

## Title I Program Evaluation 2015/2016

#### Overview

The effectiveness of the Title I program is evaluated annually using the following criteria: 1) effectiveness of program 2) successful strategies and programs 3) refinement of program per needs assessment. Information to evaluate the effectiveness of Title I programs includes performance data, surveys, attendance, input, and other data from students, parents, staff and administrators. The data is analyzed to determine strengths and areas for improvement. The results of the evaluation are shared with schools and provided to the public through an annual update during a Board of Trustees meeting.

Fullerton School District serves underperforming students at school wide Title I programs. Funds are received based on poverty levels as determined by the Federal School Lunch Programs counts. There are nine Title I School wide programs in the district: Commonwealth, Maple, Nicolas Junior High, Orangethorpe, Pacific Drive, Raymond, Richman, Valencia Park, and Woodcrest.

#### Goals of the Program

The district goals of the Title I program are for all students to have a fair, equal, and sufficient opportunity to:

- Obtain a high-quality education.
- Reach proficiency on challenging Common Core State Standards, state academic assessments, and student performance on district and site assessments.

Additionally, the Fullerton School District goal is to close the achievement gap between:

- High- and low-performing students, especially between significant subgroups including
- Disadvantaged students and their more advantaged peers.

#### **District's Program**

Programs provided for students served under Title I incorporated research-based instructional strategies and methods that strengthen the core academic program in the school. Title I programs increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

All schools have implemented the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model as well as Response to Intervention (RtI). Teachers meet on a weekly basis in their grade level PLCs to discuss student learning and teaching practices, analyze student achievement results, and identify students who need intervention or enrichment through the Response to Intervention process.

Local assessment is a key component in the analysis of student learning and the need for further interventions. The District administers diagnostic assessments, three times per year, to monitor progress of students. Teachers meet during their PLC time to conduct data analysis and develop

action plans to modify instruction as needed. Teachers work collaboratively by grade level and/or content area to determine the best possible solution for each individual student.

Each Title I school has a full-time RtI teacher and part-time paraprofessionals who support small groups of students each day to intervene on specific learning targets identified through multiple measures. Specific instructional materials to support literacy skills are implemented and students are monitored weekly to determine areas of growth and areas that need additional intervening.

Lindamood-Bell Reading Clinics are established at four district Title I schools: Nicolas Junior High, Orangethorpe, Pacific Drive, and Valencia Park. Students who are at least two years below grade level have the opportunity to receive intensive Tier III instruction during the school and afterschool in these reading clinics. Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes is a research-based program that is widely known for their specialization in in the field of teaching spelling, reading comprehension, oral language comprehension, oral language expression, written language skills and learning management. All teachers are paraprofessionals are training in the Lindamood-Bell teaching strategies and instructional materials.

Schools use a variety of research-based intervention materials such as *SIPPS* and LindaMood-Bell literacy programs for reading fluency interventions, *Accelerated Reader* and/or *Accelerated Math* for reading comprehension and math interventions, *ALEKS* and *ST* Math to support mathematics interventions and enrichment.

#### **District-wide Academic Achievement**

District-wide, students continue to make progress in moving toward proficiency in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics as measured by the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). Students of poverty (Socio-economically Disadvantaged) are moving toward proficiency in both content areas as well, and in some schools the gap between the school-wide progress and economically disadvantaged students is narrowing.

	Students Meeting Standards													
By Grade Level:														
		SBAC ELA						SBAC	Math				ST ence	
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G7	G8	G3	G4	G5	G6	G7	G8	G5	G8
2016	50	54	59	61	57	56	59	53	46	52	46	46		
2015	43	49	55	56	53	54	53	46	43	49	45	43	66	77
2014													71	82
2013													70	80
By Sign	ificant :	Subgro	up:					l					70	80
By Sign ELA	ificant :	Subgro	up:										70	80
		Subgro		Asian	His	spanic	w	hite	Ecor	n Dis	EI	-	swi	
				Asian 83	His	spanic 37	-	hite 69		n Dis	E1			D
ELA	•	Overall			His		•		3			9	swi	D
2016 2015	•	Overall 56		83	His	37	•	69	3	5	19	9	<b>SW</b>	D
ELA 2016	•	Overall 56	4	83		37	6	69	3	5	19	9	<b>SW</b>	D
2016 2015 Math		Overall 56 52 Overall	4	83 81 Asian		37 31 spanic	· ·	69 63 hite	3 2 Ecoi	9 n Dis	19 14	9 4	13 13 SWI	D
2016 2015		56 52	4	83		37	· ·	69	3 2 Ecoi	9	15	9 4	13	D

### Title III Accountability – California English Language Development Test (CELDT)

2015/2016 CELDT results indicate that AMAO 1 and 2 were met and exceeded federal targets.

