

Monson-Sultana Jt. Union
Elementary School District

2014 Single Plan for Student Achievement



The Single Plan for Student Achievement Template

School: Monson-Sultana Elementary

District: Monson-Sultana Joint Union Elementary School District

County-District School (CDS) Code: 54-72009

Principal: Roy Woods

Date of this revision: Pending School Site Council Approval January 6, 2015

The Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students. California *Education Code* sections 41507, 41572, and 64001 and the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the ConApp and ESEA Program Improvement into the SPSA.

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

Contact Person: Roy Woods

Position: Superintendent/Principal

Telephone Number: 559-591-1634 ext 115

Address: 10643 Avenue 416
Sultana, CA 93666

E-mail Address: royw@msschool.org

Table of Contents

Legal Specifics for the SPSA	1
SPSA Purpose	2
Needs Assessment	
School and Student Performance Data	3
Analysis of Current Instructional Program	8
Planned Improvements in Student Performance	11
Programs Included in This Plan	24
Single Plan for Student Achievement Annual Evaluation	26
School Site Council Membership	27
Recommendations and Assurances	28
Appendix A: Title I Program Improvement SPSA Reference Guide	29

Legal Specifics for the SPSA

EC Section 64001 specifies that schools and districts that receive state and federal or other applicable funding through the district's Consolidated Application (ConApp) process prepare a SPSA for any recipient school. The SPSA is a blueprint to improve the academic performance of all students. SPSA specifics are also included in the Federal Program Monitoring process.¹

Note: a direct-funded charter school may prepare either a SPSA, a Local Educational Agency Plan (LEAP), or a Single School District (SSD) plan.

EC Section 64001 establishes the following specifics for school plans:

1. School districts must assure that SSCs have developed and approved the SPSA for schools participating in programs funded through the ConApp process and any other school program they choose to include.²
2. Any plans required by programs funded through the ConApp and subject to Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Program Improvement (PI) requirements must be consolidated into a single plan.³ Schools may add other funding sources.
3. The SSC must annually review and update the plan, including proposed expenditures of funds allocated to the school through the ConApp.⁴
4. School goals must be based upon "an analysis of verifiable state data, including the API...and the California English Language Development Test (CELDT)," and may include any data voluntarily developed by districts to measure student achievement.⁵ In addition, schools should include an analysis of school progress on the AYP and other measures of student achievement.
5. The content of the plan must be aligned with school goals for improving student achievement.⁶
6. School plans must be developed with the review, certification, and advice of any applicable school advisory committees.
7. The SPSA must address how ConApp funds will be used to "improve the academic performance of all students to the level of the performance goals, as established by the API."

¹ EC Section 64001(g)

² EC Section 64001(a)

³ EC Section 64001(d)

⁴ EC Section 64001(g)

⁵ EC Section 64001(f)

⁶ EC Section 64001(f)

8. The SPSA must align with the LEA Plan and be submitted for approval to the LEA governing board. The board may return it to the SSC for revisions, as deemed necessary.⁷

The SPSA must be reviewed and approved by the governing board of the LEA whenever there are material changes that affect the academic programs funded through the ConApp.⁸

SPSA Purpose

The purpose of the SPSA is to coordinate all educational services at the school. The SPSA shall, at a minimum, address how funds provided to the school through any of the sources identified in *EC* Section 64000 will be used to improve the academic performance of all pupils to the level of the performance goals, as established by the API. The SPSA must integrate the purposes and requirements of all state and federal categorical programs in which the school participates.

The SPSA serves as the organizer for an individual school's improvement process. The plan should be developed with a deep understanding of root causes of student academic challenges and identify and implement research-based instructional strategies to raise the achievement of students who are not yet proficient by state standards. A well-developed SPSA can ensure that students are better equipped to meet the Common Core State Standards in English and math. It is critical that each school's SPSA:

- Builds on a premise that students are capable of learning with effective instruction.
- Includes school goals aligned with activities and goals included in the LEA Plan to maximize school reform efforts.
- Is based on verifiable data analysis.
- Focuses on student achievement and academic interventions.
- Implements high leverage school improvement actions.
- Directs resources where they will most directly improve student academic achievement.
- Ensures that all resources are aligned to serve identified students' needs.
- Uses research-based strategies.
- Implements strategic coordination of resources.

To set school goals, the SSC should carefully review district priorities as stated in the LEA Plan, and assess both state and local quantitative and qualitative student achievement data to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional program.

⁷ *EC* Section 64001(h)

⁸ *EC* Section 64001(g)

Needs Assessment

School and Student Performance Data

These tables represent samples of ways to assist the School Site Council (SSC) in representing and analyzing data and developing conclusions regarding improvement strategies:

- Table 1: Academic Performance Index (API) by Student Group
- Table 2: English-Language Arts AYP
- Table 3: Mathematics AYP
- Table 4: English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (2011-2013)
- Table 5: Discipline Data

Table 1: API by Student Group (Information may be obtained from the API report on the California Department of Education Academic Performance Index Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/api/>.)

	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX (API) DATA BY STUDENT GROUP															
	All Students				NUMERICALLY SIGNIFICANT STUDENT GROUPS											
					Hispanic				Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				English Learners			
	2011	2012	2013	Sum	2011	2012	2013	Sum	2011	2012	2013	Sum	2011	2012	2013	Sum
API Growth Values	792	765	787		788	749	780		785	752	783		767	744	759	

Trends indicated by the data: possible challenges, if any, and additional information needed

- The 2011 and 2012 school year showed improvements in API school wide and among all sub groups. A significant dip in API is seen across the board in the 2013 testing year.
- The focus for the 2013-testing year shifted to CCSS, with less emphasis and support going toward CST testing.

