

The Single Plan for Student Achievement

School: Carmel Valley Middle School
District: San Dieguito Union High
School District
County-District School
(CDS) Code): 37-68346-6117352
Principal: Cara Dolnik
Date of this revision: 05/21/2018

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: Cara C. Dolnik
Position: Principal
Telephone Number: (858) 481-8221
Address: 3800 Mykonos Lane
San Diego, CA 92130
E-mail Address: cara.dolnik@sduhsd.net

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan on:

**A. School Site Information
Carmel Valley Middle School**

Vision Statement:

The Carmel Valley Middle School will meet the developmental needs of all our students through a creative and challenging environment, which encompasses the essential tenets of a middle school philosophy:

- Strong academics and high expectations
- A positive school climate
- Flexible scheduling to better meet student needs
- Curriculum that is integrated and exploratory
- Programs that foster health, wellness and safety
- Comprehensive guidance and support services
- Family and community partnerships

Mission Statement:

Our mission is to educate our students in a safe and challenging learning environment to become life-long learners who will be resourceful, responsible, and compassionate community members.

CARMEL VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL CORE VALUES: The pioneering spirit of Carmel Valley Middle School leads us to value...

STUDENT FOCUS: We provide a caring, student-centered community that encourages students to become well-rounded, responsible members of society.

ACADEMICS: We provide a challenging academic environment that empowers students to reach their potential, develop real-life applications, and embrace life-long learning.

PROFESSIONALISM: We are a professional staff that practices respectful interactions, shared decision-making, and continuous collaboration.

COMMUNICATION: We are committed to open, honest, and respectful communication among students, staff, parents, and community.

SAFE AND SECURE ENVIRONMENT: We provide an environment that is physically and emotionally safe and secure, one that fosters self-expression, respects individuality, and accepts diversity.

Principal's Message: Carmel Valley Middle School (CVMS) opened in 1999 and celebrates its 19th year of excellence in education. CVMS currently serves approximately 1,150 students in a dynamic and highly involved community. Our mission is to educate our students to become lifelong learners who will be resourceful, responsible, and compassionate community members. Our schoolwide theme, "Carmel Valley Connects", focuses on making middle school a supportive and enjoyable transition while encouraging high academic achievement. Over 30 student clubs and activities help students feel connected on campus. Outstanding teachers and an involved and supportive parent community create a learning environment that is safe and respectful, offering each student a variety of opportunities to succeed. Staff collaborate on a regular basis using the formative process to inform instruction, reteach and individualized student needs. In 2003, 2009 and 2013 CVMS was named a California Distinguished School.

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

Carmel Valley Middle School implements a Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) to set goals to increase student achievement and success overall. CVMS has a diverse population of learners with 45.1% White, 35.3% Asian, 11.1%

Hispanic or Latino, 0.6% Black or African American, and 7.9% Two or More Races. The school also has 422 students of 1158 who speak a home language other than English, with 34 different languages represented, which accurately represents the diversity of the area.

The primary goal is to design and implement a school program that ensures each student's success in a standards-based core curriculum. Through the coordination of these services, we have an increased ability to provide additional services to any student needing them, while continuing to meet the special needs of identified students. Classroom teachers and support staff work together collaboratively to differentiate and integrate learning activities in order to address varied student-learning needs.

In addition, we have frequent staff development opportunities that provide training for staff in the areas of identified needs. We are continually striving to improve and tailor teaching and learning to meet the individual needs of all of our students. This includes regular Professional Learning Community (PLC) meeting time to review Essential Learning Outcomes, develop common formative assessments, analyze student work and data, identify students needing intervention, develop reteach and intervention plans, prioritize needs, and set learning/performance goals.

All of the services provided at Carmel Valley Middle School are coordinated for students through an inclusive process of collaborative planning and program design. This ensures that all students acquire the knowledge and skills of the standards-based core curriculum. All students engage in a high-quality, well-balanced standards-based core curriculum; yet, teachers acknowledge that students are at different developmental stages and that some may take longer to succeed and respond to different approaches. Consequently, curriculum and instructional practices are varied in order to address the academic, social, and personal needs of each student, including students who are learning English, economically disadvantaged, underachieving, gifted and talented, of average ability, and/or receiving special education services.

Additionally, students who need additional support are targeted for enrollment in a variety of academic support programs including before and after school tutoring, Math A and B Essentials classes, Bobcat Connections, Academic Power Hour, reteach opportunities through PAW and HIRE time, and online reteach opportunities using teacher developed lessons, videos or other teaching tools.

All students have access to English 7 and 8 Honors, and Integrated Math A and B Honors. Seventh grade students can qualify to move into Integrated Math B Honors through the Integrated Math Readiness Test taken before entering 7th grade. 8th graders who successfully completed Integrated Math B Honors can take Integrated Math 1 Honors, a high school level course, on campus. All students are encouraged and eligible to participate in the numerous student clubs which offer academic enrichment and/or competition opportunities including Math League, Science Olympiad, Future Problem Solvers, Academic Quiz Bowl, the After School Theater Program, Odyssey of the Mind, Speech & Debate, and *Honors Band (*must qualify).

Students with exceptional needs are served by 504 Education Plans or Individual Education Plans. Carmel Valley offers support for special education students in the standards-based core curriculum by:

- 1) Teaming special educators with general education teachers in targeted general education classes.
- 2) All Special Education teachers work with designated core subject teacher to provide support while collaborating and communicating expectations for students with a disability.
- 3) Offering Special Education courses (Fundamentals) in the areas of Math and ELA as well as Reading intervention programs to specific students in need.
- 4) A school psychologist and speech therapist provide Designated Instructional Services to students with special needs as specified in their IEP.
- 5) All teachers receive on-going training in strategies to assist special needs students.
- 6) Students with moderate to severe disabilities are enrolled in our Transitional Alternative Program (TAP) which focuses on functional academics and life skills.

Instructional practices which accelerate as well as remediate learning are employed in all classrooms. Instructional settings and practices are rich in experiences, technology, and materials that enhance the standards-based core curriculum. Educationally-disadvantaged students are provided with opportunities that allow learning time to be extended and all students who need additional support for academics are offered a variety of programs with varying levels of support. Many teachers are trained in "AVID" instructional strategies, which are infused throughout the curriculum. Students are recruited for enrollment in our College Readiness class, Math Skills class or Study Skills class based on academic, socio-emotional or behavioral factors. CVMS has extensive before, during and after school programs that are tailored to address individual learning needs as determined by a variety of both formative and summative assessment

results. These opportunities include: a) Productive Academic Work (PAW) time - 30 minutes three days a week within 3rd or 4th period class b) Homework Intervention Reteach Enrichment (HIRE) time - 15 minutes attached to classes on Thursday and Friday c) Academic Power Hour - after school tutoring offered two days a week d) peer tutoring, e) counseling programs to facilitate readiness to learn, and f) Math and general academic support electives.

Teachers respond to students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds by providing Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) in designated sheltered and ELD courses and through integration in general ed classes. Sheltered and ELD courses provide all EL students with the district's standards-based core curriculum. English Learners have access to standards-based curriculum in ELD, sheltered science class, sheltered history class, and non-sheltered math courses. All teachers have CLAD/EL certification and some have received SDAIE training. District program specialists, along with a designated counselor, work closely with the CVMS EL program coordinator and teachers to ensure that EL students have access to services and support.

Differentiated curriculum is implemented to support heterogeneous grouping. This is accomplished by adjusting the standards-based core curriculum and instruction by using one or more of the following five dimensions: depth, compacting, complexity, novelty, or acceleration. This is a key component of the long term goal for full implementation of California State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards.

