

REVISED on MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2005

**2004-2005 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program**

*U.S. Department of Education*

**Cover Sheet**

Type of School:  Elementary  Middle  High  K-12

Name of Principal Mr. Allen A. Lee  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name John Yehall Chin Elementary School  
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 350 Broadway  
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

San Francisco California 94133 - 4503  
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County San Francisco School Code Number\*38-68478-6113252

Telephone ( 415 ) 291-7946 Fax ( 415 ) 291-7943

Website/URL http://portal.sfusd.edu/template/default.cfm?page=es.chin E-mail sch872@sfusd.edu

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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date 02/07/05

Name of Superintendent\* Dr. Arlene Ackerman  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name San Francisco Unified School District Tel. ( 415 ) 241-6121

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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date 02/07/05

Name of School Board  
President/Chairperson Eric Mar, Esq.  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date 02/07/05

## **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

**[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]**

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2004-2005 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1999 and has not received the 2003 or 2004 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

---

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:       78   Elementary schools  
   18   Middle schools  
   0   Junior high schools  
   22   High schools  
   0   Other  
  
    118  TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:      \$7,485.00   
  
     Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:  \$6,881.82

**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  
 Suburban  
 Small city or town in a rural area  
 Rural
4.   4   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.  
           If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
K	24	9	33	8	0	0	0
1	12	17	29	9	0	0	0
2	21	19	40	10	0	0	0
3	21	19	40	11	0	0	0
4	19	21	40	12	0	0	0
5	19	21	40	Other	0	0	0
6	0	0	0				
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b>							<b>222</b>

[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- |             |                                  |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| 3           | % White                          |
| 1           | % Black or African American      |
| 1           | % Hispanic or Latino             |
| 95          | % Asian/Pacific Islander         |
| 0           | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| <b>100%</b> | <b>Total</b>                     |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 4 %

(This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.)

<b>(1)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	<b>5</b>
<b>(2)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	<b>4</b>
<b>(3)</b>	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	<b>9</b>
<b>(4)</b>	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	<b>224</b>
<b>(5)</b>	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	<b>0.04</b>
<b>(6)</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	<b>4%</b>

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 79 %  
175 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 9

Specify languages: Arabic, Cambodian, Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish, Tagalog, Toishonese, Urdu, and Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 80 %

Total number students who qualify: 177

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 5 %  
10 Total Number of Students Served

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

<u>0</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>0</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>6</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>4</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	

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

**Number of Staff**

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number	<u>15</u>	<u>7</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 20:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Daily student attendance	98 %	97 %	98 %	97 %	96 %
Daily teacher attendance	98 %	97 %	95 %	95 %	97 %
Teacher turnover rate	0 %	9 %	9 %	9 %	0 %
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	%	%	%	%	%
Student drop-off rate (high school)	%	%	%	%	%

## **PART III - SUMMARY**

---

*Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 600 words).*

John Yehall Chin Elementary School (JYC) is a K-5 traditional calendar public school located on the northeastern corner of San Francisco, California, right outside of Chinatown, North Beach, and the Financial Districts. 222 students currently attend JYC. Our school building, built in the mid-1910's, has been renovated a couple of times, most recently, during the 2002-2003 School Year. JYC was originally named Washington Irving Elementary School. During the mid-1960's, due to declining enrollment in the Chinatown area, Washington Irving morphed and became The School of Business and Commerce, essentially, an adult education school. Then, in 1995, due to a swell of enrollment in the Chinatown area, The School of Business and Commerce ceased operation. This building went through an extensive renovation and again began operating as an elementary school. This time, the school was renamed after John Yehall Chin, one of the earliest and most respected local Asian American pioneers in education.

JYC serves a richly diverse community. The majority of JYC students reside in the neighborhoods of Chinatown, Visitacion Valley, and the Tenderloin. Families at JYC currently represent nine languages, not including several different dialects of Chinese. The highest language concentration is Cantonese Chinese. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of JYC students are considered Limited English Proficient (LEP). Eighty percent (80%) of JYC students qualify for free or reduced breakfasts and lunches. More than fifteen percent (15%) of JYC students are identified as Gifted and Talented (GATE) and/or High Potential. About five percent (5%) of JYC students are receiving Special Education services. The mobility rate of the 2003-2004 School Year was a mere four percent (4%), and JYC has not had to suspend any student over any and all types of behavioral infractions ever since we reopened our doors as an elementary school back in 1995. Given these myriad of factors, JYC students are given ample opportunities to model respect for diversity.

