2002-2003 *No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program*
Cover Sheet

Name of Principal: Mr. William Radulovich

Official School Name: Walnut Grove Elementary School

School Mailing Address: 1999 Harvest Road
                              Pleasanton, CA 94566

Tel: (925) 426-4253   Fax: (925) 462-8293

Website: www.pleasanton.k12.ca.us/walnut_grove/

Email: bradulovich@pleasanton.k12.ca.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

_____ Date_____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent: Dr. John Casey

District Name: Pleasanton Unified School District   Tel. (925)426-4301

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date_____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson: Mrs. Kris Weaver

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date_____

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:

9	Elementary schools
3	Middle schools
0	Junior high schools
3	High schools
15	TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: $ 7,267.31

    Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: $ 7,123.64

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

    [ ]   Urban or large central city
    [ ]   Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
    [X]   Suburban
    [ ]   Small city or town in a rural area
    [ ]   Rural

4.   **3** =   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	48	42	90	7			
1	62	45	107	8			
2	73	67	140	9			
3	63	54	117	10			
4	62	63	125	11			
5	65	69	134	12			
6				Other			
			TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL				713

6. Racial/ethnic composition of   78% White
   the students in the school: 2% Black or African American
                                      6% Hispanic or Latino
                                     13% Asian/Pacific Islander
                                      1% American Indian/Alaskan Native

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 5%

   (This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred *to* the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	22
(2)	Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	15
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	37
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	713
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.050
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	5.0

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 6%
                                 43 Total Number of Limited English Proficient
   Number of languages represented: 16
   Specify languages: Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Farsi, Hindi, Tagalog, Portuguese, Russian, Hungarian, French, Pashto, Romanian, Guajarti, Armenian

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 4%

                                 31 Total Number Students Who Qualify

10. Students receiving special education services: 13%

                                            92   Total Number of Student Served

The number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

7	Autism	1	Orthopedic Impaired
	Deafness	3	Other Health Impaired
	Deaf-Blindness	26	Specific Learning Disability
1	Hearing Impaired	53	Speech or Language Disability
	Mental Retardation		Tramatic Brain Injury
1	Multiple Disabilities		Visual Impairment Including Blindness

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

	Full-time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	1
Classroom teachers	32	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	1	3
Paraprofessionals	1	6
Support staff	1	1
Total number	36	11

12. Student-"classroom teacher" ratio: 23:1

13. Attendance patterns of teachers and students

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Daily student attendance	95%	94%	96%	94%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	87%	89%	87%	91%	88%
Teacher turnover rate	6%	6%	6%	6%	3%
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

 Note: *Decline in enrollment is due to boundary changes and re-districting of attendance areas.

        **Decline in staff due to enrollment decreases, note above.

4

PART III – SUMMARY

One of California's most highly regarded schools, Pleasanton's **Walnut Grove School Elementary School** is situated in a scenic coastal valley just east of the San Francisco Bay. It is one of fifteen public schools within a middle class suburban hamlet of 60,000. Pleasanton boasts a rich history, dating back to colonial America. Quality schools, combined with proximity to Silicon Valley employers, have made Pleasanton a destination-community for families.

Much like the town in which it thrives, Walnut Grove School enjoys a proud history - one in which educational innovation has long been fostered and practiced. Built in 1966 as a progressive "open-space" school, Walnut Grove has been recognized as a regional locus for "cutting-edge" educational practices for decades. Since its inception, "the Grove" has offered options for students and families in the form of "schools-within-a-school" and progressive program alternatives. As such, Walnut Grove families have always had options for determining their children's program placements. Because of these program options and offerings, the school has historically attracted large student populations (700-900 students). A *de facto* magnet school, Walnut Grove has attracted more students through "open enrollment" and intra-district transfer than surrounding schools for over three decades.

The school has continuously offered two or more program options at all grade levels. Over the past 16 years, parents have had the option of enrolling their children in either a traditional-style K-5 program that offers high quality single-grade classes or in the *Discovery Program.* Discovery is a K-5 program (280 students/8 teachers) in which children "loop" through three consecutive multiage classrooms during their six years of education at Walnut Grove School (K/1,2/3,4/5).