New teachers are provided professional development tailored to their specific needs, particularly in classroom management, student discipline and the teaching of students with diverse needs and skills. They also receive one-on-one support from a BTSA (Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment) mentor at the school site.

Training for parents includes how to help their children transition to and thrive in middle school, and how to support the goals of the school. Parents have a variety of ways to receive training and to be meaningfully involved in the school. These include the summer Parent Orientation, monthly Coffee with the Principal meetings, Parent Information Nights throughout the year based on needs as determined by parent and administrative collaboration, PTSA parent organization membership or board participation, School Site Council, School Site Safety Committee, English Learner Advisory Committee, and a wide variety of volunteering opportunities. Training is provided by parents, staff and consultants.

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)

In 2016-17, students scored well above the state and county averages in both ELA and Math. 2017 CAASPP results show that 87.37% of 7th grade students Met or Exceeded Standards in ELA and 85.41% Met or Exceeded Standards in Math. Results for 8th grade students show, 84.91% Met or Exceeded Standards in ELA and 83.25% Met or Exceeded Standards in Math.

An analysis of multi-year CAASPP results for target student groups shows that the percentage of Students with Disabilities who Met/Exceeded standards increased by 1% in ELA, which indicates most students scored similar when compared to the prior year. Students with Disabilities demonstrated significant progress in Math-the percentage of students who Met/Exceeded standards increased by 4% when compared to the previous year.

The percent of English Learners who Met/Exceeded standards decreased by 7.38% in ELA and increased 1.51% in math. It is important to note that there are different English Learner students tested from year to year and these scores do not represent individual student progress. A multi-year review of CELDT scores shows that the percentage of students scoring in the Early Advanced to Advanced range (Level 4/5) on the annual test is steadily declining (2015=83%, 2017=75%) while the percentage of students scoring in the Beginning and Early Intermediate range (Level 1/2) is increasing (2015=6%, 2017=14%). The English Learner student profile has shifted at CVMS over the last few years which provides additional context to the decline in SBAC

score for this English Learners in ELA.

Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students continue to score similarly to their English Only peers on CAASPP assessments in both ELA and Math. Since CVMS is in declining enrollment due to the addition of a middle school in its boundary area, the demographics of the school has changed over the last two years. The 2016-17 CAASPP scores and other performance data will serve as a baseline for the school moving forward with more consistent demographic and enrollment data. Multi-year CAASPP data shows steady and sustainable growth in student performance for all students from 2015 to 2017, which indicates the supports implemented in 2015-16 should continue to be provided for maintain improvement in future years.

The English Learner Progress Indicator on the California School Dashboard reports student progress towards attaining English Proficiency on the CELDT as well as meeting the criteria to become reclassified as Fluent English Proficient. Results from the the Spring 2017 release of the California School Dashboard, shows an English Learner Progress indicator rate of 94.1% which is similar to the previous year. This indicates that English Learners at Carmel Valley continue to demonstrate sufficient progress towards English language proficiency and obtaining the academic skills necessary to become reclassified.

In 2016-17, 22.5%% of EL students at CVMS were redesignated as Fluent English Proficient. Continuing to offer and refine programs and services provided at CVMS to support English Learners is a priority.

For students in Special Education, additional data from those receiving reading intervention shows all students receiving targeted intervention through Read 180, System 44 or Read Naturally programs in 2016-17 increased their lexile performance, some with significant gains. There is still a need for continued use of the reading intervention programs with students identified as scoring below grade level in reading.

School climate indicators show that the continued focus to maintain a positive school culture at CVMS has been effective. Local attendance data reflects a chronic absenteeism (>10% absent rate) of 2.2% for all students. Multiyear discipline data shows that CVMS has had a steady suspension rate of approximately 1.5% and an expulsion rate of 0%-0.2%. 2017 Healthy Kids Survey results indicated 77% of students felt safe at school, and 90% felt there was an adult at school who cared about them and, 68% of students felt like they were a part of the school. These are positive indicators of student connectedness. The goal for student connectedness will be to maintain students' feeling of safety and well being, and to increase the percentage of students who feel like they are part of the school by 5%.

C. Involvement Process

Involvement Process:

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

During the 2017-18 school year, the SSC worked with the Principal to analyze current goals and to revise and develop goals for the school based on perceived student needs for 2018-19 at meetings on December 11, 2017, February 26, 2018 and April 30, 2018. Input was also taken from the Department Chair leaders as to the overall goals as well as the action plan for each goal at meetings on March 19 and April 23, 2018. The Principal collaborated with the Special Education Department Chairperson and the English Learner Lead teacher to incorporate goals specific to these subgroups into the plan. Input was taken from parents at the English Learner Advisory Committee meetings on March 16 and March 21, 2018. The 2018-19 School Site Council met on May 21, 2018 to approve the 2018-19 CVMS Single Plan for Student Achievement.

**D. Summary of Progress Made on 2017-18 Goals
Carmel Valley Middle School**

School Goal 1

Sustain productive teacher collaboration to implement state content standards, increase innovative learning skills and student achievement.

LCAP Priority Area:

State Priority: 1: Basics 2: Implementation of State Standards, State Standards 4: Pupil Achievement 7: Course Access

Targeted Pupil Student Group(s):

All Students

A. Actual Measurable Outcomes:

ELO's from each PLC group, common formative assessments and results, participation documentation from PLC groups, CAASPP results, PLC group survey results

2017 CAASPP results show

86.09% of all students scored in the Met or Exceeded in ELA and 84.29% in Math which is similar to the previous year's results.

87.37% (similar to prior year) of 7th grade students Met or Exceeded Standards in ELA and 85.41% (-2% from prior year) Met or Exceeded Standards in Math. Results for 8th grade students show, 84.91% (-2%) Met or Exceeded Standards in ELA and 83.25% (+3.3%) Met or Exceeded Standards in Math.

District administered PLC Progress Survey results for the 2017-18 compared to the 2016-17 school year show at CVMS:

100% of teachers understand the PLC and its purpose in both years.

83% (17-18) and 95% (16-17) of teachers agree ELOs are defined for their subject area (-12%)

83% (17-18) and 90% (16-17) say they are aligned to current standards for the subject area. (-7%)

78% (17-18) and 90% (16-17) of teachers have administered and discussed the results of a CFA for their PLC (-12%),

about 65% (17-18) and 85% (16-17) identify students in need of intervention and have a process in place for remediation/reteaching for students. (-20%)

77% (17-18) and 95% (16-17) indicate they are able to use data in their PLC to improve teaching and learning. (-18%)

Note - Science PLCs moved away from the PLC process this year to implement new science NGSS standards and timelines which may

B. Summary of Progress:

Teachers increased collaboration time with use of the Late Start Days which allowed for 1.5 hours of collaboration time, 16 times a year for 24 total hours of collaboration time. PLC groups also took Release Days for collaborative work throughout the year. Course-alike and/or department groups attended district-wide professional development days throughout the year. PLC groups are now established on campus and they have created ELO's, common formative assessments, a timeline for implementation for the current school year, methods to analyze student data, and reteach/intervention strategies for students.

All PLC groups kept notes of meetings in a designated electronic PLC folder to which administrators have access. Every staff member on campus is a part of a PLC including Math, English, Science, Social Science, World Languages, PE, and Electives. Administrators also walked around during PLC time to check in on groups and to support groups as needed.

The continued focus on PLC work has shown a positive impact on student results on CAASPP tests in ELA and Math. In 2016-17, students scored well above the state and county averages in both ELA and Math and maintained over 80% of students scoring in the Standards Met/Exceeded range in both ELA and Math.

