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## School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) Template

Instructions and requirements for completing the SPSA template may be found in the SPSA Template Instructions.

| School Name | County-District-School (CDS) Code | Schoolsite Council (SSC) Approval Date | Local Board Approval Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Century Elementary School | 10621176117550 | May 10, 2023 | June 14, 2023 |

## Purpose and Description

Briefly describe the purpose of this plan (Select from Schoolwide Program, Comprehensive Support and Improvement, Targeted Support and Improvement, or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement)

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement

Briefly describe the school's plan for effectively meeting the ESSA requirements in alignment with the Local Control and Accountability Plan and other federal, state, and local programs.
The purpose of the School Plan for Student Achievement is to provide a comprehensive document, including details of site-planned actions and expenditures as they relate to the goals of the Clovis Unified School District. The plan supports student outcomes and overall performance in connection with the District's Local Control and Accountability Plan and in alignment with the district goals supporting the expectations that all goals shall have objectives that are measurable, and actionable, and develop monitoring metrics to assess progress that guides program evaluation and resource allocation.

Within our SPSA, there are goals written around four main focus areas--ELA, Math, Attendance, and Suspensions. Our goals were written based on data, feedback from our educational partners, and the needs of our students as it is our mission to close the achievement gap at Century!
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## Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

## Data Analysis

Please refer to the School and Student Performance Data section where an analysis is provided.

## Surveys

This section provides a description of surveys (i.e., Student, Parent, Teacher) used during the schoolyear, and a summary of results from the survey(s).
The following surveys are administered annually:
*SART- School Assessment Review Team
*Student body ELCAP survey
*CUSD school climate assessment
*English Learner needs assessment Survey
*Native American Education Survey
*Parent LCAP survey
Our educational partners were also made aware of our status within ATSI around chronic absenteeism in our EL, SWD, and Two or more races subgroups; and in suspensions for SWD and Two or more races subgroups. A discussion was held at our SSC meetings to solicit feedback on solutions for improvement in these areas.

Strengths revealed:
98\%of parents feel the school provides quality education for their child
$97 \%$ of staff feel there is a positive school climate at Century
$48 \%$ of students feel Century applies school rules fairly
Weaknesses revealed:
$15 \%$ of parents do not know how to get help if their child is struggling at school
$17 \%$ of parents do not know if the staff respects the differences in student's race, ethnicity, or cultural background
$39 \%$ of students feel the school is not clean

## Classroom Observations

This section provides a description of types and frequency of classroom observations conducted during the school-year and a summary of findings.
As per CUSD Board Policy 6211Clovis Unified Board Policy \#4315 and ED CODE \#44664 require that all certificated teachers are evaluated on a regular bases. Informal and formal classroom observations occur throughout the school year. Administrators from both the site level and the district level regularly communicate their findings with the classroom teacher. The findings are used to illustrate best practices that can be replicated in other classrooms across the site and district. Site administrators also use this as an opportunity for teachers to learn from one another by observing each other within the classroom setting. The observation process also allows site administrators to use corrective feedback, provide coaching and to provide additional supports in specific areas of growth opportunities based on each individual teachers needs.

Common findings for growth opportunities include:

Behavior management
Classroom management
Articulation of Learning Objective
Frequency of Checking for Understanding
Differentiated Instruction
Frequency of Academic Conversation

## Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are derived from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 and Essential Program Components (EPCs). In conjunction with the needs assessments, these categories may be used to discuss and develop critical findings that characterize current instructional practice for numerically significant subgroups as well as individual students who are:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Discussion of each of these statements should result in succinct and focused findings based on verifiable facts. Avoid vague or general descriptions. Each successive school plan should examine the status of these findings and note progress made. Special consideration should be given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs.

## Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (ESEA)
A variety of tools are used to measure and monitor academic progress at our site and within our school district. Assessments are designed to provide staff with data so that instruction can be modified to meet individual needs, monitor student achievement, and to assess the school's overall success. Some examples of the assessments that we utilize include:
*SBAC
*ELPAC
*iReady
*iCAL
*iCAM
*DRA

Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)
Teachers use the data collected from these assessments to chart progress and design an appropriate instructional program for all students. Individualized or classroom specific materials can then be produced using to address the identified academic need. The data is analyzed in PLC's where it is then used to help guide further instruction.

In addition, all students who have not meet proficiency standards are carefully evaluated for academic deficiencies and may be recommended for additional support either through the alter/before school Extended Day labs; supplemental instruction provided by Push-In Teachers, Instructional Aide/Tutors, BIAs (Instructional Aide-Bilingual); or classroom interventions. Instruction is targeted to the identified need. The Principal and GIS/Resource Teacher support, train, and provide resources necessary to assist teachers in the process.

## Staffing and Professional Development

Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (ESEA)
Teachers who are appropriately credentialed have a deep understanding of the content they teach, have been trained in a variety of instructional strategies, and are in the best position to aid our students in reaching academic proficiency in their content areas.

All teachers on our campus hold an appropriate CTC credential, permit, or other document equivalent to that which a teacher in all other public schools would be required to hold. Those teachers that are in the status of seeking to complete their credentials (PIPS, STIPS and Interns) are in a program that will allow staff to meet the requirements needed in a timely manner. These staff members are supported by site and district administration for appropriate completion. An equivalent credential, permit, or other document would mean that the teacher has the appropriate authorization for their assignment.

All paraprofessionals whose duties include instructional support must meet the criteria as outlined in CUSD to be considered Highly Qualified to assist students.

Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to instructional materials training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)
All teachers receive site and/or district professional development on curriculum, instruction, and assessment throughout the year.

Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (ESEA)
CUSD provides professional development for all school sites that are aligned with the needs of the schools, academic content standards, social emotional supports, and more. The district provided professional development for this school include--Tiered Writing Supports aligned to the Common Core writing standards, AVID training around WICOR that is utilized across content areas, Teaching Pyramid aligned to meet behavior needs in our primary classrooms, Science training aligned to NGSS, iReady training aligned with our district adopted curriculum and the Common Core standards in both math and reading.

Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)
Teachers have access to a variety of different sources of professional development both on and offsite. CUSD Teachers On Special Assignment (TOSA) provide professional learning sessions along with co-teaching opportunities and in-class coaching. Teachers on Special Assignment are experts in their specific content area and knowledgeable in the adopted curriculum. This is in addition to professional learning opportunities provided at our school site, through conferences, or at the district level. Additionally, new teachers are assigned mentor teachers (either site-based or district based) who are available to provide coaching, mentoring, and opportunities for our new teachers to observe more experienced teachers in action.

Teacher collaboration by grade level (kindergarten through grade eight [K-8]) and department (grades nine through twelve) (EPC)
Grade level teams meet regularly in their professional learning communities (PLC's) to review student work samples, discuss and align curriculum to the state and district standards, evaluate where the students are performing and decide what their first-time best teaching and reteaching strategies should be. This time ensures that veteran and developing teachers are using the same evaluative procedures while assessing student work samples.

## Teaching and Learning

Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (ESEA)
The basic instructional program utilizes standards-aligned state adopted textbooks and/or instructional materials in the core four content areas: English Language Arts, Math, Social Science, and Science. Clovis Unified has adopted and approved a variety of materials that both align to the content standards, but that also meet the needs of our school sites and community. A full list of our adopted textbooks can be found on our school site's SARC found here:
https://www.cusd.com/sarc.aspx
In addition to the adopted textbooks and materials, CUSD utilizes Curriculum Design Teams (CDT) to produce additional materials that are standards aligned and support supplemental materials that have been purchased by school sites or the district.

Our English Learners (EL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), and students who move to an intervention program continue to receive core instruction while using the adopted instructional materials but are also provided with additional instruction using research-based materials that are aligned with the common core state standards, or in the case of our EL students aligned to the California ELD standards.

Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (K-8) (EPC)
The administration and teachers have worked collaboratively to create a daily schedule that ensures our students receive the recommended instructional minutes in all content areas.

Lesson pacing schedule (K-8) and master schedule flexibility for sufficient numbers of intervention courses (EPC)
Long-term and short-term pacing guides are created by each grade-level team based on the district's assessment calendar. These pacing guides outline the lessons for major content areas on a weekly basis and are modified throughout the year based on student needs. Sites develop intervention schedules based on data collected and analyzed in PLC's to determine an intervention calendar to meet the needs of students in tier 2 and Tier 3.

Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (ESEA) The Williams Act requires all schools to have adopted curriculum in the four core subject areas available to all students on a daily basis. This adopted curriculum is reviewed on a regular basis to ensure it is aligned to the stated standards and the district AIMS. In addition to having adopted curriculum in the four core subject areas (ELA, Math, Social Science, and Science), CUSD also has adopted ELD curriculum that is aligned to the State's ELD standards.

Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials, and for high school students, access to standards-aligned core courses (EPC)
SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials are utilized in the classrooms.
For more specific curriculum information please visit our school site link at the following site:
https://www.cusd.com/sarc.aspx

## Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)
Teachers regularly monitor students progress through assessments, observation and by analyzing work samples. This information is used by teachers to prepare an individualized plan for all students achieving below grade level expectations which then aides in the placement of intervention or acceleration--based on student needs.

Students in need of additional intervention resulting from academic, emotional or behavioral difficulties may be referred to SST where their needs are assessed, and they are linked with necessary intervention. Students struggling with attendance concerns may be referred to SARB, one-to-one counseling and student support groups based on specific needs with the school psychologist. When necessary, students may be referred to Fresno County Mental Health Services.

CUSD also offers a comprehensive summer school or extended year program designed to meet the specific needs of students K-12. A variety of extended year programs are offered for students at risk of retention, performing below proficiency and in need of credit for graduation.

Evidence-based educational practices to raise student achievement
Teachers and administration work together to continually provide first time best instruction and delivery. Training, collaboration, walk-throughs, and consistent feedback all provide research-based practices to raise student achievement. Professional learning communities (PLC's) review data, modify instruction, and provide intervention on a continuing basis so that students meet the standards.

## Parental Engagement

Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (ESEA)
Our site offers a variety of school and community resources to assist and support our families including:
*Parent communication through weekly newsletters
*Updated School Website
*Social Media Posts
*Referrals to outside resources as needed and based on needs
Additionally, we hold regular parent events and meetings to keep our families informed. These include:
*IDAC
*SART
*ELAC
*SSC
*Back to school night
*Open House
*ARMS
*SARBS
*Reentry metings after suspension

Our site also offers social emotional supports in collaboration with our school psychologists and area transition teams in order to ensure students are available for learning. These supports include CSI groups, transition supports, All 4 Youth, CYS referrals, and small group interventions.
The district also provides parent opportunities through the district parent academies which are offered six times throughout the school year and cover a variety of topics that were requested by families from within the school district.

Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, other school personnel, and students in secondary schools, in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of ConApp programs (5 California Code of Regulations 3932)
Members of the School Site Council (SSC) - composed of principal, certificated teachers, classified staff, and parents - work together to develop, review, and evaluate school improvement programs and school budgets. The SSC meets quarterly throughout the school year.

