2024-2025 School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)

School Name and School Code	Chaparral Academy of Technology 36 67710 6106702	SSC Approval Date: Initial May 15, 2024; Revised November 21, 2024
School Address	14000 Shadow Drive, Fontana, CA 92337-0640	Local Governing Board Approval Date: Initial June 19, 2024; Revised pending approval December 18, 2024
		Addendum
Name of Principal	Tim McCaffrey	Phone # and Email
		(909) 357-5450, tim.mccaffrey@fusd.net
Name of SSC Chairperson	Jaslyn Chavez Lepe	Phone # and Email
		(909) 357-5450, ChavJA@fusd.net}

Planned Improvements in Student Performance

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

LEA/School GOAL 1: Students will demonstrate improved academic growth and achievement through access to high quality educators, academic programs, and instructional resources that increase engagement and unlock potential.

School Metrics/Indicators	Previous Year Outcome	Current Outcomes	Future Expected Outcomes
Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA (ALL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS)	• 71.3 (2021-2022)	-57.2	-54.2
Smarter Balanced Assessment Math (ALL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS)	• 95.5 (2021-2022)	-67.9	-64.9
Fall MAP Growth Reading (ALL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN)	KN: -6.2 1st: -9.9 2nd: -14.3 3rd: -7.8 4th: -9.6 5th: -11.0	KN: -4.5 1st: -7.7 2nd: -8.8 3rd: -8.7 4th: -9.2 5th: -11.5	KN: -4.0 1st: -7.2 2nd: -8.3 3rd: -8.2 4th: -8.7 5th: -11.0
Fall MAP Growth Math (ALL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN)	KN: -4.4 1st: -9.5 2nd: -15.5		

CAASPP Data Analysis – ALL Students

In ELA, we have the most potential to improve in the area of writing.
In Math, we have the most potential to improve in the area of concepts and procedures.

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

Compared to our all-student group, the following student groups demonstrated the most need for targeted support:
SWD and ELL student groups.

MAP Data Analysis – ALL Students

Achievement Trends:

School: We administered MAP in the Fall of 2023.
*16% of students scored above average in Mathematics.
*Nearly one-fourth of students are projected to score standard met or exceeded on CAASPP in Mathematics. However, 77% of students are not projected to score standard met or exceeded based on MAP.
* 20% of students scored above average in Reading.
*Over a fourth of students are projected to score standard met or exceeded on CAASPP in Reading. However, 73% of students are not projected to score standard met or exceeded based on MAP.

Grade Levels:
*Compared to our schoolwide average in Mathematics, students in second, third, and fourth grade had the highest percentage of students scoring in the lowest achievement group.
*Compared to our schoolwide average in Reading, students in first, second, and third grade had the highest percentage of students scoring in the lowest achievement group.

Student Groups:
*Compared to our schoolwide average in Mathematics, students who are English Language Learners or have disabilities had a greater percentage of students scoring in the low and low average achievement bands.
*Compared to our schoolwide average in Reading, students who are English Language Learners or have disabilities also had a greater percentage of students scoring in the low and low average achievement bands.

Growth Trends:

School:

Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):
One area of growth is parent checkout rate. Although our students checked out over four thousand books during first semester alone, our parents did not utilize the Parent Library options, which include literacy kits and games. Regarding our i-Ready data, although students made Fall to Winter growth, it varied greatly in different grade levels. There were pockets of tremendous growth but also areas of less than expected growth. Our teacher survey indicated that teachers would prefer updated technology to deliver instruction. Currently our SmartBoards are being phased out and many teachers also need new projectors or document cameras.

