

California Department of Education
Local Educational Agency
TITLE III YEAR 2 AND YEAR 4 PLAN ASSURANCE

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan Information:

Title III YEAR 2 (✓) ✓ Title III YEAR 4 (✓)

Name of LEA: El Dorado County Office of Education

County District Code: 09100900000000

Address: 6767 Green Valley Road City: Placerville Zip Code: 95667

Contact Person:

Any inquiries concerning this plan should be directed to the attention of:

Print Name Angie Lind Title: Director

Phone: 530-295-2306 Fax: 530- E-mail: alind@edcoe.org

Signatures:

On behalf of LEAs, participants included in the preparation of this Plan:

Signature of Superintendent Dr. Vicki L. Barber, Ed.D.
Printed Name of Superintendent Date

Signature of Board President Heidi Ann Weiland
Printed Name of Board President Date

Signature of English Learner
Coordinator/Director Angie Lind
Printed Name of English Learner Date
Coordinator/Director

Certification:

By submission of the local Title III Plan (in lieu of the original assurance page in hard copy), the LEA certifies that the plan original signed copies of the assurances are on file in the LEA. The certification reads:

Certification: I hereby certify that all of the applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed by this LEA and that to the best of my knowledge information contained in this Plan is correct and complete. Legal assurances for all programs are accepted as the basic legal condition for the operation of selected projects and programs and copies of assurances are retained onsite. I certify that we accept all general and program specific assurances for Titles I, II, and/or III as appropriate, except for those for which a waiver has been obtained. A copy of all waivers will remain on file. I certify that actual ink signatures for this LEA Action Plan are on file, including signatures of any required external providers, i.e., district assistance and intervention team and English Learner Coordinator/Director.

The LEA also agrees that the revised/finalized Title III Plan will be posted on our LEA website and will be found at the following URL: _____.

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

Local education agencies (LEAs) receiving Title III subgrant funding are required to meet the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for their English learner (EL) subgroup. When the agency fails to make progress toward meeting such objectives for 2 and/or 4 consecutive years, the LEA shall develop a Title III plan that ensures it meets the objectives, addressing the factors that prevented the objectives being met. For LEAs that have not met AMAOs for four years, the plan must meet the objectives by modifying curriculum, program, and method of instruction, addressing the factors that prevented the objectives being met.

Directions: Provide information requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow space needed for narrative responses under each item. All Title III LEAs must submit a copy of the completed Needs Assessment to the Title III Regional Lead and submit to California Department of Education via the California Accountability and Improvement System (CAIS) at <http://64.147.175.16/tracker/Security/Login.aspx> (Outside source), as part of the **Title III Plan**.

<p>1. Briefly summarize EL linguistic and academic performance challenges, and identify and describe those key factors of the instructional program that prevented the local educational agency (LEA) from meeting Title III AMAOs</p>
<p>a. Describe findings from analyses of the CELDT, CST, CAHSEE, CAPA, CMA and other assessments used by the LEA to measure EL student English proficiency and academic achievement, and findings derived from other data analyses and state tools (e.g., ELSSA, APS), as these relate to the three AMAOs (Goals 2A, 2B, and 2C).</p> <p>The Title III Consortium led by the El Dorado County Office of Education (EDCOE) currently consists of 12 districts in El Dorado County and EDCOE's own student programs. The number of English Learners in the Consortium as a whole is 427 or 1.89% of the consortium total student population of 23,559. Consortium member districts span a range of demographic characteristics, with total student enrollment from 18 students to 6,966 students; number of English Learners from 1 English Learner to 115 English Learners, and English Learner percentage of the total student population from .04% to 14%. The Buckeye Union School District was a member of the Consortium in 2010/11 and is included the Title III Accountability data described in this needs assessment. The district left the Consortium at the beginning of the 2011/12 school year.</p> <p>All member districts completed the ELSSA to delve more deeply into their English learner data as a first step towards development of the Consortium Title III Plan. The data was aggregated to provide information about common, high priority needs across the Consortium. Individual data was also examined to ensure that the different needs of some member districts were not masked by the aggregated data.</p> <p>The Consortium has consistently exceeded the target for AMAO1. In 2010-11, the Consortium percent of students making annual progress in learning English was 55%, above the target of 54.6. District ELSSA data indicated that, consistent with statewide trends, older students, intermediate students and students already at Proficient on CELDT had more difficulty meeting the target of one level of growth on CELDT or maintaining proficiency.</p>

