

Desert Sands Unified School District Improvement Plan Addendum (IPA)

INTRODUCTION:

Desert Sands Unified School District (DSUSD), located 120 miles east of Los Angeles, serves 29,324 students, Kindergarten through grade 12, with 22% identified as English learners. The district serves students at thirty-four schools, two of which are charter schools, and 3 are alternative/continuation high schools. The percentage of English learners at these sites ranges from 5.8% to 69%. DSUSD has met or exceeded the targets for AMAO 1 and 2, but has not met AMAO 3 English Language Arts targets from 2008 on.

This addendum was developed by the Local Education Agency (LEA) Plan Advisory Committee, which included parents of English learners, principals of schools sites with a high percentage of English learners, teachers, Desert Sands Teacher Association representative, and District administrators and support staff. Using information gathered from the English Learner Sub-group Self Assessment (ELLSA), as well as the Academic Program Surveys, to determine the strengths and needs of the current LEA Plan in terms of effectiveness with EL students. The meetings and compilation of information, data, and recommendations were coordinated through State and Federal Programs department. Strategies were selected based on current research of effective practices for English learners.

A. Analysis of data and problems found.

An in-depth analysis of data using the English Learner Self-Assessment Survey (ELLSA) has been conducted.

	2008 Target	DSUSD 08	2009 Target	DSUSD 09	2010 Target	DSUSD 09
AMAO 1	50.1%	55.5% (met)	51.6%	56.5% (met)	53.1%	58.3% (met)
AMAO 2	28.95	35.4% (met)	30.6%	37.8% (met)		
AMAOa	(-5 years)				17.4%	23.2% (met)
AMAO b	(+5 years)				41.3%	40.3% (did not meet)

Identification and description of factors that prevented DSUSD from achieving the AMAOs are:

- A. AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 targets have been met for the past 4 years with a positive trend. However, at the middle and high school levels, there has been a decline in the percentage of English Learners meeting the established targets the past 2 years. Further analysis of CELDT movement patterns indicates that the most progress over the past several years is made by students scoring at levels 1 and 2. There is little movement in students scoring at CELDT level 3. Some students who reach level 4, but are not reasonably fluent, struggle to maintain at level 4 to meet reclassification criteria. This same pattern is reflected in English learners (ELs) who have been in United States or District schools for 5 years or more. Desert Sands Unified School District (DSUSD) sees little variance between the length of time in U.S. schools and the time of enrollment in our district. With the change in AMAO to include two cohorts, DSUSD did not meet AMAO 2b for the subgroup of students receiving instruction for 5+ years.

The percent of EL students scoring proficient in math and meeting AMAO 3 targets has increased annually since 2005-2006 demonstrating a positive trend. Although targets have been met annually, the rate of growth in mathematics is not sufficient to meet 2010 targets. The number of students from grade 2 to grade 8, in general math and algebra scoring Far Below Basic (FBB), Below Basic (BB), and Basic (B) increases rather than decreases.

B. AMAO 3 targets in ELA for the EL subgroup were met in 05-06 and 06-07. The trend of positive growth continued in 07-08 and 08-09; however, the percentage proficient was not sufficient to meet the annual AMAO 3 targets for ELA. The number of students scoring FBB/BB/B increases from grades 2 to grade 8.

AMAO 3	2008 Target	DSUSD 2008	2009 Target	DSUSD 2009	2010 Target	DSUSD 2010
ELA	34.0%	31.0% (did not meet)	45.0%	36.3% (did not meet)	56.0%	38.4% (did not meet)
MATH	34.6%	43.0% (met)	45.5%	45.6% (met)	56.4%	48.7% (did not meet)

C EL students taking the CAHSEE have a proficiency rate of 8% on the CAHSEE ELA and 19% on the CAHSEE Math. 36% of ELs passed the CAHSEE ELA and 54% of ELs passed the CAHSEE Math. RFEPs are outscoring EOs on the CAHSEE

B. Strengths and weaknesses of current plan:

DSUSD 2009-2014 LEA Plan was completely rewritten in early 2009 by a broad-based LEA Advisory Committee and submitted for Board of Education approval 2009. This committee has identified the following strengths and weaknesses in our LEA Plan.

STRENGTHS:

Instructional Program Implementation

Adopted Program in the Core Content: The instructional program for English learners includes Structured English Immersion (SEI) and English Language Mainstream (ELM) at all 10 schools in the district. The DSUSD requires the use of the adopted textbooks (which are aligned to the standards) on a daily basis in the core content areas. The DSUSD implemented a new adoption in mathematics for elementary schools in 2009-2010 and for secondary in 2010-11.

The district adopted textbooks for elementary grades K-5 (Houghton-Mifflin *A Legacy of Literature and OPEN Court* for Reading/ Language Arts and Harcourt *Math*) are utilized daily for core instruction. The middle (Grades 6-8) school programs Holt and in mathematics and McDougall Algebra I on a daily basis. The high schools utilize Prentiss Hall for Language Arts, and Prentice Hall, Holt, McDougall, and Thomson in mathematics on a daily basis. The district adopted K-5 ELD text is Hampton Brown *Avenues*. Middle Schools use Hampton Brown *High Point* and High Schools use *Hampton Brown EDGE* for their ELD instructional program.

Instructional Time: In the elementary schools, EL students receive 30-45 minutes of English Language Development each day in addition to their reading/language arts instruction. At the secondary level, EL students receive one period of ELD instruction in their ELD classes. Instructional time is protected from interruptions. Minimum time allotments for core instruction have been established as follows:

	<u>Reading/Language Arts</u>	<u>Mathematics</u>
Grade K	1 hour	30 minutes - Additional 15 minutes for Intervention as needed
Grade K – full-day	2.5 hours (with additional UA time)	1 hour - Additional 15 minutes for Intervention as needed
Grades 1-3	2.5 hours (with additional UA time)	1 hour - Additional 15 minutes for Intervention as needed
Grades 4-5	2 hours (with additional UA time)	1 hour - Additional 15 minutes for Intervention as needed in 4-5
Grades 6-8	1 period or 2-period block (ELD/Intervention)	1 hour or 2-period block (Intervention)
Grades 9-12	1 period or 2-period block (ELD/Intervention)	1 hour or 2-period block (Intervention)

Student Placement: Elementary schools use the results of CELDT, CST reading, AVENUES, and district benchmarks (DSAT) to group EL students for ELD instruction according to English proficiency level or provide differentiated instruction at the proficiency levels of all EL students assigned to the classroom. Secondary schools use student scores from the CELDT, CST, district benchmark tests, and grades to place students in ELD and interventions in language arts and mathematics. At the middle and high school levels, EL students are placed in math courses based on school site criteria.

Student Interventions: Elementary school teachers use Universal Access time/ELA intervention time to implement the English Learner support handbooks for RLA/Math programs to provide pre-teaching and re-teaching of key concepts and vocabulary for English Learners. Secondary school teachers use the double block classes for front loading or remediation to implement the intervention kits/materials in the adopted textbooks for English learners. The district implements several state-approved supplemental resources to further meet the needs of EL students. Identified students needing intense intervention are placed in READ 180 or California Gateways.

