Performance Management Presentation

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
Academic Performance Index (API)
Program Improvement (PI)
School Update and Progress Report (SUPR)

October 23, 2012

Purpose

➢ **To inform the Board of Education and the community about the recent release of results from the 2011-2012 Accountability Progress Reporting**

➢ **To present:**
- **AUSD District API & AYP results**
- **Update on Program Improvement**
- **School Update and Progress Report release**

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

API Results by School

Elementary API:

Site	2010 Base API	2011 Growth API	Difference	2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	Difference
Earhart	948	941	-7	941	947	+6
Bay Farm	942	947	+5	948	961	+13
Lum	867	896	+29	896	893	-3
Edison	940	943	+3	943	942	-1
Otis	886	896	+10	896	907	+11
Franklin	897	913	+16	913	916	+3
Haight	814	822	+7	822	832	+10
Ruby Bridges	816	811	-5	811	835	+24
Washington	794	778	-16	777	722	-55
Paden	836	829	-7	829	851	+22

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

API Results by School

Secondary API:

Site	2010 Base API	2011 Growth API	Difference	2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	Difference
Chipman/ AoA	739 (Growth API from 2010)	770	+31	770	774	+4
Lincoln	899	908	+9	909	912	+3
Wood	783	749	-34	750	762	+12
Alameda High	821	825	+4	824	830	+6
ASTI	842	895	+53	895	896	+1
Encinal High	764	751	-13	751	761	+10
Island High	644	615	-29	619	505	-114

Key Point: Some schools have seen some huge leaps in growth over this last year. Ruby Bridges and Paden have been particularly successful. As a continuation school, Island's population is small and its success is measured in other ways.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

API Results by Significant Subgroup

Subgroup	2010 Base API	2011 Growth API	Difference	2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	Difference
AUSD	833	842	+9	841	847	+6
African Am/ Black	700	714	+14	713	726	+13
Asian	878	883	+5	883	889	+6
Filipino	807	821	+14	820	820	0
Hispanic/Latino	755	749	-6	749	768	+19
White	880	882	+2	881	885	+4
SED	759	768	+9	767	777	+10
English Learner	786	796	+10	796	794	-2
Students w/ Disabilities	622	631	+9	630	647	+17

Key Point: AUSD continues to increase API as a district and in most significant subgroups. The African American/Black subgroup increased API by double digits again this year, and Hispanic/Latino subgroup gains give them a higher API than their base in 2010. Still, the achievement/service gap needs to be addressed as an issue of great urgency.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Safe Harbor-An Explanation

Annual Yearly Progress targets can be met in two ways.

1) Schools and subgroups can hit or surpass the <u>Annual Measurable Objective</u> (AMO) that is set by the federal government. The AMO is the percentage of students who test proficient or advanced in a subject area. This number increases about 11% each year until it reaches 100% in 2014.

2) Schools and subgroups can reach <u>Safe Harbor</u>. Safe Harbor is reached when 10% of the non-proficient students from the previous year test at the proficient or advanced level. For example, if in the 2009-2010 school year there were 67 students in a school or subgroup who were not proficient, 6.7 of them would need to test proficient the following year to reach Safe Harbor for that group.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

AMO Report District Wide: ELA

Years	AMO	AUSD ELA	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Two Races	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/ 2006	**23.0**	62.8	36.4	70.5	59.9	42.5	75.6		43.5	46.5	29.6
2006/ 2007	**23.0**	62.4	35.6	71.8	56.6	46.7	73.1		44.0	47.0	28.1
2007/ 2008	**34.0**	64.8	35.1	73.7	58.1	44.5	77.9		45.7	49.9	28.8
2008/ 2009	**45.0**	67.6	42.3	74.4	60.5	51.1	79.9		47.2	53.7	37.7
2009/ 2010	**56.0**	69.3	38.9	77.0	64.1	51.8	82.3	72.9	50.1	56.8	40.1
2010/ 2011	**67.0**	71.4	46.1	78.4	66.3	54.0	80.1	86.0	53.6	60.2	43.3
2011/ 2012	**78.0**	73.7	51.8	80.1	66.3	58.8	82.7	80.5	55.5	59.5	45.3
2012/ 2013	**89.0**										