AMAO 1	Annual Growth						
AMAO 1	201	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
Number of Annual Testers	3404	1	344	7	3,37	3	
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.	0			100		
Number in Cohort	3404	1	344	7	3,373	3	
Number Met	2312	2	238	1	2,28	2	
Percent Met	67.9		69.1		67.7		
NCLB Target	59	0.0	60.5		60.5		
Met Target	Yes		Yes		N/A		
	201	3-14	Attaining English Proficiency 2014-15 2015-16				
AMAO 2	Years of EL			instruction	Years of EL instruction		
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	
Number in Cohort	2816	1176	2833	1189	2,646	1,174	
Number Met	1060	710	1081	768	1,089	733	
Percent Met	37.6	60.4	38.2	64.6	41.2	62.4	
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	24.2	50.9	
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Title I Schools

		K 1* Standards	BMK % Meeting S	_		K 3* Standards
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA G1	81% (U2)	82% (U2)	70%	77%	71%	69%
ELA G2	39% (U2)	60% (U2)	70%	70%	52%	51%
ELA G3	52% (U2)	43% (U2)	55%	58%	60%	67%
ELA G4	15% (U2)	24% (U2)	23%	29%	43%	56%
ELA G5	34% (U2)	35% (U2)	22%	31%	49%	54%
ELA G6	47% (U2)	55% (U2)	32%	39%	45%	45%
Math G1	44% (U2)	57% (U2)	66% (U5)	77%	92%	92%
Math G2	78% (U2)	79% (U2)	42% (U4)	34%	90%	88%
Math G3	56% (U3)	49% (U3)	61% (U6)	64%	36%	53%
Math G4	37% (U2)	38% (U2)	51% (U6)	57%	24%	33%
Math G5	31% (U2)	41% (U2)	16% (U5)	31%	21%	29%
Math G6	20% (U2)	41% (U2)	22% (U5)	39%	19%	36%

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards		Writi % Meeting	ing 2 Standards	Writing 3 % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	
GK	N/A	N/A	57%	47%	76%	71%	
G1	39%	44%	55%	57%	73%	69%	
G2	30%	32%	37%	44%	48%	52%	
G3	33%	41%	54%	49%	68%	57%	
G4	36%	36%	46%	41%	47%	50%	
G5	45%	34%	46%	36%	54%	43%	
G6	49%	50%	43%	58%	49%	58%	

# Academic Achievement Gap for English Learner Students and Students of Poverty Percentage of Students Meeting State Standards

District English learner students and students who are economically disadvantaged achieved higher gains in both ELA and Mathematics as compared to both the County and the State on the 2015/2016 SBAC.

English Language Ar	ts/Literacy	2016	Growth
Foonomically	CA	35	+4
Economically Disadvantaged	County	38	+3
Disauvaniageu	FSD	35	+6
	CA	13	+2
English Learners	Orange County	15	+2
	FSD	19	+5
Students with	CA	14	+2
Disabilities	Orange County	20	+2
Disabilities	FSD	13	0

Mathematics		2016	Growth
Foonomically	CA	23	+2
Economically Disadvantaged	County	29	+3
Disauvaniageu	FSD	29	+4
	CA	12	+1
English Learners	Orange County	17	+3
	FSD	21	+3
Students with	CA	11	+2
Disabilities	Orange County	17	+2
Disabilities	FSD	13	- 1

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

### Commonwealth

	SBAC ELA					SBAC Math			
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	G5
2016	33	34	30	46	32	37	21	33	
2015	11	27	31	40	28	31	19	34	44
2014									51
2013									65

#### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	36	N/A	30	N/A	32	15	N/A
2015	27	N/A	26	N/A	25	9	N/A

#### Math

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	31	N/A	28	N/A	29	16	N/A
2015	29	N/A	27	N/A	25	16	N/A

Title III Accountability (School Data)								
	Annual Growth							
AMAO 1	2013-14	2013-14 2014-15						
Number of Annual Testers	173	204	179					
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%					
Number in Cohort	173	204	179					
Number Met	102	141	118					
Percent Met	59.0%	69.1%	65.9%					
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%					
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes					

	Attaining English Proficiency							
	201	3-14	201	4-15	2015-16			
AMAO 2	Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL	instruction		
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More		
Number in Cohort	173	39	181	53	159	44		
Number Met	51	24	67	35	62	26		
Percent Met	29.5%	61.5%	37.0%	66.0%	39.0%	59.1%		
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%		
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Commonwealth

