

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PLAN ADDENDUM (for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 School Years)

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, codified as No Child Left Behind (NCLB, Section 1116[c][7][A]), requires that local educational agencies (LEAs) identified for Program Improvement (PI) shall, not later than three months after being identified, develop or revise an LEA Plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, and others. Rather than completely rewriting the existing LEA Plan, we recommend using this LEA Plan Addendum template to address the items below. Type your responses in the expandable text boxes.

Prior to developing this revision, please use the State Assessment Tools, as applicable, to analyze school/district needs for improved student achievement. These tools are available on the California Department of Education (CDE) State Assessment Tools Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. Contact the District Innovation and Improvement Office at 916-319-0836 if you have any questions regarding the State Assessment Tools or completing the LEA Plan Addendum.

Please submit an electronic copy of your completed LEA Plan Addendum to CDE at LEAP@cde.ca.gov. If you have any questions regarding the LEA Plan Addendum, please contact Jacqueline Matranga, Education Programs Consultant, District Innovation and Improvement Office by e-mail at JMatranga@cde.ca.gov, or Jane Liang, Education Programs Consultant, District Innovation and Improvement Office by e-mail at JLiang@cde.ca.gov.

The LEA Plan Addendum **must be submitted to the CDE no later than Tuesday, April 19, 2016**. The LEA Plan Addendum should:

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

Please provide a summary analysis of the needs assessment used to identify student learning needs (especially the academic problems of low achieving students). Include an analysis of why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

1. Discuss the results of the assessments used to determine the teaching and learning needs of the schools and the district.
2. Identify academic priorities.
3. Discuss why the prior LEA Plan was not successful.

Analysis of Data – Results of Assessments

District Assistance Survey (DAS)

The TUSD LEA Plan is updated and approved by the School Board each year, and the plan is fully implemented. The School Board establishes Board Goals each year, and once the Board Goals are approved, the LEA Plan is revised to reflect the goals. The District has policies to fully implement the SBE-approved EPCs for Instructional Success in all schools in the LEA. In place and being implemented are Board approved instructional materials, pacing guides, and District formative assessments. The District Assessment Calendar reflects statewide and formative assessments. Time for professional development is provided via banking minutes.

The LEA Plan is developed in alignment with the accountabilities requirements at both the state and federal levels, and with input from all stakeholders. Four SPSA writing meetings are held with principals each year to assist in the plan writing process. SPSAs are reviewed by peers and the Educational Services team using a rubric aligned with state and federal requirements, including budget alignment. The LEA Plan is reviewed with District principals each year.

The LEA and its schools use multiple forms of two-way communication to provide timely and accurate information to all stakeholders about student achievement, academic expectations, and accountability requirements. Parents/guardians have access to their students' grades and assignments through a web-based student information system. The LEA and schools communicate with parents via automated phone messaging, phone calls, District and school websites, email, U.S. mail, newsletters, and meetings. Sites hold regular PTO, PTA, Site Council, ELAC, and other community meetings. Parent conferences are held twice a year to communicate progress. Interpretation services are provided at each site as needed. All parents of English Learners are informed yearly of progress, including Students with Disabilities. Families participate in parent nights that include: Math/Science Nights, College Night, GATE Parent University, and Career Nights.

A yearly assessment presentation to the Board, administration, and staff provides direction for instructional improvement efforts. Individual data meetings are held at the beginning of the year with each site administrator. The LEA's Title III Improvement Plan is reviewed monthly. A data management system is provided for all schools, teachers, and administrators. Data is continuously updated and provides various levels of access with rapid turnaround for all users. A K-12 standards-based instructional system is in place including curriculum, assessment, pacing, and instructional presentation. A systematic textbook adoption system is in place. Intervention plans are submitted by each site. Intervention walk-throughs monitor implementation.

EL instructional time is monitored by each site. English Learners are appropriately grouped by CELDT level for designated and integrated English Language Development. Students with Disabilities have access to core instructional materials. Instructional minutes are reviewed and audited yearly by the LEA.

