

## **The Single Plan for Student Achievement**

School: Canyon Crest Academy  
District: San Dieguito Union High  
School District  
County-District School  
(CDS) Code): 37-68346-0106328  
Principal: Brett Killeen  
Date of this revision: September 28, 2016

The Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person: Brett Killeen  
Position: Principal  
Telephone Number: 858 350 0253  
Address: 5951 Village Center Loop Rd  
San Diego, CA 92130  
E-mail Address: [brett.killeen@sduhsd.net](mailto:brett.killeen@sduhsd.net)

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan on: January 19, 2017

## A. School Site Information Canyon Crest Academy

### **Vision Statement:**

Canyon Crest Academy (CCA) is a learning community based on the values of shared responsibility and mutual respect among teachers, staff, parents and students. Canyon Crest Academy commits to providing positive, meaningful and rigorous learning experiences that promote the intellectual, social, physical and creative development of all students. The curriculum responds to evolving student interests and includes specialized and in-depth studies. Students are supported in taking intellectual and creative risks as they engage in their studies. Canyon Crest Academy honors diversity of thought and culture, while being united in its mission. Graduates of Canyon Crest Academy experience a personal connection to the curriculum that enables them to be confident, life-long learners.

### **Mission Statement:**

Canyon Crest Academy, a professional learning community, challenges and inspires students to discover their passions and pursue their goals throughout high school and beyond.

### **School Profile:** (include site demographics, remedial and advanced course enrollments, local measures of performance, special programs)

Canyon Crest Academy (CCA) is a comprehensive high school in its thirteenth year of operation. It is the newest high school to be added to the San Dieguito Union High School District (SDUHSD). CCA offers a full range of Advanced Placement (AP) and honors courses similar to those courses offered at the other high schools in the San Dieguito District. CCA offers all California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) sports with the exception of football. CCA features a California Department of Education, Specialized Secondary Program called Envision that focuses on arts and technology in the arts. CCA also offers a specialized program in science and math called Quest and a specialized program in Engineering utilizing Project Lead the Way, Inc. CCA is on a 4 by 4 schedule that currently includes grades nine through twelve. It is a school of choice available to all ninth through twelfth graders in the SDUHSD district. With a current enrollment of approximately 2250 students, Canyon Crest Academy has quickly grown from the 350 student enrollment that attended the first year beginning on August 30, 2004.

CCA is one of two schools in the district who implement the 4x4 schedule. This schedule is designed to enhance student learning and create more elective opportunities. Students take four classes that meet ninety minutes every day for one half of the school year. Another four classes are then taken during the second half of the school year. At the end of a complete school year students have had the opportunity to have taken a total of eight classes as opposed to the typical six found in schools with block scheduling. These extra two classes allow students the flexibility to take classes that best meet their academic and career goals. Students have the opportunity to take all necessary courses for entrance into University of California, California State University and private post-secondary institutions, while still having room in their schedules to pursue expanded elective opportunities. Students have opportunities to pace curriculum in a more individualized fashion.

One of the unique founding philosophies of CCA is that of collaboration. This philosophy is recognized in our mission and vision statements. CCA supports this philosophy through our staff recruitment process which includes, for all interviewees, questions regarding their experience with collaboration, and their willingness to participate as a team member. The yearly schedule is designed to support staff collaboration. Staff collaboration time is set aside on a majority of Wednesdays each semester. On these Wednesdays students begin school ninety minutes later than a normal school day. Staff use this time to develop curriculum, review student achievement data and results, discuss ways to shape school culture and devise student support systems.

Canyon Crest Academy has a technology rich environment. The new facility infrastructure is designed to support state of

the art technology systems, i.e. wireless environments, fiber optics, school intra-net, document cameras, Chromebook carts, and digital projectors. Each instructor is also expected to embrace new technologies as indicated to them during the interview process. Staff are trained on ways to use technology in the classroom as a means to improve the quality of instruction and enhance student learning as well as assistance with development of resources such as webpages.

We are proud of the rich tradition of academic excellence available at CCA. Beyond the classroom, CCA students have opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities designed to enrich, challenge, and connect to build a culture of Raven pride. Robust elective course offerings, the award-winning ENVISION program, competitive athletic teams, student clubs, the NEST, QUEST, our PALs, and ongoing ASB events, each represent opportunities for each child to get involved, foster healthy peer relationships, and contribute to our shared CCA community. We encourage each child to find their 'home' on our campus.

### Career Preparation

Envision, The Arts at Canyon Crest Academy, encompasses all of the visual and performing arts (VPA) courses offered at CCA. Envision is a unique arts program that utilizes working artists as instructors. These professional artists work side by side with our VPA teachers to deliver an outstanding arts curriculum. Envision is designed to serve the student who wishes to have the most rigorous arts education as well as the student who may only take one arts course during their high school experience. Students who participate in the extended day Envision Conservatory program will receive instruction and training that will prepare them for a college and professional experience in the arts.

Canyon Crest Academy has also developed a Quest program, which features courses in engineering, science, and math that are extensions beyond the standard scope of study in these disciplines. Additionally, multiple robotics teams are a part of the program and have had success in local and state-wide competitions. As part of Quest, CCA students can take a four-year sequence of courses, designed to introduce them to the scope, rigor and discipline of the engineering profession. The courses incorporate math, science and engineering concepts into a computer based, hands-on, inquiry-based curriculum.

The Quest program is also a specialized program that is designed to enhance the excellent math and science courses that are already in place. Quest will offer hands-on project based instruction that will add a practical dimension to math and science curriculum. It is designed in many respects to answer the question, "When will I ever use this?" It is also being built so that components fit within the UC A-G requirements, the SDUHSD Practical Art graduation requirement, and within the Career Technical Education (CTE) structure.

In addition to these specialized programs, CCA also offers additional programs under the CTE umbrella - including courses such as Digital Photography, Digital Imaging, Audio Recording Technology, and more. We partner with local junior colleges to enhance these offerings on a yearly basis.

Counselors connect with students regarding career preparation through a series of grade level presentations. These presentations are tailored to specific grade level needs in regards to college and career planning and provide students with information regarding careers, career planning resources, college resources, graduation requirements, and more. CCA also has a College and Career Center that is open daily and is staffed with a college and career specialist, a computer lab for research, and hosts a variety of guest speakers and university/college representatives on a regular basis.

## **B. School and Student Performance Data**

See Appendix A for multi-year student performance data tables

**Student Performance Summary** (conclusions from analysis of student performance data, identify and prioritize the site needs to drive goals)

92% of students who took the CAASPP ELA assessment met or exceeded standards.

80% of students who took the CAASPP Math assessments met or exceeded standards. Some students are still earning Ds and Fs and we need to establish goals and action steps to reduce these numbers.

91% of the AP exams taken earned a 3 or higher. As more students continue to take more rigorous courses and exams, including AP, we want to maintain our pass percentage.

