

The Single Plan for Student Achievement and Local Educational Agency Plan

LUCERNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

17 64048 6010656
CDS Code

Date of this revision: February 2013

The *Single Plan for Student Achievement* (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index. California *Education Code* sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program Improvement into the *Single Plan for Student Achievement*.

The *Local Educational Agency Plan* (LEAP) is a district level plan required by NCLB, which covers all of the same topics addressed in the SPSA and describes how the district will support its schools. Since Lucerne is a single school district, it makes sense to consolidate these two documents into one document.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person: Mike Brown
Position: Superintendent/Principal
Telephone Number: (707) 274-5578
Address: 3351 Country Club Drive
Lucerne, CA 95458
E-mail Address: mbrown@lucerne.k12.ca.us

The SSC/DAC approved this revision
On 2/7/13.

The District Governing Board
approved this revision
On 2/13/13.

Form A: Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The school site council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet API and AYP growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of student groups not meeting state standards:

SCHOOL GOAL: To continue to increase the percentage of students performing Proficient or Above on state standards-based tests so that this percentage, in English Language Arts and Mathematics, rises over the next year in each subject area.	
Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: Lucerne Elementary serves a population that tends to be rather homogenously white and socio-economically disadvantaged; therefore, all our goals are for the whole school. No other subgroups comprise a number of students sufficient to report on as a group.	Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Growth in percent Proficient/Advanced over one year in English Language Arts and Math as measured by the CST's. All groups will meet API growth targets.
Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Consistent use of curriculum embedded assessments on a schedule determined by pacing calendars. Twice monthly staff meetings to discuss details of student performance on curriculum-embedded assessments aimed at: 1) planning for maximally effective lesson design, 2) planning for interventions to support students based on individual diagnosis. Yearly staff and SSC meetings to review overall progress and determine best use of resources to meet goals.	Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: 1. District summative and cluster assessments. 2. Curriculum embedded assessments from: a. English Language Arts interventions programs currently used for at risk students: (Read Naturally, Accelerated Reader, Standards Plus, Bellwork) b. Houghton Mifflin embedded assessments in English Language Arts for grades K-5 and McDougal Littell for grades 6-8 c. Macmillan/McGraw-Hill, K-5 and McDougal Littell, 6-8 d. STAR benchmark e. Standards Plus Assessments

As required by NCLB, the Action Plan below addresses the fundamental teaching and learning needs of the school and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students. The actions include several major research-based strategies, including:

- A reading intervention teacher provides individual and group instruction designed to meet individual needs and motivate students. Work with staff to review and analyze student achievement data. Model, co-teach, and coach for implementation of exemplary instruction practices. Foster continuous reading improvement.
- Regular planning based on curriculum-embedded and student based benchmark assessments.

These actions were chosen because we believe they have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in meeting state standards.

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. Implement a comprehensive staff development plan that is directed at identified goals for increased student performance	Fall 2006 (ongoing as needed)	Tim Gill - LCOE		
a. Provide refresher training on Character Counts.	Ongoing as needed	Extra duty pay	\$1,000.00	Title II – Staff Development Reform (B-Back)
b. Revise pacing calendars for math and ELA	Ongoing as needed			
c. Conduct 6-8 week meetings to discuss results of embedded assessments and create standards based, quarterly benchmark assessments in ELA and math	Wing meetings need to be held every 6 to 8 weeks	Tim Gill		
d. Common Core Standards	Ongoing	Professional Development	\$1000.00	Title I
e. Provide ongoing training and support to CELDT Coordinator and key staff in order to assess and target the needs of ELL students.	Ongoing	Laura Ewing - Stipend Professional Development	\$500.00 \$1,000.00	EIA Title II/EIA
f. Provide and prioritize all possible interventions for ELL students including the learning center.	Ongoing	Mike Brown, Laura Ewing		