District PLC survey results show that CVMS teachers understand the PLC purpose components of a PLC cycle to support student achievement. Survey results show the PLC groups are not consistent in the number of CFA administered as it ranges from 0 to more than 4. Teachers indicated the support they need is in Data Analysis of CFAs and in determining the procedure for providing interventions. District professional development days had activities focused in both of these areas for all departments.

account from some decrease in the PLC Progress.
Teachers indicate they want more professional development with data analysis of CFAs and procedure for providing interventions and reteach.

C. Relevance:

This goal has been partially met. Teacher collaboration increased and designated time was used to address implementation of state content standards and increase innovative learning skills and student achievement. Teachers still need more training and practice in analyzing data and implementing reteach/intervention strategies for student learning.

D. What changes, if any, will be made as a result of reviewing measurable outcomes?

Teachers now have established PLC groups in each content area. For 2018-19, PLC groups will continue using the formative process to implement state content standards and assess student achievement. Targeted training for course-alike groups or departments will be implemented for analyzing data and reteach/intervention strategies.

School Goal 2

Maintain current student achievement for all students and focus on increasing achievement in targeted student group areas.

LCAP Priority Area:

State Priority 1:Basics, 2:Implementation of State Standards, 4: Pupil Performance, 7: Course Access

Targeted Pupil Student Group(s):

All students performing below grade level in ELA and math with focus on EL students, students in special education programs, and students in intervention/readiness classes.

A. Actual Measurable Outcomes:

SBAC results in ELA and Math, Pupil Performance on teacher created SBAC practice tests, Assessments for students enrolled in identified intervention programs, CELDT data, reading intervention data, D/F Lists

2017 CAASPP Results

All Students:

86.09% of all students scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 84.29% in Math which is similar to the previous year's results

Students with Disabilities

44.12% (+1.12%) scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 40.3% (+4.3%) in Math

English Learners:

21.62% (-7.38%) scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 63.51% (+1.5%) in Math

Economically Disadvantaged Students:

62.71% (+5.74%) scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 64.7% (+11.7%) in Math

Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)

RFEP students continue to score similarly to their English Only peers on CAASPP assessments in both ELA and Math.

CELDT

A multi-year review of CELDT scores shows that the percentage of students scoring in the Early Advanced to Advanced range (Level 4/5) on the annual test is steadily declining (2015=83%, 2017=75%) while the percentage of students scoring in the Beginning and Early

B. Summary of Progress:

Although all students and target student groups demonstrated progress on the CAASPP tests, results for English Learners highlight the need to continue to provide and refine supports to increase their academic skills and progress towards attaining English language proficiency.

The percent of English Learners who Met/Exceeded standards decreased by 7.38% in ELA and increased 1.51% in math. It is important to note that there are different English Learner students tested from year to year and these scores do not represent individual student progress. A multi-year review of CELDT scores shows that the percentage of students scoring in the Early Advanced to Advanced range (Level 4/5) on the annual test is steadily declining (2015=83%, 2017=75%) while the percentage of students scoring in the Beginning and Early Intermediate range (Level 1/2) is increasing (2015=6%, 2017=14%). The English Learner student profile has shifted at CVMS over the last few years which provides additional context to the decline in SBAC score for this English Learners in ELA.

The D/F list was reviewed each grading period by counselors, administrators, and the I-Team. Counselors met with all students who had more than one D or F as indicated on their grade report. Counselors reached out to teachers and parents to discuss supports for specific students, and recommended interventions including Bobcat Connections, Math Skills class, Study Skills class, Academic Power Hour, reteach opportunities with teachers or specific subject tutoring by teachers. For students who continued with multiple D or F grades on subsequent lists, counselors referred students to the I-Team for further intervention determination. If students on the lists are EL or on an IEP, counselors worked with the EL Lead or special education case manager for supports.

Intermediate range (Level 1/2) is increasing (2015=6%, 2017=14%). The English Learner student profile has shifted at CVMS over the last few years which provides additional context to the decline in SBAC score for this English Learners in ELA.

ELPAC

The ELPAC assessment for English Learners was given for the first time in Spring 2018. These scores will serve as a baseline to determine future measurable outcomes in determining EL progress.

Reclassification rate

In 2016-17, 22.5%% of EL students at CVMS were redesignated as Fluent English Proficient.

C. Relevance:

This goal was partially met in that overall assessment scores showed students maintained achievement in ELA and mathematics. However, targeted subgroups continue to show an achievement gap that needs to be addressed.

D. What changes, if any, will be made as a result of reviewing measurable outcomes?

Targeted intervention will focus on student groups who are scoring below the school average including students in the EL program, students in special education programs, and students who are economically disadvantaged.

School Goal 3

Increase the level of student connectedness and overall safety of pupils, staff and parents.

LCAP Priority Area:

State Priorities 1: Basic, 3: Parent Involvement, 5: Pupil Engagement, and 6: School Climate

Targeted Pupil Student Group(s):

All students

A. Actual Measurable Outcomes:

Attendance Data

Local attendance data reflects a chronic absenteeism (>10% absent rate) of 2.2% for all students. This represents a decline of 0.8% from the previous year.

CA Healthy Kids Survey

2017 Healthy Kids Survey results indicated

77% of students felt safe at school (-4% from 2015)

90% felt there was an adult at school who cared about them (-3% from 2015)

68% of students felt like they were a part of the school (+2% from 2015)

These are positive indicators of student connectedness. The goal for student connectedness will be to maintain students feeling of safety and well being, and to increase the percentage of students who feel like they are part of the school by 5%.

Student Climate Survey Results 2017-18

70.3% of students feel safe at school, 7.5% do not feel safe at school.

69.1% of students agree or strongly agree they feel like they are a part of school, 9.3% students disagree or strongly disagree they feel like a part of school.

Participation in activities - Students attend school activities at varying degrees - 63.9% attended 7th grade orientation, 34.2% participated in some type of ASB activity, 23.4% attended Academic Power Hour, 29.9% attend a club at lunch time, 19.2% are part of Science Olympiad or Math League, 51.8% attended an after school activity such as dance or movie night, 20.7% are part of Boys & Girls Club athletics, 18.2% were part of some other activity on campus. 9.3% reported they were not a part of any activity on campus.

B. Summary of Progress:

School climate indicators show that the continued focus to maintain a positive school culture at CVMS has been effective.

- Absenteeism has decreased
- Suspension and expulsion rates remain low
- CHKS survey results show positive indicators of student connectedness and sense of safety. However, positive student responses related to safety and teacher connectedness decreased slightly when compared to 2015 HKS results.

The CVMS bell schedule was changed in a previous year to incorporate time each week for students to receive more academic support as well as to allow for time for students to participate in activities during the school day. This time, called PAW, allowed for students to participate in ASB activities such as Welcome Week, Red Ribbon Week, Act of Kindness Week, Spirit Week and the Talent Show without missing class time. There are more than 30 clubs on campus that met during lunch as well as Math League and Science Olympiad that offered opportunities for students to participate in extra-curricular activities. Through the local Boys & Girls Club, students also had an opportunity to participate in athletics with other students from CVMS. There are 6 school-wide or grade level assemblies scheduled throughout the year with targeted topics to increase student awareness, safety, and/or connectedness. Academic Power Hour averaged 25 students per session with two teachers and multiple high school volunteer tutors. Counselors pushed in to classes to directly address students about topics such as career interest and inventory, high school preparedness, and planning for your future. The Safety committee which had representatives from the school community including an administrator, classified staff, certificated staff, and parents met bi-monthly to develop a comprehensive safety plan for the school. Teachers also used PAW time to review safety procedures with students and there were all school drills conducted for student safety. Working with the PTSA, there were monthly parent information sessions with day or evening events covering various topics including CyberSafety, "Anxiety in Tweens and Teens", communication with teenagers, Vaping Use Prevention Information, "High School and Beyond", and parent orientation for incoming 7th graders. Some were well attended with 150-200 parents some were not with only 20-30 parents. There were multiple opportunities for parent volunteers from weekly opportunities in the office and at lunch to other school events such as Spirit Week, school

Academic supports - Students taking advantage of academic supports on campus: PAW time is used by up to 73.8% of students for assignments, teacher questions and test or assignment make-ups. 21.8% have seen a counselor for academic support. 36.3% have seen teachers outside of class time for help. 24.4% have gone to Academic Power Hour.

