

California Department of Education

**Early Literacy Support Block Grant Program
Annual Progress Report Template**

The Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant program Annual Progress Report allows for participating districts and eligible schools to determine and describe the effectiveness in addressing the required components of the ELSB Grant planning process. **The Annual Report for Year 1 (Planning Year) is due to the California Department of Education on July 30, 2021.** Please complete the following information and email the completed report to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov.

Name of District and Eligible Participating School(s):

Alpaugh Unified School District

Report Submitted By (Name/Title): Troy Hayes/Superintendent

Phone/Email: thayes@alpaughusd.org

Period Covered: Grant Year 1 Planning Phase - 2020-21 School Year

Date Submitted: 8/10/2021

1. Account for the ELSB grant program planning activities that identify both individual and collective contributions in the conducting of a Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.

- a. Describe the process and timeline of activities conducted in the development of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment
- b. Specify the local educational agency (LEA) ELSB lead and primary fiscal contact staff.
- c. Include the names of participants for each participating school and participant roles (e.g., J Brahms – 1st grade teacher at Mozart Elementary; A. Vivaldi – Principal, Bach Elementary, R. Wagner – Bach Site Literacy Coach, G. Verdi – District Curriculum Coordinator etc.).

- a. In addition to the designated Zoom meeting times for the ELSB grant, our team met biweekly to discuss and develop our Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment. Through the months of February through May, 2021, we presented information and surveyed staff and community members to ensure we analyzed our current literacy program from the point of view of educators, other staff members, parents, and community members.
- b. ELSB lead- Ashley Atwell ashleyallen@alpaughusd.org
Primary fiscal contact- Berenice Alvarez balvarez@alpaugh.k12.ca.us
- c. Dave Juarez- Alpaugh Elementary 1st grade teacher, Amber Crain- Alpaugh Elementary 3rd grade teacher, Ashley Atwell- Alpaugh Elementary TOSA Early Lit Coach, Troy Hayes- Alpaugh Unified Superintendent

2. Validate the results of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.

- a. Specify the findings from the examination of both school-level and LEA-level practices or unmet needs, including those relating to school climate, social-emotional learning, and the experience of under-performing pupils and their families, that have contributed to low pupil outcomes for pupils in grade three on the consortium summative assessment in English Language Arts.

After completing several ELSB sessions with the Sacramento Office of Education, our Literacy Team identified the critical need for staff professional development with the current district curriculum, an explicit school wide instructional alignment/progression, and development of a multi-tiered support system. While creating our Root Cause Analysis, we were able to identify key areas of weakness in our school's literacy program. We are lacking in teacher knowledge and familiarity of our curriculum, fidelity of implementation/application, informative assessments, and multi-tiered system of support. From this identification of our school's weaknesses, we determined and prioritized the resources and supports we will need to achieve our literacy goals. We recognize students need to feel a stronger sense of connectedness, to create a positive school climate, reduce discipline practices, and improve attendance. This is not an area of need identified on our Needs Assessment or Root Cause Analysis, however it is our district's intent to establish this outside the scope of this grant plan to build our school's culture. For Social Emotional Learning, our school currently uses a county social worker that provides SEL support for our entire school district. We will continue to improve our current SEL support but do not intend to utilize grant funds for this.

3. Describe the identified strengths and weaknesses of both the eligible school(s) and the LEA regarding literacy instruction in transitional kindergarten through grade 3 (TK –3), inclusive. Identify all relevant diagnostic measures, including, but not limited to, pupil performance data, data on effective and ineffective practices, and equity and performance gaps reviewed during the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.

While creating our Root Cause Analysis, we were able to identify key areas of weakness in our school's literacy program. We are lacking in teacher knowledge and familiarity of our curriculum fidelity of implementation/application, informative assessments, and multi-tiered system of support. From this identification of weaknesses, we determined and prioritized the resources and support we will need to achieve our literacy goals. Previous to our focus on improving our Literacy practices, we utilized DRA assessments which we found to be very subjective. There was little consistency with teacher scoring of the assessment.

