

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

Directions: Using the template, provide information requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow space needed for narrative responses under each item. All Title III LEAs in Years 2, 4, or 4+ must submit a copy of this Needs Assessment with the submission of the LEA Plan Goal 2 Update that includes the appropriate sections of the Improvement Plan Addendum (IPA).

Cover Sheet for Needs Assessment

Date submitted: June 17, 2016	Date Reviewed:
Name of COE Lead: Antonio Mora	Title III Status: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y2 <input type="checkbox"/> Y4 <input type="checkbox"/> Y4+

Part A: Initial LEA, student demographics, and Title III contact information

Name of LEA Lead: Lauren H. Ramers	Contact Person: Lauren H. Ramers
LEA (or Consortium Lead) CDS Code: 37683386061964	Telephone: 619-261-3009
Region #: 9	E-mail: lauren.ramers@ofarrellschool.org
Grade Span of LEA: TK-12	Program Improvement (PI): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Number of Students Enrolled in LEA: 1521	If YES, number of years in PI: 2
Number of EL Students: 331	Consortium: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Title III LEP Funding Amount: \$33,353.00	If YES, list the consortium members and CDS Codes for each:
Number of Immigrant Students: 17	
Immigrant Funding Amount: \$1181.00	

Part B: Student Achievement Accountability History (as applicable)

Check AMAO(s) failed in 2011-12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 1: < 5 yrs. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 3 – ELA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 3 – Math
Check AMAO(s) failed in 2012-13	X AMAO 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 1: < 5 yrs. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs.	X AMAO 3 – ELA X AMAO 3 – Math
Check AMAO(s) failed in 2013-14	X AMAO 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 1: < 5 yrs. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs.	X AMAO 3 – ELA* X AMAO 3 – Math* *HS only
Check AMAO(s) failed in 2014- 15	X AMAO 1	<input type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 1: < 5 yrs. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMAO 2 – Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs.	X AMAO 3 – CAASP Participation Rate N/A AMAO 3 – Grad. Rate* *HS only

Needs Assessment Template

1. Identify and describe those key factors of the instructional program that prevented the LEA from meeting Title III AMAOs.

- a. Describe findings from student data analyses of the CELDT, CAASPP results and participation rates, attendance rates, graduation rates (as applicable), state data tools (e.g., ELSSA), and other assessments used by the LEA (e.g. benchmark assessments, curriculum embedded assessments, LCAP Metrics) to measure EL student English proficiency, academic achievement in English language arts and mathematics, and findings derived from other data analyses as they relate to the AMAOs.

O'Farrell is currently 1.7% points shy of meeting AMAO 1 target and .5% away from meeting the AMAO 2 target for students who have been in US schools more than 5 years. We got much closer to our target for AMAO 2 this year for this sub-group.

Data from the CELDT, CAASPP, and CSTs and onsite benchmarks reveal that EL students require targeted instruction in reading, particularly with word analysis, fluency and vocabulary, and comprehension. Second to reading, students need help with written conventions and grammar.

65 of our EL students also receive special education services.

After reviewing the evidence collected through CELDT score reports, test administrator feedback, EL student interviews, teacher interviews, and program evaluation, we identify the key factors that contribute to The O'Farrell Charter School from meeting the Title III AMAOs. They include:

- Student lack of stamina for longer reading and listening comprehension passages leads to more random selection of answers (guessing)
- Inconsistent implementation of academic language in all core classes and a lack of focus on structured oral responses

- Inadequate accountability for professional learning provided on CELDT specific skills and SDAIE strategies
- Lack of instructional program for long-term ELs and intermediate to early advanced (largest group) of ELs to help boost their language proficiency.

CELDT

CELDT scores indicate that the majority of English Language Learners at O’Farrell are Intermediate with the second largest cohort in the Early Advanced. Historically, our students have landed within the Intermediate-Early Advanced range since 2010. Our total population of incoming ELL students has increased significantly in recent years.

	Beginner	Early Inter.	Intermediate	Early Adv.	Advanced
2010	14	14	66	72	11
2011	9	15	79	55	10
2012	10	32	120	43	8
2013	17	36	115	100	27
2014	10	29	115	105	28
2015	7	33		119	

			120		52
--	--	--	-----	--	----

Overall, students scored the lowest on the reading section of the test followed by grammar involved in the writing portion. They are able to understand more concrete details and overarching abstract concepts when the instruction is delivered with accommodations. They are communicating with ease more frequently but they are still making errors in communication that shows up in their writing.

