BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL
2012-2013
<u>Single Plan for Student Achievement</u>
last updated: 01-30-12

*The items and targets in this plan were selected during the
2010-2012 WASC Self Study.*

They are Berkeley High School's highest priorities in supporting the achievement of all students, with a particular emphasis on raising the academic performance of students not yet meeting state standards.

Glossary of Acronyms:

ALD	Academic Language Development
BSEP	Berkeley Schools Excellence Program (city parcel tax that benefits education)
BUSD	Berkeley Unified School District
CM	Constructing Meaning (program that supports academic language development)
CST	California Standards Test (aka STAR)
EIA	Economic Impact Aid
EL	English Learner
ELA	English Language Arts
ELAC	English Learners Advisory Council
ELD	English Learners' Development
PD	Professional Development
SCE	State Compensatory Education
SDAIE	Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English
SLC	Small Learning Community
SPSA	Single Plan for Student Achievement
SSC	School Site Council
VP	Vice Principal
WASC	Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Percentages vs. Percentage Points:
This report includes some growth targets listed as *percentage points* and others listed as *percentages*.

A *percentage point* is when you subtract one percentage from another.
A *percentage* is when you divide the new value by the old value.

For example, if one of our growth targets increased from 10% to 12%, the difference in *percentage points* would be +**2**.
The difference from 10% to 12%, expressed as a *percentage,* would be +**20%**.

GOAL 1: **Increase proficiency and performance of all students in academic language, while accelerating the proficiency and performance gains of African American, English Learner, and Latino students in academic language.**

Growth Targets:
- Increase all students scoring proficient or advanced on the ELA CST by 5 percentage points each year for the next three years.
  (Note that the state assessment system may change in 2014)
- Increase African American, EL, and Latino students scoring proficient or above on the ELA CST by 7 percentage points each year for the next three years.
  (Overall ELA growth from 2010-11 to 2011-12 was +6.6 percentage points.)
  (African American students' change for same period was -4 percentage points; for EL +4 points; for Latino +6 points.)

Data To Be Collected:	Groups Participating In These Goals:
- ELA CST scores - ELA local pre- and post assessments 10th grade world history pre- and post assessments	all students, district academic lang coordinator, EL staff, SDAIE teachers, general-ed teachers, team leads, PD coordinators

Proposed Expenditures:	Estimated Cost:	Funding Source:
facilitation of CM workshops + creation of ALD strategies workshops	$4,500	bsep tip grants; title III, part A (indirect)
ongoing EIA / ELL funding	$72,912 * *see attached budget*	el funds

Action Items	Responsible Person(s)	Resources Needed	Timeline / Followup	Status *Solid progress / Initial steps / Not Started / Modified*
1.1 Ongoing support for Academic Language using research-based instructional strategies for English Learners through professional development, coaching and collaborative planning. • 1.1.1 Continue to offer 3-day workshops for *Constructing Meaning* and related trainings.	VP in charge of EL, admin team	pd time during year; stipends for summer PD; stipends for staff to analyze and implement most current research	ongoing / number of teachers completing CM training; teacher surveys on the PD	1.1.1: Solid progress
1.2. Teachers will increase use of academic language strategies: • 1.2.1 Daily agendas that include academic language learning objectives. • 1.2.2 Structured oral language practice • 1.2.3 Access and build prior knowledge • 1.2.4 Frontloading vocabulary • 1.2.5 Scaffolding • 1.2.6 Use of sentence frames. • 1.2.7 Teaching language for writing	VP in charge of EL, admin team,	pd time during year; teacher-led training sessions; pd coordinator sends out a monthly research-based article supporting development of one of these instructional-based strategies	ongoing; one training per quarter beginning in second quarter of 2012-13 / vice principal's walk-through data; peer observations	1.2.1: Initial steps 1.2.2: 1.2.3: 1.2.4: 1.2.5: 1.2.6: 1.2.7:

Notes:

1.1.1 -- As of fall 2012, 59 teachers had completed the 3-day CM trainings. Expected to have 80 by end of cohort three.