4. Explain how the LEA consulted with stakeholders, including school staff, school leaders, parents, and community members, at each eligible school about the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment and proposed expenditures of the grant funds. If the School Site Council (SSC) was used for this purpose, describe how the school provided public notice of meetings and how meetings were conducted in the manner required by Section 35147 of the *Education Code*.

Our Literacy Team conducted a staff survey and met on two separate occasions with groups of educators within our school to determine employees' perspective on literacy program weaknesses and needs. Additionally, we met with our school Leadership Team to receive more insight from educators to review our Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment. We met with our local Historical Society to present our Root Cause Analysis, Needs Assessment, and proposed expenditures of grant funds. We discussed areas of strength and areas of concern with the Historical Society board and community members present. Our proposed expenditures, Root Cause Analysis, and Needs Assessment were also presented to our School Site Council. Public notice for the School Site council was given via school website, Blackboard, Seesaw, and school Facebook page.

5. Justify LEA partnerships with literacy experts from the county office of education for the county in which the LEA is located, a geographic lead agency established, or the Expert Lead in Literacy in the development of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment and the Literacy Action Plan. If applicable, describe any partnership with a member of an institution of higher education or nonprofit organization with expertise in literacy for this purpose, which may also involve experts in participatory design and meaningful community involvement.

We are not currently partnering with literacy experts from our county office of education.

6. Describe how enrollment, program participation, and stakeholder engagement were leveraged to address the literacy needs of students enrolled in grades TK–3 at participating eligible schools, and include a brief narrative of analytical findings (see chart on page 8).

During our work on the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment we recognized our data demonstrates a high-percentage of students reading below grade level. Our DRA assessments lacked teacher guidance on next steps for students and specificity in the targeted areas where students need support. The data collected from DRA assessments, reported information from Lexia, and stakeholder feedback we concluded 67% of our students are not able to read and comprehend complex grade level texts by third grade.

NOTE: Use the chart below to identify the anticipated number of students enrolled who will be served by ELSB Grant-funded activities and the **primary** stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents, community members, etc.) who were active participants in the Root Cause Analysis, Needs Assessment, and development of the three-year Literacy Action Plan.

Description	Student Enrollment (List only the number for each grade level, TK–3, by eligible participating school)	Participating Teachers (List only the number for each grade level, TK–3, by eligible participating school)	Participating Administrator(s) (List only role and number of each by district office and eligible participating school.)	Other Stakeholder Input (List all participating stakeholder groups by eligible participating school. For example, SSC, English Learner Advisory Committee [ELAC], school board, etc., and the number of participants for each.
Example	Mozart Elementary TK = 48 K = 52 1 = 56 2 = 58 3 = 64 Chopin Elementary, etc...	Mozart Elementary TK = 0 K = 1 1 = 1 2 = 1 3 = 1 Chopin Elementary, etc...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District ELA Curriculum Director = 1 ● District Literacy Coaches = 10 ● District Budget Technician = 2 ● Mozart Admin = 1, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mozart Elementary J.S. SSC (7), ELAC (4), Title I parent meeting (28), DELAC (7), school board (7) ● Chopin Elementary, etc.
Numbers	<i>Mozart = 278</i>	<i>Mozart = 4</i>	<i>Mozart = 1</i>	<i>Mozart =39</i>
Overall Participant Totals	Alpaugh Elementary TK = K = 1 = 2 = 3 = Total =	Alpaugh Elementary TK = 1 K = 1 1=1 2 = 1 3 = 1 Total = 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alpaugh Elementary Literacy Coaches = 1 ● Alpaugh District/Elementary School Admin = 1 ● Alpaugh District CBO = 1 Total =3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alpaugh Elementary SSC (7), ELAC (7), School Board (5) Total = 19

--	--	--	--	--