Our Average Daily Attendance Percentage for 2015/2016 was: \_\_\_\_\_ Students need to be in school to be successful, so strategies will need to be developed to improve attendance for specific students who have attendance problems.

Though the Healthy Kids Survey was administered two years ago, the school is approximately 600 students larger now, and it's a different cohort of students. This year, we are administering the Healthy Kids Survey, and we will establish baseline goals.

Our suspension rate in the 2014/2015 year was: 1.0%, and our school had about 2,000 students at the time, meaning there were approximately 20 suspensions that school year. We will establish action steps this year, including developing capacity regarding restorative practices, to reduce the suspension rate.

We aim to have more students CSU/UC eligible, so an action step will be established to improve on our percentage of eligible students.

Though we have a 1 year Career Technical Education (CTE) requirement for graduation, we will create an action step related to developing career pathways.

Because the majority of our students met or exceeded standards in the CAASPP assessments and other assessments, our focus needs to be on those who did not meet standards, and any subgroup students who did not meet or exceed standards, including Special Education. There is a small group of students who did not meet or exceed standards in subgroups, though the subgroups may be too small numerically to qualify as a subgroup. As a result, we need to focus on capturing and supporting individual students who are not proficient.

Goals and Action Steps will address 3 main domains: 1. Student Achievement, Support, and Intervention, 2. Safety, School Connectedness, Balance, and Wellness, and 3. Instruction and Professional Development.

### **C. Involvement Process**

#### **Involvement Process:**

How was the SSC and site leadership involved in development of the plan?

The School Site Council made recommendations that were then vetted by the Department Chairs, Cabinet Leaders, Administration, and the whole staff. All constituents know that it is a "living document," and when substantive changes are made, the SSC must approve those changes.

**D. Summary of Progress Made on Goals  
Canyon Crest Academy**

**School Goal 1** (Description of 2015-16 School Goal)

Annual increase in pupil achievement on standardized tests, including Advanced Placement exams, develop and implement academic intervention strategies to support access and engagement for all students.

**LCAP Priority Area:**

State Priority:

- 1- Basic Services
- 2- Implementation of State Standard
- 4- Pupil Achievement
- 7- Course Access

**Targeted Pupil Subgroup(s):**

All students

**A. Measurable Outcomes:** List Specific data that was reviewed toward meeting this goal. Show growth/decline using data.

CAASPP results improved. On the English test there was an improvement of seven percentage points from 85 to 92 percent of students meeting or exceeding standards. On the math test there was an improvement of five percentage points from 75 to 80 percent of students meeting or exceeding standards. Advanced Placement pass rate improved from 88 to 91 percent of students who received a score of 3 or higher.

**B. Summary of Progress:** Describe how the actions were or were not effective in achieving the desired outcomes? (Analysis of data)

There was improvement on standardized test scores. As far as intervention strategies to support access for all students, adding extra support did not occur.

**C. Relevance:** Based on the information in boxes A and B, has this goal been met? If yes, explain. If no, complete box D.

While the improvement in standardized scores did occur, the goal has not been met due to the fact that support classes were not implemented.

**D. What changes, if any, will be made as a result of reviewing measurable outcomes?** Based on the summary of progress, how will the actions/services change moving forward?

In 2016-17 support classes will be added to the master schedule to support general education students. A closer look at the intervention process will be a part of the SPSA moving forward.

**School Goal 2** (Description of 2015-16 School Goal)

Develop and implement a comprehensive plan to ensure a safe, orderly, and secure learning environment for all students and staff with emphasis on student connectedness to the school community, attendance, and graduation rates.

**LCAP Priority Area:**

State Priority:

- 1- Basic Services
- 3- Parent Involvement
- 5- Pupil Engagement
- 6- School Climate

**Targeted Pupil Subgroup(s):**

All students

**A. Measurable Outcomes:** List Specific data that was reviewed toward meeting this goal. Show growth/decline using data.

Graduation rates remained consistent at 99% from 2014-15 to 2015-16. Average Daily Attendance was 96.7% in 2015-16.

**B. Summary of Progress:** Describe how the actions were or were not effective in achieving the desired outcomes? (Analysis of data)

School safety was maintained during the 2015-16 school year. In accordance with this goal school connectedness was a focus. There was a Field Day centered on student wellness and a "Wellness Week" to reinforce important concepts with students.

**C. Relevance:** Based on the information in boxes A and B, has this goal been met? If yes, explain. If no, complete box D.

The campus was safe and secure, but this part of the goal is ongoing. Wellness goals for our students are also ongoing.

**D. What changes, if any, will be made as a result of reviewing measurable outcomes?** Based on the summary of progress, how will the actions/services change moving forward?

Adjustments have been made to the Field Day activities and wellness week approach.

**School Goal 3** (Description of 2015-16 School Goal)

Align curriculum, develop instructional practices, and provide professional development to support the transition to California State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards and 21st Century Learning skills to prepare all Canyon Crest Academy graduates for college and career readiness. Make Chromebook carts more available to all teachers.

**LCAP Priority Area:**

- LCAP state priorities
- 1: Basics
- 2: Implementation of State Standards
- 4: Pupil achievement
- 7: Course Access

**Targeted Pupil Subgroup(s):**

All students

**A. Measurable Outcomes:** List Specific data that was reviewed toward meeting this goal. Show growth/decline using data.  
9 PLC meetings were provided to teachers for time to develop their instructional practices. Teachers were also provided professional development days to work with their department and/or course alike teachers within the district. Most departments were given two to five PD days over the course of the year. Two extra chromebook carts were added during the course of the 2015-16 school year.

**B. Summary of Progress:** Describe how the actions were or were not effective in achieving the desired outcomes? (Analysis of data)  
Implementing the new PLC process supported the transition to California State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards and 21st Century Learning skills. More work is needed in this area.

**C. Relevance:** Based on the information in boxes A and B, has this goal been met? If yes, explain. If no, complete box D.  
This goal has not been fully met. Will continue into 2016-17.

**D. What changes, if any, will be made as a result of reviewing measurable outcomes?** Based on the summary of progress, how will the actions/services change moving forward?  
More time will be added for PLC meetings in 2016-17.