Funding
Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)
Categorical funds allow our site to provide supplemental services to enable under-performing students to meet grade-level standards. Our categorical funds are used for the following but is not limited to: bilingual instructional aides to support our ELD students, push-in teachers, supplemental instructional supplies, copies and equipment, technology equipment and supplies, and professional development for classroom teachers. Federal and state laws require the COE to monitor the implementation of categorical programs operated by local educational agencies (LEAs) or district. Districts are responsible for creating and maintaining programs that meet requirements.

Fiscal support (EPC)
In addition to categorical funds, our school receives funding through the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The LCFF allows for sites to purchase additional items and provide additional supports for students with greater flexibility and allows us to address the priorities listed within our district Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). LCFF funds will be used to help achieve the goals of the LEA and district while maintaining transparency and accountability in relation to how funds will be spent to provide high-quality and equitable educational programs for all students.

Additionally, our site receives monies through the district general fund. These funds are utilized to provide basic needs for students (ex. curriculum) and to purchase other items that support our district goal of supporting students in mind, body, and spirit.

## Educational Partner Involvement

How, when, and with whom did the school consult as part of the planning process for this SPSA/Annual Review and Update?

## Involvement Process for the SPSA and Annual Review and Update

Both our SSC and our ELAC play a critical role in the creation and revisions of our SPSA. Throughout the year, we regularly revisit our SPSA at our SSC meetings by discussing the budget and goals, student achievement, available support, etc. At our most recent SSC and ELAC meetings, our SPSA monitoring tool was reviewed with our committees to allow them to see where we were with last year's goals, where we see continued gaps, and where we have identified wins in achievements. The two committees then discussed the next steps and needed changes as well as made recommendations to site administration for the new SPSA.

The following recommendations were made:
*Parents felt that increased communication around attendance is needed.
*Increase collaboration with school attendance liaison

## Resource Inequities

Briefly identify and describe any resource inequities identified as a result of the required needs assessment, as applicable.
Based on a review of quantitative data along with parent feedback and educational partner input, we found a resource inequity exists within our program in the are of chronic absences. Our analysis illustrated for us that our parents need support around attendance including bot not limited to: training on the importance of school, getting past barriers that are keeping their students home, and help in getting their students to school on time. We will address this inequity through parent training, increased communication regarding attendance in a variety of meetings, and through the support of our attendance liaison.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Enrollment <br> Enrollment By Student Group

| Student Enrollment by Subgroup |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Percent of Enrollment |  |  | Number of Students |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| American Indian | 0.8\% | 0.48\% | 0.61\% | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| African American | 2.7\% | 2.71\% | 2.73\% | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| Asian | 8.2\% | 8.44\% | 10.45\% | 49 | 53 | 69 |
| Filipino | 1.3\% | 1.11\% | 1.06\% | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 37.0\% | 35.67\% | 35.91\% | 221 | 224 | 237 |
| Pacific Islander | 0.3\% | 0.64\% | 0.45\% | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| White | 44.2\% | 45.38\% | 42.12\% | 264 | 285 | 278 |
| Multiple/No Response | 5.4\% | 5.57\% | 5.61\% | 32 | 35 | 37 |
|  | Total Enrollment |  |  | 597 | 628 | 660 |

## Student Enrollment Enrollment By Grade Level

| Grade |  | Student Enrollment by Grade Level |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Students |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 - 2 3}$ |  |
| Kindergarten | 91 | 111 | 102 |  |
| Grade 1 | 83 | 88 | 92 |  |
| Grade 2 | 95 | 94 | 97 |  |
| Grade3 | 79 | 98 | 104 |  |
| Grade 4 | 72 | 74 | 101 |  |
| Grade 5 | 96 | 75 | 77 |  |
| Grade 6 | 81 | 88 | 87 |  |
| Total Enrollment | 597 | 628 | 660 |  |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Sizeable decrease in total enrollment.
2. Asian and Latino percent of students is rising slightly, while the other subgroups are marginally decreasing.
3. Hispanic Student group has the highest percent of students subgroup at $35.67 \%$.

## School and Student Performance Data

Student Enrollment
English Learner (EL) Enrollment

| English Learner (EL) Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group |  | Number of Students |  |  | Percent of Students |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 - 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 - 2 3}$ |  |
| English Learners | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 40 | 38 | $3.5 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |  |
| Fluent English Proficient (FEP) | 35 | 29 | 35 | $5.9 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |  |
| Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) | 2 |  |  | $9.5 \%$ |  |  |  |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. Each year the number of EL students is inconsistent.
2. The percent of EL student enrollment nearly doubled in 21-22.
3. The percent of FEP students decreased over the past 2 school years. Which means more students are coming in who need EL instruction.

## School and Student Performance Data

## CAASPP Results <br> English Language Arts/Literacy (All Students)

| Overall Participation for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \# of Students Enrolled |  |  | \# of Students Tested |  |  | \# of Students with |  |  | \% of Enrolled Students |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 | 78 | 97 |  | 0 | 97 |  | 0 | 97 |  | 0.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Grade 4 | 78 | 73 |  | 0 | 73 |  | 0 | 73 |  | 0.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Grade 5 | 95 | 79 |  | 0 | 79 |  | 0 | 79 |  | 0.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Grade 6 | 82 | 91 |  | 0 | 87 |  | 0 | 87 |  | 0.0 | 95.6 |  |
| All Grades | 333 | 340 |  | 0 | 336 |  | 0 | 336 |  | 0.0 | 98.8 |  |