Assessment Practices: All students are assessed on the Desert Sands Assessment Tool (DSAT) ELA and Math benchmarks to assess proficiency and to identify areas of need. Elementary students receive trimester progress reports/report cards. At the secondary level, in addition to quarterly reports, all schools now have the ability to send home Interim Progress Reports every three weeks. Teachers create grade-level SMART goals and administer common assessments to measure student learning. Through the district-wide Team Response to Achievement and Collaboration (TRAC) process, teachers are receiving training in the use of data analysis protocols and use scores from common assessments and benchmark tests during grade-level meetings in order to identify key standards for instructional focus.

Accountability: The district office administration holds schools accountable for student learning through progress monitoring. Principals establish annual goals based on student data each year and meet with the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent in late August, as part of the principal evaluation process. In the fall, Principals work with their TRAC leadership teams and their teachers to develop and implement their accountability plans. Most sites now have release time built into their schedules for weekly collaboration for professional learning community activities that include grade-level meetings for data analysis and staff development. TRAC Teams made up of site administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches meet a minimum of three times each year to establish goals, create action plans, monitor implementation and student progress, and receive professional development in research-based practices. Each team is assigned a district Director and district level Project Facilitators to provide additional support. DSUSD contracts with Riverside County Office of Education to facilitate the process and provide research-based professional development.

ASSESSMENT: One anchor of our identified strengths is our district-wide, systematic formative assessment program, "DSAT" or Desert Sands Assessment Tool. Standards-aligned, formative benchmark assessments to measure student progress in ELA and Math have been created and implemented for district-wide use in grades 1-12. Currently, all students in grades 2-10 take these district benchmarks 3-6 times per year, with the results entered onto the EADMS system. Similar assessments for students in grades 1, 11, 12 are available, yet are not required. After implementing the use of these benchmark assessments, professional development in data analysis of results and use of that data to enhance teaching and learning was provided to all schools and staffs.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Collaboration is another cornerstone of our LEAP, and of our district's success. Effective in 2009-2010, all sites participate in our district-wide professional development model, TRAC (Team Response for Achievement and Collaboration). Through TRAC, site leadership teams and administrators receive ongoing training in data analysis, the instructional cycle, Response to Intervention, and instructional practices, with an intense focus on our English learners and other significant subgroups. Additionally, all administrators receive ongoing professional development to analyze data and improve instruction through the Instructional Leadership Team professional development trainings held throughout each year.

IMPROVED INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: Additional strengths from our LEAP include improved instructional practices for our English learners, including monitoring of instructional minutes for ELD, placement of students in appropriate settings, professional development, on-site coaching, home-school communication of student progress, interventions and technology.

NEEDS:

Continued professional development specific to elementary, middle and high school grades spans in explicit strategies for English learners with consistent implementation is needed in order to ensure that all English learners will be successful in both ELD and Core Content settings. Training in strategies to meet the needs of ELS in Grades 6-12 with CELDT levels of Intermediate, Early Advanced, Advanced and use of appropriate ancillary materials to support ELs at secondary schools in core content classes.

Within our English learner sub-group, additional monitoring and support of our Long-term English Learners (LTEL) is needed to ensure more rapid acquisition of English and mastery of core content standards. Training and support in the use of disaggregated data for placement, monitoring, and interventions is needed, as well as consistent implementation and monitoring of the Academic Support Plans for LTELs.

While all sites and district involve parents through traditional governance models (SSC, ELAC, SAC, DELAC, DAC and PTO) increased opportunities for parents to learn how to support their children to succeed academically are needed..

C. Identify and describe factors contributing to failure to meet AMAO(s). The following challenges have been identified as significant barriers to academic progress of English learners:

Students with CELDT scores of 3, 4, or 5 are placed in English Language Mainstream (ELM) classes at the secondary level. Criteria for ELD instruction within those classes is referenced in our Master Plan for English Learners (MAPEL), but it needs to be revised to provide more specificity and guidance. Some grade spans use formative assessments imbedded in adopted programs and standards-based benchmarks to monitor progress of ELs. Consistent use of such tools and the resulting data is needed at all sites. Progress has been made to ensure that ELs are provided with appropriate number of minutes for English Language Development (ELD) instruction. Creating master schedules at all levels which ensure that ELs receive the appropriate number of instructional minutes for ELD is needed. Provision of appropriate and strategic interventions for ELs at all levels is a challenge. Guidelines for providing a systematic intensive or strategic intervention program for ELs are contained in the MAPLE Plan, but more specificity is needed to support site implementation of a clear RTI model. The district has a formative assessment system in place for R/LA and math at all levels, and analysis of such data is now a part of the collaborative TRAC process at each site although disaggregation of data within the Desert Sands Assessment Tool (DSAT) can be a challenge. A high number of ELs who have been in US/district school for 5⁺ years generally do not make adequate progress or meet proficiency targets. Included in this group are students with disabilities who are long-term English learners. DSUSD has made many strides in providing professional development on research-based instruction strategies, but continued and updated training in effective strategies for ELs is needed. Implementation of effective instructional strategies for ELs needs to be consistently monitored across schools/levels.

In addition to the challenges identified in relation to meeting and/or exceeding AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 targets, we have identified the following needs in relation to ensuring that all ELs make adequate yearly progress in ELA and Math. Not all students reaching reasonable fluency on the CELDT score proficient on the CST at grades 3 – 10. A greater number of reclassified students appear to maintain proficiency in ELA/math, yet many are still not proficient on CSTs. Students who have been in US/district schools for 4⁺ years need to score at CELDT 4 or 5 in order to meet proficiency on the CST ELA/Math. Appropriate monitoring measures for Long-Term English learners (LTELs) need to be implemented consistently at all sites.

Implementation of effective strategies to ensure access to core for all ELs needs to be consistently monitored. ELA, ELD, and math instructional minutes need to be in alignment with EPCs, ELA and math Frameworks, CA ELA and math standards at each site. A system for providing strategic and intensive intervention classes using appropriate research-based programs is needed at all levels for ELs not meeting adequate progress. A monitoring system of SBE approved interventions and materials to ensure student achievement and fidelity of instruction to the programs is needed. Clear criteria for placement of ELs in appropriate ELD, ELA and math classes at the secondary level needs to be established and implemented at all sites. The progress of R-FEPs not meeting grade level proficiency in ELA and math needs to be monitored with appropriate support and interventions provided.

After analysis of CAHSEE data, the following challenges were identified. Some schools use a CAHSEE diagnostic measure for appropriate placement in intervention classes; this measure needs to be used at all high schools. Some schools use formative assessments imbedded in adopted programs and standards-based benchmarks to monitor progress of ELs. Consistent use of such tools is needed at all sites. Use of disaggregated DSAT/EADMS data to monitor the progress of ELs is needed at all sites. CAHSEE Prep classes (grades 9-10) are needed for all ELs scoring at the lowest CELDT proficiency levels. CAHSEE intervention classes (grades 11-12) are needed for ELs scoring at the lowest CELDT proficiency levels.