### E. Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The School Site Council has analyzed the student performance data of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of instructional programs. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to increase outcomes for underperforming students.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>LCAP Goal:</b> (paste aligned SDUHSD LCAP goal from SDUHSD 16-19 Board approved LCAP)</p> <p>SDUHSD LCAP Goal #1: Annual increase in student achievement for all students in English language arts and math with focus on accelerating student learning outcomes for target subgroup including English Learners, low income pupils and pupils identified as special education.</p> <p><b>School Goal 1</b> (Description of 2016-17 measurable School Goal, aligned to WASC Action Plan goals)</p> <p>Improve student achievement, based upon grades and assessments, including CAASPP English/Language Arts and Math standardized tests, Advanced Placement exams, and course-alike formative assessments to determine which students may benefit from academic intervention strategies to improve proficiency.</p> <p><b>LCAP Priority Area:</b></p> <p>State Priority:<br/>           1- Basic Services<br/>           2- Implementation of State Standard<br/>           4- Pupil Achievement<br/>           7- Course Access</p> <p><b>Targeted Pupil Subgroup(s):</b></p> <p>All students</p> |  |
| <p><b>Rationale:</b> What specific data revealed this need? What were the findings from the analysis of this data? List supporting data with a summary.</p> <p>Based upon the CAASPP results, the number of students who meet or exceed standards on this test is impressive, but every year there is need for improvement, and some students are not meeting or exceeding standards. We need to continue to develop systems to identify struggling students as early as possible to offer academic supports to enable them to be proficient.</p> <p>In terms of academic progress in classes, we want to continue to focus on and reduce the number of students who are receiving Ds and Fs in academic courses.</p> <p>At progress reporting periods, the D/F list has fluctuated between 10.31% and 12.04%.</p> <p>The quarterly D/F list has fluctuated between 5.35% and 7.39% (2015-2016 school year)</p>  | <p><b>Growth Targets:</b> Expected annual measurable outcomes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CAASPP English/Language Arts = 93% meet or exceed standards.</li> <li>2. CAASPP Math = 82% meet or exceed standards.</li> <li>3. CAASPP ELA Spec. Ed. = 80% meet or exceed standards.</li> <li>4. CAASPP Math Spec. Ed. = 55% meet or exceed standards.</li> <li>5. CAASPP RFEP will score at same percentage meeting or exceeding standards as all students.</li> <li>6. Students on the D/F List = 5% or less</li> <li>7. AP Pass Percentage = 92%</li> </ol> |

**School-wide critical area/s for follow up addressed:** How does this goal align to one of the identified “critical areas for follow up” from the most recent WASC visiting committee report?

Continue to address struggling students and non-statistically significant subgroups for increased use and refinement of the intervention sequence. Include additional training and resources to design remediation. Develop and implement a schoolwide process for identifying and supporting struggling or disconnected students. Address the issue of free periods created when students drop a class-how can we better serve those students and encourage their success? Additional course offerings available for students who elect to drop courses-remediation and support opportunities available.

**Strategy:** (briefly describe the overall plan to address the identified need)

Using data, we will identify students who need academic support. Our Student Support Team (SST) is our mechanism for collaboratively determining what resources students may need to be successful. The team looks at interventions and tiers of support. Using LCAP funding, we have added support classes in literacy and math to help students who are struggling.

| <b>Actions/Tasks</b><br>(describe specifically what will occur at the site to meet this goal)   | <b>Person(s) Responsible</b> | <b>Cost and Funding Source</b>  | <b>Means to assess improvement</b>  | <b>Timeline</b>                               |
|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1. Identify students not realizing academic potential based upon test scores.<br>Identify students not realizing academic potential based upon grades.<br>Utilizing the SST process, and the CCA Intervention Sequence, identify academic and non-academic interventions to support these students.<br><br>CCA Intervention Sequence:<br><br>Level 1 (Classroom Support)<br>Check if the student has IEP/504 Plan in in Aeries and ensure that you are providing the accommodations on the document. If you have questions about the accommodations, contact counselor (504) or case manager (IEP).<br>Review student testing results/records (i.e. SBAC, CELDT, CST available from prior years)<br>Check the Intervention Screen in Aeries to see any previous strategies implemented<br>Review criteria on Student Profile Chart (below) to determine potential level of intervention<br>Student-Teacher Individual Conference<br>Teacher provides classroom intervention(s). Some examples:<br>Provide support materials to student – templates, skeleton notes, copies of notes, etc.<br>Seating change<br>Pair with peer<br>Check for understanding and prompt student<br>Suggest/provide before or after school help/tutoring<br>Allow for short breaks<br>Progressive discipline/referrals<br>Parent-Teacher contact (phone/email) | Admin., Counseling           | Academic Intervention Sections, two per term, one for math (Math Support), and one for English (Academic Lit). Approximately \$60,000 in teacher salary.<br><br>Extra hours for teachers to supervise tutoring for any student who needs it after school and other support for students = \$4,832 Total of 125 hours. | For students who are supported by the CCA Intervention Sequence, we will look at their grades and test scores to see if the intervention support was helpful. | Fall/Spring 2016-17 quarterly progress checks |

|    |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
|    | <p>Document classroom interventions in Aeries</p> <p>Level 2 (Collaboration)<br/> Teacher consults with alpha-counselor, case manager (if student has IEP), and alpha-Assistant Principal<br/> Level changes implemented as needed<br/> Consult with Dept. Chair and collaborate with fellow teachers (SPED Dept. also has resources)<br/> Share and implement best practices and additional strategies<br/> Refer to school-sponsored tutoring, teacher office hours and/or Peer Advisory Club<br/> Suggest weekly progress report<br/> Parent-Student-Teacher conference<br/> Teacher assigns necessary discipline consequences (i.e. referral to AP, detention, Saturday School)</p> <p>Level 3 (Intervention- Meets Criteria of "Struggling Student")<br/> Multi/Inter-disciplinary teacher collaboration<br/> Implement strategies across all subjects<br/> Teacher continues to assign discipline consequences, as necessary<br/> Suggest remedial classes if necessary<br/> Parent-Counselor-Teacher-Student-Admin conference<br/> Place on Academic/Behavior/Attendance (SART) Contract</p> <p>Level 4 (Intensive Intervention- Meets Criteria of "At Risk Student"; prior strategies unsuccessful)<br/> Parent-Counselor-Teacher-Student-Admin conference<br/> SARB (Student Attendance Review Board)<br/> Refer to READI<br/> Assign contract violation consequences<br/> Post-suspension conference and/or Post-suspension IEP meeting (for SPED students)<br/> Refer student to Sunset/North Coast (process handled by the students alpha-counselor and AP)<br/> Consider referral to Student Study Team (SST)<br/> A 504 plan may be developed as a result of the SST team decision<br/> Assessment may be recommended, and if the student qualifies for special education, an IEP will be developed.</p> |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | Identify and address the needs of the "middle learner," including placing some students in more challenging courses, such as honors or advanced placement. Middle Learners at CCA are students who are in the 2.0 - 2.75 GPA range.  | Admin., Counseling, Teachers                           | no cost  | Test Data, Grades, Course enrollment data, AP exam results | Spring 2016-17 quarterly progress checks |
| 3. | Implement appropriate academic strategies to identify and encourage all students to meet A-G requirements for college eligibility and career readiness. Counselors meet with students to develop 4 year plans.   | Admin., Counseling, College & Career Counseling Staff, | \$2000.00 for Field Trips (Foundation funded) to local | A-G CSU/UC Eligibility Data                                | Ongoing                                  |

|  |   |          |  |   |   |
|--|---|----------|--|---|---|
|  | Counselors give presentations to students on A-G requirements and hold evening events for parents. College visits are coordinated. Counselors conduct transcript audits.  | Teachers | campuses   |   |   |
| 4.   | Assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the academic intervention strategies being used.   | Admin.   | no cost  | Student grades and test scores                        | Fall/Spring 2016-17 quarterly progress checks |
| 5.   | Provide professional development for staff to successfully implement uniform intervention strategies and California state curriculum through PLCs, Late Start Collaboration, conference training, and/or districtwide professional development. | Admin.   | Dept., Site, District \$24,160 for PLC support   | Struggling student grades and test scores improvement | monthly through regular Late Start meetings   |
| <b>Progress Monitoring Report (Mid-Year)</b>   |   |          | <b>Date of progress update:</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Growth Targets:</b> What indicators have been reviewed to assess progress to meet the annual goal? Summary of analysis. |   |          | <b>Summary of progress:</b> Describe how the strategy has or has not been effective in achieving the desired outcomes? |   |   |