	BMI % Meeting		_	MK 2* ng Standards	_	BMK 3* ng Standards
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA G1	100%(U1)	83% (U2)	90%	79% (50)	77%	76% (54)
ELA G2	10% (U2)	47% (U2)	81%	78% (55)	75%	88% (49)
ELA G3	11% (U1)	38% (U2)	30%	53% (53)	42%	59% (44)
ELA G4	42% (U1)	52% (U2)	62%	69% (26)	60%	54% (50)
ELA G5	27% (U1)	21% (U2)	40%	38% (48)	71%	62% (56)
ELA G6	43% (U1)	57% (U2)	35%	58% (45)	45%	74% (53)
Math G1	84% (U1)	70% (U2)	78%	75% (48)	92%	90% (50)
Math G2	82% (U2)	45% (U2)	49%	24% (55)	85%	95% (56)
Math G3	26% (U1)	48% (U3)	62%	32% (53)	18%	43% (53)
Math G4	88% (U1)	74% (U2)	67%	N/A	33%	N/A
Math G5	58% (U1)	N/A	58%	N/A	44%	N/A
Math G6	44% (U1)	59% (U2)	23%	N/A	21%	N/A

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards		Writi % Meeting		Writing 3 % Meeting Standards	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
GK	N/A	N/A	77%	48%	79%	78%
G1	46%	69%	80%	73%	82%	76%
G2	12%	23%	42%	63%	22%	48%
G3	14%	22%	43%	28%	56%	53%
G4	73%	37%	65%	48%	68%	62%
G5	74%	46%	67%	54%	67%	82%
G6	68%	44%	60%	60%	60%	70% (10)

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

### Maple

	SBAC ELA				SBAC Math				CST Science
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	G5
2016	27	33	42	20	61	23	16	15	
2015	22	26	23	17	48	15	8	13	41
2014									36
2013									48

#### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	30	N/A	30	N/A	30	16	N/A
2015	23	N/A	22	N/A	24	16	N/A

### Math

le .	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	29	N/A	29	N/A	29	23	N/A
2015	21	N/A	21	N/A	21	17	N/A

#### Title III Accountability (School Data)

	Annual Growth						
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16				
Number of Annual Testers	217	202	189				
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%				
Number in Cohort	217	202	189				
Number Met	162	131	119				
Percent Met	74.7%	64.9%	63.0%				
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%				
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes				

	Attaining English Proficiency							
	201	3-14	201	1-15	201	5-16		
AMAO 2	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction			
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More		
Number in Cohort	189	61	154	77	144	62		
Number Met	73	44	58	49	59	30		
Percent Met	38.6%	72.1%	37.7%	63.6%	41.0%	48.4%		
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%		
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Maple

		K 1* Standards	_	BMK 2* ng Standards	_	BMK 3* ng Standards
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA G1	96% (U3)	N/A	72%	69% (49)	69%	41% (49)
ELA G2	12% (U2)	38% (U2)	57%	74% (23)	28%	37% (52)
ELA G3	39% (U3)	46% (U2)	81%	70% (60)	69%	72% (60)
ELA G4	9% (U1)	6% (U2)	6%	41% (59)	61%	63% (60)
ELA G5	25% (U2)	25% (U2)	6%	12% (57)	37%	52% (58)
ELA G6	20% (U2)	31% (U2)	18%	18% (65)	17%	39% (64)
Math G1	60% (U1)	20% (U2)	50%	24% (49)	88%	82% (49)
Math G2	76% (U2)	86% (U2)	15%	16% (25)	84%	89% (53)
Math G3	81% (U4)	81% (U3)	85%	97% (58)	51%	68% (60)
Math G4	36% (U1)	35% (U2)	57%	58% (60)	10%	23% (60)
Math G5	11% (U1)	19% (U2)	5%	18% (55)	5%	12% (57)
Math G6	12% (U2)	32% (U2)	12%	0% (61)	N/A	11% (64)

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards		Writi % Meeting		Writing 3 % Meeting Standards	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
GK	N/A	N/A	46%	38%	71%	59%
G1	32%	59%	42%	52%	75%	54% (24)
G2	15%	16%	23%	31%	23%	38%
G3	17%	49%	62%	38%	75%	47%
G4	10%	32%	31%	45%	35%	37%
G5	22%	39%	80%	38%	47%	40%
G6	36%	28%	51%	49%	30%	49%

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

## **Nicolas Junior High**

	SBAC ELA		SBAC	CST Science	
	G7	G8	G7	G8	G8
2016	32	28	18	17	
2015	27	33	17	15	56
2014					55
2013					34

#### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	30	N/A	27	N/A	26	7	8
2015	30	N/A	27	N/A	27	5	9

#### Math

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	18	N/A	14	N/A	15	3	2
2015	16	N/A	14	20	14	3	3

Title III Accountability (School Data)							
		Annual Growth					
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16				
Number of Annual Testers	247	240	258				
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%				
Number in Cohort	247	240	258				
Number Met	169	183	188				
Percent Met	68.4%	76.3%	72.9%				
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%				
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes				

