



Local Educational Agency Program Improvement Plan Addendum

**Approved by the Governing Board of
Livingston Union School District on
June 12, 2014**

District Name: Livingston Union

CD Code: 24 65748

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN ADDENDUM TEMPLATE 2014

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, codified as No Child Left Behind (NCLB, Section 1116[c][7][A]), requires that local educational agencies (LEAs) identified for Program Improvement (PI) shall, not later than three months after being identified, develop or revise an LEA Plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, and others. Rather than completely rewriting the existing LEA Plan, we recommend using this LEA Plan Addendum template to address the items below. Type your responses in the expandable text boxes.

Prior to developing this revision, please use the State Assessment Tools, as applicable, to analyze school/district needs for improved student achievement. These tools are available on the California Department of Education (CDE) State Assessment Tools Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. Contact the District Innovation and Improvement Office at 916-319-0836 if you have any questions regarding the State Assessment Tools or completing the LEA Plan Addendum.

Please submit your completed LEA Plan Addendum by uploading the completed document into the Program Improvement Year I monitoring instrument in the California Accountability Improvement System (CAIS). Contact Janice Morrison, Education Programs Consultant, District Innovation and Improvement Office by e-mail at jamorrison@cde.ca.gov if you need technical assistance in uploading the document.

The LEA Plan Addendum **must be submitted to the CDE no later than Friday, April 4, 2014**. The LEA Plan Addendum should:

- 1. Identify fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools of the LEA and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students, including a determination of why the prior LEA Plan failed to bring about increased academic achievement for all student groups.**

Please provide a summary analysis of the needs assessment used to identify student learning needs (especially the academic problems of low achieving students). Include an analysis of why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

1. Discuss the results of the assessments used to determine the teaching and learning needs of the schools and the district.
2. Identify academic priorities.
3. Discuss why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

Based upon classroom observations, Instructional Rounds data collected and Success Summit goals and plans, the following areas were identified as not successful and what is needed to turn it around to improve student learning:

A) *Inconsistent Implementation –*

Problem: Classroom observations and site administrators' feedback indicates that, while schools have designated instructional Core Academic blocks with pacing calendars, which site principals and District administrative staff monitors,

there remain inconsistencies in actual instructional approaches and strategies teachers are using during these instructional periods. In spite of all staff receiving scientifically based, sustained training in the adopted ELA program and Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) instructional strategies, ongoing support by site literacy coaches, and content experts, approaches vary significantly in some classrooms.

B) *Mathematics Implementation and Support* –

Problem: 2008/09 was the first year the district implemented the newly adopted Harcourt and Holt math programs. While teaching staff has received a significant amount of training and ongoing support and monitoring in Language Arts, Mathematics instruction has not consistently been monitored as closely as ELA and sites have not had designated math coaches. Middle school staff received 40 hours of SB 472 training in the new mathematics adoption; elementary staff did not have the opportunity to participate in the full five day SB 472 Mathematics training. Upon analysis of CST and CELDT data staff has found there are some skills development gaps as well as pacing issues with the two programs that need to be addressed to coordinate better with the state assessment program. These issues with the adopted math programs have played a significant role in influencing the decline in students' math scores.

The complexity of the language of Mathematics has also proven to be an additional difficulty and math vocabulary has not always been taught and developed in the same way as in other content areas.

Intervention opportunities have often focused on the language arts and not as much on math. When students have needed intervention in all areas, ELA has normally received priority attention due to low literacy skills impacting all content areas. However, students' basic math skills have also been lagging.

There are supplemental technology resources available to staff but time and computer resources are factors limiting the use of these. Following are some tech-based supplemental programs that are available to teachers of mathematics to assist with reinforcement of math concepts and extended practice: *Enchanted Learning (K-5)*, mathematics instructional resources; *Kaplan Math (2-8)*, supplemental and intervention guided math program; *Khan Academy*, web based mathematics instruction support and *Skills Bank (7 & 8)*, math evaluation and activity program.

C) *Differentiated Instruction- Problem:* Teaching staff struggles with teaching methodologies needed to meet the variable needs of students at the various language/CELDT levels. There exists a lack of understanding by teachers that ELs' language development needs support all day long and not just during designated ELD time. There is limited application of differentiated instructional practices to support the variance in student's level of language functioning throughout the instructional day to ensure students have greater access to the core content.

All elementary special education staff and the three literacy coaches were trained in *Direct Interactive Instruction (DII)* DII in 2010-11 and in 2011-12, an outside consultant provided training for LMS administrators and all teachers utilizing the *Gateways Core Replacement* curriculum to ensure appropriate pacing and that effective instructional strategies are employed. Yet, consistent application of the new learning is not evident in all classrooms. We believe that this inconsistency reduces the effectiveness of the strategies presented.