**LCAP Goal:** (paste aligned SDUHSD LCAP goal from SDUHSD 16-19 Board approved LCAP)

SDUHSD LCAP Goal#3: Increase the level of “school connectedness” and "sense of safety" of pupils, staff and parents.

**School Goal 2** (Description of 2016-17 measurable School Goal, aligned to WASC Action Plan goals)

Develop and implement a comprehensive plan to ensure a safe, orderly, and secure learning environment for all students and staff with emphasis on staff and student connectedness to the school community, attendance, and graduation rates.

**LCAP Priority Area:**

State Priority:

- 1- Basic Services
- 3- Parent Involvement
- 5- Pupil Engagement
- 6- School Climate

**Targeted Pupil Subgroup(s):**

All students

**Rationale:** What specific data revealed this need? What were the findings from the analysis of this data? List supporting data with a summary.

LCAP State Priorities #5, and #6 and WASC self-study findings indicate the need to formalize a comprehensive plan to ensure student connectedness and engagement for all, including staff relations, within our school community by creating programs that address and monitor the social/emotional safety, attendance, and well-being of our student body while maintaining a secure learning environment for all shareholders. As our school grows, we need to ensure that our culture that is characterized by a safe, orderly, secure, and connected environment continues. Data included the Healthy Kids Survey and WASC Self-Study. Because our school is growing significantly, we will need to establish baseline growth targets after conducting the Healthy Kids Survey this year.

**Growth Targets:** Expected annual measurable outcomes.

- Healthy Kids Survey results will be analyzed, looking for improvement in areas related to wellness.
- Extra-curricular and Club participation rates
- ASB participation and programming
- PALs participation and programming
- Attendance Data ( )
- Suspension / Expulsion Data ( )
- Student and Staff Surveys

**School-wide critical area/s for follow up addressed:** How does this goal align to one of the identified “critical areas for follow up” from the most recent WASC visiting committee report?

Develop a collegial relationship between parents / teachers / administration through a variety of communication avenues to promote positive relationships. Ensure for a secure campus.

**Strategy:** (briefly describe the overall plan to address the identified need)

Ensure for many forms of communication between students, staff, and community. Ensure for safety through infrastructure and training, such as drills. Ensure for wellness, balance, school connectedness via programming throughout the year. Emphasize the importance of attendance to perform well in school. Learn about and implement restorative practices to reduce suspensions and expulsions.

| <b>Actions/Tasks</b><br>(describe specifically what will occur at the site to meet this goal)                              |  | <b>Person(s) Responsible</b>   | <b>Cost and Funding Source</b>   | <b>Means to assess improvement</b>     | <b>Timeline</b>   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| 1.   | Continue to implement and develop programs and/or resources that promote student connectedness to the school community, including tours, principal coffees, and wellness programs.   | Admin., PALs Coordinator, ASB Director, Wellness Committee   | District allocation for teaching sections for PALs and ASB. Site funds | Surveys                                | ongoing   |
| 2.   | Continue to provide a multi-tiered system of support targeted programs designed to meet the specific needs of CCA students (ex: Attendance, students facing academic pressure, mental health awareness, student transitions, etc.). Utilize addition of a social worker on campus to support these students. | Admin., Teachers, Social Worker, Counseling  | District funded position for Social Worker                             | Healthy Kids Survey<br>Attendance data | ongoing   |
| 3.   | Develop, implement, and review site safety plan to ensure a secure learning environment for all students and staff. Utilize new staff resources, such as 2nd Campus Supervisor. Continue training and drills related to ensuring for a safe campus.  | Admin.   | District funded position for campus supervisor                         | Surveys                                | Ongoing, quarterly evacuation drills, annual review of CCA emergency plan |
| 4.   | Participate in Training for Restorative Practices Model. Restorative Practice is a means by which student behaviors are improved in a non-punitive manner.   | Admin.   | no cost  | Reduction in suspension and expulsions | ongoing   |
| 5.   | Implement strategies to encourage staff connectivity, such as weekly communications, Raven Roundtable, New Raven (Teachers) Lunches, and other networking opportunities.   | Admin.   | no cost  | Staff Surveys                          | ongoing   |
| <b>Progress Monitoring Report (Mid-Year)</b>   |  | <b>Date of progress update:</b>  |  |  |   |
| <b>Growth Targets:</b> What indicators have been reviewed to assess progress to meet the annual goal? Summary of analysis. |  | <b>Summary of progress:</b> Describe how the strategy has or has not been effective in achieving the desired outcomes? |  |  |   |

**LCAP Goal:** (paste aligned SDUHSD LCAP goal from SDUHSD 16-19 Board approved LCAP)

SDUHSD LCAP Goal #1: Annual increase in student achievement for all students in English language arts and math with focus on accelerating student learning outcomes for target subgroups including English Learners, low income pupils and pupils identified as special education.

**School Goal 3** (Description of 2016-17 measurable School Goal, aligned to WASC Action Plan goals)

Align curriculum, develop instructional practices, and provide professional development to support the transition to California State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards and 21st Century Learning skills to prepare all Canyon Crest Academy graduates for college and career readiness.

Make Chromebook carts more available to all teachers.

**LCAP Priority Area:**

LCAP state priorities

- 1: Basics
- 2: Implementation of State Standards
- 4: Pupil achievement
- 7: Course Access

**Targeted Pupil Subgroup(s):**

All students

**Rationale:** What specific data revealed this need? What were the findings from the analysis of this data? List supporting data with a summary.

The transition to Common Core and the assessments is still in progress. Additionally, the NGSS is new, and we are just beginning to transition to these science standards. In addition to a college-readiness culture, our students need to have a better understanding and awareness of career readiness. Early Assessment Program data shows that 69% are College Ready in English/Language Arts and 53% are College Ready in Math. EAP data is based upon students who "exceed the standard." Meeting the standard is "conditional" readiness.

Teachers consistently report a need for more time to professionally collaborate with one another regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

The WASC Self-Study identified a few key areas of growth for this goal, which are noted below.

The percentage of students who are currently A-G CSU/UC eligible is 88.5%.