Table 2: English-Language Arts AYP (Information may be obtained from the AYP report on the California Department of Education Adequate Yearly Progress Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/>.)

AYP PROFICIENCY	All Students				NUMERICALLY SIGNIFICANT STUDENT GROUPS											
					Hispanic				Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				English Learners			
	2011	2012	2013	Dif	2011	2012	2013	Dif	2011	2012	Y2013	Dif	2011	2012	2013	Dif
AYP Target	67.6	78.4	89.2		67.6	78.4	89.2		67.6	78.4	89.2		67.6	78.4	89.2	
Percent At or Above Proficient	46	43	48		45	42	46		46	42	48		34	32	40	
Met AYP Criteria	Y S/H	NO	Y S/H		Y S/H	NO	Y S/H		Y S/H	NO	Y S/H		Y S/H	NO	Y S/H	

Table 3: Mathematics AYP (Information may be obtained from the AYP report at the California Department of Education Adequately Yearly Progress Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/>.)

AYP PROFICIENCY	All Students				NUMERICALLY SIGNIFICANT STUDENT GROUPS											
					Hispanic				Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				English Learners			
	2011	2012	2013	Dif	2011	2012	2013	Dif	2011	2012	2013	Dif	2011	2012	2013	Dif
AYP Target	68.5	79.0	89.5		68.5	79.0	89.5		68.5	79.0	89.5		68.5	79.0	89.5	
Percent At or Above Proficient	59	49	58		61	51	57		45	52	58		46	46	54	
Met AYP Criteria	Y S/H	NO	Y S/H		Y S/H	NO	Y S/H		Y S/H	NO	Y S/H		Y S/H	NO	Y S/H	

Table 4: The English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA).

California Department of Education
English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment
ELSSA 2013-14

PERFORMANCE ON THE CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT TEST (CELDT)

Note: Tables 4 - 10

4. AMAO 1: How are EL students at each level of the CELDT meeting their growth target?

Prior Year CELDT Level	Number in Proficiency Level Prior Year	% in Proficiency Level Prior Year	Number Meeting Growth Target	% Meeting Growth Target	State Avg. Meeting Growth Target
Beginning	8	6.7%	7	87.5%	TBA
Early Intermediate	25	21.0%	14	56.0%	TBA
Intermediate	56	47.1%	14	25.0%	TBA
Early Adv. / Advanced: Not English Proficient	6	5.0%	3	50.0%	TBA
Early Adv. / Advanced: English Proficient	24	20.2%	16	66.7%	TBA
Total	119	100.0%	54	45%	

5.a. AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in language instruction educational programs in U.S. schools?

[REQUIRED]

Length of Time in U.S. Schools	Number Percent	Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient	Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient	Intermediate	Early Intermediate	Beginning	Total (by Time)
6 or more years	n= 33%	10	5	10	5	0	30
	%	33%	17%	33%	17%	0%	25%
5 years	n= 19%	3	0	11	2	0	16
	%	19%	0%	69%	13%	0%	13%
4 years	n= 7%	1	0	9	5	0	15
	%	7%	0%	60%	33%	0%	12%
3 years or less	n= 33%	20	0	23	15	2	60
	%	33%	0%	38%	25%	3%	50%
Total (by ELD level)	n= 28%	34	5	53	27	2	121
	%	28%	4%	44%	22%	2%	

Note: Tables 5a & b

5.b. AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in language instruction educational programs in our district?

[OPTIONAL-High School Districts May Not Find Useful]

Length of time in district	Number Percent	Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient	Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient	Intermediate	Early Intermediate	Beginning	Total (by Time)
6 or more years	n= 37%	7	3	6	3	0	19
	%	37%	16%	32%	16%	0%	16%
5 years	n= 13%	1	0	7	0	0	8
	%	13%	0%	88%	0%	0%	7%
4 years	n= 8%	1	0	7	4	0	12
	%	8%	0%	58%	33%	0%	10%
3 years or less	n= 30%	25	2	33	20	2	82
	%	30%	2%	40%	24%	2%	68%
Total (by ELD level)	n= 28%	34	5	53	27	2	121
	%	28%	4%	44%	22%	2%	

Table 4 (continued): The English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA).

California Department of Education
English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment
ELSSA 2013-14

6. How are EL students at the **Intermediate** level on CELDT performing on the CST (ELA and mathematics) by grade level?
What percent of students are in each of the following performance levels: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced?

a. ELA CST Performance of District EL students at Intermediate level on CELDT

(as percent of Intermediate level EL population tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n=	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	4
	%	0%	17%	11%	0%	11%	0%	33%	10%
Below Basic	n=	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	6
	%	0%	17%	0%	29%	11%	100%	33%	15%
Basic	n=	3	4	3	4	7	0	1	22
	%	75%	67%	33%	57%	78%	0%	33%	56%
Proficient	n=	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	7
	%	25%	0%	56%	14%	0%	0%	0%	18%
Advanced	n=	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total (by grade)	n=	4	6	9	7	9	1	3	39
	%	10%	15%	23%	18%	23%	3%	8%	

6.b. Math CST Performance of District EL Students at Intermediate Level on CELDT

(as percent of Intermediate level EL population tested at each grade level)

Math CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8 Gen. Math	Grade 8 Algebra	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		100%	8%
Below Basic	n=	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	6
	%	0%	0%	11%	14%	44%	0%		0%	15%
Basic	n=	0	2	2	1	3	1	0	0	9
	%	0%	33%	22%	14%	33%	100%		0%	23%
Proficient	n=	1	4	3	3	1	0	0	0	12
	%	25%	67%	33%	43%	11%	0%		0%	31%
Advanced	n=	3		3	2	1	0	0	0	9
	%	75%	0%	33%	29%	11%	0%		0%	23%
Total (by grade)	n=	4	6	9	7	9	1	0	3	39
	%	10%	15%	23%	18%	23%	3%	0%	8%	

7. How are EL students at the **English Proficient** level on the CELDT performing on the CST (ELA and mathematics) by grade level?