Based on qualitative and quantitative data analysis, identified needs, and student groups listed for targeted support, what strategies will be used to meet this goal?	Our students need to improve in reading comprehension, reading fluency, math automaticity, and math word problem solving. In order to address this need, we will focus on whole group instruction, small group differentiated learning opportunities, and online learning opportunities. We need to provide parents with enhanced opportunities for family engagement, involvement, and interaction. In order to address this need, we are planning two events a month. Teachers need additional PD and PLC planning time in order to collaborate on lessons to enhance student achievement and learn additional techniques in the areas of teaching strategies for the core subjects as well as robotics/coding. To address this need, we are planning two opportunities a month for teachers to meet in PLC groups.

2024-25 Evidence-based Actions/Services	Metric(s) for evaluating Action/Service	Pupils to be served	2024-25 Estimated Cost

LEA/School GOAL 1a Academic Needs of English Language Learners: English Language Learners will demonstrate improved academic growth and achievement in math word problem solving skills through the use of differentiated instruction and small group instruction.			
MAP Growth Language (EL): Avg Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI)	0.23	-0.33	>= 0
MAP Growth Math (EL): Avg Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI)	0.25	0.17	>= 0

CAASPP Data Analysis – EL Students

CAASPP Data Analysis – EL Students
EL students have the greatest potential for growth in the area of writing in ELA. EL students have the greatest potential for growth in the area of concepts and procedures in math.

MAP Data Analysis – EL Students
How does the EL Student Group achievement compare to the ALL-Student Group?

CA Dashboard Analysis (Academic Indicator) – EL Students
English Language Arts English Learner achievement improved by 18.4 points compared to an improvement of 16.6 points for the All-Student group, therefore narrowing the achievement gap. Math English Learner achievement improved by 29.6 points compared to an improvement of 30.8 points for the All-Student group, therefore slightly widening the achievement gap.

Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services
Description of Site-Specific Data Collected for Progress-Monitoring
We collected the following site-specific data for progress monitoring: *Fall to Winter i-Ready data

Planned Improvements in Student Performance

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

LEA/School GOAL 1b Language Needs of English Language Learner Students: English Language Learners will demonstrate English proficiency growth in their reading skills by developing their listening skills, reading fluency skills, academic vocabulary skills, speaking, and reading comprehension skills.			
School Metrics/Indicators	Previous Year Outcome	Current Outcomes	Future Expected Outcomes

LEA/School GOAL 1b Language Needs of English Language Learner Students: English Language Learners will demonstrate English proficiency growth in their reading skills by developing their listening skills, reading fluency skills, academic vocabulary skills, speaking, and reading comprehension skills.			
	52% - Somewhat/Moderately Developed 42% - Beginning Development	60% - Somewhat/Moderately Developed 31% - Beginning Development	performance, but rather are measured with changes in ELPI levels
ELPAC Writing Domain: % by Performance Level	10% - Well Developed 58% - Somewhat/Moderately Developed 31% - Beginning Development	13% - Well Developed 55% - Somewhat/Moderately Developed 31% - Beginning Development	N/A - Progress cannot be measured with changes in ELPAC performance, but rather are measured with changes in ELPI levels

Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services
Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):
Although it was not listed as an area of data, reclassification is a clear area of growth. The biggest area of improvement is to increase the number of students who reclassify as fluent English proficient before exiting 5th grade and going on to middle school.