	Attaining English Proficiency									
	201	3-14	2014	I-15	201	5-16				
AMAO 2	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL instruction					
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More				
Number in Cohort	11	239	12	233	15	248				
Number Met		149	5	160	4	162				
Percent Met		62.3%	41.7%	68.7%	26.7%	65.3%				
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%				
Met Target		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary G7/G8 - Nicolas

	_	BMK 1* ng Standards	-	BMK 2* ing Standards	BMK 3* % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	
ELA G7	27%	29% (320)	20%	23% (305)	41%	33% (109)	
ELA G8	7%	21% (227)	15%	28% (257)	40%	33% (81)	
G7 Math	1%	9% (212)	4%	3% (169)	1%	8% (17)	
G7 Math Honors	63%	12% (57)	60%	11% (62)	61%	23% (14)	
G8 Math	11%	1% (249)	16%	6% (254)	26%	14% (36)	
Algebra I	46%	63% (70)	80%	61% (69)	48%	19% (13)	
Geometry	78%	100% (2)	100%	100% (2)	40%	100% (2)	

<sup>\*</sup> Due to last year's math textbook pilot, the 2015-16 math benchmark assessments are different from last year's benchmark assessments.

		ing 1 Standards	Writing 2 % Meeting Standards		
	<i>14-15</i> 15-16		14-15	15-16	
G7	42%	48%	58%	57%	
G8	66%	46%	70%	43%	

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

## Orangethorpe

	SBAC ELA			SBAC Math				CST Science	
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	G5
2016	20	32	36	44	31	24	19	28	
2015	22	16	31	26	27	19	21	26	30
2014									28
2013									46

#### **ELA**

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	34	N/A	28	N/A	29	16	N/A
2015	23	N/A	18	N/A	20	9	4

### Math

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	26	N/A	20	N/A	22	15	N/A
2015	23	N/A	19	N/A	20	12	2

#### Title III Accountability (School Data)

		Annual Growth	
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Number of Annual Testers	292	300	265
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%
Number in Cohort	292	300	265
Number Met	178	174	149
Percent Met	61.0%	58.0%	56.2%
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%
Met Target	Yes	No	No

			Attaining Engli	sh Proficiency		
AMAO 2	201	3-14	2014	1-15	201	5-16
	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL instruction	
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More
Number in Cohort	266	88	257	76	223	77
Number Met	74	46	82	41	70	46
Percent Met	27.8%	52.3%	31.9%	53.9%	31.4%	59.7%
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Orangethorpe

		K 1* Standards		BMK 2* ting Standards	_	BMK 3* ng Standards
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA G1	90% (U1)	81% (U2)	70%	76% (80)	70%	81% (77)
ELA G2	46% (U2)	66% (U2)	81%	67% (100)	65%	29% (86)
ELA G3	37% (U2)	32% (U2)	40%	51% (81)	45%	59% (79)
ELA G4	15% (U2)	17% (U2)	30%	0% (6)	64%	65% (34)
ELA G5	50% (U2)	44% (U2)	32%	30% (66)	57%	52% (92)
ELA G6	23% (U1)	68% (U2)	34%	49% (94)	63%	46% (91)
					•	
Math G1	80% (U1)	76% (U2)	61%	89% (56)	94%	89% (53)
Math G2	82% (U2)	76% (U2)	27%	24% (71)	89%	87% (70)
Math G3	32% (U1)	34% (U3)	48%	55% (44)	26%	38% (45)
Math G4	43% (U1)	50% (U2)	52%	100% (6)	22%	67% (6)
Math G5	31% (U2)	28% (U2)	16%	9% (76)	39%	14% (76)
Math G6	18% (U1)	38% (U2)	14%	44% (43)	13%	20% (44)

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

		Writing 1 % Meeting Standards		ing 2 Standards	Writing 3 % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	
GK	N/A	N/A	49%	45%	76%	74%	
G1	58%	38%	46%	60%	73%	79%	
G2	40%	36%	21%	39%	49%	55%	
G3	12%	17%	25%	40%	61%	48%	
G4	40%	26%	36%	24%	47%	43%	
G5	53%	31%	55%	35%	52%	29%	
G6	51%	61%	33%	61%	41%	60%	

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

### **Pacific Drive**

		SBAC	ELA		SBAC Math				CST Science
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	G5
2016	28	20	29	34	36	12	16	25	
2015	11	22	35	24	11	13	16	18	44
2014									45
2013									36

#### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	28	N/A	27	N/A	24	6	N/A
2015	23	N/A	22	N/A	19	5	N/A

#### Math

P	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	24	N/A	23	N/A	23	8	N/A
2015	15	N/A	14	N/A	11	5	N/A

Title III Accountability (School Data)								
	Annual Growth							
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16					
Number of Annual Testers	227	219	215					
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%					
Number in Cohort	227	219	215					
Number Met	144	128	122					
Percent Met	63.4%	58.4%	56.7%					
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%					
Met Target	Yes	No	No					

