

District Name: Huntington Beach Union
School District

CD Code: 30-66548

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PLAN ADDENDUM

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 Section 1116©(7)(A) requires that local educational agencies (LEAs) identified for Program Improvement (PI) shall, not later than three months after being identified, develop or revise an LEA Plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, and others. Rather than completely rewriting the existing LEA Plan, we recommend using this Plan Addendum template to address the items below. Type your responses in the expandable text boxes. Please submit your completed Addendum by e-mail to LEAP@cde.ca.gov.

The Plan Addendum, which must be submitted to the California Department of Education (CDE) no later than July 31, 2009, is required to:

- 1. Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools of that LEA and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students, including a determination of why the prior LEA Plan failed to bring about increased student achievement.**

The Huntington Beach Union High School District (HBUHSD) entered Program Improvement Year 1 following the final AYP data release in February 2009. In 2007 HBUHSD did not meet AYP criteria for SWD in ELA. All other subgroups meet the target for proficiency in ELA and mathematics. In 2008 SWD were safe-harbored and met their growth target, however, the EL subgroup did not meet the AYP target. An examination of the previous LEA plan revealed that the plan was very broad and not specific to the changing needs of individual subgroups. There has also been difficulties in all sites understanding that despite the fact that their schools do not receive Title I funds, all students contribute to the districts overall subgroup numbers. Without a clear understanding of this, schools may not have focused resources on addressing the academic needs of *all* students. Collaboration between reading/EL/math teachers regarding strategies and resources to support students performing below grade level was minimal.

Please describe how you will address those needs and problems and include a determination of why the prior LEA Plan was not successful. (See DAS, Standards-based Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment, pp. 3-5)	Persons Involved	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>Based on survey results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize standards-based assessment to guide/modify instruction and to monitor progress towards IEP goals and student achievement. Implement teaming model for strategic classroom instruction and to meet specific needs of students, including ELs/SWD/GATE and students performing below standard. Provide standards based professional development for special education teachers on core and supplemental research-based materials to ensure consistency in program effectiveness. Continue, and expand as needed, intervention activities (tutorial, support classes, Saturday school) for students performing below basic or not passing CAHSEE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asst Supt Ed Services Director Curriculum Instruction & Cat Programs Director Special Education Special Education Literacy coach Special Education teachers Site admin teams EL Facilitator Classroom teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sept 2009 – Jun 2010 Sept 2009 – Dec 2009 Sept 2009 – ongoing as needed Sept 2009 – ongoing Sept 2009 – ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits Teacher subs Clerical support Training costs Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000 \$10,000 \$8000 \$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title I Title II Title III EIA-LEP General fund ARRA

<p>Based on survey results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All EL students will be held to the same academic content and achievement standards established for all students. 2. Each EL student, including students who are receiving instruction under 504 or IEP structures, will receive a program of instruction in English language development in order to increase proficiency as rapidly as possible. 3. The English Language Development program will ensure sufficient rigor for all EL students, including EL students with disabilities who are mainstreamed or in a self-contained setting, so that students can meet annual English language development objectives. This includes making adequate progress on CELDT and meeting AYP. 4. Additional support resources and strategies will be used to help students learn. These include SDAIE sheltered instruction, focusing on oral language skills, and primary language and support. 5. The LEA will ensure that the individual EL students, including those who are receiving services under 504 or IEP mandates, are making progress in acquiring English language proficiency. The LEA will maintain individual and group data, analyzed by time in program, will indicate the progress of EL students acquiring English language proficiency. <p>Based on survey results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the intensive and strategic reading interventions (<i>READ 180 and Language!</i>) for alignment with the state reading/language arts framework. 2. Expand intervention strategies as needed to include more students to close the achievement gap (ELs, SWD, students performing below expectations). 3. Review standards based core materials for intensive intervention activities that can support learning. 4. Provide opportunities for Reading and EL staffs to collaborate on strategies that support academic achievement for EL students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information services • Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability • Accountability Committee • Reading Facilitator • BTSA Support providers • Parents/Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy coach • Reading Facilitator • EI Facilitator • Math Facilitator • Director of Special Education • Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Categorical Programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 – ongoing • Sept 2009 – ongoing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 – ongoing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 (ongoing) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 - ongoing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 -Dec 2009 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 • Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 (ongoing) 			
---	---	---	--	--	--