What percent of students are in each of the following performance levels: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced?

a. ELA CST Performance of District EL Students at English Proficient level on CELDT

(as percent of English proficient EL population tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0%		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Below Basic	n=	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
	%	0%		0%	33%	0%	0%	17%	9%
Basic	n=	0	0	1	2	1	2	5	11
	%	0%		100%	67%	100%	67%	83%	48%
Proficient	n=	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
	%	44%		0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	22%
Advanced	n=	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	%	56%		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	22%
Total (by grade)	n=	9	0	1	3	1	3	6	23
	%	39%	0%	4%	13%	4%	13%	26%	

Table 4 (continued): The English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA).

California Department of Education
English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment
ELSSA 2013-14

7.b. Math CST Performance of District EL Students at **English Proficient** Level on CELDT

(as percent of English Proficient EL population tested at each grade level)

Math CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8 Gen. Math	Grade 8 Algebra	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Below Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Proficient	n= 1 % 11%	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	6
Advanced	n= 8 % 89%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Total (by grade)	n= 9 % 39%	0	1	3	1	3	0	6	23	

8. How are Reclassified-Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students performing on the CST (ELA and mathematics) by grade level?

a. ELA CST Performance of District RFEP Students

(as percent of RFEP students tested at each grade level)

ELA CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Below Basic	n= 0 % 13%	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Basic	n= 0 % 25%	2	1	0	5	9	6	23	
Proficient	n= 0 % 50%	4	5	7	5	5	5	31	
Advanced	n= 0 % 13%	1	4	3	2	0	2	12	
Total (by grade)	n= 0 % 0%	8	10	10	12	14	15	69	

Note: RFEPs

8.b. Math CST Performance of District RFEP Students

(as percent of RFEP students tested at each grade level)

Math CST Performance	Number Percent	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8 Gen. Math	Grade 8 Algebra	Total (by CST)
Far Below Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Below Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	5
Basic	n= 0 % 0%	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	6	14
Proficient	n= 0 % 25%	2	3	1	4	7	0	2	19	
Advanced	n= 0 % 75%	6	7	7	4	4	0	0	28	
Total (by grade)	n= 0 % 0%	8	10	10	12	14	0	14	68	

Conclusions indicated by the data	
1.	In 2012-13, the percentage of ELs in a language instruction program for 5 years or more who met the English Proficient level on CELDT dropped from 56% to 28%, a 50% decrease. This indicates a need to work closely with these students on oral language development and CELDT preparation.
2.	Long-term ELs (LTELs) are not making adequate progress on the CELDT. However, LTELs who have been in US schools for 5 years score significantly higher on the CELDT than do those at year 6. This indicates the possibility that those who take longer than 5 years to reclassify need intensive language instruction to exit the program.
3.	More than 45% of ELs scoring Intermediate on the CELDT scored at BASIC or above on the ELA CST, and 53% on the Math CST. This indicates that approximately half of all Intermediate level ELs would be eligible for reclassification if the district criteria were at mid-basic or higher on the CST.

Table 8: Discipline Data

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate*	School 2011-12	School 2012-13	School 2013-14	District 2011-12	District 2012-13	District 2013-14
Suspensions/Rate	41 9.2%	32 5.9%	28 4.9%	41 9.2%	32 5.9%	28 4.9%
Expulsions	1	0	0	1	0	0

* The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment.

Analysis of Current Instructional Program

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

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

Special consideration should be given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs.

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

1. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (ESEA)
2. Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)

Staffing and Professional Development

3. Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (ESEA)
4. Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to instructional materials training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)
5. Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (ESEA)
6. Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)
7. Teacher collaboration by grade level (kindergarten through grade eight [K–8]) and department (grades nine through twelve) (EPC)

Teaching and Learning

8. Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (ESEA)
9. Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (K–8) (EPC)
10. Lesson pacing schedule (K–8) and master schedule flexibility for sufficient numbers of intervention courses (EPC)
11. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (ESEA)
12. Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials, and for high school students, access to standards-aligned core courses (EPC)

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

13. Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)

14. Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement

Parental Involvement

15. Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (ESEA)
16. Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, other school personnel, and students in secondary schools, in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of ConApp programs (5 *California Code of Regulations* 3932)

Funding

17. Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (ESEA)
18. Fiscal support (EPC)

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 academic performance index and adequate yearly progress growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of students not yet meeting state standards:

LEA GOAL 1: All students will reach high standards, at a minimum, attaining proficiency or better in Reading/English Language Arts by June 2015

SCHOOL GOAL: By June 2015, there will be a 10% growth in English/Language as measured by the District ELA Benchmark, iXL Language Arts, Dibels Assessments, and writing baseline benchmarks.

What data did you use to form this goal?	What were the findings from the analysis of this data?	How will the school evaluate the progress of this goal?
CST/CELDT ELA Benchmarks iXL Language Arts District Writing Benchmark Dibels	In reviewing the data, we found that many students lacked the basic foundations of literacy, and lacked sufficient opportunities to practice oral language and vocabulary skills.	Monitor quarterly assessments to ensure students are reaching our 10% goal.

