the ELD program at each of the elementary schools. Include the names of teachers teaching each level at each grade level and the numbers of ELs in each leveled group. 2. Conduct ELD Data Days (one hour per grade level) at targeted schools. 3. Encourage/model/monitor teachers' use of SDAIE strategies during content instruction. 	<p>Annually in September and February</p> <p>Annually in January and March</p> <p>Gr K-6: Monthly by principals; Gr. 7-12 Monthly by EL Department</p>	<p>Dir., EL Programs, EL TOSAs, K-6 administrators, teachers</p> <p>Dir., EL Programs, EL TOSAs</p> <p>Dir., EL Programs, EL TOSAs</p>	<p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$8,850)</p> <p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$8,850)</p> <p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$8,850)</p>	
<p><u>Goals: Secondary (Grades 7-12)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine and then monitor the amount of time allocated to targeted ELD in mainstream English classes. 2. Provide additional supplementary ELD materials for Grade 9-12 ELs at EA and Advanced CELDT levels (e.g. <i>EDGE</i> from Hampton-Brown) to accelerate ELs' progress in meeting graduation requirements. 3. Monitor teachers' SDAIE strategies during content instruction. 	<p>Annually in September and February</p> <p>September 2010</p> <p>Feb-June 2010</p>	<p>Dir., EL Programs, EL TOSAs, 7-12 admin., teachers</p> <p>Dir., EL Programs, EL TOSAs, 7-12 admin., teachers, EL Coordinators</p> <p>Dir., EL Programs EL TOSAs, 7-12 administrators</p>	<p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (\$17,700)</p> <p>General Fund Title III (salaries only) \$30,000</p> <p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$17,700)</p>	
<p><u>Goals: Elementary and Secondary (Grades K-12)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train teachers on effective data analysis leading to instructional adjustments based on identified student needs in ELD. 2. Provide high quality professional development in ELD characterized by sufficient intensity and duration so as to have a positive and lasting impact on student performance. Include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Current research and research-based ELD 	<p>Monthly, beginning 2009 and continuing indefinitely, during grade level/content meetings</p> <p>Monthly, beginning 2009 and continuing indefinitely, during grade level/content meetings</p>	<p>Dir., EL Programs; EL TOSAs; K-12 administrators</p> <p>Dir., EL Programs; EL TOSAs; K-12 administrators</p>	<p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$8,850)</p> <p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only: \$8,850)</p>	

<p>strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Most effective instructional strategies for accelerating ELs' achievement in Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing c. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) d. SDAIE strategies integrated into ELD settings e. Current achievement data in ELD for each English Learner 				
<p>3. During regularly-scheduled, bimonthly Counselors' Trainings, train counselors to ensure that ELs access vocational programs. Develop an accountability and monitoring system.</p>	<p>September 2009 continuing indefinitely</p>	<p>Director Student Services; 7-12 admin and counselors</p>	<p>General Fund, AB 1802 (salaries only: \$17,551)</p>	
<p>4. Ensure coordination among all intervention programs and services by monitoring which ELs are accessing what interventions and working with site personnel, including teachers, to determine, via data, if the selected intervention is successful in raising student achievement in ELA and/or math.</p>	<p>September 2009 continuing indefinitely</p>	<p>Dir., EL Programs; Dir., Program. Improvement, site administrators</p>	<p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA, ELAP (salaries only \$8,850)</p>	
<p>5. Via email, posting on Web, and disseminating color print copies, widely disseminate data documents such as the ALERT (<u>A</u>ccelerating <u>L</u>ongtime <u>E</u>nglish Learners <u>T</u>oward <u>R</u>eclassification <u>T</u>argets) and the HELP (<u>H</u>istorical <u>E</u>nglish <u>L</u>earner <u>P</u>rogress) that show longitudinal data re: ELs' progress in ELD.</p>	<p>Begin quarterly in September 2009 and continue indefinitely</p>	<p>Dir., EL Programs; Assessment Tech; EL Department staff</p>	<p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$8,850) SIP: \$12,000 Data tracking system</p>	
<p>6. Via student logs, student schedules, and walkthroughs by site administrators, record how various technologies are being used at the school site to make content more accessible and comprehensible to English Learners.</p>	<p>Begin quarterly in September 2009 and continue indefinitely</p>	<p>Dir., EL Programs; Dir., Ed. Tech; EL and Tech TOSAs; adminis.; site EL Coordinators; site ELD teachers</p>	<p>General Fund Title I, Title II, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$17,551)</p>	
<p>7. Ensure that site administrators provide and facilitate collaboration time for classroom teachers to develop common assessments and</p>	<p>Monthly, from Sept. 2008 & continuing indefinitely during</p>	<p>Dir., EL Programs; Dir., Elem. & Sec. Ed; EL TOSAs;</p>	<p>General Fund EIA, Title I, SIP (salaries only \$20,000)</p>	