2. Include specific measurable achievement goals and targets for student groups consistent with Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Please describe those goals and targets for student achievement, participation, growth on the API, and graduation rate, if applicable. (See DAS, Standards-based Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment, pp.3-5)	Persons Involved	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>Based on survey results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet or exceed 2009-2010 AYP targets of 95% participation rate for school wide, LEA, and all significant subgroups. 2. Meet or exceed the 2009-2010 AYP targets goals of 55.6% in ELA and 54.8% in math. 3. Meet or exceed the annual NCLB performance goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asst Supt Ed Services • Director Curriculum Instruction & Cat Programs • Director Special Education • Special Education Literacy coach • Special Education teacher • EL teachers • Site admin teams • EL Facilitator • Math Facilitator • Reading Facilitator • Core content teachers with ESL/SWD • Information services • Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability • Accountability Committee • BTSA Support providers • Parents/Community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sept 2009 -Jun 2010 • Sept 2009 -Jun2010 • Sept 2009 -Jun 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits • Teacher subs • Clerical support • Training costs • Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials • Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title I • Title II • Title III • EIA-LEP • General fund • ARRA

3. Incorporate scientifically based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program in schools served by the LEA.

Please describe the specific strategies that you will use and how you will accomplish this.	Persons Involved	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>Based on survey results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement research-based programs, to include supplemental materials, to strengthen the core academic program for all students. 2. Expand and support PLCs district wide to foster a shared purpose, a collective responsibility among staff, and a focus on student learning and results. 3. Provide subject area articulation, vertical teaming, and collaboration across subject areas to support differentiated instruction and CAHSEE preparation. 4. Provide staff development to core content teachers in the use of research based strategies to support greater student access to the core curriculum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Asst Supt Ed Services ● Director Curriculum Instruction & Cat Programs ● Director Special Education ● Special Education Literacy coach ● Special Education teachers ● Site administrative teams ● EL Facilitator ● Math Facilitator ● Reading Facilitator ● Core content area teachers (History/SS, math, science) ● Information services ● Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability ● Accountability Committee ● BTSA Support providers ● Parent/Community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 ● Sept 2009 –ongoing ● Oct 2009 – ongoing ● Oct 2009 –Jun 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits ● Teacher subs ● Clerical support ● Training costs ● Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials ● Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Title I ● Title II ● Title III ● EIA-LEP ● General fund ● ARRA

4. Identify actions that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify those actions. (See DAS, <i>Standards-based Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment</i> , pp. 3-5)	Persons Involved	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>Based on survey results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement researched based programs and supplemental materials in core content classes. 2. Monitor and evaluate progress using formative and summative assessments. Results will guide instruction and ensure program effectiveness in meeting the needs of SWD and ELs. 3. Provide differentiated instruction to support needs of students. 4. Provide transition programs and services for SWDs to ensure consistent communication. 5. Facilitate and support collaboration and vertical teaming through PLCs. 6. Develop and implement district annual grade level district reading/language arts and math guides based on semester coverage of key standards. 7. Develop benchmarks exams in reading language/arts and math through the use of Data Director item banks. 8. Monitor student achievement through formative and summative assessments and targeted instruction. 9. Develop math support courses to assist all sub groups in closing the achievement gap while having access to core curriculum. 10. Develop research based program structures that support high academic achievement for SWDs. 11. Create a district level program improvement action committee to align and coordinate services. 12. Provide collaboration opportunities for reading/EL/math facilitators and teacher to identify and implement strategies to support student achievement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asst Supt Ed Services • Director Curriculum Instruction & Cat Programs • Director Special Education • Special Education Literacy coach • Special Education teachers • Site administrative teams • EL Facilitator • Math Facilitator • Reading Facilitator • Information services • Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability • Accountability Committee • BTSA Support providers • Parents/Community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 ○Nov 2009 – ongoing ○Sept 2009 –ongoing ○Sept 2009 – ongoing ○Sept 2009 ongoing ○Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 ○Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 ○Oct 2009 – ongoing ○Aug 2009 –Jun 2010 ○Sept 2009 –Jun 2010 ○Oct 2009 –Nov 2010 ○Aug 2009 - ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits • Teacher subs • Clerical support • Training costs • Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials • Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title I • Title II • Title III • EIA-LEP • General fund • ARRA

5. Address the professional development needs of the instructional staff that will support the strategies and recommendations described above.