STRATEGY: Monson-Sultana School has created an intensive literacy program which ensures that any students not attaining goals are given additional support through intervention in a learning center (Response to Intervention program). Dibels is used to determine each student's literacy level for Grades K-3. Students who needed work with the foundations of literacy were given priority and meet with the RSP teacher, all other students identified are seen daily for 30 minutes. Students are progress monitored bi-weekly and referrals are made once 6 data points have been collected and show that students are not meeting their Rate of Improvement (ROI). In addition to Strategic Intervention, grades K-3 devote 1 hour to Guided Reading practice in the classroom daily. The Administration supports teachers and paraprofessionals through Professional Development in the areas of Literacy/Reading practices and language development.

Action/Date	Person(s) Responsible	Task/Date	Cost and Funding Source (Itemize for Each Source)
1. Providing students with Highly Qualified Teachers. (August 2014)	Board of Trustees, Superintendent, Business Manager	1. Contracting with the Tulare County Office of Education to provide weekly professional development and content coaching. (August 2014-June 2015) 2. Providing teachers release time to collaborate and review student progress.	Salaries/Benefits: \$1,338,622 Funding Source: 00000 (Base General Fund) \$379,790 Funding Source: 14000 (EPA)
2. Response to intervention: Intensive Intervention for students 2 or more years below grade level in ELA. (August 2014-June 2015)	Teachers, Principal, RSP Specialist	1. Use of intervention programs such as <i>Read Naturally</i> to provide Intensive Intervention for students 2 or more years below grade level. 2. Purchase technology-based intervention programs such as ALEKS.	Read Naturally: \$,1000 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP) ALEKS: \$2,500 Funding Source: 58126 (SRSGA)
3. Strategic Intervention for students who are below grade level in ELA using technology-based programs and extended day activities. (August 2014-June 2015)	Teachers, Principal, Categorical Program Specialist, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Provide strategic intervention through extended-day activities utilizing technology-based intervention programs.	Salaries/benefits: \$8,000 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP) iXL for ELA software: \$2,800 Funding Source: 58126 (SRSAG)
4. Accelerated Readers Software and Licensing (August 2014 – June 2015)	Teachers, Principal, Technology Director	Teachers in will implement Accelerated Reader technology-based programs as supplemental resource to help students with literacy skills.	AR Site License renewal: \$6,500 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP)

5. Extended year opportunities for students who are 2 years or more below grade level.	Teachers, Principal, Categorical Program Specialist, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Provide extended-year services for students who are below grade level.	Extended year Salary & Benefits: \$15,825 Funding Source: 30100 (Title I)
6. Stipend & Benefits for Categorical Program Specialist and Curriculum and Assessment Specialist to provide teachers with ongoing support and coaching.	Teachers, Principal, Categorical Program Specialist, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Select teachers on special assignment to serve as the Categorical Program Specialist and the Curriculum and Assessment Specialist.	CPS Stipend & Benefits: \$ 7,502 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP) CAS Stipend & Benefits: \$ 3,751 Funding Source: 00000 (Gen Fund)
7. Provide Highly Qualified paraprofessionals to provide instructional support in grades TK-3.	Principal, Categorical Program Specialist	Fund current paraprofessionals for instructional support in K-3 classrooms.	Salary & Benefits: \$60,762 Funding Source: 30100 (Title I)
8. Fund additional paraprofessionals to provide support in the library and computer lab.	Principal, Categorical Program Specialist	Fund 2 FTE paraprofessionals to support students in the library and the computer lab.	Salary & Benefits: \$88,398 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP)

9. Provide students with improved access to online learning programs and the Internet through upgraded wireless access points.	Principal, Technology Director	Purchase and install wireless access points at strategic points around campus to allow all students access to online learning opportunities.	Purchase of Meraki wireless access points: \$12,500 00000 (General Fund)
10. Purchase of 19 laptop computers to assist teachers with CCSS implementation, Eclipse access, and staff development requirements.	Director of Technology, Principal, Business Manager	Replace existing outdated teacher laptops to allow for CCSS unit and assessment planning, ongoing professional development requirements and access to TCOE ECLIPSE repository.	Laptop Purchase: \$28,500 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP)

Please duplicate this form as necessary for additional goals, strategies, or actions steps the school may have.

LEA GOAL 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standard, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in Reading/English Language Arts and Math.

SCHOOL GOAL: By June 2014, English Learners will grow by 10% on the ELLA as measured by the Fall CELDT baseline data.

What data did you use to form this goal? CELDT ELSSA CST	What were the findings from the analysis of this data? Although the school reclassified its highest number of EL students in 2013-14, the number of long term EL students remains high.	How will the school evaluate the progress of this goal? Deployment walkthroughs ELSSA Result Data analysis Leadership Team Data ELSSA analysis of Data
--	---	--

STRATEGY: ELD instruction based on ELSSA results. Students will be placed strategically in flexible groups based on CELDT levels by the EL Coordinator who specializes in English language development. 100% of teachers are trained in ELD strategies. All ELD students in grades 1-5 will receive 40 minutes of ELD instruction. All Kindergarten ELD students will receive 30 minutes of ELD instruction. The ELD Coordinator and TCOE Content Specialists will provide on-going professional development in ELD strategies.