Key Point: AUSD did not meet the AMO in ELA for this year but met AYP through Safe Harbor. However, specific subgroups did not meet AMO, and the district as a whole will need to improve by 15.3% proficient to reach the target next year. Cells are green if the percent has increased and light orange to show a decrease.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

AMO Report District Wide: Math

Years	AMO	AUSD Math	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Two Races	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/ 2006	**23.7**	63.3	34.1	78.5	59.2	40.6	71.1		47.7	57.3	33.7
2006/ 2007	**23.7**	61.5	33.1	76.6	56.0	42.8	68.2		46.9	57.5	31.9
2007/ 2008	**34.6**	62.8	33.9	76.4	54.8	40.6	71.3		46.9	56.8	31.4
2008/ 2009	**45.5**	66.3	39.1	79.9	60.7	43.7	74.3		50.8	60.5	35.3
2009/ 2010	**56.4**	68.0	41.9	79.9	59.1	47.1	77.3	72.4	52.5	63.8	40.1
2010/ 2011	**67.3**	71.2	42.4	82.9	67.6	49.1	77.4	80.4	56.7	67.8	40.3
2011/ 2012	**78.2**	73.5	49.1	84.6	68.3	55.0	78.7	82.9	59.9	67.3	43.9
2012/ 2013	**89.1**										

Key Point: AUSD did not meet the AMO in Math for this year but met AYP through Safe Harbor. However, specific subgroups did not meet AMO, and the district will need to improve by 15.6% proficient to reach the target next year. Cells are green if the percent has increased and light orange to show a decrease.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Paden AYP: Significant Subgroups

	English-Language Arts Target 78.4 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? Yes					Mathematics Target 79.0 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? Yes				
GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	224	152	67.9	Yes	SH	223	161	72.2	Yes	SH
Black or African American	48	28	58.3	--		48	27	56.2	--	
Asian	54	42	77.8	Yes	SH	54	46	85.2	Yes	
White	68	52	76.5	Yes	SH	67	55	82.1	Yes	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	113	62	54.9	Yes	SH	113	71	62.8	Yes	SH
English Learners	74	42	56.8	Yes	SH	74	52	70.3	Yes	SH

Key Point: Paden met all schoolwide and significant subgroup targets and will remain at PI Year 1 status. Out of the 1035 California schools in PI Year 1 in 2011-12, 144 are remaining at PI Year 1.

Paden Elementary School: ELA

Years	AMO	Paden ELA	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	White	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/2006	**24.4**	65.0	39.3	74.7	57.1	38.1	72.7	48.5	65.9	12.0
2006/2007	**24.4**	57.4	36.1	62.3	39.4	50.0	72.5	41.9	45.5	28.9
2007/2008	**35.2**	61.8	31.3	68.4	61.3	42.9	76.1	50.7	58.1	23.8
2008/2009	**46.0**	63.8	41.7	69.2	67.7	16.7	75.3	38.7	53.5	43.3
2009/2010	**56.8**	61.0	37.8	71.7	61.3	23.8	75.7	47.7	50.6	53.8
2010/2011	**67.6**	58.9	43.2	76.7	46.9	21.7	72.0	37.6	55.2	35.1
2011/2012	**78.0**	67.9	58.3	77.8	76.5	54.2	76.5	54.9	56.8	63.3
Increase or decrease %		+9%	+15.1%	+1.1%	+29.6%	+32.5%	+4.5%	+17.3%	+1.6%	+28.2%

Key Point: Paden increased 9% schoolwide in ELA. They also made gains in all subgroups, with several gains in the double digits, and all groups have reached their highest level of percent proficient since the start of using these measures. Green cells show an increase in percent proficient.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Paden Elementary School: Math