<p>lesson plans for ELD that address all proficiency levels.</p> <p>8. Further, site administrators will monitor that ELD teachers are including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading activities that provide comprehension development • Writing activities for academic application (descriptive, narrative, and expository) • ELD activities that accelerate English language acquisition • Sufficient opportunity for students to receive additional ELD intervention and support • Openness to staff use of observational tools to plan, implement and evaluate the effectiveness of lesson delivery in ELD. 	<p>grade level/content meetings</p> <p>Monthly, beginning September 2008 and continuing indefinitely during grade level and content meetings</p>	<p>admins.; site EL Coordinators; site ELD teachers</p> <p>Dir., EL Programs; Dir., Elem and Sec Ed; EL TOSAs; administrators; site EL Coordinators; site ELD teachers</p>	<p>General Fund, EIA, Title I, Title III (salaries only) SIP: \$7,000</p>	
<p>3. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in reading/language arts (R/LA). (AMAO 3;ELSSA)</p> <p>Our district-adopted ELA reading program for K-6, Houghton-Mifflin's <i>Reading Program: California</i>, is based on the Big Five reading strategies from the National Reading Panel: <i>phonemic awareness, phonics instruction, fluency instruction, vocabulary, and text comprehension</i>. These scientifically-based reading strategies have formed the foundation of the district's approach to improving academic achievement in reading/language arts. Every student in Grades K-6 receives this foundational instruction.</p> <p>District level staff, site administrators, and site reading coaches regularly verify that classroom teachers are implementing sound ELA instructional practices, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit direct instruction in ELA followed by guided and independent practice 				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scaffolding techniques in ELA ● Flexible grouping in ELA ● Incorporation of higher-level critical thinking skills in ELA ● Attention to different learning styles in ELA ● Lesson objectives determined by authentic benchmark assessments in ELA ● Checking for understanding throughout the ELA lesson ● Use of primary language support during ELA instruction when applicable ● Closure and reflection in ELA lessons. <p>California State Standards are reinforced in all English Language Arts materials used in all state-adopted and/or district-approved courses, K-12.</p>				
<p>1. K-12: Monitor full fidelity to implementation of ELA Standards-Based instructional materials during the prescribed number of allocated instructional minutes</p>	<p>Ongoing quarterly, benchmark assessments</p>	<p>K-12 teachers and administrators</p>	<p>General Fund (salaries only \$50,535)</p>	
<p>2. K-6: Monitor that the K-6 District ELA Pacing Plan is being followed at all elementary schools</p>	<p>Ongoing, quarterly, benchmark assessments K-6</p>	<p>K-6 teachers and administrators</p>	<p>General Fund (salaries only \$34,000)</p>	
<p>3. 9-12: Align secondary ELA courses to ensure a guaranteed, standards-based curriculum with common, skill-based assessments. This will strengthen CAHSEE outcomes as well.</p>	<p>Full implementation: Sept '10</p>	<p>7-12 teachers and administrators</p>	<p>General Fund (salaries only \$16,535)</p>	
<p>4. K-6: Provide and oversee ongoing assessment of student reading performance using district-wide benchmark assessments to adjust and monitor the instructional program to ensure student progress.</p>	<p>K-6 Pacing Plan and benchmark assessments since 2006</p>	<p>Director of Assessment; K-6 Literacy TOSA, K-6 teachers and administrators</p>	<p>General fund, EIA, Title I, Title III Salaries \$36,000 \$8,000 Data Director</p>	
<p>5. K-6: Implement common writing rubrics/assessments/anchor papers, K-6</p>	<p>K-6 Pacing Plan & benchmark assessments since 2006</p>	<p>K-12 administrators</p>	<p>General Fund (salaries only \$34,000)</p>	
<p>6. K-12: continue to develop Professional Learning</p>	<p>Biweekly meetings</p>	<p>K-12 administrators</p>	<p>General Fund</p>	