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

For the Consortium, the percent of students in the less than 5 years cohort attaining English proficiency on CELDT was 22%, well above the state target of 18.7%. The percent of students in the more than 5 years cohort was 46%, also exceeding the target of 43.2. Most, but not all, member districts met that target at the district level as well. For the Consortium, the majority of students in the U.S. for 4 or more years are at the CELDT intermediate level.

For AMAO 3, Adequate Yearly Progress for the English Learner subgroup, the consortium did not meet the state target for achievement in English/Language Arts: 67% or Mathematics: 67.3. The percentage of students proficient or above in English/Language Arts and Mathematics was 42.5% and 50% respectively. Consortium CST data shows that the majority of students at the CELDT intermediate level score basic or below on the English Language Arts assessment with the highest numbers in grades 3-5. The same trend is evident in Mathematics with the majority of students at the intermediate level scoring basic or below and with the highest numbers in grades 3-5. The majority of R-FEP students score basic or below on the English Language Arts CST with the highest numbers below at the 6-8 grades. In Mathematics, the majority of R-FEP students in grades 2-4 score proficient, but the majority of those in grades 5-8 score basic or below. R-FEP students pass the CAHSEE at a rate of 84% for English Language Arts and 86% for Mathematics, however the percentage of R-FEP students at the proficient level is only 55% in English Language Arts and 49% for mathematics. Student achievement in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics are the focus of the Consortium Title III Plan.

- b. Describe strengths and weaknesses in the design and implementation of the district's current LEA Plan, the District's EL Master Plan or the prior Year 2 Improvement Plan Addendum. The program dimensions listed below are areas to consider in reviewing current plans.
- Instructional program design
 - Implementation of state and district adopted curriculum
 - Implementation of instructional services and methods
 - Professional development (Goal 2D)
 - Parent & community participation (Goal 2E)
 - Parental Notification (Goal 2F)
 - Services for Immigrant Students if the LEA receives Title III Immigrant funds (Goal 2G)

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

Based on an analysis of EL SAA and discussion regarding the current Consortium Title III plan the following strengths and weaknesses were identified. Information was collected through data analysis, surveys and focus group input.

Instructional program design

Strengths:

- Districts that have found ways to extend learning time for English Learners have seen significant positive results. Different districts use different delivery models, most often before or after school tutorials with early/late bus support or study halls or lunch time tutoring programs.

Weaknesses:

- The adopted English Language Arts and Mathematics materials are not fully implemented for English Learners

Implementation of state and district adopted curriculum

Strengths:

- The Consortium members ensure that school schedules allocate the appropriate number of daily instruction minutes for ELA and Mathematics
- The majority of Consortium members districts' English Language Arts programs for ELs uses the state adopted materials for grades K-8 and SBE approved standards aligned materials at grades 9-12
- The majority of Consortium members districts' Mathematics programs for ELs uses the state adopted materials for grades K-8 and SBE approved standards aligned materials at grades 9-12

Weaknesses:

- Not all teachers are utilizing the ELD materials that are part of the core adopted materials for English/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Teachers with very small numbers of English learners find it difficult to find time/structure to deliver ELD daily.

Implementation of Instructional Services and Methods

Strengths:

- All teachers providing ELD instruction are appropriately authorized
- All teachers providing SDAIE instruction are appropriately authorized

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

Weaknesses:

- Administrator monitoring is inconsistent and often does not focus on the use of effective instructional strategies for English Learners for English and Mathematics

Professional Development (Goal 2D)

Strengths:

- Consortium member districts have committed significant resources to provide training for veteran teachers to obtain their EL authorization.
- Consortium member districts have changed their criteria for hiring new teachers. As a result, member districts have sufficient teachers with EL authorizations to serve all their English learners.