As a consequence of these ongoing efforts, the educational bar has been raised in several ways: high levels of achievement, continuous improvement (see data pages) and abundant evidence of parent satisfaction are byproducts of such efforts. Our vision for students, however, goes well beyond simply *achievement* and *parental satisfaction*. It is one that takes inspiration from the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., *"Intelligence plus character – that is the goal of true education*. Our mission is ***To include all stakeholders in the promotion of community values and achievement, including the belief that 'school' is a place that attends to the child's soul as well as his/her mind.*** Toward that end, we offer a comprehensive array of programs, including instruction in character education and the visual and performing arts.

Walnut Grove is ranked a "10" on California's ten-point (API) school rating scale. This ranking is well deserved. Our students enter our school performing at relatively high levels. They leave, however, performing within the highest ranges in the nation. With each succeeding year Walnut Grove students have demonstrated advances in achievement - continuously improving their ranking within their peerage (see data tables). Our 2002 graduating class (5th grade), for example, increased its aggregate median NPR's significantly since the implementation of the state testing program (STAR) in 1998. Their aggregate median NPR score (SAT/9) improved from the 65th %ile in reading (2nd grade) to the 84th %ile (5th grade). In math, their aggregate median NPR score improved from the 75th %ile to the 90th %ile over the same time. Similar results are noted for all other cohort groups – and in each case, the growth curve is evenly distributed into comparable yearly increments. We are one of few top-ranked schools to have surpassed the established *"Growth Target"* for the *"Governor's Performance Award"* every year since the award was established.

While we pride ourselves in these data and empirical indices, we are similiarly proud of the feedback we get from our students and parents. It bespeaks our passion for learning and our desire to ensure that all students succeed within a caring learning community. Corrine Behrendt, a parent, volunteer (and now aspiring teacher) summed it up well, ***"We are so enthused by the passion and commitment that the staff gives to every child, including special children like our daughter."*** At Walnut Grove, *all* children *are* special.

Community partnerships flourish at the Grove. Last year we enlisted over 600 registered parent volunteers. Parents participate as tutors in a remedial reading program, in school governance as members of our *School Site Council*, as classroom volunteers, arts docents or activity supervisors. We welcome their involvement and view them as full partners in the learning process. In a letter to the principal, a parent remarked, ***"I love how the Walnut Grove***

teachers see me, the parent, as a complete partner in my child's education, at home and in the classroom!" For these, and many other reasons, we believe that Walnut Grove's NCLB/BRS nomination is well deserved.

PART IV INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Walnut Grove students are *high achievers*! As our assessment data (see addendum) suggests, our students perform two to four times better than their peers on state criterion-referenced tests ("at or above proficient," *California Standards Test*, CST). On nationally normed tests (*Stanford Achievement Test, Edition 9*) they register mean aggregate NPR's between the 83rd percentile (Total Reading) and the 88th percentile (Total Math).

As a California school, we have been involved in a norm-referenced assessment program since 1999. Please refer to the *"Norm-Referenced Test Scores"* addendum for this data. Our norm-referenced data suggests growth trends for all populations. These data clearly reflect growth in reading and math for all subgroups as well. Particularly significant progress is noted for special education and socio-economically disadvantaged students. The data shows that over the three-year period, disadvantaged students have demonstrated a 36% improvement in math performance, and a 46% increase in reading. Special Education students posted gains of 45% and 116% respectively. The only regressive score, a 3%ile drop in reading for Hispanic students, is possibly the result of a 100% increase in our Hispanic population during that period. At least half of the Hispanic students tested in 2002 had been with us for fewer than 6 months – thereby limiting our opportunities for intervention (Note: this discrepancy may be moot - the standard error of measurement – SEM – for this measure is 3%ile points.). On a related issue, we made every effort to include all students in the assessment program. Fewer than 1% were excluded from testing, all by parental request.

Before moving on to a discussion of criterion-referenced test results, one final point remains germane to the analysis of norm-referenced data: the data related to these test scores demonstrates a high degree of *statistical coherence.* Our results show similar (positive!) year-to-year outcomes for all grades, for all sub-groups and for all years. This kind of evenly distributed growth over time suggests that *systemic factors* (i.e., programmatic quality) can be credited for our success, rather than *external factors* or chance.

We have participated in the *California Standards Test* (CST) for two years in English-language arts and for one year in mathematics. The test is a criterion-referenced test in which student scores are sorted into one of five categories: *far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient* and *advanced.* This data, along with a rubric, is provided as an addendum.