Please explain how you identified those needs and how you will address them. (See DAS, Professional Development, pp. 6-7)	Persons Involved/Timeline	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>Based on survey results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide standards based professional development for special education teachers on core and supplemental instructional materials. 2. Offer ongoing support for Special Education staff in appropriate instructional strategies and intervention in reading/language arts and math. 3. Present training for Special Education teachers in writing standards based IEP curricular goals. 4. Facilitate ongoing PLC implementation 5. Prepare staff development for teachers on the fidelity of implementation of instructional programs and materials in reading/language arts and mathematics including the intervention programs and materials. 6. Conduct staff development for site administrators on the adopted core instructional programs and materials including intervention programs and materials. 7. Provide professional development opportunities that will ensure a standards based core ELA and mathematics experience for SWD and ELs. 8. Provide staff development to core content teachers in the use of research based strategies to support greater student access to the core curriculum. 9. Provide staff development for instructional assistants in strategies to support core instruction and improve student achievement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asst Supt Ed Services • Director Curriculum Instruction & Cat Programs • Director Special Education • Special Education Literacy coach • Special Education teachers • Site admin teams • EL Facilitator • Math Facilitator • Reading Facilitator • Core content teachers • Information services • Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability • Accountability Committee • Instructional assts • BTSA Support providers • Parents/Community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oct 2009 -Jun 2010 • Oct 2009 -Jun 2010 • Oct 2009 - Nov 2010 • Sept 2009 -ongoing • Oct 2009 -Jun 2010 • Oct 2009 -Jun 2010 • Oct 2009 -Jun 2010 • Oct 2009 -Jun 2010 • Oct 2009 -Jun 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits • Teacher subs • Clerical support • Training costs • Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials • Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title I • Title II • Title III • EIA-LEP • General fund • ARRA

English Learners

- a. **Title III Status and Title I Program Improvement (PI) Status:** An LEA that is also in Title III Year 2 should insert the Improvement Plan Addendum in the expandable space below. LEAs in Title III Year 4 are required to complete the online Action Plan and need not address Item 6.

1. Conduct an analysis of data. Identify and describe the factors that prevented the LEA from achieving the AMAOs.

Analysis of Data

A review of the ELSSA offered the following information.

1. AMAO 1:

In 2004-05, and 2005-06, the EL subgroup demonstrated annual progress in English-language proficiency. The subgroup far exceeded the target in both years by as much as 29%. In 2006-07 the EL subgroup did not meet the target by .4%. It was during this year that the CELDT test was recalibrated. Concerted efforts were put into place to review test administration practices, as well as placing an emphasis on ensuring the appropriate instructional strategies used in the ELD and Limited English Proficient (LEP) instructional setting support language acquisition. There was also an emphasis in teaching the classroom teachers the components of the CELDT test to better inform their instruction. In 2007-08 the EL percentage of students making annual progress exceeded the target.

2. AMAO 2:

Likewise, AMAO 2 demonstrated a similar pattern. Students met the target for attaining English-language proficiency in both 2004-05 and 2005-06. In 2006-07 students did not meet the target by 3.4%. Again, after review with both the ELD and LEP teachers it became very evident that students on some of our campuses were not fully informed as to the importance of the CELDT test. Efforts were made to better inform students of the importance of the CELDT test for redesignation purposes and to be sure that students more fully understood the impact that not demonstrating their English skills on the CELDT only prolonged the number of times that they must continue to take the test. In 2007-08 percentage of student attaining proficiency did exceed the target, however it was by only .4 percentage points. We must continue our efforts to better inform students, parents and teachers of the value and worth of the CELDT test to their educational goals.

3. AMAO 3

3.a. As far as the percentage of EL student participation rate in both ELA and math, the district has met or exceeded the target every year. Our schools have been diligent in not only communicating the importance of the CAHSEE exam to students, but through principal newsletters, electronic communication sources, and parent meetings the importance has also been communicated to parents.

3.b. The EL subgroup has met the target for percent proficient in math every year since 2004-05. In ELA, the target had been met in 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07. In 2007-08 the target was not met. Analysis of the data on a school by school basis identifies both of our Title I schools as not meeting proficiency levels. There was also one non-Title I site that did not meet the target for levels of proficiency. The two Title I schools are well aware of the impact of Program Improvement. Both sites have taken action to intervene with students before taking CAHSEE this year. Interventions include *Brainex* on one campus and *Princeton Review* on the other campus. Through teacher and administrative meetings, it has been communicated that while AYP is specific to Title I schools, it is also a factor for Title I districts. It has been emphasized that at the schools that are not Title I, their numbers may heavily impact the district AYP. At all other sites, intervention activities have been put into place using *Measuring Up Early Prep*. The factors that may have had a big impact on preventing the LEA from achieving the target are many.