Action/Date	Person(s) Responsible	Task/Date	Cost and Funding Source (Itemize for Each Source)
1. Designate a teacher on special assignment to serve as the EL Coordinator for the school.	Principal, Business Manager	1. The district will provide an English Learner Coordinator to implement and monitor the district's ELD program. 2. Based on previous year's reclassification rate, the EL Coordinator will evaluate and advise teachers on classroom strategies for ELD implementation.	Salary & Benefits: \$48,341 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP)
3. Provide teachers and paraprofessionals with ongoing ELD staff development on research-based strategies for English Learners.	Principal, EL Coordinator, Teachers, Instructional Assistants	1. Provide staff development for teachers and paraprofessionals on the California English Language Development Standards with correlation to the CCSS, the CELDT, and the new ELPAC. 2. Contract with TCOE to provide content specialist who will provide ongoing ELD staff development for teachers and paraprofessionals.	Staff development: \$6,078 Funding Source: 42030 (Title III)

4. Implementation of <i>English 3D</i> Course I for all EL's in grades 6-8.	Principal, EL Coordinator, Teachers, Instructional Assistants	Purchase and implementation of supplemental programs to increase EL's rate of acquiring the English language (Lexia, English 3D, Academic Vocabulary Toolkit, Curriculum and Associates CELD prep program)	Supplemental Programs: \$8,000 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP)
5. All newcomers to receive a minimum of 45 minutes ELD per day.	Principal, EL Coordinator, Teachers, Instructional Assistants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purchase <i>Rosetta Stone</i> software for use by newcomers to increase their rate of acquisition of English. 2. Provide 45 minutes per day minimum of guided instruction to newcomers. 	Supplemental Programs: \$2,000 Funding Source: 42030 (Title III)
6. Provide bilingual paraprofessional classroom support where numbers of EL students are highest.	Principal, EL Coordinator, Teachers, Instructional Assistants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued funding of paraprofessionals for ELD classroom support. 2. Continued use of trained paraprofessionals to assist with administration of CELDT. 	Salary & Benefits for Bilingual Paraprofessionals: \$36,910 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP)
7. Implementation of ELD School wide	Principal, EL Coordinator, Teachers, Instructional Assistants	Each EL student will receive a program of instruction for English Language Development in order to develop proficiency in English as rapidly and effectively as possible.	N/A

8. Program Notification to Parents	Principal, EL Coordinator	The written notification of results and recommended placement includes a description of both the SEI and ELM programs, including the content, instructional goals, and extent of use of English and native language in instruction in each program.	Postage: \$400 Funding Source: 30100 (Title I)
9. Intervention for RFEP students who fall below proficiency in ELA and math.	Principal, EL Coordinator	Supplemental materials will be purchased to provide academic catch-up for RFEP students who fall below proficiency in math and/or ELA.	Purchase of <i>Standards Plus</i> materials: \$7,000 Funding Source: 07200 (LCAP)

Please duplicate this form as necessary for additional goals, strategies, or actions steps the school may have.

LEA GOAL 3: All students will reach high standard at a minimum, attaining proficiency or better in Mathematics by 2014-2015.

SCHOOL GOAL: By June 2014, students will grow 15% as measured by the local benchmark assessments.

What data did you use to form this goal?	What were the findings from the analysis of this data?	How will the school evaluate the progress of this goal?
iXL ALEKS Formative Assessment	Students demonstrated proficiency in mathematical concepts, number sense, and measurement and geometry. The data indicate a need for increased problem solving and writing skills necessary to master the CCSS.	Monitor trimester assessments to ensure students are reaching our 10% goal.

STRATEGY: Local assessments will be used to monitor student progress on CCSS math teachings. Teachers will work collaboratively sharing best practices, student data, and how best to address student needs.

Action/Date	Person(s) Responsible	Task/Date	Cost and Funding Source (Itemize for Each Source)
1. Providing students with Highly Qualified Teachers. (August 2014)	Board of Trustees, Superintendent, Business Manager	1. Contracting with the Tulare County Office of Education to provide weekly professional development and content coaching. (August 2014-June 2015) 2. Providing teachers release time to collaborate and review student progress.	See Goal 1.1
2. Response to intervention: Intensive Intervention for students 2 or more years below grade level in Math. (August 2014-June 2015)	Teachers, Principal, RSP Specialist	Use of intervention programs such as <i>ALEKS</i> to provide Intensive Intervention for students 2 or more years below grade level.	See Goal 1.2

3. Strategic Intervention for students who are below grade level in ELA using technology-based programs and extended day activities. (August 2014-June 2015)	Teachers, Principal, Categorical Program Specialist, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Provide strategic intervention through extended-day activities utilizing technology-based intervention programs.	See Goal 1.3
4. Adoption of middle school math curriculum that is aligned to the CCSS.	Teachers, Principal, Categorical Program Specialist, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Adoption and purchase of Carneige Math for middle school.	Math Curriculum: \$7,200 Funding source: 63000 (Restricted lottery)
5. Extended year opportunities for students who are 2 years or more below grade level.	Teachers, Principal, Categorical Program Specialist, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Provide extended-year services for students who are below grade level.	See Goal 1.5
6. Stipend & Benefits for Categorical Program Specialist and Curriculum and Assessment Specialist to provide teachers with ongoing support and coaching.	Teachers, Principal, Categorical Program Specialist, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Select teachers on special assignment to serve as the Categorical Program Specialist and the Curriculum and Assessment Specialist.	See Goal 1.6
7. Provide Highly Qualified paraprofessionals to provide instructional support in grades TK-3.	Principal, Categorical Program Specialist	Fund current paraprofessionals for instructional support in K-3 classrooms.	See Goal 1.7

8. Fund additional paraprofessionals to provide support in the library and computer lab.	Principal, Categorical Program Specialist	Fund 2 FTE paraprofessionals to support students in the library and the computer lab.	See Goal 1.8
9. Provide students with improved access to online learning programs and the Internet through upgraded wireless access points.	Principal, Technology Director	Purchase and install wireless access points at strategic points around campus to allow all students access to online learning opportunities.	See Goal 1.9
10. Purchase of 19 laptop computers to assist teachers with CCSS implementation, Eclipse access, and staff development requirements.	Director of Technology, Principal, Business Manager	Replace existing outdated teacher laptops to allow for CCSS unit and assessment planning, ongoing professional development requirements and access to TCOE ECLIPSE repository.	See Goal 1.10

Please duplicate this form as necessary for additional goals, strategies, or actions steps the school may have.