Our performance on these assessment instruments speaks to the efficacy of our program of instruction. This year will mark the second year for collecting of math data. While California State data is somewhat limited, Walnut Grove's performance is nevertheless impressive. As an aggregate, 93% of our students score *above basic* in math. This is nearly 50% higher than the state average (63%). With regard to the *proficient-or higher* level, we post up percentages that are 100% higher than the state average. In terms of top-performing students, we list nearly <u>three times</u> the state average of students above the *advanced* level. We do not have data for socio-economically disadvantaged or for limited English proficient students in this table because their numbers are not statistically significant. Our data for special education students is rather remarkable, however: despite their given disabilities, they outperform their *non-handicapped* peers on a statewide basis by nearly every measure! (see tables)

The *California Standards Test for English-Language Arts* (ELA) has been administered to all California students for two years. Our results are appended in table form. An analysis of the tables reveals several important points. The first point suggested by the ELA results is that there have been uniformly positive results for all groups over the two years of testing. The second point is that the data suggests that Walnut Grove students register test results that are consistently between two and four times better than their peers in the state. For example, at least twice as many Walnut Grove students score *above proficient* in ELA as their peers in California in *all* grade levels tested (2-5). Our students fared even better at the higher levels. When our students' performance is compared with their statewide peers at the *advanced* level, our students scored *three to four times better* than their peers in English-language arts. As for subgroups on this assessment, we have only one group that is statistically significant, Special Education. Again, our Special Education students posted results that were not only superior to their disabled peers – they were again *higher than their non-handicapped peers* on a statewide basis!

Test data tells only part of a school's story. To that extent, it is a source of pride for our entire school community. It also fuels us with the inspiration to seek even higher levels of

achievement. Our vision for children, however, will always draw inspiration from an even more global and comprehensive view.

How assessment data is used to understand and improve student and school performance…

At Walnut Grove School, assessment data is used as an integral part of instruction. Data is gathered in many forms. In the aggregate, we view it as a "photo album" of student work, and not as merely high- stakes "snap shots." We use both formal and informal assessments to develop formative and summative data.

On the formal level, we administer norm-referenced tests (SAT/9, CAT/6) yearly. We also administer our own criterion-referenced, standards-based assessments in reading and math three times yearly. Formal writing samples are administered grades 2-5 yearly. The Test of Phonological Awareness (TOPA) is used to screen all kindergarten students. Students who demonstrate difficulties in acquiring the content of the curriculum may also receive diagnostic assessments by our Reading Specialist, Resource Specialist, Speech & Language Specialist, School Psychologist or principal (former Reading Specialist). Text-based and teacher-made assessments are also used as needed.

We strive to balance these evaluative tools with curriculum-embedded assessments and other informal assessment tools. These *performance-based assessments* are benchmarked to our content standards. They include writing, reading fluency, reading comprehension, running records, portfolio assessments, physical education, problem solving, student-demonstrations and projects.

These data – both formal and informal – are managed through the ARMS system. ARMS is a relational database that allows us to view data in various forms. In turn, we use the data in three primary fashions:

- To evaluate program effectiveness on a grade-by-grade and school-wide basis.
- To make programmatic decisions about the efficacy of curriculum and methodological practices that are driven by data.
- To identify individual student and subgroup weaknesses for purposes of corrective and remedial treatment and to guide us in developing support systems.
  By effectively culling and organizing useful data from multiple assessments, we are able to align instructional programs with students' needs. This is a continuous and never-ending process.

How does the school communicate student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students and the community?

We feel that it is very important that our community is kept informed about student performance levels and assessment results. This commitment has been very easy for us to live up to for one simple reason: it is always easy to share good news! As you will note (see data tables), our scores are high, and they continue to rise for all groups in all areas tested.

We provide multiple opportunities for our community to stay abreast of student performance and progress. Most prominently, the following communication methods are used:

- School Site Council – we have elected body of 14 –seven-parents/community member and seven staff members – who represent their constituents. They receive all data relative to student achievement. In collaboration, parents and staff use the data to develop school goals, activities and benchmarks for achievement.
- *Principal's Green Sheet* – this weekly newsletter includes regular updates related to student achievement, as well as updates on all efforts to increase student performance levels.
- *Roadrunner* – this online "e-zine" is sent to more than 300 households. It includes all relevant information related to performance and accountability.
- Websites – our "high stakes" test data is posted on both our school website, as well as our district website.
- School Accountability Report Card – this publication is sent to all families. It covers performance data in thirteen areas. It is also posted on our websites.
- PTA Meetings – monthly reports are always provided to our PTA. They include information about student performance levels, accountability reports and achievement.

