

Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The SWP plan is developed based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that takes into account information on the academic achievement of children in relation to the challenging State academic standards, particularly the needs of those children who are failing, or are at-risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards and any other factors as determined by the local educational agency. [ESSA section 1114(b)(6)]

LEA/School GOAL 1: POWERFUL ACADEMIC OUTCOMES: FUSD will ensure that every student will be engaged in a high-quality educational program that focuses on raising the overall academic achievement and college/career readiness for all students.			
School Metrics/Indicators	Previous Year Outcome	Current Outcomes	Future Expected Outcomes
Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA (ALL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 63.9 (2021-2022)	-40.3	-37.3
Smarter Balanced Assessment Math (ALL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 91.9 (2021-2022)	-74.5	-71.5
Fall MAP Growth Reading (ALL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN)	KN: -3.1 1st: -9.6 2nd: -12.8 3rd: -12.1 4th: -13.1 5th: -10.6 6th: -5.9	KN: -1.1 1st: -7.2 2nd: -11.0 3rd: -11.3 4th: -7.1 5th: -11.9 6th: -7.1	KN: -0.6 1st: -6.7 2nd: -10.5 3rd: -10.8 4th: -6.6 5th: -11.4 6th: -6.6
Fall MAP Growth Math (ALL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN)	KN: -4.5 1st: -9.2 2nd: -14.5 3rd: -13.5 4th: -14.9 5th: -14.1 6th: -9.4	KN: -0.4 1st: -6.3 2nd: -10.8 3rd: -13.0 4th: -8.7 5th: -15.1 6th: -12.3	KN: 0.1 1st: -5.8 2nd: -10.3 3rd: -12.5 4th: -8.2 5th: -14.6 6th: -11.8
MAP Growth Reading (ALL): Average Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI)	-0.06	0.09	>= 0

CAASPP Data Analysis – ALL Students

- For both students with Disabilities, English Learners, and Homeless, Listening was the greatest area of strength in ELA. English Learners had 7% above standard and 93% near standard, while Students with Disabilities had 5% above standard and 69% near standard, and Homeless had 3% above standard and 97% near standard.
- Because English Learners and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged make up the majority of our student population, their area of strength in ELA was consistent with our schoolwide group (Research/Inquiry).
- In Math, most student groups mirrored our Schoolwide group with Communicating Reasoning as the strength. However, for Students with Disabilities, Problem Solving, Modeling, & Data Analysis was the strength.

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):

School

- For ELA, our biggest area of growth is Writing, where we had 35% of students below standard.
- For Math, our biggest area of growth is Concepts & Procedures: 53% of students were below standard in this area.

Grade Levels

- For all grade levels, Writing was the biggest area of growth in ELA. Although each grade levels made gains over the prior year, it remains the area with the greatest percentage of students below standard.
- In the area of Math, 3rd, 4th, and 6th grades had a difference of only 1% in the amount of students below standard in the areas of Concepts & Procedures and Problem Solving, Modeling, & Data Analysis. However, for 5th graders, 70% of students were below standard in Concepts & Procedures whereas 50% were below standard in Problem Solving, Modeling, and Data Analysis.

Student Groups

- For all student groups, Writing was the biggest area of growth in ELA, just as it was schoolwide.
- Concepts & Procedures was the biggest area of growth in Math for all student groups except for Homeless, which had Problem Solving, Modeling, & Data Analysis as the biggest area of growth.

List Student Groups in Need of Targeted Sup Sup Sup Sup2CC 10 Gunps2CC 1per-1(t) Sup2CC 1mio Ston Neeur bie(n)1-soups ie

MAP Data Analysis – ALL Students

- Nearly 70% of students are scoring below average (bottom two performance bands below the 41st percentile) in math.
- Nearly 60% of students are scoring below average (bottom two performance bands below the 41st percentile) in reading.
- Schoolwide, 28% of students are projected to score Standard Met/Exceeded in reading on CAASPP, while only 16% of students are projected to score standard Met/Exceeded in math.