LEA GOAL 4: All students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

SCHOOL GOAL: During the 2014-2015 school year, staff development (CCSS, TCOE Common Core strategies) will be provided so that all students can be taught by a highly qualified teacher.

What data did you use to form this goal?	What were the findings from the analysis of this data?	How will the school evaluate the progress of this goal?
Attendance sheets for Professional Development Informal Instructional rounds/ walkthroughs	On-going professional development empowers teachers by giving them the tools needed to support academic growth in all students.	Observed targeted instructional practices in the classroom during walkthrough visits.

STRATEGY: Professional development will be provided to all teachers on an on-going basis to support them with the implementation of the new California Content State Standards. Teachers will receive training in the development of CCSS units and assessments and specific strategies for the implementation of CCSS in the classroom. Content Specialists will provide on-going professional development in best practices/instructional strategies as needed.

Action/Date	Person(s) Responsible	Task/Date	Cost and Funding Source (Itemize for Each Source)
1. Partner with the Tulare County Office of Education to develop lesson pacing guides for each grade level in ELA and math.	Principal, Content Specialist	100% of teachers will receive training and ongoing support in the development of CCSS lesson pacing guides in math and ELA.	See Goal 1.1

1. Provide teachers with Instructional Assistance and Support through TCOE content coaching.	Principal, Content Specialist	100% of teachers will receive instructional support via content coaching provided by TCOE content specialist in ELA and math.	See Goal 1.1
2. The district will conduct survey of staff needs for ongoing support annually	Principal, Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	The district will conduct an annual Academic Program Survey to include a survey of teachers and paraprofessionals to determine staff needs for ongoing support and professional development.	See Goal 1.1
3. The district will establish a process for school leadership to receive training in monitoring the development and implementation of CCSS curriculum and assessments.	Principal	School leadership will receive Tier I and II training in CCSS ELA and math implementation through TCOE.	CCSS Training for administrators: \$1,500 Funding Source: Title III

Please duplicate this form as necessary for additional goals, strategies, or actions steps the school may have.

LEA GOAL 5: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.

SCHOOL GOAL: By June 2015, school violence and gang related activities will decrease 10% as measured by discipline, suspension and expulsion records. All stakeholders will create a staff environment that creates academic achievement and social development.

What data did you use to form this goal?	What were the findings from the analysis of this data?	How will the school evaluate the progress of this goal?
Aeries Discipline Records Teacher Referrals Monthly district discipline data report	Decreasing suspension rate	Monitor monthly discipline data reports and look for trends noted paying special attention to the location of incidents and devise a plan to decrease discipline issues in problem areas.

STRATEGY: Positive reinforcement, each trimester Character Counts assemblies will be utilized to bring awareness to school wide behavior expectations. Staff will work collaboratively with the leadership team in devising a plan to combat problem behaviors noted on district discipline data reports. The Character Counts team will help with data collection and reporting out to staff on Monday afternoon collaborations.

Action/Date	Person(s) Responsible	Task/Date	Cost and Funding Source (Itemize for Each Source)
1. Incentives for students (August 2014 – June 2015)	Principal, Character Counts Coordinator	As part of Character Counts, purchase and provide incentives for classes (i.e. CC Certificates, lanyard pins, CC tee shirts, Student of the Trimester trip to Me-n'-Ed's Pizza).	Purchase Incentives: \$2,500 Funding Source: Student Body
1. Continued support of the <i>Good News Program</i> (August 2014-June 2015)	Good News Club Coordinator	Provide continued support of the <i>Good news Club</i> to provide positive behavior support for students of all ages.	N/A
2. Contract with TCOE for additional behavioral counseling for students with disciplinary issues (August 2014- June 2015)	Principal	Provide conflict resolution and mediation counseling for students utilizing extra counseling services through the Tulare County Office of Education.	Counseling Services: \$ \$4,800 Funding Source: 00000 (Gen Fund)

Programs Included in this Plan

The totals on these pages should match the cost estimates in Form A and the school's allocation from the ConApp.

State Programs	Allocation
<input type="checkbox"/> California School Age Families Education Purpose: Assist expectant and parenting students to succeed in school	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/State Compensatory Education (EIA-SCE) Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/Limited English Proficient (EIA-LEP) Purpose: Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Peer Assistance and Review Purpose: Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional Development Block Grant Purpose: Attract, train, and retain classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum areas	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Pupil Retention Block Grant Purpose: Prevent students from dropping out of school	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA) Purpose: Funds are available for use in performing various specified measures to improve academic instruction and pupil academic achievement	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant Purpose: Improve library and other school programs	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> School Safety and Violence Prevention Act Purpose: Increase school safety	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Purpose: Eliminate tobacco use among students	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> List and Describe Other State or Local Funds (Lottery [Unrestricted and restricted], Common Core)	\$ 67,743
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school	\$ 67,743