1.2.1 – Solid progress with agendas that include an objective. Initial steps with the academic language component, which will not be a school-wide expectation until more teachers complete CM training.

GOAL 2: Increase proficiency and performance of all students in mathematics, while accelerating the proficiency and performance gains of African American, English Learner, and Latino students in mathematics.

Growth Targets:
- Increase all students scoring proficient or above in all math subject area CST (Geometry, Algebra 1, Algebra 2, Summative Math, and Integrated Math Year 1) by 5 percentage points each year for the next three years.
- Increase African American, EL, and Latino students scoring proficient or above on the math CST by 10 percentage points each year for the next three years.
  (Overall math growth from 2010-11 to 2011-12 was +3.4 percentage points.)
  (African American students' change for same period was +3 percentage points; for EL -2 points; for Latino +2 points.)

Data To Be Collected:	Groups Participating In These Goals:
• math CST scores • internal pre- and post- assessments	• all students, math teachers, district or site math coach, admin team

Proposed Expenditures:	Estimated Cost:	Funding Source:
stipends to develop assessments / curriculum	$4,500	general fund, teacher hourly/stipend
common core mapping / training	$2,000	indirect

Action Items	Responsible Person(s)	Resources Needed	Timeline / Follow up	Status *Solid progress / Initial steps / Not Started / Modified*
2.1 Implement common pre-, interim-, and summative math assessments that reflect incoming common core standards/existing state standards. •2.1.1 Develop and administer a common pre-assessment for incoming 9th graders in algebra 1, geometry, and imp2. • 2.1.2 Use results of universal screening (pre-assessment) to identify students in need of intervention, and direct to tutoring. • 2.1.3 Ongoing professional development in research-based instructional strategies for math teachers linking results of assessment to instruction. • 2.1.4 Administrators to use CSTP 5 (*how teachers use assessment*) as major focus of their evaluations / observations, and in their general work with teachers	VP for math, math team leads	summer stipend to write assessments; time in school year to analyze results	Winter 2012-2013 / share new assessments with VP	2.1.1: Initial steps 2.1.2: Not started 2.1.3: Initial steps 2.1.4: Initial steps
2.2 Map overlap between incoming core standards and the existing standards already in use. • 2.2.1 Develop and implement curriculum and assessments that target the overlapping areas. • 2.2.2 Administrators to use CSTP 3 (*teachers have fluency in their standards*) as major focus of their evaluations / observations, and in their general work with teachers.	VP for math, math team leads	curriculum development time + district funding for middle school/high school collaboration for vertical planning	Winter 2012-2013 / share new curriculum and assessments with VP	2.2.1: Initial steps 2.2.2: Initial steps

Notes:

GOAL 3: **Create a culture of high expectations for academic achievement.**

Growth Targets:
- Increase growth of students rated proficient on the 9th grade English and math common assessments, as measured on the pre- and the post-assessments. Growth target for each subject will be the average growth between pre- and post-assessments of all classes tested in the first year of assessment.
  (For English and math the baseline will be averages from the 2012-2013 year.)
- Maintain or exceed 95% CST participation rate for mathematics and ELA tests for all grades. *(2012 ELA percentages below.)*

Grade	*2012 ELA rate*
9th	*96.9%*
10th	*95.9%*
11th	*96.6%*

Data To Be Collected:	Groups Participating In These Goals:
• pre- and post-assessments for English and math classes • CST participation rates for all subject tests	all students, English and math teachers, pd coordinators, pd team leads, instructional coaches, administrators

Proposed Expenditures:	Estimated Cost:	Funding Source:
assessment development	$10,000	stipend / curriculum development
design & processing time for PD leads	$28,000	PD – slc grant
materials cost	TBD	indirect, district