Years	AMO	Paden Math	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	White	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/ 2006	**26.5**	71.5	48.1	86.7	60.0	40.0	76.1	56.4	76.8	22.7
2006/ 2007	**26.5**	66.1	52.8	79.2	63.6	35.0	73.8	52.7	63.6	34.2
2007/ 2008	**37.0**	72.8	62.5	78.9	67.7	52.4	81.7	61.3	71.6	47.6
2008/ 2009	**47.5**	70.8	55.6	76.9	80.6	33.3	78.9	53.3	70.4	44.8
2009/ 2010	**58.0**	68.8	54.1	83.0	74.2	33.3	75.7	57.0	70.4	46.2
2010/ 2011	**68.5**	71.8	52.3	85.0	62.5	47.8	84.0	60.6	70.1	48.6
2011/ 2012	**79.0**	72.2	56.2	85.2	60.9	58.3	82.1	62.8	70.3	55.2
Increase or decrease %		+0.4%	+3.9%	+0.2%	-2.6%	+10.5%	-1.9%	+2.2%	+0.2%	+6.6%

Key Point: Paden improved scores this year, increasing percent proficient in 7 out of 9 groups. Cells are green if the percent proficient has increased and light orange if the percent proficient has decreased.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Ruby Bridges AYP: Significant Subgroups

	English-Language Arts Target 78.4 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No					Mathematics Target 79.0 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? Yes				
GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	349	217	62.2	Yes	SH	348	238	68.4	Yes	SH
Black or African American	97	48	49.5	Yes	SH	97	49	50.5	Yes	SH
Asian	76	63	82.9	Yes		76	66	86.8	Yes	
Hispanic or Latino	59	33	55.9	Yes	SH	59	38	64.4	Yes	SH
White	70	42	60.0	No		69	50	72.5	Yes	SH
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	244	135	55.3	Yes	SH	243	152	62.6	Yes	SH
English Learners	156	97	62.2	Yes	SH	156	117	75.0	Yes	SH

Key Point: Ruby Bridges reached Safe Harbor or AMO in 13 out of 14 targets. The school has more significant subgroups than any other school in the district and only missed one subgroup. Ruby Bridges is now in PI Year 2.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Ruby Bridges: ELA

Years	AMO	Ruby Bridges ELA	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	White	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/ 2006	**24.4**	44.0	36.1	58.6	59.1	38.2	51.7	42.0	46.4	6.5
2006/ 2007	**24.4**	44.9	35.0	64.3	46.7	39.3	59.5	42.1	49.5	15.0
2007/ 2008	**35.2**	48.7	38.5	66.7	57.1	47.1	59.0	41.8	50.0	18.8
2008/ 2009	**46.0**	56.9	46.1	61.4	64.1	53.1	71.4	48.2	56.0	51.2
2009/ 2010	**56.8**	56.7	44.4	66.7	60.0	60.3	63.8	49.4	50.4	32.0
2010/ 2011	**67.6**	54.2	38.7	72.1	68.4	45.8	63.2	46.4	59.0	35.1
2011/ 2012	**78.4**	62.3	49.5	82.9	71.9	55.9	60.0	55.3	62.2	35.7
Increase or decrease %		+8.1%	+10.8%	+10.8%	+3.5%	+10.1%	-3.2%	+8.9%	+3.2%	+0.6%

Key Point: Ruby Bridges increased school wide and in all significant subgroups except one. Cells are green if the percent has increased and light orange if percent proficient decreased.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Ruby Bridges: Math

Years	AMO	Ruby Bridges Math	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	White	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/ 2006	**26.5**	55.0	40.3	72.4	63.6	60.0	58.6	52.0	67.1	19.4
2006/ 2007	**26.5**	54.2	38.8	81.0	53.3	57.1	67.4	53.2	72.2	12.2
2007/ 2008	**37.0**	59.6	49.0	76.7	66.7	52.8	75.0	54.1	67.7	18.5
2008/ 2009	**47.5**	61.2	47.1	84.2	74.4	60.0	57.1	55.2	69.1	29.5
2009/ 2010	**58.0**	65.1	51.5	84.3	67.5	64.3	75.6	59.1	69.1	37.3
2010/ 2011	**68.5**	64.9	45.4	88.2	78.9	61.7	72.1	57.4	71.4	43.1
2011/ 2012	**79.0**	68.4	50.5	86.8	75.0	64.4	72.5	62.6	75	40.5
Increase or decrease %		+3.5%	+5.1%	-1.4%	-3.9%	+2.7%	+0.4%	+5.2%	+3.6%	-2.6%