Federal Programs		Allocation
Title I, Part A: Allocation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purpose: To improve basic programs operated by local educational agencies (LEAs)		\$ 275,478
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Parental Involvement (if applicable under Section 1118[a][3][c] of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) Purpose: Ensure that parents have information they need to make well-informed choices for their children, more effectively share responsibility with their children's schools, and help schools develop effective and successful academic programs (this is a reservation from the total Title I, Part A allocation).	\$	
<input type="checkbox"/> For Program Improvement Schools only: Title I, Part A Program Improvement (PI) Professional Development (10 percent minimum reservation from the Title I, Part A reservation for schools in PI Year 1 and 2)	\$	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title II, Part A: Improving Teacher Quality Purpose: Improve and increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals		\$30,284
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students Purpose: Supplement language instruction to help LEP students attain English proficiency and meet academic performance standards		\$ 23,898
<input type="checkbox"/> Title VI, Part B: Rural Education Achievement Program Purpose: Provide flexibility in the use of ESEA funds to eligible LEAs		\$
<input type="checkbox"/> For School Improvement Schools only: School Improvement Grant (SIG) Purpose: to address the needs of schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring to improve student achievement		\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Other federal funds Title III, Part A: Immigrant		\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Other federal funds Special Ed Federal		\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other federal funds (Title II: EETT 0 and Title VI-SRSA)		\$25,196
Total amount of federal categorical funds allocated to this school		\$355,396
Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school		\$ 423,139

Note: Other Title I-supported activities that are not shown on this page may be included in the SPSA Action Plan.

Single Plan for Student Achievement Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluation by the SSC and local educational agency (LEA) is a critical part of the continuous cycle of improvement for a school.

The SPSA annual evaluation may be a summary description of the school's progress toward implementation of the strategies and actions in the SPSA. The report may also include a data analysis of the school's progress towards its student achievement goals based on local, state, or national assessment data.

During the evaluation process, the SSC and LEA will consider all relevant factors when evaluating the plan, such as the degree of implementation, student enrollment changes, and health and safety issues.

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR SPSA ANNUAL EVALUATION

Plan Priorities

- Identify the top priorities of the current SPSA. **(No more than 2–3.)**
- Identify the major expenditures supporting these priorities.

Involvement/Governance

- How was the SSC involved in development of the plan?
- How were advisory committees involved in providing advice to the SSC?
- How was the plan monitored during the school year?
- What changes are needed to ensure involvement of all stakeholders and adequate monitoring of planned activities and outcomes?

Strategies and Activities

- Identify those strategies or activities that were particularly effective in improving student achievement. What evidence do you have of the direct or indirect impact of the strategies or activities on student achievement?

Outcomes

- Based on this information, what might be some recommendations for future steps to meet the SPSA goals for student achievement?

School Site Council Membership

California *Education Code* describes the required composition of the School Site Council (SSC). The SSC shall be composed of the principal and representatives of: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school; parents of pupils attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, pupils selected by pupils attending the school.⁹ The current make-up of the SSC is as follows:

Names of Members	Principal	Classroom Teacher	Other School Staff	Parent or Community Member	Secondary Student
Roy Woods	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marissa Simmons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wendy Hernandez	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rollin Heinrichs	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carol Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Amberly Reagan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christina Marroquin	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chris Wilson	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jason Nichols	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jessica Barajas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Numbers of members in each category	1	3	1	5	N/A

⁹ EC Section 52852

Recommendations and Assurances

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

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

☐ State Compensatory Education Advisory Committee _____ Signature

X English Learner Advisory Committee _____ Signature

☐ Special Education Advisory Committee _____ Signature

☐ Gifted and Talented Education Advisory Committee _____ Signature

☐ District/School Liaison Team for schools in Program Improvement _____ Signature

☐ Compensatory Education Advisory Committee _____ Signature

☐ Departmental Advisory Committee (secondary) _____ Signature

☐ Other committees established by the school or district (list) _____ Signature

4. The SSC reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this SPSA and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the local educational agency plan.
5. This SPSA is based on a thorough analysis of student academic performance. The actions proposed herein form a sound, comprehensive, coordinated plan to reach stated school goals to improve student academic performance.
6. This SPSA was adopted by the SSC at a public meeting on: January 6, 2015

Attested:

Roy Woods

Typed name of School Principal

Signature of School Principal

Date

Amberly Reagan

Typed name of SSC Chairperson

Signature of SSC Chairperson

Date

Appendix A: Title I Program Improvement SPSA Reference Guide

Elements specified in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 Title I, Part A, Section 1116 for Program Improvement (PI)

Specified PI Plan Elements	Page(s) Addressed in SPSA
[X] Scientifically-based Research—Strategies based on scientifically-based research that will strengthen the core academic subjects in a school and address the specific academic issues that caused a school to be identified for PI	12,15,16,17,18,19,21,22
[X] Successful Policies and Practices—Adoption of policies and practices concerning a school's core academic subjects that have the greatest likelihood of ensuring that all students (and student subgroups) enrolled in a school become proficient	12,15,16,17,18,19,21,22,23
[X] Professional Development (PD)	12,15,18,21,22
[] A minimum of 10 percent of Title I funds will be used for schools in PI years 1 and 2 for the purpose of providing high-quality professional development of teachers and administrators	N/A
[X] PD meets requirements of ESEA Section 1119 (qualifications for teachers and paraprofessionals)	12,15,18,21,22
[X] PD affords increased opportunity for participation	12
[X] PD directly addresses the academic achievement problem that caused a school to be identified for PI	15,18
[X] How funds (ten percent) reserved for PD will be used to remove the school from PI status	12,15,18,21,22
[X] Description of Specific Annual Measurable Objectives—Developed for each of the student subgroups and in accordance with state's measure of adequate yearly progress	4,5,6,7,8
[X] Parent Notification—Description of how the school will provide written notice about the identification of the school for PI in understandable language and format	15,17
[X] Parent Involvement—Strategies to promote effective parental involvement	10
[X] Extended Learning—As appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during any extension of the school year	19
[] Incorporation of a Teacher Mentoring Program—See ESEA Title IX, Part A, §9101(42) for definition of "Teacher Mentoring Program"	N/A