<p>Communities (PLC) with Data Analysis Meetings. Focus on teacher-analysis of ELs' ELA data, leading to adjustments in instructional strategies, student placement, etc. Focus on CAHSEE outcomes.</p>	<p>since 2007</p>	<p>and teachers</p>	<p>(salaries only \$50,535)</p>	
<p>7. K-12 Provide teacher training for extended vocabulary instruction to English Learners using SDAIE strategies such as graphic organizers, vocabulary maps, etc.</p>	<p>Monthly Sept. '09 through June '10</p>	<p>K-12 administrators and teachers</p>	<p>General Fund (salaries only \$50,535)</p>	
<p>8. K-6: Monitor that Focus Walls are in place in all elementary classrooms to ensure proper scaffolding, vocabulary reinforcement, and concept reinforcement for English Learners requiring additional visual clues;</p>	<p>Ongoing weekly since 2007</p>	<p>ELA Reading Coaches; EL Teachers on Special Assignmt. (TOSAs)</p>	<p>General Fund, EIA, ELAP, Title I, Title III (salaries only \$17,000)</p>	
<p>9. K-12: Continue to provide time in the curricular day when teachers can pre-teach and re-teach ELA standards and skills to ELs</p>	<p>Ongoing weekly since 2007</p>	<p>K-6 administrators & teachers.</p>	<p>General Fund</p>	
<p>10. K-12: To ELs with low reading ability, offer additional, scientifically-based reading interventions (e.g. additional time on task & Voyager materials)</p>	<p>Ongoing since 2008</p>	<p>K-12 classroom teachers</p>	<p>General Fund, EIA: \$18,000</p>	
<p>11. K-12: Implement the Response to Intervention (RtI) process fully at each site, providing targeted interventions based on identified student needs in ELA.</p>	<p>Ongoing since Sept 2007</p>	<p>K-12 admins. and teacher; Program Improvement Staff; Intervention Staff</p>	<p>General Fund, Title I, EIA, SIP Title I (salaries only \$50,000)</p>	
<p>4. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics. (AMAO 3; ELSSA)</p> <p>Ongoing Support District and site administrators routinely visit classrooms to observe mathematics instruction and to verify that all ELs are being instructed appropriately in the core mathematics curriculum utilizing universal access components as appropriate for ELs.</p>	<p>This section: Biweekly visits since Sept 08 and continuing indefinitely</p>	<p>This section: District staff, site administrators</p>	<p>This section: General Fund (salaries only \$50,535)</p>	

<p>District and site administrators are developing and engaging in a process to read, discuss analyze and apply research to inform the modification of the method of instruction of Mathematics within each program design. District and site administrators will monitor the implementation of the modifications for the purpose of evaluating effectiveness.</p> <p>District and site administrators will verify that classroom teachers are implementing sound mathematics instruction practices, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Explicit, direct instruction followed by guided and independent practice; b. Scaffolding techniques c. Flexible grouping d. Incorporation of higher-level critical thinking skills e. Attention to different learning styles f. Lesson objectives determined by authentic benchmark assessments g. Checking for understanding throughout the lesson h. Use of primary language support when applicable i. Closure and reflection <p>Researched strategies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. K-6: Train one teacher from every elementary school in Cognitive Guided Instruction in Mathematics. 2. K-6: Create Math Magic staff development opportunities through built-in sustainability with a cadre of trainers. 3. K-6: Offer teachers monthly Hands-On Equation training opportunities. 4. 7-8: Support ELs in meeting California State Standards in Math by implementing ALEKS software to help students master the basic skills needed for 	<p>Monthly trainings Sept 09 – June 10</p>	<p>Exec. Dir., Elem. Ed; K-6 Math/ Science TOSA</p> <p>Exec. Dir., Elem. Ed; K-6 Math/ Science TOSA</p> <p>Exec. Dir., Elem. Ed; K-6 Math/ Science TOSA</p> <p>Director, Sec. Ed, 7-8 Principals, 7-8 Dept. Coordinators</p>	<p>General Fund, Title I, Title II, EIA \$14,784 subs General Fund SIP: \$4,000 trainings</p> <p>General Fund SIP: \$4,000</p> <p>General Fund SIP: \$3,000</p>	
---	---	--	---	--