Key Point: Ruby Bridges increased percent proficient schoolwide and in most subgroups. Cells are green if the percent has increased and light orange if percent proficient decreased.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Wood AYP: Significant Subgroups

GROUPS	English-Language Arts Target 78.4 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No					Mathematics Target 79.0 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No				
	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	539	278	51.6	No		539	250	46.4	Yes	SH
Black or African American	92	31	33.7	No		92	28	30.4	Yes	SH
Asian	175	95	54.3	No		175	106	60.6	Yes	SH
Hispanic or Latino	106	54	50.9	Yes	SH	106	38	35.8	Yes	SH
White	86	57	66.3	Yes	SH	86	45	52.3	Yes	SH
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	338	152	45.0	No		338	150	44.4	Yes	SH
English Learners	185	65	35.1	No		185	70	37.8	No	

Key Point: Despite significant gains in Math, Wood is entering PI Year 3.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Wood: ELA

Years	AMO	Wood ELA	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	White	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/ 2006	**24.4**	50.0	32.2	55.9	46.9	29.3	64.9	38.9	28.1	25.4
2006/ 2007	**24.4**	54.4	35.0	64.6	50.9	35.4	62.6	47.8	43.8	30.5
2007/ 2008	**35.2**	55.7	24.6	63.5	54.9	40.7	69.1	45.3	50.0	27.4
2008/ 2009	**46.0**	55.3	32.7	59.7	68.7	34.9	69.3	44.5	48.6	21.8
2009/ 2010	**56.8**	58.4	30.0	60.3	64.7	51.2	78.8	49.3	49.3	27.8
2010/ 2011	**67.6**	51.2	34.8	55.7	55.6	44.6	60.9	43.8	46.1	40.6
2011/ 2012	**78.4**	62.2	49.5	82.9	71.9	55.9	60.0	55.3	62.2	35.7
Increase or decrease %		+11%	+14.7%	+27.2%	+16.3%	+11.3%	-0.9%	+11.5%	+16.1%	-4.9%

Key Point: Wood students increased in percent proficient school wide and in several subgroups by double digit growth. Many groups are at their highest level of percent proficient since this system went in place in 2005. Cells are green if the percent proficient has increased and light orange shows a decrease.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Wood: Math

Years	AMO	Wood Math	African Am/Black	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	White	SED	English Learners	Students w/ Disabilities
2005/ 2006	**26.5**	43.0	22.0	62.1	39.1	14.1	47.6	36.8	38.6	25.4
2006/ 2007	**26.5**	37.6	20.0	52.5	35.1	9.9	44.4	32.3	41.1	28.2
2007/ 2008	**37.0**	33.1	13.0	43.6	29.6	16.3	37.7	30.2	30.2	17.8
2008/ 2009	**47.5**	40.4	15.1	54.5	38.8	24.4	44.5	37.7	38.9	15.5
2009/ 2010	**58.0**	35.6	16.9	45.9	26.5	25.0	40.4	33.3	37.1	18.0
2010/ 2011	**68.5**	32.1	18.8	45.9	38.9	13.9	33.3	29.5	35.0	17.2
2011/ 2012	**79.0**	46.4	30.4	60.6	38.1	35.8	52.3	44.4	37.8	30.7
Increase or decrease %		+14.3%	+11.6%	+14.7%	-0.8%	+21.9%	+19%	+14.9%	+2.8%	+13.5%

Key Point: Wood made some good gains in Math this year. Many subgroups scored at their highest rate of percent proficient since this system went in place in 2005. Cells are green if the percent proficient has increased and light orange if it decreased.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Exiting PI

In order to exit PI, schools must either meet the AMO or reach Safe Harbor for two consecutive years.

