Report of Findings

March 2013

District Assistance and Intervention Team: San Diego County Office of Education

LEA: San Diego County Office of Education

Contents

Introduction and Overall Recommendations

The San Diego County Office of Education LEA is a district comprised of:
- Community Schools, organized under six regional groupings and serving students in middle and high school grades;
- Juvenile Court Schools, organized in five regions and serving students in middle and high school grades;
- Monarch School, serving homeless students in grades K-12;
- San Pasqual Academy, a residential program serving foster youth in grades 9-12; and
- Three Special Education Program sites:
  - Davila Day School, serving deaf and hard-of-hearing students in grades K-6,
  - North Coastal Academy, serving emotionally disturbed students in grades 7-12,
  - Friendship School, serving severely handicapped students ages 3-12.

(Note: Literacy First Charter, an elementary school, operates as an independent charter and is not included in this report.)

The LEA has been undergoing major reorganization that has resulted in school closures and combining of sites, in addition to significant staffing reductions and change of leadership throughout the district.

This report serves to summarize the findings of the District Assistance and Intervention Team (DAIT), which was brought in to work with SDCOE as a result of the district's identification as a Year 3 Title I Program Improvement district, which triggered the assignment by the California Department of Education of Corrective Action 6 and Technical Assistance. Below is a summary of the district's program improvement status:

**San Diego County Office of Education
Program Improvement Status**

San Diego County Office of Education: LEA Program Improvement Status

- SDCOE **entered Program Improvement in 2010-11** based on the following criteria:
  - Missed the API target for two consecutive years (triggered entry into PI)
  - Missed ELA Percent Proficient targets for all numerically significant student groups: All Students, Hispanic students, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, and English Learners
  - Missed Mathematics Percent Proficient targets for three student groups: All Students, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, and English Learners
  - Missed the Graduation Rate target

- SDCOE **progressed to Year 2 of Program Improvement in 2011-12** by missing the following targets:
  - Missed ELA and Mathematics Percent Proficient targets for all numerically significant student groups: All Students, Hispanic students, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, and English Learners
  - Missed the API target

- SDCOE **progressed to Year 3 of Program Improvement in 2012-13** by missing the following targets:
  - o Missed ELA and Mathematics Percent Proficient targets for all numerically significant student groups: All Students, Hispanic students, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, and English Learners
  - o Missed the Graduation Rate target

San Diego County Office of Education: School Program Improvement Status

- Following the most recent reorganization of the SDCOE Juvenile Court and Community Schools, **one site remains in Program Improvement**: Monarch School entered Year 1 in 2012-13.

- Two sites identified as Program Improvement on the California Department of Education list (Mesa Region Court and San Pasqual Academy) actually did not receive Title I Part A funding in 2011-12 and thus are not in Program Improvement.

- The other sites previously in Program Improvement (Hope Region Community, Metro Region Community, and South Region Community) have been closed, and since the reorganized sites opened under new CDS codes they will not carry the PI status forward.

As a part of the DAIT process a needs assessment was conducted using the State Program Assessment Tools. Site visits, interviews and observations were completed and this information was presented, analyzed and discussed with the District Liaison Team (DLT). The findings are summarized within this report and helped to provide district recommendations to inform the revision of the Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan. This summary gives an overview of the current strengths to build upon and challenges to address that will support the development of district systems and coherence.   The recommendations for next steps were developed during the DLT meetings to build a common understanding and foundational practice in order to ensure continued growth and development of systems through the revision of the LEA plan which will be essential for building and maintaining district coherence.

Overall Recommendations

- Develop a coherent system of capacity building. Develop capacity of teachers, support staff and district and site administrators in leadership, pedagogy, and instructional decision-making.

- Develop a coherent system of high quality teaching and learning that supports continuity of learning across the system, and prepares students for college and/or career choices. Within this system are common course descriptions, course outlines, pacing guides, and embedded formative assessments to support the transition to common core state standards and 21st Century learning and provide smooth transitions and consistency of instruction for students who transfer between sites and within programs.

- Develop a coherent system for assessment and monitoring. Identify and select a data management system that will assimilate and house different types of data and allow for easy and efficient access of data by staff and students. Develop a comprehensive assessment plan articulating a continuum of practice from classroom-based formative to interim to summative assessment. Assessment will provide real time information about learning and will inform student progress monitoring and program evaluation.

- Develop a coherent system for meeting high priority student needs. Develop a comprehensive system for identifying and meeting the needs of academically at-risk students, with attention on English Learners, Students with Disabilities, and students working two or more years below grade level. This includes timely placement of students and instruction targeted to meet individual needs and accelerate learning.

- Develop a coherent system for communication. Develop a system of communication that will be structured, timely, and inclusive to keep all stakeholders (Board, Cabinet, staff and community) informed of what is happening throughout SDCOE LEA. In order to adequately facilitate this communication system, a common language will be developed to facilitate a common understanding and maintain a positive and healthy morale.

Data Sources

The following sources of information were used to complete this Report of Findings:

State Program Assessment Tools

- In February 2013 the SDCOE DAIT arranged an on-line access to the Academic Program Survey (APS). All teachers and site administrators in the JCCS schools were asked to complete the survey. The survey results represent self-perception reporting data by the responding teachers and administrators. This data provided information and ratings used to draft comments. The APS ratings for each school were aggregated into district ranges and averages for each Essential Program Component (EPC) objective.

