# 2024-2025 School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)

SPSA Year:

# 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) | • 47.6 (2021-2022) | -38.8 | -35.8 |
| Smarter Balanced Assessment Math (ALL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS) | • 98.4 (2021-2022) | -70.5 | -67.5 |
| Fall MAP Growth Reading (ALL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN) | KN: -0.6<br>1st: -6.5<br>2nd: -13.4<br>3rd: -3.5<br>4th: -12.9<br>5th: -5.8<br>6th: -6.5 | KN: -2.6<br>1st: -5.0<br>2nd: -7.6<br>3rd: -13.5<br>4th: -1.7<br>5th: -7.4<br>6th: -7.0 | KN: -2.1<br>1st: -4.5<br>2nd: -7.1<br>3rd: -13.0<br>4th: -1.2<br>5th: -6.9<br>6th: -6.5 |
| Fall MAP Growth Math (ALL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN) | KN: 0.2<br>1st: -4.7<br>2nd: -13.8<br>3rd: -2.3<br>4th: -13.7<br>5th: -12.5<br>6th: -12.8 | KN: -3.9<br>1st: -2.8<br>2nd: -6.0<br>3rd: -11.3<br>4th: -1.1<br>5th: -11.6<br>6th: -13.3 | KN: -3.4<br>1st: -2.3<br>2nd: -5.5<br>3rd: -10.8<br>4th: -0.6<br>5th: -11.1<br>6th: -12.8 |
| MAP Growth Reading (ALL): Average Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI) | -0.05 | 0.09 | >= 0 |

| 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. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| MAP Growth Language (ALL): Average Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI) | 0.12 | 0.11 | >= 0 |
| MAP Growth Math (ALL): Average Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI) | 0.05 | 0.05 | >= 0 |

## CAASPP Data Analysis – ALL Students

### Achievement Trends:

School: When looking at CAASPP data for ELA and math, students performed significantly better in ELA.
- 35.2% of students scored meeting or exceeding in ELA and 21.6% students scored meeting or exceeding in math. There is an achievement gap between reading and math of 13.6%.
- The DFS in ELA is -37.7 in ELA and -69.8 in math. This also indicates that there is an achievement gap between reading and math of when measured by DFS.
- The DFS is 12.2 points above the district in ELA and is equal points to the district DFS in math. This indicates that overall, Locust is performing slightly better than the district in ELA.

Grade Levels
- In math, the average scale score is in the standard not met range for grades 4 and 5. The average scale score for grades 3 and 6 in the Nearly Met range.
- In ELA, all grade levels average scale score fell in the Nearly Met range.

Student Group
- RFEP students outperformed the All Student Group in both math and ELA.

### Growth Trends:

For all students, the 2 Year Student Group Report indicates increased SBAC scores in both ELA, 35.2% and math, 21.6%.
Grade Levels: When looking at the 2022-23 Year Student Group Report by Achievement Level, grade level CAASPP data for ELA, although 3rd, 4th and 6th grade students showed an increase in the percent of students performing at meeting or exceeding in ELA, in 5th grade decreased by 8.2 percentage points from 2022.
- When looking at the 2 Year Student Group Report by Achievement Level, grade level CAASPP data for math, 3rd, 5th and 6th grade students showed an increase in the percent of students performing at meeting or exceeding in math, 4th grade decreased by 2 percentage points from 2023.
- When looking at the Distance from Standard Report in ELA, 3rd Grade had the greatest positive change at +32.8 and 6th grade with a positive DFS at +27.3. For all students, an average of +10.4 DFS in ELA. 4th and 5th grade both showed negative change in DFS with 4th grade at -5.9 and 5th grade more significant change in DFS at -16.0.
- When looking at the Distance from Standard Report in math, all students showed a positive change in DFS at +28.6, showing an overall positive change in DFS from -98.4 in 2022 to -69.8 in 2023. 3rd grade showed the greatest gain at +53.0 in positive change in DFS and 6th grade with +37.4.
- For the largest student group, Hispanic, had an increase in the percentage of students meeting and exceeding the standards in both math and ELA.

| CAASPP Data Analysis – ALL Students |
|---|

- EO's showed an increase in the percentage of students meeting and exceeding the standards in both math and ELA.

**Identified Areas of Strength:**

Schoolwide, listening is a relative area of strength in ELA.
Schoolwide, Communicating Reasoning is a relative area of strength in math.

**Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):**

Schoolwide, writing is the greatest area of need in ELA.
Schoolwide, Concept and Procedures is the greatest area of need in math.