➢ Paden would need to meet AYP school wide and with its 4 significant subgroups in both subjects for one more year.

➢ Ruby Bridges would need to meet AYP school wide and with its 6 significant subgroups in both subjects for two more years.

➢ Wood would need to meet AYP school wide and with its 5 significant subgroups in both subjects for two more years.

Haight AYP 2012

	English-Language Arts Target 78.4 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? Yes					Mathematics Target 79.0 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No				
GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative e Method
Schoolwide	246	157	63.8	Yes	SH	246	171	69.5	Yes	SH
Asian	89	63	70.8	Yes	SH	89	69	77.5	No	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	152	93	61.2	Yes	SH	152	102	67.1	Yes	SH
English Learners	114	75	65.8	Yes	SH	114	85	74.6	Yes	SH

Key Point: In 2011, Haight met AYP targets through Safe Harbor in six areas, hitting AMO targets in two areas. In 2012, Haight met AYP in ELA but missed one target in Math in the Asian subgroup. This group missed reaching the AMO target of 79% by 1.5%. Haight is now on the watch list and must meet AYP in all areas next year or become PI Year 1.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR (School Updates and Progress Reports)

> Given the differing needs of sites in AUSD, the SUPR was designed as part of the Performance Management System to align resources with needs based on data.

> Our goal in AUSD is success for all students, and the goal of the SUPR is to focus attention on areas of growth and strength.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Performance Management System

- Scorecards (to gauge district office service delivery)

- Steps to Success (to gauge college and career readiness)

- *SUPR: School Update and Progress Report*

  - *Student demographics, mobility, attendance*

  - *Teacher qualifications, mobility*

  - *State, Federal, and local indicators*

    - *Snapshot of current state*

    - *Growth over time*

    - *Relative to other schools*

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

Alameda Unified School District Guiding Principles

1. All students have the ability to achieve academic and personal success
2. Teachers must challenge and support all students to reach their highest academic and personal potential
3. Administrators must have the knowledge, leadership skills, and ability to ensure all students succeed
4. Parental involvement and community engagement are integral to the success of all students
5. Accountability, transparency, and trust are necessary at all levels of the organization
6. Allocation of funds must support our vision, mission, and guiding principles

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

School Update and Progress Report

- Standardized set of quality indicators

- Focus

  - Demographics and teacher qualification

  - Student performance

  - Student growth

  - School progress and accountability

- Identify areas of strength and challenge

- Alignment of resources to match needs

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Tiering

- Allocation of resources must support our vision, mission, and guiding principles
- SUPR is used to gauge performance and determine resource alignment

Strong Performance

Monitor

Area of Concern / Focus

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

The opening page of the SUPR includes:

- A description of SUPR and its intended use

- School information

- An outline of the report

- Contact information

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

School Profile   Demographics

School: Ruby Bridges Elementary

This section provides comprehensive enrollment and demographic data relevant to school learning environment. Included in this data reporting is information about attendance, SES, EL progress, Special Education, GATE, mobility and discipline.

Enrollment

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Kindergarten	120	99	106
Grade 1	102	125	100
Grade 2	102	97	116
Grade 3	125	96	98
Grade 4	80	116	96
Grade 5	85	68	100
Total	614	601	631

Enrollment Information

Enrollment information typically comes from CBEDS data on 'Information' day, usually the first Wednesday in October.

Demographic Factors

	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Socio Economically Disadvantaged	411	67%	441	67%	388	61.5%
Limited English Proficient	242	39%	247	39%	223	35%
Special Education	96	16%	59	16%	47	7%
Gifted and Talented [1]	14	8%	4	8%	6	3%
Reclassified Fluent English [2]	9	4%	18	8%		
Student Mobility [3]		21.46%		23.23%		
Racial / Ethnic Origin						
Asian	129	21%	118	19%	124	19.6%
Black/African-American	174	28%	170	27.4%	197	31.1%
Hispanic	101	16%	109	17.6%	94	14.8%
Filipino	58	9%	54	8.7%	51	8.2%
White	131	21%	128	20.6%	124	19.6%
Other	21	3%	42	6.8%	41	6.5%

Demographic Factors Information

[1] GATE student percentage calculated from grade 4 and grade 5 enrollment.
[2] Reclassified percentage calculated from all EL learners in the school.
[3] School mobility = (Entries after first day of school + Withdrawals) / (First day enrollment + Entries after first day).