- ✓ While our schools have focused efforts on assisting students in passing CAHSEE as 10th graders, there has not been a concerted effort to address the specific needs and abilities of EL students. EL students participate in English Language Development classes with Heinle *Visions* as the core text. Benchmarks have been set up at each grade level; however, there has not been a clear understanding of how the benchmarks should inform instruction.
- ✓ Students have limited engagement in activities that support acquiring the oral language proficiency that support English reading and writing skills.
- ✓ The recent CPM and teacher conversations have illustrated the limited opportunities that our ELD students are engaged in activities using Academic Language. There has been an emphasis on social and general use of language but limited opportunities for students to engage in vocabulary instruction that occur in a wide array of academic and social contexts.

- ✓ A majority of students (78%) who are scoring at Intermediate level on CELDT are no longer in Structured English Immersion classes and have been mainstreamed into English language programs with little or no targeted English language development.
- ✓ Sheltered content instruction focuses more on discipline-specific concepts and skills rather than targeted ELD instruction and support.
- ✓ District wide the emphasis was on passing CAHSEE not achieving at the Proficient level.

4. AMAO 1 – EL Students at each CELDT level meeting growth targets

In all CELDT levels, with the exception of Early Advanced/Advanced: English Proficient, the HBUHSD students are below the state average in meeting the growth targets. While scores do indicate that there is growth, the growth is not to the level required for meeting the targets. The percent meeting growth targets and the percentage below the state average are as follows: Beginning, 46.9%, 16.8% below the state average; Early Intermediate, 50.7%; 11.4% below the state average; Intermediate, 36.8%, 3.6 below the state average; Early Advanced/Advanced: Not English Proficient, 44.4%, 7% below the state average. This highlights an area of concern for the HBUHSD and the EL students attaining the growth as demonstrated on the CELDT.

5.a. AMAO 2 – Student performance on CELDT based on length of time in U.S. schools.

Of the 69% of the total HBUHSD EL population who have been in the U.S. for 6 or more years, 41% were Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient; 11% were Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient; 36% were Intermediate; 9% were Early Intermediate; and 3% were Beginning. Of the 5% of the EL population who have been in U.S. schools 5 years 37% were Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient, 5% were Early Advanced or Advanced: Not English Proficient, 28% were Intermediate, 27% were Early Intermediate and 4% were Beginning. Of the 26% of the EL population that have had 4 years of U.S. schools, 26% are Early Advanced or Advanced: English Proficient, 9% are Early Advanced or Advanced: Not English Proficient, 43% are Intermediate, 19% are Early Intermediate, and 3% are Beginning. Of the 26% of the EL population that has had 3 years, 12% are Early Advanced or Advanced: English Proficient, 5% are Early Advanced or Advanced: Not English Proficient, 27% are Intermediate, 27% are Early Intermediate, and 29% are Beginning. The data support the research that indicates students often stall at the Intermediate level. It is also noted that only very few student score Early Advanced or Advanced who are not yet English proficient.

5.b. AMAO 2 - Student performance on CELDT based on length of time in our district.

Since we are a 9-12 high school district, we can only look at students who have been in the district for 3 years, as we do not yet have the 2008-09 CELDT scores. Thirty-four percent of students were Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient, 9% are Early Advanced or Advanced: Not English Proficient, 34% are Intermediate, 14% are Early Intermediate, and 8% are Beginning. The high percentage of students who after 3 years of instruction in our district remain intermediate level continues to support the research where student do not transition out of Intermediate at the percentage one should expect for the length of time in school.

6.a. ELA CST Performance for EL students at English Proficient on CELDT.

In the Huntington Beach Union High School District, 22% of EL students whose CELDT scores are at the English Proficient level are Advanced or Proficient on the CSTs, with 51% scoring at Basic, 21% scoring at Below Basic, and 5% scoring at Far Below Basic. As a comparison for all students, district wide 59% score at Advanced or Proficient. In grade 9, only 31% of students who are English Proficient on CELDT score at the proficient or advanced level on the CST with 22% at grade 10 and 10% at grade 11. There is a clear discrepancy between students' scores on the CELDT and student performance on the CSTs. The 9th grade students perform better than students at the 10th or 11th grade; however, it raises concerns about the misalignment of CELDT and CSTs. CELDT focuses more on social and general uses of language where as CSTs focus on course content and standards.