Treatment of students by adults - Students agreed or strongly agreed teachers treat students fairly 56.1% while 16.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed teachers treat students fairly. 62.6% of students agreed or strongly agreed a teacher or adult "really cares about me". 9.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed a teacher or adult "really cares about me". 73.3% of students agree or strongly agree a teacher or adult tells them when they do a good job, 9.0% disagree or strongly disagree a teacher or adult tells them when they do a good job.

Treatment of students by students on campus - 46.7% of students say they have never been made fun of, insulted or called names while 25.2% of students say they have been made fun of, insulted or called names 4 or more times this year. 71.3% of students say they were not harassed or bullied on campus this year. 10.5% say they were bullied or harassed 4 or more times this year. 62.8% of students say they have not had mean rumors or lies spread about them. 10% of students say they have had mean rumors or lies spread about them on campus.

Online treatment of students by students - 79.3% of students say they have not had mean rumors, lies, or hurtful pictures spread about them on social media or a cell phone. 7% of students say they had mean rumors, lies, or hurtful pictures spread about them on social media or a cell phone 4 or more times.

A Parent Climate Survey was sent out but not enough responses were generated to give accurate data.

Discipline Data

Multiyear discipline data shows that CVMS has had a steady suspension rate of approximately 1.5% and an expulsion rate of 0%-0.2%.

dances, and promotion. There was an increased effort to facilitate staff connectedness during the 2017-18 school year with the implementation of a Staff Sunshine Committee who organized staff events both during and after school time and who had special staff recognition for birthdays or gifts for staff needing support.

C. Relevance:

This goal was partially met with student connectedness to school remaining about the same, parent connectedness continuing to be effective, and staff connectedness increasing.

D. What changes, if any, will be made as a result of reviewing measurable outcomes?

CVMS will continue this goal in 2018-19 to maintain the positive school climate and address areas of concern evident from survey results.

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.

LCAP Goal:
 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 performing below grade level.

School Goal 1
 Sustain productive teacher collaboration to implement state content standards, increase innovative learning skills and student achievement.

LCAP Priority Area:
 State Priority: 1: Basics 2: Implementation of State Standards, State Standards 4: Pupil Achievement 7: Course Access

Targeted Pupil Student Group(s):
 All students

A. Rationale:
 Teachers now have established PLC groups in each content area. For 2018-19, PLC groups will use the formative process throughout the year to implement state content standards and assess student achievement. There are now ample technological resources on campus for student access which allows teachers to implement more use of technology in lessons. District administered PLC Progress Survey results at CVMS for the 2016-17 school year show 100% of teachers understand the PLC and its purpose, 95% of teachers agree ELOs are defined for their subject area and 90% say they are aligned to current standards for the subject area. 90% of teachers have administered and discussed the results of a CFA for their PLC, and about 85% identify students in need of intervention and have a process in place for remediation/reteaching for students. 95% indicate they are able to use data in their PLC to improve teaching and learning. Survey results show the PLC groups are not consistent in the number of CFA administered as it ranges from 0 to more than 4. Teachers indicated the support they need is in Data Analysis of CFAs and in determining the procedure for providing interventions. In 2017-18 these numbers declined slightly, although some could be due to Science transitioning to NGSS and elective teachers who do not have a PLC on campus.

B. Expected Measurable Outcomes:

On PLC Teacher Survey core subject teachers (excluding Science teachers who are implementing new curriculum):

- 100% of PLCs develop at least four common formative assessments
- 100% of PLCs administer at least four common formative assessments
- 100% of PLCs analyze and discuss student learning based on the common formative assessments
- 100% of teachers determine reteach/intervention strategies
- 75% of teachers take at least one Release Day for collaboration
- 100% of teachers report their PLC group make progress in 2018-19.

C. Strategy:

Administration will provide allotted time and supports for teachers to complete formative process cycle for all ELO's in the PLC groups with specific emphasis on analyzing student data and implementing reteach/intervention strategies. Teachers will be given release days as needed to collaborate as well, and support from PD opportunities and district support personnel will be used.

| | Actions/Tasks | Person(s) Responsible | Cost and Funding Source | Means to assess improvement | Timeline |
|----|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1. | <p>Utilize the Professional Learning Community process with course alike groups. PLC groups utilize the formative process cycle in the 2018-19 school year on an on-going basis. PLC groups meet during Late Start Collaboration Days and release days as needed to:</p> <p>a. Evaluate alignment to state content standards, review and revise Essential Learning Outcomes. b. Discuss how they will address the ELO's through lessons and instruction. c. Review and revise common formative assessments that address specific ELO's and create a timeline for administering assessments (at least four throughout the year) to students. d. Administer common formative assessments to students on agreed upon timeline. e. Analyze and discuss student learning based on the common formative assessments. Groups use release days as needed to analyze student learning. f. Through analysis of data, identify students who need intervention or re-teach of subject matter. g. Determine and implement effective intervention, re-teach, and enrichment opportunities for students and discuss instructional best practices for continued student achievement. h. Teachers take reflective survey to analyze PLC group progress through the process and achievement of group goals for the year.</p> | <p>a-g. Teachers, PLC groups h. Principal, teachers</p> | <p>\$4,848.00 for teacher release days as needed Source: Site Formative/Achievement funds</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District PLC teacher survey results • Development of ELO's, CFA's and timelines • Participation documentation from on-going PLC meetings • PLC groups descriptions of intervention and re-teach methods. | <p>a-g. Ongoing h. May 2019</p> |
| 2. | <p>Provide Professional Development opportunities on collaboration and implementation of state content standards and research based instructional practices.</p> <p>a. During staff meetings and Late Start days, provide Professional Development and support for PLC groups with specific emphasis on analyzing student data and implementing effective reteach/intervention strategies. b. Utilize district TOSAs for on-site PD related to state content standards implementation and assessment.</p> | <p>a. Administrators, teachers b. Administrators, district TOSAs</p> | <p>\$3,300.00 for teacher release days and extra work hours as needed Source: Site Formative/Achievement funds</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Professional Development implemented • Survey from PLC groups on needs for PD • Participation documentation from on-going PLC groups | <p>Ongoing</p> |

LCAP Goal:

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 performing below grade level.
Goal #2 All English Learner (EL) pupils will receive instruction and curriculum that includes designated and integrated English language development across all core content areas. Within five (5) years of instruction in SDUHSD, all English learner pupils will meet the criteria to be reclassified as Redesignated Fluent English Proficient (RFEP).

School Goal 2

Maintain current student achievement for all students and focus on increasing achievement in targeted student group areas.

LCAP Priority Area:

State Priority 1:Basics, 2:Implementation of State Standards, 4: Pupil Performance, 7: Course Access

Targeted Pupil Student Group(s):

Students scoring below grade level, specific subgroups include English Learners, students in Special Education, and students in intervention/essentials classes.

