

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Improvement Plan Needs Assessment Template

Directions: Using the template, provide information requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow space needed for narrative responses under each item. All Title III LEAs must submit a copy of this Needs Assessment to the Title III COE Lead as part of the review process. The final version must be uploaded into CAIS as an attachment under the Needs Assessment item in the Requested Documents tab.

1. Briefly summarize LEA's characteristics, EL linguistic and academic performance challenges, and identify and describe those key factors of the instructional program that prevented the LEA from meeting Title III AMAOs.

- a. Describe the LEA's makeup including location, grade levels, and demographics. The Brea Olinda Unified School District is located in the northeast corner of Orange County, bounded on the north by the Orange County/Los Angeles County line, on the east by San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, on the west by Puente Avenue (near La Habra) and on the south by the City of Fullerton. The City of Brea encompasses roughly 12.5 square miles and has a population of about 40,000. The BOUSD, with six elementary schools, one junior high, one high school and one continuation high school serves nearly 6,000 students. Approximately 34% of the students are Hispanic or Latino, 19% Asian, 40% White, with the other 7% varied African American, Filipino, and other. Approximately 10% of our student population are English Learners.

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Improvement Plan Needs Assessment Template

- b. Describe findings from analyses of the CST, CAPA, CMA, CELDT, CAHSEE, state tools (e.g., ELSSA, APS), graduation (if appropriate), and other assessments used by the LEA (e.g. benchmark assessments, curriculum embedded assessments, ELSSA Supplement) to measure EL student English proficiency, academic achievement, and findings derived from other data analyses as these relate to the three AMAOs (Goals 2A, 2B, and 2C).

AMAO #1 – ELs continue to make annual progress in learning English. Over the past 4 years, there has been a slight decline in the percent meeting target, but the percent remains above the target.

AMAO #2 – Regardless of being in the English-language instruction program for fewer than 5 years or 5 years or more, the percent of students meeting the target well exceeds the given target.

AMAO #3 – EL students have full participation in the CSTs for ELA and Math. The area in which they failed to meet the target for Achieving Academic Standards was in CST for ELA.

General findings: (This data is from the 2013 CST assessment. New data will be forthcoming this summer and will be analyzed in August.)

- For students who are not yet proficient in English, very few scored higher than Basic in the ELA CST.
- There are 10 students who are Proficient in CELDT, but BB or FBB in ELA CST.
- Students who pass the CAHSEE, but are below 380 are not proficient. This is an AYP measure.
- 41 EL students took the CMA in ELA. Of those students, 14 (34%) scored either Proficient or Advanced. There were 6 students who scored EA on the CELDT, however Basic and BB on the ELA CMA. Eleven students scored FBB and BB on the CMA ELA, but their CELDT scores were still in the Int and Early Int range.
- 85% of the RFEP students scored Proficient or Advanced on the CST ELA. 14% (70 students) were Basic. 1% (6 students) scored BB.
- 6 of our EL students took the CAPA. 4 scored Advanced, 1 Proficient, and 1 Basic
- The latest graduation rate for the EL population was approx. 83% while the LEA-wide grad rate was 95%

Conclusions and questions derived from the 2014 ELSSA results:

- AMAO 1 and 2 Targets were met. There was a slight decrease in our percent of students making the target. Because the target increases every year, we need to investigate why we have a slight decrease over time. At the continued rate, we will eventually run into a place where we would NOT meet the targets.
- Based on the Survey Items for AMAO, we need to investigate our formative and summative assessments used to monitor progress of ELs in ELD.
- After having been in school in the US for at least 4 years, too many students (22%) remain at the Beginning to Intermediate levels on the CELDT. What kind of strategic interventions are we offering to these specific students? What kind of professional development are we continuing to provide to the teachers? For the students in our district, 16% remain in the Beg to Int level on CELDT.
- 51% of the students who are Intermediate on CELDT, scored Basic on the ELA CST. Who are these students specifically, and how many years have they been in our program?
- For two years our EL subgroup failed to meet the proficient target in ELA on the CST. We need to take a close look at our instruction in ELA for our English Learners.
- What kind of strategic and intensive interventions are being provided to the students?

c. Describe strengths and weaknesses in the design and implementation of the EL related to goals (2A-2G and 5A) in the current LEA Plan, the prior Year 2 Title III IP, and any other appropriate documents, (e.g. the LEA's Master Plan). The program dimensions listed below are areas to consider in reviewing current plans.

- **Implementation of Instructional Services and Methods (Goal XX)**

STRENGTHS: All teachers have been certified to teach English Learners. All site administrators have been trained in observation of strategies for English Learners. All EL students received ELD daily. Instructional Aides provide support in classes where EL students are enrolled in order to provide more individualized assistance. Each site has an EL Coordinator who oversees the implementation of the EL program and services.