- ✓ Once again the limited access to academic language hinders students' ability to become proficient or advanced on the CSTs.
- ✓ The achievement gap that exists between EL and the total district population is highlighted with these numbers.

6.b. Math CST Performance for EL students at English Proficient on CELDT

In grade 9, only 14% of students who are English Proficient on CELDT scored at the Proficient or Advanced level on the Algebra CST. There were only 10% at the

10th grade and 0% at the 11th grade. For comparison district wide with all students, 21% scored at Advanced or Proficient. Since math is not a grade level test, but rather a subject level test it is difficult to make sweeping generalizations. For our purposes we focused on the Algebra CSTs. Most students who come to us from the middle school and enter the high school math sequence at geometry have been identified as accelerated. Since algebra is the required math for high school, we felt this was our best measure to compare. Our district has 3 different levels of algebra supporting the struggling student with basic computational skills to the comprehensive algebra course and the spread of abilities is quite broad.

- ✓ With the heavy language content on all math CSTs, there is additional support that indicates that the CELDT does not measure academic language but more social and general uses of language.
- ✓ The achievement gap between the EL and total district population is once again very evident.

7.a. ELA CST Performance for EL students at Intermediate level on CELDT

District wide only 5% of EL students scoring at the Intermediate level on CELDT score as proficient or advanced on the CSTs. By grade the breakdown is 8% at the 9th grade, 4% at the 10th grade, and 5% at the 11th grade. Again district wide, all students scored at 59%

7.b. Math CST Performance for EL students at the Intermediate level on CELDT

District wide only 6% of EL students scoring at the Intermediate level on CELDT score as proficient or advanced on the CSTs. By grade, the breakdown is 7% at the 9th grade level, 8% at the 10th grade, and 4% at the 11th grade.

8.a. ELA CST Performance of R-FEP Students

As expected, our R-FEP student performance is stronger. District wide 32% score at the Advanced level, with 35% scoring at the Proficient level, 25% scoring at Basic, 5% scoring at Below Basic, and 3% scoring at Far Below Basic. With 67% of our R-FEP students scoring Advanced or Proficient, this is, in fact, better than the district-wide for all students who scored Advanced or Proficient at 59%. At the 9th grade the percentage of students scoring at Advanced is 43% with 35% scoring Proficient, 18% scoring Basic, 3% scoring Below Basic, and 1% at Far Below Basic. For grade 10, the percentage of students scoring at Advanced is 30% with 39% scoring Proficient, 24% scoring Basic, 5% scoring Below Basic, and 2% at Far Below Basic. For grade 11, the percentage of students scoring at Advanced is 23% with 31% scoring Proficient, 35% scoring Basic, 8% scoring Below Basic, and 4% at Far Below Basic. At each grade level over 50% of student scored at Advanced or Proficient. Moving students from Basic to Proficient is the challenge.

8.b. Math CST Performance of R-FEP Students

The percentage of R-FEP student who scored Advance or Proficient on the Algebra CST was 36% which was higher in comparison all students district wide that scored Advanced or Proficient at 21%. At the 9th grade the percentage of students scoring at Advanced is 16% with 28% scoring Proficient, 29% scoring Basic, 24% scoring Below Basic, and 4% at Far Below Basic. For grade 10, the percentage of students scoring at Advanced is 3% with 20% scoring Proficient, 41% scoring Basic, 28% scoring Below Basic, and 8% at Far Below Basic. For grade 11, the percentage of students scoring at Advanced is 1% with 35% scoring Proficient, 26% scoring Basic, 29% scoring Below Basic, and 10% at Far Below Basic. At each grade level the percentage of R-FEPs who scored at Advanced or Proficient on the Algebra I CST was higher than the district wide for all students. Moving students from Basic to Proficient is the challenge.

9. Performance of EL on CAHSEE

Of the 370 10th grade EL students, 40% passed and 7% were proficient on ELA. District wide the percentages were 89% passing and 66.5% proficient. In math, of the 362 10th grade EL students, 59% passed and 25% were proficient. District wide the percentages were 89% passed and 65% proficient.

