AIMS College Prep High School
Performance Improvement Plan - 2026-27

I. School Profile and Dashboard Summary

AIMS College Prep High School is a grades 9-12 charter school in Oakland, California, authorized by the Oakland Unified School District. In 2024-25, we served 386 students (Census Day): 46.9% African American, 64.5% socioeconomically disadvantaged, 62% English Learner-origin (current EL plus Reclassified Fluent English Proficient), and 4.9% students with disabilities (19 students). Our mission is ensuring all graduates earn admission to four-year post-secondary institutions, and we have maintained 100% four-year college acceptance for every year for which data is available. Our SBAC tested cohort of approximately 68 students means that small shifts in individual performance produce meaningful year-over-year volatility in Distance from Standard metrics. Enrollment in this profile uses the Census Day point-in-time count (386); renewal data tables use the CDE cumulative count (393) for the same 2024-25 year.

2025 California School Dashboard Summary

Indicator	Status	Color	Trend
ELA (DFS)	-37.5	Orange	Declined 13.9 pts
Math (DFS)	-63.9	Orange	Declined 32.9 pts
Science (CAST)	44.3 pts	Orange	Declined 5.3 pts
Graduation Rate	89.2%	Orange	Declined 7.3 pts
ELPI	76.7%	Blue	Increased 55.2 pts
CCI (Prepared)	88.2%	Green	Declined 8.3 pts
Suspension Rate	0.0%	Blue	Improved 2.3 pts

Source: 2025 California School Dashboard (CDE)

AIMS HS is positioned at the MIDDLE renewal tier. We are submitting this Performance Improvement Plan voluntarily to demonstrate proactive improvement management across our Orange academic indicators. Chronic Absenteeism is a state indicator but is not among the academic-performance indicators addressed by this Performance Improvement Plan; it is monitored through the school's MTSS and attendance systems.

Graduation Rate: Orange (89.2%)

Our graduation rate declined from 96.5% (Blue) in the prior year to 89.2% (Orange) on the 2025 Dashboard. An internal audit of CALPADS Report 15.2 identified the primary driver: five of seven students classified as dropouts were actually coded as California transfers (T160), but their SSIDs could not be matched to a receiving school in the CALPADS system. Without a verified match, these students automatically defaulted to dropout status in CDE's cohort calculation. A sixth student had an active discrepancy between CALPADS and our local student information system. The seventh was a mid-year exit not coded as a transfer. The four-year adjusted cohort comprised 93 students, of whom 83 graduated. Had the five confirmed California transfers been correctly excluded from the cohort rather than defaulting to dropout status, the graduation rate would have been approximately 94 percent, restoring most of the year-over-year decline and confirming that the drop reflects a data-certification gap rather than a change in student outcomes.

The root cause is a gap in our end-of-year data certification process. CALPADS Report 15.2 shows how CDE will classify each student in the graduation cohort, but AIMS did not review this report before certifying end-of-year data. Unmatched transfer records and coding errors went uncaught and became final in the Dashboard calculation.

We are taking two corrective actions:

Mandatory Report 15.2 review before every EOY certification. Beginning with the Class of 2026 cycle, our Manager of Enrollment and Records will review every Dropout and Still Enrolled classification in Report 15.2, resolve SSID mismatches, verify exit codes against PowerSchool, and correct discrepancies before certification closes.

Proactive SSID reconciliation for all transfers. When a student exits with a T160 code, staff will confirm the receiving school's CALPADS enrollment within 30 days of exit rather than relying on the automated SSID match at year-end.

These process changes will not retroactively correct the 2025 Dashboard, but they ensure that future cohort calculations accurately reflect student outcomes rather than data reporting gaps.

II. Areas of Strength (No PIP Required)

The following indicators meet or exceed the standard for charter renewal. These results reflect the same structures of data-driven instruction, targeted intervention, and staff accountability that we are now applying to the academic indicators addressed in this plan. Peer comparison data throughout this plan is drawn from the 2025 California School Dashboard (CDE).

English Learner Progress (ELPI): Blue (76.7%)

We posted the strongest single-indicator improvement on the 2025 Dashboard, gaining 55.2 percentage points year over year to reach Blue status. Our Long-Term English Learner subgroup performed even higher at 79.5%, also earning Blue.

School	ELPI %	Color	Change
AIMS HS	76.7%	Blue	+55.2
Life Academy	53.3%	Green	+3.3
EBIA	48.9%	Green	+23.3
CCPA	44.0%	Yellow	+5.5
Fremont	43.2%	Yellow	+23.2
Oakland High	37.2%	Yellow	+11.5
Latitude 37.8	35.4%	Yellow	+7.7
Oakland Unity	34.6%	Red	-8.5
ARISE	28.8%	Red	-1.1
OUSD District	40.3%	Orange	+1.2
California	46.4%	Yellow	+0.7

College/Career Indicator (CCI): Green (88.2% Prepared)

Our CCI stands at 88.2% Prepared, ranking third among Oakland peer schools. While this represents a decline from the prior year's 96.5%, the broader trajectory tells the story: we have risen from 52.2% in 2022-23 to 88.2% today, driven by 100% A-G completion across all subgroups.