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>g. Provide coaching to support instruction that is specifically targeted to goals identified by student needs. Current coaching needs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • examination of delivery of ELA and Math instruction in light of most recent cluster test results • coherence in the delivery of the writing initiative • support for new teachers • support for uniform delivery of coherent discipline approach (see below) 	Ongoing	Release time Cost for substitutes Coaching Peer	\$1,200.00	Title II
h. Hire classroom teacher(s) to reduce class size in grades K-8.	August 2012	Classroom teacher-salary	\$80,911.00	Title I
i. Provide professional development in area of autism to address specific need of these students in meeting the above goals.	Fall 2011	Doreen Walstad regular and release time	\$2,000.00	PL 194
2. Train instructional aides to effectively implement Read Naturally, Study Island, Standards Plus, Bellworks and any newly identified intervention strategies and to collect valid results from assessments.	Ongoing	Yearly cost of program (Study Island) Release Time	\$2,200.00 \$270.00	REAP Title II
3. Aides will be updated on Character Counts.	September (annually)	On site trainer – Christa No subs needed	No Cost	
4. Each year new programs will be reviewed to see if their use makes a difference.	Regularly	No cost		
5. Use expectations for student writing to increase overall English Language Arts competence.	Ongoing as needed	On site trainer No cost		
a. Increase the usefulness of the current district writing assessments by recalibrating scoring and revising scoring rubrics as deemed necessary.				

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
b. Provide time for staff to score writing samples and discuss those results, along with data from embedded assessments in ELA and Math, on a 6-8 week basis.	Regularly	No cost		Title II
c. Provide staff development to make it possible for the entire staff to systematically provide instruction that uses resources from the 4 Square Writing Program, and other appropriate writing to supplement core materials in writing.	Regularly	Professional Development	\$1,200.00	
d. Systematically employ writing as a means of note-taking, summarizing, and demonstrating competence in lessons aimed at language arts, science, social studies, and mathematics standards. Include discussion of this work in regular 6-8 week data meetings.	Ongoing	No cost		
6. Increase effectiveness of instruction by increasing time-on-task and reducing interruptions due to discipline events.				
a. Objectively record time-on-task in classrooms and use this data as part of the coaching/lesson design work.	Regularly	Peer to Peer		Title II
b. Review procedures and intent of Character Counts. Systematically reinforce the messages in it, by training all staff (certificated as well as classified) to deliver a consistent message throughout the student's entire day.	Regularly	Substitute for Christa Mott	\$180.00	
c. Discuss appropriate means of evaluating the success of this effort, collect and examine evidence as agreed. Adjust, monitor and coach this effort.	Regularly			
d. Develop and implement Incentive Program for students.	Regularly Ongoing	Stipend CC Coordinator/ Leadership, Incentives Videos/Curriculum	\$1,000.00 \$500.00	EIA LBG

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
e. Develop program to teach tolerance, diversity and respect for all. (Second Step, Friendship Groups, Life Skills)	Regularly	Jennifer Nielson	\$480.00	EIA/Tier III
7. Analyze performance in ELA and Math across the strands in CST data to determine which areas should be the focus for improvement each year.	August, yearly	See Page 3		
8. Analyze currently available interventions designed to support students who are not proficient in terms of the current processes for service delivery and also in terms of the gains in student achievement shown by students served in each program. Continue to fund successful programs. Investigate how to best use new categorical funding available each year to increase intervention structures in a coherent manner. Currently, the district funds the following interventions: Classified staff in classrooms (Title I) Classified staff in Special Education After School Tutoring (SES services) PRO Reading Read Naturally – targeting 3 rd -8 th grade below ASES afterschool program for kindergarten Standards plus reading intervention / Accelerated Reader Bell works 7 th -8 th Intervention teacher Intervention aide	August, yearly	Salary and benefits Salary and benefits Salary and benefits/Stipend Program costs Books and Materials Books and Materials	\$65,000.00 \$10,000.00 \$2,800.00 \$1000.00 \$2500.00 \$600.00 \$1,000.00	Title I, EIA Sp.Ed, PI 194, Title I REAP EIA GATE EIA
	2013 2013	Salary and benefits Salary	\$80,000.00 \$12,000.00	EIA Title I
9. New students will be introduced to the school in a systematic way. Students will be taken on a school tour and introduced to the Character Counts program. Testing using the San Diego Quick Test and Accelerated Reader will be conducted to give the classroom teacher information about student achievement. Kids will be assigned buddies who will help welcome new students.	As needed, throughout the year	No cost Kindergarten Teacher		