	Attaining English Proficiency								
AMAO 2	201	3-14	2014	1-15	201	5-16			
	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL instruction				
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More			
Number in Cohort	228	57	227	43	214	48			
Number Met	66	36	59	22	56	21			
Percent Met	28.9%	63.2%	26.0%	51.2%	26.2%	43.8%			
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%			
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No			

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Pacific Drive

		K 1* Standards	_	BMK 2* ng Standards	_	MK 3* ng Standards
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA G1	86% (U1)	84% (U2)	85%	76% (68)	73%	71% (69)
ELA G2	32% (U1)	55% (U2)	67%	72% (82)	46%	44% (72)
ELA G3	18% (U2)	40% (U2)	44%	49% (95)	44%	41% (75)
ELA G4	18% (U2)	13% (U2)	13%	19% (67)	34%	42% (65)
ELA G5	39% (U2)	35% (U2)	30%	24% (74)	34%	42% (74)
ELA G6	47% (U2)	43% (U2)	29%	31% (71)	33%	22% (73)
Math G1	77% (U1)	68% (U2)	66%	85% (40)	N/A	88% (43)
Math G2	79% (U2)	77% (U2)	28%	15% (82)	93%	85% (87)
Math G3	20% (U1)	30% (U3)	33%	50% (94)	21%	43% (93)
Math G4	47% (U1)	7% (U2)	36%	39% (66)	24%	27% (66)
Math G5	26% (U2)	41% (U2)	14%	24% (70)	14%	12% (76)
Math G6	13% (U1)	81% (U2)	20%	67% (15)	22%	33% (15)

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards			ing 2 Standards	Writing 3 % Meeting Standards	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
GK	N/A	N/A	63%	25%	80%	66%
G1	26%	55%	63%	59%	66%	70%
G2	28%	34%	39%	40%	57%	55%
G3	35%	54%	31%	61%	50%	65%
G4	46%	42%	53%	60%	49%	49%
G5	70%	38%	52%	43%	60%	51%
G6	40%	49%	40%	61%	60%	65%

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

## Raymond

		SBAC	ELA		SBAC Math				CST Science
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	<b>G</b> 5
2016	41	33	44	59	39	34	25	44	
2015	32	17	41	40	34	17	22	19	71
2014									70
2013									56

#### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	44	N/A	41	N/A	36	18	N/A
2015	33	N/A	25	N/A	22	7	N/A

#### Math

Met Target

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	37	N/A	32	N/A	29	15	N/A
2015	24	N/A	19	N/A	14	8	N/A

Title III Accountability (School Data)								
	Annual Growth							
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16					
Number of Annual Testers	175	166	152					
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%					
Number in Cohort	175	166	152					
Number Met	112	109	84					
Percent Met	64.0%	65.7%	55.3%					
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%					

	Attaining English Proficiency								
AMAO 2	201	3-14	201	4-15	201	5-16			
	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction		Years of EL instruction				
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More			
Number in Cohort	139	58	135	62	127	53			
Number Met	45	35	46	39	38	25			
Percent Met	32.4%	60.3%	34.1%	62.9%	29.9%	47.2%			
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%			
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No			

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Raymond

		K 1* Standards	_	BMK 2* ng Standards	_	BMK 3* % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16		
ELA G1	93% (U2)	87% (U2)	79%	85% (61)	68%	30% (44)		
ELA G2	78% (U3)	68% (U2)	85%	84% (61)	60%	69% (62)		
ELA G3	51% (U2)	43% (U2)	55%	64% (64)	49%	70% (64)		
ELA G4	7% (U2)	9% (U2)	3%	16% (75)	4%	47% (45)		
ELA G5	40% (U3)	26% (U2)	26%	31% (51)	47%	59% (54)		
ELA G6	20% (U1)	50% (U2)	13%	36% (73)	27%	49% (73)		
Math G1	56% (U1)	54% (U2)	63%	89% (61)	93%	98% (60)		
Math G2	82% (U2)	90% (U2)	77%	52% (60)	97%	95% (61)		
Math G3	47% (U2)	45% (U3)	42%	75% (32)	24%	62% (32)		
Math G4	23% (U2)	22% (U2)	29%	22% (46)	10%	6% (17)		
Math G5	36% (U2)	N/A	19%	0% (11)	32%	9% (11)		
Math G6	32% (U2)	44% (U2)	10%	58% (64)	7%	47% (64)		

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards			ing 2 Standards	Writing 3 % Meeting Standards	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
GK	N/A	N/A	58%	58%	75%	76%
G1	55%	66%	75%	80%	84%	95%
G2	67%	72%	69%	85%	80%	81%
G3	35%	31%	61%	31%	62%	50%
G4	46%	48%	64%	47%	67%	58%
G5	39%	56%	52%	52%	66%	60%
G6	54%	66%	69%	71%	67%	73%