A. Rationale:

2017 CAASPP Results

All Students:

86.09% of all students scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 84.29% in Math which is similar to the previous year's results

Students with Disabilities

44.12% (+1.12%) scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 40.3% (+4.3%) in Math

English Learners:

21.62% (-7.38%) scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 63.51% (+1.5%) in Math

Economically Disadvantaged Students:

62.71% (+5.74%) scored in the Met or Exceeded range in ELA and 64.7% (+11.7%) in Math

Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)

RFEP students continue to score similarly to their English Only peers on CAASPP assessments in both ELA and Math.

87.37% (similar to prior year) of 7th grade students Met or Exceeded Standards in ELA and 85.41% (-2% from prior year) Met or Exceeded

B. Expected Measurable Outcomes:

CAASPP data:

All students:

Maintain over 80% of all students scoring in the Standard Met/Exceeded range in ELA and Math

Target student groups; Students with Disabilities, English Learners, Economically Disadvantaged Students:

Increase of 2% in the percentage of student in each target student group who score within the Standard Met/Exceeded range in ELA and Math

Decrease number of students on quarterly D/F list by 2% from the 1st Semester Progress Report to the Final 2nd Semester Progress Report.

Standards in Math. Results for 8th grade students show, 84.91% (-2%) Met or Exceeded Standards in ELA and 83.25% (+3.3%) Met or Exceeded Standards in Math.

Although all students and target student groups demonstrated progress on the CAASPP tests, results for English Learners highlight the need to continue to provide and refine supports into increase their academic skills and progress towards attain English language proficiency.

The percent of English Learners who Met/Exceeded standards decreased by 7.38% in ELA and increased 1.51% in math. It is important to note that there are different English Learner students tested from year to year and these scores do not represent individual student progress.

D/F data: For the 2016-17 school year, AERIES data shows the percent of students enrolled with at least one D or F for the 1st Semester Progress Report was 11% which decreased for the 1st Semester Report Card to 10%. The 2nd Semester Progress Report D/F rate was 16% which decreased for the 2nd Semester Report Card to 11%. This does show the 1st 9 weeks D/F rate was the same as the Final Grade D/F rate at 11% but also shows a decrease in the number of students on the list from the 9 weeks progress report to the semester grade for each semester. This data will serve as a baseline for D/F data.

CVMS has experienced a decline in enrollment (approximately -15% since 2015) and a shift in student demographics with the opening of an additional district middle school within CVMS boundaries. In order to effectively assess student achievement trends for target student groups, CVMS will use the 2017 CAASPP scores as a new baseline for measuring future growth target student groups.

C. Strategy:

| Actions/Tasks | | Person(s) Responsible | Cost and Funding Source | Means to assess improvement | Timeline |
|---------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. | Use SBAC assessment results in ELA and math to identify areas to revise or supplement curriculum. a. Utilize late start collaboration time and provide release days for teacher to meet as department/grade level teams to analyze pupil performance data from SBAC results. b. Identify common standards that were not met and add/revise curriculum and instruction. | Administrators, Teachers | none | CAASPP results | a. November 2018 b. Identify by November 2018, add/revise ongoing |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|---|
| 2. | <p>Continue to maintain a system to track effectiveness of interventions for students performing below grade level.</p> <p>a. iTeam (Counselors, Administrator, School Psychologist, Special Ed Dept Chair, Social Worker) meet weekly to review student data including grades, assessment results, teacher reports, attendance, and parent input to determine general education interventions and level of support needed.</p> <p>b. Use established criteria with counselors to identify students who could benefit from Academic Lab or Math Skills (general education) classes - grade in Math and/or English, MDTP entrance test, SBAC score from 6th grade, parent or teacher reports, SRI lexile scores, GPA, I-Team recommendation.</p> <p>c. Counselors meet with each student on D/F list quarterly to identify issue(s) and communicate areas of need to parents and teachers.</p> <p>d. Counselor and/or support teacher will work with student to develop an action plan to address issues.</p> <p>e. Counselors and teachers will track meetings and team agreed upon interventions through the Intervention screen on Aeries.</p> <p>f. iTeam will communicate with families and support teachers related to effectiveness of identified interventions.</p> | <p>a. iTeam members, Assistant Principal</p> <p>b. Counselors</p> <p>c. Counselors</p> <p>d. Counselors, teachers</p> <p>e. Counselors, teachers</p> <p>f. iTeam members, Assistant Principal, counselors</p> | <p>\$72,000</p> <p>Source: LCAP funded non-formula section</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D/F list comparisons throughout year • SBAC • MDTP entrance tests • Progress of students in Math Skills and Study Skills, grades & assessments • Intervention records | <p>Ongoing</p> |
| 3. | <p>Support implementation of ELD standards to support EL students in ELA and math classes.</p> <p>a. EL Lead will collaborate with specific teachers of EL students to support implementation of standards in ELA and math curriculum.</p> <p>b. EL Lead will meet with administrators and counselors twice a year to review student progress on district EL monitoring documents. Progress will be shared with department chairs or teacher leaders.</p> <p>c. EL Lead meets quarterly with site EL team to support EL students in Sheltered classes and across other core areas.</p> <p>d. EL Lead meets with students to review Reclassification criteria and academic progress.</p> | <p>a. EL Coordinator, teachers</p> <p>b. EL Coordinator, administrators</p> <p>c. EL Coordinator, Sheltered subject area teachers</p> | <p>\$24,000</p> <p>Source: LCAP funded non-formula section</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student CELDT scores • Assessments given within EL classes • Student performance data including grades, assessments, and SBAC scores • District EL monitoring documents | <p>a. September 2018</p> <p>b. September 2018, May 2019</p> <p>c. Ongoing</p> |
| 4. | <p>For students with disabilities, increase access to general education curriculum while implementing targeted specific support for students.</p> <p>a. Continue Reading Intervention programs for students scoring below grade level lexile with Read 180 Universal, System 44 and Read Naturally in Academic Support classes, English Fundamental classes, and TAP Reading Intervention class. Special Education teachers will continue training and support for these programs to implement in their classes.</p> <p>b. All Special Education teachers work with designated core subject teacher to provide support while collaborating and communicating</p> | <p>a. Special Education teachers, District Reading Intervention Coordinator</p> <p>b. Special Education teacher and support staff</p> <p>c. Special Education teacher, administration</p> | <p>none</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRI scores • Student progress in Essentials classes including assessments on ALEKS program | <p>Ongoing</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | expectations for students with a disability. c. Continue Math Fundamentals class, Team Taught Int Math A Essentials and Int Math B Essentials courses to support students below grade level in math. | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|

LCAP Goal:

Goal #4 Increase the level of “school connectedness” and "sense of safety" of pupils, staff and parents.

School Goal 3

Increase the level of student connectedness and overall safety of pupils, staff and parents.

LCAP Priority Area:

State Priority 1:Basics, 2:Implementation of State Standards, 4: Pupil Performance, 7: Course Access

Targeted Pupil Student Group(s):

All students

A. Rationale:

Attendance Data

Local attendance data reflects a chronic absenteeism (>10% absent rate) of 2.2% for all students. This represents a decline of 0.8% from the previous year.

CA Healthy Kids Survey

2017 Healthy Kids Survey results indicated

77% of students felt safe at school (-4% from 2015)

90% felt there was an adult at school who cared about them (-3% from 2015)

68% of students felt like they were a part of the school (+2% from 2015)

The CA Healthy Kids Survey will be administered in Spring 2019 so is the best comparative data for 2018-19.

These are positive indicators of student connectedness. The goal for student connectedness will be to maintain students feeling of safety and well being, and to increase the percentage of students who feel like they are part of the school.

Discipline Data

Multiyear discipline data shows that CVMS has had a steady suspension rate of approximately 1.5% and an expulsion rate of 0%-0.2%.