The Single Plan for Student Achievement

**Growth Targets:** Expected annual measurable outcomes.

1. There are 19 late start days incorporated into the work year calendar, along with 3 District/Site Professional Development Days. There are also funds set aside for District Departmental Collaboration in English, math, social studies, science, visual and performing arts, and world language to facilitate collaboration and articulation.
2. 72% EAP Readiness in E/LA
3. 56% EAP Readiness in Math
4. Teacher feedback via survey results that show an increase in experimentation with new instructional strategies.
5. A-G CSU/UC eligible percentage will increase to 90%.
6. Special Education students: 80% will meet or exceeded standards on the CAASPP ELA test, and 55% will meet or exceeded standards on the CAASPP Math.

Updated for 2016-17: Focus on Special Education students. 76% met or exceeded standards on the CAASPP ELA test, and 53% met or exceeded standards on the CAASPP Math test.

**School-wide critical area/s for follow up addressed:** How does this goal align to one of the identified “critical areas for follow up” from the most recent WASC visiting committee report?

Need additional training and resources to maintain a technologically rich learning environment - both instruction and facilities. Lack of funding inhibits the progression of technology in the classroom - how can we share resources more efficiently? Courses are in need of updated materials and texts that support our shift to common core standards. Improve connections / articulation with middle schools, especially in the areas of math, world language, and the arts.

**Strategy:** (briefly describe the overall plan to address the identified need)

Teachers will have time and resources to collaborate to ensure that students are proficient and college and career ready. Subject area teams, through PLCs, will evaluate and revise Essential Learning Outcomes and common assessments aligned with Common Core and 21st century Learning Skills.

|    | <b>Actions/Tasks</b><br>(describe specifically what will occur at the site to meet this goal)   | <b>Person(s) Responsible</b>                 | <b>Cost and Funding Source</b>   | <b>Means to assess improvement</b>                           | <b>Timeline</b> |
|----|---|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 1. | Provide release time and utilize Late Start PLC time to enable teachers to engage in professional development in all subject areas around:<br>1. Transition to Standards and appropriate instructional strategies<br>2. 21st century skills (collaboration, critical thinking, creativity, and communication) and appropriate instructional strategies<br>3. NGSS<br>4. College and Career Readiness (CCR) ‘Anchor’ Standards<br>5. Formative Assessments to Identify Students' Needs and Inform Instructional Practice | District & Site Admin.                       | District funded Achievement Funds  | Student achievement will improve as per goal #1 in the SPSA. | Ongoing         |
| 2. | Continue to work closely with Prop AA Bond Committee to ensure adequate technological infrastructure to support instructional resource, in addition to updating replacement equipment using non-capitalized tech. equipment funds.  | District and site admin.                     | \$34,800 in non-capitalized tech. equipment budget.<br><br>Foundation budget to be determined for chromebooks and carts. | Number of devices  | Ongoing         |
| 3. | Increase student access to Career Technical Education (CTE) courses, work/internship placements, and pathway opportunities. We hold elective fairs to promote our offerings, and new courses are sometimes part of a pilot. If there is sufficient interest, based upon student tallies, we may be able to offer the course in the master schedule. Perkins funds   | Admin. / District CTE Leadership, Counseling | Perkins funding for 1 section of Engineering Pathway   | Enrollment data in CTE                                       | Ongoing         |

|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | were used to support the investment and launching of Principles of Engineering. |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Progress Monitoring Report (Mid-Year)</b>   |   |  | <b>Date of progress update:</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Growth Targets:</b> What indicators have been reviewed to assess progress to meet the annual goal? Summary of analysis. |   |  | <b>Summary of progress:</b> Describe how the strategy has or has not been effective in achieving the desired outcomes? |  |  |

### D. School Site Council Membership Canyon Crest Academy

Education Code Section 64001 requires that the SPSA be reviewed and updated at least annually, including proposed expenditures of funds allocated to the through the Consolidated Application, by the school site council. The current make-up of the council is as follows:

| Name of Members                            | Principal | Classroom Teacher | Other School Staff | Parent or Community Member | Secondary Students |
|--|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Brett Killeen                              | X         |                   |                    |                            |                    |
| Mark Caton                                 |           |                   |                    | X                          |                    |
| Lance Clifner                              |           |                   |                    | X                          |                    |
| Glen Ragins                                |           |                   |                    | X                          |                    |
| Mary Christensen                           |           |                   |                    | X                          |                    |
| Sam Cummings                               |           | X                 |                    |                            |                    |
| Ed Gerstin                                 |           | X                 |                    |                            |                    |
| Mark Van Over                              |           | X                 |                    |                            |                    |
| Chiara Luna                                |           | X                 |                    |                            |                    |
| Gretchen Schultz                           |           | X                 |                    |                            |                    |
| Karen Burrows                              |           |                   | X                  |                            |                    |
| Bernard Steinberger                        |           |                   | X                  |                            |                    |
| Melody Li                                  |           |                   |                    |                            | X                  |
| Julia Yang                                 |           |                   |                    |                            | X                  |
| Shawdi Sani                                |           |                   |                    |                            | X                  |
| Rachel Fu                                  |           |                   |                    |                            | X                  |
| <b>Numbers of members of each category</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>5</b>          | <b>2</b>           | <b>4</b>                   | <b>4</b>           |

*At elementary schools, the council must be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers and other school personnel and (b) parents of pupils attending the school or other community members. Classroom teachers must comprise a majority of persons represented under section (a). At secondary schools there must, in addition, be equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and students. Teachers, other school personnel, parents and (at secondary schools) students select representatives to the council (Education Code 52012).*



**Form F. Budget 2016-17  
Canyon Crest Academy**

| <b>State/Federal Categorical Program</b>                                | <b>Allocation</b>     |
|---|-----------------------|
| Site LCFF Supplemental Funding - Site Formative/Achievement Funds       | <b>\$24,160.00</b>    |
| Site LCFF Supplemental Funding - Site Tutoring Funds                    | <b>\$4,832.00</b>     |
| Site LCFF Supplemental Funding – District Funded Sections (non-formula) | <b>\$\$72,600.00</b>  |
| Title I Funds   | <b>\$0.00</b>         |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>\$1,015,692.00</b> |

## Appendix A. Student Performance Data

### Section 1: Enrollment

**Table 1.1 Site enrollment trends with subgroup breakdown**

|  | 2015-16 |      | 2014-15 |      | 2013-14 |      | 2012-13 |      |
|--|---------|------|---------|------|---------|------|---------|------|
|  | #       | %    | #       | %    | #       | %    | #       | %    |
| <b>Total enrollment</b>  | 2,255   | -    | 1,987   | -    | 1,867   | -    | 1,857   | -    |
| <b>Number &amp; Percent of English Learners</b>                                  | 15      | 0.7% | 22      | 1.1% | 13      | 0.7% | 33      | 1.8% |
| <b>Number &amp; Percent of Long Term English Learners</b>                        | *       | *%   | *       | *%   | *       | *%   | *       | *%   |
| <b>Number &amp; Percent of Redesignated Fluent English Proficient students</b>   | 208     | 9.2% | 142     | 7.1% | 91      | 4.9% | 85      | 4.6% |
| <b>Number &amp; Percent of students who are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged</b> | 70      | 3.1% | 72      | 3.6% | 59      | 3.2% | 55      | 2.9% |
| <b>Number &amp; Percent of Special Education students</b>                        | 160     | 7.1% | 164     | 8.2% | 166     | 8.9% | 166     | 8.9% |