The "\% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard |  |  | \% Standard Met |  |  | \% Standard Nearly |  |  | \% Standard Not |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 2467. |  |  | 47.42 |  |  | 20.62 |  |  | 15.46 |  |  | 16.49 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 2514. |  |  | 42.47 |  |  | 23.29 |  |  | 24.66 |  |  | 9.59 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 2529. |  |  | 29.11 |  |  | 39.24 |  |  | 16.46 |  |  | 15.19 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 2588. |  |  | 44.83 |  |  | 28.74 |  |  | 19.54 |  |  | 6.90 |  |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 41.37 |  |  | 27.68 |  |  | 18.75 |  |  | 12.20 |  |


| Reading <br> Demonstrating understanding of literary and non-fictional texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 27.84 |  |  | 54.64 |  |  | 17.53 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 26.03 |  |  | 72.60 |  |  | 1.37 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 27.85 |  |  | 60.76 |  |  | 11.39 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 39.08 |  |  | 49.43 |  |  | 11.49 |  |
| All Grades |  | 30.36 |  |  | 58.63 |  |  | 11.01 |  |


| Writing <br> Producing clear and purposeful writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 36.08 |  |  | 47.42 |  |  | 16.49 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 28.77 |  |  | 64.38 |  |  | 6.85 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 21.52 |  |  | 63.29 |  |  | 15.19 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 39.08 |  |  | 49.43 |  |  | 11.49 |  |
| All Grades |  | 31.85 |  |  | 55.36 |  |  | 12.80 |  |


| Listening <br> Demonstrating effective communication skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 20.62 |  |  | 70.10 |  |  | 9.28 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 17.81 |  |  | 73.97 |  |  | 8.22 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 18.99 |  |  | 73.42 |  |  | 7.59 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 26.44 |  |  | 66.67 |  |  | 6.90 |  |
| All Grades |  | 21.13 |  |  | 70.83 |  |  | 8.04 |  |


| Research/Inquiry Investigating, analyzing, and presenting information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 25.77 |  |  | 56.70 |  |  | 17.53 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 30.14 |  |  | 64.38 |  |  | 5.48 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 24.05 |  |  | 65.82 |  |  | 10.13 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 32.18 |  |  | 63.22 |  |  | 4.60 |  |
| All Grades |  | 27.98 |  |  | 62.20 |  |  | 9.82 |  |

Conclusions based on this data:

1. 89 \% of Century Elementary students met or exceeded overall standards in English Language Arts.
2. All areas in reading were the same or $+/-1 \%$, which shows a stable maintainance through covid asynchronis learning.
3. Century maintains at or near $10 \%$ below grade level standards in all areas.

## School and Student Performance Data

## CAASPP Results <br> Mathematics (All Students)

| Overall Participation for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \# of Students Enrolled |  |  | \# of Students Tested |  |  | \# of Students with |  |  | \% of Enrolled Students |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 | 78 | 97 |  | 0 | 97 |  | 0 | 97 |  | 0.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Grade 4 | 78 | 73 |  | 0 | 73 |  | 0 | 73 |  | 0.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Grade 5 | 95 | 79 |  | 0 | 79 |  | 0 | 79 |  | 0.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Grade 6 | 82 | 91 |  | 0 | 87 |  | 0 | 87 |  | 0.0 | 95.6 |  |
| All Grades | 333 | 340 |  | 0 | 336 |  | 0 | 336 |  | 0.0 | 98.8 |  |

* The "\% of Enrolled Students Tested" showing in this table is not the same as "Participation Rate" for federal accountability purposes.

| Overall Achievement for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Mean Scale Score |  |  | \% Standard |  |  | \% Standard Met |  |  | \% Standard Nearly |  |  | \% Standard Not |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 2461. |  |  | 32.99 |  |  | 31.96 |  |  | 19.59 |  |  | 15.46 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 2525. |  |  | 38.36 |  |  | 35.62 |  |  | 23.29 |  |  | 2.74 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 2521. |  |  | 26.58 |  |  | 29.11 |  |  | 24.05 |  |  | 20.25 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 2584. |  |  | 43.68 |  |  | 22.99 |  |  | 21.84 |  |  | 11.49 |  |
| All Grades | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 35.42 |  |  | 29.76 |  |  | 22.02 |  |  | 12.80 |  |


| Concepts \& Procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Applying mathematical concepts and procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% Above Standard |  | $\%$ At or Near Standard |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 - 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 - 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 - 2 3}$ |
| Grade 3 |  | 38.14 |  |  | 47.42 |  |  | 14.43 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 53.42 |  |  | 42.47 |  |  | 4.11 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 29.11 |  |  | 49.37 |  |  | 21.52 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 39.08 |  |  | 44.83 |  |  | 16.09 |  |
| All Grades |  | 39.58 |  |  | 46.13 |  |  | 14.29 |  |


| Problem Solving \& Modeling/Data Analysis <br> Using appropriate tools and strategies to solve real world and mathematical problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 36.08 |  |  | 44.33 |  |  | 19.59 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 32.88 |  |  | 54.79 |  |  | 12.33 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 17.72 |  |  | 56.96 |  |  | 25.32 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 28.74 |  |  | 60.92 |  |  | 10.34 |  |
| All Grades |  | 29.17 |  |  | 53.87 |  |  | 16.96 |  |

Communicating Reasoning
Demonstrating ability to support mathematical conclusions

| Grade Level | \% Above Standard |  |  | \% At or Near Standard |  |  | \% Below Standard |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 |
| Grade 3 |  | 37.11 |  |  | 53.61 |  |  | 9.28 |  |
| Grade 4 |  | 38.36 |  |  | 52.05 |  |  | 9.59 |  |
| Grade 5 |  | 16.46 |  |  | 68.35 |  |  | 15.19 |  |
| Grade 6 |  | 35.63 |  |  | 51.72 |  |  | 12.64 |  |
| All Grades |  | 32.14 |  |  | 56.25 |  |  | 11.61 |  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Just over $72 \%$ exceeded or met the standard overall in math .
2. There was a decrease in the number of students performing below standard overall.
3. Eventough the percent of students exceeding standard dropped in each category, the percent of students reaching exceeding and met stayed steady through Covid.