Through the expert utilization of the Direct Instruction model, our Classroom Teachers as well as our Support Staff design and teach interconnected lessons that have been tailored to address each student's unique needs. Our Classroom Teachers and our Support Staff understand the simple and undeniable fact that we can do nothing to change any of the myriad of factors that our students are associated with as they walk through our doors, especially those that are not altogether positive. We hold high expectations of all of our students, in spite of the above mentioned factors and challenges. Having disaggregated our state/district/school/classroom assessment data, we adapt and modify our instructional practices, assessment modalities, and even personnel assignment to make certain that all of our students have full access to our curriculum.

For example, after having disaggregated our state assessment data from the 2001-2002 as well as the 2002-2003 School Years, JYC Staff decided to modify and fortify our instructional practices, assessment modalities, and even personnel assignment in order to bolster our students' performance in the specific area of literary analysis. Students who were/are struggling in this content area have received/are receiving Extended Day Instruction/Support through our after-school enrichment program. This shift in our daily instructional practices has already paid resounding dividends in our students' performance on last year's state assessments. We will continue to monitor our data for further gains in student performance.

Despite negative fluctuations in our site budget for the last four school years, JYC students receive an array of support from various in-district as well as outside sources. From early intervention for struggling students, to classroom SST's for "run of the mill" students, to acceleration and enrichment for GATE/High Potential students, JYC students are individually treated with care and respect. "No Child Left Behind" is not just a mere slogan here at JYC. Our Staff work tirelessly, before school, after school, and during lunch to make certain that indeed no child is left behind.

Here at JYC, we relish simplifying teaching and learning for the sake of the students. Our school community shares and reflects our school motto/vision of "Fostering Deeper Understanding" through our commitment to upholding strong academic standards in consideration of the students' social emotional development.

## PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### *1. Describe in one page the meaning of the school's assessment results in reading and mathematics.*

Each spring, students at John Yehall Chin Elementary School participate in STAR. The California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition (CAT/6), replaced the Stanford 9 (SAT/9) as the nationally norm-referenced test in the 2003-2004 School Year. Students from grades 2-11 are tested in reading, language, and mathematics. Students from grades 2-8 are also tested in spelling. During the current 2004-2005 School Year, the California State Legislature has deemed that only 3<sup>rd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> graders will need to take the CAT/6 portion of the STAR. In 1999, the State of California added the California Standards Test (CST) component to the STAR program. The CST's involve language arts, mathematics, and writing. The CST's in language arts and mathematics are administered to students from grades 2-11. The CST in writing is only administered to 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> graders. The CST's measure each student's grade-level skills and knowledge as required by the California Academic Content Standards. Only students who scored at the "Proficient" and "Advanced" (top two) levels on the CST's are considered to have demonstrated/met the standards.

Another measurement of school/student achievement of the STAR program is the Academic Performance Index (API). The API measures both the academic performance and the ongoing growth of California schools. It is a numeric index that ranges from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. The statewide API target for all schools is 800. Additional information regarding California's state assessment system may be found online at [www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov).

In the 2000-2001 School Year, JYC's combined SAT/9 and CST scores gave us a final growth API of 745, with a statewide rank of 7, a similar schools rank of 10, and a growth target next school year of 3 points. In the 2001-2002 School Year, not only did we surpass our growth target of 3 points, our combined SAT/9 and CST scores gave us a final growth API of 763, with a statewide rank of 7, a similar schools rank of 9, and a growth target next school year of 2 points. In the 2002-2003 School Year, again we surpassed our growth target of 2 points. Our combined SAT/9 and CST scores gave us a final growth API of 832, with a statewide rank of 9, and a similar schools rank of 10. Finally, in the 2003-2004 School Year, our combined SAT/9 and CST scores gave us yet another boost with our final growth API being 862, a statewide rank of 9, and a similar schools rank of 10.

A more thorough analysis of our statistically valid subgroup assessment data – Asians, LEP's, and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged – tells us that all three subgroups have compiled API's of 800+, surpassing the statewide API target of 800. Out of the three statistically valid subgroups, the Asians subgroup is scoring a tad bit higher than the LEP's and those who are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged. However, given the fact the makeup of our subgroups are practically the same, we still need to continue to make data driven instructional decisions in order to further close the achievement gap between our subgroups. We need to make certain that all assessments will drive differentiated needs-based instruction for our various student subgroups. Assessment data has been paramount in the student recruitment and the grouping of our after-school program, which has been serving our more instructionally needy students.