Action Items	Responsible Person(s)	Resources Needed	Timeline / Follow up	Status *Solid progress / Initial steps / Not Started / Modified*
3.1 Common Assessments: • 3.1.1 Improve use of assessments by developing a PD calendar that supports identifying common outcomes, assessments and interim assessments and provides training in using assessment data to inform instruction. • 3.1.2 Develop & implement common math assessments that reflect incoming common core standards. • 3.1.3 Create a 9th & 10th grade common reading and writing assessments focusing on academic language and expository writing • 3.1.4 Use existing 9th grade ELA assessments for pre- interim, and post- assessments • 3.1.5 Develop ELD level assessments in reading, writing, listening, and speaking • 3.1.6 Develop and administer pre-tests as common assessment for all disciplines • 3.1.7 Use data from common assessments to inform instruction.	Principal, PD team leads,	PD plan / PD time / release time or stipend for summer, Calendar time time throughout year to review results and inform practice	3.1.1 = spring 2012 3.1.2 - 3.1.7 = ongoing for next three years / results of common assessments shared with teachers, team leads, admin, SSC, and board	3.1.1: Solid progress 3.1.2: Initial steps 3.1.3: Solid progress 3.1.4: Initial steps 3.1.5: 3.1.6: Not started 3.1.7: Initial steps
3.2 State Assessments. • 3.2.1 Emphasize the importance of CST testing to all stakeholders. • 3.2.2 Continue to increase student participation in CSTs • 3.2.3 Deepen the use of disaggregated CST to inform instruction in all learning communities.	Principal, VPs for STAR	PD plan / PD time / release time or stipend for summer, Calendar time time throughout year to review results and inform practice	ongoing / results of common assessments shared with teachers, team leads, admin, SSC, and board	3.2.1: Initial steps 3.2.2: Initial steps 3.2.3: Not started

Notes:

| GOAL 4: **Improve student engagement and achievement through innovative, standards-based curriculum that addresses the range of students' needs.** |

Growth Targets:
- Increase number of students who report they are engaged in class by 1 percentage point for each of the next three years.
  (2011 baselines for behavior engagement: 74%. 2011 baselines for emotional engagement: 64%.)

Data To Be Collected:	Groups Participating In These Goals:
• student surveys with questions rating level of engagement in different classes	• students, course-alike groups of teachers, team leads, district curriculum person

Proposed Expenditures:	Estimated Cost:	Funding Source:
peer observations	$6,000	bsep – tipd
mapping & outline development	$30/hour - total time to be determined *not to exceed $15,000*	teacher hourly and stipends

Action Items	Responsible Person(s)	Resources Needed	Timeline / Followup	Status *Solid progress / Initial steps / Not Started / Modified*
4.1 Support For Innovative, Standards Based Curriculum: • 4.1.1 Increase opportunities for teacher-led presentations on curriculum. • 4.1.2 PD on upcoming new national standards for math and ELA. • 4.1.3 Develop a standards-based outcome map for each course directly related to regular interim formative assessments. • 4.1.4 All courses align curriculum and assessments to the state and new common core standards. • 4.1.5 Create vertical and horizontal integration in English and social studies classes.	Principal, PD coordinators	funds for after-school workshops and summer workshops; department collaboration time	4.1.2 = by spring 2013; all other items ongoing / presentations to teacher leaderships, SSC, and BUSD board	4.1.1: Solid progress 4.1.2: 4.1.3: Not started 4.1.4: Varies greatly by LC and dept 4.1.5: Varies greatly by LC and dept
4.2 Support For Instructional Strategies And Assessments That Promote Engagement: • 4.2.1 Increase opportunities for teacher-led presentations on student engagement. • 4.2.2 Develop authentic assessments (include art / media models, portfolios, etc) and analyze the results to inform instruction. • 4.2.3 All departments identify and implement two to three common, research-based instructional practices. • 4.2.4 Provide incentives for teachers to observe other teachers' classrooms during the school year.	Principal	funds for after-school workshops and summer workshops; department collaboration time	ongoing / presentations to teacher leaderships, SSC, and BUSD board	4.2.1: Initial steps 4.2.2: Initial steps 4.2.3: Modified * 4.2.4: Solid progress

Notes:

* 4.2.3 modified as follows: instead of having departments identify their own common practices, the administration distributed list of 10 principles of instruction from Barak Rosenshine article.