## School and Student Performance Data

## ELPAC Results

| Number of Students and Mean Scale Scores for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade <br> Level | Overall |  | Oral Language |  | Written Language |  | Number of <br> Students Tested |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 2}$ |
| Grade K | $*$ | 1457.5 | $*$ | 1440.3 | $*$ | 1497.7 | 9 | 11 |
| Grade 1 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 6 | 7 |
| Grade 2 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 6 | 6 |
| Grade 3 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 7 |
| Grade 4 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Grade 5 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Grade 6 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| All Grades |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 | 35 |

Overall Language
Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students

| Grade Level | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| K | * | 36.36 | * | 36.36 | * | 27.27 | * | 0.00 | * | 11 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 23.33 | 31.43 | 50.00 | 34.29 | 20.00 | 28.57 | 6.67 | 5.71 | 30 | 35 |


| Oral Language <br> Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| K | * | 18.18 | * | 36.36 | * | 45.45 | * | 0.00 | * | 11 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 20.00 | 22.86 | 50.00 | 45.71 | 26.67 | 28.57 | 3.33 | 2.86 | 30 | 35 |


| Written Language <br> Percentage of Students at Each Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Level 4 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 1 |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| K | * | 27.27 | * | 54.55 | * | 18.18 | * | 0.00 | * | 11 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 23.33 | 20.00 | 43.33 | 45.71 | 26.67 | 22.86 | 6.67 | 11.43 | 30 | 35 |


| Listening Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| K | * | 27.27 | * | 63.64 | * | 9.09 | * | 11 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 33.33 | 25.71 | 63.33 | 62.86 | 3.33 | 11.43 | 30 | 35 |


| Speaking Domain <br> Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| K | * | 9.09 | * | 81.82 | * | 9.09 | * | 11 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 13.33 | 28.57 | 83.33 | 62.86 | 3.33 | 8.57 | 30 | 35 |


| Reading Domain <br> Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| K | * | 27.27 | * | 72.73 | * | 0.00 | * | 11 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 33.33 | 31.43 | 56.67 | 45.71 | 10.00 | 22.86 | 30 | 35 |


| Writing Domain Percentage of Students by Domain Performance Level for All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Well Developed |  | Somewhat/Moderately |  | Beginning |  | Total Number of Students |  |
|  | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| K | * | 90.91 | * | 9.09 | * | 0.00 | * | 11 |
| 1 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 3 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 4 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 5 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 6 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| All Grades | 30.00 | 45.71 | 60.00 | 48.57 | 10.00 | 5.71 | 30 | 35 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. The number of students taking the ELPAC increased by 5 .
2. Overall Language scores for kindergarten are $78 \%$ proficient and above.
3. $90 \%$ of EL students in Kindergarten scored Well Developed in writing.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Student Population

For the past two years, many state and federal accountability requirements were waived or adjusted due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on LEAs, schools, and students. Beginning with the 2021-22 school year, the requirements to hold schools and districts accountable for student outcomes has returned with the release of the 2022 California School Dashboard (Dashboard). The Every Student Succeeds Act is requiring all states to determine schools eligible for support. Similarly, under state law, Assembly Bill (AB) 130, which was signed into law in 2021, mandates the return of the Dashboard using only current year performance data to determine LEAs for support. Therefore, to meet this state requirement, only the 2021-22 school year data will be reported on the 2022 Dashboard for state indicators. (Data for Change [or the difference from prior year] and performance colors will not be reported.)
This section provides information about the school's student population.


2021-22 Enrollment for All Students/Student Group

| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| English Learners | 40 | 6.4 |
| Foster Youth | 3 | 0.5 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 258 | 41.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 61 | 9.7 |


| Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Total | Percentage |
| African American | 17 | 2.7 |
| American Indian | 3 | 0.5 |
| Asian | 53 | 8.4 |
| Filipino | 7 | 1.1 |
| Hispanic | 224 | 35.7 |
| Two or More Races | 35 | 5.6 |
| Pacific Islander | 4 | 0.6 |
| White | 285 | 45.4 |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Century's highest ethnnic group is Hispanic.
2. The SED group is near $50 \%$.
3. Century has a diverse population where white ethnicity is the minority at less than $50 \%$.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Overall Performance

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state law allows the 2022 Dashboard to only display the most current year of data (also known as Status). For this year only, performance levels will be reported using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for state measures. Please note that the Status levels associated with the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate Indicators are reversed (ranging from Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High). Information regarding this year's Dashboard data is available within the Dashboard Communications Toolkit.

Because performance on state measures is based on current year (i.e., 2021-22) results only for the 2022 Dashboard, the color dials have been replaced with one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low).


## 2022 Fall Dashboard Overall Performance for All Students


Academic Engagement

Conditions \& Climate
Suspension Rate


Medium

## English Learner Progress

No Performance Level

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Math and ELA are high.
2. Chronic absenteeism is a great concern.
3. Suspension rates are medium and should be watched closely.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance <br> English Language Arts

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state law allows the 2022 Dashboard to only display the most current year of data (also known as Status). For this year only, performance levels will be reported using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for state measures. Please note that the Status levels associated with the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate Indicators are reversed (ranging from Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High). Information regarding this year's Dashboard data is available within the Dashboard Communications Toolkit.

Because performance on state measures is based on current year (i.e., 2021-22) results only for the 2022 Dashboard, the color dials have been replaced with one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low).


This section provides number of student groups in each level.

## 2022 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Equity Report

| Very Low | Low | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts assessment. This measure is based on student performance on either the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11.