School	% Prepared	Color	Change
ARISE	96.0%	Blue	+9.8
EBIA	92.2%	Green	-4.8
AIMS HS	88.2%	Green	-8.3
Oakland Unity	85.7%	Blue	+19.9
CCPA	83.8%	Blue	-0.9
Envision	78.0%	Green	-7.4
Latitude 37.8	73.1%	Blue	+6.4
Life Academy	67.2%	Green	+3.3
Oakland High	51.6%	Green	+3.4

School	% Prepared	Color	Change
Fremont	38.3%	Yellow	-0.3
OUSD District	43.4%	Yellow	-1.1
California	51.7%	Green	+3.1

Suspension Rate: Blue (0.0%)

We recorded zero suspensions across 393 cumulative enrollment in 2024-25, earning Blue status and the lowest rate among all peer schools. This outcome reflects our restorative practices model.

School	Rate	Color	Change
AIMS HS	0.0%	Blue	-2.3
Life Academy	0.7%	Blue	-1.8
Oakland High	2.7%	Green	-0.9
EBIA	2.8%	Green	-4.3
ARISE	3.1%	Green	-2.0
Latitude 37.8	3.2%	Green	-3.8
Oakland Unity	3.5%	Green	-3.6
CCPA	6.4%	Yellow	-1.8
Fremont	7.4%	Yellow	-0.6
Envision	23.7%	Red	+5.0
OUSD District	4.1%	Yellow	-0.2
California	2.9%	Green	-0.4

College Acceptance: 100% for Every Year With Available Data

Every graduating class for which acceptance data is available (six verified years) has achieved 100% acceptance to four-year colleges and universities.

III. PIP 1: Enrollment and Retention

Category: Operations | Growth Area: Enrollment, Yield, and Retention

Baseline Data

Our high school enrollment peaked at 467 students in 2021-22 and has since declined to 393 in 2024-25 (CDE cumulative enrollment), an approximately 16% contraction. This trajectory mirrors district-wide trends, but our losses have outpaced regional patterns, pointing to school-specific drivers that demand a targeted response.

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Enrollment (CDE cumulative)	430	463	467	450	395	393
YoY Change	--	+7.7%	+0.9%	-3.6%	-12.2%	-0.5%

Our current-year point-in-time enrollment is 356 students (2025-26, internal records). The difference between this figure and the 393 cumulative count above reflects two distinct measures: cumulative enrollment counts every student served at any point in the year, while the point-in-time figure reflects active enrollment on a single date.

A closer look at our enrollment operations reveals that the contraction is not primarily a problem of awareness or demand. Across the system, AIMS generated 696 applications in the most recent cycle and extended offers to all applicants, yet 163 families declined enrollment after receiving an offer, a post-offer decline rate of approximately 23.4% against an internal goal of 15 to 18%. Tour-to-application conversion is strong at approximately 76%, and community outreach events convert to applications at approximately 29%. These funnel figures reflect system-wide enrollment operations, the most granular data currently available; the school is building the capacity to disaggregate the funnel by school level. The pattern is consistent: families know AIMS, visit AIMS, and apply to AIMS at healthy rates. The largest measurable loss occurs after a family has already been offered a seat, and among continuing families weighing whether to return. This shifts the center of gravity for our plan from recruitment volume toward enrollment yield and retention.

Root Causes

Post-application yield leakage. Our most significant and most addressable loss occurs after families apply and are offered admission. A post-offer decline rate near 23.4% means roughly one in four offered families does not complete enrollment. Contributing factors include delayed follow-up after application, incomplete documentation, competing offers from other schools, and the absence of a structured accepted-family onboarding experience that builds commitment between offer and first day. Because awareness and application volume are already strong, closing this gap is the single highest-yield lever available to us.

Program-level retention drivers among continuing families. Direct outreach to families in spring 2026 surfaced a consistent set of themes among those weighing whether to continue at AIMS HS: clarity about curriculum changes, confidence in college-readiness supports, counselor accessibility, consistency of uniform expectations, cultural representation in programming, and the consistency and timeliness of school-to-family communication. These are not recruitment issues; they are experience-and-trust issues that determine whether an enrolled family stays. Left unaddressed, they erode the continuing-enrollment base that recruitment is meant to build on.

Weak internal feeder pipeline. A significant share of our K-8 eighth graders choose a different high school each year, despite having attended the AIMS system since elementary school. Focus groups with departing families reveal a consistent theme: students want a "fresh start" after spending up to nine years on the same campus. Our current 8th grade transition programming is passive; we hold an information session but do not actively re-recruit our own students or differentiate the high school experience from the K-8 one. A meaningful share of our enrollment loss occurs at this transition and in the early high-school years, where students who do not find an immediate fit are most likely to leave. Without a deliberate bridge program, we risk losing the same families to the same impulse regardless of other organizational changes.