The LEA establishes expectations, monitoring, and training for the successful implementation of Professional Learning Communities and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) at all sites. All sites implement frequent PLC meeting time to analyze data, share practice, and to participate in professional development. PLCs are monitored by administrators who participate in regular analysis of data. The implementation of District

formative assessments is monitored by principals and the District Educational Services team. Every teacher administers formative assessments, which are analyzed throughout the year by teachers, principals, and the Educational Services team.

The Board certifies ending balances and reserves three times each year. The LEA plan and SPSA budgets are aligned to the fullest extent possible. The District allocates 20% of its Title I budget to Title I schools in Program Improvement.

Highly successful principals are placed at Title I schools. New administrators are supported, trained, and monitored throughout the year. Monthly principals' meetings include ongoing professional development and support to site principals. Highly qualified teachers are equitably distributed across the LEA in accordance with Title II requirements. The District provides a complete BTSA program including a BTSA Support Provider for each new teacher. BTSA provides targeted professional development for individual teachers including coaching, instructional specialists, and instructional strategies. When professional development is provided, it is aligned to standards, district goals and priorities, and targeted classroom instruction.

Academic Priorities:

1. Although the District Assistance Survey (DAS) shows full implementation in most areas, the focus for the 2016-17 school year is on monitoring the instructional program to ensure programs and interventions are being implemented with fidelity.
2. Monitoring walk-throughs of Signature Practices, Performance Tasks, Thinking Maps, Balanced Literacy, Readers' and Writers' Workshop, GATE strategies, and English Language Development shall occur regularly with District administrators and coaches providing monitoring and support.
3. Principals shall participate in instructional rounds at regular intervals, and results from these walk-throughs are monitored by the Educational Services Team.
4. A strong emphasis shall be placed on monitoring by observation and data, with a focus on the subgroups that have not made Adequate Yearly Progress.

English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA)

AMAOs 1 and 2 have been met each year by District English learners. However, AMAO 3 has not been met in English/Language Arts and Mathematics for the past four years. English learner graduation rates exceed the statewide target. Although longitudinal data reflect consistent incremental growth has been realized each year, the percent of English Learners who were proficient fell below the target.

Academic Priorities:

1. Overall, TUSD English learners are making annual progress in learning English, attaining English proficiency, and in gaining academic proficiency.
2. However, some students are taking 6 or more years to achieve proficiency in English, and EL students have not met AMAO 3 for the past four years.
3. ELSSA data confirm that many English learners stall at the CELDT Intermediate level, and as a result the District will monitor the full implementation of English Language Development programs.
4. Sheltered classes are in place, and continue to be needed at the secondary level to provide support in academic content courses (Mathematics and Science).

Academic Program Surveys

Academic Program Surveys were completed in October/November 2015 at each of the District's Title I Program Improvement schools.

Academic Priorities:

Identified areas for improvement:

1. Instructional time for English Language Development should be monitored to ensure at least 30 minutes or one class period is devoted each day to the development of English language skills for English learners,
2. Intensive intervention needs to be provided to all intensive learners within the master schedule or regular school day.
3. Math intervention should be provided when students are identified as needing instructional support.
4. Continue to provide professional development to administrators and teachers in the ELA/ELD standards, English Language Development programs, and intervention curricula and programs implemented in the District's schools.
5. Continue to monitor principals' instructional leadership efforts, particularly in the context of providing quality first instruction and effective intervention programs.
6. Schools shall address, plan for, and budget for site-based instructional assistance and ongoing support to all teachers of ELA, ELD, and other core academic subjects.
7. Site-based teacher collaboration meetings have focused on ELA. There is a need to expand efforts to guide instruction in Mathematics.