D) *Long Term English Learners*: Data reviews show that students plateau at the Intermediate level in CELDT and others who have progressed beyond Intermediate–do not meet other redesignation criteria. These students go on to the local high school designated as ELL. Although more has been done to identify and track students who are chronically entrenched at the Intermediate or below CELDT level; an effective intervention has not been designated. Across the district progress-monitoring of EL students has improved but needs to continue to improve to the point where each long-term ELL student is closely monitored and receives a prescriptive educational support.

“Data Chats” are conducted on multiple levels throughout the school year. Chats occur between individual teachers and their principal, among grade level teams and sometimes between grade levels. The meetings are designed to provide staff an opportunity to analyze data and discuss best practices and what works for EL students. Data and information taken from these meetings is designed to be used to inform instruction and identify instructional areas of strength and weakness. Addressing the weak areas is not systematically done and when there are multiple weak areas, again the focus is on language arts.

Scheduling more staff development sessions on the district’s Online Assessment and Reporting (OARS) system to foster more effective and efficient data analyses by administrators and all teaching staff. This resource has not been explored and used as extensively as it could be.

Commencing with the 2012-13 school year, Structured English Language Development (ELD) classes/periods utilizing the newly published **English 3D** curriculum written by Dr. Kate Kinsella have been provided for ELL students at the middle school. Teachers utilizing the curriculum received 3 days of professional development and coaching at the County level.

2. Include specific, measurable achievement goals and targets for student groups identified as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe specific, measurable academic goals and targets for student achievement for student groups identified as not making AYP. (Refer to the CDE AYP Reports Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypreports.asp>.)

Using a baseline score posted in 2015, the number of students scoring on grade level on the SBAC assessments in English Language Arts will increase by 15% each year, 2016 & 2017.

Using a baseline score posted in 2015, the number of students scoring on grade level on the SBAC assessments in Mathematics will increase by 15% each year, 2015 & 2016.

The number of EL students achieving reclassification (RFEP) status will increase by 15% each year, 2014 & 2015.

On locally developed Benchmark assessments aligned to Common Core, an increase in student scores will be realized in each content and grade level.

Graduation rates at the middle school will increase to the 95% target set by the board.

LUSD DATA SUMMARY

SCHOOL	2013 API	3 YR NON-WEIGHTED AVG API	2013- % MAKING AYP in ELA	2013- % MAKING AYP in MATH	STATEWIDE RANK	SIMILAR SCHOOLS RANK
District	771		49.3	45.5	N/A	N/A
CP	756	786	44.4	52.7	3	6
LMS	752	752	45.0	33.5	3	8
SH	804	816	57.1	54.8	5	9
YC	803	796	55.0	56.8	5	7

CELDT Annual Assessment Results for 2013-14

Performance Level	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Advanced	(0.0%)	8 (4.0%)	10 (5.0%)	5 (3.0%)	5 (4.0%)	3 (3.0%)	3 (3.0%)	2 (3.0%)	2 (3.0%)	38 (4.0%)
Early Advanced	(0.0%)	40 (21.0%)	53 (25.0%)	24 (16.0%)	44 (31.0%)	42 (41.0%)	23 (27.0%)	23 (38.0%)	24 (39.0%)	273 (27.0%)
Intermediate	6 (35.0%)	84 (43.0%)	93 (43.0%)	84 (56.0%)	74 (52.0%)	48 (47.0%)	47 (55.0%)	25 (42.0%)	25 (41.0%)	486 (47.0%)
Early Intermediate	5 (29.0%)	37 (19.0%)	46 (21.0%)	31 (21.0%)	11 (8.0%)	9 (9.0%)	5 (6.0%)	6 (10.0%)	5 (8.0%)	155 (15.0%)
Beginning	6 (35.0%)	26 (13.0%)	14 (6.0%)	6 (4.0%)	8 (6.0%)	1 (1.0%)	8 (9.0%)	4 (7.0%)	5 (8.0%)	78 (8.0%)
Number Tested	17 (100.0%)	195 (100.0%)	216 (100.0%)	150 (100.0%)	142 (100.0%)	103 (100.0%)	86 (100.0%)	60 (100.0%)	61 (100.0%)	1,030 (100.0%)

3. Incorporate research-based strategies to strengthen the core academic program for identified student groups in schools served by the LEA, including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe the specific strategies that the district will use and how those strategies will be implemented and monitored to strengthen the core academic program.