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

### Richman

	SBAC ELA				SBAC Math				CST Science
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	G5
2016	42	22	43	39	55	24	38	36	
2015	18	31	27	33	20	37	17	22	34
2014									49
2013									57

### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	36	N/A	34	N/A	35	19	N/A
2015	28	N/A	24	N/A	24	8	N/A

#### Math

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	38	N/A	36	N/A	36	23	N/A
2015	23	N/A	21	N/A	22	11	N/A

Title III Accountability (School Data)									
	Annual Growth								
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16						
Number of Annual Testers	423	428	410						
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%						
Number in Cohort	423	428	410						
Number Met	270	251	253						
Percent Met	63.8%	58.6%	61.7%						
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%						
Met Target	Yes	No	No						

	Attaining English Proficiency								
	201	3-14	201	1-15	2015-16				
AMAO 2	Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL instruction				
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More			
Number in Cohort	397	108	402	118	365	112			
Number Met	148	48	121	57	125	69			
Percent Met	37.3%	44.4%	30.1%	48.3%	34.2%	61.6%			
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%			
Met Target	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Richman

		K 1* Standards	· ·	BMK 2* ting Standards		BMK 3* ing Standards
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA G1	97% (U1)	84% (U2)	35%	68% (120)	61%	62% (99)
ELA G2	36% (U1)	64% (U2)	52%	66% (93)	41%	40% (99)
ELA G3	69% (U2)	66% (U2)	76%	82% (89)	85%	98% (60)
ELA G4	17% (U1)	29% (U2)	34%	32% (95)	46%	45% (65)
ELA G5	35% (U2)	47% (U2)	9%	36% (90)	N/A	58% (93)
ELA G6	33% (U1)	59% (U2)	36%	27% (93)	39%	46% (94)
Math G1	63% (U3)	50% (U2)	58%	74% (117)	89%	90% (121)
Math G2	24% (U1)	87% (U2)	43%	43% (93)	85%	94% (94)
Math G3	66% (U2)	63% (U3)	81%	88% (90)	68%	84% (58)
Math G4	70% (U1)	46% (U2)	71%	66% (93)	27%	39% (96)
Math G5	40% (U2)	59% (U2)	N/A	46% (93)	11%	39% (94)
Math G6	33% (U1)	21% (U2)	20%	27% (93)	16%	34% (90)

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards		Writi % Meeting		Writing 3 % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	
GK	N/A	N/A	55%	49%	70%	73%	
G1	27%	28%	44%	28%	60%	46%	
G2	29%	20%	40%	34%	54%	44%	
G3	65%	85%	83%	85%	86%	81%	
G4	34%	44%	59%	50%	52%	54%	
G5	44%	36%	43%	30%	58%	43%	
G6	46%	55%	56%	58%	54%	65%	

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

### Valencia Park

	SBAC ELA			SBAC Math				CST Science	
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	G5
2016	37	35	32	60	44	44	16	45	
2015	21	28	36	42	46	28	29	31	42
2014									51
2013									57

#### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	41	N/A	41	N/A	40	32	N/A
2015	32	N/A	31	N/A	30	18	N/A

#### Math

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	38	N/A	37	N/A	36	27	N/A
2015	34	N/A	33	N/A	32	21	N/A

#### Title III Accountability (School Data)

AMAO 1		Annual Growth						
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16					
Number of Annual Testers	352	355	344					
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%					
Number in Cohort	352	355	344					
Number Met	230	237	220					
Percent Met	65.3%	66.8%	64.0%					
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%					
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes					

	Attaining English Proficiency								
	201	3-14	2014	4-15	2015-16				
AMAO 2	Years of EL instruction		Years of EL	instruction	Years of EL instruction				
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More			
Number in Cohort	319	86	304	99	279	104			
Number Met	104	50	114	72	99	72			
Percent Met	32.6%	58.1%	37.5%	72.7%	35.5%	69.2%			
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%			
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Valencia Park

	BMK 1* % Meeting Standards		· ·	BMK 2* ing Standards	•	BMK 3* % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16		
ELA G1	99% (U1)	85% (U2)	85%	76% (85)	75%	78% (83)		
ELA G2	61% (U1)	65% (U2)	85%	74% (84)	69%	65% (85)		
ELA G3	77% (U2)	N/A	63%	N/A	77%	N/A		
ELA G4	5% (U2)	21% (U2)	12%	21% (98)	35%	49% (101)		
ELA G5	31% (U3)	29% (U2)	19%	37% (93)	58%	37% (57)		
ELA G6	57% (U2)	57% (U2)	31%	41% (105)	56%	52% (106)		
Math G1	95% (U1)	62% (U2)	89%	84% (85)	96%	98% (83)		
Math G2	88% (U2)	89% (U2)	54%	49% (53)	98%	96% (57)		
Math G3	79% (U2)	N/A	77%	N/A)	43%	N/A		
Math G4	32% (U2)	44% (U2)	32%	73% (98)	21%	36% (90)		
Math G5	39% (U1)	61% (U2)	8%	48% (92)	16%	45% (93)		
Math G6	22% (U3)	41% (U2)	26%	30% (74)	29%	19% (79)		