<p>success in Algebra. This will strengthen CAHSEE.</p> <p>5. 7-8: As a Tier II intervention, expand implementation of the Math Intervention curriculum as either a second math class period or as a pull-out service to support middle school instruction and time on task. This will strengthen CAHSEE skills as well.</p>	<p>Sept '09 – June '10</p>	<p>7-8 Counselors, 7-8 Dept. Coord., 7-8 Principals</p>	<p>General Fund, AB 1802 IMF: \$7,000</p>	
<p>Math Program Development:</p>				
<p>1. K-12: Enlist a cross-district cadre of math teachers to identify and implement a common academic math vocabulary. The goal is application and transference. Goal also to improve CAHSEE scores.</p>	<p>June 2010</p>	<p>Exec. Dir., Elem., Dir., Secondary Ed, 7-12 Math TOSA, K-6 Math TOSA</p>	<p>General Fund, EIA, Title I, SIP (salaries only \$8,850)</p>	
<p>2. 7-12: Develop and implement Algebra Readiness and Pre-Algebra common assessments to identify students who need math intervention (e.g. additional period to provide more time on task and concept reinforcement; additional time to practice skills with computer program). Strengthen CAHSEE.</p>	<p>Fall 2010</p>	<p>Dir., Secondary Ed, 7-12 Math TOSA,</p>	<p>General Fund, SIP (salaries only \$8,850)</p>	
<p>3. 7-12: Implement Math Topics as an alternate math course option designed to assist 9th and 10th grade ELs. Evaluate the resulting student achievement data and make the course available at all high schools as needed. Strengthen CAHSEE.</p>	<p>June 2010</p>	<p>Dir., Secondary Ed, 7-12 Math TOSA, Gr. 9-12 Dept. Chair, Counselors</p>	<p>General Fund, SIP, AB 1802 (salaries only \$8,850)</p>	
<p>4. 7-12: Through examining Master Schedules, student placements, and resulting data, monitor and refine appropriate math placement for each student based on end-of-year, 6th grade pre-assessment.</p>	<p>In place and monitored quarterly since Fall 2008</p>	<p>Dir., Secondary Ed, 7-12 Math TOSA, 9-12 Dept. Coord.</p>	<p>General Fund, SIP (salaries only) \$10,000</p>	
<p>5. 7-12: Annually review student achievement data to monitor the secondary Math Matriculation Matrix to promote creation of new courses targeted to identified student need. Strengthen CAHSEE.</p>	<p>In place and monitored quarterly since Fall 2008</p>	<p>Dir., Secondary Ed, 7-12 Math TOSA; 9-12 Dept. Coord.</p>	<p>General Fund and SIP: \$4,000</p>	
<p>6. 7-12: Facilitate subject-specific, district-wide and multi-school PLC groups in grades 7-12 to review student performance data on district math common</p>	<p>In place and monitored quarterly since Fall 2008</p>	<p>Dir., Secondary Ed, 7-12 Math TOSA, 7-12 Principals;</p>	<p>General Fund, SIP: \$3,000 substitutes</p>	

<p>assessments and share best instructional practices.</p> <p>7. 9-12: In all high schools, expand implementation of the new Business Math course (applied) to offer an alternative opportunity for successful math achievement to all students in grades 10-12.</p>	<p>In place and monitored quarterly since Fall 2009</p>	<p>9-12 Dept. Coord. Dir., Sec. Ed, 7-12 Math TOSA, Gr 9-12 Prin; Math Curriculum Comm.</p>	<p>General Fund, SIP</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>We are committed to providing high quality professional development characterized by sufficient intensity and duration so as to have a positive and lasting impact on student performance. Through these trainings, teachers are empowered to use current research-based instructional strategies in ELA and math that are most effective for accelerating ELs' achievement.</p> <p>We generate data reports in ELA and math to assist teachers in accessing current achievement data for each EL & in basing instructional decisions on student needs.</p> <p>Teachers are encouraged to visit other schools to build a broader repertoire of EL instructional strategies in ELA and math and to learn how successful schools engage in collaborative conversations around EL student data.</p> <p>1. The LEA has implemented a plan to ensure that all teachers have the proper authorization to teach ELs. The great majority of teachers hold the CLAD, SB 395, or similar authorization. Our district also provides professional development for teachers seeking to be NCLB highly qualified. This county program, Verification Process for Special Settings (VPSS), is geared to teachers in Grades 7-12 who are teaching in Special Education, alternative education, or home schooling. Teachers receive specific, research-based strategies and activities in</p>	<p>Ongoing and monitored monthly since October 2009</p>	<p>Director of Human Resources; Credentials Supervisor</p>	<p>General Fund, Title 1 (salaries only \$15,303)</p>	