Weaknesses:

- Teachers, as well as district and site administrators, report that many authorized teachers need additional assistance in implementing ELD and SDAIE in English Language Arts and Mathematics to meet the specific needs of their English learners.
- Teachers with small numbers of English learners sometimes struggle with finding an appropriate structure to implement daily ELD for all English learners.
- Not all teachers understand how the CELDT measures English proficiency or how to modify instruction based on student performance levels.
- Administrator monitoring is inconsistent and often does not focus on the use of effective instructional strategies for English Learners.

Parent & Community Participation (Goal 2E)

Strengths:

- Member districts have implemented DELAC and ELAC committees as required.
- Member districts actively seek to increase parent participation in school events including, meetings, conferences and community events.

Weaknesses:

- Consortium members report that while they have had some success at increasing parent participation, they would like to see higher participation rates

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

Parental Notification (Goal 2F)

Strengths:

- Most member districts are not required to send all communications in a language other than English, but some of these districts use the Clearinghouse for Multilingual Documents and other resources to provide information in the parents' primary language.

Services for Immigrant Students if the LEA receives Title III Immigrant funds (Goal 2G) - Not all Title III-LEP Consortium members receive Title III Immigrant funds.

2. Describe the factors contributing to failure to meet AMAO(s).

Identify and describe factors that which prevented the LEA from achieving the AMAO(s) and explain how the identified factors above were verified from evidence gathered.

- ELD support materials in the adopted core English Language Arts and Mathematics programs are not implemented consistently across the consortium. In particular, teachers with very small numbers of English learners find it difficult to find time/structure to deliver ELD daily.
- Some teachers do not understand CELDT results and their implications for instruction. Not all teachers receive timely information about English learners' proficiency in English and their academic achievement.
- Authorized teachers need additional assistance in implementing SDAIE strategies to support the academic achievement of English learners.
- Districts programs with smaller number of English learners are less likely to have implemented structured intensive intervention programs to accelerate English Language Arts and Mathematics achievement of English learners.
- An EL strategies observation tool has not been implemented to allow administrators to provide the necessary feedback to teachers

3. Determine goals and focus areas derived from analysis above.

All LEAs must address annual progress leaning English, English Proficiency, and AYP for EL Subgroup, high-quality professional development, and parent and community participation. If identified as in need of improvement in the Needs Assessment, LEA must also address parental notification, services for immigrant students (if such funding received), highly qualified teachers, increased graduation rates, decreased dropout rates, and increased enrollment in AP courses. Identify the LEA's goals in each of the corresponding LEA plan goals. In the Title III Plan, the LEA must describe the research-based strategies it will implement to address the areas of weakness identified through data analysis. The strategies, activities and tasks are further developed in the Plan template, specifying timelines, persons responsible, estimated costs, and funding

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

resources.
<p>Goal 2A: (AMAO 1 Annual Progress Learning English) By June 2013, the percentage of English learners learning English will increase from 55% to 60% to continue meeting the state defined growth target of 56% as measured by CELDT. Consortium members will meet this goal by ensuring that each English Learner receives ELD instruction.</p>
<p>Goal 2B: (AMAO 2 English Proficiency) By June 2013, the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs fewer than 5 years attaining English language proficiency will increase from 22.2% to 25% to continue meeting the state the target of 20.1%. Consortium members will meet this goal by ensuring that each English Learner receives ELD instruction.</p>
<p>By June of 2013, the percentage of English learners in language instruction educational programs 5 or more years attaining English language proficiency will increase from 43.2% to 46% to continue meeting state-defined target of 45.1%. Consortium members will meet this goal by ensuring that each English Learner receives ELD instruction.</p>
<p>Goal 2C: (AMAO 3-AYP for ELs in English Language Arts) By June of 2013, the percentage of English Learners attaining proficiency in English/Language Arts will increase by 10% (Safe Harbor goal) from 42.5% to 52.5% as measured by the CST, CMA, CAPA and/or CAHSEE in order to move toward state-defined expectations for proficiency in English/Language Arts. Consortium members will meet this goal by providing SDAIE training for English Language Arts, monitoring strategies and provide materials.</p>
<p>Goal 2C: (AMAO 3-AYP for ELs in Mathematics) By June of 2013, the percentage of English Learners attaining proficiency in Mathematics will increase by 10% (Safe Harbor goal) from 50% to 60% as measured by the CST, CMA, CAPA and/or CAHSEE in order to move toward state-defined expectations for proficiency in Mathematics. Consortium members will meet this goal by providing SDAIE training for Mathematics, monitoring strategies and provide materials.</p>
<p>Goal 2D: (High Quality Professional Development) By June of 2013, 80% of Consortium teachers will receive professional development on research-based strategies to improve English Learner attainment of English language proficiency and/or achievement in English Language Arts and/or Mathematics, as determined by the Consortium needs assessment.</p>
<p>By June of 2013, 80% of Consortium administrators will receive professional development on research-based strategies to improve English Learner attainment of English language proficiency and/or achievement in English Language Arts and/or Mathematics, as determined by the Consortium needs assessment.</p>
<p>By June of 2013, 80% of Consortium administrators will receive professional development on how to effectively observe</p>

