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## Purpose and Description

Briefly describe the purpose of this plan (Select from Schoolwide Program, Comprehensive Support and Improvement, Targeted Support and Improvement, or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement)

## Schoolwide Program

Briefly describe the school's plan for effectively meeting the ESSA requirements in alignment with the Local Control and Accountability Plan and other federal, state, and local programs.
The Blanche Sprentz Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) aligns with the goals of the district Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), which is aligned with state and federal priorities and mandates, including those of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The long-term goal of eliminating the achievement gap and improving learning outcomes for all students will be a focus. To meet district LCAP goals and ESSA requirements, and to support learning for all students at Blanche Sprentz, this year we will continue our focus on school climate, working as a professional learning community to maximize student growth, and targeting essential standards with evidencebased practices and common assessments.

## School Vision and Mission

The faculty and staff at Blanche Sprentz Elementary School (BSE) believe that a child's education is a responsibility shared by school, students, family and community. Our mission is to promote individual growth, academic achievement, and creativity for all students through positive school climate involving cooperation and communication among students, staff, parents, and the community. Our vision is to prepare all students to become responsible citizens and productive members of a culturally diverse society. Blanche Sprentz students are provided with an environment that is safe, kind, respectful, supportive, and educationally inspiring. Our school climate encourages students to demonstrate openness, trust, self-esteem, self-determination, and respect for self and others. We provide ongoing opportunities for learning and continuously focus on student achievement. We recognize and stimulate special talents in all students.

Language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, technology, physical education and the fine arts are included in our district adopted curriculum. All subjects are taught in the context of meaningful learning experiences that take advantage of children's natural curiosity. Learning in the classroom is reinforced with homework assignments that students can complete independently. Special services are provided by a psychologist, speech pathologist, occupational therapist, behavior specialist, nurse, health clerk, resource specialist, self-contained special education teacher, and library clerk. Students have access to a well-equipped Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Math (STEAM) lab to enrich learning and increase exposure to science and technology.

## School \& Community Profile

> Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD) is comprised of two communities located in Sacramento County along HWY 50 . With a population of more than 20,000 students, schools are an average of twenty miles from downtown Sacramento and just over 100 miles from San Francisco. Folsom Cordova Unified School District enrolls preschool through adult students. There are twenty elementary schools, one charter School, four middle schools, three comprehensive senior high schools, three alternative high schools, and an adult school.
> Blanche Sprentz enrollment was 420 students in the $2019-20$ school year, $25 \%$ of which were socioeconomically disadvantaged. In addition, $11 \%$ of our students were English Language Learners (ELL). BSE's attendance for the 201920 school year was s $9.6 \%$. The school's largest ethnic group is white, with $59.3 \%$ of the school population identifying themselves as white. In terms of racial subgroups, significant numbers include Hispanic at $19.8 \%$, two or more races at $11.2 \%$, and Asian at $6.4 \%$. All of our teachers hold appropriate credentials. We have a library clerk and parent coordinator who facilitate educational opportunities for all our students. All of our educational programming operates with three tenets in mind, "All means all," "We are here for the children," and "Parents are their children's first teacher."

Blanche Sprentz Elementary School provides a challenging curriculum aligned with district adopted curriculum, while allowing students to explore and develop their interests and talents. All students are assessed formally throughout the year and ongoing formative assessments guide the development of appropriate interventions to meet the needs of each student. We hold Student Study Team (SST) meetings for students as needed, based on parent and/or teacher requests, and regular reviews of student performance data during Every Child by Name (ECBN) meetings. We assess students for 504 plans and special education services when needs are suspected and/or identified, or when appropriate requests for testing are received. Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) students are clustered in fourth and fifth grades, and conferences are held between the parent/guardian and teacher to discuss differentiated instruction to meet their child's needs for enrichment. Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) is taught school-wide from kindergarten through second grade, with some SIPPS instruction continuing into third grade for students who need additional support. Our English Learners (EL) receive assistance from a Bilingual Instructional Assistant (BIA), who supports students in their general education classrooms.

Blanche Sprentz maintains a positive school environment through teamwork and the efforts of our staff, students and parents. Our hardworking school staff is called upon to model the behavior we expect from our students. We expect our staff and students to be Respectful, On-time, Courageous, and Kind (ROCK). We have a school social worker at our site three days per week, as well as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) based upon clearly defined standards of student behavior, consequences and rewards, and including weekly character awards, biweekly raffles, and trimester awards. Before and after school care is provided by our Student Care Center and Folsom STARS. During all school activities, including extracurricular, emphasis is placed on developing personal responsibility and a social conscience. We teach students to support their own and one another's social, intellectual and emotional growth, and to support and advocate for one another. We offer extra-curricular activities including student council and chorus, and Young Rembrandt and Good News Club (offered by community partners on site). Our strong Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) enhances positive parent/teacher/principal interactions, communication, and cooperation, provides a calendar full of fun activities for students, and supports the school site and facilities.

Blanche Sprentz families consistently and repeatedly express the desire to be involved in their children's education, and we enjoy a high rate of parent and community volunteerism. We encourage a productive partnership between home and school, including frequent and open communication. Our PTO is extremely active, with participation of parents, community members, teachers and our site principal, and provides many activities, fundraisers, and events for the students and families of Blanche Sprentz. The school expends considerable time and resources establishing strong connections to our families and community through our School Site Council (SSC), communications using Blackboard Connect, soliciting input through district surveys, as well as multiple volunteer opportunities. Our Blackboard Connect messages (voice, email, and text), school marquee, and school web page keep families informed about schedules, events and activities happening at school. Frequent communications from teacher by email, phone, and text, regular conferences, and parent involvement in the classroom all help to build a positive learning environment and strong relationships. We collaborate with community partners including the PC Pals/Intel program, Oak Hills Church (for a community service day) Folsom's Hope, Kaiser Permanente, Micron Corporation, Sacramento Rivercats, Folsom Parks and Recreation, Folsom Rotary Club, Folsom Lions Club, and Folsom Police and Fire Departments. Many parents are frequent and active volunteers in the classroom, providing robust support for students and staff. Our strong and energized PTO further enhances positive parent/teacher/principal interactions and cooperation. Our PTO meets monthly and they play a key role at Blanche Sprentz. In addition to providing fun extracurricular opportunities, they provide supplemental instructional materials for each classroom, help fund classroom field trips and provide funding for after school clubs.

# Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components 

## Data Analysis

Please refer to the School and Student Performance Data section where an analysis is provided.

## Surveys

This section provides a description of surveys (i.e., Student, Parent, Teacher) used during the school-year, and a summary of results from the survey(s).
Through our PTO, SSC, teacher communications, and parent coordinator, we gather information to address needs and concerns of our community ongoing. Our principal regularly receives verbal and written communications regarding parent concerns and kudos, and staff stays in touch with concerns when shared via social media platforms, addressing them promptly. Our school solicits input and feedback via regular Blackboard communication, and our district surveys the community regularly during the decision-making process.

Participation in the parent portion of the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) delivered during the 2019-20 school year was down by 10 respondents from the previous year. Based on responses received, and in comparing to data from the previous year, there were perceived improvements and new areas of concern. Reported participation in parent teacher conferences increased by $35 \%$ over 2018-19. However, there was a $16 \%$ decline in parents reporting that they got updates on how their child was doing between report cards. There was also a $16 \%$ increase in parents reporting physical fights that are a small problem at our school.

Per the teacher portion of the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) delivered during the 2019-20 school year, 100\% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the learning environment is supportive and inviting, and that there were high standards for academic performance for all students. Areas of previous concern, including resources to work with special education students and clean and well-maintained facilities, showed improvements over survey results in the previous year. Staff agreement that they were provided resources to work with special education students improved by $38 \%$ in 2019-20 over the previous school year, and staff agreement that our school has clean and well maintained facilities went up by $36 \%$. Areas of increased concern included staff support and respect for one another, which went down by $27 \%$ over previous results. Additionally, the number of staff disagreeing that the school promotes trust and collegiality went up by $24 \%$.