- In 2012-2013 school year, the English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA) was completed by Wendell Callahan, Director of Assessment at JCCS. Patterns, trends, and wonderings from the data were shared with the DLT members to guide focused conversations about English Learners.

- In February 2013, SDCOE facilitated an Inventory of Services and Supports for Students with Disabilities (ISS) with the Special Education coordinator of JCCS that included an interview and review of artifacts. During the interview, areas of strengths and areas of need in relation to the DAIT standards were identified. Interviews were also conducted with the Director of Assessment and Senior Director of JCCS. Site visits, classroom observations, student interviews and review of IEPs and coursework were also completed at five different programs and sites to further inform and validate the ISS findings.

Observational Data

- Members of the DAIT team conducted site visits of a representative "slice" of schools and programs across regions to gather observational data on a cross-section of JCCS and Special Education programs and sites. The purpose of the visits was two-fold. First the DAIT team increased their knowledge of the unique programs and services offered within the JCCS system. At the same time data was collected around teaching and learning. (Referred to subsequently as "Slice Visits.")

- A twenty-eight member DLT was formed by representative stakeholders from both the site and district levels, who then participated in two focused meetings. There were three purposes of the meetings: 1) to develop a common understanding of the qualities found in high achieving schools and the systems that support the achievement; 2) to engage in an analysis of and conversation about student achievement, student demographic, curriculum and instruction, and program implementation data in order to identify the strengths and areas for growth that will inform the development of the LEA plan; and 3) to develop action steps in support of the goals and strategies that will guide the instructional improvement and build coherent systems throughout the district resulting in improved teaching and learning.

Technical Assistance Provider Findings and Recommendations by LEA Plan Goal

The following findings and recommendations emerged from a review and analysis of the LEA Plan; APS, ELSSA, and ISS results; observational data; student achievement data; and input from the DLT. SDCOE DAIT team meets regularly to discuss current work, identify patterns and trends, and assess progress. The DAIT team includes individuals from our District and School Improvement, Special Education, English Learner, Data, Assessment and Monitoring and Curriculum and Instruction units. In addition, the DAIT Senior Director meets with the Executive Director and senior leadership from JCCS to discuss progress.

Goal 1A and 1B: Increase percentage of students scoring proficiency in Reading Language Arts/Math

Strengths:
- 86% of teachers reported fully or substantially using core reading/language arts instructional materials, and 80% of teachers reported fully or substantially using core mathematics instructional materials. (APS)
- The District has developed "Power Standards" and an Academic Vocabulary program that are in use in some of the JCCS classrooms. (Slice visits, DLT)
- 77% of teachers reported fully or substantially of appropriate instructional time allocated for core reading/language arts and 80% in math. (APS)
- The NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments are used throughout JCCS as a progress monitoring tool as well as for diagnostic information. (APS, slice visits, DLT)

Challenges:
- Teachers reported and observers noted that curriculum materials and pacing varied from school to school and program to program. This can result in discontinuity for students who transfer between sites or programs. (DLT, APS)
- Teachers reported, both on the APS and in the DLT, that there are a lot of interruptions to classroom instruction. Some of the interruptions discussed by teachers are due to probation needing to speak to students during class time or other professionals pulling students from class in order to provide counseling or support other socio-emotional needs. In other programs students experience abruptly changed "unit" assignments, which cause them to move into another classroom with very little time for a teacher to prepare for a move. These moves, in some programs, can be daily. (APS, DLT, Slice visits)
- Although the MAP assessments are administered three times a year, the classroom teachers find this information difficult to use in order to guide their daily instruction in a meaningful way. There are not common assessments that are administered in courses. (DLT, Slice visits)
- There is inconsistent use of summative and formative assessment data within and across schools and teachers do not feel adequately prepared in knowing how to use data in making instructional decisions and designing targeted interventions. (APS, DLT, slice visits)

Recommendations:
- Develop common course outlines that contain competencies defining what students should know and be able to do. Ensure that there is a mechanism to track these competencies so that students' learning can be communicated efficiently with the next school/teacher.
    - Develop a workgroup of teachers who will create the course competencies and assign corresponding credits (for high school).
    - Standardize course competencies across programs and platforms (online or face-to-face, independent study).
    - Develop common formative and summative assessments based on course competencies. Include some constructed response / open-ended tasks and project assessments (similar to those in SBAC).
- Determine a common CCSS mathematics pathway for middle and high schools across all regions and programs.
- Investigate the use of Expository Reading, and Writing Course (ERWC) modules for use in classrooms in order to infuse nonfiction reading and writing for students.
- Investigate the flipped instruction model with the online and blended classes.