2022 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Performance for All Students/Student Group


| Foster Youth |
| :---: |
|  |
| No Performance Level |
| 1 Student |
|  |


Socioeconomically Disadvantaged

## Students with Disabilities

No Performance Level
80.4 points below standard 25 Students




| Filipino |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
| No Performance Level |
| 6 Students |






This section provides additional information on distance from standard for current English learners, prior or Reclassified English learners, and English Only students in English Language Arts.

2022 Fall Dashboard English Language Arts Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner |
| :---: |
| 10 Students |
|  |
|  |


| Reclassified English Learners |
| :---: |
| 13.3 points above standard |
| 12 Students |
|  |


| English Only |
| :---: |
| 41.3 points above standard |
| 287 Students |
|  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. SED students scored high in ELA.
2. Hispanic students scored high overwell.
3. Reclassified students scored abouve standard.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance <br> Mathematics

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state law allows the 2022 Dashboard to only display the most current year of data (also known as Status). For this year only, performance levels will be reported using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for state measures. Please note that the Status levels associated with the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate Indicators are reversed (ranging from Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High). Information regarding this year's Dashboard data is available within the Dashboard Communications Toolkit.

Because performance on state measures is based on current year (i.e., 2021-22) results only for the 2022 Dashboard, the color dials have been replaced with one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low).


This section provides number of student groups in each level.
2022 Fall Dashboard Mathamtics Equity Report

| Very Low | Low | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

This section provides a view of how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the Mathematics assessment. This measure is based on student performance either on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11.

2022 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Performance for All Students/Student Group



This section provides additional information on distance from standard for current English learners, prior or Reclassified English learners, and English Only students in mathematics

## 2022 Fall Dashboard Mathematics Data Comparisons for English Learners

| Current English Learner |
| :---: |
| 10 Students |
|  |
|  |


| Reclassified English Learners |
| :---: |
| 25.4 points below standard |
| 12 Students |
|  |


| English Only |
| :---: |
| 23.9 points above standard |
| 287 Students |
|  |

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. All students scored better in ELA than math.
2. SED students scored below standard in math.
3. Reclassified students scored far worse in math than ELA.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Performance English Learner Progress

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state law allows the 2022 Dashboard to only display the most current year of data (also known as Status). For this year only, performance levels will be reported using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for state measures. Please note that the Status levels associated with the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate Indicators are reversed (ranging from Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High). Information regarding this year's Dashboard data is available within the Dashboard Communications Toolkit.

This section provides information on the percentage of current EL students making progress towards English language proficiency or maintaining the highest level.

## 2022 Fall Dashboard English Learner Progress Indicator

| English Learner Progress |
| :---: |
|  |
| No Performance Level |
| 57.1 making progress towards English |
| language proficiency |
| Number of EL Students: 21 Students <br> Performance Level: No Performance <br> Level |

This section provides a view of the percentage of current EL students who progressed at least one ELPI level, maintained ELPI level 4, maintained lower ELPI levels (i.e, levels 1, 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H), or decreased at least one ELPI Level.

## 2022 Fall Dashboard Student English Language Acquisition Results

| Decreased <br> One ELPI Level |
| :---: |
| $14.3 \%$ |


| Maintained ELPI Level 1, <br> 2L, 2H, 3L, or 3H |
| :---: |
| $28.6 \%$ |


| Maintained <br> ELPI Level 4 |
| :---: |
| $0.0 \%$ |

Progressed At Least One ELPI Level 57.1\%

## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Majority of EL students progressed at leat one ELPI level.
2. Three \% decreased which could be due to new influx on non english speaking students.
3. the majority of EL students maintained or grew in ELPI results.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Academic Engagement Chronic Absenteeism

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state law allows the 2022 Dashboard to only display the most current year of data (also known as Status). For this year only, performance levels will be reported using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for state measures. Please note that the Status levels associated with the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate Indicators are reversed (ranging from Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High). Information regarding this year's Dashboard data is available within the Dashboard Communications Toolkit.

Because performance on state measures is based on current year (i.e., 2021-22) results only for the 2022 Dashboard, the color dials have been replaced with one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low).


This section provides number of student groups in each level.
2022 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism Equity Report

| Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled.

2022 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism for All Students/Student Group


## 2022 Fall Dashboard Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity



## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Overall chronic absenteeism is on averge very high.
2. Hispanic students had the highest chronic absenteeism rates.
3. EL, SED, Two or More Races, and Students with disabilities had the very high absenteeism rates.

## School and Student Performance Data

## Conditions \& Climate Suspension Rate

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state law allows the 2022 Dashboard to only display the most current year of data (also known as Status). For this year only, performance levels will be reported using one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) for state measures. Please note that the Status levels associated with the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate Indicators are reversed (ranging from Very Low, Low, Medium, High, and Very High). Information regarding this year's Dashboard data is available within the Dashboard Communications Toolkit.

Because performance on state measures is based on current year (i.e., 2021-22) results only for the 2022 Dashboard, the color dials have been replaced with one of five Status levels (ranging from Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low).


This section provides number of student groups in each level. 2022 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate Equity Report

| Very High | High | Medium | Low | Very Low |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |

This section provides information about the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 12 who have been suspended at least once in a given school year. Students who are suspended multiple times are only counted once.

2022 Fall Dashboard Suspension Rate for All Students/Student Group



Socioeconomically Disadvantaged

2.4\% suspended at least one day 287 Students

| Foster Youth |
| :---: |
|  |
| No Performance Level |
| Less than 11 Students |
| 7 Students |

Students with Disabilities

High
3.7\% suspended at least one day 81 Students


## Conclusions based on this data:

1. Hispanic and White student groups are equal in low suspension rates
2. Students with disabilites has a higher percent of suspensions but less students suspended.
3. Students with Two or more races have the highest suspension rate.