Marketing reach and program differentiation. Awareness is a relative strength, but two gaps remain. First, bilingual enrollment materials do not exist despite a significant Spanish-speaking population in the surrounding community, limiting reach into families for whom language is a barrier. Second, prospective families consistently cite facilities, sports, and extracurriculars as deciding factors when choosing between AIMS and competitor schools. We operate in a constrained facility with limited athletic infrastructure. Our basketball program had a strong season this year, but that success is not yet leveraged in recruitment messaging, and the BUILD entrepreneurship program launching in 26-27 has not yet become a recognized identity pillar. These factors shape yield and differentiation rather than basic awareness.

Strategies

Post-application yield and retention system. We will convert our enrollment operation from event-driven recruitment into a managed conversion pipeline, with the post-offer window as the priority.

- Establish a structured accepted-family engagement sequence: rapid personal follow-up after application, tour and document reminders, accepted-family events, student shadow days, and a "Welcome to AIMS" onboarding experience.
- Institute an Open House conversion cadence (October, November, January, February) as the primary commitment-building touchpoint for families already in the funnel.
- Stand up the data infrastructure that makes yield measurable: phone number as primary family identifier, low-friction digital lead capture at events, and tour-to-enrollment attribution, replacing the disconnected records that currently obscure where families are lost.
- Track and report post-offer decline, tour conversion, and event conversion each cycle so resource allocation follows the data.

Continuing-family retention and belonging. Retention is the most cost-effective enrollment strategy: families who stay strengthen reputation, drive referrals, and reduce acquisition pressure. We will systematize the experience-and-trust factors that keep families enrolled.

- Address the surfaced retention themes directly: confirm college-readiness supports (SAT/PSAT and college-application support), establish counselor communication norms, set consistent uniform expectations, and publish a family communication calendar so changes are communicated proactively rather than reactively.

- Partner with AIMS Parents United, a newly formed parent leadership organization, as a standing channel for family voice, listening sessions, and peer-to-peer engagement.
- Use Panorama survey results (first administration May 2026) to establish a school-connectedness and family-satisfaction baseline in 2026-27 and set retention-linked improvement targets from that baseline.

Family ambassador program. Current families are our most effective recruiters, and most new families report learning about AIMS through word of mouth. Formalizing this channel, anchored by AIMS Parents United, turns an informal strength into a measurable system. This strategy directly addresses the marketing-reach and visibility gap identified in the Marketing reach and program differentiation root cause, converting word-of-mouth into a tracked referral channel.

- Design and launch a family ambassador program with a clear structure and recognition.
- Add "How did you hear about AIMS?" and family-priority questions to all enrollment intake forms to establish channel attribution (now in progress through the updated enrollment packet).
- Report referral metrics quarterly to the enrollment team to inform resource allocation.

8th-to-9th grade bridge program. A significant share of our own K-8 students currently leave for other high schools. A structured bridge program makes the high school feel new and distinct from the K-8 experience.

- Launch a spring semester bridge experience: HS shadow days, mentorship pairing with current 9th and 10th graders, and participation in HS signature events.
- Host dedicated 8th grade family nights at the HS campus, separate from K-8 events, to establish the HS as its own community.
- Provide early course selection and elective previews so 8th graders see expanded HS offerings.
- Administer intent-to-return surveys in January and May of 8th grade to identify at-risk families early.

Targeted bilingual outreach. Reaching Spanish-speaking families requires deliberate, culturally responsive outreach in addition to our existing channels.

- Produce Spanish-language video content showcasing student experiences and academic programs for social media.
- Ensure enrollment materials (applications, FAQs, website, signage) are available in English and Spanish.
- Host community focus groups with Latino, Black, African diaspora, and Asian families to understand priorities and barriers, and use targeted neighborhood outreach (including direct mail near feeder and early-childhood pipelines) to extend reach.

Program differentiation. Families want more than academics. Our constrained facility limits traditional athletics, but other differentiation pathways are available.

- Scale the BUILD entrepreneurship program from pilot into a full 9-12 pathway, positioning business and entrepreneurship as a signature pillar.
- Expand after-school clubs and student organizations, with student leadership driving program design.
- Leverage the basketball program's strong season in recruitment messaging and school identity materials.

Action Plan

Strategy	Key Actions	Owner	Timeline	Evidence
Post-Application Yield	Build accepted-family engagement sequence (follow-up, shadow days, onboarding)	Manager of Enrollment	Y1 Fall	Sequence live; yield tracked
	Open House cadence (Oct/Nov/Jan/Feb)	Manager of Enrollment	Y1 ongoing	Open Houses held; attendance
	Enrollment data infrastructure (phone ID, lead capture, tour attribution)	Manager of Enrollment	Y1 Fall	Attribution operational
Continuing-Family Retention	Confirm college-readiness supports; counselor norms; communication calendar	Head of School	Y1 Fall	Commitments published
	Partner with AIMS Parents United on listening and engagement	Head of School	Y1 ongoing	Sessions held; participation
	Panorama belonging baseline	Director of Teaching and Learning / Head of School	Y1 May	Baseline established
Family Ambassador	Launch ambassador program anchored by Parents United	Manager of Enrollment	Y1 Winter	Program launched
	Channel attribution on all intake forms	Manager of Enrollment	Y1 Fall	100% source attribution
8th-to-9th Bridge	Spring bridge: shadow days + mentorship;	Heads of Schools / Enrollment	Y1 Spring	Bridge held; attendance logs