Goal 1C: Proficiency for High Priority Students

Strengths:
- About half of teachers reported that intensive intervention programs and materials in Mathematics are implemented as designed. (APS)
- Special Education students are fully included in general education classrooms through the implementation of a collaborative teaching model (ISS, DLT)

Challenges:
- Teachers report a wide variety of materials are used as intervention and strategic support for students. (APS, DLT)
- There is not a clearly defined intervention program and diagnostic assessments that help to identify students who might benefit from more intensive instruction (ISS, APS)

Recommendations:
- Identify and administer additional screening assessments for students identified as at-risk upon enrollment, to drill down to determine specific gaps and needs.
- Provide professional development on administration of the screening assessment and use of the assessment results.
- Identify, select, and implement clearly defined intervention programs both within regular instruction time as well as during intersessions.
- Plan for extended learning opportunities during intersessions that are flexible and are targeted based upon 1 or 2 focused areas of needs.
- Develop strategic interventions that support building and strengthening early literacy and numeracy skills to fill the gaps in foundational learning.
- Assess outcomes of intersessions in order to inform further sessions.

- Develop a common, clearly articulated system for monitoring instruction, student access to instruction, and student academic progress for students with disabilities.

Goal 1D: Effective Teaching and Administration (Leadership)

Strengths:
- Site and district level Professional Learning Communities exist at some JCCS sites for teacher collaboration. (Slice visits, DLT)
- Over the last several years a majority of staff have been trained in SDAIE, and in the 50 week Academic Vocabulary (APS, DLT)
- The staff desires professional development that will help improve their practice (DLT)

Challenges:
- Staff indicated that professional development opportunities have decreased in recent years due to budget constraints. (APS)
- There does not appear to be a system for monitoring the implementation of strategies learned during professional development. (Slice visits)
- The LEA Plan and APS report have discrepant results on teachers' completion of instructional materials-based professional development focused on ELA or math adoptions, and on administrators' completion of professional development focused on leadership, support, and monitoring of the implementation of ELA and math adoptions. (LEA Plan, APS)
- There is variation in the frequency, duration, and quality of PLC collaboration time within and across schools (DLT, APS)

Recommendations:
- Engage representative cohorts across JCCS regions in developing an annual professional development plan with multiple structures of professional development (PD) outlined by month. This plan should include weekly collaboration via professional learning communities as well as formal PD through face-to-face and online venues.
    - Include high-quality professional development on implementation of the common core state standards in ELA, Math and across other disciplines
    - Ensure that paraprofessionals receive training in Common Core Standards.
    - Teachers and administrators to attend the PD
    - Work samples brought to PD to plan and monitor instruction and student learning
- Investigate options for online PD to involve all teachers and administrators without needing to be in the same location.
- Provide professional development and leadership coaching for administrators.
- Provide training to support teachers in managing classroom behaviors to help the focus on academics/learning (e.g. expanding BEST Behavior program)

- Define high quality teaching and learning and identify system for monitoring instruction and providing support for classroom teachers based upon a common understanding and practice.
- Establish a common walk-through protocol for principals to use while conducting site and classroom visits; provide professional development for principals in observing instruction and effectively using the walk-through protocol to positively impact teaching and learning.
- Collect observational data using the walk-through protocol, and develop a structure to analyze the data for patterns and trends.
- Consider the use of flipped learning and observation for administrators to monitor and coach teachers.
- Include site administration in professional learning focused on instructional best practices for English learners and Students with disabilities.

Goal 1E and 1F: Implementation and Monitoring and Support for Schools in Corrective Action

Strengths:
- The adoption of a new data system, PROMIS, has allowed teachers more accurate and timely student information than had been previously available. (DLT, Slice visits)
- The MAP assessments provide common data across sites, and their adaptive nature gives a more precise picture of student achievement including gaps in learning. (APS, DLT)

Challenges:
- The data system(s) are not fully integrated to provide teachers and administrators will all of the data they need in one data location (DLT, Slice Visits)

Recommendations:
- Implement an integrated data system that will provide access for all staff through the district to a variety of student and program data.
    - o Tag students, migrate into one data system
    - o Provide professional development for teachers and administrators in accessing and using the system to monitor progress and inform the planning of instruction.
- Establish a system wide process to use Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and other appropriate interim assessment data to monitor student growth by program and student population.
- Identify/select and implement diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments for all at risk students, including English Learners and students with disabilities.

Goal 2A, 2B, and 2C: English Learners

Strengths:

- 58% of teachers reported that ELD instructional materials are implemented fully or substantially (APS)

Challenges:
- There is not clear criteria for EL placement and students may not be receiving required and necessary ELD instruction (APS, DLT)
- 42% of teachers reported that ELD materials are only partially or minimally in use, and there is inconsistency in the materials used and whether they are state-approved. (APS)
- Assessment team, who may not know the students, come in to conduct CELDT assessment which can impact student effort when taking the CELDT. In addition, teachers don't always have a clear understanding of criteria used in measuring English language proficiency within each domain.