Per the student portion of the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) delivered during the 2019-20 school year, there were also shifts from the previous school year. There was a $13 \%$ increase in students reporting they feel proud to belong to our school, an $11 \%$ increase in students who say they know the rules all the time, and a $12 \%$ improvement in students trying to stop bullying any time they see it. However, students reporting they have at least one caring adult at school went down $9 \%$, with a gap of 22 points between boys and girls responding, with boys more likely to report connecting to a caring adult at school than girls. On a related item, students reporting that teachers and grown-ups listen to them all the time went down by $20 \%$

## Classroom Observations

This section provides a description of types and frequency of classroom observations conducted during the school-year and a summary of findings.
Formal evaluations are completed throughout the school year per the district's evaluation process and timeline. Additionally, a formal evaluation may be initiated by the school principal during a non-evaluation year if she has cause for concern. Formal observations for probationary teachers occur twice in the fall and twice in the spring. Tenured teacher formal evaluation is once in the fall and once in the spring during an evaluation year. We have an electronic teacher evaluation process, Talent Ed-Perform, that houses our evaluation forms and documents. Classroom observations are made throughout the campus, formally and informally as needed or wanted, and spontaneously. Teacher and staff observations are made on a scheduled and drop-in basis with ongoing supports in place to provide guidance, options and knowledge to better their teaching. Areas of need, strengths and growth are targeted throughout the school year, providing areas and suggestions for professional development. The school principal also takes advantage of "teachable moments" with staff as they arise during the course of their work, and encourages open dialog and continuous self-reflection on practice for all staff. Based on input from the previous principal as well as observations by the new principal, who has now been at Blanche Sprentz for one year, classroom management and managing student behaviors continues to be a challenge for a small number of staff, and will continue to be an area of focus for the 2020-21 school year.

## Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are derived from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 and Essential Program Components (EPCs). In conjunction with the needs assessments, these categories may be used to discuss and develop critical findings that characterize current instructional practice for numerically significant subgroups as well as individual students who are:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Discussion of each of these statements should result in succinct and focused findings based on verifiable facts. Avoid vague or general descriptions. Each successive school plan should examine the status of these findings and note progress made. Special consideration should be given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs.

## Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (ESEA)
California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP), i-Ready, English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), and curriculum-embedded assessment data is used throughout the school year to determine instructional groups, drive interventions/enrichment, and to identify patterns of strengths and weaknesses over time. i-Ready diagnostic and growth monitoring assessments are administered to monitor student progress. We have additional district curriculum assessments that are given to appropriately monitor student progress including fluency assessments, Benchmark weekly (formative), Benchmark Unit (summative), envision MATH topic tests, and SIPPS Mastery tests. These results are used to plan instruction and provide interventions as needed. Teachers participate in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) to dialogue and discuss ways in which to effectively maximize their efforts to support and increase student achievement. Our teachers spent time during the 2019-20 school year identifying essential standards for ELA and math at each grade level, so that their PLC time could target those learning outcomes identified as non-negotiable. Every Child by Name (ECBN) meetings are conducted twice yearly to provide structure and accountability around these common assessments and help us target resources to students who need additional support.

Due to COVID related school closures in the Spring of 2020, CAASPP was not administered, thus testing data for the 2019-20 school year is not available. Instead, areas of focus will be determined using other sources of data and continued analysis of older testing data from CAASPP. Based on 2018-19 CAASPP data, areas of improvement can be identified for both English Language Arts (ELA) and math. For ELA, while 49\% of students were scored at or above standard, the number of students exceeding standards dropped from $38.1 \%$ to $26.7 \%$ compared to the previous year. There was also a $21 \%$ increase in students scoring below standard in Research/Inquiry. In math, the percentage of students scoring at and above standard decreased from 62\% to $49 \%$ from 2017-18 to 2018-19, and the number of students scoring below standard in concepts and procedures increased from $17 \%$ to $33 \%$. Finally, the number of students scoring below standard in problem solving and modeling/data increased from $14 \%$ to $28 \%$.

Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)
Teachers collaborate in PLCs and use programs such as i-Ready to monitor data from district-provided and curriculumembedded assessments. Additionally, they use ongoing formative assessments to modify instruction and determine flexible grouping in classrooms. Teachers conduct i-Ready formative assessment three times yearly and curricular assessments regularly to monitor student progress, as directed by the district's adopted curriculum. The third i-Ready diagnostic was not administered in the 2019-20 due to COVID-19 related school closure. Data from these sources directs discussions among staff to increase student learning support and progress. Benchmark Advance provides teachers online assessment tools that can be disaggregated in a number of ways including by-student-by-standard.

## Staffing and Professional Development

Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (ESEA)
All teachers at Blanche Sprentz are highly qualified and appropriately credentialed.

Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to instructional materials training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)
State, district, and site purchased materials are provided to support intervention, classroom needs, and students exceeding grade level standards. Training in SIPP, Handwriting Without Tears, and all district adopted curricula have been made available to all teachers at our site. Our site coaches have worked with the district lead teachers to learn best practices for English language arts, math, and science instruction, and have shared these practices at site level staff meetings. During the 2019-20 school year, our school PLC Guiding Coalition attended professional development in implementing PLC at our site, and provided some PLC training to all site teachers prior to school closures due to COVID-19.

Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (ESEA) Staff are provided district and site-based targeted Professional Development (PD) to meet their ongoing needs. All PD addresses common core state standards while increasing implementation of evidence based instructional strategies.

Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC) District and site level coaches provide support for staff. We offer release days for teachers to gain insight and deeper understanding of core curriculum. These PD days/collaborations center around curriculum delivery and needs analyses. Teachers support one another during PLC time discussing and researching instructional strategies and effective teaching efforts for their classrooms.

Teacher collaboration by grade level (kindergarten through grade eight [K-8]) and department (grades nine through twelve) (EPC)
Grade level PLC meetings occurred at least twice monthly during the 2019-20 school year, and centered around data analysis, reading, writing, and math instruction, and identifying essential standards for each grade level. Increased grade level collaboration time is needed for the 2020-21 school year, as some members of grade level teams have changed due to staff moves between grade levels, and weekly grade level team time is necessary to better target essential standards and provide responsive multi-tiered instruction. Also, teachers new to grade level assignments will need more time with grade level teaching partners to calibrate and synchronize their instruction and assessment.

## Teaching and Learning

Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (ESEA)
State recommended and evidence-based materials are used to support instruction. District adopted curriculum and supplementary supports materials that align with common core are used, such as SIPPS and i-Ready. Teachers participate in district led staff development and work with materials aligned with performance standards, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and Common Core. Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) aligned curriculum, Amplify, was adopted for implementation in the 2019-20 school year. Initial implementation during 2019-20 varied widely between classrooms, and continued professional development, refinement, and monitoring of instruction is necessary to facilitate a strong implementation of this curriculum school-wide state recommended and evidence-based materials are used to support instruction. District adopted curriculum and supplementary supports materials that align with common core are used, such as SIPPS and iReady. Teachers participate in district led staff development and work with materials aligned with performance standards, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and Common Core. Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) aligned curriculum, Amplify, was adopted for implementation in the 2019-20 school year. Initial implementation during 2019-20 varied widely between classrooms, and continued professional development, refinement, and monitoring of instruction is necessary to facilitate a strong implementation of this curriculum school-wide.

Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (K-8) (EPC)
State mandated instructional minutes are provided. Language arts and math times are protected from interruptions or pull out supports to help maintain the fidelity and integrity of academic programs.

Lesson pacing schedule ( $\mathrm{K}-8$ ) and master schedule flexibility for sufficient numbers of intervention courses (EPC) District and site pacing guides are used. District mandated assessment windows facilitate monitoring of student progress. Classes share students based on SIPPS levels and needs, providing leveled reading instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Other times, such as "Bear Workshop," are implemented in which grade level teams group and share students for targeting needed instruction.

Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (ESEA)
The Sacramento County of Education conducted a Williams Act review and Blanche Sprentz was found to be in compliance. All classes have curriculum to support grade level learning for all students.

Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials, and for high school students, access to standards-aligned core courses (EPC)
Instructional materials include Benchmark Advanced for ELA, enVision MATH, and Amplify science, all of which align with CCSS. Teachers have been trained in the use of supplemental material including but not limited to Second Step, Daily Five, Step Up to Writing, Lexia, SIPPS, and i-Ready.

## Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)
We have a BIA that supports our EL in their general education classrooms. In addition, we work with a community partner called Folsom's Hope, which provides the Bears and Mentors (BAM) program, partnering students identified as at-risk with mentor volunteers, and the Students Together Achieving Results (STARS) program, which provides after school tutoring and enrichment to identified at-risk students. We are staffed with support from our district Early Intervention Program (EIP), which provides individual and small group counseling and support to students identified by teachers as needing extra social-emotional support, based on Second Step curriculum. We have a resource teacher and a self-contained class for students who require more intensive special education supports than can be provided through a resource model.

Evidence-based educational practices to raise student achievement
In order to create a positive, safe, and orderly school climate, our school increased implementation of PBIS during the 2019-20 school year. Last year we increased the number of reward opportunities, highlighted the Trait of the Week with fidelity and provided weekly shout-outs and charms to students from each class, collectively built a site-wide behavioral matrix, and implemented a progressive discipline ladder. When learning shifted to distance learning due to COVID-19 closure, we continued to highlight Traits of the Week by producing weekly videos and providing highlight videos on Fridays in which students modeled the Trait of the Week. Our teachers were trained in Second Step strategies designed to build character in our students. Our grade level Professional Learning Community (PLC) teams meet regularly to review data and refine instruction to support continuous student growth.

## Parental Engagement

Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (ESEA)
Parents are encouraged to attend Back to School Night, open house, site council meetings, and PTO meetings and events. During the 2020-21 school year, these meetings will continue in a virtual format. Time sensitive information is relayed through Blackboard Connect phone messages and texts. Our website is updated regularly to assist parents in accessing needed information and contact teachers and staff. BAM and STARS provide extra mentoring and tutoring support to students. We work with community partners to provide food and needed items to families identified by our staff. Our site conducts regular SST meetings to target the needs of individual students identified as academically at risk by families and/or staff. The full continuum of special education services is available to students found eligible.

Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, other school personnel, and students in secondary schools, in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of ConApp programs (5 California Code of Regulations 3932)
Our school site council consists of five parents, the principal, three teachers, and one other staff member, and meets 3 times per school year. Our PTO meets a minimum of one time per month, and our English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) meets 3 times per year. Each of these groups reviews school progress and ongoing concerns, and provides input in our Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA).

Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)
Our site does not receive categorical funding.

Fiscal support (EPC)
District services and funding are provided to support FCUSD LCAP goals.

## Stakeholder Involvement

How, when, and with whom did the school consult as part of the planning process for this SPSA/Annual Review and Update?

## Involvement Process for the SPSA and Annual Review and Update

Blanche Sprentz utilized a variety of outreach efforts for input and feedback on the development of our Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA). Our SSC provides input into the plan during our scheduled meetings, noting areas of concern and growth. Despite COVID-19 related school closure in the spring of 2020, our SSC met in May to discuss needs and concerns for the upcoming school year. Our site council reviewed the final SPSA in August 2020, and our staff reviewed the plan in August as well. Our PTO was updated on our new SPSA and progress toward our previous goals during our August meeting. In composing this year's SPSA, our principal reflected on teacher and community input collected anecdotally during the 2019-20 school year as well.

## Resource Inequities

Briefly identify and describe any resource inequities identified as a result of the required needs assessment, as applicable.
No resource inequities were identified.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Enrollment <br> Enrollment By Student Group

| Student Enrollment by Subgroup |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Percent of Enrollment |  |  | Number of Students |  |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 19-20 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 19-20 |
| American Indian | \% | 0.24\% | 0.25\% |  | 1 | 1 |
| African American | 2.56\% | 1.9\% | 1.47\% | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| Asian | 9.21\% | 6.43\% | 8.82\% | 36 | 27 | 36 |
| Filipino | 0.51\% | 0.71\% | 0.74\% | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 20.20\% | 19.76\% | 19.61\% | 79 | 83 | 80 |
| Pacific Islander | 0.26\% | 0.24\% | 0\% | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| White | 59.34\% | 59.29\% | 56.62\% | 232 | 249 | 231 |
| Multiple/No Response | 0.26\% | 0.24\% | 12.25\% | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Total Enrollment |  |  | 391 | 420 | 408 |

## Student Enrollment

 Enrollment By Grade Level| Grade | Student Enrollment by Grade Level |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $19-20$ |
| Kindergarten | 152 | 164 | 130 |
| Grade 1 | 68 | 47 | 58 |
| Grade 2 | 43 | 70 | 43 |
| Grade3 | 45 | 45 | 67 |
| Grade 4 | 44 | 48 | 59 |
| Grade 5 | 39 | 46 | 51 |
| Total Enrollment | 391 | 420 | 408 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. $46 \%$ of our total enrollment at BSE is under the age of 7 .
2. BSE's current enrollment dropped 12 students from 18-19 to 19-20, with percentages of student in each race/ ethnicity category remaining roughly the same.
3. 105 BSE students, or $25 \%$, are considered socioeconomically disadvantaged.

## School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment
English Learner (EL) Enrollment

| English Learner (EL) Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Number of Students |  | Percent of Students |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 0}$ |
| English Learners | 51 | 46 | 45 | $13.0 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0} \%$ | $11.0 \%$ |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) | 9 | 16 | 16 | $2.3 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) | 2 | 8 | 0 | $3.7 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. $38.8 \%$ of EL at BSE made at least one level of growth on the English Language Proficiency Index (ELPI).
2. Two students were newly identified as RFEP in 2019-20. Spring ELPAC was not completed during the 2019-20 school year due to COVID-19 related school closure.
3. The percentage of students at BSE who are EL has remained stable over the last three school years.

## School and Student Performance Data

## CAASPP Results <br> English Language Arts/Literacy (All Students)

| Overall Participation for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \# of Students Enrolled |  |  | \# of Students Tested |  |  | \# of Students with |  |  | \% of Enrolled Students |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 39 | 46 | 46 | 39 | 46 | 45 | 39 | 46 | 45 | 100 | 100 | 97.8 |
| Grade 4 | 43 | 42 | 49 | 43 | 42 | 49 | 43 | 42 | 49 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Grade 5 | 31 | 41 | 49 | 31 | 41 | 49 | 31 | 41 | 49 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| All | 113 | 129 | 144 | 113 | 129 | 143 | 113 | 129 | 143 | 100 | 100 | 99.3 |

*The "\% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability

| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard |  |  | \% Standard Met |  |  | \% Standard Nearly |  |  | \% Standard Not |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 2428. | 2459. | 2446. | 23.08 | 34.78 | 31.11 | 25.64 | 28.26 | 28.89 | 28.21 | 28.26 | 22.22 | 23.08 | 8.70 | 17.78 |
| Grade 4 | 2467. | 2483. | 2491. | 18.60 | 28.57 | 32.65 | 30.23 | 26.19 | 22.45 | 30.23 | 26.19 | 24.49 | 20.93 | 19.05 | 20.41 |
| Grade 5 | 2526. | 2534. | 2526. | 29.03 | 26.83 | 18.37 | 19.35 | 43.90 | 48.98 | 38.71 | 14.63 | 22.45 | 12.90 | 14.63 | 10.20 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 23.01 | 30.23 | 27.27 | 25.66 | 32.56 | 33.57 | 31.86 | 23.26 | 23.08 | 19.47 | 13.95 | 16.08 |


| Reading <br> Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 15.38 | 26.09 | 31.11 | 46.15 | 60.87 | 53.33 | 38.46 | 13.04 | 15.56 |
| Grade 4 | 25.58 | 26.19 | 40.82 | 53.49 | 54.76 | 38.78 | 20.93 | 19.05 | 20.41 |
| Grade 5 | 29.03 | 36.59 | 26.53 | 61.29 | 46.34 | 61.22 | 9.68 | 17.07 | 12.24 |
| All Grades | 23.01 | 29.46 | 32.87 | 53.10 | 54.26 | 51.05 | 23.89 | 16.28 | 16.08 |


| Writing <br> Producing clear and purposeful writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 33.33 | 23.91 | 15.56 | 43.59 | 67.39 | 64.44 | 23.08 | 8.70 | 20.00 |
| Grade 4 | 23.26 | 26.19 | 18.37 | 55.81 | 50.00 | 63.27 | 20.93 | 23.81 | 18.37 |
| Grade 5 | 32.26 | 37.50 | 36.73 | 54.84 | 47.50 | 53.06 | 12.90 | 15.00 | 10.20 |
| All Grades | 29.20 | 28.91 | 23.78 | 51.33 | 55.47 | 60.14 | 19.47 | 15.63 | 16.08 |