Attendance and Suspensions

	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	%		%		%	
Annual Attendance Rate	95.49%		95.69%		97.20%	
	Days	Students	Days	Students	Days	Students
Student Suspension Days	52	48	32	17	8	5

Student Attendance and Discipline Information

Attendance is an important indicator of school climate and student participation. Attention is paid to improving attendance as well as addressing student discipline through collection of data in order to inform a school's theory of action to make improvement in these areas.

October 14, 2012

Page | 2

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance								
Blue Monitor								
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate							

Key Point: Ruby Bridges has experienced a rise in overall enrollment this year and a slight drop in Limited English Proficient and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students for 2012-2013. Student mobility continues to rise at the school. However, 2011-12 showed a decrease in the number of suspensions and students suspended.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance		X Stable						
Blue Monitor								
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate							

Key Point: All teachers at Ruby Bridges are highly qualified to teach at the school, and many (36%) have a master's degree. The turnover rate is also exceptionally low: only 2/33 teachers this year, none last year, and 1 in 2010-11.

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance		X Stable						
Blue Monitor			X PI Year 2 API: 24 pt gain; 835 AYP: Met 13/14 targets					
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate							

Key Point: Ruby Bridges showed a strong performance last year in both ELA and Math, meeting Annual Yearly Progress goals in 13/14 target areas. Their API also went up 24 points. However, as a Title 1 school, they needed to meet all 14 targets, so the school will advance into PI Year 2.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance		X Stable						
Blue Monitor			X PI Year 2 API: 24 pt gain; 835 AYP: Met 13/14 targets					
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate			**ELA:** SH in 5/7 areas **Math:** SH in 6/7 areas				

Key Point: Ruby Bridges met AYP in 11/14 areas through Safe Harbor. Although the school has much to celebrate from their successes last year, they only met Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) set by the federal government in 2 areas, and being in PI Year 2 means they will need continued support and resources .

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance		X Stable			X ELA: 3rd & 5th Slippage, strong 4th **Math**: Strong 3rd, 4th gr slippage			
Blue Monitor			X PI Year 2 API: 24 pt gain; 835 AYP: Met 13/14 targets					
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate			ELA: SH in 5/7 areas **Math**: SH in 6/7 areas				

Key Point: Ruby Bridges is split in this category. In ELA, 3rd and 5th grade students had some overall slipping into lower performance levels, but 4th grade students made good growth. In Math, 3rd grade students had excellent growth while 4th grade students had a much greater loss than gain in performance bands.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance		**X** Stable			**X** ELA: 3rd & 5th Slippage, strong 4th **Math:** Strong 3rd, 4th gr slippage			
Blue Monitor			**X** PI Year 2 API: 24 pt gain; 835 AYP: Met 13/14 targets			**X** Moderate Gains 0.60		
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	**X** High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate			**ELA:** SH in 5/7 areas **Math:** SH in 6/7 areas				

Key Point: Ruby Bridges EL students gained an average of 0.60 bands on the CELDT. The federal goal is for 54.5% EL students to gain one band, and Ruby Bridges is at 47.3%.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance		X Stable			X ELA: 3rd & 5th Slippage, strong 4th Math: Strong 3rd, 4th gr slippage			
Blue Monitor			X PI Year 2 API: 24 pt gain; 835 AYP: Met 13/14 targets			X Moderate Gains 0.60		
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate			ELA: SH in 5/7 areas Math: SH in 6/7 areas			X 5/6 areas below 80%	

Key Point: Ruby Bridges had one area in which 91.7% met the Healthy Fitness Zone target. The other five areas were between 54% and 77%.