How the school will share its success with other schools?

The Walnut Grove staff will proudly – but humbly – share its successes with other schools. We already have forums in place to do so at the district, regional, state and national levels.

At the district level, we can share our successes through our Principals' Counsel, through the teacher-based Curriculum Council, via grade-alike collaborations, using district newsletters and by maintaining an open door to all.

At the regional level, we will offer support to other schools through the Alameda County Office of Education. Workshops, site visitations and collaborations with regional staffs will be made available.

At the state level, we will gladly avail our site to all interested collaborators. We will welcome visiting teams from throughout the state. We would be very amenable to providing a team to present statewide support through state-sponsored conferences as well.

On the national level, we humbly offer our site as a demonstration school for high-performing schools. We have successfully continued to move ahead, even though we have been a top-performer for years. The formula for success – research-based instruction and collegial reflection – is something we are anxious to share with all fellow educators.

Using our website, we feel that we can offer support to all of America's schools. We would proudly create a national bulletin board through which we connect with interested schools. The site could provide more than just our story – it could act as a clearinghouse for all like-minded schools throughout the country.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Describe the school's curriculum and show how all students are engaged with significant content, based on high standards.

That Walnut Grove students have posted yearly achievement results that are well beyond the statistical norm is by no means coincidental. We have had exceptional results because we provide a curriculum for all students that is truly exceptional. Ours is a curriculum that is assessment-based, data-driven and predicated on scientifically supported pedagogical practices. It is too comprehensive to describe in a single page, however, a broad-stroke description follows.

Beginning with kindergarten, students receive instruction that is based on challenging content standards in reading, math, science, PE and social studies. At the kindergarten level, students begin reading instruction with phonological awareness screening (Torgesen, Jeul, Stanovich). Based on screening results, students move on to differentiated levels of instruction. "Academic language" (Shefebine) begins at this level in the form of read-aloud literary experiences that are universal for each grade level ("Core Reading"). Math instruction begins with extensive pre-algorithmic experiences using concrete, manipulative tools (Coons, Burns, Alpert). Writing instruction includes the introduction of the *Six-Traits* writing approach (Spandell) and constructivist spelling approaches (Tempelton, Gentry). Science instruction includes both scientific content and process skills. In social studies and science, the content of instruction is more general, while the emphasis is on process skills: observation and analysis (Pearson).

The succeeding primary grades - first and second grades – follow these content parameters, adding depth and complexity to each. In reading, fluency and comprehension gain significance (Kameanui, Goods, Miller, Harvey), while word recognition skills (phonics and sight word recognition: SIPPS) are still at the center of instruction. In math, we add a strong algebra component in second grade (*Hands-on Equations*) and we transition students from concrete operational experiences to more formal operations and abstractions (applied algorithms, mathematical reasoning). Writing becomes more formalized, expanding on the *Six-Traits* while using illustrative literary examples to exemplify each trait and genre. Science instruction, along with instruction in the social sciences, becomes more content-oriented, although the cognitive processes of observation and analysis continue to be emphasized. Physical education begins to transition during these years from psychomotor development to "personal growth." By second grade, students begin to view physical education as a means to improving their individual abilities.

Third grade is a pivotal year. At this point, the shift in reading instruction moves away from word recognition skills (phonics and sight words) and the emphasis turns to fluency, comprehension and contextual analysis. Students begin to develop fluency because they possess strong word recognition skills. To ensure growth in fluency, we use "*Read Naturally*," a program that increases fluency, in all third grade classes.

Comprehension strategies improve as a result of instructional practices based on the work of PERC (Harvey, Miller and others). "Core Reading" experiences become more complex and enriching, leading to improved vocabulary and "academic language." In math, algebra instruction continues, along with a greater emphasis on complex operations, like fractions, percentage, decimals, probability and statistical analysis. Social studies and science content become more specialized, and students begin their first endeavors in developing research projects in these areas. Technology-based research techniques are introduced at this level.