<p>the content areas, such as math and English. The program is scheduled to expand to all core areas.</p> <p>2. All teachers providing instruction to ELs in ELD are authorized to deliver ELD instruction.</p> <p>3. All teachers providing instruction to ELs in ELA are authorized for ELA, ELD, and SDAIE instruction.</p> <p>4. All teachers providing instruction to ELs in mathematics are authorized to deliver mathematics and SDAIE instruction.</p> <p>5. Teachers with EL responsibilities are provided monthly coaching and consultation in best practices by qualified staff members, knowledgeable in EL issues. Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) and the Director of English Learner Programs regularly provide staff development to math, English, science and history teachers in Grades 7-12. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. SDAIE training by content areas at all high schools and middle schools b. Moonlight Series, developed for teachers of ELs, offered four times per year in the late afternoon, in partnership with BTSA c. Customized trainings offered through the district system of professional development called Walking Your Strand, introducing teachers to research-based strategies in a number of areas impacting ELs (e.g. ELD, SDAIE, cultural proficiency, CELDT, Professional Learning Communities, data analysis, etc.) <p>6. Classroom teachers, principals, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other support staff receive professional development training in research-based methods of instruction that specifically address the ELA and math needs of EL students. This will strengthen CAHSEE outcomes as well.</p>	<p>Ongoing and monitored monthly since Oct 2009</p> <p>Ongoing and monitored monthly since Oct 2009</p> <p>Ongoing and monitored monthly since Oct 2009</p> <p>Focused, monthly staff development in 8 secondary schools: Sept. 2009-June 2010</p> <p>Ongoing since 2005; monthly for Grades 7-12; Moonlight Series 6 times/year</p>	<p>Dir. Human Res.; Creds. Supervisor</p> <p>Dir. Human Res.; Creds. Supervisor</p> <p>Dir. Human Res.; Creds. Supervisor</p> <p>Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Education; Director of EL Programs</p> <p>Dir. English Learner Programs; English Learner TOSAs; K-12 administrators</p>	<p>General Fund, Title I (salaries only \$7651)</p> <p>General Fund, Title I (salaries only \$7651)</p> <p>General Fund, Title I (salaries only \$7651)</p> <p>General Fund Title I, Title III (salaries only \$32,000)</p> <p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$30,207)</p>	
---	--	--	--	--

7. Teachers have adequate time for staff collaboration regarding ELs ELA and math needs, assessment results, methods of instruction.	Weekly data analysis 2009-2010	K-12 administrators and Leadership Teams	General Fund	
8. The LEA's professional development plans are based on feedback received from teachers, administrators, and site personnel via the Staff Development Survey administered annually. This Survey provides local research based on authentic data relating to ELA and math instruction and allows the district to deliver the p.d. requested by the practitioners. This will assist with CAHSEE support.	Survey annually in Spring	Director of Human Resources; BTSA Coordinator; K-12 administrators	General Fund Title I EIA: \$30,000 K-12 <i>Insight Surveys</i>	
9. The LEA's professional development plans are integrated, long-term, and based on the needs of staff serving English Learners and their identified academic needs in ELA and math.	Monthly monitoring of implemented plans	Dir. English Learner Programs and K-12 Principals	General Fund Title I, Title III (salaries only \$50,535)	
10. District staff and site administrators ensure that the following activities occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Analysis of curriculum-embedded common benchmark assessments to plan additional staff development based on ELs' achievement of content standards in ELA and math; ● Collaboration with teacher leaders to develop and implement a written plan for professional development for support in ELA and math; ● Regular training of all instructional staff (including teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals) to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify early, appropriate interventions to help ELs learn in ELA and math; b. Improve student behavior and motivation to learn and succeed in ELA and math; c. Involve parents of ELs in their students' success in ELA and math; d. Understand and use assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning in areas of ELA and math; e. Effectively teach students with different learning styles and meet the needs of underperforming ELs in ELA and math. 	Monthly monitoring since 2006; offerings listed in <i>Walking Your Strand</i>	Directors, Elementary and Secondary Ed; Director, EL Programs, EL TOSAs, site administrators	General Fund Title I, Title III SIP EIA (salaries only \$25,257)	