D. Conclusion:

- A.** Desert Sands Unified School District will implement the following plan to improve the language proficiency and student achievement in English Language Arts and Math for English learners. We believe that we must improve our instructional program through providing intense and systematic professional development for all teachers and administrators of English learners; enhancing the analysis and use of disaggregated data for this sub-group; extending current monitoring and instructional practices focusing on the LTEL; better use student data for placement, instructional planning/delivery and interventions; and through the provision of more effective parent education opportunities to enhance the partnership between school and home. By establishing and monitoring cohesive and consistent practices at all sites, we will improve student achievement for all ELs. In addition to the improvement strategies outlined below, we are committed to implementing, monitoring and enhancing the effective practices stated in our 2009-2014 LEA Plan.

Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement	Timeline, with Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Funding Sources and Estimate	Progress Reports (to be completed periodically through June 30, 2011)
<p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English-language Development (ELD). (AMAOs 1 and 2; English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA))</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: <i>Full and consistent implementation of standards-based ELD instruction to all students classified as EL at all grade levels.</i></p> <p>In addition to activities described in LEA Plan Goals 1,2,3, the following strategies are identified to improve the annual increase in the percentage of students making progress in learning English one level per year and/or reaching/maintaining reasonable fluency on the CELDT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Grades 6-12, professional development on a focused approach is needed to address ELD within the English-language Mainstream (ELM) ELA setting. Embed research-based strategies which explicitly provide instruction in language functions, language tools, and 	<p>February, 2010 to June, 2011</p> <p>Benchmarks: EL Coaches Trainer of Trainers 2010-11 LQHS 2/2010 PDHS, 6/2010 I.H.S, 11/2010</p>	<p>Asst. Supt. Of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; Site Coaches</p>	<p>SFPO Facilitator Salaries for 2010-11: T-I: \$145,321 T-III: \$173,914 EIA-LEP;\$16,477 ELAP;\$112,366 Site Coaches are funded .5 FTE by district funds at all Title I schools:</p>	<p>By June, 2010</p> <p>By November 30, 2010</p> <p>On March 26, 2010, Site EL Coaches were trained in a T.O.T. model in Academic Discussions, Data Analysis, Planning RTI for ELs, and research from <i>Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning</i> Book Chat. Follow-up support provided by SFPO</p>

<p>application in ELA classes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All secondary teachers of English learners will use SBE approved ancillary materials to support acquisition of content standards in all core subjects. All annual CELDT tests will be hand-scored for Listening, Speaking, Reading; placed in the CELDT engine; and data used for placement of students. <p>Verify and monitor the full implementation of the instructional program, including instructional minutes, to optimize EL student learning of rigorous ELD standards-aligned content (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Westover,</p>	<p>SHHS 6/2011</p> <p>Jefferson 11/2010 By June, 2011: Indio MS LQMS Glenn Paige Desert Ridge</p> <p>Daily (March 2010-June 2011)</p> <p>November, 2010</p> <p>January-March, 2011</p>	<p>Site Principals; Site coaches/EL Leads</p> <p>Site Principals Secondary Counselors Site Coaches Site EL Leads</p> <p>Asst. Supt. Of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site</p>	<p>T-I \$1,236,786</p> <p>Release time for classroom teachers to attend Coach training: T-III \$600</p> <p>Duplication of Materials:EIA-LEP\$500 Centralized T-1 \$1500</p> <p>CDE Books Title III</p> <p>IMF/General funds purchased with initial adoption</p> <p>No cost relating to the CELDT engine. Some sites use site funds to pay extra duty for hand-scoring & inputting of data. (site T-I, EIA-LEP or EIA-SCE)</p> <p>No cost</p>	<p>facilitators at school sites.</p> <p>On October 1, 2010, Coaches were trained in 14 Guidelines for ELD from CDE's <i>Improving Education for English Learners</i> and in Best Practices for leveling for ELD & effective instructional strategies for EL learners.</p> <p>Per Self-study survey of all EL Coaches on Oct. 1, 2010, 8 of 10 secondary sites report that teachers consistently use ancillary materials in their core content classes to provide ELD within ELA.</p> <p>As of November 5, 2010, 25 of 32 schools have inputted their scores into CELDT engine.</p> <p>SFPO staff conducted on-site ELD walkthroughs Spring, 2010. Walkthroughs are scheduled for early 2011. Each site submitted their ELD Program Description and instructional schedule by November, 2010.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p>2008).</p> <p>SFPO staff will revise the existing ELD Observation Walkthrough Tool and share with site administrators and coaches.</p> <p>Site administrators will routinely visit classrooms to observe ELD instruction and to verify that all EL's are being instructed appropriately in the core ELD curriculum utilizing research based strategies and ELD standards as appropriate for EL student proficiency. The walk through logs will be kept on-site.</p> <p>Site administrator, classroom teachers, and R/LA/ELD coaches will participate in professional development relative to the ELD/ELA correlation of standards (<i>West Ed Map of Standards for English Learners</i>). (See <i>Professional Development Section</i>)</p> <p>LEA/site administrators will verify that classroom teachers are implementing sound ELD instructional practices, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a classroom environment conducive to language acquisition • Use of Direct Instruction model • Use of teacher strategies that include comprehensible input, checking for understanding, and the use of response frames • Use of student strategies that include cooperative grouping, graphic organizers, and active engagement • Use of assessment to guide 	<p>Dec, 2010</p> <p>September-June (weekly)</p> <p>See Section 5</p> <p>Principal Walkthroughs, weekly</p> <p>SFPO Walkthroughs, Jan-March, 2011</p>	<p>Principal; Site Coaches</p> <p>SFPO Director and Project Facilitators</p> <p>Site Administrators SFPO Staff</p> <p>See Section 5</p> <p>Principals SFPO Staff</p>	<p>No cost</p> <p>No cost</p> <p>See Section 5</p> <p>No cost</p>	<p>Existing tool was last revised in 9/2008 and will be updated to reflect current strategies and rigor of instruction.</p> <p>Each site principal is responsible for conducting his/her walkthroughs and maintains records of Observation Tool on-site.</p> <p>See Section 5</p> <p>Once Observation Tool is revised, it will be shared at January 20, 2011 Con-App meeting and EL Leadership Team, January 24, 2011.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<p>instruction at the appropriate language level</p> <p>Provide on-going coaching, feedback and reflection to EL Coaches to support implementation of EL instructional strategies at the sites, including but not limited to: Explicit academic vocabulary instruction, Use of language function frames, Use of vocalized reading strategies, Use of interactive student engagement strategies. (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Westover, 2008). (This should also be placed in the professional development section).</p>	<p>October 1, 2010 January 7, 2011 February 4, 2011 April 1, 2011 May 20, 2011</p>	<p>SFPO staff Site Coaches</p>	<p>No additional cost (See section 5)</p>	<p>On October 1, 2010, coaches were trained in Expected Roles of the Coach, EL Data Analysis, Guidelines for ELD instruction (CDE book), Best practices for ELD leveling, intro to Marzano's <i>Building Academic Vocabulary</i>.</p>
---	--	------------------------------------	---	---