| Listening |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  | \% At or Near Standard |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| Grade 3 | 15.38 | 21.74 | 33.33 | 71.79 | 67.39 | 57.78 | 12.82 | 10.87 | 8.89 |
| Grade 4 | 11.63 | 11.90 | 30.61 | 67.44 | 80.95 | 63.27 | 20.93 | 7.14 | 6.12 |
| Grade 5 | 19.35 | 17.07 | 16.33 | 77.42 | 75.61 | 73.47 | 3.23 | 7.32 | 10.20 |
| All Grades | 15.04 | 17.05 | 26.57 | 71.68 | 74.42 | 65.03 | 13.27 | 8.53 | 8.39 |


| Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 25.64 | 34.78 | 28.89 | 53.85 | 60.87 | 53.33 | 20.51 | 4.35 | 17.78 |
| Grade 4 | 11.63 | 26.19 | 28.57 | 79.07 | 59.52 | 42.86 | 9.30 | 14.29 | 28.57 |
| Grade 5 | 29.03 | 39.02 | 26.53 | 58.06 | 51.22 | 48.98 | 12.90 | 9.76 | 24.49 |
| All Grades | 21.24 | 33.33 | 27.97 | 64.60 | 57.36 | 48.25 | 14.16 | 9.30 | 23.78 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The percentage of 5th grade students exceeding standard in ELA fell from $26.83 \%$ in 2017-18 to $18.37 \%$ in 201819, while the number of students meeting standard increased from $43.9 \%$ in 2017-18 to 48.98\% in 2018-19. Therefore, it appears that the majority of students who fell from "exceeds standards" continued to "meet standard" rather than falling "below standard."
2. Based on data from 2018-19 (CAASPP testing not available in 2019-20 due to COVID-19 related school closure), $27.27 \%$ of 3rd-5th grade students exceeded the standard in ELA, and $33.57 \%$ met standard. Therefore, 60.84 of 35th grade students are at or above standard in ELA based on available CAASPP data, and 39.16 students are below grade level.
3. In the substandard of research/ inquiry, the number of students reaching standard fell $16.35 \%$, and the number of students falling below standard increased $9.62 \%$. There have been significant gains in the areas of listening and reading.

## School and Student Performance Data

## CAASPP Results

Mathematics (All Students)

| Overall Participation for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \# of Students Enrolled |  |  | \# of Students Tested |  |  | \# of Students with |  |  | \% of Enrolled Students |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 39 | 46 | 46 | 39 | 46 | 45 | 39 | 46 | 45 | 100 | 100 | 97.8 |
| Grade 4 | 43 | 42 | 49 | 43 | 42 | 49 | 43 | 42 | 49 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Grade 5 | 31 | 41 | 49 | 31 | 41 | 49 | 31 | 41 | 49 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| All | 113 | 129 | 144 | 113 | 129 | 143 | 113 | 129 | 143 | 100 | 100 | 99.3 |

* The "\% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard |  |  | \% Standard Met |  |  | \% Standard Nearly |  |  | \% Standard Not |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 2440. | 2451. | 2452. | 23.08 | 21.74 | 26.67 | 30.77 | 39.13 | 33.33 | 28.21 | 26.09 | 28.89 | 17.95 | 13.04 | 11.11 |
| Grade 4 | 2477. | 2476. | 2482. | 13.95 | 16.67 | 18.37 | 30.23 | 33.33 | 28.57 | 44.19 | 26.19 | 32.65 | 11.63 | 23.81 | 20.41 |
| Grade 5 | 2526. | 2501. | 2511. | 25.81 | 12.20 | 28.57 | 19.35 | 26.83 | 14.29 | 38.71 | 41.46 | 28.57 | 16.13 | 19.51 | 28.57 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 20.35 | 17.05 | 24.48 | 27.43 | 33.33 | 25.17 | 37.17 | 31.01 | 30.07 | 15.04 | 18.60 | 20.28 |


| Concepts \& Procedures <br> Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 41.03 | 30.43 | 40.00 | 33.33 | 45.65 | 37.78 | 25.64 | 23.91 | 22.22 |
| Grade 4 | 20.93 | 30.95 | 32.65 | 46.51 | 38.10 | 32.65 | 32.56 | 30.95 | 34.69 |
| Grade 5 | 29.03 | 19.51 | 34.69 | 41.94 | 39.02 | 30.61 | 29.03 | 41.46 | 34.69 |
| All Grades | 30.09 | 27.13 | 35.66 | 40.71 | 41.09 | 33.57 | 29.20 | 31.78 | 30.77 |


| Problem Solving \& Modeling/Data Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grade Level |  | $\%$ Above Standard |  |  | $\%$ At or Near Standard |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| Grade 3 | 30.77 | 32.61 | 35.56 | 41.03 | 52.17 | 51.11 | 28.21 | 15.22 | 13.33 |
| Grade 4 | 16.28 | 23.81 | 26.53 | 58.14 | 42.86 | 48.98 | 25.58 | 33.33 | 24.49 |
| Grade 5 | 32.26 | 9.76 | 20.41 | 38.71 | 60.98 | 59.18 | 29.03 | 29.27 | 20.41 |
| All Grades | 25.66 | 22.48 | 27.27 | 46.90 | 51.94 | 53.15 | 27.43 | 25.58 | 19.58 |


| Communicating Reasoning Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade 3 | 30.77 | 28.26 | 33.33 | 53.85 | 60.87 | 48.89 | 15.38 | 10.87 | 17.78 |
| Grade 4 | 25.58 | 23.81 | 24.49 | 58.14 | 40.48 | 42.86 | 16.28 | 35.71 | 32.65 |
| Grade 5 | 22.58 | 9.76 | 22.45 | 58.06 | 58.54 | 48.98 | 19.35 | 31.71 | 28.57 |
| All Grades | 26.55 | 20.93 | 26.57 | 56.64 | 53.49 | 46.85 | 16.81 | 25.58 | 26.57 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Looking at CAASPP data available for the last three years, the number of students in 4 th and 5 th grade who fell from "standard nearly met" to "below standard" increased significantly. The number of 4th graders in "standard nearly met" fell from $44.19 \%$ of students to $32.65 \%$, while the number of 4 th grader students in "standard not met" increased from $11.63 \%$ to $20.41 \%$. The number of 5th graders in "standard nearly met" fell from $38.71 \%$ of students to $28.57 \%$, while the number of 5th grader students in "standard not met" increased from $16.13 \%$ to $28.57 \%$. The number of students in these two grades did not increase in the "standard met" category, confirming that students moved down, rather than up, on math proficiency.
2. Based on data from 2018-19 CAASPP compared to the previous year, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 meeting or exceeding the achievement standard in math decreased from 59\% to 51\%.
3. Sub-standard scores showing the most consistent declines over a three-year period were in the area of communicating reasoning. Increases in students scoring "below standard" ranged from $2.5 \%$ to $16 \%$, with the number of students below standard in 4th grade doubling over the three-year period.

## School and Student Performance Data

## ELPAC Results

| ELPAC Summative Assessment Data Number of Students and Mean Scale Scores for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Overall |  | Oral Language |  | Written Language |  | Number of Students Tested |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| Grade K | 1473.3 | 1443.4 | 1487.8 | 1454.4 | 1439.2 | 1417.5 | 25 | 22 |
| Grade 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Grade 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 6 |
| Grade 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 6 |
| Grade 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 5 |
| All Grades |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 | 44 |


| Overall Language <br> Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| K | 56.00 | 27.27 | * | 31.82 | * | 31.82 |  | 9.09 | 25 | 22 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * |  | * |  | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * |  | * |  | * | * | * |
| 3 |  | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 |  | * | * | * | * | * |  | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * |  | * |  | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 47.73 | 20.45 | 36.36 | 40.91 | * | 31.82 | * | 6.82 | 44 | 44 |


| Oral Language <br> Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| K | 72.00 | 31.82 | * | 40.91 | * | 18.18 |  | 9.09 | 25 | 22 |
| 2 | * | * | * | * |  | * |  | * | * | * |
| 3 |  | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * |  | * |  | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * |  | * |  | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 65.91 | 38.64 | 27.27 | 38.64 | * | 13.64 | * | 9.09 | 44 | 44 |


| Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| K | 72.00 | 22.73 | $*$ | 59.09 |  | 18.18 | 25 | 22 |
| All Grades | 77.27 | 38.64 | $*$ | 47.73 |  | 13.64 | 44 | 44 |


| Reading Domain <br> Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| K | $*$ | 9.09 | 56.00 | 81.82 | $*$ | 9.09 | 25 | 22 |
| All Grades | 31.82 | 9.09 | 52.27 | 75.00 | $*$ | 15.91 | 44 | 44 |


| Wercentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number <br> of Students |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 1 9}$ |
| K | 60.00 | 31.82 | $*$ | 45.45 | $*$ | 22.73 | 25 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| All Grades | 45.45 | 18.18 | 47.73 | 65.91 | $*$ | 15.91 | 44 | 44 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. The majority of our ELs are in primary grades, specifically K .
2. The ELs are represented in all language levels beginning to well developed.
3. ELs K-5th grade are getting first instruction and and ELD support with the Benchmark curriculum.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Population

This section provides information about the school's student population.

| 2018-19 Student Population |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Enrollment | Socioeconomically <br> Disadvantaged | English <br> Learners |  |
| 420 | 25.0 | 11.0 | Foster <br> Youth |
|  | 0.5 |  |  |

This is the total number of students enrolled.