Inventory of Services and Supports (ISS)

The District's high expectations for student achievement are inclusive of students with disabilities. Test results for significant subgroups are reviewed annually with the Board. The Special Education and the Educational Services departments work collaboratively on the inclusion of special education teachers in the yearly instructional staff development opportunities that are provided to general education teachers. All of the District's special education teachers meet the highly qualified requirements of NCLB. The District has consistently provided equal access to special education teachers to participate in professional development opportunities provided to general education teachers. The Special Education Department has clearly articulated transition procedures for the transitions from pre-K to K, elementary to middle, middle to high, high school to transition, and transition to adult. Students with disabilities are educated in the least restrictive environment with access to the core curriculum to the maximum extent possible.

The Special Education Department provides on-going staff development opportunities throughout the year on pertinent issues. All District schools have been trained in the School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) model.

The District has allocated additional resources to improve the amount of supplemental materials available to assist students who need additional curricular support and intervention.

School sites should encourage parents of students in special day classes to participate in activities that are designed for all parents at the school site and not just special education related parent activities.

Academic Priorities:

1. The Special Education Department shall expand the curriculum materials available to the moderate-severe program classes at all age levels.
2. The Special Education Department needs to more closely monitor the provision of ELD instruction to English Learners in special day classes for the required number of minutes per day and the effectiveness of ELD instruction provided.
3. There is a need for a focused intervention curriculum for students with disabilities who have not demonstrated growth in MTSS groups using general education intervention curricula.
4. School sites should continue to build upon collaboration opportunities between general education and special education teachers (particularly special day class teachers).
5. Special education teachers could benefit from training on how to use assessment results for placement in and monitoring of progress in tiered interventions.
6. The Special Education Department will continue offering professional development on writing CCSS grade-level standards-based IEP goals.
7. The Special Education Department will continue to expand its assistive technology program.

Analysis of LEA Plan Implementation

Why was the plan not successful?

The District's instructional program is in alignment with the LEA Plan, which has been fully implemented. The LEA Plan has been revised and approved by the School Board each year since its inception, and revisions have reflected a thorough analysis of data and practice, including yearly AYP and API subgroup analyses.

An in-depth analysis of LEA programs and student achievement is included in the District's LCAP needs assessment. District students continue to outperform the percent proficient for all students in the state on the CST, CMA, CAPA, and the new CAASPP ELA/Literacy and Mathematics.

Despite these findings, the federal 2016 AYP targets of 100% percent proficient in English/Language Arts and 100% proficient in Mathematics were not met by all District subgroups.

It is the District's conclusion that the LEA Plan has not failed. The 2015 AYP targets were not met by all subgroups because the targets were unrealistically high and the federal AYP is not a growth model. When compared to a growth model, such as the State's former API, and when analyzed through the LCAP data analysis, all of the District's subgroups have demonstrated growth and perform at a higher level than the State average.

However, the following LEA Plan Addendum activities will be implemented as part of the District's laser-like focus on providing exemplary learning opportunities and outcomes for all students.

Plan Clarification

The LEAP Addendum addresses subgroups that did not meet AYP targets for 2013 (the most recent AYP data). The term, *at-risk students*, refers to students within the District's significant subgroups who have not met the achievement targets.

A comprehensive Title III Addendum for 2016-17 is currently being implemented in the District to address English language development and achievement goals and activities for English Learners. Goals and activities already identified in the Title III Addendum were not duplicated in this LEAP Addendum.

2. Include specific, measurable achievement goals and targets for student groups identified as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe specific, measurable academic goals and targets for student achievement for student groups identified as not making AYP. (Refer to the CDE AYP Reports Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypreports.asp>.)