--	--	--	--	--

<p>3. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in reading/language arts. (AMAO 3; ELSSA Section B)</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: <i>All English Learners have Access to Appropriate Reading/Language Arts Instruction: All English Learners will have access to an appropriate reading/language arts curriculum based on their assessed needs and to all curricular materials with appropriate modifications targeted to the students' English language proficiency level and academic skill.</i></p> <p>In addition to activities described in LEA Plan Goals 1,2,3, the following strategies are identified to improve the annual increase in the percentage of students reaching, maintaining or exceeding proficiency on the CST and CAHSEE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All annual CELDT tests will be hand-scored for Listening, Speaking, Reading; placed in the CELDT engine; and data used for placement of students. 	<p>November, 2010</p>	<p>Site Principals; Secondary Counselors; Site Coaches and EL Leads; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators</p>	<p>No cost relating to the CELDT engine. Some sites use site funds to pay extra duty for hand-scoring & inputting of data. (site T-I, EIA-LEP or EIA-SCE)</p>	<p>As of November 5, 2010, 25 of 32 schools have inputted their scores into CELDT engine.</p>
---	-----------------------	--	---	---

<p>Grades K-5 will receive training on and implement access to core strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit vocabulary instruction • Incorporate language functions, language tools and application (academic language frames) • Use vocalized reading strategies • Implement the use interactive strategies such as think-pair-share, instructional conversation, idea wave, numbered heads, inside-outside circle, give one-take one 	<p>By June 2011, all sites will be trained. January, 2010 T.O.T. for EL Coaches</p>	<p>Site Principals; Site Coaches and EL Leads; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators;</p>	<p>Facilitator salary (see Section 2)</p>	<p>By June, 2010: Monroe & Kennedy Elementary Schools were trained by SFPO in academic language frames & use of interactive strategies, with follow-up support to classroom teachers and coach provided. All EL Coaches were trained in January 2010.</p> <p>By November 5, 2011: Truman, Adams, Carter Schools were trained by SFPO in academic language frames & use of interactive strategies, with follow-up support, including modeling use of these strategies in the classroom, to classroom teachers and coach provided.</p>
<p>Grades 6 – 10 will receive training on and implement access to core strategies, with a particular emphasis on Long-term English Learners (LTELs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit vocabulary instruction - high utility words and content words • Incorporate language functions, language tools and the opportunity for application during content classes • Use of interactive strategies such as think-write-pair-share, instructional conversations, numbered 	<p>By June 2011, all sites will be trained.</p> <p>LQHS 2/2010 PDHS, 6/2010 I.H.S, 11/2010 SHHS 11/2010</p> <p>Jefferson 12/2010 By June, 2011: Indio MS LQMS Glenn Paige</p>	<p>Site Principals; Site Coaches and EL Leads; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators;</p>	<p>Facilitator salary (see Section 2)</p>	<p>La Quinta High School participated in a workshop, “Strategies for Structured Academic Discussions and Summarization” on February, then site coach/EL lead provided follow-up thru June, 2010. LQHS will receive update training on the 4 identified strategies this year. Shadow Hills High will begin their training, November 16, 2010 with ELA department.</p> <p>Palm Desert and Indio High School received training on Academic Language Frames and Interactive Strategies on Nov. 30</p>

<p>heads, idea waves, inside-outside circle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide students with content and language objectives daily <p>District and site administrators monitor teacher implementation of strategies learned in professional development including but not limited to Explicit academic vocabulary instruction, Use of language function frames, Use of vocalized reading strategies, Use of interactive student engagement strategies. (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Westover, 2008).</p> <p>Grades 1-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English learners will participate in DSAT assessments and the disaggregated data will be used to inform instruction and provide teachers the information they need for re-teaching and differentiating instruction. 	<p>Desert Ridge January, 2010 T.O.T. for EL Coaches</p> <p>January-June, 2011 (after receiving training)</p> <p>March, 2010 June, 2010 Nov. 2010</p>	<p>SFPO Staff Site Administrators Site Coaches</p> <p>Asst. Supt. of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; Site Coaches; Classroom teachers</p>	<p>No Cost</p> <p>ETS Item bank T-I \$95,000 Ed Facilitator / Prof Dev Salaries(See above)</p> <p>Assessment Printing, General Fund</p> <p>Many sites use EIA-SCE, LEP and/or Title I for release time to analyze data and plan instruction/interventions following DSAT admin.</p>	<p>and Nov. 10, respectively. Jefferson Middle School's training will be rescheduled.</p> <p>As of November 30, 2010, SFPO has developed the Trainer of Trainers model. The next phase of training will occur at Coaches Training on 1-7-2011.</p> <p>After each ELA DSAT (6 times per year for secondary; 3 times for elementary) Asst Superintendent/Ed Services monitors participation and site principals/teachers monitor results.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Grades 9 – 10 To ensure that all ELs, including LTELs, score Proficient on CAHSEE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9th and 10th ELA teachers will provide targeted instruction to support ELs in mastering the content standards which will be tested on CAHSEE ELs will take the CAHSEE diagnostic for purposes of identifying students that need CAHSEE prep. 9th and 10th grade ELs scoring below proficiency on CST will be placed in a CAHSEE prep class, with rigorous, targeted instruction based on previous CST/DSAT strand analysis. Grades 9–10 CAHSEE prep teachers will provide 	<p>Sept-June, 2011 Sept</p> <p>Spring, 2010 for 9th graders OR fall, 2010 for 10th graders (site decision)</p> <p>All 4 comprehensive High Schools provide CAHSEE intervention each year in some manner, some are 6-8 week classes and others are 1 semester, depending on site/EL needs.</p> <p>Sept-June, 2011</p>	<p>Asst. Supt. of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Site Principal; Site Coaches; Classroom teachers</p> <p>Site Principal; Site Coaches; Counselors; Classroom teachers</p> <p>Site Principal; Site Coaches; Counselors; Classroom teachers</p> <p>Site Principal; Site Coaches;</p>	<p>No categorical funds needed.</p> <p>Site-funded EIA-LEP, SCE or CAHSEE funds at approximately \$1.00 per pupil.</p> <p>Intervention/CAHSEE prep class is provided for identified students, using site LEP or SCE funds (approximately \$10,000 per class).</p> <p>Site funds may be used to provide support</p>	<p>Individual sites monitor progress using DSAT disaggregated results, quick quizzes, common assessments.</p> <p>While this is not mandated, all high schools now use CAHSEE diagnostic, and results are used to place at-risk ELs in appropriate intervention settings.</p> <p>Student Data is monitored at each formal TRAC day: Day 3(09-10) May/June 2010 Day 1 Sept, 2010 Day 2, with support follow-up: Oct-Dec, 2010</p> <p>Administrative (principal/asst</p>
---	--	---	--	---