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards		Writi % Meeting		Writing 3 % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	
GK	N/A	N/A	46%	49%	72%	67%	
G1	48%	54%	61%	48%	77%	59%	
G2	25%	25%	28%	29%	45%	45%	
G3	27%	23%	58%	37%	67%	44%	
G4	20%	19%	23%	28%	29%	40%	
G5	28%	15%	30%	18%	32%	26%	
G6	45%	42%	51%	50%	51%	45%	

# School-Wide and Sub Group SBAC Results 2015 - 2016

### Woodcrest

	SBAC ELA				SBAC Math				CST Science
	G3	G4	G5	G6	G3	G4	G5	G6	G5
2016	19	37	45	32	41	37	35	21	
2015	19	32	23	33	39	45	17	21	37
2014									42
2013									30

#### ELA

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	33	N/A	32	N/A	30	20	N/A
2015	27	N/A	24	N/A	26	12	N/A

#### Math

	Overall	Asian	Hispanic	White	Econ Dis	EL	SWD
2016	33	N/A	32	N/A	30	26	N/A
2015	31	N/A	28	N/A	28	21	N/A

#### Title III Accountability (School Data)

	Annual Growth						
AMAO 1	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16				
Number of Annual Testers	228	229	226				
Percent with Prior Year Data	100.0%	100%	100.0%				
Number in Cohort	228	229	226				
Number Met	135	137	139				
Percent Met	59.2%	59.8%	61.5%				
NCLB Target	59.0	60.5	62.0%				
Met Target	Yes	No	No				

	Attaining English Proficiency								
	2013-14 Years of EL instruction		2014	4-15	2015-16 Years of EL instruction				
AMAO 2			Years of EL	instruction					
	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More	Less Than 5	5 Or More			
Number in Cohort	205	63	203	62	189	66			
Number Met	51	32	55	32	57	40			
Percent Met	24.9%	50.8%	27.1%	51.6%	30.2%	60.6%			
NCLB Target	22.8	49.0	24.2	50.9	25.4%	52.8%			
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			

2015-16 FSD Benchmark Summary - Woodcrest

	BMK 1* % Meeting Standards		_	BMK 2* ng Standards	BMK 3* % Meeting Standards	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA G1	98% (U1)	81% (U2)	63%	96% (67)	78%	77% (62)
ELA G2	53% (U2)	65% (U2)	42%	51% (55)	17%	52% (27)
ELA G3	41% (U2)	30% (U2)	40%	28% (57)	64%	47% (51)
ELA G4	20% (U2)	41% (U2)	21%	27% (60)	37%	62% (58)
ELA G5	31% (U2)	45% (U2)	24%	38% (53)	32%	68% (50)
ELA G6	40% (U2)	68% (U2)	62%	63% (60)	69%	
Math G1	92% (U1)	61% (U2)	67%	91% (67)	88%	98% (64)
Math G2	88% (U2)	76% (U2)	42%	38% (55)	81%	57% (28)
Math G3	32% (U2)	39% (U3)	60%	47% (57)	26%	44% (52)
Math G4	70% (U1)	52% (U2)	69%	58% (60)	48%	33% (58)
Math G5	29% (U3)	30% (U2)	35%	35% (51)	12%	29% (38)
Math G6	36% (U2)	63% (U2)	52%	50% (60)	31%	39% (31)

<sup>\*</sup> Teachers who participated in the math textbook pilot or the i-Ready pilot did not administer the Synced unit assessments.

	Writing 1 % Meeting Standards			ing 2 Standards	Writing 3 % Meeting Standards		
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	
GK	N/A	N/A	69%	75%	78%	83%	
G1	8%	12%	35%	77%	74%	86%	
G2	18%	30%	38%	39%	51%	25% (28)	
G3	55%	29%	55%	59%	86%	57% (28)	
G4	32%	44%	44%	48%	34%	49%	
G5	31%	29%	37%	37%	32%	41%	
G6	41%	42%	50%	63%	46%	55%	

#### **Schoolwide Achievement**

Commonwealth: SBAC – Steady growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Met AMAO 1 and 2

Maple: SBAC – Limited growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Met AMAO 1, did not meet

AMAO 2

Nicolas: SBAC – Limited growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Met AMAO 1 and 2