Strategy	Key Actions	Owner	Timeline	Evidence
	dedicated HS family nights			
	Intent-to-return surveys (Jan + May)	Heads of Schools / Enrollment	Y1 Jan/May	Survey completion rate
Bilingual Outreach	Spanish-language materials and video; community focus groups	Communications / Enrollment	Y1 Fall	Materials live; focus groups held
Program Diff.	Scale BUILD to 9-12; expand clubs; basketball in messaging	Head of School	Y1-Y2	BUILD enrollment; new clubs

Owner titles reflect current convention; the interim executive leadership title transitions to Superintendent effective July 1, 2026.

Targets

Metric	Baseline (2025-26)	Y1 (2026-27)	Y2 (2027-28)	Y3 (2028-29)
HS Enrollment	356	356	355	355
9th	83	92	86	86
10th	97	72	98	90
11th	103	90	76	99
12th	73	102	95	80
Annual student retention	97.0%	97.5%	98.0%	98.5%

Enrollment yield leading indicators:

Metric	Baseline	Y1 Target	Y2 Target
Post-offer decline rate	~23.4%	18%	15%
Event-to-application conversion	~29%	35%	38-40%
Monthly tour attendance	Current	+25%	Sustained

Annual student retention reflects the share of continuing students who re-enroll year over year. Grade-level counts reflect projected cohort size and incoming-class composition, including intake and class-size shifts, and are not a direct measure of student attrition. Enrollment yield indicators reflect system-wide enrollment operations pending school-level disaggregation. The headline enrollment target is held essentially flat as a conservative planning assumption: projected yield and retention gains are *expected to offset continued regional enrollment pressure and a constrained facility rather than produce net growth within the plan period.*

IV. PIP 2: Academic Performance (ELA, Math, Science, History)

Category: Performance | Dashboard: ELA Orange (-37.5 DFS), Math Orange (-63.9 DFS), Science Orange (44.3 Scale Points). History has no state assessment but is addressed through cross-cutting strategies.

Baseline Data

ELA: Distance from Standard by Subgroup

Subgroup	2018-19	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
All Students	10.6	-30.1	39.9	-23.6	-37.5
African American	--	-72.7	9.4	-16.2	-49.6
Asian	48.1	22.1	102.9	-1.2	33.4
Hispanic	--	-40.9	-14.8	-86.1	-102.6
English Learners	-60.3	-70.7	-60.4	-93.1	-98.9
SED	-8.4	-41.3	46.7	-16.6	-47.2

Math: Distance from Standard by Subgroup

Subgroup	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
All Students	-74.1	+17.4	-31.0	-63.9
African American	-131.8	-30.7	-57.6	-112.1
Asian	+9.2	+103.0	+52.3	+38.6
Hispanic	-107.5	-75.6	-130.5	-111.4
English Learners	-119.0	-40.9	-44.1	-127.5
SED	-104.6	+23.5	-21.0	-70.4

Science CAST: Scale Points by Subgroup

Subgroup	Scale Points	Change	N
All Students	44.3	-5.3 (Orange)	80
African American	41.9	+2.4	35
Hispanic	32.6	-3.8	14
English Learners	39.9	-2.4	29
SED	43.8	-4.5 (Orange)	55
Asian	52.5	-14.4	24

The 2024-25 results represent the lowest point in a volatile five-year pattern driven by a tested cohort of approximately 68 students. ELA declined 13.9 points and Math declined 32.9 points year over year. The 83.4-point decline in English Learner Math DFS is the largest single-subgroup decline in any subject. Hispanic Math was the only subgroup to show positive movement (+19.1 points). NWEA MAP Math at the 65th national percentile suggests formative capacity above the national median; the gap between NWEA and SBAC reflects differences in test format and conditions. These NWEA MAP percentiles are based on the partial 2024-25 administration (approximately 75% completion) and are leading indicators, not a whole-school measure. All CAASPP and CAST figures in this section are drawn from the 2025 California School Dashboard (CDE), reflecting 2024-25 results.