A) The district will fully implement the ***Instructional Rounds*** model for developing a collaborative, inquiry-based culture that challenges the norms of isolation and autonomy leading to the establishment of an educational practice that transforms how we look at and manage teaching and learning: Richard Elmore and Elizabeth City (*Instructional Rounds in Education*)

B) We are in transition to implementing the new Common Core State Standards. Teachers will continue to receive professional development and collaboration opportunities to develop and evaluate CCSS units and lesson design. As the transition continues, teachers will have the option to also instruct using the district adopted language arts curriculum Macmillan-McGraw Hill (MMH) grades K-5 and Holt grades 6-8; adopted mathematics curriculum Harcourt for grades K-5 and Holt for grades 6-8. These programs and units will be strengthened with the ELD strategies which are used in combination with strategies taken from researchers such as Robert J. Marzano (*What Works for Schools –Direct, Explicit & Differentiated Instruction*), Louisa C. Moats (*Speech to Print- Language Essentials for Teachers*), Sally Shaywitz (*Overcoming Dyslexia – Science-Based Program for Reading Problems at any level*)

C) All teachers of Core Academic subjects will employ writing instruction and strategies that facilitate students' critical thinking, content analysis, synthesis of information, and persuasive arguments.

D) CELD (California English Language Development) training will be delivered to all content area teachers through the use of both site level trainers and district academic coaches.

E) Technology as a tool to increase student learning and motivation will be incorporated at a systematically increasing rate over the 2014-2017 time span.

F) All Long-Term EL students in grades 4-8 will be assessed twice annually using A Developmental English Proficiency Test (ADEPT), developed by Susana Dutro, to help ascertain weaknesses in forms and functions of the English language, for the purpose of identifying specific areas of needed instruction.

4. Specify actions to implement the identified strategies that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions to be implemented to accomplish the identified strategies and how they will be supported and monitored. (See examples of full implementation descriptions in the Academic Program Survey [APS] and the District Assistance Survey [DAS] on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp .)	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost/ Funding Source
<p>The items referred to in Section 3 are the keys to improving student achievement; <i>Instructional Rounds</i> to support program implementation, <i>Progress Monitoring</i> to keep implementation consistent and Staff Development (inclusive of collaboration) are the critical factors to embrace and apply to academic improvement efforts throughout the years.</p> <p>Focus on intervening before achievement gaps widen and also supporting students with enriching school experiences are additional areas of focus. To achieve this, academic clinicians and tutors will be hired for the 2014-15 school year.</p>	<p>Ed. Services Director</p> <p>Director of Instructional Technology</p> <p>Principals,</p> <p>Academic Coaches</p> <p>Teachers</p>	<p>Professional Development for the 2014-15 school year per schedule</p> <p>Hire and assign additional student support personnel (clinicians and tutors) prior the beginning of the school year.</p>	<p>Professional Development Plan includes the following funding sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title I- \$70,000 Title II- \$35,620 Supplemental/Concentration- \$63,174 PI Grant- \$180,626 Medi-Cal Billing- \$8,488 CCSS- \$115,392 Supplemental/Concentration- \$228,000

5. Provide high-quality professional development for the instructional staff that focuses on instructional improvement and supports the strategies and actions described above.

Please describe the professional development the LEA will provide to instructional staff to address the identified strategies and actions.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost/ Funding Source (including 10% set-aside from Title I, Part A)
<p>The district will continue to invest in staff development to strengthen the core academic program. The basic tools are in place; teacher skills need to be further developed and supported. All teachers will receive professional development in standards-based instructional strategies during the 2013-14 school year. TK-1 teachers had release days to create CCSS units and all teachers had an overview of CCSS. In the fall of 2014, a five-day professional learning opportunity will focus on the new ELD standards, inclusion of technology in</p>	<p>Director of Ed. Services</p> <p>Director of Instructional Technology</p> <p>District Coaches</p> <p>Consultants</p>	<p>Summer PD- July 31-Aug. 5, 2014</p> <p>CCSS Unit Development and Collaboration- Throughout the year, per schedule</p>	<p>PI Grant and CCSS Funds \$189,000</p> <p>PI Grant, CCSS Funds and Supplemental/Concentration Funds \$95,000</p>