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
10. Each year, collect a list of supplies and materials needed to provide teachers the resources to implement interventions. Purchase these.	Every June	Estimate cost for each year's list	\$8,000.00	EIA/REAP/Gen.
11. Implement RTI in grades K-2 to target students needing early intervention.	As needed	Assessment grading and reporting	\$80.00	EIA
12. Increase Parent Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Literacy Nights • Effective Communication (SST, Parent Conferences, Newsletters, Progress Notes) • School Site Council • Open House/Back-To-School Night • School Plays • Title I Parent Meetings • Web Site • Booster Club 	Ongoing	Principal Supplies and Materials	\$1,000.00	EIA EIA/Tier III/Title I
13. Develop and Implement Strategic Intervention Instruction/SII in grades K-3 to address targeted ELA strategies and math (K-8)	Ongoing			

Form B: Centralized Support for Planned Improvements in Student Performance

Lucerne Elementary is a single school district. Therefore, there is no essential difference between site support and centralized support.

Form C: Programs Included in this Plan

Check the box for each state and federal categorical program in which the school participates and, if applicable, enter amounts allocated. (The plan must describe the activities to be conducted at the school for each of the state and federal categorical program in which the school participates. If the school receives funding, then the plan must include the proposed expenditures.)

State Programs	Allocation
Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education <u>Purpose:</u> Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program.	\$ 62,374.00
List and Describe Other State or Local funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education-GATE)	\$ 7,957.00
Tier III "Flexed" Programs: Per board resolution, funding for the following unrestricted programs will be used for any educational purpose.	
Professional Development Block Grant	\$13,751.00
Pupil Retention Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Prevent students from dropping out of school.	\$51,058.00
School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant <u>Purpose:</u> Improve library and other school programs.	\$25,647.00
Peer Assistance and Review <u>Purpose:</u> Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring.	\$2,048.00
School Safety and Violence Prevention Act <u>Purpose:</u> Increase school safety.	\$4,162.00
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school	\$166,997.00

Federal Programs under No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	Allocation
Title I, Neglected <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement instruction for children abandoned, abused, or neglected who have been placed in an institution	\$ N/A
Title I, Part D: Delinquent <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement instruction for delinquent youth	\$ N/A
Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program <u>Purpose:</u> Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	\$141,795.00
Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program <u>Purpose:</u> Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency	\$ N/A
Title I, Part A: Program Improvement <u>Purpose:</u> Assist Title I schools that have failed to meet NCLB adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets for one or more identified student groups	\$ N/A
Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting <u>Purpose:</u> Improve and increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals	\$ 19,346.00
ARRA Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology <u>Purpose:</u> Support professional development and the use of technology	\$ N/A
Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students <u>Purpose:</u> Supplement language instruction to help limited-English-proficient (LEP) students attain English proficiency and meet academic performance standards	\$ N/A
Title VI, Part B: Rural Education Achievement <u>Purpose:</u> Provide flexibility in the use of NCLB funds to eligible LEAs	\$11,638.00
Total amount of federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$73,996.00
Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$246,775.00

Form D: School Site Council Membership

Education Code Section 64001(g) requires that the SPSA be reviewed and updated at least annually, including proposed expenditures of funds allocated to the through the Consolidated Application, by the school site council. The current make-up of the school site council is as follows:

Names of Members	Principal	Classroom Teacher	Other School Staff	Parent or Community Member
Mike Brown	X			
Nick Esposti				X
Rosa Wilkie				X
Julia Portlock				X
Andrea Saldaña				X
Molly Belveal				X
Rosa Pulido			X	
Ron Hale		X		
Stella Winckler		X		
Kathy Hughes		X		
Numbers of members of each category	1	3	1	5

Form E: Recommendations and Assurances

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

1. The school site council is correctly constituted and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.
2. The school site council reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the school plan requiring board approval.
3. The school site council sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan (**Check those that apply**):

☒ School Advisory Committee for State Compensatory Education Programs

☐ English Learner Advisory Committee

☐ Community Advisory Committee for Special Education Programs

☐ Gifted and Talented Education Program Advisory Committee

☐ Other

Lucerne Elementary serves a population of about 250 students. This population has remained, over time, fairly homogeneous in this respect: it rarely contains as many as 10 students (the threshold that triggers group reporting on the state website) in any subgroup other than white and socio-economically disadvantaged. Thus, the only group convened to plan for Lucerne Elementary is the School Site Council.