WEAKNESSES: Methods and level of services are not consistent across the district.

- **Professional Development (Goal 2D)**

STRENGTHS: Many teachers have been GLAD trained. Teachers and administrators have been to access quality professional development at the OCDE.

WEAKNESSES: Many teachers still need GLAD training. All staff need training in the new ELD standards in conjunction with CCSS implementation.

- **Parent and Community Participation (Goal 2E)**

STRENGTHS: Parent and community are supportive of education.

WEAKNESSES: Difficult to get parents to participate.

- **Parental Notification (Goal 2F)**

STRENGTHS: All notification has been approved by state GPM review. Forms are comprehensive.

WEAKNESSES: Difficult to translate into languages of low incident students. Rare languages.

- **Services for Immigrant Students if the LEA receives Title III Immigrant Funds (Goal 2G)**

STRENGTHS: Immigrant students receive intervention services as needed.

WEAKNESSES: None known

- **Increase Graduation Rates (Goal 5A)**

STRENGTHS: English Learners continue to meet the target for Grad Rate.

WEAKNESSES : None known

2. Describe factors contributing to the failure to meet AMAO(s). Identify and describe factors that prevented the LEA from achieving the AMAO(s) and explain how the identified factors above were verified using the evidence gathered.

AMAOs	FACTORS (e.g., inconsistent implementation, inadequate PD, inadequate resources)	EVIDENCE (e.g., data analyses, classroom walk through, program evaluation, surveys)
AMAO 1	Met target	
AMAO 2 Cohort 1: < 5 yrs	Met target	
AMAO 2 Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs	Met target	
AMAO 3 ELA	Inconsistent implementation	Data analysis, observation
AMAO 3 Mathematics	Met target	

3. Write a brief description/bulleted outline of each goal below that was identified as an area of focus from the Needs Assessment; the details for these will be part of your plan. Goal statements should be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely (i.e., SMART Goals), since they must be made actionable through strategies, actions and tasks in the Title III Improvement Plan.

Goal 2A: (AMAO 1 Annual Progress Learning English) By June 2016, the percentage of English learners learning English will remain at least 61.8%, which is above the state defined growth expectations as measured by CELDT.

Goal 2B: (AMAO 2 English Proficiency) By June 2016, the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs fewer than 5 years attaining English language proficiency will remain at 32.8%, which is above meeting the CELDT criterion for English-language proficiency.

By June 2016, the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs 5 or more years attaining English language proficiency will remain 53.5%, which is above the state-defined expectations for meeting the CELDT criterion for English-language proficiency.

Goal 2C: (AMAO 3-AYP for ELs in English Language Arts) By June 2016, the percentage of English learners meeting standards on the CAASPP in ELA will be commensurate with the overall student population percentage meeting standard.

Goal 2C: (AMAO 3-AYP for ELs in Mathematics) By June 2016, the percentage of English learners meeting standards on the CAASPP in Mathematics will be commensurate with the overall student population percentage meeting standard.

Goal 2D: (High Quality Professional Development) By June 2016, 100% of LEA teachers will receive professional development on research-based strategies to improve English learner attainment of English language proficiency and/or achievement in Reading/Language arts and/or Mathematics, as determined by the LEA needs assessment.

- By June 2016 100% of LEA administrators will receive professional development on research-based strategies to improve English learner attainment of English language proficiency and/or achievement in reading/language arts and/or mathematics, as determined by the LEA needs assessment.

Goal 2E: (Parent and Community Participation)

Goal 2F: (Parental Notification) By June 2016 the LEA will provide 100% of parents of ELs with the following information regarding their children, in a language parents can understand: identification as EL; program placement options; program placement notification; English language proficiency level, as determined by CELDT results and any local English Proficiency assessments used; academic achievement level; redesignation information; and at the high school level, graduation requirements and annual notification of their students' progress toward meeting those requirements.

Goal 2G: (Services for Immigrant Students: **must be addressed if the LEA receives Title III Immigrant Education Funds**)
By June 2016 enhanced instructional opportunities will be provided to 100% of immigrant students and their families.

Goal 5A: (Increase Graduation Rates) Results from our analysis of graduation rates indicate that the EL students have a graduation rate of about 83%, while the total population is about 95%

Based on these data, our district goal is to have more than 90% of students from all subgroups graduate in four years.

Our district goal for English learners is to have more than 90% of those who entered their freshman year in 2012 graduate in four years.

4. Title III Year 4 Requirements (Section 3122[b][4][A]): Summarize how the LEA will specifically address changes in curriculum, program, and method of instruction to address the factors that prevented