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

Other Key Performance Indicators

School: Ruby Bridges Elementary

Parental Involvement   TBD

School Site Council Compliance

Single Plan for Student Achievement   Fall 2011 & Spring 2012

Parental Involvement is an area that is being developed as a performance metric.

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Similar School Ranking [1]	8	9	8
State School Ranking	6	6	6

[1] For the similar schools rank, schools are ranked into deciles according to school type: elementary, middle, and high. To determine the similar schools rank for a school, a comparison group of 100 similar schools of the same type is formed for that school, based on similar demographic characteristics. APIs for this group of 100 schools are ranked into ten categories of equal size, called deciles, from one (lowest) to ten (highest). Each decile contains 10 percent of all of the 100 similar schools in the comparison group. The school's similar schools rank is the decile where that school's Base API falls compared with the Base APIs of the 100 other similar schools in the comparison group.

The Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) specifies the demographic characteristics to include in similar schools rank calculations:

- Pupil mobility
- Pupil ethnicity (seven variables)
- Pupil socioeconomic status (two variables)
- Percentage of teachers who are fully credentialed
- Percentage of teachers who hold emergency credentials
- Percentage of pupils who are English learners (ELs)
- Average class size per grade level
- Whether the school operates a multitrack year-round educational program
- Percentage of grade span enrollment (grades two, three to five, six, seven to eight, and nine to eleven)
- Percentage of students in gifted and talented education program
- Percentage of students with disabilities
- Percentage of reclassified fluent-English-proficient (RFEP) students
- Percentage of migrant education students

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green — Strong Performance		X Stable			X ELA: 3rd & 5th Slippage, strong 4th Math: Strong 3rd, 4th gr slippage			X High Similar School rank: 8
Blue — Monitor			X PI Year 2 API: 24 pt gain; 855 AYP: Met 13/14 targets			X Moderate Gains 0.60		
Purple — Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate			ELA: SH in 5/7 areas Math: SH in 6/7 areas			X 5/6 area below 50%	

October 14, 2012   Page | 10

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Example: Ruby Bridges

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4	Cohort Performance 5	CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Green Strong Performance		X Stable			X ELA: 3rd & 5th Slippage, strong 4th Math: Strong 3rd, 4th gr slippage			X High Similar School rank: 8
Blue Monitor			X PI Year 2 API: 24 pt gain; 835 AYP: Met 13/14 targets			X Moderate Gains 0.60		
Purple Area of Concern/Focus	X High SED, EL & student mobility; moderate suspension rate			ELA: SH in 5/7 areas Math: SH in 6/7 areas			X 5/6 areas below 80%	

Key Point: The last page of the SUPR document includes school ranking information and has the tiering chart. Ruby Bridges has a State school ranking of 6 again this year, and the school dropped from similar school ranking of 9 to 8 this year. This is still a high score for similar school ranking.

ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Excellence & Equity For All Students

SUPR Tiering for AUSD

AUSD Resource Tiering
SUPR-School Progress and Update Report

	Color Coding		
Strong Performance	Monitor		Area of Concern/Focus

	Demographics 1	Teacher Data 2	Accountability 3	School Performance 4		Cohort Performance 5		CELDT 6	Physical Fitness Test 7	Similar School 8
Bay Farm										
Earhart										
Edison						ELA	Math			
Franklin						ELA	Math			
Haight										
Lum										
May Lin										
Otis						ELA	Math			
Paden										
Ruby Bridges										
Lincoln						ELA	Math			
Wood				ELA	Math	ELA	Math			
Alameda										
ASTI										
Encinal										
Island									NA	NA

Fall 2012 for 2012-13

Key Point: Based on the SUPR tiering structure, AUSD schools vary greatly in their need for resources. This year, every category except Teacher Data is represented by schools that fall into all three tiering levels, and although some of the results are predictable, there may be surprises that this report calls to attention.

Next Steps

- Staff will use the information from SUPR to align resource allocations which include but are not limited to:
  - Funding
  - Specific project support
  - Materials
  - Dedicated time
- 2012-13: Possible effort to include additional school stakeholders and community members
- Staff continue to invite input to improve SUPR