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**SCHOOL VISION & CONTEXT**

Vision Statement: At James Denman Middle School we believe that each student will develop the habits and skills necessary to become a successful and productive member of a diverse community. Our staff, students, and families are committed to creating an effective structure and supportive learning atmosphere. All available resources will be used to create an engaging curriculum for students. Denman Mission: James Denman Middle School students are preparing for high school and their future education. Our diverse and dynamic community is developing social and academic skills along with the core values needed to be successful citizens. The students of James Denman Middle School are safe, responsible, respectful, engaged learners who celebrate diversity, and show compassion and commitment towards their community.

Priority Actions: Build the Instructional Core, which includes ongoing PD centered around Common Core Implementation, implementation of school wide Instructional Rounds with a focus on student discourse and continuing our focus on integration of technology and STEM instruction. Continue offering AVID in grades 6-8 and further build our AVID strategies throughout the whole school. Launch Academic Response to Intervention with a clear PD plan, coaching and supports. Solidify our Behavioral RTI and implement Tier 3. Continue our work on inclusive practices and examining disproportionality and actively trying to positively impact it. Launching our partnership with Verizon's Digital Promise.

In the section above, please include salient points from your SARC School Vision and complete an Executive Summary for your school site. Include the following components:

- **Who are you:** What are three to five facts about your school? What is essential to know about your students, staff, and community?
- **Areas of success or strengths:** What are your school’s top one or two strengths that directly impact student academic success, student social/emotional development, and/or school culture/climate?
- **Areas of challenge:** What are your school’s top one or two challenges that directly impact student academic success, student social/emotional development, and/or school culture/climate?
- **Key strategies:** What are the main two or three strategies driving work across your entire school and/or within a large component of your school? (For instance, if someone were to ask any teacher at the school, “what is the school mainly working on right now,” what would he/she say?)
- **High Schools:** You can include the information you have in your WASC Self-Study Report (School Data Profile Section)
SECTION I: Overview and Key Components

SECTION II: School Data Profile

SECTION III: School-Wide Analysis and Plan

1. Strategies in Action: Instructional Core/Engaging & Challenging Curriculum
   - Language Arts Core Curriculum in English & Other Targeted Languages (including Language Pathways)
   - Mathematics Core Curriculum
   - English Language Development (ELD)
   - Other Subject Areas (Secondary Schools, optional for Elementary)
   - College & Career Readiness

2. Strategies in Schools:
   - Leadership, Instructional Guidance & Professional Development
   - Student-Centered Learning Climate
     - Students with Disabilities
     - School Engagement
     - School Climate

3. Parent-School-Community Ties
   - Family Engagement
   - Deepening a Community Schools Approach

SECTION IV: School Budget & Resource Priorities

SECTION V: Recommendations and Assurances

Supplemental Reference Documents
- Vision 2025 Graduate Profile
- SFUSD’s 2016-18 Strategic Plan Transform Learning, Transform Lives
- Site-Based Budget Guide
SECTION I: Overview and Key Components

Overview
Vision 2025 stands as an important beacon for all schools in San Francisco Unified School District. It signals an audacious commitment to a uniquely 21st century graduate. The Graduate Profile from Vision 2025 is one embodiment of this commitment, and all schools are called on to consider their contributions to this vision. The Graduate Profile includes:

- Content Knowledge
- Career and Life Skills
- Global, Local, and Digital Identity
- Leadership, Empathy, and Collaboration
- Creativity
- Sense of Purpose and Sense of Self

The Balanced Score Card (BSC) for the 2016-2018 school years is intended to draw all schools into conversations about this vision.

Transform Learning, Transform Lives is SFUSD’s newest strategic plan. It articulates a new round of efforts, drawn from the successes and learning of past plans, that advance our district and all its schools towards Vision 2025. This template is intended to support schools to use student outcome data more deeply; to reflect on successes and challenges in implementing SFUSD’s key priorities from the 2015-2016 school year; and to build with increased specificity on each school’s efforts to realize the goals and strategies outlined in the SFUSD 2016-18 Strategic Plan Transform Learning, Transform Lives.

The Balanced Score Card serves as the site’s Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and as a platform for continuous improvement. The design is intended to integrate components of the Strategic Plan (specifically the “Strategies in Action: Schools”), the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) and metrics and targets used as part of the School Quality Improvement Index (SQII). We believe this redesign will further deepen system-wide coherence and enable communities to have informed conversations about teaching and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Has Changed?</th>
<th>Why Has it Changed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The School Data Profile section has been added</td>
<td>In previous versions schools were required to transcribe data points into the BSC. With the advent of the School Quality Improvement Index and our shift toward a more holistic set of measures, we can produce summary data reports that can be easily accessed from the BSC document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School-Wide Analysis and School Planning sections have been combined into one section, as a single progression.</td>
<td>SFUSD’s Balanced Score Card process has always included a section dedicated to school-wide analysis, including analysis of available data and identification of student groups. This has not changed. This year, however, the School-Wide Analysis and School Planning sections have been combined into one section. Combining these sections pivots the focus away from identifying and gathering data to analyzing data, complementing it with site-based qualitative and anecdotal variables, and determining the appropriate and deliberate actions, interventions and resources. Sites are called on to consider all students and targeted or focus students, across different tiers. This refashioned approach links the analysis to the targets and identified strategies and actions in one section, irrespective of terminology (Problems of Practice, Critical Areas of Need, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Requirements
In addition to its use as a strategic planning tool, the Balanced Score Card (BSC) Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and accompanying school planning process are designed to meet the requirements outlined in California Education Code § 64001.