GOAL 5: **Increase access and utilization of social and emotional support for all students, with an emphasis on struggling students.**

Growth Targets:

- Reduce the percentage of all students who drop out of school before senior year by 1 percentage point for each of the next three years with the 2009-2010 Cohort serving as a baseline year.
- Reduce the percentage of African American and Latino students who drop out of school before senior year by 2 percentage points for each of the next three years with the 2009-2010 Cohort serving as a baseline year.
- Reduce the percentage of total suspensions that were issued to African-American students by 7 percentage points annually
  (2010-11: 59%   2011-12: 52%   change in percentage points: -7)
- Reduce the percentage of total African-American students who were suspended by 2 percentage points annually
  (2010-11: 16%   2011-12: 14%   change in percentage points: -2)
- Reduce total suspensions by 5 percentage points annually
  (2010-11: 8.8% 2011-12: 7%   change in percentage points: -1.8)

Data To Be Collected:	Groups Participating In These Goals:
• drop-out rates -- by cohorts and by ethnicity	• all students, counselors, dean of attendance and other intervention leaders, health center staff, Parent resource center, OCI staff, intervention team (with connections to external partners), drug and alcohol counselors, special-ed case managers, all teachers

Proposed Expenditures:	Estimated Cost:	Funding Source:
continued funding for intervention and resource providers	$64,686	1.2 fte from eia – sce .27 fte from district bsep .53 fte from site bsep
academic support coordinator	$81,000	bsep
intervention counselor	$48,700	bsep
student welfare & attendnce	$58,000	bsep
parent resource center	$30,000 / $68,000	bsep / eia-sce
bridge program	$40,000	expanded course offerings
rise	$12,000	bsep
student court	$ ---?	bsep
EL home school liason	$26,826	eia/ell/bsep

Action Items	Responsible Person(s)	Resources Needed	Timeline / Followup	Status *Solid progress / Initial steps / Not Started / Modified*
5.1: Intervention And Counseling: • 5.1.1. Form intervention support team. • 5.1.2 Create comprehensive list of all interventions and contact information to provide to teachers and staff. • 5.1.3 Counselors will meet in first month of school with new students who in their previous schools struggled with attendance and had scored below basic on CSTs. • 5.1.4 Through the use of periodic screens of attendance, grades, and graduation progress, identify students who need intervention and refer to appropriate resource / program. • 5.1.5 Develop a specific set of responses for when a student receives a second suspension in one year. • 5.1.6 Students will be tagged in PowerSchool according to the support service / intervention they receive.	Principal, admin team	develop a filter in PowerSchool for struggling students	Intervention team meets spring of 2012; quarterly meetings begin 2012-2013; ongoing / list of resources shared with staff; intervention team focuses on "power goals" and tracks growth; quarterly meetings with the principal with reports by all intervention providers	5.1.1: solid progress 5.1.2: 5.1.3: not started 5.1.4: solid progress 5.1.5: 5.1.6: not started

5.2 Increase participation of general education teachers in IEP meetings • 5.2.1 When requested, teachers to submit feedback forms and/or attend IEP meetings.	<u>Principal, special ed program supervisor</u>	None	ongoing / Number of teachers reported to program supervisor	5.2.1:

Notes:

Form C: Programs Included in this Plan / 2012-13 projections

The School Site Council intends for this school to participate in the following programs:

	State Programs	Allocation
☐	California School Age Families Education Purpose: Assist expectant and parenting students to succeed in school	$0
☒	Economic Impact Aid/State Compensatory Education Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program	$64,686
☒	Economic Impact Aid/English Learner Program Purpose: Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners * *see budget attached, approved by SSC and ELAC*	$72,912
☐	Peer Assistance and Review Purpose: Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring	$0
☐	Professional Development Block Grant Purpose: Attract, train, and retain classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum areas	$0
☐	Pupil Retention Block Grant Purpose: Prevent students from dropping out of school	$0
☐	Quality Education Investment Act Purpose: Funds are available for use in performing various specified measures to improve academic instruction and pupil academic achievement	$0
☐	School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant Purpose: Improve library and other school programs	$0
☐	School Safety and Violence Prevention Act Purpose: Increase school safety	$0
☐	Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Purpose: Eliminate tobacco use among students	$0
☐	List and Describe Other State or Local Funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education)	$0
	Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school	$115,912