<p>rigorous targeted instruction to ensure ELs will score at the proficient level on CAHSEE</p> <p>Grades 4-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSUSD will identify Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) and provide schools with a data-base of identified students. • Each identified LTEL will be placed on an Academic Support Plan in the fall, with targeted interventions in ELA if needed and monitoring of progress defined and recorded on Plan in the spring. (2 student/adult meetings per year) Examples of interventions include: READ 180;READ About; EL CAHSEE intervention class; before/after school tutoring; summer session; etc. 	<p>By October, 2010</p> <p>October 21, 2010 with follow-up meeting by June, 2011</p>	<p>Classroom teachers</p> <p>Admin, Assessment & Testing Coordinator; SFPO Director; SFPO Facilitators</p> <p>Admin, Assessment & Testing Site Principal; Site Counselors; Site Coach Classroom teachers</p>	<p>materials.</p> <p>No cost</p> <p>No cost for plan; Individual sites may provide extra duty to instructional staff for parent/student Plan meetings.</p>	<p>principal) walk-throughs (on-going)</p> <p>Databases were provided to each site by October 21, 2010 (hard copy and email attachment)</p> <p>All sites received individual plans by Oct. 21, 2010. Each site will devise own implementation time for development/meeting with students (Fall, 2010) SFPO Facilitators monitor each site's database of meeting dates, interventions, SSTs etc on LTELs.</p>
<p>Verify and monitor the full implementation of the instructional program to optimize EL student learning of rigorous R/LA standards-aligned content (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006;</p>				

<p>Schmoker, 2006; Westover, 2008).</p> <p>LEA/ site administrators will routinely visit classrooms to observe direct instruction model during core ELA instruction and to verify that all EL's are being instructed appropriately in the core ELA curriculum utilizing universal access components as appropriate for ELs.</p> <p>Site administrator, classroom teachers, and R/LA coaches will participate in professional development relative to the implementation of the direct instruction model.</p> <p>Observation tools and lesson planning templates based on the Direct Instruction model will be developed and shared with sites. Tool will include the following direct instruction components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards, Content & Language Objectives • Orientation • Presentation • Structured Practice • Guided Practice • Independent Practice • Pre-teach; Re-teach • Checking for Understanding • Assessment 	<p>Weekly walk-throughs by site administrators;</p> <p>TRAC Day 1 Sept-Oct, 2010 TRAC Day 2, Oct-Dec, 2010 TRAC Day 3, Jan-March 2011</p> <p>By June, 2011</p>	<p>Site Principals</p> <p>Ed Services and SFPO Staff; RCOE Consultants</p> <p>Ed Services & SFPO department</p>	<p>No Cost</p> <p>See Section 5</p> <p>No cost</p>	<p>Individual site principals conduct weekly walkthroughs and maintain their own records.</p> <p>TRAC Day 1 Sept/Oct 2010 TRAC Day 2 Oct/Dec, 2010</p> <p>To be developed.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Site Coaches provide on-going coaching, feedback and reflection to support implementation of EL instructional strategies including but not limited to: Explicit academic vocabulary instruction, Use of language function frames, Use of vocalized reading strategies, Use of interactive student engagement strategies. (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Westover, 2008). (This should also be placed in the professional development section).</p>	<p>November, 2010 February, 2011 May, 2011</p>	<p>Site Administrator Site Coaches SFPO staff</p>	<p>No cost</p>	<p>Coaches submitted Time Accounting logs and monthly calendars to SFPO by Nov. 30, 2010.</p>
---	--	---	----------------	---

<p>4. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics. (AMAO 3; ELSSA)</p> <p>. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics. (AMAO 3; ELSSA Section C)</p> <p>In addition to activities described in LEA Plan Goals 1, 2 and 3, the following strategies and activities are identified: Grades K – 12, Training on and implementation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit mathematical vocabulary instruction 	<p>Coach Training Book Study using <i>Building Academic Vocabulary</i>(Marzano/Pickering). Trainer of Trainers Model</p>	<p>SFPO Director; SFPO Facilitators;</p>	<p>Title II funds 2009-2010</p>	<p>October 1, 2010 Coach Training – books provided and reading assigned.</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiate instruction so that students will understand and apply mathematical problem solving <p>Grades 1-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> English learners will take the DSAT and the disaggregated data will be used to inform instruction and provide teachers the information they need for re-teaching and differentiating <p>Grades 6 -12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6th, 7th and 8th grade teachers will provide targeted instruction to support ELs in mastering the content standards which will be tested on CAHSEE. (Rigor of 	<p>provided to Site Coaches with follow-up discussion and support provided, 2010-2011.</p> <p>K-5 and 6-12 received new adoption training (all teachers plus Trainer of Trainers), 09-10</p> <p>March, 2010 June, 2010 Nov. 2010 January-June, 2011</p> <p>2010-2011 TRAC Process, (Trainer of Trainers model, 3 release days for K-8; 5 for 9-12))</p>	<p>Site Coaches</p> <p>Asst Supt, Ed Services; Director, Ed Services; Ed Services Facilitators; SFPO Facilitators</p> <p>Asst. Supt. of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; Site Coaches; Classroom teachers</p> <p>Asst. Supt. of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Site Coaches;</p>	<p>Title II funds 09-10</p> <p>Item bank Ed Facilitator / Prof Dev Salaries (see above) Assessment Printing, General Fund Many sites use EIA-SCE, LEP and/or Title I for release time to analyze data and plan instruction/interventions following DSAT admin.</p> <p>See Section 5</p>	<p>Followup at Coach trainings Jan-May, 2011.</p> <p>Grades K-5 were trained in May/June 2009 and gr 6-12 were trained in May/June 2010</p> <p>After each Math DSAT (6 times per year for secondary; 3 times for elementary) Asst Superintendent/Ed Services monitors participation and site principals/teachers monitor results.</p> <p>All sites completed DAY I of TRAC by October 6 (High School Support Days by Oct. 19, 2010)</p>
--	---	---	---	---