10. Performance of R-FEP on CAHSEE

Of the 652 10th grade R-FEP students, 96% passed and 71% were proficient on ELA. The R-FEP percentages were higher in comparison to the district wide percentages. In math, of the 648 10th grade R-FEP students, 94% passed and 76% were proficient. Again, the R-FEP percentages were higher in comparison to

the district wide percentages.

Please describe those goals and targets.	Persons Involved	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English-language Development (ELD). (AMAO 1 and 2; English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA) Section A.)</p> <p>2.1 Train LEP/ELD teachers in the importance of academic vocabulary development and academic and oral language usage in improving English language Development:</p> <p>2.1.1 Send ELD/LEP teachers to Kate Kinsella workshop "Vocabulary Development Strategies that Boost Reading and Language Learning"</p> <p>2.1.2 Require that teachers select one strategy to use in the classroom over a period of several days</p> <p>2.1.3 Follow up at next ELD meeting as to success and challenges with strategies</p> <p>2.1.4 Increase focus on Academic language in the ELD classroom</p> <p>2.1.5 Increase opportunities for students to develop oral language proficiency in the ELD classrooms.</p> <p>2.1.6 Embed explicit vocabulary development into ELD classroom</p> <p>2.1.7 Provide specifically designated academic instruction in English to ensure access to grade-appropriate core curriculum</p> <p>2.1.8 Train administrators on language activities that support language acquisition for observation purposes</p> <p>2.1.9 Evaluate strategies using available data (CELDT, CST, etc), and as necessary, modify the program</p> <p>2.2 Review ELD course sequencing to identify activities that support increased opportunities for usage of academic language and embed these activities into the ELD classroom/courses</p> <p>2.3 Review <i>Visions</i> benchmark assessments as tools to support Academic language along with social and general language</p>	<p>2.1.1 Director Curr, Inst, and Cat Programs, Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers</p> <p>2.2.1 Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers</p> <p>2.3.1 Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers</p> <p>2.4.1 Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers,</p>	<p>• Jan 2009 –Feb 2009</p> <p>• Sept 2009 –Jan 2010</p> <p>• Sept 2009 –Jun 2010</p>	<p>District/site Support Personnel salaries/ benefits Teacher subs</p> <p>Clerical support</p> <p>Conference registration/ training costs</p> <p>Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials</p> <p>Duplication</p>	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<p>Title I Title II EIA-LEP GF ARRA</p>

<p>2.4 Identify and purchase teacher support materials and monitor effectiveness.</p> <p>2.5 Review transition criteria from SEI to ELM</p>	<p>Director Curr, Inst, and Cat Programs</p> <p>2.5 1Facilitator ELD, PELL coord, Director C., I, CP</p>	<p>• Sept 2009 –Jun 2010</p> <p>• Jun 2009 –Dec2009</p>			
<p>3. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve reading/language arts. (AMAO3; ELSSA Section B)</p> <p>3.1 Review longitudinal data from the <i>Write Institute</i> to identify strengths in the program and areas for improvement</p> <p>3.2 Annually analyze data from the <i>Write Institute</i>, CAHSEE testing, and ELA CST scores to monitor student progress/improvement and to make necessary modifications to improve academic performance of English learners</p> <p>3.3 Expand the use of technology based intervention materials with programs that support phonemic awareness, fluency, and comprehension (i.e. <i>Scholastic Read 180, System 44</i>) in ELA classrooms with EL students</p> <p>3.4 Train LEP teachers in the importance of vocabulary development and academic and oral language usage in improving reading language arts.</p>	<p>3.1.1 Director Curr, Inst, and Cat Programs, Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers</p> <p>3.2.1 Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers</p> <p>3.3.1 Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers</p> <p>3.4.1 Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers, Director Curr, Inst, and Cat Programs</p>	<p>• Jan 2009 –Jun 2009</p> <p>• Ongoing annual review of available data</p> <p>• Jun 2009 – Nov 2010</p>	<p>District/site Support Personnel salaries/ benefits Teacher subs Clerical support Conference registration/ training costs Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials Duplication Computer based programs</p>	<p>\$20,000 \$20,000 \$10,000 \$8000 \$100,000 \$2000 \$120,000</p>	<p>Title I Title II Title III EIA-LEP GF ARRA</p>