NWEA MAP Diagnostic Baseline

Metric	Value (Year)	Source
NWEA MAP Math percentile	65th (2024-25)	LCAP p.20
NWEA MAP ELA percentile	46th (2024-25)	LCAP p.20

Peer Comparisons

ELA Distance from Standard

School	DFS	Color	Change
Oakland Unity	+32.8	Green	-17.4
EBIA	+3.6	Yellow	-5.6
Latitude 37.8	-2.8	Yellow	+8.8
ARISE	-4.3	Orange	-2.9
Life Academy	-31.5	Orange	-12.7
AIMS HS	-37.5	Orange	-13.9
Oakland High	-38.3	Yellow	+7.6
Envision	-49.6	Yellow	+35.2
CCPA	-68.6	Orange	+0.2
Fremont	-150.0	Orange	+5.9
OUSD District	-50.1	Yellow	+4.8
California	-8.1	Yellow	+5.1

Math Distance from Standard

School	DFS	Color	Change
AIMS HS	-63.9	Orange	-32.9
EBIA	-65.2	Orange	-19.7
Oakland Unity	-78.3	Orange	-29.4
Latitude 37.8	-82.6	Yellow	+20.8
ARISE	-88.1	Yellow	+14.3

School	DFS	Color	Change
Oakland High	-100.1	Yellow	+17.7
Life Academy	-102.3	Red	-29.1
Envision	-127.3	Orange	+37.8
CCPA	-134.6	Red	-1.0
Fremont	-227.6	Orange	+8.2
OUSD District	-78.7	Yellow	+6.3
California	-42.4	Yellow	+5.2

In Math, we rank first among peers in absolute DFS, though our decline is the steepest. In ELA, we sit just above Oakland High and above the district mean. The peer data confirms that low Math DFS is regional; every comparison school is Orange or worse. Our challenge is trajectory: most peers improved while we declined.

Root Causes

Inconsistent evidence-based writing across content areas. Four departments teach claim-evidence-reasoning using four different vocabularies: ELA uses claim plus analysis, History uses CCQC (Claim, Context, Quote, Commentary), Science uses CER (Claim, Evidence, Reasoning), and Math uses construct-interpret-justify. Students encounter each framework in isolation rather than building cumulative proficiency across subjects. The result is visible in our Spring 2026 SBAC Interim Assessment Block (IAB) data: in ELA, 90% of students scored Below Standard on the Revision IAB (n=10) and 43% Below on Research (n=16); in Math, 46% scored Below on Algebra and Functions I (n=39) and 40% Below on Algebra and Functions II (n=57). Because the 2026 IABs were administered at teacher discretion rather than under standardized conditions, these results are diagnostic indicators of skill gaps, not comparable trend data. The pattern is consistent: students can state a claim but cannot sustain evidence-based reasoning across multiple paragraphs, regardless of subject.

Uneven instructional supports for Multilingual Learners. GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) adoption reached 72% through dedicated Cycle of Inquiry work, but saturation is incomplete. Some high school teachers resist interactive strategies they perceive as elementary-level pedagogy. During 2024-25, long-term substitutes in EL-heavy classes could not deliver designated ELD instruction, directly contributing to the 83.4-point decline in EL Math DFS (from -44.1 to -127.5), the largest single-subgroup decline on the entire 2025 Dashboard. The counterpoint is that where GLAD has been implemented with fidelity, it works: the ELPI jumped from 21.4% to 76.7% (Blue). The issue is coverage, not efficacy.

Loss of instructional coaching capacity. The instructional coach passed away midyear 2024-25, disrupting coaching cycles, classroom observations, and professional development continuity for the remainder of the year. The position was not replaced in time. Without a coach to facilitate PLCs, drive observation-feedback loops, and connect PD to classroom practice, instructional variation across classrooms went unmonitored. Teacher credentialing stands at 72.2% (13 of 18 teachers). Three vacancies remain: ELA, Special Education, and Teacher Assistant. Adult capacity is the gating constraint on every other strategy in this plan.

Cycles of Inquiry implementation variability. Our COI framework is the primary mechanism through which departments set goals, implement strategies, analyze data, and reflect on practice. Where cycles run at fidelity, practice changes are measurable: ELD Cycle 3 produced a documented increase in GLAD adoption from 41% to 72%. Where cycles do not run at fidelity, nothing moves: the SPED Cycle 2 workbook is completely blank, and Geometry SMART goals were left with placeholder text. The framework is sound; what is missing is consistent facilitation and an accountability mechanism that makes blank workbooks visible before the end of the cycle.

Intervention supports lack systematic activation. Saturday School, tutoring, and Break/Summer classes are funded and operational, but student enrollment is teacher-nominated rather than data-triggered. The MTSS Director position is new (previously did not exist), and the incumbent is still building systems. NWEA MAP completion stands at 75%, meaning one in four students lacks the diagnostic data needed for systematic tier placement. No published decision rules define when a student moves from Tier 1 to Tier 2 or Tier 3. The infrastructure exists; what is missing is the activation discipline that connects assessment data to intervention placement.

Theory of Improvement

Our improvement architecture is built on the AIMS Way Plan and executed through Cycles of Inquiry (COI). COI is not one strategy among several; it is the operating system through which all strategies in this plan are implemented, monitored, and refined. Each quarter, every department sets measurable goals, implements targeted practices, analyzes student data, and reflects on impact. The strategies below are designed to be delivered through this existing COI structure, not as standalone initiatives layered on top of it. Strategy 1 (writing framework alignment) becomes the content of COI goals across departments. Strategy 2 (Integrated ELD) becomes a practice standard monitored through COI walkthroughs. Strategy 4 (MTSS activation) connects to COI because the 9-week data cycle reviews generate the intervention placement data. Strategy 3 addresses COI fidelity directly. The instructional coach (Enabling Infrastructure) is the person who facilitates COI cycles, conducts the walkthroughs, and connects professional development to classroom practice. When COI runs at fidelity, our school produces measurable gains: EL Progress jumped from 21.4% to 76.7% through a COI-driven GLAD adoption effort. This plan applies that same discipline to ELA, Math, Science, and History.