LEA/School GOAL 2: Students will demonstrate grade level literacy skills by the end of 3rd grade.			
School Metrics/Indicators	Previous Year Outcome	Current Outcomes	Future Expected Outcomes
Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA: % of 3rd Grade Students Scoring Standard Met or Exceeded	25.5% (2021-2022)	28.3%	31.3%
Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA: 3rd Grade Average Distance from Standard (DFS)	• 59.9 (2021-2022)	-46.1	-43.1
MAP Growth Reading: Average Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI) for K-3 By Grade Level	Fall Kinder to Fall 1st: -0.78 Fall 1st to Fall 2nd: -0.64 Fall 2nd to Fall 3rd: 0.45 Fall 3rd to Fall 4th: 0.28	Fall Kinder to Fall 1st: -0.54 Fall 1st to Fall 2nd: 0.18 Fall 2nd to Fall 3rd: 0.52 Fall 3rd to Fall 4th: -0.05	>= 0 for each grade level
Fall MAP Growth Reading: % of Students At-risk of Not Reading at Grade Level by the End of 3rd Grade (by Cohort)	21-22 3rd Gr. Cohort (22-23 4th Gr): 38% 22-23 3rd Gr. Cohort: 40% 23-24 3rd Gr. Cohort (22-23 2nd Gr.): 64% 24-25 3rd Gr. Cohort (22-23 1st Gr.): 60% 25-26 3rd Gr. Cohort (22-23 Kinder): 46%	22-23 3rd Gr. Cohort (23-24 4th Gr): 41% 23-24 3rd Gr. Cohort: 49% 24-25 3rd Gr. Cohort (23-24 2nd Gr.): 58% 25-26 3rd Gr. Cohort (23-24 1st Gr.): 43% 26-27 3rd Gr. Cohort (23-24 Kinder): 37%	23-24 3rd Gr. Cohort(24-25 4th Gr.): 39% 24-25 3rd Gr. Cohort (24-25 3nd Gr.): 48% 25-26 3rd Gr. Cohort (24-25 2nd Gr.): 33% 26-27 3rd Gr. Cohort (24-25 1st Gr.): 27%

CAASPP Data Analysis – 3rd Grade ELA
Achievement Trends:
28.3% of our 3rd grade students scored standard met/exceeded in ELA compared to 32.3% of all 3rd grade students district wide. The average scaled score for 3rd grade students was 2386, which is 2 points higher than the district average of 2384. The Distance from Standard for 3rd grade was -46.1, relatively close to the district average of -48.3. Our 3rd grade ELA scores were lower than our 4th and 5th grade scores (30% and 32% respectively met/exceeded standards).
Growth Trends

CAASPP Data Analysis – 3rd Grade ELA
Whereas 25.5% of students met/exceeded standards in 2022, 28.3% met/exceeded in 2023, a net increase of 2.8%. In 2022, the Distance from Standard for 3rd grade students in ELA was -59.9. For 2023, the Distance from Standard was -46.1 for an increase of 13.8 points. This represents a greater improvement than our 5th grade students, who improved their DFS by 7.6 points. Our 4th grade students improved their DFS by 21.6 points.
Identified Areas of Strength:
Third grade students have a relative strength in the area of listening.
Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):
Third grade students have the most potential for growth in the area of writing.

Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services
*Classroom walkthroughs (principal observations) *PLC documentation

Identified Areas of Strength:
Classroom walkthroughs (principal observations) were an area of strength. Observations reflected that K-3 teachers consistently engaged in strong literacy practices during ELA lessons over 90% of the time, to include: direct explicit instruction, small group interventions, scaffolding vocabulary, graphic organizers, activating prior knowledge, and phonics/phonemic awareness activities. PLC documents also indicate a focus on literacy, with a special emphasis on student writing.

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):
Our Fall to Winter i-Ready scores indicate some good growth and pockets of high achievement, but there is room for improvement and consistency in all grade levels K-3.

Based on qualitative and quantitative data analysis, identified needs, and student groups listed for targeted support, what strategies will be used to meet this goal?	Based on our MAP scores, our K-3 students need to improve their early literacy skills. Teachers need additional time to plan early literacy whole group lessons and interventions.

2024-25 Evidence-based Actions/Services	Metric(s) for evaluating Action/Service	Pupils to be served	Person(s) Responsible	2024-25 Estimated Cost	
				Title 1	SUPC
2A: Provide students with whole group and small group differentiated reading instruction during the school day • Instructional materials to include listening stations and listening station book/CD kits • Books	i-Ready scores (Fall/Winter/Spring), district benchmark scores Principal walkthrough observation data, teacher survey	All students K-3	Principal and teachers	2,215	

Programs Included in this Plan

Federal Programs	Allocation
X Title I, Part A: Allocation Purpose: To provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.	$43,566