B. Expected Measurable Outcomes:

Attendance Data

Reduce chronic absenteeism rate by 0.5%

CA Healthy Kids Survey results for 2019:

Increase students' sense of safety by 3%.

Increase number of students who feel there is an adult who cares about them by 3%.

Increase number of students who feel like they are part of the school by 5%.

Establish baseline for staff & student connectedness and safety using climate surveys in Spring 2018.

Discipline Data

Suspension rate of >2% and an expulsion rate of 0%

C. Strategy:

Focus on student opportunities for participation in school related activities both in and out of the classroom. Establish a baseline through student and parent surveys for longitudinal comparison of perceived opinion of student and parent connectedness.

| | Actions/Tasks | Person(s) Responsible | Cost and Funding Source | Means to assess improvement | Timeline |
|----|---|---|---|--|----------|
| 1. | <p>Continue current programs and implement additional programs to increase student connectedness with one another and staff.</p> <p>a. Administrators and counselors work with ASB to plan student activities throughout the year during PAW time, lunch and after school including Welcome Week, Red Ribbon Week, Act of Kindness Week, Spirit Week, Wellness Week, student dances, and movie nights.</p> <p>b. Utilize PAW time to allow for teachers and staff to check in on students, especially those who need support academically or social/emotionally. Encourage teachers to make personal connections with students during PAW time and other school related activities.</p> <p>c. Offer a variety of student-led clubs including academic, social, student-interest, and creative type clubs, and hold Club Day to encourage students to get involved in at least one activity on campus. Hold a second club day later in the year to encourage student participation.</p> <p>d. Administrators collaborate with counselors and ASB advisor to conduct assemblies based on student needs and safety such as Bully Prevention, Anti-drug & alcohol, Cybersafety, Career Fair and planning for the future.</p> <p>e. Provide voluntary Academic Power Hour tutoring twice a week for students after school to support student success in classes with support from teachers and high school peer volunteers.</p> <p>f. Counselors meet individually with students who are at risk for feeling less connected to school such as students on the D/F list, students whose parents do not have a college degree, and others who have generated concerns from teachers or parents.</p> <p>g. Create a Wellness Committee who will discuss and implement activities to increase student and staff wellness, including student-student, student-staff, and staff-staff connectedness.</p> <p>h. Communicate with Boys & Girls Club on student activities after school which our students are involved in to foster a collaborative environment for student participation.</p> <p>i. Develop a Student Stand Out recognition system which recognizes and rewards students for going above and beyond in areas such as academically, emotional support, community service, extra-curricular activities, etc. Use ASB Bobcat Brag Cards and monthly recognition party as one means of recognition.</p> | <p>a. Administrators, counselors, ASB advisor</p> <p>b. Teachers, Administrators</p> <p>c. Teachers as Club Advisers, ASB advisor, students</p> <p>d. Administrators, counselors, ASB advisor</p> <p>e. Administrators, teachers</p> <p>f. Counselors</p> <p>g. Administrators, school staff</p> <p>h. Administrators, school staff</p> <p>i. Administrators, ASB Adviser, teachers, school staff</p> | <p>a-d. None</p> <p>e. \$4,074 LCAP funded Site Tutoring Funds; \$3,500 Site Budget Tutoring Funds</p> <p>f - i. none</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in student activities, number of activities • Data on number of clubs and extra curricular activities offered for students • Survey on student participation in clubs • Participation in Academic Power Hour • CHKS Survey Spring 2019 • Staff climate survey in Spring 2019 • Parent climate survey in Spring 2019 • D/F lists | Ongoing |
| 2. | <p>Provide a comprehensive safety plan for students and staff.</p> <p>a. Develop school safety plan with safety committee comprised of administrators, classified and certificated staff, and parents. Coordinate with school resource officer for safety on campus and surrounding campus.</p> <p>b. Safety committee will review safety plan and will meet quarterly for updates, school safety walk and feedback on comprehensive safety plan.</p> <p>c. Provide appropriate communication and support regarding school safety procedures for students and staff, and send updates during year to</p> | <p>a - b. Administrators, Safety Committee</p> <p>c - e. Administrators, School Community</p> <p>f. Administrators, teachers</p> | None | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in Safety Drills throughout year • Feedback from Safety Committee • CHKS student survey in 2019 • Staff climate | Ongoing |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|------|---|---|
| | <p>all staff through email and staff meetings.</p> <p>c. Use PAW time to review safety plan with students.</p> <p>d. Share safety plan with parents through website and discuss plan as part of Coffee with the Principal series.</p> <p>e. Use email and voice notification system to communicate with school community any safety concerns, and use text message alert system with staff to communicate in emergency situations.</p> <p>f. Implement a Digital Citizenship plan using Common Sense Media curriculum school-wide to educate students regarding online safety and appropriate use of digital media. Include presentation to students and parents regarding cybersafety annually.</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> survey in Spring 2019 Digital Citizenship plan developed and implemented | |
| 3. | <p>Increase Parent Participation through support programs and volunteer opportunities.</p> <p>a. Incorporate Parent Information nights throughout year for student safety and information on such topics as bullying prevention, drug and alcohol awareness, cybersafety and supporting an independent teenager.</p> <p>b. Encourage parents to volunteer for school activities including Parent Orientation, dances, movie nights, Spirit Week activities, Science Olympiad and Math League, and other opportunities throughout the year.</p> | Administrators | None | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Parent Information Nights Attendance at Parent Information Nights Number of Parent Volunteers Parent climate survey in Spring 2018 | Ongoing |
| 4. | <p>Communicate with School Community stakeholders on an ongoing basis to support positive atmosphere with students, teachers, staff, parents, and community.</p> <p>a. Send a weekly email (eblast) through communication system to parents highlighting events and giving information about CVMS. Include a message from Principal or other staff members relevant to school connectedness or support of students each week.</p> <p>b. Include updates on school events and information on school website and social media pages.</p> <p>c. Hold Coffee with the Principals each month to update parents on school and community related events and issues. Invite guest speakers to present to parents with any determined needs such as school safety, vape pen prevention and education, and suicide prevention information and protocol.</p> <p>d. Encourage communication with parents by teachers through update websites, email and other messages.</p> | Administrators and support staff | None | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weekly Eblasts sent Website updates List of topics discussed at Coffee with the Principal | Ongoing |
| 5. | <p>Increase student connectedness with school as a means for building capacity of students' college and career readiness.</p> <p>a. Begin to connect students to school through early college and career readiness inventories with online career exploration programs and six year school plans.</p> | <p>a. Counselors</p> <p>b - d. Counselors and Administrators</p> | None | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> College and Career Inventory data Six year plans developed | <p>a. By January 2019</p> <p>b. March 2019</p> <p>c. February 2019</p> <p>d. January 2019</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>b. Hold annual Career Fair supported by counselors and parents for students to begin exploration of careers in our community.</p> <p>c. High School students present to students at an assembly on how to be successful in high school, opportunities to explore in high school both college prep and career technical prep, and how to prepare for the college admission process.</p> <p>d. Principals from high schools present to parents on programs at high school that lead to college and career readiness for students.</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHKS student Survey Spring 2019 | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

F. School Site Council Membership Carmel Valley Middle School

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 |
|--|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Cara Dolnik | X | | | | |
| Renee Cody | | X | | | |
| Lori Meyer | | X | | | |
| Scott Dreschel | | X | | | |
| Roberta Blank | | | X | | |
| Ryan Clairmont | | | | | X |
| Cathy Kuo | | | | | X |
| Aditya Hegde | | | | | X |
| Kyle Peng | | | | X | |
| Josh Raysman | | | | X | |
| Stephanie Van Vinkle | | | | X | |
| Jessica Starcher | | X | | | |
| Numbers of members of each category | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 |

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).