Recommendations:
- Create a master plan which includes:
  - Initial Identification & Placement
  - Instructional Programs
  - Monitoring of Students
  - Monitoring of Students
  - Progress and Reclassification
  - Staffing and Professional Growth
  - Parent and Community Involvement
  - Evaluation and Accountability
  - Funding and Resources (2A)
- Single Plan for Student Achievement include goals for:
  - English Language Development for all EL proficiency levels
  - Access to Core Instruction
  - Establish actions steps related to the goal and review the progress quarterly. (2A)
- Examine placement of ELD students and how specific needs are being addressed (2A).
- Identify instructional resources for CELDT levels 3,4,5 (including "Keys to Learning" curriculum). (2A)
- Administer Initial and Annual CELDT in following required timelines and in an appropriate testing environment by a qualified test administrator. (2B)
- Provide professional development to teachers to understand CELDT assessment results for the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
- Provide support to English Learners based on both over all fluency as well as domain specific needs (2B)
- Identify long-term English learners. Determine structures for their English Language Development that address the unique needs of long-term English Learners (2B)

- Provide professional development to teachers on how to accelerate the learning of "level 3,4,5" long-term English learners.(2B)
- Explore options for structuring ELD instruction within classes and across school sites that support the grouping of English Learners by like proficiency levels (2C)
- Ensure all students have access to core instruction, strategic interventions and intensive interventions; as appropriate and meeting the required instructional minutes.(2C)
- Provide professional development for teachers and administrators in the ELA and mathematics Common Core State Standards and the new ELD standards. Develop understandings on how to support English learners to access the rigor of the Common Core standards.(2C)

Goal 2D: English Learners: High Quality Professional Development

Strengths:
- Teachers have received previous professional development in SDAIE strategies (DLT)

Challenges:
- Not all English Learners receive English Language Development (DLT)
- Not all teachers have access to or understand how to best utilize EL support materials for ELA instruction (DLT)

Recommendations:
- Develop a professional development system that supports teachers in meeting the different needs of English learners. Topics that should be addressed within the system include:
    - Understanding the new proficiency levels as identified in the new ELD standards
    - Planning for the instructional needs of English learns to access the rigor of the CCSS
    - Developing monitoring structures to gather formative information about the ELD and content understandings of English learners
    - Implementing effective use of small group, targeted instruction vs. whole group instruction to meet the various instructional and language needs of English learners
    - Identifying appropriate ELD materials and instructional strategies that are most effective for the different language development of students
- Provide training for staff on new guidelines and requirements for reclassification of English learner students who have an IEP.

Goal 2E and 2F: English Learners: Parent Participation and Notification

Strengths:

- JCCS has a Family Involvement Coordinator. (DLT)
- Some sites are increasing their focus on Parent Involvement. (DLT)
- ELAC and DELAC committees are in place. (DLT)

Challenges:

- The high mobility rates of the students at JCCS make maintaining consistent parent groups difficult. (DLT)

Recommendations:
- Provide workshops for parents so that they are knowledgeable of the expectations of the English Learner program and can provide input.
- Ensure parents/guardians receive information and are given an opportunity to provide input on their child's program placement and language development status annually.
- Ensure that Administrators attend and provide information to the ELAC and DELAC meetings
- Ensure that parents are informed in a timely manner of upcoming meetings
- Utilize regional Parent Support Network Centers to act as liaison between parent/family needs and community resources
- Provide learning opportunities for parents about the common core state standards, and about rigorous high school course options.

Goal 3: Highly Qualified Teachers

Strengths:
- Currently 98% of SDCOE teachers have met some highly qualified requirements in core subjects, regardless of their assignment. 71% of teachers of record are highly qualified in at least two core subjects.

Challenges:
- Court and probation regulations can create challenges for student placement and instructional focus at the secondary level, especially when teachers do not have single subject expertise in the content area needed for student course credit.

Recommendations:
- Analyze highly qualified teacher requirements in pre-hire screening of teacher candidates.
- Provide hiring department the analysis of each teachers' HQT status before class assignments are made.
- Communicate with teachers not HQT of Verification Process for teachers in Special Settings (VPSS) options.

- Provide professional learning opportunities for staff who serve special populations such as Deaf & Hard of Hearing (DHH) to broaden their knowledge and expertise across all content areas in general education.

Goal 5A and 5B: Increase Graduation Rates/ Decrease Dropout Rates

Strengths:
- There are a variety of opportunities and staff resources to support students in transitioning after high school. (Slice Visits, DLT)

Challenges:
- Currently no courses being offered have been submitted for A-G approval. (DSLT, slice visits).

- Teachers report that data is difficult to access and given the high mobility of their students, it is difficult to "track" down information about students to inform course placement and credit needs. Multiple data systems that are used that do not interface with each other. (APS, DSLT)

Recommendations:
- Conduct a transcript audit for a representative sample of students in each secondary program to determine course-taking patterns and typical student course grades.
- Ensure graduation requirements for students receiving an SDCOE diploma are consistent with those of other districts in the county, to support students transferring into and out of SDCOE programs.
- Develop and implement a plan to secure A-G approval for at least English/Language Arts and Mathematics courses.

- Develop a data system that will provide access for all staff throughout the district to essential student information (demographic, assessment, transcript, and program).

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS BY DATA SOURCE

STATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT TOOLS

<u>Academic Program Survey (APS)</u>

Data Sources: The APS is a tool that collects teacher and site administrator self-assessment and perception data that helps to analyze the extent to which it is providing a coherent instructional program to support improved student achievement. The data derived from the APS are intended to be used as a catalyst for conversations about school improvement and to identify specific structures and supports where schools need to invest resources. Survey results may be limited by the experience and/or knowledge of stakeholders using the tool.