District students met all 2015 AYP targets, as noted below:

Participation Rate: LEA-wide and Student Groups

<u>Student Groups</u>	<u>ELA Enrollment</u>	<u>ELA Number of Students Tested</u>	<u>ELA Rate</u>	<u>ELA Met 2015 Criteria</u>	<u>ELA Alternative Method</u>	<u>Math Enrollment</u>	<u>Math Number of Students Tested</u>	<u>Math Rate</u>	<u>Math Met 2015 Criteria</u>	<u>Math Alternative Method</u>
LEA-wide	13198	13091	99	Yes	--	13222	13087	99	Yes	--
Black or African American	275	272	99	Yes	--	275	271	99	Yes	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	31	100	--	--	31	31	100	--	--
Asian	2324	2311	99	Yes	--	2338	2325	99	Yes	--
Filipino	251	251	100	Yes	--	251	251	100	Yes	--
Hispanic or Latino	6093	6059	99	Yes	--	6101	6052	99	Yes	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	35	35	100	--	--	35	35	100	--	--
White	3818	3763	99	Yes	--	3818	3751	98	Yes	--
Two or More Races	311	309	99	Yes	--	313	311	99	Yes	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	5647	5621	100	Yes	--	5655	5623	99	Yes	--
English Learners	3839	3821	100	Yes	--	3868	3842	99	Yes	--
Students with Disabilities	1316	1266	96	Yes	--	1314	1253	95	Yes	--

Attendance Rate Target: 90 Percent

Average Daily Attendance	Met Criteria
97%	Yes

Graduation Rate Goal: 90 Percent

Met Schoolwide Graduation	Met Student Group Graduation Rates	Met Overall Graduation Rate Criteria
Yes	Yes	Yes

Current Year: Graduation Rate Results

Groups	2014 Cohort Graduation Rate (class of 2012-13)	2015 Cohort Graduation Rate (class of 2013-14)	2015 Target Graduation Rate	2015 Graduation Rate Criteria Met	2016 Target Graduation Rate Class of 2014-15)	Exclusion/Alternative Method
LEA-wide	96.78	96.97	90.00	Yes	90.00	--
Black or African American	--	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	U50
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	U50
Asian	96.93	98.32	90.00	Yes	90.00	--
Filipino	--	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	U50
Hispanic or Latino	95.31	95.21	90.00	Yes	90.00	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	U50
White	98.75	98.54	90.00	Yes	90.00	--
Two or More Races	--	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	U50
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	94.54	95.11	90.00	Yes	90.00	--
English Learners	91.64	89.87	88.48	Yes	88.86	--
Students with Disabilities	82.35	87.30	83.88	Yes	87.98	--

Percent Proficient – Annual Measureable Objectives (AMOs)

Percent Proficient Statement: Due to the transition to the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) approved the California Department of Education’s waiver request to exclude the percent proficient results from AYP determinations. However, the ED is requiring the percent proficient results be displayed on the AYP reports.

Percent Proficient Targets: 100%

Percent Proficient: LEA-wide and Student Groups

<u>Student Groups</u>	<u>ELA Valid Scores</u>	<u>ELA Number At or Above Proficient</u>	<u>ELA Percent At or Above Proficient</u>	<u>Math Valid Scores</u>	<u>Math Number At or Above Proficient</u>	<u>Math Percent At or Above Proficient</u>
LEA-wide	12604	7215	57.2	12575	6200	49.3
Black or African American	250	100	40.0	249	88	35.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	28	20	71.4	28	17	60.7
Asian	2220	1865	84.0	2218	1866	84.1
Filipino	235	171	72.8	235	146	62.1
Hispanic or Latino	5817	2165	37.2	5805	1487	25.6
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	33	17	51.5	33	14	42.4
White	3669	2622	71.5	3655	2339	64.0
Two or More Races	297	221	74.4	297	206	69.4
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	5374	1854	34.5	5368	1275	23.8
English Learners	3623	963	26.6	3620	785	21.7
Students with Disabilities	1108	206	18.6	1099	184	16.7

Achievement Goals for 2015-16:

- Exceed statewide averages for CAASPP ELA/Literacy scores for all students and significant subgroups (base year for CAASPP ELA/Literacy).
- Exceed statewide averages for CAASPP Math scores for all students and significant subgroups (base year for CAASPP Math).