In fourth and fifth grades, students are expected to apply the skills and strategies that they have acquired in order to become self-directed learners. At this point their skills are generally strong enough for them to begin to explore and construct their own understandings through projects and research assignments. In reading, students are required to read, interpret, analyze and report on a wider range of texts, including works of fiction and non-fiction. They will incorporate all six of the writing "traits" as they compose cogent written works. In mathematics they use a strong foundation in the basic skills to problem solve and they use mathematical reasoning to develop solutions to complex real-world situations. They select areas of interest in science and the social sciences for in-depth study. These undertakings are presented formally to peers (e.g., classroom demonstrations) and community (e.g., science fair).

As a backdrop to all this, exceptional students at both ends of the spectrum receive special support. Gifted students participate in "clustered" classroom units, receiving differentiated instruction that includes *Independent Learning Plans*. Academically challenged students receive support from special classroom aides, our Reading Specialist or our Resource Specialist through IEP's. They also receive intensive small group instruction before or after school through our "*Intervention Program*." While we set the academic bar quite high, we provide safety nets for all so that *truly* no child is left behind.

Describe the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.

Reading instruction at Walnut Grove is well balanced. We recognize that the reading process is composed of sensory, perceptual, experiential, linguistic, cognitive and affective components (Adams). With this in mind, we have developed a reading program that is based on "best practices."

As the data demonstrates, our students are highly skilled readers (average composite NPR = 84%ile). They also love to read, as evidenced by the tremendous volumes of books that are checked out through our school library - over 16, 000 per year!

Our approach to reading instruction is *eclectic*. We draw from research on phonological awareness (Stahl, Juel, Stanovich) to begin kindergarten instruction. Students are assessed (*Test of Phonological Awareness*) each fall to assay their readiness to begin formal instruction. Those who demonstrate proficiency with phonological awareness move on to formal instruction, including explicit phonics instruction (Chall, Adams). *Zoo phonics, Words Their Way* (Templeton*), Systematic Instruction in Phonics & Phonological Awareness* (Shefebine), *Making Words*, *Earobics*, word walls, personal dictionaries, and guided practice are among the many approaches used to teach both synthetic and analytical approaches to phonics. Essential "sight words" are identified and taught both in context and in isolation. The use of contextual analysis is taught and modeled daily. Daily skill practice, in context, is built into instruction to help students to develop fluency and automaticity (Heineman).

The development of automaticity and fluency is associated with comprehension (Kamaenui, Simmons, Stahl). To promote fluency we have installed *Read Naturally*, a program designed to promote fluency. It serves second and third grades as a developmental tool; in fourth and fifth grades it is a remedial tool. Guided reading is practiced extensively; recreational reading is expected of all, with recreational reading practice being assigned to students nightly.

As students move into succeeding grade levels, a greater emphasis is placed on comprehension and vocabulary development. We teach *Essential Vocabulary* terms (Marzano) as a core vocabulary and we augment it with content-specific terms. Extensive instructional time is devoted to teaching "strategic reading" in all classrooms (Pressley, Brown, Harvey). Using the methodologies developed by the Denver-*based Public Education and Business Coalition* (Strategies that Work, Harvey & Goudvis), we teach students eight specific strategies for "connecting with text" on deep and meaningful levels. Additionally, reciprocal teaching methods are used extensively.

A full time Reading Specialist provides corrective instruction on a pullout basis. She also supports teachers by demonstrating new methods and techniques on a push-in basis. "Intervention" classes are offered before and after school for students who are considered "at-risk" for not mastering standards.

Our reading program yields dramatic results. We attribute this to our commitment to providing a curriculum that is founded on a balanced analysis of educational research and best practices.

Describe one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

Our writing curriculum supports the mission of the school in many ways. While helping students to become more skilled communicators, it also reinforces instruction in reading, spelling and character education.

The writing curriculum is organized around the *Six-Traits Writing* approach (Spandell). This method focuses on six elements ("traits") that are essential to quality written composition. Learning to apply rubrics to unlock the elements of effective composition, students are empowered with highly effective writing tools. The "traits" integrate written conventions effectively with rhetorical dynamics.

Our writing program begins in kindergarten. Students are introduced to the traits through exemplary forms of literature. In turn, they apply the trait to their own writing. At each succeeding grade level, the complexity of the trait, the depth of the connected literary piece and the breadth of rubric is increased.

The writing program is woven into our character education program. We use literary examples that reinforce our school "character traits" (e.g., <u>The Little Engine That Could</u> is used in K-1to teach the trait of perseverance.") Writing prompts, often used school-wide, are also keyed to character themes.