F. School Site Council Membership Carmel Valley Middle School

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 |
|--|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Cara Dolnik <i>Cara Dolnik</i> | X | | | | |
| Renee Cody | | X | | | |
| Lori Meyer <i>Lori Meyer</i> | | X | | | |
| Scott Dreschel <i>Scott Dreschel</i> | | X | | | |
| Roberta Blank <i>Roberta Blank</i> | | | X | | |
| Ryan Clairmont | | | | | X |
| Gathy Kuo <i>Gathy Kuo</i> | | | | | X |
| Aditya Hegde <i>Aditya</i> | | | | | X |
| Kyle Peng <i>Kyle Peng</i> | | | | X | |
| Josh Raysman <i>Josh Raysman</i> | | | | X | |
| Stephanie VanWinkle <i>S. Van Winkle</i> | | | | X | |
| Jessica Starcher <i>Jessica Starcher</i> | | X | | | |
| Numbers of members of each category | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 |

NIVEDITA HEGDE X
 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).

Stephanie PETIT - ELAC Representative *Delia*
Susan Polizzotto - P.T.S.A Representative *Susan Polizzotto*

**Form G. Budget 2018-19
Carmel Valley Middle School**

| Of the four following options, please select the one that describes this school site: | |
|--|---|
| | This site operates as a targeted assistance school (TAS), not as a schoolwide program (SWP). |
| | This site operates a SWP but does not consolidate its funds as part of operating a SWP |
| | This site operates a SWP and consolidates only applicable federal funds as part of operating a SWP. |
| | This site operates a SWP and consolidates all applicable funds as part of operating a SWP. |

| State/Federal Categorical Program | Allocation |
|---|---------------------|
| Site LCFF Supplemental Funding - Site Formative/Achievement Funds | \$8,148.00 |
| Site LCFF Supplemental Funding - Site Tutoring Funds | \$4,074.00 |
| Site LCFF Supplemental Funding – District Funded Sections (non-formula) | \$96,000.00 |
| Title I Funds Does Not Apply | \$0.00 |
| Total | \$108,222.00 |

Appendix A. Student Performance Data

Section 1: Enrollment

Table 1.1 Site enrollment trends with Student Group breakdown

| | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | | 2017-18 | |
|--|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|--------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Total enrollment | 1,361 | - | 1,176 | - | 1,159 | 100.0% |
| Black or African American | 10 | 0.7% | 5 | 0.4% | 7 | 0.60% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3 | 0.2% | 3 | 0.3% | 0 | 0% |
| Asian | 457 | 33.6% | 399 | 33.9% | 408 | 35.2% |
| Filipino | 17 | 1.3% | 16 | 1.4% | 15 | 1.30% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 111 | 8.2% | 129 | 11.0% | 131 | 11.3% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 3 | 0.2% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0% |
| White | 724 | 53.2% | 561 | 47.7% | 521 | 45.0% |
| Two or More Races | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 91 | 7.9% |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 70 | 5.1% | 52 | 4.6% | 71 | 6.1% |
| English Learners | 71 | 5.2% | 71 | 6.0% | 75 | 6.5% |
| Students with Disabilities | 112 | 8.2% | 80 | 7.1% | 86 | 7.4% |
| Foster Youth | | % | | % | | % |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Section 2: Student Achievement Indicators

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

| 8 th grade | Number of students tested | All Students | English Only | RFEP | English Learner | Special Education | Socioeconomically disadvantaged |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2016-17 | 603 | 85% | 88% | 89% | 14% | 46% | 47% |
| 2015-16 | 781 | 84% | 84% | 88% | 32% | 39% | 61% |
| 2014-15 | 783 | 83% | 83% | 89% | 50% | 50% | 57% |
| 7 th grade | | | | | | | |
| 2016-17 | 562 | 87% | 92% | 89% | 28% | 41% | 89% |
| 2015-16 | 580 | 88% | 91% | 92% | 25% | 47% | 51% |
| 2014-15 | 731 | 83% | 81% | 88% | 44% | 37% | 60% |
| Source: California Department of Education, https://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 | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 748 | 590 | 575 | 731 | 580 | 562 | 721 | 577 | 562 | 97.7 | 98.3 | 97.7 |
| Grade 8 | 805 | 793 | 614 | 783 | 781 | 603 | 779 | 779 | 603 | 97.3 | 98.1 | 98.2 |
| All Grades | 1553 | 1383 | 1189 | 1514 | 1361 | 1165 | 1500 | 1356 | 1165 | 97.5 | 98.2 | 98 |

* 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 | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 2627.4 | 2645.5 | 2639.3 | 44 | 55 | 50.89 | 38 | 33 | 36.48 | 11 | 7 | 7.83 | 6 | 5 | 4.80 |
| Grade 8 | 2643.7 | 2648.4 | 2653.9 | 41 | 49 | 49.25 | 41 | 35 | 35.66 | 13 | 11 | 9.62 | 4 | 6 | 5.47 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 43 | 51 | 50.04 | 39 | 34 | 36.05 | 12 | 9 | 8.76 | 5 | 6 | 5.15 |

| Reading | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
| Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade Level | % Above Standard | | | % At or Near Standard | | | % Below Standard | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 50 | 60 | 61.03 | 40 | 33 | 32.56 | 9 | 7 | 6.41 |
| Grade 8 | 54 | 58 | 57.21 | 38 | 32 | 34.49 | 8 | 10 | 8.29 |
| All Grades | 52 | 59 | 59.06 | 39 | 32 | 33.56 | 9 | 9 | 7.38 |

| Writing Producing clear and purposeful writing | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
| Grade Level | % Above Standard | | | % At or Near Standard | | | % Below Standard | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 62 | 68 | 63.88 | 32 | 28 | 30.78 | 5 | 4 | 5.34 |
| Grade 8 | 60 | 64 | 66.17 | 35 | 29 | 27.36 | 5 | 7 | 6.47 |
| All Grades | 61 | 66 | 65.06 | 34 | 29 | 29.01 | 5 | 6 | 5.92 |

| Listening Demonstrating effective communication skills | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
| Grade Level | % Above Standard | | | % At or Near Standard | | | % Below Standard | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 29 | 39 | 33.27 | 64 | 59 | 61.74 | 7 | 2 | 4.98 |
| Grade 8 | 35 | 37 | 43.12 | 60 | 59 | 52.57 | 6 | 4 | 4.31 |
| All Grades | 32 | 38 | 38.37 | 62 | 59 | 57.00 | 6 | 3 | 4.64 |

| Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
| Grade Level | % Above Standard | | | % At or Near Standard | | | % Below Standard | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 56 | 64 | 64.77 | 39 | 33 | 30.60 | 6 | 3 | 4.63 |
| Grade 8 | 51 | 53 | 58.04 | 44 | 40 | 35.99 | 6 | 6 | 5.97 |
| All Grades | 53 | 58 | 61.29 | 41 | 37 | 33.39 | 6 | 5 | 5.32 |

| Conclusions based on this data: | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Overall, 83% of students met or exceeded standards in ELA. |
| 2. | Students scored below standard between 5-9% in the specific strands. |

III School and Student Performance Data

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

| 8 th grade | Number of students tested | All Students | English Only | RFEP | English Learner | Special Education | Socioeconomically disadvantaged |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2016-17 | 603 | 83% | 83% | 82% | 69% | 37% | 53% |
| 2015-16 | 779 | 80% | 78% | 84% | 59% | 30% | 56% |
| 2014-15 | 782 | 80% | 75% | 90% | 70% | 38% | 56% |
| 7 th grade | | | | | | | |
| 2016-17 | 562 | 85% | 86% | 86% | 59% | 46% | 84% |
| 2015-16 | 579 | 87% | 85% | 88% | 67% | 41% | 50% |
| 2014-15 | 734 | 80% | 78% | 87% | 64% | 30% | 51% |
| Source: California Department of Education, https://caaspp.cde.ca.gov/ | | | | | | | |