4. The school site council reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this *Single Plan for Student Achievement* and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the LEA Plan.
5. This school plan 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.
6. This school plan was adopted by the school site council at a public meeting on: _____.

Attested:

Mike Brown
School principal

Signature of school principal

Date

SSC chairperson

Signature of SSC chairperson

Date

**LOCAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN
ASSURANCE PAGE**

LEA Plan Information:

Name of Local Educational Agency:

Lucerne Elementary School District

County District Code:

17-64048

Date of Local Governing Board Approval:

District Superintendent:

Michael V. Brown

Address:

3351 Country Club Drive; PO Box 1083

City:

Lucerne

Zip Code:

95458

Phone:

(707) 274-5578

FAX:

(707) 274-9865

E-mail:

mbrown@lucerne.k12.ca.us

Signatures:

Participants included in the preparation of this Local Educational Agency Plan Addendum:

Signature of Superintendent

Mike Brown

Printed Name of Superintendent

Date

Signature of Board President

Mark Sadler

Printed Name of Board President

Date

Table 1: Academic Performance by Subgroup in English Language Arts

		All Students					Whites					Socio-economically Disadvantaged				
		08	09	10	11	12	08	09	10	11	12	08	09	10	11	12
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#	83	98	91	94	70	61	82	67	63	47	51	69	64	69	60
	%	41%	47.5%	47.6%	56.3%	49%	37.3%	51.5%	52%	54.7%	49.4%	32.4%	44.2%	44.4%	52.2%	48.7%
Number and Percent At Basic	#	61	50	58	44	35										
	%	30%	24.3%	30%	26.3%	25%										
Number and Percent at Below Basic	#	48	36	27	19	21										
	%	23%	17.5%	14%	11.4%	15%										
Number and Percent at Far Below Basic	#	14	22	16	10	16										
	%	7%	10.7%	8.3%	6%	11%										

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. After consistent growth for the past 4 years, 2012 showed a decline in students scoring proficient or above.
2. Lucerne Elementary has only two subgroups that have enough students to be considered “significant” in state reporting. With the exception of 2008, the performance of these groups, Whites and Socio-economically Disadvantaged, is very similar to the performance of All Students. Beginning in 2010 the socio-economically disadvantaged subgroup is beginning to have a noticeable achievement gap. In 2012 the socio-economically disadvantaged student scores grew to be within 1% of the other two groups.

* Results on this table differ from those on Table 3, which also shows English Language Arts results, in that this table is taken from state reports that reflect the achievement of only those students who are included in the state and federal accountability system, where as those on Table 3 represent all students who were tested. Some students are excluded from the state/federal accountability system because they move during the year, or have not been taught in a school in the USA for a year.

Table 2: Academic Performance by Subgroup in Mathematics

		All Students					Whites					Socio-economically Disadvantaged				
		08	09	10	11	12	08	09	10	11	12	08	09	10	11	12
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#	90	85	103	90	72	70	71	68	60	50	60	59	78	69	63
	%	45%	41.7%	54.4%	53%	50%	43%	45.2%	53%	51.2%	51.5%	38%	37.8%	54%	51%	50.4%
Number and Percent At Basic	#	60	47	43	35	36										
	%	29%	23%	22%	21%	25%										
Number and Percent at Below Basic	#	41	44	35	36	29										
	%	20%	21.5%	18%	21%	20%										
Number and Percent at Far Below Basic	#	12	28	10	8	7										
	%	6%	13.7%	5%	5%	5%										

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. The size of the Far Below Basic and Basic groups has diminished.
2. 2012 showed a slight drop in students scoring proficient or above.
3. Lucerne Elementary has only two subgroups that have enough students to be considered “significant” in state reporting. The performance of these groups, Whites and Socio-economically Disadvantaged, is very similar to the performance of All Students. The Socio-economically disadvantaged subgroup outscored white by 1% in 2010.

* Results on this table differ from those on Table 3, which also shows Mathematics results, in that this table is taken from state reports that reflect the achievement of only those students who are included in the state and federal accountability system, where as those on Table 3 include all students who were tested. Some students are excluded from the state/federal accountability system because the move during the year, or have not been taught in a school in the USA for a year.