Cross-Cutting Strategies

Strategy 1: Common Schoolwide Evidence-Based Writing and Reasoning Frame. All four content areas already teach evidence-based reasoning, but with four different vocabularies. We will adopt an aligned disciplinary writing frameworks with explicit crosswalks, so students encounter the same core reasoning structure in every class. Departments embed writing framework goals into their quarterly COI plans, ensuring adoption is tracked through the existing cycle structure. To increase writing volume, every content area assigns at least one extended multi-paragraph evidence-based writing task per unit, building the sustained reasoning capacity that current assessments identify as the binding constraint.

- Finalize the aligned framework crosswalk at summer Bootcamp with all department leads, mapping each department's existing framework to the common template.
- Embed writing prompts aligned to the framework crosswalk in every department's pacing guide, ensuring at least one framework-aligned assignment per unit.

- Conduct PLC calibration sessions using student work samples scored on the framework crosswalk, building inter-rater reliability across departments.
- Administer a cross-content writing project each May where students produce one framework-aligned response in each subject.

Increase writing frequency: each department assigns at least one extended (multi-paragraph) evidence-based writing task per unit, scored on the framework crosswalk, ensuring students practice sustained reasoning across all four content areas.

Strategy 2: Integrated ELD Strategies Across All Content Areas. GLAD strategies are proven at our school: ELPI jumped from 21.4% to 76.7% (Blue). The problem is coverage, not efficacy. We will move from 72% adoption to 100%. ELD strategy adoption becomes a standing COI metric, tracked through quarterly walkthrough data and reported at each Exhibition of Learning.

- ELD Manager conducts demonstration lessons in every HS class (all subjects, not only English), reframing GLAD as rigorous, AP-compatible differentiation.
- Complete observation-debrief cycles with 100% of HS teachers (18 total; 2025-26 coverage reached HS English classes only), with follow-up walkthroughs to verify strategy adoption.
- Address resistance directly: provide HS-specific GLAD modeling that demonstrates the strategies work in AP and college-prep contexts.
- Ensure designated ELD via LIFT curriculum serves Level 1-2 ELs in grades 9-12 with a credentialed teacher.

Strategy 3: Cycles of Inquiry Fidelity with Quarterly Exhibition of Learning. Our COI framework produces measurable gains when executed at fidelity, but execution is uneven. The fix is not a new system; it is accountability within the existing one.

- Every content team completes all four cycle workbooks (Plan, Implement, Analyze, Reflect) at full fidelity, audited quarterly by the Head of School.
- Launch a Quarterly Exhibition of Learning (5/5/2/10/5 protocol) for cross-department review, making cycle results visible to peers.
- Departments with bottom-quartile completion receive mandatory facilitated coaching.
- Begin with two Exhibitions in Y1, moving to quarterly in Y2.

Strategy 4: MTSS Activation: Intervention Stack Sequenced to NWEA Triggers. Our intervention infrastructure is funded and available. What is missing is the activation discipline that connects existing supports to assessment data. MTSS tier placement connects to COI through the 9-week data cycle reviews, which generate the assessment data that triggers intervention assignments.

- Publish Tier 1/2/3 entry and exit criteria: below 40th percentile triggers Tier 2 (tutoring, IXL); sustained below 30th triggers Tier 3 (specialist, Saturday/Break/Summer cohort).
- MTSS Director coordinates all referrals, tracks participation, and reports intervention-to-outcome match rates quarterly. The MTSS Director will have Tier criteria and referral protocols operational by Y1 Fall, supported by the external data consultant who provides continuity from prior-year data cycle work.

- Raise NWEA MAP completion from 75% to 89% in Y1, targeting 95%+ by Y2. The remaining 11% in Y1 typically represents students who enroll after the testing window or have extended absences; these students receive intervention placement through teacher observation and classwork until NWEA data becomes available.
- Implement 9-week data cycle reviews with the external data consultant to adjust pacing and intervention intensity quarterly.

Enabling Infrastructure: Adult Capacity Stabilization. This is not a co-equal strategy. It is the infrastructure that makes Strategies 1-4 work.

- Re-staff the instructional coach position to restore observation-feedback cycles and PLC facilitation.
- Launch a credentialing pathway from the current 72.2% toward an interim target of 80% properly credentialed by June 2027, with quarterly progress monitoring.
- Fill three vacancies (ELA, SpEd, TA) by October Census Day of Y1, prioritizing candidates with EL instructional experience.
- Maintain teacher turnover below 10%.