Summary:
Essential Program Component 1: Instructional Program
English/language arts (ELA) and Math textbooks and instructional materials and are implemented as designed and are in daily use in all classrooms.
- ELA 86% reported as fully or substantially
- Math 80% reported as fully or substantially
- Comments reflect a use of supplemental materials in order to "meet student's needs"

English-language Development (ELD) instructional materials are implemented as designed and documented to be in daily use with materials for every identified EL.
- 42% reported as partially or minimally
- 58% reported it is fully or substantially.
- Comments indicate wide array of instructional materials used (Rosetta Stone, Longman's Keys to Learning, High Point, Treasures, and teacher created materials).

ELA and Math intensive intervention programs and materials for appropriately identified intensive students are implemented as designed and documented to be in daily use.
- ELA 56% reported partially or minimally
- ELA 44% reported it is fully or substantially
- Math 48% reported as partially or minimally
- 52% reported it is fully or substantially
- Comments indicate that a variety of instructional materials used ELA (Lindamood-Bell Reading Program, High Point, Treasures, and outside reading teachers who provide services for students reading below grade level; Math, teachers indicated that they use teacher created supplemental materials or a GED program.

Essential Program Component 2: Instructional Time
Instructional time for ELA and Math is monitored and given priority and protected from interruptions.
- ELA 77% reported as fully or substantially
- Math 80% reported as fully or substantially
- Comments reflect interruptions such as interruptions from the probation staff and from partner agency. One comment stated interruptions take 25%-75% of the instructional time.

Instructional time for ELD is monitored and given priority and protected from interruptions.
- 62% reported as fully or substantially
- Comments indicate challenges for teachers with a small number of students within one CELDT level and a comment about no ELD curriculum.

Essential Program Component 3: Pacing Guides
A district-instructional/assessment pacing guide for ELA and Math classes is in place in order for all teachers to follow a common sequence of instruction and assessment
- ELA 68% reported as fully or substantially
- Math 61% reported it as fully or substantially
- Algebra 52% reported it as fully or substantially
- Comments included there are JCCS Power Standards and/or the textbook scope and sequence, but not a District wide pacing guide or common assessments that are given. Comments about the use of Algebra pacing guide included those who had used a CAHSEE pacing guide and Power Standards but not a pacing guide specific to Algebra.

Essential Program Component 5: Professional Development for Teachers
The school/district provides instructional assistance and ongoing support to teachers.
- ELA 50% reported as fully or substantially
- Math 47% reported it as fully or substantially
- Comments stated there had not been any professional development in a few years, comments related the lack of professional development to "budget cuts."

Essential Program Component 7: Student Achievement Monitoring System
An ongoing assessment and monitoring system from common assessments are used to inform teachers and principals on student placement, diagnoses, progress, and effectiveness of instruction.
- ELA 68% reported as fully or substantially
- Math 60% reported it as fully or substantially
- Comments indicate that MAP, CAHSEE, CELDT were used as assessments.

Essential Program Component 8: Teacher Collaboration
The school/district facilitates and supports a one-hour structured collaboration meeting per month in order for teachers to analyze, discuss, and utilize the results of the

assessment system to guide student placement, instructional planning and delivery, and progress monitoring within the current adopted ELA/Math programs.

- ELA 57% reported as fully or substantially
- Math 51% reported as fully or substantially
- Comments stated monthly PLC, however, others stated there was not time for collaboration or the conversations were not centered on student achievement.

Questions to Consider:

- What steps need to be taken to ensure all staff are using core adopted materials and are able to support and scaffold instruction so that all students have access to rigorous, grade level content?
- How will you ensure that English learners are receiving ELD instruction that supports their acquisition in English?
- How can the development or revision of pacing guides and course of study support instruction of all students in court, community and independent study classes and provide access to A-G courses?
- How can the professional development and collaboration needs of all staff be addressed through a district wide plan that will support staff in their transition to the common core and 21st Century learning?
- What type of data and monitoring system is needed so that staff can easily monitor student progress and supports student transitions across the district?

English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA)

Data Sources:
English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA)
Data Quest

Summary of DATA:

- The percent of English Learners achieving academic proficiency on the state standardized test has declined from 2009 to 2012 by 5.7% in ELA and 4.2% in math.
- Only 2 out of 65 EL students were proficient on the CAHSEE ELA and mathematics.
- Less than ¼ of EL students (11 students in ELA &14 in math) passed the CAHSEE in ELA and math.
- 960 out of 1154 (83%) of the English Learners attending SDCOE schools have been in U.S. schools for **six years or more**, and close to two-thirds of these students are at the intermediate English fluency level or below.
- Almost all of the remaining English learners (152 students) are students who have been in U.S. schools **3 years or less.**
- Two-thirds of English learners with a prior year fluency of Intermediate failed to advance one level in their language fluency.

Questions to Consider:

- How many of the English learners in U.S. schools 6 years or more have also been in SDCOE schools for more than 2 years? 3 years?