Grade Levels

- Kindergarten has the highest percentage of students scoring in the top two performance bands (above the 60th percentile) in math, while fourth graders have the highest percentage in reading.
- Kindergarten students are closest to the norm in both reading and math.
- In Reading, the biggest decrease in distance from the norm is reflected in 1st grade scores, indicating that the largest drop occurs in kindergarten.
- In Math, the biggest decrease in distance from the norm is reflected in 5th grade scores, indicating that the largest drop occurs in 4th grade.
- In Reading, 2nd grade has the highest percentage of students performing below the 21st percentile.
-

Grade Levels

- Every grade level made one year's growth in reading, except for Kindergarten. 3rd grade made accelerated growth, and 5th grade came close to making accelerated growth.
- Every grade level except kindergarten and 1st grade made one year's growth in math. 3rd grade again made accelerated growth, and 5th grade again came close to making accelerated growth. Kindergarten made less than a year's expected growth.
- Based on the Conditional Growth Index, the least growth occurred in kindergarten for both reading and math, and the most growth was made by 3rd grade students.
- Only 18% of kindergarten students met/exceeded their projected growth, whereas nearly 2/3 of students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade met/exceeded their projected growth in reading, and 2nd, 3rd, 5th, and 6th grade met/exceeded their projected growth in math.

Student Groups

- Based on the Conditional Growth Index, our All Students, Hispanic, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, and English Learners made expected growth in reading and math. Our Students with Disabilities made expected growth in math, but not reading.
- The same percentage of English Learners as All Students met/exceeded their projected growth in both reading and math.
- About the same percentage of Students with Disabilities as All Students met/exceeded their projected growth in math. However, fewer met/exceeded their projected growth in reading.

Identified Areas of Strength:

MAP Data Analysis – ALL Students

CA Dashboard Analysis (Academic Indicator) - ALL Students

English Language Arts Performance (Status AND Change)

List Student Groups in Need of Targeted Support (underperforming compared to the ALL-Student group)

- None of our Student Groups scored in the Red, meaning none require Targeted Support.
- However, we will want to keep an eye on our Students With Disabilities; they scored in the Very Low range in both ELA and Math. We need to ensure they grow by at least 3 points to remain Orange. If we continue to Increase Significantly and ensure our participation rate is at or above 95%,(n)-1n above

1D - AVID Fall and Winter Assessment data shows that over 90% of our students regularly implementing most elements of our organization strategies. 96% of our teachers are AVID trained.

2024-25 Evidence-based Actions/Services	Metric(s) for evaluating Action/Service	Pupils to be served	Person(s) Responsible	2024-25 Estimated Cost	
				Title 1	SUPC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> materials sensory tools 		Students with Disabilities			
1F - Implement Social Emotional Learning curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online instructional subscriptions, licenses, and software 	Second Steps Lesson Completion Report Panorama SEL Survey	All Students, Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, English Learners, & Students with Disabilities	Administrators, Teachers	0	

2024-25 Evidence-based Actions/Services			Metric(s) for evaluating Action/Service	Pupils to be served	Person(s) Responsible	2024-25 Estimated Cost	
						Title 1	SUPC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classified hourly Instructional Materials Organizational Materials 				Learners, & Students with Disabilities			
	113,079	30,615					

Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The SWP plan is developed based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that takes into account information on the academic achievement

LEA/School GOAL 1a Academic Needs of ELs:

English Learners will demonstrate improved academic growth and achievement in Reading and Math through teachers collaborating with TOA around integrated EL strategies into their ELA and Math instruction.

CAASPP Data Analysis – EL Students

- In ELA, the greatest area of growth was Writing; 50% of English Learners were below standard here.
- In Math, the greatest area of growth was Concepts & Procedures, with 68% of students below standard.

MAP Data Analysis – EL Students

How does the EL Student Group achievement compare to the ALL-Student Group?

- 60% of English Learners are in the lowest achievement band for math, compared to 44% of All Students.
- 59% of English Learners are in the lowest achievement band for reading, compared to 40% of All Students.
- Only 9% of English Learners are projected to score Standard Met/Exceeded in ELA compared to 28% schoolwide.
- Only 7% of English Learners are projected to score Standard Met/Exceeded in math compared to 16% schoolwide.

How does the EL Student Group growth compare to the ALL-Student Group?

- In reading and math, English Learners had a slightly higher average conditional growth index than All Students, thus narrowing the achievement gap.

Identified Areas of Strength:

- The Literary Text goal area is a relative strength for English Learners in reading.
- Geometry is a relative strength for English learners in math.

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):

- Vocabulary is the greatest area of need in reading for English Learners.
- Measurement and Data is the greatest area of need in math for English Learners.

CA Dashboard Analysis (Academic Indicator) – EL Students

How does the EL Student Group achievement compare to the All-Student Group?