Reading instruction is enhanced by promoting the reading/writing connection (Pearson). It is also promoted by the use of quality works of literature to demonstrate the traits. Extensive discussion, analysis and examination help to promote deeper understanding as well *as self-to-text* connections (Harvey).

Throughout the year our teachers administer various writing assessments. These assessments are used to evaluate student progress. They provide valuable data that guides us in making program adjustments and to plan program enhancements.

Describe the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

At Walnut Grove we believe that instructional methodology is a seminal factor for achieving our vision for children. Realizing that no single approach will meet all needs, we draw upon many techniques, relying most heavily upon those considered "best practices" (Lieberman).

Toward that end, we incorporate a full spectrum of techniques and methods. In the interest of brevity with detail, they are listed by focus area:

Language Arts – Reading	**Mathematics**
phonological awareness training	developmental instruction
"Earobics"	hands-on/concrete instruction
analytical/synthetics phonics	early us of manipulatives/realia
"making words" (constructive phonics)	early, concrete algebra (Hands-on Equations)
explicit phonics instruction (SIPPS)	emphasis on writing in math
phonemically embedded controlled readers	emphasis on mathematical communication
word sorts/sight words/word walls	extensive use of "applied" math
guided reading	daily problem-solving activities
reader's workshop	timed tests/drill strategically implemented
virtual books	technology used for reinforcement
language experience approach	technology used for application
reciprocal teaching	"Essential Vocabulary" (Marzano)
fluency training (Read Naturally)	math/literature connection emphasized
literature circles	classroom speakers (engineers, scientists)
metacognitive strategies (Harvey, Costa)	**Science/Social Sciences**
schema analysis	weekly "lab" experiences
Languag Arts – Written Expression	school-wide ecology program (Go Green)
developmental spelling (Gentry, Templeton)	partnership w/business (govt. & businesses)
d'Nealian scrip/manuscript	science fun fair/ field trips
Bay Area Writing methods (Gray)	Individual Learning Plans (special projects)
student-made rubrics	Historical performances/reenactments
writer's workshop	**Other**
Four-Block Writing (remedial)	cooperative learning
Six-Traits Writing	learning hats/icons
author's chair (developmental)	Tribes/Socratic discussions
student-generated publications	Student peer mediation/peer tutoring
peer editing	Brain-based instruction (Caine, Sylwester)
metacognitive strategies (Spandell)	Differentiated instruction
	Integrated arts/character ed program

5. Describe the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

As the quality of curriculum and instruction improves, so goes achievement. The Walnut Grove staff fully appreciates the integral relationship between staff development and student achievement. As a result, we have developed a three-year plan for staff development. The plan is written into our *Consolidated School Plan*, which is in the second year of a three-year cycle. Our primary efforts are focused on four areas: 1) content area reading comprehension, 2) writing strategies, 3) mathematical reasoning and 4) character education.

Each of these goals has a staff development component as well as an assigned budget. This year's plan, for example, includes $17,646.00 for targeted staff development. Some of the activities that have been conducted include the following:

- ❖ **Book Groups** – all teachers have read *Strategies that Work* (Harvey) and participated in book discussion groups (6 hours total). Embedded in-service training resulted for all teachers. Primary (K-2) staff has read *Reading With Meaning* (Miller) and met after school (6 hours total) for reflection and discussion. Teachers in grades 3-5 have read and discussed *Nonfiction Counts* (Miller) in the same manner. In all cases, teaches implemented teaching strategies suggested by the authors and conducted "action research" within their classrooms. Results were shared and a number of embedded trainings/demonstrations resulted.
- ❖ **Curriculum Auditing** – primary staff felt the need to evaluate the alignment of their curriculums in math and reading with the state content standards. They met for a total of 8 hours (after school) to use an audit-process to determine their "capacity" for bringing all students to the level of mastery. Their discussions, analysis and recommendations have led to significant program improvements, in terms of both vertical and horizontal articulation.
- ❖ **Six-Trait Writing** – this year we hired a consultant to spend two days on our campus demonstrating the Six-Traits methods and holding after school debriefing sessions. Substitutes were hired in order to allow all teachers to observe numerous lessons. Additionally, we have an on-site lead writing teacher.
- ❖ **Hands-On Algebra** – all 2nd –5th grade staff members have received training and program materials for teaching this program. As a result, our children are very facile with algebra.