- Of the EL students in U.S. schools 6 years or more:
  - How many are special education students? How English Language Development (ELD) is provided to these EL's who also qualify for special education services?
  - What domain (Listening/Speaking/Reading/Writing) are the students falling behind that we can provide the additional support so the students move forward?
  - Are there any options for offering a different type of ELD for Intermediate student in U.S. schools 6 years or more?
- What formative assessments are available for use on an ongoing basis to monitor the progress of ELs in ELD and content instruction?
- Is there a uniform Reclassification process for EL students attending SDCOE schools?
  If so what are the criteria for Reclassification?
- Are all English Learners made aware of their status in their English Language Development and what they must do to reclassify?

Table (3b) pertains to students Grades 2-11

ELSSA Table 3b: Progress in Achieving Academic Standards-Proficiency in ELA & Math
- From 2009 to 2012 the percent of students scoring proficient or above has declined from 15% to 9.3% in ELA.
- From 2009 to 2012 the percent of students scoring proficient or above has declined from 15% to 9.3% in ELA 15% to 10.8%.
- 960 out of 1154 (83%) of the English Learners attending SDCOE schools have been in U.S. schools for six years or more, and close to two-thirds of these students are at the intermediate English fluency level or below.
- 13% (152 students) of the EL students have been in U.S. schools **3 years or less.**

Table (5a) pertains to students Grades 1-12

California English Language Development Test Results by Prior Performance Level (Data Quest Report)
- Prior Year Level Early Intermediate -**52.7%** (55 students) advanced one or more levels on the CELDT vs. the **68.5%** average for the state.
- Prior Year Level Intermediate -**33.4%** (161 students) advanced one or more levels on the CELDT vs. the **46.2%** average for the state.
- 31.2% (94 students) with prior year level of Early advanced regressed one or more levels on the CELDT.

ELSSA Table 5a AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in language instruction educational programs in U.S. schools?
- 83% (960 students) of the EL students have been in U.S. schools **6 or more years.**

- Of the 960 EL students in U.S. school **6 or more years**, 570 (59%) are at the intermediate level of English fluency or below.
- 13% (152 students) of the EL students have been in U.S. schools **3 years or less.**

Tables (6a – 8a) pertain to students Grades 6-8.

ELSSA Table 6a: How are EL students at the Intermediate level on CELDT performing on the CST (ELA) by grade level?
- Of 30 students 26 are 6th-8th grade students; 23 of the 26 scored below basic to far below basic on the ELA CST and 3 of the 26 scored basic. Zero score proficient or above.

ELSSA Table 6b: Math CST Performance of District EL Students at **Intermediate** Level on CELDT
- Of 28 students 24 are 6th-8th grade students; 6 are FBB; 11 are BB; 5 basic; 2 proficient.

ELSSA Table 7a: How are EL students at the English **Proficient** level on the CELDT performing on the CST (ELA)?
- Of 22 scores 18 are 6th-8th grade students; 1 is FBB; 6 BB; 7 Basic; 3 proficient; 1 Advanced.

ELSSA Table 7b: Math CST Performance of District EL Students at English **Proficient** level on CELDT
- Of 23 students 19 are 6th-8th grade students; 2 FBB; 10 BB; 2 Basic; 3 proficient.

ELSSA Table 8a: Howa re Reclassified-Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students performing on the CST (ELA) by grade level?
- All 22 RFEP students are in grades 6th-8th.
- Almost two-thirds of RFEP students (13) scored basic on the ELA CST.
- 5 of 22 RFEP students scored proficient or higher on the ELA CST.

How are Reclassified-Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students performing on the CST (mathematics) by grade level?
- All 22 RFEP students are in grades 6th-8th.
- 9 of 22 RFEP students scored FBB or BB on the mathematics CST.
- 7 of 22 RFEP students scored basic on the mathematics CST.
- 6 of 22 RFEP students scored proficient or higher on the mathematics CST.
-

Table (9) pertains to students Grade 10.

ELSSA Table 9: How are EL students performing on the CAHSEE according to the length of time they have been in the U.S. schools?
- 3% (2 students) of EL students were **proficient** on both the **ELA** and Math **CAHSEE.**
- 17% (11 students) of EL students passed the **ELA** portion of the **CAHSEE.**

- 23% (14 students) of EL students **passed** the **mathematics** portion of the **CAHSEE.**

ELSSA Table 9: How are RFEP students performing on the CAHSEE according to the length of time they have been in the U.S. schools?
- 22% (6 students) of RFEP students were **proficient** on the ELA portion of **CAHSEE.**
- 16% (4students) of RFEP students were **proficien**t on the **mathematics** portion of **CAHSEE.**
- 59% (16 students) of RFEP students passed the **ELA** portion of the **CAHSEE.**
- 68% (17 students) of RFEP students **passed** the **mathematics** portion of the **CAHSEE.**

Inventory of Services and Supports (ISS) for Students with Disabilities
Data Sources:
1. Inventory of Services and Supports Interview with **Mike Thompson**, JCCS Special Education Coordinator, **Carla Guzman,** South County RSP, **Wendell Callahan**, Director Assessment and Pupil Services, **Sean Morrill**, Senior Director, JCCS Operations
2. Team visits to South, Metro and North Regions
3. Coordinator visit to Special Education Programs: La Mesa Community Schools, McPhatter, Reflections and San Pasqual Academy
4. STAR Assessment Data
5. Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) Report