In California, certain Special Education students and certain students in the Inclusion Program can take an alternate annual assessment called the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) if their Individualized Education Plans deems it necessary. During the last two school years, one JYC student was assessed through the use of the CAPA. The CAPA data showed that this student was considered to be "Proficient" in reading/language arts and "Advanced" in math.

In addition to state mandated assessments, JYC also has utilized a variety of other on-going individual as well as classroom assessments such as the Brigance (for Kindergarten & 1<sup>st</sup> Grade), the Assessment of Basic Comprehension (for 1<sup>st</sup> Grade only), and the Bay Area Writing Project (for 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Grades). Last but not least, JYC has consistently utilized the chapter and unit assessments from our adopted textbook series.

We are fully confident that our student achievement will continue to rise for many years to come!

## **2. *How the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.***

Assessment data are reviewed on an as-needed basis to help us identify our collective as well as individual strengths and weaknesses. Once these strengths and weaknesses are clearly identified and defined, we will determine what our students' needs are.

We continue to make sound, deliberate, and systematic instructional decisions based on the assessment data of our students. As the instructional decisions are being implemented, we further analyze ongoing assessment data to fine-tune the implementation of different instructional deliveries. No instructional decision will be made in a vacuum, absent from analysis of assessment data. Once this cycle of inquiry begins, it will snowfall and become a continuous process that all JYC staff will expertly utilize.

At JYC, assessment results, especially ones that indicate weaknesses and needs, are not utilized as excuses for not succeeding. At the school level, we utilize a multitude of assessments because we understand and readily accept the simple fact that there is not a "perfect" assessment program. Rather, assessments and assessment results are analyzed and utilized as tools in order to better modify/align our daily instructional practices and intervention strategies.

Data crunching enables us to leave nothing to luck or chance. JYC support staff meets regularly with our classroom teachers so they can, as a cohesive team, closely and systematically monitor the progress and/or the struggles of our students. Our SST process, in conjunction with assessment data, will pinpoint the specific learning needs of our students. If identified to have special needs, our RSP students receive constant academic support through both the push-in and pull-out models from our RSP Specialist and the RSP Paraprofessional. Similarly, our ACE after-school program provides directed daily enrichment support interventions for those students who have scored below the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile.

## **3. *How the school communicates student performance to parents, students, and the community.***

JYC communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community through a variety of channels. This constant back and forth communication fortifies our goal of keeping all of the stakeholders in the loop so to speak. The reinforced communication also helps all of us in focusing on student achievement/performance.

On top of regular report cards, our classroom teachers send out bi-weekly Student Progress Updates to give our parents immediate feedbacks to how their children have done during the last two weeks of school. Once these bi-weekly Student Progress Updates are brought home, parents are asked to review the data and the comments, discuss the ramifications of the data and the comments, then sign and return the Student Progress Updates back to the classroom teachers.

On the alternate weeks when the bi-weekly Student Progress Updates aren't send out to our parents, our classroom teachers send out bi-weekly Classroom Newsletters to inform our parents as to what has been happening and what will be happening in their respective classrooms. Each classroom teacher sends out a unique set of Classroom Newsletters that are tailored for her/his students and families.

Both the bi-weekly Student Progress Updates as well as the bi-weekly Classroom Newsletters have proven to be very powerful communication tools between JYC and our families. In order to supplement the bi-weekly Classroom Newsletters with updates regarding school-wide events, JYC sends home a school newsletter titled *Yehall Times* on a monthly basis. On these school newsletters, parents and the community at large are informed about school-wide activities, school-wide safety reminders, and last but certainly not least, the date and time of the next joint School Site Council/English Language Advisory Council/Parent Teacher Club monthly meeting.

During these monthly meetings, parents, staff, and community members are kept informed about the school's Site Plan. Voting members will also make important decisions on the expenditures of the school and the PTC budgets. School-wide as well as disaggregated student assessment data are also shared with the parents, staff, and community members during these monthly meetings. Last but not least, at the beginning of each subsequent school year, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction at the California Department of Education sends home *The STAR Student Report* to all JYC families.

**4. Describe how the school has shared and will continue to share its successes with other schools.**

JYC Staff strives to maintain a strong collaborative relationship with other schools in our district. Many of our classroom teachers have taken leadership roles in various district curriculum committees. These leadership roles allow our classroom teachers the opportunities to share our successes with classroom teachers from other schools in our district.

Even though JYC is a relatively small school located on the northeastern corner of the city of San Francisco, we readily welcome teachers from other schools in or out of our district to visit us and glean instructional ideas from us. Various local universities and colleges have chosen to place their student teachers from their teacher preparation programs here at JYC. These student teachers have in turn put into use in their own classrooms the skills they have learned from our classroom teachers.