These requirements include:

- School Site Councils must approve the BSC and categorical budget prior to SFUSD Board of Education approval. In order for this to be valid, the School Site Council must have parity.
- Prior to voting on and approving the BSC and budgets, School Site Councils must receive and use feedback from English Learner Advisory Councils (ELACs).
- The BSC must align with the District’s goals for improving student achievement and outcomes and articulate schools’ indicators and assessments for evaluating progress toward these goals. School goals must be based upon an analysis of verifiable state data.
- The plan must be reviewed annually and updated by School Site Councils and approved by SFUSD’s Board of Education whenever there are material changes that affect the academic program for students.
- Onsite reviews for compliance and/or complaints will continue, and may require revision and resubmission of the school plan and appropriate expenditures, specifically as they involve categorical programs and services.

BSC Development Checklist
To be sure that all schools satisfy the key requirements for the BSC and school planning process, sites are required to PDF and upload all of the below documents, including the SharePoint BSC template, to SharePoint in the 2016-18 School Site Folder found on the “School Balanced Score Card” page by March 25, 2016.
1. **Balanced Score Card/ Single Plan for School Achievement**
   - All 2016-2018 School-Wide Action Steps, aligned to the District’s priorities, should be described completely in the SharePoint BSC template and, as necessary, revised in Fall 2016 in alignment with the release of any additional data and final budget allocations.

2. **School Site Council Roster*, Signatures, Bylaws & Agendas**
   - SSC Roster that has been verified to have parity, designating either “staff-alternate” or “parent/community-alternate” for any alternate members selected. Names listed should reflect elected members.
   - SSC Signatures (Please scan the final two pages of your BSC for signatures, and upload them to the SharePoint site). **Note:** Signature from the principal and the SSC Chair are required, other members can sign but it is not required.
   - SSC Bylaws
   - SSC and Community meeting(s) Agenda, Minutes, Sign-In Sheets and handouts that demonstrate feedback and input in the development of the BSC/ SPSA and Budget.

3. **Budget**
   - Articulation of activities and strategies that both school site-managed funds (e.g. WSF, SCG, QEIA, TIIG, Title I) and any centrally-managed FTE or resource allocations will support
   - SIG Carryover Expenditures
   - All 2016-2017 Title I funds should be accounted for in the BSC
   - Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA) Schools – All 2015-2016 carryover QEIA funds are accounted for in the BSC

4. **Title I Parent Involvement Policy**
   - All Title I schools have an SSC-approved *Parent Involvement Policy (PIP)* and *Home-School Compact* in their upload package

---

*The 2016-18 BSC template also incorporates your School Site Council Roster, SSC Signature & Assurances page, and Title I Parent Involvement Policy into the body of this document. Please note that ELAC and rosters will be collected in January 2017 at the same time that schools submit their annual revisions to the Lau Protocol.*
In previous versions of the BSC, schools were required to transcribe data points from SharePoint into their school’s BSC. This year, the data section has been eliminated and schools are called on to invest their time into the analysis of the data, reflection on current practice, targets, strategies and interventions.

Follow this [link](https://district.sfusd.edu/dept/rpa/aao/DataDisk/default.aspx) to your data. Inside your school folder look for the folder titled “SchNum_Balanced_Scorecard_2016-18”. This folder includes the following reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title (Description)</th>
<th>Contains data for the following Strategies in Action</th>
<th>Data in Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mid-Year Performance Metrics* (School-wide and sub-group performance in comparison to the district) | • Instructional Core: ELA, ELD and Math  
• Student-Centered Learning Climate | 2015-16 Chronic Absenteeism Rates, IAB ELA and Math, F&P English and Spanish, SRI, Math Task and Writing Task |
| CELDT Performance and Trend (3-year AMAO Trends and current year school-wide and sub-group performance) | • Instructional Core: ELD | Annual Growth on CELDT (AMAO 1) and Attaining English Proficiency (AMAO 2) for 3-years, 2015-16 CELDT Performance Levels |
| SQII 2014-15 (SQII Performance, definitions, thresholds and targets) | • Instructional Core: ELA, ELD and Math  
• Student-Centered Learning Climate  
• College and Career Readiness | Overall and sub-group SQII domain and metric data, metric definitions, CORE thresholds and SFUSD suggested targets |
| Fall 2015 Grades Summary Gr 6-12 (School-wide and sub-group performance in 4-Core Content areas) | • Instructional Core: ELA, Math, Other Subject Areas  
• College and Career Readiness | Overall and sub-group grades – % A’s and % D&F’s for English Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Science and GPA Average |
| College Readiness School Profile** (Performance on college readiness indicators) | • College and Career Readiness | 3-year trend data on SAT, ACT, AP and EAP with number tested and average scores |

NOTES:

- All data is provided to you as an overall school average, as well as disaggregated by grade, ethnicity and program. This disaggregated data is what will guide you in identifying your Tier 1, Tier 2 and Focus students.
- Refer to Illuminate Focal Report List to link to student level data
- *In addition your data disk contains other assessment reports such as F&P.
- ** Only applicable to high school, other high school data reports will include On Track/Off Track, FAFSA Completion, Student Clearinghouse and AP Subject Area Test Results
- WASC Tags are helpful recommendations, they do not represent discrete and perfect alignment. Your Chapters may overlap into other areas of the BSC & vice versa.
SECTION III: School-Wide Analysis and Plan

With the adoption of and transition to the Local Control Funding Formula, the State has also issued the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) that outlines the state’s priorities. These align well with SFUSD’s articulated performance indicators and the work we’ve done with the more holistic measures and targets in the School Quality Improvement Index. As you use the data above and other sources accessible to you, please consider the following guiding questions:

- What are the implications of the data, based on your analysis?
- Beyond the quantitative data provided, have you considered anecdotal and internally developed measures to create a more robust representation of your school’s context?
- In each area, identify targets/outcomes that measure impact on student achievement.
- What shifts, in strategy, actions or initiatives are necessary to meet those successful targets/outcomes for students?