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

- In ELA, the following groups performed significantly lower than the ALL-student group:
- ELs students
- Students with Disabilities
- In math, the following groups performed significantly lower than the ALL-student group:
- EL students
- Students with Disabilities

| MAP Data Analysis – ALL Students |
|---|

**Achievement Trends:**

SCHOOL
- Schoolwide, 56% of students scored in the Low and LoAvg performance bands in reading; 58% of students scored in the lowest two performance bands in math.
- Schoolwide, 32% of students projected to score Standard Met & Exceeded in the SBAC for reading, whereas only 26% of students projected to score Standard Met & Exceeded in math.

GRADE LEVELS
- Grade 4, 39% of students scored in the HiAvg and Hi performance bands in both reading and math. Almost half of 4th grade students are projected to meet or exceed the standards on ELA and Math SBAC Performance.
- Grade 1, 26% of students scored in the two highest performance bands in reading.

## MAP Data Analysis – ALL Students

- Grade 1, 37% of students scored in the two highest performance bands in math.
- Grade 2, 56% of students met or exceeded the Projected RIT/Growth Period in reading.
- Grades 3 and 5 have the highest percentage of students scoring in the two lowest performance bands in math.
- Almost half of grades 2, 3, and 5 scored in the lowest performance band in reading.

STUDENT GROUPS
- Gender, Male students outperformed the schoolwide and Female student group, where 37% of male students are projected to meet or exceed SBA performance in ELA as compared to only 32% schoolwide.
- Gender, Male students outperformed the schoolwide and Female student group, where 34% of male students are projected to meet or exceed SBA performance in math as compared to only 26% schoolwide.
- English Learners and SWD, the majority of students scored in the lowest performance in reading and math.

## Growth Trends:

SCHOOL
More than half of the students met or exceeded projected growth in both reading and math.
GRADE LEVELS
- Grade 4 students made accelerated growth in reading.
- All grade levels with the exception of kindergarten and grade 1 made expected growth in math and reading.

STUDENT GROUPS
- Hispanic, 53% of students met or exceeded the Projected RIT/Growth with an Average Achievement Percentile of 38.63% in reading.
- SWD student group made accelerated growth in both math and reading.
- English Learners, 48% met or exceeded Projected RIT Growth.as compared to English Only with 56% meeting their projected growth in reading.
- Gender, Females outperformed Male students by higher percentage that met or exceeded Projected RIT Growth.
- Gender, both males and females showed a positive growth trend, Average Conditional Growth Index, CGI, thus making expected growth in reading.

## Identified Areas of Strength:

- Below are relative strengths for each grade level in reading and math.
- Kindergarten, Vocabulary Use & Functions and Measurement & Data
- Grade 1, Literature and Information and Operations & Algebraic Thinking
- Grade 2, Literary Text and Algebraic Thinking
- Grade 3 Literary Text and Geometry
- Grade 4 Informational Text and Operations & Algebraic Thinking
- Grade 5 Literary Text and Vocabulary, and Number & Operations
- Grade 6 Literary Text and Operations & Algebraic Thinking

| Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services |
|---|
| iReady Fall to Winter was used to monitor students progress and academic performance. Walkthrough data was utilized to progress monitor implementation of professional development. Number of awards distribution were used for progress monitoring. |
| **Identified Areas of Strength:** |
| A higher percentage of students showed growth in ELA from fall to winter compared to mathematics.<br>Based on classroom observations, it was evident that teachers implemented strategies learned from the weekly grade level PLC and whole group PD were implemented in daily instruction.<br>For academic awards, the percentage of students receiving awards for academics increased from fall to spring. |
| **Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):** |
| According to iReady data, mathematics has been identified as an area for growth. Geometry and Measurement & Data is the greatest area of need for mathematics.<br>Walkthrough data indicates that teachers still need support with high leverage strategies in math that deepen the students' understanding of number sense and mastery of foundational math skills. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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? | PD, Parent Workshops for SWD, Implementation of Second Step SEL Curriculum, Collaboration/PLC between Gen Ed. teachers and SPED teachers, data chats/goal setting w/students, recognize student accomplishments to help build confidence, extended learning opportunities, targeted/differentiated instruction |

| 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 Board approval 1/22/25
A- Provide after school tutoring to bu0 0 911a.90