DAIT Standard 1- Governance
Areas of Strength
- Special Education students are fully included in general education
  - Collaboration teaching model
- Special Education department uses and follows the same mission as the district
- Services are brought into the classroom allowing students to experience full range of education settings
- MAP assessment (pre & post) provides growth data
- IEP review drive fiscal and staffing decisions
- Individualized Transition Plan monitors matriculation of students
Areas for Growth
- Develop a system for monitoring IEPs with attention to:
  - Compliance
  - Goals that correspond to courses
  - Services
- Strengthen the practice of progress report monitoring by coinciding progress report to scheduled report cards
  - Create a system that includes information of progress and ensures efficient student transition to new placement
- Ensure that all IEPs have either site administrator or the administrator designee in attendance (FCMAT)

DAIT Standard 2- Alignment of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
Areas of Strength
- Collaboration between special education and general education administration
- SWDs are offered full continuum of options
- All Special Education students participate in all district and state assessments
- Goals in goal bank are aligned with state standards (including ELD) and CAHSEE
- IEP goals reflect linguistically appropriate

Areas for Growth
- Ensure that IEPs when appropriate include:
  - Goals that address writing
  - The number of minutes of ELD instruction required
  - Individualized Transition Plan
- Develop strategies to increase general education teacher participation in IEP process

DAIT Standard 3- Fiscal Operations
Areas of Strength:
- Increased staff to meet growing student population
  - According to formula
- Increased school psychologist time for each region based on need
- Shared resources with South SELPA and SDUSD services
- Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) with all San Diego County SELPA- including outline of fiscal responsibility
- Fiscal monitoring of program needs with use of SEIS and PROMIS

Areas for Growth:
- Continue monitoring case loads to ensure staffing ratio meets the needs of students and is cost efficient (FCMAT)

DAIT Standard 4- Parent and Community Involvement
Areas of Strength:
- Parent involvement w/in IEP meetings
- Parent Brochure reflect services for special education students
- Parent Survey informs professional development for teachers
- IEP due diligence is practiced via:
  - Parent-team conference (phone or skype)
  - Interpreters
  - Flexibility of times and date
  - Flexibility of meeting locations

Areas for Growth
- Increased parent attendance at all IEP meetings

DAIT Standard 5- Human Resources
Areas of Strength
- Para-professional recruited and matriculated to teacher positions
- High teacher and para-educator retention, including all other staff members

- Good connection with local university which allows for student teachers in general education and special education at all times
- System for alignment of credential and student population- Special Education collaborate with Human Resources

Areas for Growth
- ❖ No areas for growth identified during the interview

DAIT Standard 6- Data Systems and Achievement Monitoring
Areas of Strength
- Collaboration/Consultation between General Education and special education
- Increased High School graduation rate for Special Education students from 2011 to 2012
- JCCS inclusive settings model provide peer models that have supported expectations for SWDs for:
  - o Academics
  - o Behavior
  - o Social Skills
- IEP at a glance provides general education teachers information in Math, ELD, and behavior information

Areas for Growth
- District-wide formative assessment for ELA and Math to guide instructional planning
- Monitor collaboration to ensure consistency throughout district

DAIT Standard 7- Professional Development
Areas of Strength
- Coordinator of Special Education receives coaching support from the Senior Director for providing overview of programs and services.
- Leadership meeting twice per month for all administrators
- Special Education and General Education administrators meet once per month to discuss students, staff and programs
- BEST Behavior Program at two sites
- General Education and Special Education collaboration
- SANDCASE, Professional Network for Special Education Administrators

Areas for Growth
- Build staff awareness and understanding for:
  - o Vocational courses
  - o Current resources to support students in transition
- Professional Development for teachers and support staff to support transition to Common Core State Standards and 21st Century Learning
- Expand professional development and coaching for site and district administrators to effectively lead and support instruction and services for students with disabilities.

Questions to Consider:
- How does Education Specialist provide guidance or direct teacher assistants in supporting special education students?
- Do teacher assistants participate in any professional development geared in supporting SWDs?
- How do Special Education teachers, General Education teachers and administrators monitor each student's instructional levels to inform daily instruction and or assist in the transition of students from one site, program or district to another?
- What percentage of time do students receive whole group direct teaching and/or modeling of concepts in core content areas?
- What process do schools follow to identify students for intervention?
- Is RtI^2 for academics implemented in any of the schools and/or programs?
  - If so, what impact is it having on student achievement?
- How are SAI hours of service provided for SWD in inclusive settings?
- What academic content areas do SAI hours provide support for?

Slice Visits

Data Sources: Slice Visits to SDCOE North, Metro, Mesa and South Regions North County Tech, Escondido Community, Breaking Cycles, San Pasqual, Sarah Anthony, Sierra Vista, McPhatter, Lindsay Daycare and Independent Study, South Bay Tech, National City, South Bay YMCA, Monarch. These visits were conducted at Court Schools, Community Schools, and Independent Study Programs from the different regions. Classroom observations and principal and teacher interviews were conducted as part of the process.