Our efforts in the area of staff development go well beyond these examples. These are merely highlights. We have had additional in-service training in science, social studies, character education and P.E.. Our teachers meet every Wednesday morning for one hour to collaborate on curriculum issues. Our goal is continue to embed staff development into our daily routines, making it more systemic, sustainable and dynamic.

Addendum Pages

Walnut Grove Elementary School

Norm-Referenced Assessment Data
<u>**Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition**</u>**(SAT/9)**

Criterion-Referenced Assessment Data
<u>**California Standards Test (CST)**</u>

CST Description
Proficiency Rubric

Norm-Referenced Test Scores: <u>Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition</u>

The following tables (2) reflect three years of scores on the SAT/9 section of the STAR program, California's testing and accountability system. The scores provided are the percentage of students scoring above the 50th percentile. Boxes marked "N/A" do not have statistically significant populations.

<u>Total Reading</u>

	Grade Level	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	--	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Total Score (Percent at or Above 50th Percentile)	Grade 2	88	88	88
	Grade 3	85	88	85
	Grade 4	91	88	85
	Grade 5	91	87	85
Number of students tested		525	562	603
Percent of total students tested		99	99	100
Number of students excluded		5	4	3
Percent of students excluded		1	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. Females		91	88	89
2. Males		87	87	79
3. Asian/Asian America		87	89	84
4. Hispanic or Latino		72	82	77
5. White		91	89	85
6. Special Education Enrollment		67	N/A	31
7. Gifted and Talented (GATE) Enrollment		100	100	100
8. Limited English Profi		52	N/A	N/A
9. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	73	50

Walnut Grove Elementary

Norm-Referenced Test Scores: <u>Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition</u>
 Total Math

	Grade Level	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	--	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Total Score (Percent at or Above 50th Percentile)	Grade 2	95	86	85
	Grade 3	88	89	87
	Grade 4	94	87	87
	Grade 5	91	96	90
Number of students tested		525	562	603
Percent of total students tested		99	99	100
Number of students excluded		5	4	3
Percent of students excluded		1	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. Females		94	89	86
2. Males		89	90	86
3. Asian/Asian America		94	91	84
4. Hispanic or Latino		84	83	73
5. White		92	91	87
6. Special Education Enrollment		74	N/A	51
7. Gifted and Talented (GATE) Enrollment		100	99	100
8. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged		68	64	50
9. Limited English Proficiency		N/A	N/A	N/A

Walnut Grove Elementary

Criterion-Referenced Test Scores

The following tables contain data from the CST, California Standards Test. The test is part of the statewide STAR assessment system and it has been in place for two years in English-language arts and one year in math. While the state has not adopted definitions for *basic, proficient* and *advanced,* we have provided our district rubric at the end of this section to assist with understanding.

California Standards Test English-Language Arts at Grade 2

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	90	93
At or Above Proficient	69	68
At Advanced	27	34
Number of students tested	110	119
Percent of total students tested	96	98
Number of students excluded	5	3
Percent of students excluded	4	2
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. Females	92	91
At or Above Basic	75	63
At or Above Proficient	33	34
At Advanced		
2. Males		
At or Above Basic	87	95
At or Above Proficient	63	72
At Advanced	22	33
3. Limited English Proficiency		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
4. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
5. Special Education Enrollment		
At or Above Basic	75	N/A
At or Above Proficient	67	N/A
At Advanced	17	N/A
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	63	61
At or Above Proficient	32	32
At Advanced	9	10

Walnut Grove Elementary

Criterion-Referenced Test Scores

The following tables contain data from the CST, California Standards Test. The test is part of the statewide STAR assessment system and it has been in place for two years in English-language arts and one year in math. While the state has not adopted definitions for *basic, proficient* and *advanced,* we have provided our district rubric at the end of this section to assist with understanding.

California Standards Test, English-Language Arts at Grade 3

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	91	93
At or Above Proficient	74	73
At Advanced	35	36
Number of students tested	124	123
Percent of total students tested	98	96
Number of students excluded	3	5
Percent of students excluded	2	
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. Females	95	95
At or Above Basic	77	71
At or Above Proficient	36	30
At Advanced		
2. Males		
At or Above Basic	88	90
At or Above Proficient	72	75
At Advanced	35	42
3. Limited English Proficiency		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
4. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
5. Special Education Enrollment		
At or Above Basic	82	N/A
At or Above Proficient	64	N/A
At Advanced	35	N/A
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	62	59
At or Above Proficient	32	30
At Advanced	9	9

Walnut Grove Elementary

Criterion-Referenced Test Scores

The following tables contain data from the CST, California Standards Test. The test is part of the statewide STAR assessment system and it has been in place for two years in English-language arts and one year in math. While the state has not adopted definitions for *basic, proficient* and *advanced,* we have provided our district rubric at the end of this section to assist with understanding.