<p>instruction and ELA or Math content unit development. PD for the 2014-15 school year includes: continuing with Instructional Rounds, GLAD Coaching, Technology training, CCSS unit development and continued participation in the Silicon Valley Math Institute (SVMI). In addition, we are considering joining the Merced County Literacy Collaborative. Interweaving coaching support into the staff development is a vital part of effective program implementation and district coaches will continue their professional development with a consultant from MCOE.</p> <p>Teachers will continue working with on-site GLAD coaches and one GLAD consultant to continue effective implementation of GLAD instructional strategies. Monitored by the site principal. Schedules of visits will be maintained by coaches. Six district teachers have completed GLAD Tier II certification, enabling them to serve as GLAD trainers and coaches.</p> <p>Site administrators will have the opportunity to request the time of the district coaches to advance the adult leaning needed on their individual campuses. Among other things, this may include one-on-one coaching to support full implementation of GLAD strategies, of CELD and content writing strategies.</p>	<p>Site Admin. IRT's Teachers</p>	<p>Instructional Rounds- throughout the year, per schedule</p> <p>Technology Training for Instructional Support- throughout the year, per schedule</p> <p>Leadership team and district coach PD- throughout the year, per schedule</p> <p>Silicon Valley Math Institute Workshops Series- throughout fall, per schedule</p> <p>Release days for coaching support.</p>	<p>Title I-\$9,600</p> <p>CCSS Funds and Supplemental/Concentration Funds \$36,000</p> <p>Title 1- \$35,000 CCSS- \$8,000</p> <p>Title 1- \$15,000 Supplemental/Concentration Funds \$2600</p> <p>Site Title I funding</p>
--	---	---	--

6. Incorporate, as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and/or during an extension of the school year.

Please describe those activities and how the LEA will incorporate them.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>The district has provided a comprehensive intervention 4 week summer program for students who were performing Below or Far Below Basic on the State STAR testing in the past and will be bringing back a summer school program in 2015.</p>	<p>Director of Ed Services Site Admin Academic Clinicians</p>	<p>June 11-July 10,2015</p>	<p>\$200,000</p>	<p>Supplemental/Concentration</p>
<p>Sites provide a mixture of Lunch-time support interventions and after school interventions. Students are placed based on testing results and formative Benchmark assessment results. Intervention that is delivered in an engaging and motivating manner will be implemented at all levels.</p>	<p>Site Admin IRT's Intervention Support Staff</p>	<p>September to April three days per week (T-Th)</p>	<p>\$50,000</p>	<p>Supplemental/Concentration</p>

Include transportation as a part of extended learning opportunities.	Transportation Dept. Staff	September to April three days per week (T-Th)	\$50,000	Supplemental/ Concentration
--	----------------------------	---	----------	-----------------------------

7. Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school.

Please describe parental involvement strategies and how the LEA will support them across the LEA.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Parents will be provided opportunities throughout the school year to participate in school activities such as Cultural Festivals, Site Carnivals, Speech Contests, plays and other productions, etc.	Site Admin. IRT's Teachers	Throughout the year as scheduled on school calendars.	Dependent on number of activities	Site Lottery
Parents will be notified of meetings and recruited by teachers and principals to become members of/participate on the School Site Council, English Language Learner Advisory Committee, Title I Parent Committee, and Parent Club.	Site Admin. IRT's Teachers	Spring Conference Week in March and Back to School Night in August.	None	
Parents will be offered opportunities to participate in Parent Trainings on: Language Arts, Homework, and Dual Language support.	Site Admin Teachers Parent Liaison District coaches	Throughout the year as scheduled	\$10,000	Title I & Supplemental/ Concentration
Parents will be invited to participate in Student Study Team meetings that will be conducted throughout the year to review students of concern.	Teachers Counselors Sp. Ed. Staff	As needed if a referral is made.	None	
Schools will continue to provide extended library hours for students and parents.	IRT's Library clerks	Throughout the year on two monthly designated Saturdays at the Middle School	Already in place	

**LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN ADDENDUM
ASSURANCE PAGE**

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan Information:

Name of LEA: Livingston Union School District

County District Code: 24 65748

Date of Local Governing Board Approval: June 12, 2014

District Superintendent: Andres Zamora

Address: 922 B Street

City: Livingston

Zip Code: 95334

Phone: 209-394-5421

FAX: 209-394-5401

**E-mail:
azamora@lUSD.k12.ca.us**

Signatures:

On behalf of LEAs, participants included in the preparation of this LEA Program Improvement Plan Addendum:

Andres Zamora

Andres Zamora

6-12-14

Signature of Superintendent

Printed Name of Superintendent

Date

Susan Ruth

Susan Ruth

6-12-14

Signature of Governing School Board

Printed Name of Board Trustee

Date

By submission of the local board approved LEA PI Plan Addendum (in lieu of the original signature assurance page in hard copy), the LEA certifies that the plan has been locally adopted and original signed copies of the assurances are on file in the LEA. The certification reads:

Certification: I hereby certify that all of the applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed by this LEA and that, to the best of my knowledge, information contained in this Plan is correct and complete. Legal assurances for all programs are accepted as the basic legal condition for the operation of selected projects and programs and copies of assurances are retained onsite. I certify that we accept all general and program specific assurances for Titles I, II, and/or III as appropriate, except for those for which a waiver has been obtained. A copy of all waivers will remain on file. I certify that actual ink signatures for this LEA Plan/Plan Addendum/Action Plan are on file, including signatures of any required external providers.