Federal Programs under the Elementary Secondary Education Act	Allocation
☐ Title I, Part A: Neglected Purpose: Supplement instruction for abandoned, abused, or neglected children who have been placed in an institution	$0
☐ Title I, Part D: Delinquent Purpose: Supplement instruction for delinquent youth	$0
☐ Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program Purpose: Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	$0
☐ Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency	$0
☐ Title I, Part A: Program Improvement Purpose: Assist Title I schools that have failed to meet ESEA Adequate Yearly Progress targets for one or more identified student groups	$0
☐ Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Purpose: Improve and increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals	$0
☐ Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology Purpose: Support professional development and the use of technology	$0
☐ Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students Purpose: Supplement language instruction to help LEP students attain English proficiency and meet academic performance standards	$0
☐ Title IV, Part A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Purpose: Support learning environments that promote academic achievement (NO LONGER FUNDED BEGINNING WITH THE 2010-11 SCHOOL YEAR)	$0
☐ Title VI, Part B: Rural Education Achievement Program Purpose: Provide flexibility in the use of ESEA funds to eligible local educational agencies	$0
☐ Other federal funds (list and describe)[1]	$0
Total amount of federal categorical funds allocated to this school	$0
Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school	$115,912

FUNDING SOURCES LISTED IN THIS SPSA:

BSEP total = $750,000

BSEP tip grant = just under $16,000

Title III = district budget

EL / eia funds = $72,912 * see below for details

SCE / eia funds = $64,686 for parent resource center

Teacher stipend = $15,000
Teacher hourly = $15,000

SLC grant = (*in final phase, is about to sunset*) $1.7 million over five years:
currently $170,000 funds teacher-leader structure, part of PD coordinators, part of data manager

EIA / ELL Budget and Funding:

EIA/ELL* projected total: $72, 912 Projected carryover $12,000 *State money to only be used for English Learner students*	**Carry-Over Priorities for EIA/ELL from ELAC:** 1. Bilingual tutors $ 8,000 2. PD for teachers $ 2,000 3. Instructional Materials/ Office Supplies $2,000 for EL Program/ LTEL program 4. College resources/field trips/transportation for EL students $1,000 5. Equipment for EL Program/ LTEL program $1000
.60 FTE EL Lead Teacher $ 43,490	
.47 FTE EL Bilingual Home School Liaison $ 26,826	
Parent Involvement (ELAC meetings) $1000	
Travel/Conferences (PD training for teachers) $1, 596	
Other Money is a BSEP Grant, approved in BSEP Committee Meeting—pending SSC and board approval: .53 FTE Bilingual Home School Liaison Bilingual Academic Tutors/Youth Advisors *(see attached BSEP grant)* BHSDG to pilot EL Family Literacy and Parent Involvement class *(see grant attached)*	

How This Single Plan for Student Achievement Was Written:

The items and targets in this plan were selected during the 2010-2012 WASC Self Study. In looking for implications of our data, BHS followed an extensive process of data inquiry.   In the start of the 2010-2011 school year, faculty groups examined CST English and Math proficiency rates for the school overall, as well as for disaggregated subgroups. A month later the staff did the same with CAHSEE data.

The CST and CAHSEE analysis days served as a foundation for early 2011, when home groups examined the self-study's community profile. All Berkeley High School home groups read a rough draft of the first chapter of our report. Each home group chose what it found most compelling among the BHS data and those home-group lists were forwarded to our WASC leadership team. The leadership team examined the lists and discussed the data, and then winnowed down the home groups' submissions and selected our critical academic needs. We had home groups and focus groups for teachers, classified staff, students, parents, and administrators. The School Site Council also served as a focus group.