This is the percent of students who are eligible for free or reduced priced meals; or have parents/guardians who did not receive a high school diploma.

This is the percent of students who are learning to communicate effectively in English, typically requiring instruction in both the English Language and in their academic courses.

This is the percent of students whose well-being is the responsibility of a court.

| 2018-19 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| English Learners | 46 | 11.0 |
| Foster Youth | 2 | 0.5 |
| Homeless | 5 | 1.2 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 105 | 25.0 |
| Students with Disabilities | 52 | 12.4 |


| Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| African American | 8 | 1.9 |
| American Indian | 1 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 27 | 6.4 |
| Filipino | 3 | 0.7 |
| Hispanic | 83 | 19.8 |
| Two or More Races | 47 | 11.2 |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.2 |
| White | 249 | 59.3 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. BSE's proportion of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, at $25 \%$, has dropped from the previous year, at $28.1 \%$, but remains one of the highest percentages for a Folsom elementary school.
2. Our percentage of students identified as having disabilities is slightly above local and state averages. This may be in part to having a mild-moderate self-contained class on our site.
3. Our percentage of EL students, at $11 \%$, is a small drop from the 2018-19 school year, at $13 \%$.

## School and Student Performance Data

Overall Performance

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students



Academic Engagement

Chronic Absenteeism


Conditions \& Climate

Suspension Rate


Orange

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Based on 2018 fall dashboard data, 2018-19 i-Ready diagnostic data, and data from 2018-19 CAASPP, math is a school-wide area of need. In particular, the sub-standards of concepts and procedures, problem solving and modeling data, and communicating reasoning should be areas of focus in the upcoming school year.
2. Our suspension rate increased in 2018-19 over the prior year, and remained stable in 2019-20. It should remain an area of focus. We had a total of 17 suspensions during the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school years, an increase from 13 in 2017-18.
3. Chronic absenteeism decreased during the 2018-19 and remained stable during the 2019-20 school year, though it remains higher for our ELs and socioeconomically disadvantaged students than the school average.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance <br> English Language Arts

The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:
Lowest
Performance


Green

Blue
Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Equity Report



This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 .

2019 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance for All Students/Student Group


Students with Disabilities


No Performance Color
0.3 points below standard

Increased
Significantly
++クつ a nninte 18


This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner |
| :---: |
| 42.8 points below standard |
| Increased |
| Significantly |
| ++242 nninte |
| 16 |



| English Only |
| :---: |
| 26.1 points above standard |
| Declined -6.7 points |
| 110 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall, students are showing satisfactory growth in ELA.
2. The difference in points between the school average and English Learners is 43.7 points, with EL scoring 43.7 points lower than the site average. Furthermore, the difference between EL and English only students is 68.9, with English only students scoring 68.9 points higher than English Learners.
3. The difference in points between the school average and the average for students with disabilities is 20.5 points, with Students With Disabilities (SWDs) scoring 20.5 points lower than the site average.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance

Mathematics
The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:
Lowest
Performance


Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.
2019 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Equity Report

| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green | Blue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Mathematics assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11.

2019 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance for All Students/Student Group

| All Students |
| :---: |
| Green |
| 0.5 points below standard |
| Increased ++3.2 points |
| 136 |


| English Learners |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 42.3 points below standard |
| Declined -10.9 points |
| 22 |

$\square$

| Homeless |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| Less than 11 Students - Data Not |
| Displayed for Privacy |
| 2 |
|  |

Socioeconomically Disadvantaged

Orange
28.7 points below standard
Maintained ++1.2 points
46

| Students with Disabilities |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 46 points below standard |
| Increased |
| Significantly |
| ++727 nninte |
| 18 |



This section provides a view of Student Assessment Results and other aspects of this school's performance, specifically how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Mathematics assessment. This measure is based on student performance on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner | Reclassified English Learners <br> 62.6 points below standard <br> Increased ++5.5 points <br> 16 | Less than 11 Students - Data Not <br> Displayed for Privacy <br> 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Based on 2018-19 CAASPP scores, the overall percentage of students who met achievement standard in math increased by 3.2 points from the previous year. 2019-20 CAASPP scores were unavailable due to COVID-19 related school closure.
2. SWD scored an average of 41.8 points lower than the site average.
3. EL scored an average of 27.7 points lower than the site average.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance <br> English Learner Progress

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students making progress towards English language proficiency or maintaining the highest level.

2019 Fall Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator

| English Learner Progress |
| :---: |
| No Performance Color |
| 38.9 making progress towards English |
| language proficiency |
| Number of EL Students: 18 |
| Performance Level: Low |

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students who progressed at least one ELPI level, maintained ELPI level 4, maintained lower ELPI levels (i.e, levels 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H), or decreased at least one ELPI Level.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Student English Language Acquisition Results

| Decreased <br> One ELPI Level |
| :---: |
| 4 |

Maintained ELPI Level 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H
7
Maintained
ELPI Level 4
0
Progressed At Least One ELPI Level 7

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. In the 2018-19 school year, there was a $10 \%$ increase in ELs scoring proficient over the 2017-18 school year.
2. Based on fall 2019 ELPAC scores, $77.7 \%$ of English learners maintained or progressed one ELPI level, with 4 students showing regression.
3. Average EL proficiency for Blanche Sprentz is low.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Engagement

Chronic Absenteeism
The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:
Lowest
Performance

$\underset{\text { Yellow }}{\text { T }}$

Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

|  | 2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Equity Report |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green | Blue |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled.

2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism for All Students/Student Group




## Students with Disabilities


6.3

Declined -4.6

63

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity

| African American | American Indian | Asian | Filipino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy | No Performance Color <br> 10.3 <br> Increased +5.3 <br> 29 | No Performance Color <br> Less than 11 Students - Data Not Displayed for Privacy |
| Hispanic | Two or More Races | Pacific Islander | White |
| $\overbrace{\text { Blue }}$ | $7$ | No Performance Color | $\prod_{\text {Yellow }}^{\uparrow}$ |
| 1.2 | 5.6 | Less than 11 Students - Data | 4.8 |
| Declined -3.8 <br> 84 | Declined -3 <br> 54 | $1$ | Increased +0.6 <br> 251 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. BSE overall 2019-20 chronic absenteeism rate was reduced by $.5 \%$ from the 2018-19 school year.
2. Attendance of our SWD in 2019-20 increased by $4.6 \%$ over the prior year. Hispanic student chronic absenteeism was reduced by $3.8 \%$.
3. Our socioeconomically disadvantaged students showed a $3.5 \%$ increase in absenteeism over the previous year, and EL students' absenteeism increased by $2.3 \%$.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Conditions \& Climate Suspension Rate

The performance levels are color-coded and range from lowest-to-highest performance in the following order:
Lowest
Performance


Green

Blue

Highest Performance

This section provides number of student groups in each color.

|  | 2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate Equity Report |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red | Orange | Yellow | Green |
| 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Blue |  |  |  |

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 12 who have been suspended at least once in a given school year. Students who are suspended multiple times are only counted once.

