CAASPP Data Analysis – ALL Students

Identified Areas of Strength:

- 62.9% of 8th graders in ELA were on track according to the Lexile and Quantile Report compared to only 23.3% of 6th graders.
- RFEP's grew in both ELA and Math between 2019 and 2022.
- In math, Communicating/Reasoning is a relative strength as FMS has fewer percentage of students that scored below standard compared to the other three claims.
- In ELA, Listening and 0 -1 1.4000001 cm0arch/I(tag)qu(ng ad)-1y1(s a re)1(I)-1(ative strL)-100001(ength)-1(MS)-0001MS has FMSentd Mat 1(e)1(core)1(

MAP Data Analysis – ALL Students

- In Reading 62% of students scored at or below the LoAvg Percentile.
- In Reading, 28% of students are projected to Meet or Exceed Standards on the SBAC.
- Between the Fall of 22/23 and 23/24, there was an increase percentage of students that scored at HiAve to Hi was in Math.

Grade:
- In Mathematics, Grade 8 students exceeded the school percentage for scoring at or above the HiAvg Percentile.
- 6th graders exceeded the school percentage in the number of students that met or exceeded standard in Reading.
-

MAP Data Analysis – ALL Students

- Schoolwide, students performed better in Vocabulary than in Literary and Informational Text,
- Schoolwide, students performed better in Operations and Algebraic Thinkin compared to RCNS, GEO and S & P.

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):

- Schoolwide, Informational Text goal area is the greatest area of need in Reading,.
- Schoolwide, Statistics and Probability goal area is the greatest area of need in Math.
-

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

Revised pending approval 12/18/24
1A. Provide small group instruction during and after school to reinforce and differentiate instruction in all content areas.
   • College tutors
   • Certificated and classified additional					

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
1E. Provide Parent Engagement opportunities and college visits that increase their understanding of their student's social and emotional, academic and behavioral needs to improve academic achievement and reduce disciplinary referrals. 　・　Consultants 　・　Travel/Conferences and related fees 　・　Certificated/Classified Hourly 　・　Books and Resources 　・　College Campus Transportation	Sign-In Sheets Survey/Feedback Data	All parents (Primary focus at-promise African American and SWD parents)	Administrative Team Community Aide	8,775	2,400

Revised pending approval 12/18/24
Revised pending approval 120 cm 0.25 0.5 m 75.
1F. Provide curricular trips to enrich and expand
-the curriculum, strengthen observation skills
by immersing children into sensory activities,

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 1a Academic Needs of Els:
English Learners will enhance their academic growth and achievement in reading and writing by leveraging their background knowledge, providing explicit instruction in vocabulary, and incorporating the Claim-Evidence-Reasoning (CER) framework across all content areas, and regularly assessing comprehension to ensure understanding.

School Metrics/Indicators	Previous Year Outcome	Current Outcomes	Future Expected Outcomes
Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA (EL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS)	• 133.9 (2021-2022)	-150.0	-147.0
Smarter Balanced Assessment Math (EL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS)	• 168.5 (2021-2022)	-178.9	-175.9
Fall MAP Growth Reading (EL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN)	6th: -17.3 7th: -22.0 8th: -19.0	6th: -16.5 7th: -19.3 8th: -24.1	6th: -16.0 7th: -18.8 8th: -23.6
Fall MAP Growth Math (EL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN)	6th: -18.9 7th: -22.5 8th: -26.2	6th: -17.5 7th: -20.3 8th: -24.8	6th: -17.0 7th: -19.8 8th: -24.3
MAP Growth Reading (EL): Avg Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI)	-0.25f 1 0 0 -1 0 10.47399998 Tm 0 g		

CAASPP Data Analysis – EL Students

- In ELA, English English Learners have 19.1% fewer students scoring at Standards Met/Exceeded than the All-Student group and have an average Distance from Standard 62.8 points below the All-Student group.
- In Math, English Learners have 14% fewer students scoring at Standards Met/Exceeded than the All-Student group and have an average Distance from Standard 64.4 points below the All-Student group.

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

- The percentage of English Learners that scored at Standards Met/Exceeded decreased more than the All-Student group for both ELA and Math.
- In ELA, English Learners declined in Distance from Standards but declined less than the All Student group by 3.2 points.
- In Math, English Learners declined in Distance from Standards but declined more than the All Student group by 6.3 points.

Identified Areas of Strength:

- In ELA, Listening and Research/Inquiry is a relative strength as FMS has fewer percentage of EL students that scored below standard compared to the other two claims.
- In Math, Communicating/Reasoning is a relative strength as FMS has fewer percentage of EL students that scored below standard compared to the other three claims.

Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):

- The greatest need for EL's in ELA is Writing.
- The greatest need for EL's in Math is Con>> BD56e7.IEQnWis?

MAP Data Analysis – EL Students
How does the EL Student Group growth compare to the ALL-Student Group?
• In Math, English Learners made expected growth, while the All-student group made also made expected growth, therefore maintaining the achievement gap. • In Reading, made less than one year of growth while All-Students group made less than one year growth thus sustaining the gap.
Identified Areas of Strength:
• The Vocabulary goal area is relative strength in reading for English Learners. • The Real and Complex Number System goal area is a relative strength in math for English Learners,
Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):
Informational Text goal area is the greatest area of need in reading for English Learners. Statistics and Probability goal area is the greatest area of need in math for English Learners.

CA Dashboard Analysis (Academic Indicator) – EL Students
How does the EL Student Group achievement compare to the All-Student Group?
English Language Arts • On average, English Learners are performing 26 points below than All-Student group in ELA. Math • On average, English Learners are performing 30.2 points below the All-Student group in Math.
How does the EL Student Group growth compare to the All-Student Group?
English Language Arts • English Learners achievement declined by 13.3 points compared to the decline of 18.8 points for "All-Students", therefore narrowing the achievement gap. Math

- English Learners achievement declined by 5.6 points compared to the decline of 2.4 points for "All-Students", therefore widening the achievement gap.

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 Els:
English Learners will demonstrate English language proficiency growth through reading short informational passages and justifying their opinions by citing textual evidence using the CER writing strategy.

School Metrics/Indicators	Previous Year Outcome	Current Outcomes	Future Expected Outcomes
% by ELPI level	Level 4: 19% Level 3H: 16% Level 3L: 19% Level 2H: 19% Level 2H: 12% Level 1: 16%	Level 4: 18% Level 3H: 17% Level 3L: 19% Level 2H: 13% Level 2H: 14% Level 1: 20%	N/A - Progress cannot be measured with changes in ELPAC performance, but rather are measured with changes in ELPI levels
ELPI Change: % Made Progress	49.9%	45.2%	48.2%
% by ELPAC Level	Level 4: 19% Level 3: 34% Level 2: 31% Level 1: 16%		

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.	$198,081
Title I, Part A: Carryover	