<p>3.4.1 Send LEP teachers to Kate Kinsella workshop “Vocabulary Development Strategies that Boost Reading and Language Learning”</p> <p>3.4.2 Require that teachers select one strategy to use in the classroom over a period of several days</p> <p>3.4.3 Follow up at next ELD meeting as to success and challenges with strategies</p> <p>3.4.4 Require that student responses in ELD/LEP classes use complete sentences both orally and in writing.</p> <p>3.4.5 Increase opportunities to develop oral language proficiency</p> <p>3.4.6 Emphasize sentence structure and grammar to increase reading and language arts skills</p> <p>3.4.7 Train site administrators on the importance of structured language usage in English language acquisitions</p> <p>3.4.8 Monitor student success using CELDT data, CST data, and CAHSEE data for 10th grade EL students</p> <p>3.5 Review and select textbooks for adoption for use in the LEP English classes that include research-based strategies that improve reading/language arts.</p> <p>3.6 EL student schedules reflect additional academic support with targeted curricular acceleration for CAHSEE using People’s Education <i>Measuring Up Early Prep</i>, Princeton Review’s CAHSEE support materials (WHS) and <i>Brainex</i> (OVHS)</p>	<p>3.5 1Facilitator ELD, PELL coord, Director Curriculum, Instruction, Cat 3.6.1 Site administrators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 2009 – Jun 2010 (ongoing) • Aug 2009 - ongoing • Aug 2009 – ongoing • Oct 2008 – Jun 2009 • Oct 2008 – Mar 2009 annually there after 			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>4. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve academic achievement in mathematics, (AMAO 3; ELSSA Section C)</p> <p>4.1. Train math teachers on the importance of oral language usage in language acquisition and learning</p> <p>4.1.1 Math teachers will Increase opportunities to develop oral proficiency</p> <p>4.1.2 Math teachers will embed academic vocabulary building activities into math instruction</p> <p>4.2 Use technology-based intervention activities to close the achievement gap</p>	<p>4.1.1 Director Curr, Inst, and Cat Programs, Facilitator ELD, ELD teachers</p> <p>4.2.1 Director Curr, Inst, and Cat Programs, Facilitator Math, Math teachers</p>	<p>• May 2009 –Jun 2009 ongoing</p> <p>• Sept 2009 –Jun 2010</p>	<p>District/site Support Personnel salaries/ Benefits</p> <p>Teacher subs</p> <p>Clerical support</p> <p>Conference registration/ training costs</p> <p>Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials</p> <p>Duplication</p>	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<p>Title I Title II EIA-LEP GF ARRA</p>
<p>5. Describe scientifically based research professional development strategies and activities, including coordination of efforts with other No Child Left Behind (NCLB) programs. (ELSSA Section D)</p> <p>5.1 Develop needs assessment to identify staff development needs and develop a staff development plan to address identified needs</p> <p>5.2 Develop and implement a plan to ensure that all teachers have proper authorization to teach EL students to include offering CTCL authorization classes supporting teachers in obtaining EL authorization</p> <p>5.3 Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Categorical Programs and ELD Facilitator will participate in the K-12 Trainer of Trainers Institute “Advancing English Learners” sponsored by OCDE to present to ELD teachers to bring back to the district as a component of staff development for the ELD/LEP teachers</p> <p>5.4 Develop a coaching schedule to support teacher implementation of strategies in the ELD classroom</p>	<p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program</p> <p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program, Asst Supt Human Resources</p> <p>Cancelled at county</p> <p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat</p>	<p>• Feb 2009</p> <p>• Jan 2009 –ongoing</p> <p>• Mar 2009 –ongoing</p>	<p>District/site Support Personnel salaries/ Benefits</p> <p>Teacher subs</p> <p>Clerical support</p> <p>Conference registration/ training costs</p> <p>Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials</p> <p>Duplication</p>	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<p>Title I Title II Title III GF ARRA</p>

<p>5.5 Continue <i>Write Institute</i> activities to include the collaborative scoring of essays for consistency</p> <p>5.6 Provide support for staff collaboration regarding EL students needs, assessment results, and methods of instruction</p> <p>5.7 Train principals and administrators on activities to look for in the ELD classroom that support the acquisition of English skills</p> <p>5.8 Train paraprofessional in the use of academic vocabulary and oral language activities to support language acquisition</p>	<p>Program, ELD Facilitator</p> <p>ELD/LEP Teachers, <i>Write Institute</i> trainers</p> <p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program, ELD Facilitator, Coord Assessment and Accountability</p> <p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program, ELD Facilitator</p> <p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program, ELD Facilitator</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing • Sept 2008 –ongoing every 4 – 6 weeks • Aug 2009 • Feb 2009 -ongoing 			
<p>6. Describe parent involvement and outreach strategies to help parents become active participants in the education of their children, including coordination efforts with other NCLB programs. (ELSSA Section E)</p> <p>6.1 Use DELAC to a greater degree to communicate with parents regarding programs</p> <p>6.2 Implement activities as outlined in Categorical Program Monitoring Report of Findings to address areas out of compliance</p>	<p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program, ELD Facilitator, PELL Coordinators</p> <p>Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program, ELD Facilitator, Asst HR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mar 2009 – ongoing • Jan 2009 – until compliance met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits • Training costs • Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<p>Title I EIA LEP Title III ARRA .</p>