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 | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 748 | 590 | 575 | 734 | 579 | 562 | 727 | 575 | 562 | 98.1 | 98.1 | 97.7 |
| Grade 8 | 805 | 793 | 614 | 782 | 776 | 603 | 777 | 774 | 603 | 97.1 | 97.5 | 98.2 |
| All Grades | 1553 | 1383 | 1189 | 1516 | 1355 | 1165 | 1504 | 1349 | 1165 | 97.6 | 97.8 | 98 |

* 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 | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 2641.9 | 2664.3 | 2669.9 | 58 | 67 | 69.04 | 22 | 20 | 16.37 | 12 | 9 | 10.68 | 7 | 4 | 3.91 |
| Grade 8 | 2667.8 | 2674.8 | 2682.8 | 58 | 64 | 67.16 | 22 | 16 | 16.09 | 13 | 11 | 8.96 | 7 | 9 | 7.79 |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A | 58 | 65 | 68.07 | 22 | 18 | 16.22 | 13 | 10 | 9.79 | 7 | 7 | 5.92 |

| Concepts & Procedures Applying mathematical concepts and procedures | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
| Grade Level | % Above Standard | | | % At or Near Standard | | | % Below Standard | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 69 | 75 | 77.40 | 20 | 18 | 16.37 | 10 | 7 | 6.23 |
| Grade 8 | 67 | 69 | 71.14 | 23 | 20 | 19.57 | 10 | 11 | 9.29 |
| All Grades | 68 | 72 | 74.16 | 22 | 19 | 18.03 | 10 | 9 | 7.81 |

| Problem Solving & Modeling/Data Analysis Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
| Grade Level | % Above Standard | | | % At or Near Standard | | | % Below Standard | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 58 | 69 | 69.22 | 33 | 25 | 25.80 | 9 | 6 | 4.98 |
| Grade 8 | 59 | 61 | 66.67 | 34 | 32 | 24.21 | 6 | 7 | 9.12 |
| All Grades | 59 | 65 | 67.90 | 33 | 29 | 24.98 | 8 | 7 | 7.12 |

| Communicating Reasoning Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
| Grade Level | % Above Standard | | | % At or Near Standard | | | % Below Standard | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| Grade 7 | 57 | 70 | 66.90 | 39 | 27 | 29.18 | 4 | 3 | 3.91 |
| Grade 8 | 52 | 61 | 64.51 | 41 | 32 | 28.69 | 7 | 7 | 6.80 |
| All Grades | 55 | 65 | 65.67 | 40 | 30 | 28.93 | 6 | 5 | 5.41 |

| Conclusions based on this data: | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Overall, 80% of students met or exceeded the standard. |
| 2. | Students scored below standard between 4-10% in the specific strands. |

Section 3: School Climate Indicators

Table 3.1 Truancy rates

| | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| All Students | 24.86 | 28.88 | 28.84 |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Table 3.2 Chronic Absenteeism Rates by Ethnicity and Student Group

| | 2016-17 |
|--|---------|
| All Students | 3.7 |
| Black or African American | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * |
| Asian | 0.7 |
| Filipino | 0.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 8.8 |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | * |
| White | 5.2 |
| Two or More Races | 0.0 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 10.0 |
| English Learners | 8.2 |
| Students with Disabilities | 7.1 |
| Foster Youth | * |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Table 3.3 Suspension Data

| | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Cumulative Enrollment | 1,579 | 1,411 | 1,218 |
| Total Suspensions | 27 | 34 | 28 |
| Unduplicated Count of Students Suspended | 23 | 19 | 22 |
| Suspension rate | 1.50% | 1.30% | 1.80% |
| Percent of Students Suspended with One Suspension | 87.00% | 47.40% | 90.90% |
| Percent of Students Suspended with Multiple Suspensions | 13.00% | 52.60% | 9.10% |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Table 3.4 Suspension Rate by Ethnicity and Student Group

| | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| All Students | 1.50% | 1.30% | 1.80% |
| Black or African American | 4.80% | 30.00% | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Asian | 0.50% | 0.20% | 1.00% |
| Filipino | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 5.70% | 3.40% | 3.60% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| White | 1.50% | 1.50% | 1.90% |
| Two or More Races | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.60% |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 8.0% | 8.9% | 8.3% |
| English Learners | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | | | |
| Foster Youth | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Table 3.5 Expulsion Data

| | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Cumulative Enrollment | 1,579 | 1,411 | 1,218 |
| Total Expulsions | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unduplicated Count of Students Expelled | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Expulsion rate | 0.00% | 0.07% | 0.16% |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Table 3.6 Expulsion Rate by Ethnicity and Student Group

| | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| All Students | 0.00% | 0.07% | 0.16% |
| Black or African American | 0.00% | 0.00% | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Asian | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Filipino | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.46% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| White | 0.00% | 0.13% | 0.00% |
| Two or More Races | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | | | |
| English Learners | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | | | |
| Foster Youth | | | |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Section 4: Progress Monitoring of English Learners

California English Language Development (CELDT) Data

Table 4. 1 2014-15 CELDT (Annual Assessment) Results

| Grade | Percent of Students by Proficiency Level on CELDT Annual Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-------|-------|----------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|
| | Advanced | | | Early Advanced | | | Intermediate | | | Early Intermediate | | | Beginning | | |
| | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |
| 7 | 19 | 36 | 29 | 44 | 21 | 41 | 31 | 29 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 18 |
| 8 | 31 | 33 | 21 | 62 | 43 | 58 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 27 | 34 | 25 | 56 | 36 | 50 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 8 |

Conclusions based on this data:

1.

Table 4.1 Enrollment by English Language Acquisition Status

| | English Only | Initial Fluent English Proficient | English Learner | Reclassified Fluent English Proficient | To Be Determined | Total |
|---------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|------------------|-------|
| 2017-18 | 61.6% | 17.4% | 6.3% | 14.7% | 0.0% | 1,158 |
| 2016-17 | 62.80% | 17.90% | 6.00% | 13.30% | 0.00% | 1,176 |
| 2015-16 | 63.60% | 17.20% | 5.20% | 14.00% | 0.00% | 1,361 |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Table 4.2 English Learner Enrollment by Years in English Language Development Programs

| | English Learners | | | EL 4+ Years Not At-Risk or LTEL | Reclassified Fluent English Proficient | Total (Ever-EL) |
|---------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | EL 0-3 Years | At-Risk 4-5 Years | LTEL 6+ Years | | | |
| 2017-18 | 65 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 170 | 243 |
| 2016-17 | 59 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 156 | 227 |
| 2015-16 | 53 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 190 | 261 |

* Long-Term English Learners (LTEL)

Table 4.3 2017-18 English Learner Enrollment by Years in English Language Development Programs by Grade

| | English Learners | | | EL 4+ Years Not At-Risk or LTEL | Reclassified Fluent English Proficient | Total (Ever-EL) |
|---|------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | EL 0-3 Years | At-Risk 4-5 Years | LTEL 6+ Years | | | |
| 6 | 25 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 92 | 121 |
| 7 | 40 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 78 | 122 |
| 8 | 27 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 85 | 120 |

* Long-Term English Learners (LTEL)

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.

Table 4.4 Reclassification (RFEP) Counts and Rates

| | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|
| Number and percent of EL students Redesignated to Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) | 32.5% | 31.2% | 31.2% |

Conclusions indicated from this data:

1.