Table 3: Academic Performance by Grade Level in English Language Arts

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX (API) DATA BY GRADE FOR LUCERNE ELEMENTARY STUDENTS																				
		Grade: 2			Grade: 3			Grade: 4			Grade: 5			Grade: 6			Grade: 7			Grade: 8		
		10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#	16	11	8	15	12	11	17	17	9	12	14	15	10	10	9	14	10	10	7	20	8
	%	61 %	39 %	43 %	63 %	63 %	43 %	65 %	81 %	47 %	46 %	66 %	71 %	35 %	41 %	47 %	37 %	43 %	50 %	28 %	64 %	45 %
Number and Percent At Basic	#	9	9	4	7	4	10	6	4	6	6	5	4	8	9	4	12	5	4	9	8	3
	%	35 %	32 %	21 %	30 %	21 %	38 %	23 %	19 %	32 %	22 %	24 %	19 %	29 %	38 %	21 %	35 %	22 %	20 %	38 %	26 %	17 %
Number and Percent Below Basic	#	1	4	4	2	3	2	3	0	2	3	1	1	7	2	4	4	7	3	7	2	5
	%	4 %	14 %	21 %	9 %	16 %	8 %	12 %	0 %	11 %	12 %	5 %	5 %	24 %	8 %	21 %	12 %	30 %	15 %	29 %	6 %	28 %
Number and Percent Far Below Basic	#	0	4	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	5	1	1	0	3	2	5	1	3	2	1	2
	%	0 %	14 %	16 %	0 %	0 %	12 %	0 %	0 %	11 %	19 %	5 %	5 %	0 %	13 %	11 %	15 %	4 %	15 %	8 %	3 %	11 %

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. We have looked at change in grade level performance by following each class from one year to the next as they move up through the grades. Because of our high mobility, we decided to look at matched scores on the same students from one year to the next. Patterns we saw in this data lead us to fund a Reading Intervention Teacher beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.
2. We have strong percentages of students at Proficient or Advanced at most grade levels.
3. We also have significant percentages of students at Basic at all grade levels, making it likely that we can continue to move more students into the Proficient and Above category.

Table 4: Academic Performance by Grade Level in Mathematics

API PROFICIENCY LEVEL		ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX (API) DATA BY GRADE FOR LUCERNE ELEMENTARY STUDENTS																				
		Grade: 2			Grade: 3			Grade: 4			Grade: 5			Grade: 6			Grade: 7			Grade: 8		
		10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12
Number (#) and Percent (%) At or Above Proficient	#	22	14	12	21	16	20	21	21	9	11	14	12	9	11	6	14	5	9	4	9	4
	%	85 %	50 %	63 %	91 %	85 %	74 %	81 %	95 %	48 %	41 %	67 %	58 %	24 %	46 %	32 %	40 %	21 %	43 %	16 %	28 %	23 %
Number and Percent At Basic	#	3	6	4	2	2	4	4	0	6	8	5	4	8	4	8	10	7	5	8	11	5
	%	12 %	21 %	21 %	9 %	11 %	15 %	15 %	0 %	32 %	31 %	24 %	19 %	29 %	17 %	42 %	29 %	30 %	24 %	35 %	34 %	28 %
Number and Percent At Below Basic	#	1	7	3	1	1	3	1	1	4	7	2	5	8	8	4	8	8	7	9	9	3
	%	4 %	25 %	16 %	4 %	5 %	11 %	4 %	5 %	21 %	27 %	10 %	24 %	28 %	33 %	21 %	24 %	35 %	33 %	39 %	28 %	17 %
Number and Percent At Far Below Basic	#	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	1	1	2	3	0	3	3	6
	%	0 %	4 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	4 %	0 %	0 %	14 %	4 %	5 %	6 %	13 %	0 %	13 %	9 %	33 %

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. There is considerable variability in Mathematics achievement between grade levels.
2. All of our 8th grade students were enrolled in Algebra last year. The Algebra course is extremely challenging. Passing Algebra in 8th grade puts a student on track to enter college.
3. Math achievement is higher than ELA achievement.
4. Additional support needed in ELA (Reading Intervention Teacher).