<p>instruction and access to core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELs will take the CAHSEE diagnostic for purposes of identifying students that need CAHSEE prep • 9th and 10th grade ELs scoring below proficiency in CELDT and CST will be placed in a CAHSEE prep class, with rigorous, targeted instruction based on previous CST/DSAT strand analysis. • Grades 7 – 12 will provide rigorous targeted instruction to ensure ELs will score at the proficient level on CAHSEE. <p>Grades 4-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSUSD will identify Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) and provide schools with a data-base of identified students. 	<p>Spring, 2010 for 9th graders OR fall, 2010 for 10th graders (site decision)</p> <p>All 4 comprehensive High Schools provide CAHSEE intervention each year in some manner, some are 6-8 week classes and others are 1 semester, depending on site/EL needs</p> <p>Sept, 2010-June, 2011</p> <p>By October, 2010</p>	<p>Classroom teachers; RCOE consultants</p> <p>Site Principal; Site Coaches; Classroom teachers</p> <p>Site Principal; Site Coaches; Classroom teachers</p> <p>Site Principal; Site Coaches; Classroom teachers</p> <p>Admin, Assessment & Testing Coordinator; SFPO Director; SFPO Facilitators</p>	<p>Site-funded EIA-LEP, SCE or CAHSEE funds at approximately \$1.00 per pupil.</p> <p>Intervention/CAHSEE prep class is provided for identified students, using site LEP or SCE funds. (approximately \$1.00 per pupil)</p> <p>Site funds may be used to provide support materials</p> <p>No cost</p>	<p>While this is not mandated, all high schools now use CAHSEE diagnostic, and results are used to place at-risk ELs in appropriate intervention settings.</p> <p>Student Data is monitored at each formal TRAC day: Day 3(09-10) May/June 2010 Day 1 Sept, 2010 Day 2, with support follow-up: Oct-Dec, 2010</p> <p>Administrative (principal/asst principal) walk-throughs (on-going)</p> <p>Data-bases were provided to each site by October 21, 2010 (hard copy and email attachment)</p>
---	---	--	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each identified LTEL will be placed on an Academic Support Plan in the fall, with targeted interventions, such as: EL CAHSEE class; Before/During/After school tutoring; summer school, provided in Math if needed and monitoring of progress defined and recorded on Plan in the spring. (2 student/adult meetings per year) 	<p>Fall, 2010 Spring, 2011</p>	<p>Admin, Assessment & Testing Site Principal; Site Counselors; Site Coach Classroom teachers</p>	<p>No cost for plan; Individual sites may provide extra duty to instructional staff for parent/student Plan meetings.</p>	<p>All sites received individual plans by Oct. 21, 2010. Each site will devise own implementation time for development/meeting with students (Fall, 2010)</p>
<p>Verify and monitor the full implementation of the instructional program to optimize EL student learning of rigorous mathematics standards-aligned content (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Westover, 2008).</p>	<p>May-June, 2010 May-June, 2010 Sept-Nov. 2010</p>	<p>Ed Services</p>	<p>Title II \$10,960 Title I \$4500</p>	<p>K-5 Mapping & refinement of Curriculum Guides, May 2010 Secondary training in pacing/curriculum guides, Sept, 2010</p>
<p>LEA/ site administrators will routinely visit classrooms to observe math instruction and to verify that all EL's are being instructed appropriately in the core math curriculum using supplementary materials for ELs included in math program.</p>	<p>Weekly walk-throughs by site administrators 2010-2011</p>	<p>Site Principals</p>	<p>No cost</p>	<p>Individual site principals conduct walk-throughs and maintain own records.</p>
<p>Site administrator, classroom teachers, and coaches will participate in professional development relative to the implementation of the direct instruction model.</p>	<p>TRAC Day 1 Sept-Oct, 2010 TRAC Day 2 Oct-Dec. 2010 TRAC Day 3, Jan-March, 2011</p>	<p>Ed Services and SFPO staff RCOE Consultants</p>	<p>See Section 5</p>	<p>TRAC Day 1 Sept/Oct 2010 TRAC Day 2 Oct/Dec 2010</p>

<p>Observation tools and lesson planning templates based on the Direct Instruction model will be developed and shared with sites. Tool will include the following direct instruction components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards, Content & Language Objectives • Orientation • Presentation • Structured Practice • Guided Practice • Independent Practice • Pre-teach; Re-teach • Checking for Understanding • Assessment 	<p>By June 2011</p>	<p>Ed Services and SFPO Dept</p>	<p>No Cost</p>	<p>To be developed</p>
<p>Site Coaches provide on-going coaching, feedback and reflection to support implementation of EL instructional strategies including but not limited to: Explicit mathematical vocabulary instruction, mathematical problem solving, use of interactive student engagement strategies. (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Westover, 2008). (This should also be placed in the professional development section).</p>	<p>November, 2010 February, 2011 May, 2011</p>	<p>Site Admin Site Coaches SFPO Staff</p>	<p>No Cost</p>	<p>Coaches submitted Time Accounting Logs and monthly calendars to SFPO by Nov. 30, 2010.</p>
<p>District and site administrators monitor teacher implementation of strategies learned in professional development including but not limited to: Explicit mathematical vocabulary instruction, mathematical problem solving, use of interactive student engagement strategies (CDE, 2007; Dufour, Dufour,</p>	<p>March-June, 2011 (after receiving training)</p>	<p>Site Admin Site Coaches Ed Services and SFPO Staff</p>	<p>No Cost</p>	<p>Coaches will receive training on mathematical vocab and problem solving strategies March 4, 2011.</p>

<p>Eaker, & Many, 2006; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Reeves, 2006; Schmoker, 2006; Westover, 2008).</p>				
<p>5. Describe scientifically based research professional development strategies and activities, including coordination efforts with other Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs. (ELSSA)</p> <p><i>OBJECTIVE: Coordinate district-wide professional development to focus on English Learners.</i></p> <p>Describe scientifically based research professional development strategies and activities, including coordination efforts with other No Child Left Behind (NCLB) programs. (ELSSA Section D)</p> <p>In addition to activities described in LEA Plan Goals 1,2,3 the following strategies and activities are identified:</p>				

<p><u>District Level Models:</u> Continue through TRAC model to provide professional development to site leadership on RTI model and its implementation, with specific emphasis on the English learner sub-group. Sites are grouped in cohorts and receive a minimum of 3 full-days of Professional Dev (2 in cohort and 1 at site) High Schools receive an additional 2 days of site support. DAY 1 of TRAC provided support to sites on the identification of LTELs and the appropriate placement of ELs in ELD, Core Content and Intervention classes was a focus under the RTI portion. DAY 2 of TRAC provides systematic professional development in the direct instruction model, with an emphasis on Tier 1 & Tier 2 interventions for identified students. DAY 3 will be designed to meet the needs of each cohort, with monitoring, reflection and planning for further implementation of individual site plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide District-wide RLA Framework and Adoption trainings, with a focus on ELs 	<p>Day 1: Sept-Oct, 2010 Day 2: Oct-Dec, 2010 Day 3: Feb-March, 2011 (high schools have an additional 2 days on-site Oct-April)</p> <p>TRAC Day 1 Sept-Oct, 2010 Instructional Leadership for Administrators, Sept, 2010. Framework Trainings/Adoption Process, Sept-March, 2011.</p>	<p>Asst. Supt. of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; Site Coaches; TRAC Teams RCOE Consultants</p> <p>Ed Services</p>	<p>RCOE Consultants fees \$50,000 T-I Subs: \$53,000 T-I</p> <p>TRAC (see above) Frameworks T-II \$6600 Subs for Framework T- II \$9742</p>	<p>Day 1-2 will be completed by Dec.14, 2010: All K-8 sites participated in cohort groups for Day I and on-site for Day 2. High Schools met individually for each day, including additional support days. Each site has a working TRAC action plan, with identified goals focusing on EL sub-group, Actions, Monitoring points. This plan is a working document, used by site between TRAC days and updated with the RCOE consultants, Ed Services & SFPO staff at TRAC day.</p> <p>TRAC Day I and ILT for administrators included an overview of the RLA Framework and training/adoption process trainings were held on Oct 18 & Dec. 7 for site reps. In depth analysis of the Framework and proposed adopted materials was conducted, with an emphasis on ELs. Sign-in sheets and agendas.</p>
---	---	---	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide EL Coaches with 5-6 full-day trainings each year, using a Trainer of Trainers model. For 2010-2011, the focus is on the identified strategies in Sections 2, 3, 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓Explicit academic vocabulary instruction in ELA and Math ✓ Use of language function frames ✓ Use of vocalized reading strategies ✓Use of interactive student engagement strategies ✓Mathematical problem solving 	<p>October 1, 2010 January 7, 2011 February 4, 2011 March 4, 2011 April 1, 2011 May 20, 2011</p>	<p>SFPO Staff Ed Services Site Coaches</p>	<p>See Facilitator Salaries, section 2</p>	<p>Coach trainings were conducted on Oct, 1, 2010, with the focus being Roles of the coach, EL data, guidelines for ELD instruction, Best practices in ELD, and vocabulary book introduction with reading assignment. Sign-ins and evaluations were collected to monitor attendance & effectiveness.</p>
<p><u>Site Level Trainings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the Trainer of Trainers model, site coaches will provide at least one training to their sites/departments on the following strategies for ELs in ELD, ELA, and/or Math by June, 2011. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓Explicit academic vocabulary instruction in ELA and Math ✓ Use of language function frames ✓ Use of vocalized reading strategies ✓Use of interactive student engagement strategies ✓Mathematical problem solving 	<p>January- June, 2011</p>	<p>Site Coaches Site Admin SFPO Facilitators</p>	<p>No Cost</p>	<p>After receiving training, coaches are expected to provide on-site training of at least one strategy by June, 2011, and submit the agenda, sign-ins, related hand-outs and next steps to their assigned SFPO Facilitator by June 10, 2011. SFPO facilitators will provide individual support to site coaches as needed/requested. See Section 3 for on-site trainings provided by SFPO Project Facilitators at individual sites.</p>