As we move forward in our work, we will continue to work towards the enactment of Vision 2025, and the more specific strategies articulated in the 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Transform Learning. Transform Lives.

Strategies in Action: Classrooms

School Plan
Instructional Core / Engaging and Challenging Curriculum

As a school community, please review “Strategies in Action: Classrooms” prior to completing this section. School teams will also find great value by visiting the websites for each subject area described in the section. Data needed to complete this section of the BSC is included in Section II above.

*Focal Group: Site leaders identify a focal group who is not yet meeting high expectations on outcome measures (such as academic achievement, social-emotional learning, etc.). Site leadership teams set specific goals for a focal group and measure their progress toward these desired outcomes on a daily, weekly and monthly basis.

Language Arts Core Curriculum in English and Other Targeted Languages (including Language Pathways)

**Academic Tier One**-Access to the core curriculum for all students: What will you do to ensure that all students have access to and success in the core academic program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Results Language Arts-All Students</th>
<th>Based on the analysis of the results, what are your targets/performance goals?</th>
<th>What instructional shifts will be required to achieve these goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denman students are struggling slightly in English Language Arts compared with 2014-15, 53% of Denman students earned As in English Language Arts in fall 2015 and 55.5% earned As in spring 2016, as compared with 59.6% in the spring of 2015. Our students struggle more at the higher grade levels. In spring 2016, 69.1% of Denman’s sixth graders earned As in English Language Arts, compared with 58.1% of seventh graders and 34.6% of eighth graders. Students had a slight gain in reading in 2015-16, scoring 30% and 34% on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 32% of Denman students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman students’ performance on the ELA SBAC improved slightly in 2015-16. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 32.2% of Denman students met or exceeded the standard. On the 20215-116 SBAC, 32.5% of students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 24% nearly meeting the standard. This improvement was less than the 66% of students near, at or above the standard that was projected based on students’ performance on the 2015-16 IABs. The overall ELA SBAC acceleration rate for all Denman students is -0.146, indicating that Denman students performed less well in 2016 than in 2015, compared to the district overall. The acceleration rate for seventh and eighth graders, while still negative, was better than the acceleration rate for sixth graders. Although Denman students struggle more in terms of grades at higher levels, they are demonstrating improvement over time in terms of the percentage of students meeting ELA standards.</td>
<td>Denman is committed to begin piloting standards-based grading and insuring that our grades/assessments are aligned and calibrated. Our goal is to have students continue their high performance in terms of grades throughout their three years at Denman, and for 100% of students to either meet or exceed the standard as measured by the SBAC. Although our goal is always 100% meeting or exceeding the standard, for the 2016-17 academic year we are committed to raising our scores to 50% proficient which will be an 18.5% increase.</td>
<td>The achievement of our goals for improvement in students’ performance in ELA will require a huge lift by the ELA department to revamp their grading policies and reexamine their techniques for assessment. Over the summer, we had 3 ELA teachers attend a readers/writers workshop PD which has proven to be successful in raising scores across the country. These teachers are committed to sharing the strategies and techniques they learned and implementing them across the department. In addition, ELA teachers have committed to meeting both during CPT and outside of contractual time to develop and implement a cohesive curriculum. Denman will continue to administer the IDAs and the RIs with fidelity and work on our own standards based assessments. We will use the data from all these assessments to inform instruction. The strong, cohesive curriculum together with the use of data to plan instruction should help us reach our goals in terms of students’ grades and SBAC performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASC Ch.2

WASC Ch.5
Based on the analysis of results for Language Arts-Focal Group:

- **Denman's AA students** are our lowest performing subgroup, and they are struggling significantly in English Language Arts compared with 2014-15. 27.6% of Denman's AA students earned As in English Language Arts for fall 2015, and 24.6% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 48.5% in the spring of 2015. AA students had a slight drop in reading, scoring proficient or advanced at the rate of 9% and 14% on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 16% of Denman's AA students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman's AA students did not improve their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 13% of Denman AA students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 19% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 6.3% of Denman's AA students met or exceed the standard, and 19% nearly met the standard. Denman's Latino students are our largest subgroup, and they are also struggling significantly in English Language Arts compared with 2014-15. 35.3% of Denman's Latino students earned As in English Language Arts for fall 2015, and 39.7% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 46.1% in the spring of 2015. Latino students had a slight drop in reading, with 18% and 20% scoring proficient or advanced on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 22% of Denman's Latino students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman's Latino students did not improve their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 17% of Denman's Latino students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 32% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 15.8% of Denman's Latino students met or exceeded the standard, and 25% nearly met the standard.