2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate for All Students/Student Group


| African American | American Indian | Asian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Performance Color |  |  |
| Less than 11 Students - Data |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |

This section provides a view of the percentage of students who were suspended.

## 2019 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate by Year

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 1.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Our overall suspension rate increased $.9 \%$ between fall 2018 and fall 2019 based on Dashboard data.
2. Based on Powerschool data for the 2019-20 school year, our total number of suspensions was reduced to 13 , which was 4 less than the 2018-19 school year.
3. The suspension rate for SWD and EL remained static, while suspensions increased by $1 \%$ over the previous year for socioeconomically disadvantages students and $.7 \%$ for white students.

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

## LEA/LCAP Goal

All students will receive instruction from a highly-qualified teacher and have access to curriculum which promotes college and career readiness. (State Priority 1)
1.1 Maintain the appropriate assignment of fully credentialed teachers and provide new teacher support.
1.2 Maintain schools in good repair.
1.3 All students, including English Learners, must have access to curriculum that is aligned to the state standards.

## Goal 1

All students at Blanche Sprentz, including English Learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students, will have access to curriculum and high quality instruction aligned with state standards, including access to related field trips and experiential learning.

## Identified Need

In fall of 2019, our teachers were trained in Amplify, our new district science curriculum that aligns with Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), but implementation was not consistent across classrooms in the 2019-20 school year. Our EL, SWD, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students show lower levels of proficiency in ELA and math on CAASPP than other student groups and our school average. Overall, students showed declines in the math sub-standards of communicating reasoning, concepts and procedures, and problem solving and modeling data.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| California Assessment Student <br> Performance and Progress <br> (CAASPP), preliminary data | 51\% of all students met or <br> exceeded the achievement <br> standard in math in 2018-19. <br> CAASPP scores were <br> unavailable for the 2019-20 <br> school year due to COVID <br> related school closure. | 54\% of all students will meet or <br> exceed achievement standard <br> in math. |
| i-Ready diagnostic | 61\% of student made at least <br> one year's growth in math <br> during the 2018-19 school <br> aear. Summative iReady <br> diagnostic data was not <br> available for the 2019-20 <br> school year due to COVID-19 <br> related school closure. | 64\% of students will make at <br> least one year's growth in math <br> as measured by iReady <br> diagnostic data. |

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

## Strategy/Activity 1 <br> Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity (Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

Strategy/Activity
Having now completed Solution Tree PLC training, team of 7 staff from BSE will participate in a regional Response to Intervention (RtI) training together, as recommended by our director of curriculum and instruction, to increase Rtl implementation and the ability of our grade level teams to systematically address student learning needs. This guiding coalition will then train all staff on PLC and Rtl essentials during scheduled professional development staff meetings during the 202021 school year.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
10,000

Source(s)
LCFF - Supplemental
5000-5999: Services And Other Operating Expenditures Rtl conference costs, substitute teacher coverage during teacher participation in conference

## Strategy/Activity 2

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity (Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

## All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD

## Strategy/Activity

For all grade level teams, meetings will be held for 30 minutes weekly to focus on data, student achievement, and targeted interventions. These meetings will address district identified essential standards in ELA and math. Targets will be set, and data will be collected to review progress toward identified student growth targets.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
Source(s)

## Strategy/Activity 3

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.

Strategy/Activity

Every Child By Name (ECBN) meetings will be held in September and January between teachers and site principal to foster sharing of student progress data and understanding of individual student needs.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
500

Source(s)
LCFF - Supplemental 1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries Substitute teachers to allow release time for teacher/administrator collaboration

## Strategy/Activity 4

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.

## Strategy/Activity

Due to teacher movement between grade levels between the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school years, 2 teachers will complete PLC training already completed by our school's existing guiding coalition, in order to have a PLC trained teacher on each grade level team.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
2000

Source(s)
LCFF - Supplemental
5000-5999: Services And Other Operating Expenditures
PLC conference costs, substitute teacher coverage during teacher participation in conference

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2019-20

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

It cannot be determined if Blanche Sprentz Elementary (BSE) met the CAASPP and i-Ready targets set, as summative assessments were not given during spring 2020 due to COVID-19 related school closure. A team of 7 teachers, our guiding coalition, participated in in-depth PLC training provided by Solution Tree, and twice monthly PLC meetings were held with grade level teams to discuss common needs, instructional strategies, and assessments.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
BSE had no significant differences between our planned budget and expenditures.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.
Since our guiding coalition completed foundational PLC training during the 2019-20 school year, they will now complete an in-depth Rtl training to guide grade level teams in targeted intervention and support of progress in ELA and math. Due to movement of teachers between grade levels, additional teachers will complete foundational PLC training so there are trained teachers on each new grade level team. Those adjustments are reflected in goal one of this SPSA.

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Increase parent and student engagement and provide a safe, healthy, and positive learning environment. (State Priority 3, 5 and 6)
2.1 Increase student attendance rates and reduce chronic absences.
2.2 Increase the high school graduation rate and decrease the dropout rate for all students including historically underperforming sub groups.
2.3 Decrease 8th grade dropout rates.
2.4 Reduce student suspension, expulsion rates, and reduce bullying incidents. Increase school connectedness.
2.5 Increase family engagement and parent input and the utilization of volunteers.
2.6 Increase community partnerships that support student learning.
2.7 Increase the efficiency, timeliness and accessibility of district communications.

## Goal 2

We will reduce student suspensions, reduce bullying incidents, increase attendance, and increase school connectedness for both staff and students. We will increase the efficiency, timeliness, and accessibility of communications from our school. We will maintain a high level of family engagement and community partnerships in support of student learning.

## Identified Need

There was a significant increase in student suspensions during the 2018-19 school year based on data available in PowerSchool, and suspensions rates remained stable in 2019-20, though in-person learning was suspended on March 13th, 2020 due to COVID-19. We need to continue to fortify our comprehensive PBIS tier 1 to set, teach, and reinforce school-wide behavioral expectations for all students, and increase focus on tier 2 small-group supports, particularly during our distance learning related to COVID-19. Social Emotional Learning (SEL) shall be provided in all classrooms.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome |
| :---: | :---: |
| California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) | Parent CHKS: From 2018-29 to 2019-20, there was a $16 \%$ decline in parents reporting that they got updates on how their child was doing between report cards over the previous year, with $52 \%$ of respondents saying teachers do this "very well." There was also a $16 \%$ increase over the previous year in parents reporting physical fights are at least a small problem at our school with $2 \%$ indicating it is a "large problem," and 10\% indicating "somewhat a problem." Student CHKS: Students reporting they have at least |

## Expected Outcome

Parent CHKS: 60\% of parents will respond that our school does "very well" on reporting student progress between report cards. No parents will indicate physical fighting to be a "large problem, and no more that $8 \%$ will indicate "somewhat a problem." Student CHKS: No students will respond "no, never" to having at least one caring adult at school.
Staff CHKS: No more than $10 \%$ of staff will "disagree" that staff support one another, and no more than $20 \%$ will disagree or strongly disagree that the

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | one caring adult at school went down $9 \%$, with $7 \%$ of students responding "no, never." <br> Staff CHKS: Areas of increased concern included staff support for one another, which went down by $27 \%$ over 2018-19 results, with $19 \%$ responding "disagree." Additionally, the number of staff disagreeing that the school promotes trust and collegiality went up by $24 \%$ with $24 \%$ of respondents indicating "disagree," and 10\% indicating "strongly disagree." | school promotes trust and collegiality. |
| Site PBIS documents, student "Bear Reset" tracking records, | Parent CHKS: 60\% of parents will respond that our school does "very well" on reporting student progress between report cards. No parents will indicate physical fighting to be a "large problem, and no more that $8 \%$ will indicate "somewhat a problem." Student CHKS: No students will respond "no, never" to having at least one caring adult at school. <br> Staff CHKS: No more than 10\% of staff will "disagree" that staff support one another, and no more than $20 \%$ will disagree or strongly disagree that the school promotes trust and collegiality. | PBIS posters for each location (hallways, cafeteria, office, etc.) will be posted and referenced daily by all staff in framing behavioral expectations for students. The number of students and instances of "Bear Resets" will remain stable during the 202021 school year. |
| Suspension data available through Powerschool | We had a total of 22 site suspension during the 2018-19 school year, and 13 during the 2019-20 school year. Seven total students were suspended one or more times during the 2019-20 school year. | We will reduce the number of suspension events from 201920 to $2020-21$ by $10 \%$. |

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

## Strategy/Activity 1

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity
(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.