**Source:**

Total enrollment, English Learner enrollment, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged enrollment, Special Education enrollment:  
California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System. Report. 1.1 Enrollment - Primary Status by Subgroup. (Fall 1)

Long Term English Lerner Enrollment, Redesignated Fluent English Proficient enrollment:  
Aeries Student Information System data. Analytics dashboards: LTEL, RFEP (retrieved 8/23/16)

\*In order to protect student privacy, an asterisk (\*) will be displayed instead of a number where 10 or fewer students are represented.

## Section 2: Student Achievement Indicators

**Table 2.1 Percent of students tested who scored in the Standard Met to Standard Exceeded range in ELA**

| 11 <sup>th</sup> grade | Number of students tested | All Students | English Only | RFEP | English Learner | Special Education | Socioeconomically disadvantaged |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>15-16</b>           | 463                       | 92           | 92           | 90   | *               | 76                | 95                              |
| <b>14-15</b>           | 406                       | 85           | 85           | 88   | *               | 53                | 65                              |

Source:

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results. Retrieved from <http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/>

## CAASPP Results (All Students)

### English Language Arts/Literacy

| Overall Participation for All Students |                        |         |                      |         |                           |         |                               |         |
|--|------------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Grade Level                            | # of Students Enrolled |         | # of Students Tested |         | # of Students with Scores |         | % of Enrolled Students Tested |         |
|  | 2014-15                | 2015-16 | 2014-15              | 2015-16 | 2014-15                   | 2015-16 | 2014-15                       | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11                               | 419                    | 482     | 406                  | 463     | 405                       | 463     | 96.9                          | 96.1    |
| All Grades                             | 419                    | 482     | 406                  | 463     | 405                       | 463     | 96.9                          | 96.1    |

\* The “% of Enrolled Students Tested” showing in this table is not the same as “Participation Rate” for federal accountability purposes.

| Overall Achievement for All Students |                  |         |                     |         |                |         |                       |         |                    |         |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| Grade Level                          | Mean Scale Score |         | % Standard Exceeded |         | % Standard Met |         | % Standard Nearly Met |         | % Standard Not Met |         |
|                                      | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15             | 2015-16 | 2014-15        | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15            | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11                             | 2683.8           | 2707.8  | 59                  | 69      | 26             | 23      | 11                    | 6       | 4                  | 2       |
| All Grades                           | N/A              | N/A     | 59                  | 69      | 26             | 23      | 11                    | 6       | 4                  | 2       |

| Reading<br>Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts |                  |         |                       |         |                  |         |
|--|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| Grade Level  | % Above Standard |         | % At or Near Standard |         | % Below Standard |         |
|  | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15          | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11   | 61               | 70      | 34                    | 27      | 5                | 3       |
| All Grades   | 61               | 70      | 34                    | 27      | 5                | 3       |

| Writing<br>Producing clear and purposeful writing |                  |         |                       |         |                  |         |
|---|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| Grade Level                                       | % Above Standard |         | % At or Near Standard |         | % Below Standard |         |
|   | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15          | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11  | 66               | 72      | 28                    | 24      | 5                | 4       |
| All Grades  | 66               | 72      | 28                    | 24      | 5                | 4       |

| Listening<br>Demonstrating effective communication skills |                  |         |                       |         |                  |         |
|---|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| Grade Level   | % Above Standard |         | % At or Near Standard |         | % Below Standard |         |
|   | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15          | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11  | 40               | 53      | 52                    | 45      | 7                | 2       |
| All Grades  | 40               | 53      | 52                    | 45      | 7                | 2       |

| Research/Inquiry<br>Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information |                  |         |                       |         |                  |         |
|--|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| Grade Level  | % Above Standard |         | % At or Near Standard |         | % Below Standard |         |
|  | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15          | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11   | 61               | 73      | 35                    | 25      | 4                | 2       |
| All Grades   | 61               | 73      | 35                    | 25      | 4                | 2       |

Data Source

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results. Retrieved from <http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/>

### III School and Student Performance Data

**Table 2.2 Percent of students tested who scored in the Standard Met and Exceeded range in Math**

| 11 <sup>th</sup> grade | Number of students tested | All Students | English Only | RFEP | English Learner | Special Education | Socioeconomically disadvantaged |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>15-16</b>           | 463                       | 80           | 79           | 78   | *               | 53                | 75                              |
| <b>14-15</b>           | 401                       | 75           | 72           | 88   | *               | 25                | 41                              |

Source:

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results. Retrieved from <http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/>

## 15-16 CAASPP Results (All Students)

### Mathematics

| Overall Participation for All Students |                        |         |                      |         |                           |         |                               |         |
|--|------------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Grade Level                            | # of Students Enrolled |         | # of Students Tested |         | # of Students with Scores |         | % of Enrolled Students Tested |         |
|  | 2014-15                | 2015-16 | 2014-15              | 2015-16 | 2014-15                   | 2015-16 | 2014-15                       | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11                               | 419                    | 482     | 401                  | 461     | 400                       | 461     | 95.7                          | 95.6    |
| All Grades                             | 419                    | 482     | 401                  | 461     | 400                       | 461     | 95.7                          | 95.6    |

\* The "% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

| Overall Achievement for All Students |                  |         |                     |         |                |         |                       |         |                    |         |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| Grade Level                          | Mean Scale Score |         | % Standard Exceeded |         | % Standard Met |         | % Standard Nearly Met |         | % Standard Not Met |         |
|                                      | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15             | 2015-16 | 2014-15        | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15            | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11                             | 2696.4           | 2714.7  | 50                  | 53      | 25             | 27      | 12                    | 13      | 12                 | 7       |
| All Grades                           | N/A              | N/A     | 50                  | 53      | 25             | 27      | 12                    | 13      | 12                 | 7       |

| Concepts & Procedures<br>Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |                  |         |                       |         |                  |         |  |
|--|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|--|
| Grade Level  | % Above Standard |         | % At or Near Standard |         | % Below Standard |         |  |
|  | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15          | 2015-16 |  |
| Grade 11   | 65               | 69      | 23                    | 23      | 12               | 8       |  |
| All Grades   | 65               | 69      | 23                    | 23      | 12               | 8       |  |

| Problem Solving & Modeling/Data Analysis<br>Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems |                  |         |                       |         |                  |         |
|--|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| Grade Level  | % Above Standard |         | % At or Near Standard |         | % Below Standard |         |
|  | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15          | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11   | 50               | 50      | 36                    | 41      | 14               | 8       |
| All Grades   | 50               | 50      | 36                    | 41      | 14               | 8       |

| Communicating Reasoning<br>Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions |                  |         |                       |         |                  |         |
|--|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| Grade Level  | % Above Standard |         | % At or Near Standard |         | % Below Standard |         |
|  | 2014-15          | 2015-16 | 2014-15               | 2015-16 | 2014-15          | 2015-16 |
| Grade 11   | 53               | 58      | 39                    | 38      | 8                | 4       |
| All Grades   | 53               | 58      | 39                    | 38      | 8                | 4       |