Elements specified in ESEA Title I, Part A, Section 1114 for Program Improvement
SPSA Title I School wide Requirements

Specified Elements of the ESEA	Location (by Page) in SPSA
[X] Comprehensive needs assessment of all children enrolled in the school, including migratory children, which includes the analysis of student performance data in relation to the state academic content standards	3-8
[X] School wide reform strategies that: [X] Provide opportunities for all students to meet the academic standards at the proficient and advanced levels [X] Use instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that strengthen the core academic program that: [X] Increase the amount and quality of learning time such as through an extended school year, before- and after-school and summer school programs, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum [X] Include strategies for meeting the educational needs of historically underserved populations [X] Include strategies to address the needs of all children in the school, and in particular, the needs of low-achieving students and those at risk of not meeting the state content standards	9,12,13,14,16,19,20
[X] Instruction by highly-qualified teachers	12,13,15,18,22
[X] Provisions for high quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, paraprofessionals and other staff to enable all children to meet the state's academic achievement standards	15
[X] Strategies for timely and effective assistance to students that need additional help	12-14,18,19,20

Monson-Sultana Joint Union Elementary Schoc 2015/2016 WORKING BUDGET

Program Name	NCLB: Title III Limited English Proficient (LEP)	42030	0	Project Year
Allocation/Grant amt	\$10,708	Program period from:	07/01/15	to: 06/30/16
Program carryover	0	Funding calc and/or notes: Competitive award		
Site carryover				
Gross budget amt	10,708			
Less indirects	214	Indirects allowed?	yes	15,046 = Health & Welfare amt
Program spendable amount	10,494	Indirect rate to use	2.00%	(CDE approved rate is 3.89%)
			010	Fund
			0	Mgr Code

Category	Object Code	Description	Goal 00000	Goal 11100	Goal 11100	Goal 11100														Total
		Description	Function 72100	Function 10000	Function 10000	Function 10000														
		Site Code	0	2	3	5														
		Certificated FTEs with H&W																		0.00
		Classified FTEs with H&W																		0.00
		Site carryover	0	0	0	0														0
		Site net allocation	214	3,517	2,925	4,052														10,708
		Site Spendable Amt	214	3,517	2,925	4,052														10,708
Certificated	11000	Teachers																		0
	11000	Teachers																		0
	11002	Subs Teachers				660														660
	11003	Auxiliary				1,960														1,960
	12000	Counselor/Nurse																		0
	13000	Admin																		0
	19000	Other Cert. Salaries																		0
Benefits	1xxxx	Certificated Wages	0	0	0	2,620	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,620
	31010	STRS-10.730%	0	0	0	281	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	281
	32010	PERS-11.847%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	33012	OASDI-6.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	33013	MEDI-1.45%	0	0	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
	34010	H & W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	35010	SUI-0.05%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	36010	W/C-2.406%	0	0	0	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
	37010	Retiree H&W-1.61% of H&W	0	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
	3xxxx	Certificated Benefits	0	0	0	432	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
		Total Certificated Costs	0	0	0	3,052	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,052
Classified	21000	Inst'l Aides																		0
	21002	Subs																		0
	21003	Aides/OT		802																802
	22000	Custodians																		0
	22002	Subs																		0
	22003	Aides/Custodians OT																		0
	24000	Clerical																		0
	24002	Clerical - Subs																		0
	24003	Clerical O/T																		0
	29000	Other Classified																		0
	29002	Other Classified-Subs																		0
	29003	Other Classified Auxiliary																		0
Benefits	2xxxx	Classified Wages	0	802	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802
	32020	PERS-11.847%	0	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
	33022	OASDI-6.2%	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
	33023	MEDI-1.45%	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	34020	H & W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	35020	SUI-0.05%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	36020	W/C-2.406%	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	37020	Retiree H&W-1.61% of H&W	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	37520	OPEB FTE - \$1,144.92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3xxxx	Classified Benefits	0	190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
		Total Classified Costs	0	992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	992
		Total Personnel	0	992	0	3,052	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,043
		Amount Remaining	214	2,525	2,925	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,665
Supplies	41000	Approved Textbooks																		0
	42000	Books & Ref. Materials		1,525																1,525
	43000	Materials & Supplies																		0
	44000	Non-Cap Equipment																		0
Services	51000	Subagreements for Services																		0
	52000	Travel & Conference				1,000														1,000
	53000	Membership																		0
	56000	Rental & Repair		1,000																1,000
	57103	Transportation																		0
	57104	Printing																		0
	58000	Services & Operating			2,925															2,925
	59000	Communications																		0
Capital	61000	Sites & Improvements																		0
	62000	Bldgs & Improvements																		0
	64000	Equipment																		0
	73100	Indirect Costs	214																	214
Financing	74380	Debt Svc - Interest																		0
	74390	Debt Svc - Principal																		0
		Non Personnel	214	2,525	2,925	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,664
		Amt Remaining s/b 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1