Orangethorpe: SBAC – Steady growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Did not meet AMAO 1,

Met AMAO 2

Pacific Drive: SBAC – Limited growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Did not meet AMAO 1 or

AMAO 2

Raymond: SBAC – Steady growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Did not meet AMAO 1 or

AMAO 2

Richman: SBAC – Steady growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Did not meet AMAO 1, Met

AMAO 2

<u>Valencia Park</u>: SBAC – Steady growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Met AMAO 1 and 2

Woodcrest: Steady growth by grade level and subgroup; Title III: Did not meet AMAO 1, Met AMAO 2

Overall, most of our Title I schools have made growth over the last two years on SBAC schoolwide and significant subgroups. Several of our Title I schools meet one or more of their AMAOs per the CEDLT. Eight of our Title I schools remain frozen in Program Improvement. Targeted interventions will be plan to address the needs of both newcomer EL students and students identified as at-risk of becoming LTEL or are currently identified as LTELs.

#### Academic Achievement Gap for English Learner Students and Students of Poverty

In order to determine the difference in achievement between advantaged and disadvantaged students, the attached graph of the achievement gap for the entire district shows students making good progress in Mathematics. The gap between overall districtwide and EL and SES students has remained fairly constant since 2004, with a gap of approximately 14-15% percentage points.

### **Program Improvement: Corrective Actions and Academic Supports**

Eight of our Title I schools are identified for Program Improvement and have remained frozen in this status since 2013/2014. The sites identified under NLCB as program improvement are as follows:

- Commonwealth Year 4
- ➤ Nicolas Junior High Year 5
- Orangethorpe Year 5
- Pacific Drive Year 5
- Raymond Year 3
- > Richman Year 1
- Valencia Park Year 1
- ➤ Woodcrest Year 3

Commonwealth has made steady gains and has made fundamental reforms such as implementing Response to Intervention schoolwide and increased parental involvement. Nicolas Junior High School has hired a new principal and assistant principal and are working closely with staff and community to implement new programs including AVID and Response to Intervention. Orangethorpe hired a new

principal in the 2015/2016 school year and have expanded their Rtl program. Pacific Drive is implementing a LindaMood Bell reading clinic both during and after school to support their at-risk students. Raymond expanded their intervention services and are currently supporting the first Dual Immersion program in the district. Richman and Valencia Park have also expanded intervention supports to students. Valencia Park has implemented a LindaMood Bell reading clinic along with Orangethorpe.

All Title I school sites have a full time Rtl teacher to provide academic supports to students who qualify. The schools and district are working hard to continue to expand programs to students and meet goals set forth through their SPSA.

District supports have included the following:

- Assistance from Educational Services personnel in analyzing assessment data (use of
   *Illuminate* data management system and the *iReady* online assessment system) as well as
   educational practices.
- Assistance from Educational Services personnel in developing, writing, and revising a 2year SPSA plan.
- Provide professional development in the areas of writing, mathematics, and early literacy skills.
- Provide supplemental intervention instructional materials and online programs.
- Continue Systematic ELD 3-day staff development based on the work of Susan Dutro offered to all new teachers.
- Provide a full time intervention teacher and part time instructional assistants to support struggling students.
- The District Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services and the school site principals hold regular monthly meetings to support school efforts for improvement.
- The Directors of Educational Services, Program Coordinators, and Teachers on Special Assignment meets regularly with school site personnel to provide assistance in designing and implementing interventions as well as educates staff on compliance and mandates at regular staff meetings.

#### **Parent Outreach and Participation**

Fullerton School District seeks the support of parents and community members. There is a conscious effort within the district to further build capacity for parental involvement with the goal of improved student academic achievement. Parent programs are well attended and provide good information and tools for parents to become active and integral to the academic success of their children.

Parents have the opportunity to participate and provide input in their children's education through a variety of means. Surveys, committees, focus groups

District and School staff implement the work of the Latino Educational Attainment Group by providing parent training such as *School Smarts, Ten Education Commandments for Parents* and the *40 Developmental Assets*. Schools are working with their staff and communities to develop well-organized, goal-linked, and sustainable partnership programs with parents. School sites provide literacy classes for parents and offer ESL classes in two locations across the district. In addition, many workshops have been provided based on parent needs assessment through the School Site Councils, DELAC and ELAC committees.

#### Recommendations

In the 2016/2017 school year, the following actions will be taken:

- Continue targeted interventions for students based on current data (Rtl Model).
- Refine focus areas for interventions including intervention programs for ELs to include newcomers and Long Term English learners.
- Provide staff development for teachers in the area of strategies to support English language acquisition.
- Expand Parental opportunities at each school and district by eliciting information from parents and focus groups in the following areas:
  - a) Site and District Activities
  - b) Advisory and Advocacy Roles
  - c) Ways to Support Learning at Home