Directions: Using the template, provide information requested for each cell in the outline. The cells expand to allow space needed for narrative responses under each item. All Title III LEAs in Years 2, 4, or 4+ must submit a copy of this Needs Assessment with the submission of the LEA Plan Goal 2 Update that includes the appropriate sections of the Improvement Plan Addendum (IPA).

Cover Sheet for Needs Assessment							
Date submitted: 6/28/2016			Date Reviewed:				
Name of COE Lead: Tracy Klee			Title III Status: ☐ Y2 ☐ Y4 X Y4+				
Part A: Initial LEA, student demographics, and Title III contact information							
Name of LEA Lead: Tracy Klee			Contact Person: Tracy Klee				
LEA (or Consortium Lead) CDS Code: 101080000000			Telephone: 559-443-4871				
Region #: 4			E-mail: tklee@fcoe.org				
Grade Span of LEA: 7-12			Program Improvement (PI): X Yes □ No				
Number of Students Enrolled in LEA: 372			If YES, number of years in PI: 4+				
Number of EL Students: 211			Consortium: ☐ Yes X No				
Title III LEP Funding Amount: \$17,935.00			If YES, list the consortium members and CDS Codes for each:				
Number of Immigrant Students: N/A							
Immigrant Funding Amount: N/A							
Part B: Student Achievement Accountability History (as applicable)							
Check AMAO(s) failed in 2011-12	□ AMAO 1		2 – Cohort 1: < 5 yrs. 2 – Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs.	☐ AMAO 3 – ELA ☐ AMAO 3 – Math			
Check AMAO(s) failed in 2012-13	☐ AMAO 1	,		☐ AMAO 3 – ELA ☐ AMAO 3 – Math			
Check AMAO(s) failed in 2013-14	□ AMAO 1	☐ AMAO 2 – Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs.		☐ AMAO 3 – ELA* ☐ AMAO 3 – Math* *HS only			
Check AMAO(s) failed in 2014-15	☐ AMAO 1	☐ AMAO 2 – Cohort 1: < 5 yrs.		☐ AMAO 3 – CAASP Participation Rate			

 \Box AMAO 2 − Cohort 2: ≥ 5 yrs.

☐ AMAO 3 – Grad. Rate*

*HS only

Needs Assessment Template

1. Identify and describe those key factors of the instructional program that prevented the LEA from meeting Title III AMAOs.

a. Describe findings from student data analyses of the CELDT, CAASPP results and participation rates, attendance rates, graduation rates (as applicable), state data tools (e.g., ELSSA), and other assessments used by the LEA (e.g. benchmark assessments, curriculum embedded assessments, LCAP Metrics) to measure EL student English proficiency, academic achievement in English language arts and mathematics, and findings derived from other data analyses as they relate to the AMAOs.

A thorough review of CELDT, SBAC, local and district-level assessments was completed with the following linguistic and academic performance challenges noted.

- 92% of English learners in grades 3-11 scored "Standards Not Met" and 8% of ELs in grades 3-11 scored "Standard Nearly Met" on SBAC ELA test.
- 100% of English learners in grades 3-11 scored "Standards Not Met" on SBAC Mathematics test.

Integrated ELD instruction needs to be provided within all content areas that builds on designated ELD instruction. English learners need additional opportunities to engage with language (orally and written) to develop English language skills.

b. Describe findings from EL program design and implementation analyses of the strengths and weaknesses in the program related to the AMAOs in the current LEA Plan Goal 2, the prior Year 2 Title III IPA (as applicable), and any other appropriate documents (e.g. the LEA's EL Master Plan). The program dimensions listed below are areas of implementation to consider in reviewing current plans.

Area of	Evidence Reviewed	Findings: Strengths & Weaknesses	Next Steps
Implementation Instructional Program Design for English learners (including language programs)	 CELDT SBAC (ELA and Mathematics) District Benchmark Assessments Professional Development evaluations Classroom observations 	Strengths: All teachers of EL's scaffold content instruction so that it's comprehensible. All English Learners receive instruction in all content areas that is differentiated to meet their English language development needs.	The reading and language instruction curriculum will be aligned with California Common Core standards and will include a comprehensive EL component.
		Weaknesses: Teachers require training in the development of assessment tools to inform and evaluate training	
Implementation of Instructional Services and Methods (including language programs)	 ELD instruction Language proficiency assessment data State Mathematics and ELS assessment data Classroom observations 	Strengths: All English learners have access to the curriculum. All classroom teachers scaffold, differentiate, and provide access to the core content Weakness: Teachers require training in the development of assessment tools to inform and evaluate training	Provide professional development for common core ELD implementation; training on new curriculum Provide professional development for common core ELD implementation; training on new curriculum

Professional Learning	 ELD instruction Language proficiency assessment data State Mathematics and ELA assessment data 	 Strengths: Professional development services are provided through various opportunities and agencies. The district has developed extensive professional plans for district-wide implementation of California State Standards. All teachers in the district were offered workshops on the implementation of the CCSS and the CA ELD Standards 	The district will provide professional development for common core ELD implementation; training on new curriculum, and pull-out and in-class EL instructional support.
Parent and Community Participation	 Parent Feedback Stakeholder Feedback 	Strengths: Parenting classes SSC/ELAC PTA Weekly orientations LCAP stakeholder meetings Weakness: Limited attendance by parents	Provide parenting classes, SSC/ELAC meetings and other regularly scheduled parent-school engagement meetings; and PTA outreach
Services for Immigrant Students (if LEA receives Title III Immigrant Funds)	n/a	n/a	n/a

California Department of Education

April 2016