More than three years ago, JYC chose to adopt and implement the commercially successful Kaplan Test Readiness Preparation Program. Since then, along with the hard work and the perseverance of our students and staff, we have made a gain of 108 points on our API, from 745 points to 853 points. JYC Staff has readily shared our success with many other schools' staff and a majority of these other schools have since chosen to also adopt and implement the Kaplan Test Readiness Preparation Program.

From the simple use of a set of walkie-talkies to address campus security issues to a brand new staff attitude toward standardized testing, JYC's Principal strives to share as many helpful school-wide practices with his colleagues as long as they are willing to listen to his enthusiastic pitches, in person, over the phone, or through e-mails. There has been a tremendous increase in these requests for assistance from other schools since JYC was awarded with the California State Title I Academic Achievement Award.

In the next couple of years, JYC will aim to expand our school web site so that other schools from around the world can tap into the resources that we have successfully utilized with our students. Last but certainly not least, if awarded with the National Blue Ribbon Award, our Blue Ribbon application will be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's web site for dissemination to other schools across the country and around the world.

## PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. Describe in one page the school's curriculum.

The San Francisco Unified School District has adopted rigorous standards that are aligned with the State's standards in all curricular areas. Moreover, we have managed to interweave as many curriculum areas/subjects together as we can. JYC classroom teachers meet regularly to address the issues associated with articulation and transition from one year to the next, from one grade to the next.

Reading/Language Arts – All grade levels utilize the State and District adopted Houghton Mifflin series. The series provides systematic and explicit instruction for language acquisition. The Houghton Mifflin curriculum is supplemented as needed with the *Into English* and *Wordly Wise* series. The *Into English* series further delineates our language acquisition goals and standards for our English Language Learners. The *Wordly Wise* series, on the other hand, extends our language acquisition goals and standards for our advanced learners.

Mathematics – All grade levels utilize the State and District adopted Harcourt Math series. The series provides a concrete and systematic format for mathematics instruction – introduce, teach, practice, and assess. The Harcourt math series is supplemented as needed with the *Math Steps* series. The *Math Steps* series further provides the classroom teachers additional opportunities for reteach and provides our students extended practices so they can fine-tune their math skills.

Social Studies – Kindergarteners, 1<sup>st</sup> graders, 2<sup>nd</sup> graders, 3<sup>rd</sup> graders, and 5<sup>th</sup> graders utilize the State and District adopted McGraw-Hill Social Studies series while 4<sup>th</sup> graders utilized the State and District adopted Harcourt Brace Social Studies series. Both of these series provide rich and relevant content. The McGraw-Hill Social Studies series, in its partnership with the National Geographic Society, consistently reinforces geographic literacy skills throughout the various lessons. Both series utilize a variety of assessment modalities to check our students' recall of factual information and their application of that knowledge. "Active Citizenship" and "Making a Difference" are emphasized throughout both series, therefore bridging the disconnect that often exists between what is being taught from the textbooks and what is happening in the real world. Last but certainly not least, both series stress the important value behind respect and diversity.

Science – All grade levels utilize the State and District adopted University of California, Berkeley Lawrence Hall of Science's Full Option Science System, better known as FOSS. 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> graders also utilize the State and District adopted Harcourt Science series as supplement. The FOSS curriculum is inquiry based where the students learn science by doing. For assessment purposes, the FOSS curriculum utilizes a number of formative and summative strategies to help monitor student progress. The Harcourt Science series is organized into Life, Earth, and Physical Science units. The Harcourt Science series employs an assessment system that measures both content and process in an array of contexts.

Computer/Technology – All grade levels utilize the JYC Computer Lab, with both Mac's and PC's, staffed by our 60% FTE Computer Technology Integration Specialist (CTIS). Students' activities in the Computer Lab are tied to our school's overall curriculum, especially in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics. From the development of simple typing skills to putting together a multimedia slide show utilizing various computer software programs, our CTIS communicates on a consistent basis with our classroom teachers for planning purposes.

Physical Education/Health – JYC teachers have recently attended a PE in-service focusing on the implementation of non-traditional PE activities. JYC teachers regularly and consistently promote PE and healthy lifestyles for our students and their families.

Fine Arts – JYC Staff regularly and consistently promote fine arts activities throughout the school year, often integrating fine arts with other core curriculum. In addition, JYC has a consultancy based partnership with LEAP...Imagination for Learning where a resident instructor spends half of the school year working with all JYC students on a particular aspect of the fine arts. For the current 2004-2005 School Year, our focus is in performing arts.