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

## Goal Subject

ELA

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Aim I: Maximize Achievement For ALL Students
The District will provide a high-quality educational system for ALL students focusing on mind, body, and spirit by using engaging instruction, rigorous curriculum, and systematic intervention to ensure college and career readiness

## Goal 1

The percent of 3-6 grade students that take the ELA SBAC assessment meeting or exceeding the standards will increase from $69 \%$ to $72 \%$ by the end of the 2022-2023 school year measured by the ELA SBAC assessment. Over the next three years, Century will have a target growth of $78 \%$ of 3-6 grade students "meeting" or "exceeding the standards in English Language Arts.

## Identified Need

All student groups are identified as needing additional support in ELA as measured in the CAASPP assessment.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 English Language Arts SBAC data | 69\% of Century Elementary 3 <br> 6 Graders "met" or "Exceeded" standards in English Language Arts. | By the end of the 2021-22 school year, Century Elementary as a $69 \%$ overall ELA score, which is unusually low Century. We are anticipating a growth of $3 \%$ of students' "Meeting" or "Exceeding" standards in English Language Arts; over the next three years - Century will target $72 \%$ of $3-6$ graders "Meeting" or "Exceeding" standards in English Language Arts. |

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

## Strategy/Activity 1 <br> Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity <br> (Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

All Hispanic, SED, EL, and Special Education students (3-6 grade) The objective would be to execute this by aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and utilizing push-in teachers with systematic RTI, BIAs, before/after school intervention, and supplemental materials to give additional support to students performing below the standards.

## Strategy/Activity

Tasks:
Teachers will provide intervention
BIA will provide EL intervention
Push-in teacher assistance
Incentives and trainings for chronically absent students and parents.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
3,500.00

14,144.01
4294.19

Source(s)
LCAP Intervention

LCAP Supplemental

Title III English Learner

## Strategy/Activity 2

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)

## ALL Students

Strategy/Activity
Tasks
Teachers with EL students will deliver ELD instruction in the area of ELA.
A Bilingual Aide will also provide additional assistance and targeted support as needed designated intervention time

## Measures

1. BIA support in the classroom
2. Annual ELPAC
3. ELD Assessments (progress monitoring)

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
Source(s)

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2022-23

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
The intervention was run in 6-week cycles and students were re-evaluated. Students who showed significant growth were reassigned.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
The materials used are not included in the budget-
Leveled Readers received from the Foundations Grant
More intense and focused intervention will be utilized by grades 1-3
Part of the funding for the BIA will come directly from the title III funding

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

One additional intervention teacher was added as a one time hire for 3 months hoping to raise 2 nd grade scores
This change is added under strategy/activity "people assigned".

## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

## Goal Subject

Math

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Aim I: Maximize Achievement For ALL Students
The District will provide a high-quality educational system for ALL students focusing on mind, body, and spirit by using engaging instruction, rigorous curriculum, and systematic intervention to ensure college and career readiness

## Goal 2

The percent of 3-6 grade students that take the Math SBAC assessment meeting or exceeding the standards will increase by $4.0 \%$ from $65 \%$ to $69 \%$ by the end of the 2022-2023 school year measured by the Math SBAC assessment. The objective would be to execute this by aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and utilizing intervention teachers with systematic RTI, BIAs, an additional intervention teacher January-March, and supplemental materials to give additional support to students performing below the standards.

## Identified Need

Several of our subgroups are performing lower than expected on their math assessments or showing less growth than desired. This includes the following subgroups:

- EL students
- SED students
- Special Ed. students
- Hispanic students


## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2021-22 Mathematics SBAC <br> data | 65\% of 3-6 Graders "Met" or <br> "Exceeded" standards in <br> Mathematics | Century is expecting a 4\% <br> targeted growth in "meeting" or <br> "exceeding" standards in <br> Mathematics as measured by <br> the SBAC - Mathematics <br> assessment. |
|  |  | asen |
|  |  |  |

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

## Strategy/Activity 1 <br> Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity <br> (Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups) <br> All Students in Grades K - 6

## Strategy/Activity

Tasks
Credentialed Intervention teachers will provide pull-out instruction and/or additional instructional assistance for students who are below the proficient level in the area of mathematics, with a focus on Hispanic students, SED students, EL students, and Special Education students. Teachers will also be provided with any necessary supplementary materials needed to help provide this additional instruction.

## Measures

Individual student math state test scores, district assessments, and teacher-created assessments will be tracked over time. Students' assigned classroom teachers will provide periodic progress reports as well as a year-end evaluation of each student involved. The goal is to increase math proficiency.

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
8,093.73

14,399.99

LCAP Intervention

LCAP Supplemental

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2022-23

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
What is working:
*Intervention and differentiated instruction
*Iready exams
*Iready and Zearn math
What needs improvement:
*Attendance
*Ineffective differentiated instruction

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.
no discrepancies

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

- Addition of 2 credentialed intervention teachers
- Utilization of Technology Coach
- Intervention teachers and technology coach will assist with using i ready to prepare students for SBAC
- Baseline scores disaggregated by Kim Alto will provide a foundation for teachers to access showing the correlation between i ready and SBAC scores for 2022


## Goals, Strategies, \& Proposed Expenditures

Complete a copy of the following table for each of the school's goals. Duplicate the table as needed.

## Goal Subject

Student Engagement

## LEA/LCAP Goal

Aim I: Maximize student achievement for all kids

## Goal 3

Decrease suspension and attendance rates

## Identified Need

Our California Dashboard data illustrated high levels of chronic absentee rates and suspension rates in multiple student groups.