### Analysis of Results for Language Arts-Focal Group

| Denman's African-American (AA) students are our lowest performing subgroup, and they are struggling significantly in English Language Arts compared with 2014-15. 27.6% of Denman's AA students earned As in English Language Arts for fall 2015, and 24.6% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 48.5% in the spring of 2015. AA students had a slight drop in reading, scoring proficient or advanced at the rate of 9% and 14% on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 16% of Denman's AA students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman's AA students did not improve their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 13% of Denman AA students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 19% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 6.3% of Denman's AA students met or exceed the standard, and 19% nearly met the standard. Denman's AA students did not improve their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 13% of Denman AA students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 19% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 6.3% of Denman's AA students met or exceed the standard, and 19% nearly met the standard. Denman's Latino students are our largest subgroup, and they are also struggling significantly in English Language Arts compared with 2014-15. 35.3% of Denman's Latino students earned As in English Language Arts for fall 2015, and 39.7% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 46.1% in the spring of 2015. Latino students had a slight drop in reading, with 18% and 20% scoring proficient or advanced on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 22% of Denman's Latino students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman's Latino students did not improve their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 17% of Denman's Latino students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 32% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 15.8% of Denman's Latino students met or exceeded the standard, and 25% nearly met the standard. English language learners (ELL) represent 20.5% of our population, and they are struggling slightly in English Language Arts compared with 2014-15. For fall 2015, 40.1% of Denman's ELL students earned As in English Language Arts, and 45.1% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 46.5% in the spring of 2015. ELL students had a slight drop in
reading, scoring proficient or advanced at the rate of 1% and 0% on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 3% of Denman’s ELL students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman’s ELL students did not improve their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 6.3% of Denman ELL students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 17% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 3.1% of Denman ELL students scored at or above standard, and 17.0% nearly met the standard. Denman’s Special Education (SPED) students represent 16.5% of our population, and they are struggling in English Language Arts compared with 2014-15. For fall 2015, 44% of Denman SPED students earned As in English Language Arts, and 52.0% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 62.8% in the spring of 2015. SPED students had a slight decline in reading, scoring proficient or advanced at the rate of 1% and 4% on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 4% of Denman's SPED students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman’s SPED students improved their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 1.5% of Denman's SPED students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 11% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 2.0% of Denman SPED students scored at or above standard, and 8.0% nearly met the standard.

Mathematics Core Curriculum

**Academic Tier One** - Access to the core curriculum for all students: What will you do to ensure that all students have access to and success in the core academic program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Results Mathematics-All Students</th>
<th>Based on the analysis of the results, what are your targets/performance goals?</th>
<th>What instructional shifts will be required to achieve these goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Denman students performed better in their mathematics classes in 2015-16 than in 2014-15. For fall 2015, 45.3% of Denman students earned As in Mathematics, and in spring 2016, 55.5% of Denman students earned As in Mathematics, compared with 40.7% in the spring of 2015. Denman students improved their performance on the Mathematics SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 29% of Denman students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 27% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 30.3% of Denman students met or exceed the standard, and 30% nearly met the standard. The overall Mathematics SBAC acceleration rate for all Denman students is -0.41, indicating that Denman students performed less well in 2016 than in 2015, compared to the district overall. The acceleration rate represents an average result compared with other middle schools in the district. Although the overall acceleration rate was negative, the rate for seventh graders was positive, and the rate for eighth grade students was better than the rate for sixth grade students. Denman students are showing improvement over time in terms of meeting the grade-level standards for mathematics.

Denman is committed to begin piloting standards-based grading and insuring that our grades/assessments are aligned and calibrated. Our goal is to have students continue their high performance in terms of grades throughout their three years at Denman, and for 100% of students to either meet or exceed the standard as measured by the SBAC. Although our goal is always 100% meeting or exceeding the standard, for the 2016-17 academic year we are committed to raising our scores to 50% proficient which will be an 18.7% increase.