Annual progress in CELDT scores for students that have been in US schools more than 5 years is the remaining area that O'Farrell has yet to meet. One of the key factors of the instructional program that have prevented O'Farrell from meeting Title III AMAOs is the lack of emphasis by the administration, teachers and subsequently, students on the importance of CELDT. In addition, the start of the year instruction has been focused on warming students up after a summer off from school instead of direct instruction geared at the CELDT. Older, more advanced students are demonstrating more apathy while taking the CELDT.

CELDT test administrators report that while students quickly and successfully address the short reading comprehension passages, they show signs of fatigue once they face the longer reading passages. This has a direct impact on their reading comprehension scores.

CAASPP

140 EL students took the CAASPP in 2014-2015 to establish a baseline for performance. Nearly 2/3 of our population are not meeting standard on the CAASPP.

	English	Math
Standards Exceeded and Math	21 (15%)	24 (17%)
Standards Nearly Met	37 (26%)	38 (27%)
Standards Not Met	87 (62%)	82 (59%)

Data from these assessments, and other onsite benchmarks, indicate that performance challenges for O'Farrell's English Language Learners are in the areas of vocabulary acquisition and usage as well as comprehension and academic writing.

b. Describe findings from EL program design and implementation analyses of the strengths and weaknesses in the program related to the AMAOs in the current LEA Plan Goal 2, the prior Year 2 Title III IPA (as applicable), and any other appropriate documents (e.g. the LEA’s EL Master Plan). The program dimensions listed below are areas of implementation to consider in reviewing current plans.

Area of Implementation	Evidence Reviewed	Findings: Strengths & Weaknesses	Next Steps
Instructional Program Design for English learners (including language programs)	Differentiated Instruction within inclusive classrooms Club del Sol (after school) Paraprofessionals	See below	Implement an ELD elective and select a program Strategic placement of paraprofessionals Review and Refine after school program (Club del Sol) Summer Program for EL students
Implementation of Instructional Services and Methods (including language programs)	Rosetta Stone SDAIE strategies Academic Language use IXL – math ST Math Reading A-Z Accelerated Reader	See below	Reading Plus in middle school Continue with Accelerated Reader in elementary Illuminate for data tracking Critical Reading strategies and other effective research-based techniques English/History collaboration for reading/writing standards
Professional Learning	Academic Discourse Differentiated Instruction Formative Assessment Illuminate training for data collection and analysis in PLC	See below	In-house monthly professional learning Reach out to county office for more opportunities Provide PL to paraprofessionals Training on CELDT indicators and levels
Parent and Community Participation	ELAC meeting agendas Parent feedback	See below	Create robust ELAC meeting agendas to include professional learning Expand parent education classes

			provided in Spanish
Services for Immigrant Students (if LEA receives Title III Immigrant Funds)	Assessment data Power School grades	See below	Targeted push-in support ELD course More robust data-tracking for immigrant students Increase awareness among staff and parents

Instructional Program Design for English learners

Strengths:

Middle/Elementary: Students experience 30-minute skills classes four times per week. Students are grouped homogeneously and instruction is targeted to meet specific academic deficiencies according to assessment data. In middle school, students are grouped in Language Arts classes such that content is tiered according to students' ability levels as demonstrated through annual reading assessments. In elementary school, students are assessed every six weeks and grouped

by reading level for targeted small-group instruction. O'Farrell enrolls students who score level one – three on the annual CELDT assessment in an afterschool academic support class (Club Del Sol). In this class, ELL paraprofessionals assist students with class assignments and work on fundamental mathematics and English skills. Students testing at CELDT level one use the online program Rosetta Stone to work on speaking, reading, and writing in English.

High: Students receive support from paraprofessionals within core classes.

Weaknesses:

O'Farrell has used various curricula to meet the needs of students and has changed the curriculum since the implementation of skills classes in 2009. The current curriculum may not be meeting the needs of all English Language Learners. In addition, none of the classes they are taking address specific language objectives. Therefore, we need to consider additional support we provide students in levels one through three, including the addition of an ELD course using curriculum such as 3D by Scholastic.

Implementation of Instructional Services and Methods (Goal 2A, 2B, 2C ELA, and 2C MATHEMATICS)

Strengths: Instruction is delivered by highly qualified, credentialed teachers in all classes and content areas. English Language Learners in need of additional support, as measured through annual CELDT tests and other school assessments, are supported by ELL paraprofessionals inside the classroom. All teachers have been trained in Advanced SDAIE techniques and use them in class. Techniques are discussed, presented, and practiced during weekly staff professional development meetings and in weekly department chair meetings.