Achievement Goals for 2016-17:

- Increase LEA-wide CAASPP ELA/Literacy proficiency rates by at least 3%
 - Increase CAASPP ELA/Literacy proficiency rates by 5% for significant subgroups below the LEA-wide average (Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities) to close the achievement gap.
- Increase LEA-wide CAASPP Math proficiency rates by at least 3%
 - Increase CAASPP Math proficiency rates by 5% for significant subgroups below the LEA-wide average (Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities) to close the achievement gap.

3. Incorporate research-based strategies to strengthen the core academic program for identified student groups in schools served by the LEA, including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe the specific strategies that the district will use and how those strategies will be implemented and monitored to strengthen the core academic program.

Strategies	How Implemented	How Monitored
Describe scientifically based strategies to improve academic achievement in English-Language Arts/Literacy.		
Identify at-risk students (Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners, Students with Disabilities) who are below grade level and provide appropriate research-based ELA intervention.	Provide intensive intervention during the regular school day. Include extended class period and tutorials for students in grades 6 – 12.	Observe classroom teachers during ELA instructional periods to monitor the implementation of CCSS, including intervention. (Ongoing)
K-8: Provide and oversee ongoing assessment of student reading performance using districtwide formative assessments to adjust and monitor the instructional program to ensure student progress.	Site-based implementation with district-level ELA/ELD leadership team guidance and support.	Student data management system (Quarterly)
9-12: Align secondary ELA courses to ensure a guaranteed, standards-based curriculum with site-specific common, skill-based assessments.	Site-based implementation with district-level ELA/ELD leadership team guidance and support.	Measured by course outline audits, classroom observations, and student data management system assessment results.(Ongoing)
K-12: Continue to develop Professional Learning Communities (PLC) with Data Analysis Meetings. Focus on teacher-analysis of ELA data for all learners, with emphasis on at-risk students, leading to adjustments in instructional strategies, and student placement. Data analysis will include all statewide assessments, local assessments, and site-based common assessments.	Provide extended time through banking minutes for teachers to work in PLCs to review data and articulate strategies for differentiating instruction focusing on at-risk students based on their proficiency levels.	Meeting logs (collected monthly)
To support reading improvement, access to state-of-the-art technology labs and classroom/library technology will be supported by District and school site.	Use of software to promote reading skill development will include programs such as Accelerated Reader, and Tier II intervention software.	Lesson plans, Accelerated Reader reports, Tier II Intervention Software reports (Weekly)
Describe scientifically based strategies to improve academic achievement in Mathematics.		
Develop and implement CCSS K-12 math unit plans, which include suggestions for supplemental materials.	K – 8: Ensure all students have state-adopted CCSS Mathematics textbooks and/or instructional materials.	K - 12: Observe classroom teachers during Mathematics instructional periods to monitor the implementation of standards-based instruction and Mathematics unit plans.

3. Incorporate research-based strategies to strengthen the core academic program for identified student groups in schools served by the LEA, including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe the specific strategies that the district will use and how those strategies will be implemented and monitored to strengthen the core academic program.

Strategies	How Implemented	How Monitored
		Monitor CCSS Mathematics unit plan implementation in all math courses through classroom observations, PLC agendas, lesson plans, and formative assessments. (Monthly)
K – 12: Provide and oversee ongoing assessment of student mathematics performance using Districtwide formative assessments and site-based common assessments to adjust and monitor the instructional program to ensure student progress.	Through examining Master Schedules, student placement, and resulting data, monitor and refine appropriate math placement for each student based on summative and pre-assessments, District formative assessments (3x per year), and common assessments.	For all students, monitoring will occur at least after each formative and common assessment, and as frequently as weekly for at-risk students.
9 – 12: Increase the number of students who take four years of high school math.	9 – 12: Implement secondary CCSS Mathematics progressions to ensure a guaranteed, standards-based curriculum with common, skill-based assessments. This will also strengthen CASSPP outcomes. 4-year planning will occur at all comprehensive high schools to encourage and support more students in taking four years of high school mathematics.	Measured by course outline audits, classroom observations, and student data management system assessment results.(Ongoing)
K – 12: Continue to develop Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with Data Analysis Meetings. Focus on teacher-analysis of Mathematics data for at-risk students, leading to adjustments in instructional strategies, student placement, etc.	Provide extended time through late-start banking minutes for teachers to work in PLCs to review data and articulate strategies for differentiating instruction focusing on at-risk students based on their proficiency levels. K – 12: Facilitate site-based PLC groups to review student performance	Meeting logs (collected monthly)

3. Incorporate research-based strategies to strengthen the core academic program for identified student groups in schools served by the LEA, including students with disabilities and English learners, as appropriate.

Please describe the specific strategies that the district will use and how those strategies will be implemented and monitored to strengthen the core academic program.

Strategies	How Implemented	How Monitored
	data on District math formative assessments, identify students for intervention, and share best instructional practices.	
6 – 12: Provide sheltered academic instruction courses in Mathematics and Science.	Site-based implementation with district-level support.	Aeries reports, weekly walk-throughs, lesson plans.

4. Specific actions to implement the identified strategies that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions and how they will be supported. (See full implementation statements in the Academic Program Survey [APS] and the District Assistance Survey [DAS] on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>.)

	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. Single Plans for Student Achievement will reflect the coordination of all programs. All SPSAs will be kept up-to-date in Document Tracking Services.	Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval Principals	2015-16 Sept – Nov, Plan writing; Dec – June, plan Implementation; May/June, Annual Evaluation implementation (cycle repeated yearly)	\$4,565	Title I, A
	Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval Principals	2016-17 Sept – Nov, Plan writing; Dec – June, plan;	\$4,566	

4. Specific actions to implement the identified strategies that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions and how they will be supported. (See full implementation statements in the Academic Program Survey [APS] and the District Assistance Survey [DAS] on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp .)	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
		May/June, Annual Evaluation implementation (cycle repeated yearly)		
2. Each site will develop, sustain, and refine MTSS and tiered intervention strategies according to student need, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals, and applying child-response data to important educational decisions.	Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval Principals	2015-16	\$9,585	Title I, A And Site Funds
	Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval Principals	2016-17	\$9,585	
3. Additional academic counselor for Columbus Tustin Middle School.	Chief Academic Officer	2015-16 August 2015 – June 2016	\$44,838	Title I, A
4. Using a student data management system and creating specialized reports, identify at-risk students (Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners, Students with Disabilities) who are not meeting standards and provide appropriate research-based ELA intervention.	Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval Principals	2015-16 August 2015 – June 2016 Reporting each quarter and trimester	\$36,000	Other Funding Source
		2016-17 August 2016 – June 2017 Reporting each quarter and trimester	\$36,000	

4. Specific actions to implement the identified strategies that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions and how they will be supported. (See full implementation statements in the Academic Program Survey [APS] and the District Assistance Survey [DAS] on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp .)	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
5. K-8: Provide and oversee ongoing assessment of student reading performance using districtwide formative assessments to adjust and monitor the instructional program to ensure student progress.	Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval Principals	2015-16 Assessments administered 3X per year.	\$24,000	Title I, A
		2016-17 Assessments administered 3X per year.	\$24,000	
6. 9-12: Align secondary ELA courses to ensure a guaranteed, standards-based curriculum with site-specific common, skill-based assessments.	Director, Sec Ed, Assess/Eval Principals	2015-16 July 2015 – June 2016	\$5,000	Title I, A
		2016-17 July 2016 – June 2017	\$5,000	
7. K-12: Continue to implement Professional Learning Communities (PLC) with Data Analysis Meetings. Focus on teacher-analysis of ELA and Mathematics data for all learners, with emphasis on at-risk students, leading to adjustments in instructional strategies, and student placement. Data analysis will include all statewide assessments, local assessments, and site-based common assessments.	Director, Sec Ed, Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval	2015-16 Sept. 2015 – June 2016	\$18,000	Title I, A
		2016-17 Sept. 2016 – June 2017	\$18,000	
8. Develop and implement CCSS K-12 math unit plans, which include suggestions for supplemental materials.	Directors, Elem & Sec Ed,	2015-16 August 2015 – June 2016	\$9,000	Title I, A
		2016-17 August 2016 – June 2017	\$4,500	

4. Specific actions to implement the identified strategies that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Please identify actions and how they will be supported. (See full implementation statements in the Academic Program Survey [APS] and the District Assistance Survey [DAS] on the CDE State Assessment Tools Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp .)	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
9. K – 12: Provide and oversee ongoing assessment of student mathematics performance using Districtwide formative assessments and site-based common assessments to adjust and monitor the instructional program to ensure student progress.	Director, Sec Ed, Directors, Elem & Sec Ed, Assess/Eval	2015-16 3X per year	\$9,368	Title I, A
		2016-17 3X per year	\$9,000	
10. 9 – 12: Increase the number of students who take four years of high school math by providing academic counseling to ensure students make use of the full complement of courses available to them.	Director, Sec. Ed.	2015-16 Monitoring Sept, Feb. and June	No additional cost	N/A
		2016-17 Monitoring Sept, Feb. and June	No additional cost	
11. 6 – 12: Provide sheltered academic instruction courses in Mathematics and Science.	Director, Sec. Ed.	2015-16 Monitoring Sept, Feb. and June	No additional cost	
		2016-17 Monitoring Sept, Feb. and June	No additional cost	

5. Provide high-quality professional development for the instructional staff that focuses on instructional improvement and supports the strategies and actions described above.

Please describe the professional development the LEA will provide to instructional staff to address the identified strategies and actions.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. <i>Illuminate DnA training</i> on creating assessments, uploading, analyzing disaggregated student data, and instructional response to results. Design, train on, and	Director, Assess/Eval	2015-16 August 2015 – June 2016	\$27,663	Other Funding Source

5. Provide high-quality professional development for the instructional staff that focuses on instructional improvement and supports the strategies and actions described above.

Please describe the professional development the LEA will provide to instructional staff to address the identified strategies and actions.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
implement data protocol. Designing specialized reports for Running Records.		2016-17 August 2016 – June 2017	\$27,617	
2. Train teachers in GATE strategies to encourage increase in overall rigor for all students including at-risk students.	Directors, Elem. & Sec. Ed District GATE Coordinator Principals Teachers	2015-16 Ongoing monitoring	\$16,000	Title I
		2016-17 Ongoing monitoring	\$15,200	
3. Summer Institute training for teachers.	Directors, Elementary and Secondary Ed.	2015-16	\$13,000	Title I
		June 2016		
		2016-17 June 2017	\$12,500	
4. ELA/ELD and Math Leadership Teams.	Directors, Elementary and Secondary Ed	2015-16 Sept 2015 – June 2016	\$3,000	Other Funding Source
		2016-17 Sept 2016 – June 2017	\$3,000	
5. Professional development resources.	Director, Assessment & Evaluation	2015-16		Title I
		July 2015 – June 2016	\$564	
		2016-17 July 2016 – June 2017	\$600	

5. Provide high-quality professional development for the instructional staff that focuses on instructional improvement and supports the strategies and actions described above.

Please describe the professional development the LEA will provide to instructional staff to address the identified strategies and actions.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
6. MTSS support and training.	Directors, Elementary and Secondary Education	2015-16 August 2015 – June 2016	\$10,000	Title I
		2016-17 Ongoing coaching and support	\$9,691	
7. Elementary and Secondary Districtwide professional development days.	Directors, Elementary and Secondary Education	2015-16 (2 per year)	\$20,000	Title I
		2016-17 (2 per year)	\$19,382	