Action Plan

Strategy	Key Actions	Owner	Timeline	Evidence
Framework Alignment	Finalize framework crosswalk at Bootcamp; embed in pacing guides	Dir. of Teaching & Learning	Bootcamp	Crosswalk adopted
	PLC calibration sessions with student work	Dir. of Teaching & Learning	Quarterly	Inter-rater reliability data
	May cross-content writing project	Dir. of Teaching & Learning	Y1 May	Student work scored across 4 subjects
Integrated ELD	Demo lessons in every HS class (all subjects)	ELD Manager	Y1 ongoing	Demo lesson completion log
	Observation-debrief: 100% of HS teachers	ELD Manager	Y1 ongoing	Walkthrough data quarterly
	HS-specific GLAD modeling for AP contexts	ELD Manager	Y1 Fall	PD session held
COI Fidelity	All depts complete 4 cycle workbooks	Head of School	Quarterly	Workbook completion audit
	Exhibition of Learning (2x	Head of School	Y1 per schedule	Exhibitions held

Strategy	Key Actions	Owner	Timeline	Evidence
	Y1, quarterly Y2+)			
	Bottom-quartile coaching triggered	Head of School	As needed	Coaching logs
MTSS Activation	Publish Tier 1/2/3 criteria	MTSS Director	Y1 Fall	Criteria document published
	NWEA triggers replace teacher nomination	MTSS Director	Y1 Fall	NWEA-to-intervention match rate
	Raise NWEA completion 75% to 89%	MTSS Director	Each cycle	Completion rate tracked
	9-week data cycle reviews	MTSS Director	Quarterly	Review notes; adjustments logged
Adult Capacity	Re-staff instructional coach	Head of School	Y1 ASAP	Position filled
	Fill ELA/SpEd/TA vacancies	Head of School	Y1 by Oct Census	Vacancies filled
	Credentialing pathway: quarterly monitoring	Head of School	Quarterly	Progress reports

Targets

ELA Targets (LCAP-Aligned)

Subgroup	Baseline	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	Growth
All Students	-37.5	-34.5	-31.5	-28.5	+3/yr
African American	-49.6	-43.6	-37.6	-31.6	+6/yr
Hispanic	-102.6	-90.6	-78.6	-66.6	+12/yr
English Learners	-98.9	-86.9	-74.9	-62.9	+12/yr
SED	-47.2	-41.2	-35.2	-29.2	+6/yr
Asian	+33.4	+33.4	+33.4	+33.4	Maintain

Math Targets (LCAP-Aligned)

Subgroup	Baseline	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	Growth
All Students	-63.9	-60.9	-57.9	-54.9	+3/yr
African American	-112.1	-109.1	-106.1	-103.1	+3/yr
Hispanic	-111.4	-108.4	-105.4	-102.4	+3/yr
English Learners	-127.5	-121.5	-115.5	-109.5	+6/yr
SED	-70.4	-67.4	-64.4	-61.4	+3/yr
Asian	+38.6	+38.6	+38.6	+38.6	Maintain

Science CAST Targets (Scale Points)

Subgroup	Baseline	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	Growth
All Students	44.3	46.3	48.3	50.3	+2 SP/yr
African American	41.9	43.9	45.9	47.9	+2 SP/yr
Hispanic	32.6	36.6	40.6	44.6	+4 SP/yr
English Learners	39.9	41.9	43.9	45.9	+2 SP/yr
SED	43.8	45.8	47.8	49.8	+2 SP/yr
Asian	52.5	54.5	56.5	58.5	+2 SP/yr

NWEA MAP Leading Indicators

Metric	Baseline (2024-25)	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
NWEA MAP: Math (%ile)	65th	65th	65th	65th
NWEA MAP: ELA (%ile)	46th	49th	52nd	55th

Growth rates: ELA subgroups +6/yr (Hispanic and EL at +12/yr); Math subgroups +3/yr (EL at +6/yr); Science +2 SP/yr (Hispanic +4 SP/yr). All aligned to LCAP. History has no state assessment; addressed through Strategy 1 (Common Writing Frame) and Strategy 2 (GLAD Saturation).

V. OUSD Performance Improvement Plan Tables

The following tables satisfy the OUSD Office of Charter Schools PIP template requirements. Improvement plan narratives reference strategies from Section IV with subgroup-specific emphasis. SQR v5 (January 2024) element citations connect each plan to OUSD quality standards. Per California School Dashboard rules, only numerically significant subgroups (n=30 or more) receive a performance level and a corresponding plan table below; English Learner and Hispanic/Latino counts at the high school fall below this threshold on the academic indicators (across Mathematics and Science these counts range from 14 to 29 students, all below 30), so they receive no Dashboard color or separate table here. Their needs are addressed through the schoolwide and EL-targeted strategies in Section IV, including Integrated ELD/GLAD saturation and the common evidence-based writing framework.

ELA: All Students (Orange)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	ELA Academic Performance (CAASPP DFS)
Baseline	-37.5 DFS, Low, Declined (Orange), N=68
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	-34.5 DFS
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	-31.5 DFS
Y1 Plan	Aligned cross-content writing frameworks unifies reasoning instruction across ELA, History, Science, Math (SQR 2A.1). Integrated ELD strategies in all classrooms supports MLL access (SQR 2A.3). NWEA-triggered MTSS replaces teacher-nominated intervention (SQR 2C.1).
Y2 Plan	Cross-content writing project administered schoolwide. Exhibition of Learning quarterly. MTSS refined from Y1 data (SQR 2A.1, 2A.2, 3A.2).