Weaknesses:

While the ELL students most at risk receive additional push-in services from ELL aides, not all ELL students receive this support.

Professional Development (Goal 2D)

Strengths: Staff-wide professional learning is provided in-house once a month, four days before the start of school, and one full day at the end of the first semester. In weekly professional learning sessions, teachers are presented with a “strategy of the month.” They learn a specific teaching technique or pedagogical approach, implement it in their classrooms, and then bring evidence showcasing their use of the strategy back to their teams of implementation. Discussions are held on modifications, differentiation, and methods of implementation of the technique. Monthly leadership professional learning is provided for all department chairs in their content areas, and for other teachers as needed and as determined by the Principals and the Academic Coach.

Weaknesses: Reports from teachers indicate that accountability for implementation of strategies taught and learned during Strategy of the Month is not as strong as it could be.

Parent and Community Participation (Goal 2E)

Strengths: Parent participation is encouraged through participation in O’Farrell’s ELAC and PTO (Parent Teacher Organization). The ELAC team meets once every other month and the PTO team meets every month. ELL paraprofessionals call the parents of English Language Learners to personally invite them to ELAC meetings.

Weaknesses:

On average, approximately ten to twenty parents of ELL students attend ELAC meetings. Parent

participation could be higher. Agendas could include professional learning.

Parental Notification (Goal 2F)

Strengths: O'Farrell sends out parental notification of its program improvement status each year in English and Spanish. Notices are also made available on the school's website and updated as needed.

Weaknesses: Notices are not translated for the other languages spoken by our families at The O'Farrell Charter School, such as Tagalog. A translation service is currently being considered.

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

Strengths: none

Weaknesses: Need a more targeted program for immigrant students; more professional learning for paraprofessionals; progress monitoring

Title III LEA Plan Performance Goal 2

All limited English Learner (EL) students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

CDS Code: 37683386061964

LEA Name: The O'Farrell Charter School

Title III Improvement Status: Year 2

Fiscal Year: 2016-2017

EL Amount Eligibility: \$33,353

Immigrant Amount Eligibility: \$1,181

Plan to Provide Services for English Learner Students

Please summarize information from district-operated programs and provide descriptions of how the LEA is meeting or plans to meet each requirement.

How the LEA will:

A. Required Content	Implement programs and activities in accordance with Title III
	Use the subgrant funds to meet all accountability measures

	Hold the school sites accountable
	Promote parental and community participation in programs for ELs

How the LEA will:		Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost
B. Required Content	Provide high quality language instruction			
	Provide high quality professional development			
C. Required for Year 2	Goal 2 Improvement Plan Addendum* (IPA) for items A-B: **See chart below Please describe the factors contributing to failure to meet desired accountability measures. **See chart below			
D. Required for Year 4	Goal 2 IPA* for items A-B: See chart below Please describe the factors contributing to failure to meet desired accountability measures.			
	Please describe all required modifications to curriculum, program, and method of instruction.			

*Please ensure the Needs Assessment is submitted if LEA is in improvement status Year 2 or beyond.

Required for Year 2	<p>**Goal 2 Improvement Plan Addendum* (IPA) for items A-B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addition of a summer ELL Camp designed to improve CELDT scores• Creation of ELD Elective course• Additional professional learning for staff, including paraprofessionals• Revise and refine afterschool program for ELLs <p>**Please describe the factors contributing to failure to meet desired accountability measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decreased student motivation to pass CELDT test• Student fatigue in reading comprehension sections of assessments• No ELD course offering in master schedule
------------------------	--

LEAs receiving or planning to receive Title III EL funding may include allowable activities.		Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
E. Allowable Activities	<p>Describe all allowable activities chosen by LEA relating to: Supplementary services as part of the language instruction program for EL students</p> <p>*Please see http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/ELprogrview.asp for a list of allowable EL activities</p>				
F. EL Overall Budget		EL 2% for Administrative/Indirect Costs:			
		EL Estimated Costs Total:			

Plan to Provide Services for Immigrant Students

Please complete this table <u>IF</u> the LEA is receiving or planning to receive Title III Immigrant funding.		Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
G. Allowable Activities	<p>Describe all allowable activities chosen by LEA relating to: Enhanced instructional opportunities to immigrant students and their families</p> <p>*Please see http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/immprogrview.asp for a list of allowable Immigrant activities</p>				
		Immigrant Administrative/Indirect Costs:			

H. Immigrant Overall Budget	Immigrant Estimated Costs Total:	
------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--

3