California Standards Test, English-Language Arts at Grade 4

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	96	96
At or Above Proficient	83	77
At Advanced	49	40
Number of students tested	124	151
Percent of total students tested	94	97
Number of students excluded	8	4
Percent of students excluded	6	3
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. Females	93	98
At or Above Basic	84	76
At or Above Proficient	46	42
At Advanced		
2. Males		
At or Above Basic	99	95
At or Above Proficient	82	78
At Advanced	53	38
3. Limited English Proficiency		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
4. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
5. Special Education Enrollment		
At or Above Basic	75	N/A
At or Above Proficient	60	N/A
At Advanced	10	N/A
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	71	66
At or Above Proficient	36	33
At Advanced	14	11

Walnut Grove Elementary

Criterion-Referenced Test Scores

The following tables contain data from the CST, <u>California Standards Test</u>. The test is part of the statewide STAR assessment system and it has been in place for two years in English-language arts and one year in math. While the state has not adopted definitions for *basic, proficient* and *advanced,* we have provided our distric t rubric at the end of this section to assist with understanding.

California Standards Test English-Language Arts at Grade 5

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	93	93
At or Above Proficient	74	67
At Advanced	38	26
Number of students tested	154	160
Percent of total students tested	99	99
Number of students excluded	2	1
Percent of students excluded	1	1
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. Females		
At or Above Basic	94	97
At or Above Proficient	81	71
At Advanced	43	30
2. Males		
At or Above Basic	92	90
At or Above Proficient	68	65
At Advanced	33	23
3. Limited English Proficiency		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
4. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged		
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A
5. Special Education Enrollment		
At or Above Basic	48	50
At or Above Proficient	24	17
At Advanced	12	0
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	71	66
At or Above Proficient	31	28
At Advanced	9	11

Walnut Grove Elementary

Criterion-Referenced Test Scores

The following tables contain data from the CST, <u>California Standards Test</u>. The test is part of the statewide STAR assessment system and it has been in place for two years in English-language arts and one year in math. While the state has not adopted definitions for *basic, proficient* and *advanced,* we have provided our district rubric at the end of this section to assist with understanding.

<u>California Standards Test (CST) Mathematics at Grades 2-5</u>

	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
Testing month	April			
SCHOOL SCORES				
At or Above Basic	98	89	93	94
At or Above Proficient	84	65	78	74
At Advanced	42	18	41	32
Number of students tested	113	125	129	154
Percent of total students tested	98	98	98	99
Number of students excluded	2	2	3	2
Percent of students excluded	2	2	2	1
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. Females				
At or Above Basic	96	90	93	95
At or Above Proficient	81	63	73	72
At Advanced	38	15	35	26
2. Males				
At or Above Basic	98	89	95	94
At or Above Proficient	85	68	85	76
At Advanced	45	22	48	38
3. Limited English Proficiency				
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
At or Above Basic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
At or Above Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
At Advanced	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. Special Education Enrollment				
At or Above Basic	93	78	70	71
At or Above Proficient	72	50	55	24
At Advanced	36	11	15	6
STATE SCORES				
TOTAL				
At or Above Basic	68	65	67	59
At or Above Proficient	43	38	37	29
At Advanced	16	12	13	7

Proficiency Rubric
CST

Proficiency Level	Proficiency level description with respect to the California standards
Advanced	Distinguished achievement. In-depth understanding of academic knowledge and skills tested and exceeds the grade level expectation.
Proficient	Competent level of achievement in the academic knowledge and skills tested and meets the grade level expectation.
Basic	Somewhat competent in the academic knowledge and skills tested and partially meets the grade level expectation.
Below Basic	Limited achievement in the academic knowledge and skills tested and does not meet the grade level expectation.
Far Below Basic	Minimal achievement in the academic knowledge and skills tested and does not meet the grade level expectation.

NOTE

This table is provided to explain relative distinctions between the levels of proficiency that are described in the California Standards Test. It is not an official state document, rather it is a guideline that we have used to better understand the proficiency designations.