## Annual Measurable Outcomes

| Metric/Indicator | Baseline/Actual Outcome | Expected Outcome |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| California Data Dashboard | SWD: Very High <br> EL: Very High <br> Attendance | SWD: Reduce to High |
| Two or More Races: Very High |  |  | | EL: Reduce to High |
| :--- |
| Two or More Races: Reduce to |
| High |

Complete a copy of the Strategy/Activity table for each of the school's strategies/activities. Duplicate the table, including Proposed Expenditures, as needed.

## Strategy/Activity 1

Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity
(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
All students with a specific focus on our EL, SWD, and two or more races subgroups
Strategy/Activity
Strategy:
*Communication

## Activities:

*Increase communication with families around the importance of attendance
*Increase educational partner knowledge around options when students are out for a long period of time

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

Amount(s)
Source(s)

## Strategy/Activity 2

## Students to be Served by this Strategy/Activity

(Identify either All Students or one or more specific student groups)
Strategy:
*Professional Development

## Activities:

*Specific staff members will be provided with professional development around proactive strategies to decrease attendance
*Specific staff members will be provided with professional development around alternatives to suspension
*Specific staff members will be provided with professional development to increase student engagement within the classroom and around the school

Strategy/Activity

## Proposed Expenditures for this Strategy/Activity

List the amount(s) and funding source(s) for the proposed expenditures. Specify the funding source(s) using one or more of the following: LCFF, Federal (if Federal identify the Title and Part, as applicable), Other State, and/or Local.

0 District Funded

## Annual Review

## SPSA Year Reviewed: 2022-23

Respond to the following prompts relative to this goal. If the school is in the first year of implementing the goal, an analysis is not required and this section may be deleted.

## ANALYSIS

Describe the overall implementation of the strategies/activities and the overall effectiveness of the strategies/activities to achieve the articulated goal.
This is a new goal that we will implement in 2023-2024, so there is no analysis at this time.

Briefly describe any major differences between the intended implementation and/or the budgeted expenditures to implement the strategies/activities to meet the articulated goal.

Describe any changes that will be made to this goal, the annual outcomes, metrics, or strategies/activities to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis. Identify where those changes can be found in the SPSA.

## Budget Summary

Complete the table below. Schools may include additional information. Adjust the table as needed. The Budget Summary is required for schools funded through the ConApp, and/or that receive funds from the LEA for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).

## Budget Summary

| Description | Amount |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Funds Provided to the School Through the Consolidated Application | $\$ 4,294.19$ |
| Total Federal Funds Provided to the School from the LEA for CSI | $\$ 0$ |
| Total Funds Budgeted for Strategies to Meet the Goals in the SPSA | $\$ 44,431.92$ |

## Federal Programs

## Allocation (\$)

Subtotal of additional federal funds included for this school: \$

List the State and local programs that the school is including in the schoolwide program. Duplicate the table as needed.

## State or Local Programs

District Funded
LCAP Intervention

LCAP Supplemental
Title III English Learner

## Allocation (\$)

$\$ 0.00$
\$11,593.73
\$28,544.00
\$4,294.19

Subtotal of state or local funds included for this school: $\$ 44,431.92$
Total of federal, state, and/or local funds for this school: \$44,431.92

## Budgeted Funds and Expenditures in this Plan

The tables below are provided to help the school track expenditures as they relate to funds budgeted to the school.

## Funds Budgeted to the School by Funding Source

| Funding Source | Amount |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Balance |  |
| LCAP Supplemental | $\$ 28,544.00$ | 0.00 |
| LCAP Intervention | $\$ 11,593.73$ | 0.00 |
| Title III English Learner | $\$ 4,294.19$ | $\square$ |

## Expenditures by Funding Source

| Funding Source | Amount |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| District Funded |  | 0.00 |
| LCAP Intervention |  | $11,593.73$ |
| LCAP Supplemental |  | $28,544.00$ |
| Title III English Learner |  | $4,294.19$ |

## Expenditures by Budget Reference

## Budget Reference

Amount

## Expenditures by Budget Reference and Funding Source

Budget Reference
$\square$
Expenditures by Goal

Funding Source

| District Funded |
| :--- |
| LCAP Intervention |
| LCAP Supplemental |
| Title III English Learner |

Amount

| Goal 1 |
| :---: |
| Goal 2 |
| Goal 3 |

21,938.20
22,493.72
0.00

## School Site Council Membership

California Education Code describes the required composition of the School Site Council (SSC). The SSC shall be composed of the principal and representatives of: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school; parents of pupils attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, pupils selected by pupils attending the school. The current make-up of the SSC is as follows:

## 1 School Principal

2 Classroom Teachers
2 Other School Staff
5 Parent or Community Members

| Name of Members |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Brion Warren | Principal |
| Kim Fox-Kristensen | Classroom Teacher |
| Sara Baker | Other School Staff |
| Diana Distefano | Parent or Community Member |
| Geizi Penaloza | Parent or Community Member |
| Stephanie Wait | Classroom Teacher |
| Gretchen Heisdorf | Parent or Community Member |
| Krystal Cressal | Parent or Community Member |
| Lauren Trzeciak | Parent or Community Member |
| Lisa Peterson | Other School Staff |

At elementary schools, the school site council must be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel, and (b) parents of students attending the school or other community members. Classroom teachers must comprise a majority of persons represented under section (a). At secondary schools there must be, in addition, equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents, and students. Members must be selected by their peer group.

## Recommendations and Assurances

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:

The SSC is correctly constituted and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.
The SSC reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) requiring board approval.

The SSC sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan:


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.

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.

This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on 12/14/22.
Attested:


