

LEA name:

Santa Monica Boulevard Community Charter School

Performance Indicator Review 2018–19

State Performance Plan Indicator 3

Statewide Assessments

Root Cause Analysis and Action Plans

The California Department of Education (CDE) will conduct a Performance Indicator Review (PIR) for each local educational agency (LEA) that fails to meet a certain performance value in relation to one or more of the State Performance Plan Indicators (SPPIs, Indicators), including SPPI 3 Assessment.

Indicator 3: Statewide Assessments is a four-part indicator on the Local Level Annual Performance Report (APR) that measures the participation rate and achievement level of all students with disabilities in the areas of both English language arts (ELA) and mathematics (math) as it pertains to the requirements of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). The local education agency (LEA) reports this data to the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) from the Spring 2018 assessment.

For participation in statewide assessments for English language arts and math, the APR target of 95% will be used. Any LEA with a percentage less than the statewide target for SPPI 3 participation for English language arts or mathematics will participate in the PIR.

For achievement on the statewide assessments in English language arts and math, the 2018 Fall Dashboard Release (Dashboard) in English Language Arts (3-8) and Mathematics (3-8) will be used instead of the achievement rates reported on the APR. Any LEA with a performance level of Red or Orange for English language arts or mathematics for students with disabilities, as listed on the Student Groups Five-by-Five Report will participate in the PIR and be required to develop a PIR Improvement Plan for that indicator.

Current Performance

According to California School Dashboard Fall 2018 and Annual Performance Report 2017–18

Indicator 3: Assessment

ACHIEVEMENT

Using the data from the LEA's California School Dashboard, Fall 2018 (Dashboard), fill in the LEA information for English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) and Mathematics (Grades 3-8 and 11) for

students with disabilities. The questions below will use the detailed data from the Student Groups Five-by-Five Report in English language arts assessment for students with disabilities.

English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) (Achievement)

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan for the LEA, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

The following questions will focus on achievement in English language arts on statewide assessments and use data from the Five-by-Five Report on the Dashboard to complete.

Directions to Access the Five-by-Five Report for English Language Arts

The Five-by-Five English Language Arts Placement Report (Grades 3-8 and 11) will be needed to complete the next section. To get to the detailed report, follow these steps:

1. Open the Fall 2018 California School Dashboard for the LEA, School Performance Overview.
2. Select "View Additional Reports" in the upper right hand corner. This will bring you to a new screen, "School Dashboard Additional Reports and Data."
3. Choose "5x5 English Language Arts Placement Report (Grades 3-8 and 11)" by clicking the radio button and click the Submit button.

For small districts and charter schools, the new screen will be the "Student Group Five-by-Five Placement Report."

For multi-school districts, this new screen will be the "Schools Five-by-Five Placement."

- a. If the LEA is a multi-school district, add the following step to get to the Five-by-Five Report for student groups:

On this new screen, select the link, "View Student Groups Five-by-Five Report" in upper right hand corner.

4. Select "View Detailed Data," in the top right-hand corner.
5. On the vertical axis of this chart, find Students with Disabilities to answer the following questions:

What is the student performance color for English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) for Students with Disabilities?

Orange

What is the Status Level (e.g. Very High, Low, etc.) for English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) for Students with Disabilities?

Very Low

What is the Change Level (e.g. Increased, Declined, etc.) for English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) for Students with Disabilities?

Increased
Significantly

What is the Current Status -- Average distance from Standard for English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) Students with Disabilities)?

-84

What is the Change – Difference (e.g. + or – average # of points) between current status and prior status for English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) Students with Disabilities (e.g. + or - # of points)?

21.9

In addressing the root cause(s) for achievement for students with disabilities on the statewide assessment in English Language Arts, what area(s) from the Five-by-Five Report need to be included? (Put an 'X' in the appropriate box to indicate which area LEA will need to address for English Language Arts Achievement. If English Language Arts Achievement is an area that the LEA does **not** need to address at all, put NA in all of the boxes.)

English Language Arts Achievement

Status Level	Change Level	Both
X		

Mathematics (3-8 and 11) (Achievement)

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan for the LEA, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

The following questions will focus on achievement in Mathematics on statewide assessments and use data from the Five-by-Five Report on the Dashboard to complete.

Directions to Access the Five-by-Five Report for Mathematics

The Five-by-Five Mathematics Placement Report (Grades 3-8 and 11) will be needed to complete the next section. To get to the detailed report, follow these steps:

- 1. Open the Fall 2018 California School Dashboard for the LEA, School Performance Overview.*
- 2. Select "View Additional Reports" in the upper right hand corner. This will bring you to a new screen, "School Dashboard Additional Reports and Data."*
- 3. Choose "5x5 Mathematics Placement Report (Grades 3-8 and 11)" by clicking the radio button and click the Submit button.*

For small districts and charter schools, the new screen will be the "Student Group Five-by-Five Placement Report."

For multi-school districts, this new screen will be the "Schools Five-by-Five Placement."

- a. If the LEA is a multi-school district, add the following step to get to the Five-by-Five Report for student groups:*

On this new screen, select the link, “View Student Groups Five-by-Five Report” in upper right hand corner.

4. Select “View Detailed Data,” in the top right-hand corner.
5. On the vertical axis of this chart, find Students with Disabilities to answer the following questions:

What is the student performance color for Mathematics (3-8 and 11) for Students with Disabilities?

Orange

What is the Status Level (e.g. Very High, Low, etc.) for Mathematics (3-8 and 11) for Students with Disabilities?

Very Low

What is the Change Level (e.g. Increased, Declined, etc.) for Mathematics (3-8 and 11) for Students with Disabilities?

Increased

What is the Current Status -- Average distance from Standard (e.g. + or – average # of points) for Students with Disabilities in Mathematics (3-8 and 11)?

-107.9

What is the Change – Difference between current status and prior status Students with Disabilities (e.g. + or - # of points) for Mathematics (3-8 and 11)?

14.6

In addressing the root cause(s) for achievement for students with disabilities on the statewide assessment in Mathematics, what area(s) from the Five-by-Five Report need to be included? (Put an ‘X’ in the appropriate box to indicate which area LEA will need to address for Mathematics Achievement. If Mathematics Achievement is an area that the LEA does not need to address at all, put NA in all of the boxes.)

Mathematics Achievement

Status Level	Change Level	Both
X		

PARTICIPATION

Using the data from the 2017–18 Local Level Annual Performance Report Measure (APR), answer the questions below. The Participation Target for students with disabilities in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math is 95 percent. Indicate the LEA percentage for both English Language Arts and Math.

English Language Arts (Participation)

The following questions will focus on participation arts on statewide assessments in English Language Arts and use data from the APR to complete.

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan for the LEA, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

What is the participation rate (Rate) of students with disabilities in English Language Arts assessment?

N/A

Participation Target

>95%

Was the participation target met in English Language Arts? (Answer 'Yes' or 'No.')

N/A

Mathematics (Participation)

The following questions will focus on participation arts on statewide assessments in Mathematics and use data from the APR to complete.

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan for the LEA, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

What is the participation rate (Rate) of students with disabilities in Mathematics?

N/A

Participation Target

>95%

Was the participation target met in Mathematics? (Answer 'Yes' or 'No.')

N/A

Focus Elements for Root Cause Analysis and PIR Planning

Using the information from above, complete the chart.

Which of the areas will the PIR Team’s Root Cause Analysis and Improvement Plan address for Indicator 3: Assessment?

(Put an ‘X’ in the appropriate box to indicate which area LEAs will need to address for Indicator 3.)

	English Language Arts	Mathematics
Achievement (Dashboard)	X	X
Participation (APR)		

Current Improvement Strategies

What current improvement strategies are in place that relate to Indicator 3 participation rate in statewide assessments (APR)?

N/A

What current improvement strategies that relate to Indicator 3 achievement (Dashboard):

Santa Monica Boulevard Community Charter School implements a cohesive instructional program rooted in providing children with a systematic response, time on task, access to resources, and results that measure progress. This strategic instructional program requires a multi-tiered model of instructional delivery responding to the individual need of each child. A cohesive instructional program consists of both systematic teacher practices and reflective leadership practices.

Systematic teacher practices of a cohesive instructional program include: **1) Use of Standards Based Curriculum; 2) Universal Screening; 3) Progress Monitoring; and 4) Tiered Interventions.** The systematic practices are rooted in researched based components to effectively improve the academic achievement of students with disabilities.

1) Use of Standards Based Curriculum

A cohesive instructional program is rooted in equipping all students with the appropriate grade level curriculum. Teachers present information through a personalized delivery of instruction to meet the needs of their students. Granting students a reliable high quality instruction helps bridge the gap in cultural capital between students of low and high socioeconomic status. A systematic approach begins with the child’s classroom teacher and a relationship that builds a connection to the child. It is at this point where a child learns about success or failure. By providing all children with best practices and standards based curriculum, the child will begin the path to a successful academic experience.

2) Universal Screening

The second core component of a systematic approach is a method for the universal screening of students to establish baseline data. Universal screening will be most effective when teachers use these assessment measures to guide their instruction and inform their practice. Universal screening enables teachers to identify strengths and weaknesses of student learning and of their own ability to deliver instruction in a concrete manner for student understanding.

3) Progress Monitoring

Progress monitoring is an extension of universal screening and is used by classroom teachers and support personnel to monitor student progress of students who show signs of struggling with proficiency. Frequent data collection enables teachers to monitor student growth between summative assessments. This formative assessment tool not only documents student progress, but also enables the teacher and student to understand what instructional methods are successful on an individual basis. If a student is not successful with the current intervention in place, the teacher is able to adjust instruction to accommodate student need. Schools implementing a systematic approach to progress monitoring have shown evidence of being able to ignite a culture of continuous improvement.

4) Tiered Intervention

Problem solving is a necessary component of the tiered intervention approach. It is composed of four basic steps: 1) Define the problem; 2) Analyze why it is happening; 3) Develop a plan to solve the problem; 4) Evaluate if the plan worked. The problem solving approach begins to transcend into the reflective nature of a cohesive instructional program by analyzing the systematic approaches using standards based curriculum, universal screening, progress monitoring, and tiered intervention.

Reflective leadership practices required for implementation of a cohesive instructional program include: **5) Commitment; 6) Professional Development; 7) Leadership; and 8) Harmony with Special Education.** These practices are reflective of the organic nature of schools and the learners within them.

5) Commitment

Frequently missing from the implementation of a cohesive instructional program is the critical component of commitment. Most of the research on systematic instructional practices validates and supports its success, but often lacks the need to have teacher buy in. A successful instructional program requires the empowering of school members with inquiry into their own practice to stimulate growth and commitment to the instructional approach. Creating an atmosphere of trust and collaboration enables change and empowers commitment to the new practice.

6) Professional Development

Professional development is fundamental to the implementation of a cohesive instructional program due in large part because it requires a change not only in how teachers think, but what they do. Teachers will be familiar with new change initiatives that require them to change the instruments in which they teach, but they typically do not alter their fundamental practice of teaching. A cohesive instructional program is even more complicated because it requires a second order change that exists outside of their current paradigm for meeting the needs of diverse learners. Sustained technical assistance is needed to enact school reform efforts. Allocating time and resources to equip teachers with targeted assistance during professional development helps to ensure the adoption and implementation of research based practices.

7) Leadership

The implementation of a cohesive instructional program requires successful and strong leadership by administration and lead teachers. A school reform effort flourishes or dwindles based on the ability of school leadership to ensure the goals are put into practice. A successful and strong leadership team will be able to establish a positive climate for student learning, provide professional development, manage resources, and provide accountability to ensure action is in alignment with what is espoused.

8) General Education and Special Education Partnerships

A strong trusting relationship with the special education support staff and general education staff is fundamental for the successful implementation of a cohesive instructional program. This harmony enables schools to implement a system of early interventions to students in the manner that works to meet their individual needs. A harmony between special education staff and general education classroom teachers is vital to share their collective expertise on assessment, instruction, and strategies to provide an equitable education to all students.

Check the box(es) to indicate whether these current strategies support improvement in English Language Arts, Math or both and whether they support improvement in participation, achievement or both.

(Put an 'X' in the appropriate box to indicate which areas are being addressed by current improvement strategies.)

	English Language Arts	Mathematics
Participation (APR)		
Achievement (Dashboard)	x	x

How are students with disabilities included in the above-listed strategies or other strategies that relate to Indicator 3?

Santa Monica Boulevard Charter School employs a strategic instructional program to increase student achievement among students with disabilities. This program enables a cohesive team to implement procedural steps based on diagnostic feedback, use of scientifically-based curriculum, frequent progress monitoring, modification of instruction based on student outcomes, and instructional delivery based on outcomes of the intervention in place.

Root Cause(s)

Why was the target not met?

Achievement – English Language Arts and Mathematics (3-8 and 11)

Fill in the root causes below for the Root Cause Analysis on Achievement, based on the data from the LEA's California School Dashboard, Fall 2018 (Dashboard) in English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) and/or Mathematics (3-8 and 11).

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

Root Cause 1:

Professional Development: Professional Development opportunities have not specifically addressed the needs of students with disabilities. Continual professional development is needed to ensure that a targeted and cohesive instructional program is implemented to meet the needs of all students. A significant amount of time has been spent in the area of professional development. However, the majority of this time has been focused on compliance, monitoring, and the identification of students with disabilities. The Charter School will continue professional development on the implementation of state adopted curriculum, such as Benchmark Advance (ELA/ELD) and My Math, with an emphasis on specific strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

This root cause addresses (Check all that apply): English Language Arts Math Both

Root Cause 2:

Tiered Intervention: The Charter School has done an excellent job monitoring baseline data, summative data, and formative data. However, instruction has not been modified to the greatest extent possible to target specific skills, provide small group instruction, and intensive support. The Charter School will use data to implement tiered interventions to ensure the academic success of students with disabilities.

This root cause addresses (Check all that apply): English Language Arts Math Both

Root Cause 3:

Special Education and General Education Collaboration: Scheduling conflicts have impeded the ability of our special education and general education staff to develop collaborative and cohesive plans to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

This root cause addresses (Check all that apply): English Language Arts Math Both

If the LEA has additional root causes for Achievement, copy and paste the box and subtitle above, then change the number to indicate the number of root causes.

Participation – English Language Arts and Mathematics (3-8 and 11)

Fill in the information below for the Root Cause Analysis on Participation, based on the data from the 2017–18 Local Level Annual Performance Report (APR).

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan for the LEA, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

Root Cause 1:

N/A

This root cause addresses (Check all that apply): English Language Arts Math Both

Root Cause 2:

N/A

This root cause addresses (Check all that apply): English Language Arts Math Both

Root Cause 3:

N/A

This root cause addresses (Check all that apply): English Language Arts Math Both

If the LEA has additional root causes for Participation, copy and paste the box and subtitle above, then change the number to indicate the number of root causes.

Action Plan for Improving Schoolwide Assessment for Students with Disabilities

ACHIEVEMENT – English Language Arts and Mathematics (3-8 and 11)

Use the charts below for the PIR Team’s Root Cause Analysis and PIR Planning, using the data from the LEA’s California School Dashboard, Fall 2018 (Dashboard) in English Language Arts (3-8 and 11) and/or Mathematics (3-8 and 11).

Copy each root cause into the charts below that addresses the LEA’s achievement rate for students with disabilities on the statewide assessments in English Language Arts and Mathematics. For each root cause, fill in the following:

- Planned strategies and activities
- The subject the planned strategy or activity is targeting (English language arts, math or both)
- Resources needed for the planned strategy or activity to be successful
- The person(s) and title(s) responsible for that particular strategy or activity
- The methods and standards that will be used to measure the relative success of the strategy or activity
- The date that activity is due to begin or the deadline for its completion

Add rows to the chart to input additional strategies/activities, etc. as needed.

If this is an area that does not apply to this year’s PIR Plan for the LEA, enter ‘N/A’ into the blanks.

Root Cause 1:

Professional Development

Planned Strategies/Activities	ELA, Math or Both	Resources Required	Person(s)/ Title(s) Responsible	Methods/ Standards to Measure Success	Due Date
-------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------

<p>1. Identify research findings, specific programs or components of existing programs to provide professional development in order to target the needs of students with disabilities in ELA and Math.</p>	<p>Both</p>	<p>Benchmark ELA Training</p> <p>My Math Training</p> <p>Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) Training</p> <p>Kagan Professional Development</p>	<p>David Riddick, Chief Academic Officer</p> <p>Cary Rabinowitz, Director</p> <p>Beth Henschel, SPED Lead Teacher</p> <p>Caroline Engel, General Education Lead Teacher</p>	<p>2-3% Increase in students that scored At or Above the 41st %tile on the Middle Of Year MAP assessment in ELA and Math</p> <p>SPED Subgroup will increase in the Status Level and Change Level as measure by the CA Dashboard</p>	<p>January 24, 2020</p>
--	-------------	---	---	--	-------------------------

Root Cause 2:

Tiered Intervention

Planned Strategies/Activities	ELA, Math or Both	Resources Required	Person(s)/ Title(s) Responsible	Methods/ Standards to Measure Success	Due Date
-------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------

<p>2. Compile effective strategies considering developmental needs of students and grade level standards to provide students with tiered intervention lessons and activities to maximize student learning.</p>	<p>Both</p>	<p>Shared Google Drive Folder to Place Strategies</p> <p>Classroom Visits to Observe Best Practices</p> <p>Attend Professional Development Sessions</p>	<p>David Riddick, Chief Academic Officer</p> <p>Leticia Padilla Para, Director</p> <p>Beth Henschel, SPED Lead Teacher</p> <p>Caroline Engel, General Education Lead Teacher</p> <p>Angie Castellana Ferri and Teresa Elvira, FCPS Instructional Coaches</p>	<p>Results of Staff Satisfaction Survey Above 85%</p> <p>2-3% Increase in students that scored At or Above the 41st %tile on the Middle Of Year MAP assessment in ELA and Math</p> <p>SPED Subgroup will increase in the Status Level and Change Level as measure by the CA Dashboard</p>	<p>January 24, 2020</p>
--	-------------	---	--	--	-------------------------