## Strategy/Activity

Posters/Banners will be displayed in all areas outlining behavior matrix expectations for that area, indicating expected student behaviors that align with Respect, On-task, Courteous, and Kind (ROCK), and will continue to implement a reward system that celebrates students for showing these elements of pro-social behavior through the uniform distribution of 'Bear Hugs,' which are tokens that can be collected and redeemed for privileges and rewards. Biweekly raffles associated with Bear Hugs to reward students for their positive behavior, and "shout-outs" and charms will be given for the student in each class that best demonstrated the character trait of the week.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
1100

## Source(s)

LCFF - Supplemental 4000-4999: Books And Supplies Awards for students demonstrating ROCK

## Strategy/Activity 2

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD
Strategy/Activity
All teachers will participate in training in social/emotional curriculum and instruction, including Second Step and other available training opportunities, and will implement social emotional lessons weekly throughout the 2020-21 school year in all learning formats (distance, hybrid, and in-person).

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
1,000

1,000

Source(s)
LCFF - Supplemental
5000-5999: Services And Other Operating Expenditures
Training registration costs and travel.
LCFF - Supplemental

## Strategy/Activity 3

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.
Strategy/Activity
All staff meetings will include positive team-building activities and group work with grade level teams, in order to increase collaboration and positive interactions with peers.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
200

Source(s)
LCFF - Supplemental
4000-4999: Books And Supplies
Printing and supplies

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2019-20

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
As a result of work done during 2019-20, we now have a school-wide PBIS behavior matrix, highlight weekly character traits aligned with ROCK, biweekly reward raffles for students earning "Bear Hugs" for modeling good behavior, and a standardized, site-wide progressive discipline ladder. We made great progress in PBIS tier 1 during the 2019-20 school year.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
PBIS training was provided by district staff during 2 teacher PD days, which saved the costs we expected to incur by going to regional training opportunities.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.
The updates to this goal reflect continued forward movement toward implementing tier 1 and 2 PBIS strategies at our site. Our new goal builds upon work done in the 2019-20 school year, prior to COVID-19 related school closure.

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Provide students with high quality classroom instruction and access to a broad course of study. (State Priority 2, 4 and 7)
3.1 Provide professional development in new adoptions and local curriculum.
3.2 Ensure all teachers/students have access to research-based EL instructional strategies to improve achievement.
3.3 Provide access to A-G, Career and Technical Education (CTE), International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced Placement (AP) and STEM courses.

## Goal 3

Teachers and support staff will increase student proficiency in ELA, math, and science by using evidence based instructional strategies and effectively implementing district adopted curriculum.

## Identified Need

Student proficiency in math has decreased over the last two years in several sub-standards, including communicating reasoning, concepts and procedures, and problem solving and modeling data. Student growth in ELA must be maintained for some and increased for others. Teachers and staff have not yet implemented the newly district adopted curriculum for science with fidelity in all classrooms.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator |
| :--- |
| 2018-19 CAASPP data for <br> math |
| i-Ready diagnostic data from <br> 2018-19 for math | | Staff science training |
| :--- |
| participation data, classroom |
| observation, lesson plans and |
| teaching schedules |

[^0]Baseline/Actual Outcome
During the 2018-19 school year, math proficiency dropped from $59 \%$ to $51 \%$. Data for 2019-20 CAASPP is not available due to COVID-19 related school closures.
$61 \%$ of students made at least one year's growth in math during the 2018-19 school year. Data for 2019-20
CAASPP is not available due to COVID-19 related school closures.

BSE received Amplify curriculum training in fall of 2019. Teachers were not monitored for implementation, but anecdotal observations reflect varying levels of implementation, from low to high.
PLC grade level teams met twice monthly in 2019-20 to

## Expected Outcome

$55 \%$ of students will score proficient or above in math on the Spring 2021 CAASPP.
$66 \%$ of students will make at least one year's growth in math during the 2020-21 school year.

> All teachers at BSE will implement Amplify science curriculum during the 2020-21 school year, providing science lessons no less than weekly.

PLC grade level teams will meet weekly in 2020-21 to

## Expected Outcome

target essential standards with instruction and assessment.

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

## Strategy/Activity 1

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.
Strategy/Activity
We will use monthly staff PD meeting times throughout the 2020-21 school year to learn and practice instructional strategies to increase student math proficiency at communicating math reasoning, problem solving and modeling data, and demonstrating math concepts and procedures, and to increase proficiency with delivery of Amplify science curriculum.

Our grade level team meetings, which will be scheduled weekly during the 2020-21 school year, will focus on ongoing student progress data for identified essential standards in math, and will target students in need of additional intervention through additional instruction and assessment.

Our primary and intermediate lead teachers will participate in district training opportunities for math curriculum and instruction, and will share these trainings with our site staff at grade level meetings.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

## Amount(s)

800

## Source(s)

LCFF - Supplemental
1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries Substitute teacher coverage for our site coaches to participate in math and science curriculum training opportunities.

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2019-20

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.

BSE made significant progress on this goal. A district lead teacher came to a staff PD to provide math strategy training in fall of 2019. Twice monthly grade level team meetings were held to share teaching strategies and monitor progress. CAASPP and i-Ready diagnostic data was unavailable for 2019-20 due to COVID-19 related school closure, so outcome metrics were unavailable.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
BSE had no significant differences between our planned budget and expenditures.
Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.
BSE will continue to focus on math and science for the 2020-21 school year. We will use our grade level meeting times, Rtl training and staff PD to increase our implementation of evidence-based instruction strategies for math, as outlined in the strategies above and in goal 1.

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Student progress and educational outcomes will be monitored for success using assessment results. (State Priority 4 and 8)
4.1 Ensure students are reading at grade level (1st, 3rd, 5th, 8th, and 11th grades).
4.2 Ensure students are meeting grade level standards in math (1st, 3rd, 5 th, 8 th, and 11th grades).
4.3 Ensure English Learners make yearly progress.
4.4 Ensure Special Education students make yearly progress.
4.5 Improve kindergarten readiness as measured by curriculum embedded assessment.
4.6 Increase the percentage of 9th grade students completing 60 units by using interventions and credit recovery.

## Goal 4

Teachers and support staff will increase student proficiency in ELA and math by using evidence based instructional strategies and effectively implementing district adopted curriculum.

## Identified Need

Student proficiency in math has decreased over the last two years in several sub-standards, including communicating reasoning, concepts and procedures, and problem solving and modeling data. Student growth in ELA must be maintained for some and increased for others.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator |
| :--- |
| 2018-19 CAASPP data for |
| math |
| i-Ready diagnostic data from <br> 2018-19 for math |
| Weekly PLC schedule and |
| agendas |

Baseline/Actual Outcome
During the 2018-19 school year, math proficiency dropped from $59 \%$ to $51 \%$. Data for 2019-20 CAASPP is not available due to COVID related school closures.
$61 \%$ of students made at least one year's growth in math during the 2018-19 school year. Data for 2019-20 CAASPP is not available due to COVID-19 related school closures.
PLC grade level teams met twice monthly in 2019-20 to target essential standards with instruction and assessment.

## Expected Outcome

$55 \%$ of students will score proficient or above in math on the Spring 2021 CAASPP.
$66 \%$ of students will make at least one year's growth in math during the 2020-21 school year.

PLC grade level teams will meet weekly in 2020-21 to target essential standards with instruction and assessment.

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

## Strategy/Activity 1

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.

Strategy/Activity
We will use monthly staff PD meeting times throughout the 2020-21 school year to learn and practice instructional strategies to increase student math proficiency at communicating math reasoning, problem solving and modeling data, and demonstrating math concepts and procedures.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
Source(s)

## LCFF - Supplemental

1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries Substitute teacher coverage for our site coaches to participate in math curriculum training opportunities. Costs already accounted for in goal 3.

## Strategy/Activity 2

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.
Strategy/Activity
Our grade level team meetings, which will be scheduled weekly during the 2020-21 school year, will focus on ongoing student progress data for identified essential standards in math, and will target students in need of additional intervention through additional instruction and assessment.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
Source(s)

## Strategy/Activity 3

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

 (Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.
Strategy/Activity
Our primary and intermediate lead teachers will participate in district training opportunities for math curriculum and instruction, and will share these trainings with our site staff at grade level meetings.