- Like our All Student group, our English Learners scored in the Low area. However, English Learners scored 22.6 points lower.
- However, unlike our All Student group, which was considered to have Increased Significantly, by growing over 15 points, our English Learners only grew by 13.8 points. While this was considered to have Increased, it missed the cutoff for Increasing Significantly.

CA Dashboard Analysis (Academic Indicator) – EL Students

How does the EL Student Group growth compare to the All-Student Group?

- Both our All Students and English Learners scored Low in Math. Our English Learners scored 23.3 points lower.
- As with ELA, while our All Students Increased Significantly in Math, our English Learners did not. They did, however, grow by 10.9 points.

Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services

Description of Site-Specific Data Collected for Progress-Monitoring

PLC Minutes, iReady

Identified Areas of Strength:

PLC Minutes show that the English Learner TOA worked with our 3rd and 6th grade teams and helped them with their planning.

Our iReady data shows that English Learners in all grades except 4th exceeded midyear reading growth targets. 3rd grade and 6th grade in particular had over 100% of their students exceed these targets. In math, Kinder, 2nd grade, 3rd grade, and 6th grade all met or exceeded their midyear Reading growth targets. Again, 3rd grade and 6th grade had the highest percentage of their kids meet these targets.

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):

PLC Minutes showed that the English Learner TOA was unable to work with Kinder, 1st grade, 4th grade, or 5th grade. She was only available on our campus on Mondays, and these grade levels collaborated on Tuesday and Thursdays.

Based on iReady mid-year assessment data, 4th grade only had about 32% of their kids meet mid-year growth targets in reading. In math, 1st grade, 4th grade, and 5th grade also fell short of their mid-year growth targets.

Based on qualitative and quantitative data analysis, identified needs, and student groups listed for targeted support, what strategies will be used to meet this goal?

1. Provide coaching during PLCs around integrating EL strategies

2024-25 Evidence-based Actions/Services	Metric(s) for evaluating Action/Service	Pupils to be served	Person(s) Responsible	2024-25 Estimated Cost	
				Title 1	SUPC
1aA - Provide time for EL TOA to collaborate in PLCs to improve instruction	Teacher Surveys	English Learners	Administrator, EL TOA, Teachers	0	0

CAASPP Data Analysis – 3rd Grade ELA

Growth Trends

Identified Areas of Strength:

- For our 3rd graders, the greatest area of strength was Listening. While it only had 8% above standard, it had the least amount of students below standard (13%).

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):

- The greatest area of growth for our 3rd graders was Writing. Ironically it had the highest percentage of students above standard (16%), but it also had the highest percentage of students below standard (33%).

MAP Data Analysis – Kinder through 3rd Grade Reading

Achievement Trends:

- Kindergarten has the highest percentage of students in the HiAvg and Hi achievement bands, while grade 2 has the highest percentage of students in the LoAvg and Lo bands.
- The average score is furthest from the norm in 3rd grade and closest to the norm in kindergarten.
- The distance from the norm increases as the grade level increases.

Growth Trends:

- Based on conditional growth index, 1st and 2nd grade made expected growth in reading, 3rd grade made accelerated growth, and kindergarten made significantly less than expected growth on average.
- Average growth for kindergarten was around the 25th percentile, while grades 1-3 had around the 50th percentile or higher on average.

Identified Areas of Strength:

- Language and Writing is a relative strength for kindergarten.
- Literature and Informational is a relative strength for 1st grade.
-

Programs Included in this Plan

Federal Programs		Allocation
X	Title I, Part A: Allocation Purpose: To provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.	\$113,079
	Title I, Part A: Carryover	
X	Title I, Part A: Parent and Family Engagement Purpose: Ensure that parents have information they need to make well-informed choices for their children, more effectively share responsibility with their children's schools, and help schools develop effective and successful academic programs (this is a reservation from the total Title I, Part A allocation).	\$3,567
X	Supplemental Concentration (SUPC) Allocation Purpose: To increase and/or improve services for English Learners, Foster Youth, and pupils meeting income requirements to receive a free or reduced-price meal (FRPM)	\$30,615
	SUPC Carryover	
Total amount of state and federal funds allocated to this school		143,694
Total amount of state funds spent (SUPC)		30,615
Total amount of federal funds spent (Title I)		113,079
Total amount of state and federal funds spent		143,694
Balance		0