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

Please describe those activities and how the LEA will incorporate them.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. Individual schools and Adult Education will offer intervention during and after school to assist students who are at-risk of not graduating from high school, needing to recover high school credits, or not meeting standards on the CAASPP.	Directors, Elementary and Secondary Education Site Administrators	2015-16 School Year	\$20,000	Title I
		2016-17 School Year	\$19,000	Title I
2. AVID Tutors will be trained to support the AVID program at the District's middle and high schools.	Chief Academic Officer Director, Secondary Ed.	2015-16 September 2015 and throughout the school year.	\$18,820	Other Funding Source
		2016-17 Sept 2016 – June 2017	\$18,820	
3. Provide SES tutoring to eligible students at the District's Title I Program Improvement schools, and provide transportation to NCLB school choice transfer students.	Director, Assessment & Evaluation	2015-16 Dec 2015 – April 2016	\$587,773	Title I (20% SES and School Choice Transportation)
4. For the ESSA transition year, provide alternative supports to eligible students at the District's Title I Program Improvement Year 2+ schools.	Directors, Elementary and Secondary Education Director, Assessment & Evaluation	2016-17 Planning May/June 2015; Implementation Sept 2016 – June 2017	\$528,667	Title I (20% Alternative Supports)
5. Provide transportation and other supports for Homeless students in need of transportation.	Chief Academic Officer Coordinator, Student Services	2015-16 September 2015 and thereafter.	\$4,500	McKinney-Vento
		2016-17	\$4,500	

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

Please describe parental involvement strategies and how the LEA will support them across the LEA.	Person(s) Responsible	Specific Timeline	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. LEA outreach to parents will include sending notices of opportunities for parent involvement, notifying schools of parent involvement opportunities, developing templates for parent policies and home/school compacts, updating and issuing parent rights and responsibilities packets, and monitoring site-based parent involvement activities. All notices will be translated in English and Spanish.	Director, Assessment and Evaluation	2015-16 August 2015 – June 2016	\$7,000	Title I
	District Communications Officer	2016-17 August 2016 – June 2017	\$7,000	
2. Train administrators and classified staff in effective parent involvement strategies.	Directors, Assess/Eval, Elem & Sec Ed	2015-16 August 2016, and ongoing thereafter	\$1,500	Title I
		2016-17 August 2017, and ongoing thereafter	\$1,200	
3. Explore avenues for parent participation by attending meetings and trainings.	Directors, Assess & Eval, Elem Ed & Sec Ed	2015-16 Sept 2015 – June 2016	\$1,800	Title I
		2016-17 Sept 2016 – June 2017	\$1,800	

**LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN ADDENDUM
ASSURANCE PAGE**

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan Information:

Name of LEA: Tustin Unified School District

County District Code: 30-73643

Date of Local Governing Board Approval: June 29, 2016

District Superintendent: Gregory A. Franklin, Ed.D.

Address: 300 South C Street

City: Tustin

Zip Code: 92780

Phone: 714-730-7301 ext. 305

FAX: 714-7436

E-mail: gfranklin@tustin.k12.ca.us

Signatures:

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

	Gregory A. Franklin, Ed.D.	June 29, 2016
Signature of Superintendent	Printed Name of Superintendent	Date

	Lynn Davis	June 29, 2016
Signature of Board President	Printed Name of Board President	Date

By submission of the local board approved LEA PI Plan Addendum (in lieu of the original signature assurance page in hard copy), the LEA certifies that the plan has been locally adopted and original signed copies of the assurances are on file in the LEA. The certification reads:

Certification: I hereby certify that all of the applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed by this LEA and that, to the best of my knowledge, information contained in this Plan is correct and complete. Legal assurances for all programs are accepted as the basic legal condition for the operation of selected projects and programs and copies of assurances are retained onsite. I certify that we accept all general and program specific assurances for Titles I, II, and/or III as appropriate, except for those for which a waiver has been obtained. A copy of all waivers will remain on file. I certify that actual ink signatures for this LEA Plan/Plan Addendum/Action Plan are on file, including signatures of any required external providers.