Data Source  
California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results. Retrieved from  
<http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/>

### Section 3: School Climate Indicators

**Table 3.1 Truancy rates**

|                     | 2014-15 | 2013-14 | 2012-13 | 2011-12 |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>Truancy rate</b> | 52.47%  | 54.55%  | 14.37%  | 11.9%   |

Source:  
California Department of Education Data Reporting Office. Truancy Report. Retrieved from <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>

**Table 3.2 Chronic absenteeism rates by subgroup**

|              | All Students | English Learners | Socioeconomically disadvantaged | Special Education |
|--------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>15-16</b> | 4.1          | *                | *                               | 10.6              |
| <b>14-15</b> | 4.9          | 0                | *                               | 12.2              |
| <b>13-14</b> | 4.9          | 0                | *                               | 10.3              |

Source:  
Aeries Student Information System data. Analytics dashboards: Attendance% (retrieved 9/28/16)  
\*In order to protect student privacy, an asterisk (\*) will be displayed instead of a number where 10 or fewer students are represented.

**Table 3.3 Discipline data**

|                                     | 2014-15 | 2013-14 | 2012-13 | 2011-12 |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>Number of students suspended</b> | 20      | 15      | 15      | 14      |
| <b>Suspension rate</b>              | 1.0%    | 0.8%    | 0.8%    | 0.7%    |
| <b>Number of students expelled</b>  | 1       | 2       | 2       | 0       |
| <b>Expulsion rate</b>               | 0.0%    | 0.1%    | 0.1%    | 0.0%    |

Source:  
California Department of Education Data Reporting Office. Suspension and Expulsion Report. Retrieved from <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>

**Table 3.4 Cohort dropout rate by subgroup**

|                     | 2014-15 | 2013-14 | 2012-13 | 2011-12 |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>All Students</b> | 0.0%    | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.0%    |

Source:  
CALPADS report 1.9 Completers and Dropouts - Count

**Table 3.5 Student connectedness survey results (CHKS or Site Climate Survey). Percent of students who disagree with target statements.**

|   | <b>*2015-16</b> | <b>**2014-2015</b> | <b>**2012-2013</b> | <b>**2010-2011</b> |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Feel safe at school</b>                          | n/a             | 2                  | 3.1                | 4.1                |
| <b>Adult who cares about me</b>                     | n/a             | 4                  | 5.8                | 27.4               |
| <b>Feel like part of my school.</b>                 | n/a             | 8                  | 8.1                | 10.2               |
| <b>Teachers at school treat students fairly</b>     | n/a             | 8                  | 6.5                | 6.9                |
| <b>I do things at school that make a difference</b> | n/a             | 18                 | 16.9               | 53.0               |
| <i>insert statements from internal survey:</i>      |                 |                    |                    |                    |
| <i>insert statements from internal survey:</i>      |                 |                    |                    |                    |
| <i>insert statements from internal survey:</i>      |                 |                    |                    |                    |
| <i>insert statements from internal survey:</i>      |                 |                    |                    |                    |

Source:  
 \*Site Climate Survey results  
 \*\*CHKS results

## Section 4: Progress Monitoring of English Learners

**Table 4.1 English Learner enrollment**

|              | English Learners<br>(number & % of total enrollment) |      | Percent of ELs who are LTELs | Percent of ELs who qualify for<br>Special Education |
|--------------|--|------|------------------------------|---|
|              | Number   | %    |                              |   |
| <b>15-16</b> | 15   | 0.7% | *                            | *   |
| <b>14-15</b> | 22   | 1.1% | *                            | *   |
| <b>13-14</b> | 13   | 0.7% | *                            | *   |

Source:

English Learner enrollment:

California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System. Report. 1.1 Enrollment - Primary Status by Subgroup. (Fall 1)

Percent of ELs who are LTELs, Percent of ELs who qualify for Special Education:

Aeries Student Information System data.

\*In order to protect student privacy, an asterisk (\*) will be displayed instead of a number where 10 or fewer students are represented.

## California English Language Development (CELDT) Data

**Table 4. 2 CELDT (Annual Assessment) Results**

| Grade        | Percent of Students by Proficiency Level on CELDT Annual Assessment |       |       |                |       |       |              |       |       |                    |       |       |           |       |       |
|--------------|---|-------|-------|----------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|
|              | Advanced  |       |       | Early Advanced |       |       | Intermediate |       |       | Early Intermediate |       |       | Beginning |       |       |
|              | 13-14   | 14-15 | 15-16 | 13-14          | 14-15 | 15-16 | 13-14        | 14-15 | 15-16 | 13-14              | 14-15 | 15-16 | 13-14     | 14-15 | 15-16 |
| <b>9</b>     | 50  | 67    | 25    | 33             | 22    | 75    | 17           | 0     |       |                    | 11    |       |           | 0     |       |
| <b>10</b>    | 29  | 60    |       | 71             | 40    |       |              | 0     |       |                    | 0     |       |           | 0     |       |
| <b>11</b>    |   | 100   | 25    |                | 0     | 75    |              | 0     |       |                    | 0     |       |           | 0     |       |
| <b>12</b>    |   | 0     |       |                | 0     |       |              | 0     |       |                    | 0     |       |           | 0     |       |
| <b>Total</b> | 38  | 75    | 20    | 54             | 20    | 70    | 8            | 0     | 10    |                    | 5     |       |           | 0     |       |

Data Source

California Department of Education Data Reporting Office. California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Reports. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/t3reports.asp>

\*data not available from California Department of Education Data Reporting Office