<p><u>Other Professional Development</u> Continue to provide professional development on language learning strategies, methods and materials with specific focus on academic language development and strategies that increases student to student interaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide EL Leads training on compliance, documentation, & student placement criteria of ELs into appropriate instructional settings to site personnel. • Provide CON-APP site reps training on compliance, documentation, & funding relating to ELs. • Provide Dennis Parker <i>Strategic Schooling</i> 	<p>Monthly meetings, Sept 2010-May, 2011</p> <p>Monthly meetings, Sept 2010-May, 2011</p> <p>2009-2010~ Completed 5 days of training at LQMS Sept-May, 2010 2010-2011: Provide 4 additional days of site support to LQMS (PI school) Sept-May, 2010</p>	<p>SFPO Staff EL Leads</p> <p>SFPO Staff Site Admin Site Reps</p> <p>SFPO staff, Consultant, LQMS Staff</p>	<p>Extra Duty, Title III \$28,265 09-10 Title III \$39,000 10-11</p> <p>No cost</p> <p>Title II &ELAP \$27,144</p>	<p>Fifteen sites have received on-site training at least once between January, 2010-November, 2010 (see pages 6-10 for detailed accounting)</p> <p>Sign-ins, agendas, handouts for Sept-Oct-Nov,2010 EL Leadership Team meetings are maintained in SFPO binders.</p> <p>Sign-ins, agendas, handouts for Sept-Oct-Nov,2010 Con-App meetings are maintained in SFPO binders.</p> <p>LQMS principal has maintained agendas, handouts, sign-ins for 5 days of training in 2009-10, and is doing so for 2010-11. Weekly classroom visits are</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIOP • Direct Interactive Instruction (DII) • WestED <i>Map of Standards for English Learners</i>-A Trainer of Trainers training was provided to 	<p>Dec. 2009-May 2010</p> <p>Jefferson Middle: Indio Middle: Eisenhower</p> <p>September 17, 2010 (John Carr, Trainer of Trainers model</p>	<p>SFPO staff, Site instructional staff</p> <p>Action Learning Systems & Site Staff; Director, SFPO</p> <p>Ed Services Facilitators,</p>	<p>No costs</p> <p>T-I PI 09-10 \$\$66,000 T-I PI 10-11 \$26,000</p>	<p>conducted by LQMS staff, including teachers. Weekly collaboration time is used to monitor implementation and student data.</p> <p>A district level SIOP training for interested site staff on Dec. 1, 2009, Jan 4, Feb 1, March 1, April 13, May 3, 2010. Hoover ES received one-full day of training in August and a monthly follow-up Sept-Oct-Nov-Dec, 2010.</p> <p>These sites have contracted with Action Learning Systems or Dennis Parker for additional follow-up after at least one full year of training: Jefferson Middle: DII follow-up Indio Middle: DII follow-up Eisenhower Eisenhower ES: DII follow-up</p> <p>Trainer of Trainers model was held on 9-17-2010,</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>district level facilitators, focusing on the correlation of the ELD to the ELA standards and how to use for classroom instruction. SFPO staff will train individual sites or departments on the use of the ELD standards and correlation to the ELA standards & how to plan for instruction (January, 2011- June 2012).</p> <p>District and site administrators monitor teacher implementation of strategies learned in professional development including but not limited to Explicit academic vocabulary instruction, Use of language function frames, Use of vocalized reading strategies, Use of interactive student engagement strategies.</p> <p><u>Support Materials:</u> Purchase and/or use research materials to support on-going learning of instructional staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Visible Learning, John Hattie</i> (Research on effect size of 800 meta-analyses relating to academic achievement) 	<p>for Ed Services and SFPO staff) Pilot Training, Indio High School, Jan. 2011 Coaches Training, March-may, 2011</p> <p>Weekly Walkthroughs by Site Administrators SFPO walkthroughs, using EL Instructional checklist at each site by June, 2011.</p> <p>Purchased in spring & provided to each site principal, June, 2010 Referenced at TRAC Day 1, Sept-Oct. 2010 & Day 2, Oct-Dec. 2010.</p>	<p>SFPO Facilitators</p> <p>Site Admin Site Coaches SFPO staff</p> <p>Asst. Supt. of Ed Services; Director of Instructional Support; Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; Site Coaches; TRAC Teams RCOE</p>	<p>WestEd consultant \$3600</p> <p>No Cost</p> <p>T-I PI 2009-2010 \$1,642</p>	<p>with sign-in, agenda and handouts on file. SFPO staff have developed site training model. Site training will be piloted for Indio High's ELD department in January, 2011. All EL coaches will be trained spring, 2011.</p> <p>Site administrators will maintain own records/calendars of walkthroughs and feedback provided. SFPO will calendar walkthroughs January- March, 2011.</p> <p>All principals received copies of Hattie's book in May, 2010, and were asked to review in connection with their TRAC goals, School Plan development. Book was referenced/used at TRAC trainings & Instructional Leadership Team meetings. Principals reviewed research of</p>
---	---	---	--	--