The achievement of our goals for improvement in students’ performance in Mathematics will require the Math department to continue refining their grading policies and their techniques for assessment. Our seventh and eighth grade math team has been working to implement the SFUSD curriculum and to use Complex Instruction strategies in the classroom. This year, the sixth grade team is making use of common planning time to bring cohesion to the sixth grade curriculum as well. Denman will continue to administer the IDAs with fidelity and work on our own standards based assessments. We will use the data from these assessments to inform instruction. The strong, cohesive curriculum together with the use of data to plan instruction should help us reach our goals in terms of students’ grades and SBAC performance.
**Academic Tier Two**—What intervention strategies will you use to serve students who need additional support to be successful in the core academic program? If you have a centrally allocated Academic RtI Facilitator, please articulate how that staff will be utilized in pursuit of those goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Results for Mathematics Intervention</th>
<th>Based on the analysis of the results, what are your targets/performance goals?</th>
<th>What interventions are required to ensure all students reach mastery?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denman's eighth grade math classes are limited to a maximum of 24 students. Eighth grade students are maintaining their level of performance in their Mathematics classes compared with 2014-15. In the spring of 2015, 38.4% of Denman eighth graders earned As in Mathematics. For fall 2015, 39.9% of Denman eighth graders earned As in Mathematics, and in spring 2015, 34.6% of Denman eighth graders earned As in Mathematics. Denman eighth grade students did not improve their performance on the Mathematics SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 28.5% of Denman eighth grade students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 28% nearly meeting the standard.</td>
<td>Denman is committed to begin piloting standards-based grading and insuring that our grades/assessments are aligned and calibrated. Our goal is to have students continue their high performance in terms of grades throughout their three years at Denman, and for 100% of students to either meet or exceed the standard as measured by the SBAC. Although our goal is always 100% meeting or exceeding the standard, for the 2016-17 academic year we are committed to raising our scores to 50% proficient which will be an 18.7% increase.</td>
<td>The achievement of our goals for improvement in students’ performance in Mathematics will require the Math department to continue refining their grading policies and their techniques for assessment. Our seventh and eighth grade math team has been working to implement the SFUSD curriculum and to use Complex Instruction strategies in the classroom. This year, the sixth grade team is making use of common planning time to bring cohesion to the sixth grade curriculum as well. Denman will continue to administer the IDAs with fidelity and work on our own standards-based assessments. We will use the data from these assessments to inform instruction. The strong, cohesive curriculum together with the use of data to plan instruction should help us reach our goals in terms of students’ grades and SBAC performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Focal Group**: For your focal group (African American, English Language Learners, Students with Special Needs), what specific goals and shifts will you set to ensure access to the core curriculum and academic success?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of results for Mathematics-Focal Group</th>
<th>Based on the analysis of the results, what are your targets/performance goals?</th>
<th>What interventions are required to ensure all students reach mastery?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denman's goals for our AA students are 1) for an additional 30% of AA students to earn As in Math in fall 2016 and 2) for an additional 20% of AA students to score near, at or above standard on the Math IDAs for 2016-17. Denman's goals for our Latino students are 1) for an additional 15% of Latino students to earn As in Math in fall 2016 and 2) for an additional 15% of Latino students to score near, at or above standard on the Math IDAs for 2016-17. With respect to our English Language Learners (ELLs), Denman's goals are 1) for an additional 30% of ELL students to earn As in Math in fall 2016 and 2) for an additional 30% of ELL students to score near, at or above standard on the Math IDAs for 2016-17. With respect to our Special Education students (SpEd), Denman's goals are 1) for an additional 30% of SpEd students to earn As in Math in fall 2016 and 2) for an additional 35% of SpEd students to score near, at or above standard on the Math IDAs for 2016-17.</td>
<td>Our math department will continue to work to implement the SFUSD math curriculum and to use Complex Instruction strategies to provide access to the curriculum for all learners. In addition, we will continue our efforts to implement standards-based grading and to use strategies such as the Warm Demander to keep students engaged in the classroom. Math teachers will also use data from the IDAs and both formal and informal common assessments to inform their instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC Ch.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denman's African-American (AA) students are our lowest performing subgroup, and they have improved their classroom performance in Mathematics compared with 2014-15. For fall 2015, 15.2% of Denman's AA students earned As in Mathematics, while 29.8% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 21.2% in the spring of 2015. Denman's AA students fell slightly in their performance on the Mathematics SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 7.5% of Denman AA students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 14% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 6.5% of Denman AA students scored met or exceeded the standard with an additional 22% nearly meeting the standard. Denman's Latino students are our largest subgroup, and they have also improved their performance in Mathematics compared with 2014-15. For fall 2015, 25.9% of Denman's Latino students earned As in Mathematics, while 34.8% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 22.5% in the spring of 2015. Denman's Latino students improved their performance slightly on the Mathematics SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 12% of Denman's Latino students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 28% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 12% of Denman's Latino students scored met or exceeded the standard with an additional 29% nearly meeting the standard. Denman's English language learners (ELL) students represent 20.5% of our population, and they improved their performance in Mathematics compared with 2014-15. For fall 2015, 16.5% of Denman's ELL students earned As in Mathematics, compared with 17.7% in the spring of 2015. In the spring of 2016, however, 30.0% of Denman's ELL students earned As in Mathematics. Denman's ELL students improved their performance on the Mathematics SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 2.5% of Denman ELL students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 22% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 3.6% of Denman ELL students scored met or exceeded the standard with an additional 20% nearly meeting the standard. Denman's Special Education (SPED) students represent 16.5% of our population, and they improved their performance Mathematics compared with 2014-15. For fall 2015, 17.7% of Denman SPED students earned As in Mathematics compared with 22.0% in the spring of 2015. In the spring of 2016, however, 36.8% of Denman's SPED students earned As in Mathematics. Denman's SPED students maintained their performance on the Mathematics SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 1.5% of Denman's SPED students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 6% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 1.1% of Denman SPED students scored met or exceeded the standard with an additional 9% nearly meeting the standard.

English Language Development (ELD)

School sites are implementing comprehensive Designated and Integrated ELD instruction based on the 2012 California ELD Standards. This happens by working in tandem with ELA and other content standards as a pathway towards accelerated language learning, so English Learners can fully access the core curriculum and grade-appropriate tasks and texts.

Reflecting on your school site data, including CELDT, what will you do to ensure that all students have access to and success in English Language Development and become Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)?
Analysis of results (including CELDT, F&P or SRI and SBAC) for all ELs (By Typology: Newcomer, Developing, LTEls, recently reclassified)

In a narrative, describe what your analysis of the data says about your school.

Based on the analysis of the results, what are your targets/performance goals?