<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>In N-MUSD, we are committed to fully including our parents in the education of their children. They are their students' first teachers and our strongest partners in our shared goals of academic excellence for all students.</p> <p>Our dominant second language is Spanish (93% of our ELs list Spanish as their primary language); therefore, student achievement documents, policies, notifications, etc. are translated into Spanish, and parent education programs are offered in both English and Spanish. We ensure that when 15% or more of the students at the school speak a primary language other than English, all notices, reports, statements, or records that the school sends to parents or guardians are written in the primary language and English.</p> <p>Regular communication with parents includes, but is not limited to, student progress in ELD, student progress in core and overall academic proficiency, grade-level standards, high school graduation requirements, data reporting for the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, local assessments, and available interventions in ELD, reading/language arts, and mathematics.</p> <p>1. Continue to teach the required training topics in both ELAC and DELAC. Continue to encourage parents of English Learners to attend these meetings and</p>	<p>Sept: ELAC schedule submitted; monthly: submittals of ELAC</p>	<p>Dir, of EL, Coord., School Community Relations (SCR), K-</p>	<p>General Fund Title I: \$2,000 Title III</p>	

become more involved in the education of their children	Agendas, Minutes	12 admins.		
2. Continue to have four trained School Community Facilitator (SCF) instructors provide Parenting Wisely classes (in both English and Spanish). Discuss importance of CAHSEE.	Classes offered Fall and Spring since 2005	Dir. of EL, Coord., School Comm. Rel. (SCR), 4 SCFs	Title I, Title III, EIA \$29,130	
3. Continue to network with parents of low-achieving ELs through the School Community Facilitator (SCF) program. Focus on student attendance and student achievement in ELD, ELA and Math	Biweekly trainings with SCFs since 2000.	Dir. of EL, Coord., School Community Relations (SCR), eleven (11) SCFs	Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$112,000)	
4. Attend the Latino Family Literacy Project Training in Riverside in February 2010 to explore/investigate their parenting programs	February 2010	Director, EL Programs	Title I, Title III, EIA (\$1,000)	
5. Concentrate on providing culturally proficient and home-language (Spanish) competent communications throughout all programs, sites, district depts through media such as broadcast messages, written materials, and district website information;	Ongoing with monthly monitoring since 2005	Dir. of EL Programs; Coord., School Community Relations (SCR); eleven (11) SCFs	Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$112,000) General Fund: School Loop \$5,000	
6. Continue collaborating with local social services agencies to provide support to families with low achieving students in areas that are directly impacting academic performance/attendance (e.g. mental and physical health);	Ongoing collaboration four times per year since 2000	Dir. of EL, Programs; Coord., School Community Relations (SCR); eleven (11) SCFs	Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$112,000)	
7. Continue to build leadership in parents of English Learners by training ELAC and DELAC Officers on leadership procedures and skills and supporting all parents' active participation in site committees such as School Site Council and district-level opportunities such as Task Forces.	Ongoing networking since 2005	Dir. of EL Programs; Coord., School Community Relations (SCR); eleven (11) SCFs; K-12 principals	General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$112,000)	
8. In order to maximize customer service, encourage parent involvement, and involve all stakeholders, continue building cultural proficiency in district staff at all levels in both classified and certificated departments.	Staff dev. Classified: March and Nov 09; SCF trainings '09-'10	Dir. of EL Programs; Coord., School Comm. Relations (SCR)	Title I, Title III, EIA (\$3,500)	

<p>9. Train parents on the district's new Student Information System to be implemented in Spring '10. Describe how the new system can interface with School Loop to provide additional information to parents, thus opening another avenue of parent involvement in their student's academic success.</p>	<p>Training rollout scheduled throughout district commencing January 2010</p>	<p>Dir., Info Tech; Dir., EL Programs; Coor., Schl Comm. Relations; 11 SCFs; K-12 Principals</p>	<p>General Fund Title I, Title III, EIA (salaries only \$2,000)</p>	
<p>7. If applicable, identify any changes to the Title III Immigrant Education Program.</p> <p>Not Applicable</p>				