ELA: African American (Red)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	ELA, African American (CAASPP DFS)
Baseline	-49.6 DFS, Very Low, Declined Significantly (Red), N=31
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	-43.6 DFS
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	-37.6 DFS
Y1 Plan	Schoolwide strategies plus: PLCs disaggregate NWEA ELA by race for AA-specific strand analysis (SQR 3A.2). Counseling identifies at-risk AA students quarterly (SQR 2C.1, 2A.3).
Y2 Plan	PLC disaggregation tracks AA trajectories. Counseling reviews incorporate student voice and family input (SQR 2A.2, 3A.2, 1B.2).

ELA: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (Red)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	ELA, SED (CAASPP DFS)
Baseline	-47.2 DFS, Very Low, Declined Significantly (Red), N=48
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	-41.2 DFS
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	-35.2 DFS
Y1 Plan	Schoolwide strategies plus: transportation passes remove access barriers to Saturday School and tutoring (SQR 2A.3). MTSS Tier 2 attendance interventions target SED students (SQR 2C.1).
Y2 Plan	Access support refined using Y1 attendance data. MTSS incorporates attendance stability alongside NWEA triggers (SQR 2C.1, 2C.3).

Math: All Students (Orange)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	Math Academic Performance (CAASPP DFS)
Baseline	-63.9 DFS, Low, Declined Significantly (Orange), N=68
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	-60.9 DFS
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	-57.9 DFS
Y1 Plan	Common writing frame addresses the Math reasoning and justification weakness identified in IAB data (SQR 2A.1). GLAD math vocabulary in all classrooms (SQR 2A.3). NWEA <40th triggers Tier 2 (SQR 2C.1). Coach re-staffed for Math PLCs (SQR 3A.3).
Y2 Plan	Cross-content writing includes Math justification. Target 50%+ meeting NWEA RIT growth. MTSS refined from Y1 data (SQR 2A.1, 2A.2, 2C.1).

Math: African American (Orange)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	Math, African American (CAASPP DFS)
Baseline	-112.1 DFS, Low, Declined Significantly (Orange), N=31
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	-109.1 DFS
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	-106.1 DFS
Y1 Plan	AA-All Students gap is 48.2 points in Math vs. 12.1 in ELA. PLCs disaggregate NWEA Math by race (SQR 2A.3, 3A.2). Counseling targets AA Math students for Tier 2 (SQR 2C.1).

Category	Performance
Y2 Plan	Coaching cycles prioritize Math classrooms with highest AA concentrations. PLCs track gap closure rate (SQR 3A.3, 2A.2, 1B.2).

Math: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (Orange)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	Math, SED (CAASPP DFS)
Baseline	-70.4 DFS, Low, Declined Significantly (Orange), N=48
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	-67.4 DFS
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	-64.4 DFS
Y1 Plan	Transportation passes sustain SED access to Saturday School and Math tutoring (SQR 2A.3). NWEA-triggered intervention with priority scheduling (SQR 2C.1).
Y2 Plan	Y1 participation and growth data evaluated. Resource allocation adjusted (SQR 2C.3, 2C.1).

Science: All Students (Orange)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	Science (CAST, Scale Points)
Baseline	44.3 SP, Low, Declined Significantly (Orange), N=80
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	46.3 SP
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	48.3 SP
Y1 Plan	CER framework aligned to schoolwide common rubric (SQR 2A.1). Inquiry-based labs anchor instruction. Science PLCs complete all 4 COI cycles (SQR 3A.2). ELD strategies embedded in Science classrooms (SQR 2A.3).
Y2 Plan	Cross-content writing includes Science CER. Exhibition quarterly with Science tasks. AP Science proficiency +5pp target (SQR 2A.1, 2A.2, 3A.2).

Science: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (Orange)

Category	Performance
Growth Area	Science, SED (CAST, Scale Points)
Baseline	43.8 SP, Low, Declined (Orange), N=55
Y1 Goal (2026-27)	45.8 SP
Y2 Goal (2027-28)	47.8 SP

Category	Performance
Y1 Plan	Transportation supports ensure SED access to after-school lab sessions and Saturday Science (SQR 2A.3). NWEA-triggered protocols extended to Science (SQR 2C.1).
Y2 Plan	Y1 Science intervention data analyzed. Resource allocation adjusted (SQR 2A.2, 2C.1, 2C.3).

VI. Board Adoption

This Performance Improvement Plan was reviewed and adopted by the AIMS College Prep Governing Board. The Board commits to monitoring progress on all identified metrics through quarterly Academic Review presentations, ensuring alignment with our LCAP and existing governance structures. Progress will be reported to OUSD through the charter oversight process.

Board Meeting Date: June 16, 2026

Resolution Number: Action Items III.B