Root Cause 3:

Special Education and General Education Collaboration:

<p>Planned Strategies/Activities</p>	<p>ELA, Math or Both</p>	<p>Resources Required</p>	<p>Person(s)/ Title(s) Responsible</p>	<p>Methods/ Standards to Measure Success</p> <p>Results of Staff Satisfaction Survey Above 85%</p>	<p>Due Date</p>
---	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	---	---	------------------------

<p>Conduct staff surveys to determine best practices to avoid scheduling conflicts for SPED and General Education meetings.</p> <p>Calendar specific times for SPED and General Education meetings to review the academic progress of students.</p> <p>Identify specific areas of interest from SPED and General Education staff to model and observe one another teacher.</p>	<p>Both</p>	<p>Full-day of collaborative work with all Lead Teachers (General Education and SPED)</p> <p>Classroom Visits to Observe Best Practices</p>	<p>David Riddick, Chief Academic Officer</p> <p>Judy Werner, Special Education Coordinator</p> <p>Leticia Padilla Para, Director</p> <p>Beth Henschel, SPED Lead Teacher</p> <p>Caroline Engel, General Education Lead Teacher</p> <p>Angie Castellana Ferri and Teresa Elvira, FCPS Instructional Coaches</p>	<p>2-3% Increase in students that scored At or Above the 41st %tile on the Middle Of Year MAP assessment in ELA and Math</p> <p>SPED Subgroup will increase in the Status Level and Change Level as measure by the CA Dashboard</p>	<p>January 24, 2020</p>
--	--------------------	---	--	--	-------------------------

Add rows to the chart to input additional strategies/activities, etc. as needed.

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan for the LEA, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

PARTICIPATION – English Language Arts and Mathematics (3-8 and 11)

Use the charts below for the PIR Team's Root Cause Analysis and PIR Planning, using the data from the 2017–18 Local Level Annual Performance Report Measure (APR).

Copy each root cause into the charts below that addresses the LEA's participation rate for students with disabilities on the statewide assessments in English Language Arts and Math. For each root cause, fill in the following:

- *Planned strategies and activities*

- The subject the planned strategy or activity is targeting (English Language Arts, Math or both)
- Resources needed for the planned strategy or activity to be successful
- The person(s) and title(s) responsible for that particular strategy or activity
- The methods and standards that will be used to measure the relative success of the strategy or activity
- The date that activity is due to begin or the deadline for its completion

Add rows to the chart to input additional strategies/activities, etc., as needed.

If this is an area that does not apply to this year's PIR Plan for the LEA, enter 'N/A' into the blanks.

Root Cause 1:

N/A

Planned Strategies/Activities	ELA, Math or Both	Resources Required	Person(s)/ Title(s) Responsible	Methods/ Standards to Measure Success	Due Date

Root Cause 2:

N/A

Planned Strategies/Activities	ELA, Math or Both	Resources Required	Person(s)/ Title(s) Responsible	Methods/ Standards to Measure Success	Due Date

Root Cause 3:

N/A

Planned Strategies/Activities	ELA, Math or Both	Resources Required	Person(s)/ Title(s) Responsible	Methods/ Standards to Measure Success	Due Date

If the LEA has additional root causes, copy and paste the chart, then change the number to indicate the number of root causes. If there are additional Planned Strategies/Activities, add additional rows, as needed.

After completing Indicator 3: Assessment, save this document with other PIR documents. If it has not already been done, complete the initial LEA Identification document. Then, complete the documents that correspond to the Indicators in which the LEA has not met the performance measure or target. Each Indicator will have a separate document.

It is recommended that the full PIR Plan be presented to the Local Board.

Once all of the Indicators and Child Find have been addressed, as indicated in the LEA's PIR letter, and added to the PIR Plan, LEA will send the PIR Plan documents to the SELPA for their review of required elements. Be aware of any deadlines set by the SELPA. The SELPA will send the PIR Plan, which includes all of the forms for each indicator and the LEA Identification document, to the California Department of Education, Special Education Division, FMTA II on or before June 30, 2019.

Prepared by California Department of Education February 2019