What interventions are required to ensure all students reach mastery?

| Denman's English language learners (ELL) students represent 20.5% of our population. On the 2015-16 CELDT, 33.3% of ELL students met AMAO 1 (growth in English proficiency), compared with 46.3% in 2014-15. With respect to AMAO 2 (percent proficient), 10.5% of Denman's ELLs who have been in the ELD program for less than five years met the target for 2015-16, compared with 38.1% in 2014-15. 23.7% of Denman's ELLs who have been in the ELD program for five years or more met the target for 2015-16, compared with 33.3% in 2014-15. In the spring of 2015, 46.5% Denman's ELL students earned As in English Language Arts, compared with 40.1% in fall 2015 and 45.1% in spring 2015. In the spring of 2015, 17.7% of Denman's ELL students earned As in Mathematics, compared with 16.5% for fall 2015 and 30.0% for spring 2016. ELL students had a slight drop in reading, scoring proficient or advanced at the rate of 1% and 0% on the SRI for windows one and two, respectively. In 2014-15, 3% of Denman's ELL students scored proficient or advanced on both windows one and two. Denman's ELL students did not improve their performance on the ELA SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 6.3% of Denman ELL students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 17% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 3.1% of Denman ELL students scored at or above standard, and 17.0% nearly met the standard. Denman's ELL students improved their performance on the Mathematics SBAC. On the baseline SBAC in 2014-15, 2.5% of Denman ELL students met or exceeded the standard, with an additional 22% nearly meeting the standard. On the 2015-16 SBAC, 3.6% of Denman ELL students scored met or exceeded the standard with an additional 20% nearly meeting the standard. |
| Denman's goal for our ELL students in 2016-17 is to reclassify students as quickly as possible so that they can fully access the core curriculum. Specifically, we are going to work on reclassifying ELL students who are also receiving Special Education services. |
| Our ELL department will need to work closely with our Special Education department and with appropriate representatives from SFUSD to make sure students are receiving the appropriate instructional supports. |

Other Subject Areas (Secondary Schools, optional for Elementary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Results - All Students</th>
<th>Based on the analysis of the results, what are your targets/performance goals?</th>
<th>What instructional shifts will be required to achieve these goals? What resources or support will be required to achieve these goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For these departments, data is not collected centrally. Consider data points that are internally developed and/or qualitative.</td>
<td>As we move to the NGSS, our goal is that 100% of Denman students will demonstrate proficiency in science, including our underperforming subgroups. Similarly, our goal as that 100% of Denman students will be proficient in Social Studies.</td>
<td>Denman teacher will need to create and implement formative assessments in Science and Social Studies in order to make sure that all students have access to the curriculum and have appropriate support. Teachers need to continue to implement strategies, such as the &quot;Warm Demander&quot; approach, to engage all students in learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denman students showed improvement in Science, both overall and among certain subgroups. 52.2% of Denman students earned As in the fall of 2015 and 51.6% earned As in the spring of 2016, compared with 44.0% in the fall of 2014. In terms of focal subgroups, AA and SPED students struggled compared to the school population overall, while Latinos and ELLs improved their performance. 38.2% of AA students earned As in Science in fall 2015 and 20.8% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 27.1% in the fall of 2014. 41.3% of Latino students earned As in Science in fall 2015 and 36.3% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 27.0% and 45.0%, respectively, in the fall of 2014. In Social Studies, Denman students struggled in the fall of 2015 compared with the fall of 2014. 53.7% of Denman students earned As in the fall of 2015, compared with 58.2% in the fall of 2014. In spring 2016, 53.5% of Denman students earned As in Social Studies. Focal subgroups, with the exception of ELLs, also struggled. 32.7% of AA students earned As in Social Studies in fall 2015, and 28.0% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 43.5% in the fall of 2014. 35.2% of Latino students earned As in Social Studies in fall 2015, and 37.0% earned As in Social Studies in fall 2015, compared with 43.3% in the fall of 2014. 31.9% of ELLs earned As in Social Studies in fall 2015, and 38.8% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 38.1% in the fall of 2014 and 45.2% of SPED students earned As in Social Studies in fall 2015, and 43.8% earned As in spring 2016, compared with 60.4% in the fall of 2014.

**College and Career Readiness**

Describe your site’s goals and actions to promote a college and career going culture and to ensure student outcomes are aligned to and support the Graduate Profile and the 10 Big Shifts, as described in Vision 2025.

**High Schools Indicators:** On-Track/Off-Track, SAT/ACT, PSAT, Advanced Placement courses offered/passage rate for underrepresented populations, Career Pathways, internship opportunities, dual/concurrent enrollment, AVID, FAFSA completion, Credit Recovery, etc.

**Middle Schools Indicators:** AVID, High School Readiness, College visits, college and career plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative describing college going culture (using indicators suggested above)</th>
<th>What are your targets/goals?</th>
<th>What shifts will be required to achieve these goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASC Ch.2</td>
<td>Denman’s goal is to improve our High School Readiness Rate to 75% for 2016-17.</td>
<td>We will continue our First Graduate program and increase our efforts to recruit qualified students into seventh and eighth grade AVID. We will support our eighth grade students in terms of maintaining high G.P.A.s and strong attendance records, while using RTI and restorative practices to minimize suspension rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elementary Schools**

What is your plan for promoting college and career readiness?

**Strategies in Action: Schools**
In *Transform Learning, Transform Lives*, the “Strategies in Action: Schools” section describes the actions of effective schools. The section is organized in keeping with a framework created by researcher Anthony Bryk, which describes five essential supports found in effective schools: (1) leadership, (2) instructional guidance, (3) professional development, (4) student-centered learning environment, and (5) parent-school-community ties. School teams are encouraged to refer to “Strategies in Action: Schools” as you consider plans for the coming school year.