Summary of Data:
- Students were at secondary level, grades 6-12, with the exception of students at Monarch K-5 and one classroom of males at Sarah Anthony Court School.
- Technology is evident throughout all regions; used in whole group instruction via SMART boards, individual student use for class assignments and independent study work.
- Students were observed working on independent work packets in a number of classrooms; some settings included all students working independently either in packets or on computer, others were classrooms that had whole class direct instruction with several students working independently on their own assignment at the same time.
- Students were reading, discussing or responding to novels read in several classrooms.
- Evidence of students participating in CAHSEE prep, credit recovery and GED completion in all regions.
- JCCS standards were posted in many classrooms and a common vocabulary development curriculum was evident.
- Opportunities and staff resources to support students in transitioning after high school were available.
- The BEST behavior model has been implemented at some sites, and there has been a decrease in student referrals.

- Respectful and positive adult/student interactions were frequently observed.
- Substitute teachers were present in all regions and there appeared to be less planned, rigorous instruction occurring at the time of observation.
- In some classrooms the tasks students were completing involved copying the notes or steps to solve a mathematical equation from a teacher model.
- In some classrooms there was no evidence of teaching and learning at the time of the visit, students were sitting or talking with peers, teacher was socializing with students or other adults.
- When interviewed, students frequently shared their feeling of success with being in school and completing their work.

Questions to Consider:
- What system is in place for administrators to monitor instruction and provide feedback to teachers?
- How does the district manage student data, across schools, programs, and county districts?
- Does every teacher provide an effective, high quality, rigorous instructional program that meets the needs of all students?
    - If not, what supports are in place for teachers to improve?
- What support and training do teachers receive to help them differentiate instruction while keeping focused on rigorous, grade-level standards?
- Does every teacher's instructional practice ensure that all students meet or exceed grade level requirements?
- How are site substitutes provided opportunity for professional learning that builds understanding of content and pedagogy?
- How does the principal effectively build capacity among staff through targeted ongoing professional development, monitoring and feedback to teachers?
    - To what degree does professional development and feedback support teachers in building content knowledge as well as pedagogy?
    - What kind of guidance have teachers received to promote high-quality PLCs? To what degree are PLC conversations focused on teaching and student learning?
- What assessments are being used for placement, progress monitoring, course credit, etc.? How are teachers and students using assessment data to monitor growth and inform instruction?
- Is there an instructional plan or focus for the day care?
- How do the credit(s) students earn through JCCS Community School programs (including Independent Study) transfer when students return to regular district schools, especially in terms of graduation requirements and A-G?
- What benefits would become available for students if schools would be able to offer courses that meet A-G requirements?
- Would a focus on improving instructional strategies help to remediate the behavioral issues staff face?
- When student interventions are provided by outside agencies, how is progress monitored and communicated to staff and parents?

- How are support staff and teachers organized to maximize and support learning of all students?
- Is there an instructional model that is used to teach, monitor and ensure understanding?
- How can you build a sense of urgency and collective responsibility for all students to ensure no loss of learning time within each day, includes rigorous daily instruction and prepares students to successfully transition to college and the world or work?

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Summary: SDCOE DAIT and SDCOE district staff reviewed state assessment and accountability data trends to provide a baseline understanding of student academic performance in English language arts and mathematics.

Areas of Success
- The district made API growth from 2011 to 2012 after two years of declines. The English Learner student group showed API growth for three consecutive years.
- From 2010 to 2012, the percentage of JCCS Community School students scoring below and far below basic on the California Standards Test in English Language Arts decreased by 6% and the percentage of Court School students below and far below basic decreased by 7%.
- The California High School Exit Exam passing rate for grades 11-12 students increased in both ELA (+3%) and Math (+8%) from 2011 to 2012.
- The total number of JCCS students completing high school via a regular diploma or a GED increased from 444 in 2007-08 to 547 in 2011-12. The proportion of students receiving a regular diploma v. a GED has also increased, from 50% in 2007-08 to 60% in 2011-12.
- In nearly all grades, 7-12, average RIT scores on the Measures of Academic Progress increased from Fall 2011 to Spring 2012 for matched cohorts of students.

Areas of Growth
- Very low percentages of JCCS students score proficient or above on the CST in English Language Arts. In Spring 2012, 22% of San Pasqual students, 19% of Monarch students, 10% of Court School students, and 7% of Community School students reached the proficient level or above.
- Few grades 8-11 students in county-run programs take or demonstrate proficiency in Math courses beyond Algebra 1. In Spring 2012, out of 664 students in grades 8-11 with CST Math scores, 448 (67%) took the General Math test, 136 (20%) took the Algebra 1 test, 51 (8%) took the Geometry test, and 9 (1%) took the Algebra II test. Across all math tests at grades 8-11, fewer than 10% of the students scored proficient or above.
- After an increase from 2010 to 2011, the percentage of tenth graders passing the CAHSEE declined in 2012 to 45% in ELA (-10%) and 49% in Mathematics (-6%).

- Based on Spring 2012 results from the MAP assessments, the average scores for JCCS students in grades 7-12 are four to six years below grade level when compared to national norms. In both Reading and Mathematics, JCCS seventh and eighth grade students scored at about the national average for third to fourth grade; JCCS ninth and tenth grade students were at about the fourth grade level; and JCCS eleventh and twelfth grade students scored at about the fifth grade national norm.