| 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 |
| F- Provide professional development to support Teacher Clarity, Supporting Students w/Disabilities, Science of Reading, Signs of Dyslexia and How to Support, Best Ways to use Math Manipulatives in ALL grade levels, How to Use iReady w/SWD, Early Numeracy Strategies, Implementation of Second Step SEL curriculum, technology and PBIS.<br>* Certificated/Classified Additional Hourly<br>* Substitute Cost<br>* Contracted Services and related fees<br>* Professional Books/PD Materials<br>* Travel & Conference Related Fees | | | Common Core TOA, EL TOA, Teachers | | |
| G- Provide structured PLC collaboration time for student data analysis and planning, including time for General Ed. teachers to collaborate w/SPED teachers<br>* Certificated/Classified Additional Hourly<br>* Substitute Cost | Observational Learning Walk Data<br><br>iReady and District Benchmark Data | ALL, with an emphasis on SWD | Principal, Common Core TOA, EL TOA, Teachers | 3045 | 7038 |
| H- Provide enrichment opportunities in STEAM to support students in building 21st Century Skills in all content areas.<br>* Instructional Materials<br>* Robotics and Coding Technology<br>* Instructional Software and Digital Resources<br>* Contracted Services<br>* Additional certificated hourly | Observational Learning Walk Data, Student Surveys, Teacher Surveys | ALL | Principal, Teachers, Secretary | | 500 |
| I- Implement Blended Learning to increase student achievement.<br>* Headphones<br>* Mice | Observational Learning Walk Data<br><br>iReady and District Benchmark Data | ALL | Principal, Teachers, Common Core TOA, EL TOA, Support from | | 500 |

# 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 demonstrate improved academic growth and achievement in reading and math through the use of high leverage instructional strategies that support ELs and targeted small group support. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| School Metrics/Indicators | Previous Year Outcome | Current Outcomes | Future Expected Outcomes |
| Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA (EL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS) | • 65.1 (2021-2022) | -90.9 | -87.9 |
| Smarter Balanced Assessment Math (EL): Average Distance from Standard (DFS) | • 106.5 (2021-2022) | -107.5 | -104.5 |
| Fall MAP Growth Reading (EL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN) | KN: -2.2<br>1st: -8.3<br>2nd: -17.4<br>3rd: -10.2<br>4th: -15.5<br>5th: -11.7<br>6th: -14.7 | KN: -8.1<br>1st: -12.3<br>2nd: -16.2<br>3rd: -20.4<br>4th: -9.4<br>5th: -15.1<br>6th: -13.1 | KN: -7.6<br>1st: -11.8<br>2nd: -15.7<br>3rd: -19.9<br>4th: -8.9<br>5th: -14.6<br>6th: -12.6 |
| Fall MAP Growth Math (EL): Average Distance from Norm (DFN) | KN: -4.5<br>1st: -4.4<br>2nd: -22.7<br>3rd: -8.1<br>4th: -17.1<br>5th: -14.9<br>6th: -19.5 | KN: -8.9<br>1st: -7.3<br>2nd: -4.0<br>3rd: -16.8<br>4th: -9.6<br>5th: -17.5<br>6th: -21.9 | KN: -8.4<br>1st: -6.8<br>2nd: -3.5<br>3rd: -16.3<br>4th: -9.1<br>5th: -17.0<br>6th: -21.4 |
| MAP Growth Reading (EL): Avg Fall-to-Fall Conditional Growth Index (CGI) | 0.17 | -0.07 | >= 0 |

| MAP Data Analysis – EL Students |
|---|
| How does the EL Student Group achievement compare to the ALL-Student Group? |
| EL student group performed lower than the all-student group with the majority of students scoring in the lowest performance bands in reading and math. EL Student Group performed lower in all categories as compared to the All-Student Group. Over 50% of the EL students scored in the lowest performance bands in reading and math. |
| How does the EL Student Group growth compare to the ALL-Student Group? |
| In math, EL students made similar growth to the All-Student Group, thus maintaining the achievement gap. In reading, EL student group did not make expected growth while the All Student Group did make expected growth, thus widening the gap. |
| Identified Areas of Strength: |
| Literature & Informational Text for K-1 EL Students.  Literary Text for EL students in grades 2-6. For math, Operations & Algebraic Thinking for EL students in all grades. |
| Identified Needs (Areas for Growth): |
| For reading, Foundational Skills for grades K and 1& Informational text for grades 2-6.   For math, Number and Operations; Geometry |

| CA Dashboard Analysis (Academic Indicator) – EL Students |
|---|
| How does the EL Student Group achievement compare to the All-Student Group? |
| In ELA, English Learners performance level is orange as compared to yellow level for the All-Student group. For math, EL students performance level was the same the All-Student group, yellow level. |
| How does the EL Student Group growth compare to the All-Student Group? |
| In ELA, English Learners achievement declined by 3.5 points compared to the All-Student group improvement by 10.6. As a result, the achievement gap widened. In math, English Learners achievement increased by 3.9 points as compared to the All-Student group that increased by 28.8 point. Although the EL students improved, the gains were not enough to close the achievement gap. |

| Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services |
|---|
| Description of Site-Specific Data Collected for Progress-Monitoring |
| iReady Fall to Winter assessment, Walkthrough data |
| Identified Areas of Strength: |
| ELA data from fall to winter indicates an increase in students performing early on grade level (green) and one grade level below (yellow), thus decreasing the percentage of students performing at three or more grade levels below ( red) and two grade levels below (orange level).<br>Walkthrough data indicates teachers have implemented ELD strategies in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and primary language support. |

| Site Measur... ...aluating Actions/Servi... |

| Identified Needs (Areas for Growth): |

Math is an area of growth with over 50% of ... 1 grade leve... ...r more according to iReady da... ...winter results.
Walkthrough data indicates that teachers ... professional ... n ELD strategies to support stu... ...earning math vocabulary, number sense, a...
complex word problems.