### Leadership, Instructional Guidance & Professional Development

Schools with coherent instructional guidance can articulate the what and how their site’s instructional program. Student tasks are foundational and assessment plays an integral role in student learning. Teachers are clear as to the steps they will take to differentiate instruction and site leaders create the appropriate conditions to ensure all students reach mastery. As you reflect on your site’s current context, what steps, from a leadership perspective, do you need to take to deepen your site’s coherence and mastery of the vision. How will you resource these steps? (consider: IRFs, coaching, site based instructional rounds, data-driven decision making, lesson design, standards-based grading, district sponsored professional development, teacher collaboration)

#### How will you structure site-based and district professional development/learning?

For 2016-17, our professional learning is centered around student learning. We continue to focus on student engagement and academic discourse, continued implementation of the Common Core and grading for mastery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-Wide Action Step(s)</th>
<th>How will you resource this? (Site Budget, Specific Categorical Fund, People, etc.)</th>
<th>(Prop A, MTSS Resource Staff Facilitation, Site Funded Sub release, Title I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-wide action steps to achieve a more student-centered learning environment include continued professional development around &quot;Warm Demander&quot; strategies to foster student engagement; instructional rounds with a focus on academic discourse; the use of data from IDAs and RIs to inform instruction; more effective use of CPT to develop more cohesive curriculum and assessments; and the development of a school-wide standards-based grading system.</td>
<td>Administration and ILT will provide ongoing professional development for staff in engagement strategies and will facilitate instructional rounds. The ELA and Math departments will review IDA and RI data, supported by administration and the IRF. ILT members will facilitate CPT to promote teacher collaboration. District-sponsored professional development for administrators and the IRF network will provide an introduction to standards-based grading that will be brought back to the staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student-Centered Learning Climate

A school environment that is safe and orderly communicates an expectation that all students will achieve social emotional and academic success. In keeping with a Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI2) model, the school maintains a safe and supportive school environment where all students benefit from multiple tiers of support including research-based academic interventions and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

As you complete the table below, consider what shifts would be necessary to create a positive school and classroom climate in which all students are in classrooms, supported, learning and engaged, in the least restrictive environment?

Consider the following items as they relate to each category:

**Students with Disabilities/ Promotion of Inclusive Practices**: percentage of students in Special Education schoolwide (identified internally) and number of referrals to Special Education (total & for subgroups-AA,EL). Your community is called upon to consider SFUSD’s commitment to full inclusion and increased expectations for students with disabilities.

**Student Engagement/Attendance**: school attendance rates, chronic absenteeism rates

**School Climate**: suspensions, discipline referrals, middle school and high school dropout rates, high school graduation rates and any indicators from student surveys

#### Reflecting on and improving a Student-Centered Learning Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Analysis of Data</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Strategies &amp; Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities/ Promotion of Inclusive Practices</td>
<td>16% of Denman students have been identified as Students with Disabilities.</td>
<td>Our target is to reduce the number of students in separate classes (SDC, RSP) so that students have access to the least restrictive classroom environment.</td>
<td>We will continue to develop our use of strategies designed to increase student engagement and participation, such as Warm Demander and Complex Instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement/ Attendance</td>
<td>4.1% of Denman students were chronically absent in 2014-15, which is lower than the District average for middle schools of 5.8%. AA, Latino, ELL and SpEd students were overrepresented among chronically absent students.</td>
<td>Continue to maintain an overall absence rate below the district average while decreasing the rate for targeted subgroups (AA, L, ELL and SpEd).</td>
<td>Review the data for targeted subgroups (AA, L, ELL and SpEd) to identify patterns and barriers to attendance; work with staff, families and community partners to develop plans to remove those barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our target is to continue to decrease suspensions overall, while focusing on achieving proportionality among subgroups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mid-year SQII report indicates that suspensions have decreased slightly, from 6% to 5%. AA students were suspended at the disproportionately high rate of 26%.

We will continue and grow our support for students through RTI and the use of restorative practices, while also developing strategies to engage students academically.

### Parent-School Communities Ties

Families are the first and most influential teachers of their children. Respecting and welcoming all families into the school community to deepen relationships and engage them will support student achievement and school improvement. Additionally, a community school approach organizes and maximizes the resources of your school and community-based organization partnerships to support student success. The intent of a community school approach is to intentionally support and align these valuable resources around your school’s key strategies, to ensure coherence within your school community.

Reflecting on quantitative and qualitative data (e.g. site-developed measures, survey questions), identify specific school strategies to promote parent input and participation in alignment with SFUSD’s Family Engagement Standards.

**Family Engagement:** Your school's family engagement strengths and challenges  (And how you know…)

**Deepening A Community Schools Approach:** the depth and breadth of CBO partnerships that are essential to your school community.

### Parent-School-Community Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative describing Parent-School-Community culture</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Strategies &amp; Impact What is the strategy &amp; how will you know you were successful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denman has strong connections to parents and the community, including an active PTSA and ELAC. Our Parent Liaison has been very effective in helping to build those relationships. We host a Food Pantry for families every Thursday, and work with CBOs such as OMIE Beacon and AACE to provide support for students and their families.</td>
<td>We need to develop a stronger connection to the parents of our Special Education Students. They are present on campus for their students’ IEPs, but not for many of the other activities in which families and community are involved, such as Family Academic Night or History Night/Ice Cream Social.</td>
<td>We will continue to work to support the needs identified by our students and families, such as the Food Pantry and after-school programs. In addition, we will increase our efforts to be inclusive of the families of our Special Education students at school events by making effective use of our Parent Liaison.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION IV: School Budget & Resource Priorities

### Weighted Student Resources in WSF and Other LCFF-Funded Allocations

In the fields below, list the amount of funds you received and describe how you plan to use these funds to increase and improve services to specific student groups.

**Special Education Weighted Student Formula (WSF-SpEd)**  
**Allocation** = 8,800

These funds are essential to assisting us in meeting the needs of all of our students. We will purchase high interest academic programs, hand fidgets, weighted vests and items that will support the success of our students.

**Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:**
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

### Supplemental Concentration Grant-English Learner (SCG-EL) 07091

**Allocation** = 55,058

*How will your site use SCG-EL resources to increase and improve services for English Learners? Why is that the best use?*

These funds will help to pay the salaries of key support personal for our EL community. In addition, we will be able to expand our supports to include AVID Excel because of these funds.

**Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:**
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

### Supplemental Concentration Grant - Low Income (SCG-LI) 07090

**Allocation** = 0

*How will your site use SCG-LI resources to increase and improve services for low income students? Why is that the best use?*

**Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:**
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

### LCFF Concentration Grant (SCG-C) 07092

**Allocation** = 20,000

*If your school site receives a Concentration allocation, how will these additional resources be used to increase and improve services for these (EL/LI) populations? Why is that the best use?*

We will allocate this money for professional growth in the area of standards based grading. Denman will be completing a heavy lift of focusing our work on a shift in grading and assessments.

**Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:**
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

### Targeted Instruction Improvement Grant (TIIBG) 07940

**Allocation** = 286,388

*If your school site receives a TIIBG allocation, how will these additional resources be used to increase and improve services for these populations? Why is that the best use?*

TIIG will be allocated to pay for support positions for students to support 100% of students being proficient or advanced. We will use TIIG to pay for positions and PD around Tier Two interventions.

**Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:**
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)
Categorical Expenses

In the fields below, list the amount of funds you received and describe how you plan to use these funds to support your work related to either district priorities or school initiatives.

**Title I**  
= 149,053  
31500

*How do you plan to use these funds?*

We will use these funds to meet the needs of our Socioeconomically disadvantaged families.

Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

**1% Title I Parent Set Aside**  
5,000

*For Title I schools, describe how the school involves parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely way in the planning, review, and improvement of its Title I programs and Parent Involvement Policy.** Please ensure that you attach the Parent Involvement Policy's full text when you upload your BSC to SharePoint.*

We are always outreaching to our families and we set aside more than 1% to engage our community members.

**Date** your school’s Parent Involvement Policy was reviewed by your School Site Council: 3/15/2016

Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

**Impact & Innovation Awards** = 0

*Referencing your plan, how do you plan to use these funds?*

Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

**Principal’s Innovation Fund:**  
(For Middle Schools and PK-8 Schools as applicable)

*How do you plan to use these funds?*

Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

**Equity Grant** =  
(as applicable 16-17)

*Identify Sub-group & specific actions*

Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)

**QEIA Carryover** =

*How do you plan to use these funds?*

Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:
- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)
How do you plan to use these funds to support your school-wide actions?

Select the Bryk Essential that most aligns to the use of these funds:

- Instructional Guidance (LCAP Priorities: Implement Standards, Pupil Achievement, Course Access)
- Professional Capacity (LCAP Priorities: Basic)
- Student-Centered Learning Climate (LCAP Priorities: Pupil Engagement, School Climate, Other Outcomes)
- Parent-School-Community Ties (LCAP Priorities: Parental Involvement)
Central Supports & Resources

In addition to the resources included in your site budget, you were also provided a list of the centrally funded, site-based resources that your school will receive. Please identify each support, the intended role as prescribed by the Central Office and two to three high leverage strategies that will be accomplished because of these supports and resources here:

NOTE: If the district provides .75 and you supplement .25 for a full FTE of 1.0, below you would enter ".75"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Number of FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor:</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker:</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse:</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Liaison:</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness Coordinator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOW:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Advisor:</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRF:</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Coach:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rtl Facilitator:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard To Staff:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two to three high leverage strategies that will be accomplished:
Please print these final two pages of your BSC/SPSA. Be sure that the principal has reviewed, checked, and initialed each assurance and that the principal and SSC president have signed the assurances page, and that all SSC members, along with their role & title, are listed in the roster.

The School Site Council has voted on this school plan and its related expenditures and passes it on to the district governing board for approval, assuring the board of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Checkmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SSC is correctly constituted, and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SSC reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the school plan requiring board approval.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SSC sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan:</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Advisory Committee for Special Education Programs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SSC reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this Balanced Scorecard/Single Plan for Student Achievement and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies, SFUSD’s strategic plan, and in the Local Improvement Plan.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school plan is based upon 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.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The school held two (2) community meetings prior to the completion of the school site plan.  
  1. One meeting to gather input from the school community including all advisory committees.  
  2. One meeting to present plan upon its completion before March 25, 2016. | ✔️         |
| The SSC reviewed the impact of the school’s categorical programs and made alterations to these investments on the basis of student achievement data. This review was conducted on: 3/15/2016 | ✔️         |
| For Title I School-Wide Program Schools ONLY: Based on our comprehensive review of school data and program goals, our SSC elects to have our site continue as School-Wide Program. | ✔️         |
| Our site has a process and budget for replacing lost or damaged textbooks as well as a process for managing textbooks to ensure that each student has standards-aligned textbooks or other required instructional materials to use in class or to use at home in order to complete required homework assignments. | ✔️         |
| Our site uses an IEP Master Calendar to ensure compliance with Special Education timelines. | ✔️         |
| This school plan was adopted by the SSC on: 3/15/2016 | ✔️         |
Please make sure the role listed clearly indicates whether the person is a principal, classroom teacher, other staff, parent, community member or student. Co-Chair and alternates can be identified in addition to role as listed above (i.e., “Teacher/Co-Chair” or “Parent/Alternate”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>