		Consultants		effect size of research-based classroom and RTI strategies. TRAC teams used this research
2. <i>Improving Education for English Learners, CDE</i> research of effective practices, emphasis on the secondary LTEL.	Fall, 2010	SFPO Staff	T-III 2009-2010(purchased for use in 2010-11) \$658	Ed Services division (Asst Supt, Directors and Facilitators) are using this resource to guide professional development trainings for EL Coaches and Sites. Additional training is provided for Directors through Riverside County Office of Education.
3. <i>Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning, Pauline Gibbons</i>	June, 2010	See above	T-III 2009-2010 \$898	Each site EL Coach was provided a copy of this book and was guided through a Book Study at each of the spring, 2010 Coach trainings.
4. <i>Reading/Language Arts Framework, CDE</i>	Fall, 2010	See above	Title II \$6600	In Sept, 2010, all site principals, TRAC teams and Ed Services staff were provided with the new Framework, for use in both TRAC & in preparation of the new RLA adoption, with a focus on the EL component. Trainings were in

<p>5. <i>Enhancing RTI, Fisher & Frey and The Collaborative Teacher, Solution Tree</i></p>	<p>Fall, 2010,</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>T-II \$9749</p>	<p>September/October at EL Leadership and DAY 1 of TRAC, with a full day provided on Oct 18 for site reps, Copies were provided as background research/support to all principals and members of their TRAC teams. Material was referenced on DAY 1 of TRAC, Sept-Oct, 2010</p>
<p>6. <i>Map of Standards English Learners, WestEd</i></p>	<p>Fall, 2010</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>T-III \$3660 training T-III \$13,334 (books for all teachers/principals)</p>	<p>A full day training for the Ed Services department was presented by John Carr on Sept. 17, 2010. Monroe ES was trained in spring, 2010.</p>
<p>7. <i>Building Academic Vocabulary, Marzano</i></p>	<p>Fall, 2010</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>T-I \$1016</p>	<p>Each site EL coach was provided a copy of this book on Oct. 1, 2010, and will participate in a Book Study throughout the 2010-11 school year.</p>

<p>6. Describe parental participation and outreach strategies to help parents become active participants in the education of their children, including coordination efforts with other ESEA programs.</p> <p><i>OBJECTIVE: Provide clear and timely communication and offer relevant training , in English and the primary languages, to parents and community members, on student achievement, academic expectations, accountability requirements and support services.</i></p> <p>Describe parent involvement and outreach strategies to help parents become active participants in the education of their children, including coordination efforts with other NCLB programs. (ELSSA Section E) In addition to activities described in LEA Plan Goals 1,3 and 4 the following strategies and activities are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (District English Learner Advisory Committee) DELAC continues to serve as an advisory body to the school board. 	<p>Monthly, Sept-June, 2010-11</p>	<p>Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal.</p>	<p>T-III \$7000</p>	<p>DELAC meets monthly; training in leadership, roles/responsibilities & CPM required topics.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (District Advisory Committee) DAC continues to serve as a liaison between the district and School Site Council (SSC). • Special Education Parent Advisory Committee (SEPAC) continues to serve as a liaison between the district and parents of students with disabilities. • Provide specific district-wide training for parents and site personnel on the purpose, function and roles of the SSC and ELAC committee 	<p>Monthly, Sept-June, 2010-11</p> <p>Monthly, Sept-June, 2010-11</p> <p>Spring, 2010 Spring, 2011</p>	<p>Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal;</p> <p>Director of Director, Special Ed; Site Principal;</p> <p>Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; parent leads;</p>	<p>SIP Carryover \$4500</p> <p>IDEA</p> <p>No cost (translation services through SFPO) and printing through CTA/DSTA</p>	<p>DELAC also has Focus Groups comprised of parents who review the By-Laws, plan Parent Events, and draft the Annual Report to the Board.</p> <p>DAC meets monthly; training in leadership, roles & responsibilities Monthly parent education is provided based on annual DAC survey of parent interest.</p> <p>Five meetings were held in 2009-2010 school year, with parent education topics focusing on special needs learners success at home and school. Many of the identified special needs students are also ELs.</p> <p>January, 2010 Will schedule for spring, 2011 Each site provides SSC & ELAC Roles & Responsibilities training prior to commencement of the new SSC/ELAC cycle. This process is monitored by SFPO facilitators throughout the year by review of monthly minutes.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide specific opportunities for parents to attend the CABE conference and share learnings and experiences at DELAC & ELAC (site) 	<p>Spring 2010 Spring 2011</p>	<p>Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; parent leads;</p>	<p>T-III \$11,129</p>	<p>March 2010 with follow-up reports at April & May DELAC meetings; March, 2011 parents selected @ Nov. 2010 DELAC meeting</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide opportunity for parents to attend Bilingual Educators Succeeding Together (BEST) awards conference, in recognition of their service to EL students. Parents are also recognized in this event for their leadership contributions to the education of English Learners either in district level involvement or site level. 	<p>Spring 2010 Spring 2011</p>	<p>Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; parent leads;</p>	<p>T-III \$2500</p>	<p>May, 2010 May 2011</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide district-wide parent education events on how to support their children to be more successful at school. The fall parent workshop included how to establish positive relationships at home to enhance learning and attendance to improve academic performance at school. The spring event will include the above, with additional training provided to 	<p>DELAC Focus Group Planning Session, Spring 2010. Parent Education Event, Fall, 2010 Parent Event, October 23, 2010 Spring Event, May, 2011 (TBD)</p>	<p>Director of SFPO; SFPO Facilitators; Site Principal; parent leads;</p>	<p>\$1500</p>	<p>Based on feedback from parents who attended the March, 2010 CABE, parents requested that Lucio Padilla be the guest speaker for the Fall Parent Institute. Parents planned and co-hosted the event, October 23, 2010.</p>

<p>parents on successful practices to support college readiness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and SSC committees serve in an advisory capacity at the school site and provide input into the development of school plans. Sites will offer parent trainings and workshops to empower parents to provide academic support for their child, such as Latino Family Literacy Project, PRICE Parenting, Parenting for Success. 	<p>Established at each school site, minimum of 5 times per year.</p> <p>Individual sites develop their parent involvement opportunities throughout the year. Sites plan and pay for site trainings; documentation will be collected, as they occur and no later than June, 2011 for the 2010-2011 year.</p>	<p>Director of SFPO; Site Principal; parent leads;</p> <p>Director of SFPO; Site Principal; parent leads;</p>	<p>Site funded</p> <p>Site funded</p>	<p>Sites submit their agendas and minutes after each meeting. SFPO Facilitators use a checklist to monitor that School Plans are reviewed at each meeting, including the monitoring of goals, student data, funding and improvement strategies.</p> <p>Many sites use our School Assistance Program, through Child, Welfare & Attendance office to provide on-site parent ed. Site funds are used to pay related costs such as extra hours, materials, and translation services. In fall 2010, SFPO began requesting copies of all agendas, flyers, sign-in sheets for any parent involvement opportunity held at the school site.</p>
---	---	---	---------------------------------------	--

<p>7. If applicable, identify any changes</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
--	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

to the Title III Immigrant Education Program.				
--	--	--	--	--