**Table 4.3 Percent of students who made progress learning English as measured by CELDT**

| AMA0 1                          | Annual Growth |         |         |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------|---------|
|                                 | 2013-14       | 2014-15 | 2015-16 |
| <b>Number of Annual Testers</b> | 13            | 20      | 10      |

|                              |        |       |        |
|------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|
| Percent with Prior Year Data | 100.0% | 100%  | 100.0% |
| Number in Cohort             | 13     | 20    | 10     |
| Number Met                   | --     | 19    | --     |
| Percent Met                  | --     | 95.0% | --     |
| NCLB Target                  | 59.0   | 60.5  | 62.0%  |
| Met Target                   | --     | Yes   | --     |

| AMAO 2           | Attaining English Proficiency |           |                         |           |                         |           |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
|                  | 2013-14                       |           | 2014-15                 |           | 2015-16                 |           |
|                  | Years of EL instruction       |           | Years of EL instruction |           | Years of EL instruction |           |
|                  | Less Than 5                   | 5 Or More | Less Than 5             | 5 Or More | Less Than 5             | 5 Or More |
| Number in Cohort | 10                            | 3         | 15                      | 5         | 5                       | 5         |
| Number Met       | --                            | --        | 14                      | --        | --                      | --        |
| Percent Met      | --                            | --        | 93.3%                   | --        | --                      | --        |
| NCLB Target      | 22.8                          | 49.0      | 24.2                    | 50.9      | 25.4%                   | 52.8%     |
| Met Target       | --                            | --        | Yes                     | --        | --                      | --        |

Source:

California Department of Education Data Reporting Office. 2014-15 Title III Accountability Reports Local Educational Agency (LEA) Level Data, School-level Data. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/t3reports.asp>

**Table 4.4 Percent of students who made progress learning English as measured by LAS Links Assessment (Fall to Spring administration comparison results)**

|   | 2015-16 | 2014-15 | 2013-14 | 2012-13 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Percent of students who attained proficiency      | *       | *       | *       | **      |
| Percent of students who increased one proficiency | *       | *       | *       | **      |

Source:

LAS Links Assessment results for those students who participated in both the fall and spring administration and received valid Overall scores.

\*\*In order to protect student privacy, an asterisk (\*) will be displayed instead of a number where 10 or fewer students are represented.

\*\*LAS Links Assessment was not administered

**Table 4.5 Reclassification Rate**

|  | 2015-16    | 2014-15  | 2013-14   | 2012-13   |
|--|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number and percentage of students Redesignated Fluent English Proficient | 15 (68.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 8 (47.1%) | 2 (33.3%) |

Source:

California Department of Education Data Reporting Office Data as of: 3/13/2015. Number and Percent of Students Redesignated to FEP. Retrieved from <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>

## Section 5: College and Career Readiness Indicators

**Table 5.1 Early Assessment Program (EAP) ELA results by subgroup**

|              | All Students  |                     |           | English Learners |                     |           | Socioeconomically disadvantaged |                     |           | Special Education |                     |           |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|
|              | College Ready | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready | College Ready    | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready | College Ready                   | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready | College Ready     | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready |
| <b>15-16</b> | 69            | 23                  | 8         | *                | *                   | *         | 65                              | 30                  | 5         | 52                | 24                  | 24        |
| <b>14-15</b> | 59            | 26                  | 15        | *                | *                   | *         | 24                              | 41                  | 35        | 22                | 31                  | 47        |

Source:

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results. Retrieved from <http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/>

\*In order to protect student privacy, an asterisk (\*) will be displayed instead of a number where 10 or fewer students are represented.

**Table 5.2 Early Assessment Program (EAP) math results by subgroup**

|              | All Students  |                     |           | English Learners |                     |           | Socioeconomically disadvantaged |                     |           | Special Education |                     |           |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|
|              | College Ready | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready | College Ready    | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready | College Ready                   | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready | College Ready     | Conditionally Ready | Not Ready |
| <b>15-16</b> | 53            | 27                  | 20        | *                | *                   | *         | 50                              | 25                  | 25        | 24                | 29                  | 47        |
| <b>14-15</b> | 50            | 25                  | 25        | *                | *                   | *         | 12                              | 29                  | 59        | 14                | 11                  | 75        |

Source:

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results. Retrieved from <http://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/>

\*In order to protect student privacy, an asterisk (\*) will be displayed instead of a number where 10 or fewer students are represented.

**Table 5.3 Advanced Placement Exam results**

|  | 2015-16 | 2014-15 | 2013-14 | 2012-13 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>Percent of exams with a score of 3+ (passing)</b> | 91%     | 87%     | 88%     | 87%     |
| <b>Number of tests taken</b>                         | 2,494   | 1,955   | 1,942   | 2,040   |
| <b>Number of testers</b>                             | 958     | 705     | 748     | 812     |
| <b>Average number of tests per student</b>           | 2.6     | 2.8     | 2.6     | 2.5     |

Source:

2016 College Board District Summary Report. Retrieved from <https://scores.collegeboard.org>

**Table 5.4 College Entrance Exam results**

|            |   | 2015-16 | 2014-15 | 2013-14 | 2012-13 |
|------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>SAT</b> | <b>Number and Percent of Seniors tested</b> | *       | 328/75% | 384/81% | 362/80% |
|            | <b>Mean Score : Critical Reading</b>        | 624     | 611     | 627     | 619     |
|            | <b>Mean Score : Math</b>                    | 640     | 626     | 647     | 626     |
|            | <b>Mean Score: Writing</b>                  | 628     | 611     | 630     | 617     |
| <b>ACT</b> | <b>Number and Percent of Seniors tested</b> | *       | 265/61% | 276/58% | 256/56% |
|            | <b>Average Score : English</b>              | 28.8    | 28.3    | 29.2    | 27.5    |
|            | <b>Average Score : Math</b>                 | 28.6    | 27.9    | 28.8    | 27.6    |
|            | <b>Average Score: Reading</b>               | 28.5    | 27.9    | 28.4    | 27.4    |
|            | <b>Average Score: Science</b>               | 27.7    | 26.9    | 27.5    | 26.1    |
|            | <b>Average Score: Composite</b>             | 28.5    | 27.9    | 28.6    | 27.3    |

Source:

SAT data provided by College Bound Senior Level Reports, ACT College Bound School Level Senior Reports \*2015-16 data not available from the ACT and SAT College Bound Senior School Level Reports at the time of this report

**Table 5.5 UC/CSU eligibility rates by subgroup**

|              | All students | English Learner | Socioeconomically disadvantaged | Special Education |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>14-15</b> | 88.5 %       | *               | 80.0 %                          | *                 |
| <b>13-14</b> | 92.4 %       | *               | 77.8 %                          | *                 |
| <b>12-13</b> | 87.8 %       | *               | 76.9 %                          | *                 |

Source:

California Department of Education Data Reporting Office. 12th Grade Graduates Completing all Courses Required for U.C. and/or C.S.U. Entrance. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/t3reports.asp>

\*data not available from California Department of Education Data Reporting Office

**Table 5.6 Cohort graduation rates by subgroup**

|              | All students | English Learner | Socioeconomically disadvantaged | Special Education |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>14-15</b> | 99.3%        | 100%            | 100%                            | 97.7%             |
| <b>13-14</b> | 99.8%        | 100%            | 100%                            | 98.1%             |
| <b>12-13</b> | 99.3%        | 100%            | 100%                            | 100%              |

Source:

California Department of Education Data Reporting Office. Cohort Outcome Data for the Class of 2014-15, 13-14, 12-13. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/t3reports.asp>