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

and provide feedback to teachers to increase use of research-based strategies to improve English Learner attainment of English language proficiency and/or achievement in English Language Arts and/or Mathematics, as determined by the Consortium needs assessment.

Goal 2E: (Parent and Community Participation)
 By June of 2013, the Consortium will work to increase parent outreach strategies so that 80% of parents are active participants in the education of their children.

Goal 2F: (Parental Notification)
 Consortium districts will continue to provide all required parent notifications to 100%

Research Based Strategies

SDAIE classes are those classes containing LEP students, taught by teachers using special techniques and strategies designed to assist LEP students in both language-acquisition and subject-matter content.

SDAIE emphasizes the concept of comprehensible input to making concepts understood by the learner. This is accomplished through the use of realia, manipulatives, visuals, graphic organizers, planned opportunities for interaction between all individuals in the classroom

English language development (ELD) instruction is designed specifically to advance English learners' knowledge and use of English in increasingly sophisticated ways. Available research suggests that one way to promote higher levels of English language development among English learners is to make sure it is a school- and district-wide priority. ELD instruction must be focused, level-specific, and based on the ELD standards. This allows all English learners to consistently move up one or more proficiency levels each year as measured by the CELDT. All English learners will receive support until reclassification occurs.

The ELD standards are designed so that as students develop English proficiency, they have access to mainstream ELA curriculum. The ELD standards define a range of competence; give teachers and students goals for achievement; provide

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

a clear and consistent basis for assessment; and offer a coherent shared vision for learning. Any plan for instruction must take into account relevant standards, for they outline the core content of instruction.

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement	Personnel Responsible	Timeline with Benchmarks	Funding Source
<p>Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics. (AMAO 3)</p> <p>Teachers will implement SDAIE strategies for English learners in reading/language Arts and mathematics to ensure that ELs have meaningful access to grade appropriate core curriculum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure teachers providing instruction to ELs are authorized 2. Provide additional professional development for authorized teachers to review and extend SDAIE strategies 3. Monitor use of strategies by teachers <p>Provide English learners increased opportunities to practice oral language and utilize academic vocabulary in English/language arts and mathematics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide professional development in strategies for active participation and student engagement. 2. Provide professional development in effective strategies for teaching academic vocabulary 3. Share results and refine strategies in PLCs 4. Monitor use of strategies <p>Provide intensive intervention to secondary students whose academic performance is two grade levels or more below standard in English/language arts and mathematics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review intensive intervention programs from 	<p>Principal, HR</p> <p>EDCOE Pr dev, teachers Principal</p> <p>EDCOE Pr dev, teachers</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>CILC, EL network, principals</p> <p>Principal</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Spring, Fall 2012 2012-13</p> <p>Spring, Fall 2012</p> <p>2012-13</p> <p>Spring, Fall 2012</p> <p>Fall 2012</p> <p>2011-12</p>	<p>General fund, Title II & III</p> <p>General fund, Title II & III</p> <p>Title III, General fund</p>

Title III Year 2 and Year 4 Plan Local Educational Agency Needs Assessment Template

<p>the ELA adopted and mathematics materials lists to select a program for intensive intervention</p> <p>2. Purchase intensive intervention program, adjust master schedule, implement program</p>			
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--