| Based on qualitative and qu... data analysis, identified ... student groups liste... ...ed support, what st... ...be used to meet this ... | Targeted differentiated ... on, PD, implementation of high ... EL strategies, collaboration/P... ...ent workshops |

| 202... | Metric(s) for eval... Action/Service | ...Pupils to be s... | ...son(s) Respons... | 2024-25 Estimated |

| LEA/School GOAL 1b Language Needs of ELs: English Learners will demonstrate English language proficiency growth in their receptive language by developing their reading comprehension skills. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 35% - Beginning Development | 38% - Beginning Development | measured with changes in ELPI levels |
| ELPAC Writing Domain: % by Performance Level | 24% - Well Developed<br>55% - Somewhat/Moderately Developed<br>21% - Beginning Development | 29% - Well Developed<br>46% - Somewhat/Moderately Developed<br>25% - Beginning Development | N/A - Progress cannot be measured with changes in ELPAC performance, but rather are measured with changes in ELPI levels |

| ELPAC Data Analysis – EL Students |
|---|
| • Speaking Domain showed half of the students scoring Well Developed |
| Identified Needs (Areas for Growth): |
| -Reading continues as a noted category for improvement across the grade levels. |
| List Grade Levels and ELPI Levels in Need of Targeted Support (underperforming compared to schoolwide ELPAC or progressing at a lower rate compared to schoolwide ELPI): |
| Grade 3<br>ELPI levels 3L, 2H, and 1 |

| CA Dashboard Analysis (English Learner Progress Indicator) – EL Students |
|---|
| ELPI Performance (Status AND Change) |
| 63.6% of EL's made adequate progress towards English proficiency which was an increase of 7.6 percent which is considered high and green performance level on the Dashboard. |

| Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services |
|---|
| Description of Data Collected for Progress-Monitoring |
| Assessment data from classroom walkthroughs and pre/post tests |
| Identified Areas of Strength: |
| Based on walkthrough data, teachers utilize strategies that build vocabulary development and reading comprehension during whole group and small group instruction. Teachers also set academic goals with students based on assessment results from pre/post tests. Teachers engaged students in ELPAC practice and training tests in preparation for the annual assessment. |
| Identified Needs (Areas for Growth): |
| Although EL students showed growth in reading, students still need support with reading comprehension (main idea and supporting details) and vocabulary development, according to walkthrough data. |

| Based on qualitative and quantitative data analysis, identified needs, and | Targeted differentiated instruction, PD, implementation of high leverage EL strategies |
|---|---|

| MAP Data Analysis – Kinder through 3rd Grade Reading |
|---|
| |
| **Growth Trends:** |
| <ul><li>From Fall 2022 to Fall 2023, grades 2 and 3 showed a positive change in the distance from the norm, closing the achievement gap.</li><li>Grades 2 and 3 demonstrated positive trend on the Average Conditional Growth Index (CGI).</li><li>Grades K and 1 demonstrated a negative change in the distance from the norm, widening the achievement gap.</li></ul> |
| **Identified Areas of Strength:** |
| <ul><li>Foundational Skills and Vocabulary Use & Functions indicated relative strengths for kindergarten.</li><li>Language and Writing is a relative strength for grade 1.</li><li>Literary Text is a relative strength for grade 2 and grade 3.</li></ul> |
| **Identified Needs (Areas for Growth):** |
| <ul><li>Informational Text for Grades K-3</li><li>Vocabulary is the greatest area of need for grade 3.</li></ul> |

| Site Measures for Evaluating Actions/Services |
|---|
| Description of Data Collected for Progress-Monitoring |
| iReady, A2i, and classroom walkthrough data |
| Identified Areas of Strength: |
| High frequency words and phonological awareness were areas of strength as indicated by iReady assessments.<br>A2i data indicates letter recognition, and the identifying letter sounds as an area of strength.<br>Walkthrough data indicates sight words word fluency, letter recognition, letter sounds, and reading decodable books are areas of strength. |

# Programs Included in this Plan

| Federal Programs | Allocation |
|---|---|
| | |