6.3 Academic achievement of all students a standing agenda item for DELAC to discuss annual testing cycles and results	Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program,	• May 2009 – ongoing			
6.4 Collaborate with county liaison and other school districts to identify and implement ways to increase parent involvement and expand EL parent education opportunities	Director Curr., Inst., and Cat Program,	• Mar 2009 - ongoing			

7. Incorporate, as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during an extension of the school year.

Please describe those activities and how you will incorporate them.	Persons Involved	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>1. Develop intervention activities offered before/after school, during tutorial periods, and during Saturday school for identified students, including SWD and ELs.</p> <p>2. Provide Extended School Year for SWDs.</p> <p>3. Pursuant to IEP goals, SWDs will be provided with necessary technology to access curriculum.</p> <p>4. Evaluate data for students involved in intervention activities to make appropriate changes and revisions to increase program effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asst Supt Ed Services • Director Curriculum Instruction & Cat Programs • Director Special Education • Special Education Literacy coach • Special Education teachers • Site admin teams • EL Facilitator • Math Facilitator • Reading Facilitator • Information services • Coord of Assessment & Accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually • Annually • Sept 2009 – ongoing • Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits • Teacher subs • Clerical support • Training costs • Purchase standards based supplemental instructional materials • Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$8000</p> <p>\$100,000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title I • Title II • Title III • EIA-LEP • General fund • ARRA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability Committee • BTSA Support providers • Parents/Community 				
--	---	--	--	--	--

8. Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school.

Please describe those strategies. (See DAS, Parent and Community, p. 10)	Persons Involved	Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>1. Present to the district Special Education Council topics related to student achievement and program effectiveness.</p> <p>2. Continue to involve parents in the development of the annual IEP to discuss student progress.</p> <p>3. Focus student academic progress on IEPs based on data regarding standards based assessments.</p> <p>4. Continue to provide parents of ELs information as mandated through Title III:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reason for identification as EL • Placement criteria • Level of English proficiency as measured by CELDT. • Method of instruction (SEI, SDAIE, ELD) • Criteria for redesignation • Ways the program will support ort their student in becoming English proficient • Parental rights <p>5. Train School Site Councils/ DELAC in roles and responsibilities in the development of the site SPSA and district Program for English Learners.</p> <p>6. Share data and implication with parents regularly through a variety of avenues to include parent newsletters, PTSA meetings, SSC, ELAC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director Curriculum Instruction & Cat Programs • Director Special Education • Site administrators • Coordinator of Assessment and Accountability • Parents/Community <p>Timeline:2009-2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually • Annually • Annually • Annually per law • Annually • Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District/site Support personnel salaries/benefits • Clerical support • Training costs • Duplication 	<p>\$20,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$1000</p> <p>\$2000</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title I • Title II • Title III • EIA-LEP • General fund • ARRA

**LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY (LEA) PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN
ASSURANCE PAGE**

LEA Plan Information:

Name of Local Educational Agency: Huntington Beach Union High School District

County District Code: 30-66548

Date of Local Governing Board Approval: July 14, 2009

District Superintendent: Van Riley, Ph.D

Address: 5862 Bolsa Ave

City: Huntinton Beach

Zip Code: 92649

Phone: 714-903-7000

FAX: 714-892-5750

**E-mail:
vriley@hbuhsd.org**

Signatures:

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

Signature of Superintendent	Printed Name of Superintendent	Date
-----------------------------	--------------------------------	------

Signature of Board President	Printed Name of Board President	Date
------------------------------	---------------------------------	------

Send this signed assurance page **no later than July 31, 2009**, to:

Peggy Carter, Consultant
Assessment and Accountability Branch
Accountability and Improvement Division
Intervention Assistance Office
California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 4401
Sacramento, CA 95814