Table 5: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																							
	All Students				White				Hispanic				English Learners				Socio-economically Disadvantaged				Students w/Disabilities			
	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12
Participation Rate	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
Number At or Above Proficient	88	86	89	63	75	63	57	43	*	14	20	11	*	*	*	*	59	63	64	54	*	6	9	6
Percent At or Above Proficient	49.2 %	50.6 %	56.3 %	49.2 %	52.8 %	52.9 %	52.3 %	49.4 %	*	41.2 %	64.5 %	50%	*	*	*	*	45 %	49.2 %	52.0 %	50%	*	18.8 %	32.1 %	35.3 %
AYP Target	46 %	56.8 %	67.6 %	78.4 %	46 %	56.8 %	67.6 %	78.4 %	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	46 %	56.8 %	67.6 %	78.4 %	*	*	*	*
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	*	*	*	*

- * Means group is too small to report and/or has no NCLB target

Conclusions indicated by the data:
<p>1. Students with disabilities continue to bring schoolwide AYP% down.</p> <p>2. In 2007 all significant-sized subgroups scored above the federally required target for 2008 of 35.2% Proficient. In 2010 Safe Harbor was missed for all students by less than 1%. 2012 brought drops across the board with all groups except students with disabilities who went up 3% points. Interventions in ELA will be increased including the possibility of a Reading Intervention Teacher.</p>

Table 6: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP																							
	All Students				White				Hispanic				English Learners				Socio-economically Disadvantaged				Students w/Disabilities			
	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12	09	10	11	12
Participation Rate	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
Number At or Above Proficient	80	96	84	66	67	69	54	46	*	17	20	12	*	*	*	*	54	73	63	57	*	9	9	6
Percent At or Above Proficient	44.9 %	56.8 %	53.2 %	51.6 %	47.5 %	58 %	49.5 %	52.9 %	*	50 %	64.5 %	54.5 %	*	*	*	*	41.2 %	57.5 %	51.2 %	52.8 %	*	28.1 %	32.1 %	35.3 %
AYP Target	47.5 %	58 %	68.5 %	79%	47.5 %	58 %	68.5 %	79%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	47.5 %	58 %	68.5 %	79%	*	*	*	*
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	yes	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	*	*	*	*

- * Means group is too small to report

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. Math scores have risen from 7 to 10 points in percent Proficient and Advanced from 2007 to 2010. Our gains over the four year period are consistent and large. 2012 showed two drops and three rises in student groups scoring proficient or above. These scores are particularly impressive when you consider that all 8th grade students are enrolled in Algebra.
2. Our numbers are small, so each child makes a big impact of percentages.

Table 7: Base API, Growth API and Change in Each Year

Year	Base API (Statewide Rank, Similar Schools Rank)	Growth API	Change (Made Target)
1999-2000	634 (6,8)	672	+38 (Yes)
2000-2001	672 (5,8)	701	+29 (Yes)
2001-2002	696 (6,7)	703	+7 (Yes)
2002-2003	670 (5,6)	677	+7 (Yes)
2003-2004	670 (3,4)	672	+2 (No)
2004-2005	669 (3,2)	710	+41 (Yes)
2005-2006	710 (4,3)	714	+ 4 (No)
2006-2007	711 (3,1)	749	+38 (Yes)
2007-2008	749 (3,3)	727	-22 (No)
2008-2009	724 (2,3)	729	+5 (Yes)
2009-2010	728 (3,4)	763	+35 (Yes)
2010-2011	763 (4,7)	784	+21 (Yes)
2011-2012	782	760	-22 (Yes)

Conclusions indicated by the data:

1. Lucerne has made its API growth targets in 5 of our past 8 years. However, dropping statewide ranking and similar schools rankings show that the school is not growing as rapidly as other schools in the state or other schools with similar demographics.
2. Growth in 2006-07 and 2009-2010 was substantial. In 2012, the score of 760 API was sufficient enough to make target, even though it was a substantial drop from 2011.
3. The API scale goes from 200 to 1000. The state has set the goal of having all schools reach 800, which is the point at which the average student at the school makes it into the Proficient range. The difficulty of the student exams is set so that a score in the Proficient range means that the student is ready to enter college and will not need remedial courses. At 760, Lucerne's API is approaching 800.