Over the next year, our WASC home groups and focus groups continued to meet and analyze student performance data, through the filter of our critical academic needs and thus built the action plan. Focus groups and home groups nominated goals, growth targets, and action items. Final selections were made by the WASC leadership team, which included students, teachers, parents, administrators, district representatives, and a board member. Further details on this whole process can be read in our WASC Self Study Report, which can be downloaded from the BHS website.

Once our WASC action plan was finished, funding sources and funding projections were added to it to create the first draft of SPSA. An SPSA working group was formed, composed of two SSC parent representatives, an SSC student representative, an SSC teacher representative, a BSEP representative, an EL teacher representative, the WASC coordinator, and the BHS principal. After the administration added funding sources, this working group reviewed SPSA and revised it for clarity, and the plan was then presented to the SSC for approval. The SSC requested additional data and discussion and, in the SSC meeting of November 20th, the SPSA was approved by a majority of SSC members present, but a quorum was lacking. The SPSA was resubmitted to SSC on December 19th, and approved by quorum. SSC requested the following caveat be inserted in this document:

"Because the primary work done on the plan to date was done by the school staff through its WASC process last year and translated into a draft SPSA this summer, the SSC has not been given the opportunity for an in-depth review of the plan. Therefore, our approval of the plan means only that we see nothing on its surface that would militate against pursuing it this year while we evaluate how and in what form it should continue. We have not had the opportunity to analyze any of the following factors or to discuss them with staff or among ourselves as a deliberative body:

- *The research showing evidence that the action items chosen are likely to achieve the school's goals, as implemented.*
- *The types of data that must be collected to show implementation or effectiveness of the action items.*
- *Whether alternate action items might be better supported in research as more likely to achieve the school's goals.*

Doing those analyses, with the assistance of school staff, will be the work of this year. Our approval of the draft 2013-2014 plan this spring will be dependent upon successful resolution of the SSC's need for meaningful engagement with school staff on each of these three factors."

BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL
2012-13
School Site Council Membership

Names of Members	Principal	Classroom Teacher	Other School Staff	Parent or Community Member	Secondary Student
Bugarini, Janelle		x			
Burch, Eli (alternate)					x
Bussaca Ryan, Anne		x			
Ehnle, Landi				x	
Himes, Rita **(chair)**				x	
Kudera, Diana (alternate)				x	
Lopez-Tello, Jessica			x		
Nakayama, Michelle (alternate)				x	
Olaya-Hermes, Sophia					x
Otero-Amad, Farah (alternate)					x
Pace, Alyssa					x
Rao, Satish				x	
Rodney, Laurie					
Roos-Collins, Margit				x	
Rothman, Shira					x
Scuderi, Pasquale	x				
Skeels, Wyn		x			
Stevens, Dave			x		
Van der Vegt, Robin		x			
Walton, Cooper					x
Zinabadine, Salma (alternate)					x
Numbers of members in each category	1	4	2	6	7

BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL
2012-13
<u>Recommendations and Assurances</u>

The school site council (SSC) recommends this school plan and proposed expenditures to the district governing board for approval and assures the board of the following:

1. The SSC is correctly constituted and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.

2. The SSC reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) requiring board approval.

3. The SSC reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this SPSA and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the local educational agency plan.

4. This SPSA is based on a thorough analysis of student academic performance. The actions proposed herein form a sound, comprehensive, coordinated plan to reach stated school goals to improve student academic performance.

5. This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on: 12/18/12.

6. This SPSA was reviewed by the BHS English Learner Advisory Committee on 11/29/12.

Attested:

__Pasquale Scuderi___   _____   _____
School Principal   Signature   Date

____Rita Himes_____   _____   _____
SSC Chair   Signature   Date

__Ivonne Padilla___   _____   _____
ELAC Chair   Signature   Date

__Neil Smith_____   _____   _____
Assistant Superintendent,   Signature   Date
Educational Services

Note: signatures are on file at BHS and second copy of signatures provided to superintendent's office.