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

## Amount(s)

## Source(s)

LCFF - Supplemental
1000-1999: Certificated Personnel Salaries Substitute teacher coverage for our site coaches to participate in math and science curriculum training opportunities. Costs already accounted for in goal 3.

## Strategy/Activity 4

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students, including EL, low income students, and SWD.
Strategy/Activity
For all grade level teams, meetings will be held for 30 minutes weekly to focus on data, student achievement, and targeted interventions. These meetings will address district identified essential standards in ELA and math. Targets will be set, and data will be collected to review progress toward identified student growth targets.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
Source(s)

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2019-20

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
BSE made significant progress on this goal. A district lead teacher came to a staff PD to provide math strategy training in fall of 2019. Twice monthly grade level team meetings were held to share teaching strategies and monitor progress. CAASPP and i-Ready diagnostic data was unavailable for 2019-20 due to COVID-19 related school closure, so outcome metrics were unavailable.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
BSE had no significant differences between our planned budget and expenditures.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.
BSE will continue to focus on math for the 2020-21 school year. We will use our grade level meeting times to increase our implementation of evidence-based instruction strategies for math, as outlined in the strategies above and in goals 1 and 3.

## Budget Summary

Complete the table below. Schools may include additional information. Adjust the table as needed. The Budget Summary is required for schools funded through the ConApp, and/or that receive funds from the LEA for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).

## Budget Summary

Description
Total Funds Provided to the School Through the Consolidated Application
Total Federal Funds Provided to the School from the LEA for CSI
Total Funds Budgeted for Strategies to Meet the Goals in the SPSA
Other Federal, State, and Local Funds
List the additional Federal programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Adjust the table as needed. If
the school is not operating a Title I schoolwide program this section is not applicable and may be deleted.

## Federal Programs

## Allocation (\$)

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: \$

List the State and local programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Duplicate the table as needed.

## State or Local Programs

LCFF - Supplemental

## Allocation (\$)

\$16,600.00

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: \$16,600.00
Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: \$16,600.00

## School Site Council Membership

California Education Code describes the required composition of the School Site Council (SSC). The SSC shall be composed of the principal and representatives of: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school; parents of pupils attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, pupils selected by pupils attending the school. The current make-up of the SSC is as follows:

## 1 School Principal

3 Classroom Teachers
1 Other School Staff
5 Parent or Community Members

| Name of Members | Role |
| :--- | :--- |
| Robin Smay | Principal |
| Steve Callahan | Classroom Teacher |
| Rose Ann Morrison | Classroom Teacher |
| Bonnie Napton | Classroom Teacher |
| Emily Vinson | Parher School Staff |
| Tona Johnson | Parent or Community Member |
| Stephanie Carr | Parent or Community Member |
| Mary Romero | Parent or Community Member |
| Tony Truppa | Parent or Community Member |
| Katie Salcone |  |

At elementary schools, the school site council must be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel, and (b) parents of students attending the school or other community members. Classroom teachers must comprise a majority of persons represented under section (a). At secondary schools there must be, in addition, equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and students. Members must be selected by their peer group.

## English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC)

A committee comprised of parents, staff, and community members specifically designated to advise school officials on English Learner program services. Education Code Section 35147 (c), 52176 (b), and (c), 62002.5, and 64001 (a). The current make-up of the ELAC is as follows:

| Name of ELACMembers |
| :--- |
| Robin Smay |
| Tona Johnson |
| Steve Callahan |
| Chantalle Richard |

## Role

## Principal

## Parent or Community Member

## Classroom Teacher

Parent or Community Member

Parents of English learners must comprise the same percentage of the ELAC membership as English learners constitute of the school's total student population. Example, if $25 \%$ of the students in a school are English learners, then parent/guardians of English learners must comprise 25\% of the ELAC membership. Other members can be parent/guardians, school staff, and/or community members as long as the minimum percentage requirement for EL parents is maintained.

Each California public school, grades kindergarten through 12, with 21 or more English learners must form an ELAC.

1. The ELAC shall be responsible for advising the principal and staff on programs and services for English learners and the School Site Council on the development of the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)
2. The ELAC shall assist the school in the development of:
a. The school's needs assessment.
b. The school's annual language census.
c. Ways to make parents aware of the importance of regular school attendance.

## Recommendations and Assurances

The School Site Council (SSC) recommends this school plan and proposed expenditures to the district governing board for approval and assures the board of the following:

The SSC is correctly constituted and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.
The SSC reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) requiring board approval.

The SSC sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan:
Signature
Committee or Advisory Group Name
English Learner Advisory Committee
The SSC reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this SPSA and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the local educational agency plan.

This SPSA is based on a thorough analysis of student academic performance. The actions proposed herein form a sound, comprehensive, coordinated plan to reach stated school goals to improve student academic performance.

This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on 8/24/2020.
Attested:


- Second language support
- SPSA input and review
- Open Discussion
- Question and Answer
- Second language support
- SPSA input and review
- Open Discussion
- Question and Answer

Discussion:
What does a BIA do? Discussed push in support and communication with families, translation at site How can our BIA support the current distance learning format? For the first couple weeks of school, this support has mostly been tech problem solving, helping families connect with materials distribution, request Chromebooks and Hotspots, and online system navigation. Our BIA will push into classes shortly, be available for office hours with students in different grade bands, and consult with families and provide ongoing communication support.

## ELAC MEETING

August 24, 2020

All participants in attendance via Microsoft Teams virtual meeting

| Name | Parent | Staff |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Robin Smay |  | X |
| Steve Callahan | X | X |
| Tona Johnson | X |  |
| Chantalle Richard |  |  |

- Welcome and introductions: Attendees Tona Johnson, Steve Callahan, Robin Smay, Rose Ann Morrison, Mary Romero, Stephanie Carr, Emily Vinson, Katie Salcone, Bonnie Napton, Tony Truppa
- Single Plan for Student Achievement
- Goals focus on math, culture, and grade level teams
- Open discussion
- New items
- Questions and answers
- Next meeting scheduled October 19th, will review/ approve updated school safety plan

Staff - Robin Smay, Steve Callahan, Rose Ann Morrison, Bonnie Napton, Emily Vinson Parents - Mary Romero, Katie Salcone, Tony Truppa, Tona Johnson, Stephanie Carr

Minutes:
300 Meeting began
Copy of SPSA emailed in advance of today's virtual meeting via Microsoft Teams 305 SPSA - a summary of items that were discussed

- Due Sept. 1, draft was turned in on August 1
- Had to compose plan without last year's CAASPP data or Spring iReady diagnostic
- CA Healthy Kids Survey: discussed staff, parent, and student results and areas of focus.
- 18-19 CAASSP data - some decreases and some increases, goals will be determined based on data
- Increase grade level collaboration times this year because of movement amongst grade level teams, increased focus on PLC
- Chronic absenteeism has been reduced by .5\%
- Suspension rates stable from 18-19 to 19-20
- 4 site goals that relate to LCAP -
- Goal 1 activities: Staff to Rtl training, weekly PLC meetings, ECBN meetings twice yearly, PLC training for staff for expert at each grade level
- Goal 2 activities: PBIS banners and raffles, teacher training in SEL curriculum and implementation in all classrooms, staff team building
- Goal 3 activities: Monthly staff collaboration on math instructional strategies, PLC meetings to focus on essential standards, instruction and assessment for math, PLC guidance to be provided by site PLC coaches.
418 Verbal consent by role call, all staff and parent/community members verbally agreed to plan as proposed.

Meeting Adjourned: 422
Next meeting: Monday, October 19, 2020

## School Site Council Meeting

August 24, 2020

Name
Staff Member
Parent

| Rose Ann Morrison | X |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Emily Vinson | X |  |
| Robin Smay | X |  |
| Steve Callahan | X | X |
| Bonnie Napton |  | X |
| Stephanie Carr | X |  |
| Tona Johnson | X |  |
| Tony Truppa | X |  |
| Katie Salcone |  |  |
| Mary Romero |  |  |

All participation was virtual via a meeting on Microsoft Teams due to COVID related school closure.


[^0]:    Weekly PLC schedule and agendas