***2a. (Elementary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's reading curriculum.***

The Houghton Mifflin Reading series was adopted by SFUSD in the 2003-2004 School Year. The Houghton Mifflin series delivers explicit, systematic instruction that is aligned with the California English Language Arts Standards. In the lower grades, the series seeks to develop the students' oral language, phonemic awareness, letter recognition, phonics and blending skills, and high-frequency vocabulary recognition. Utilizing a full selection of engaging text, the series aims to focus on decoding skills for the lower graders. In the upper grades, the series gradually transitions the students from decodable text to trade literature.

The Houghton Mifflin series supports four multifaceted, balanced, and yet distinct reading instructional models that are being utilized in all JYC classrooms: #1. Large group instruction – including shared reading in which classroom teachers model various reading techniques; #2. Small group instruction – including guided reading in which students read from their assessed instructional levels; #3. Literature circle – giving students opportunities to discuss at greater length and depth different literature selections under the direction and guidance of classroom teachers; #4. Independent reading – allowing the students to read independently at their own reading levels.

Throughout the entire Houghton Mifflin series, there is a consistent development of comprehension strategies and skills. For students who may be in need of additional support and intervention, the series provides a myriad of support and intervention strategies. “Universal Access” time allows instructional reinforcement and extension.

The Houghton Mifflin series employs a comprehensive system of diagnostic, prescriptive, and summative assessment – addressing the different learning styles of JYC students.

***3. Describe in one-half page one other curriculum area of the school's choice.***

The Harcourt Math series was adopted by SFUSD in the 2002-2003 School Year. The Harcourt Math series provides JYC students ample opportunities to solve meaningful, challenging, and real-world problems. The series also provides a plethora of practices for every lesson so that JYC students can hone in on their computational and procedural skills. Within the series, on both the student textbooks as well as the teacher's edition, lots of concrete pictorial models were utilized throughout the various lessons so that JYC students can conceptualize their understanding, therefore, “fostering a deeper understanding.”

Deductive and inductive mathematical reasoning are emphasized throughout the Harcourt Math series. Students are constantly reminded that there may be more than one correct way to solve any given math problem. Once a given math problem is solved, students are required to justify their answer through math journals and other special math projects.

As a precursor to each lesson and each unit, the Harcourt Math series assesses JYC students' prior knowledge. Different levels of instructional intervention tools are available if certain students struggle with certain concepts. On the side margins of the teacher's edition, the series offered English-language acquisition strategies for the instruction of students whose primary language is not English.

Differentiated instruction at various levels allows our students access to the core math curriculum at their own ability level. Whole class instruction, small group instruction, math centers, and independent learning/practice are the instructional models we have utilized in the area of math.

The Harcourt Math series is aligned with the goals and Standards of the California Mathematics Framework. Each grade level is organized into units and chapters that develop number sense, algebra and functions, measurement and geometry, statistics, data analysis, and probability. The series takes on a very concrete and logical system for mathematics instruction – introduce, teach, practice, and assess.

The Harcourt Math series reaches far beyond just obtaining the right answers. The series utilizes three vastly different ways to assess the students' understanding of the lessons – discuss, write, and lesson/unit quiz. These different assessment modalities address the different learning styles of JYC students. Through careful analysis of these assessment data, JYC Staff can further bolster our students' already stellar performance in the area of mathematics.

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

JYC Staff utilizes a myriad of different instructional methods in order to improve student learning. The utilization of these different instructional methods is systematic, equitable, student-centered and last but not least, needs-based. When needs arise, we will collaboratively generate various approaches in order to address the needs of our students.

In order to assess our students' needs, JYC Staff takes time to individually assess their students. The results from the assessment will allow classroom teachers to determine the overall needs of the class at large. The results from the assessment will also provide rationales for the classroom teachers to put together learning groups/centers throughout the day. Some classroom lessons are taught in whole-class settings while others are taught in smaller learning groups/centers in order to address the unique needs of certain students. Writer's Workshops and Literature Circles are examples of other instructional delivery methods that our classroom teachers employ on a consistent basis.

Our upper grade students provide cross age tutoring through our "classroom buddies" program where each upper grade classroom is matched up with a lower grade classroom. This program allows our students opportunities to interact with one another. We have found that this particular program, along with the use of Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD), Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD), and TPR (Total Physical Response) techniques are especially helpful with our English Language Learners.

Our GATE/High Potential students are grouped in a multi-graded project-based learning classroom. These students are required to utilize their higher-level critical thinking skills and to think outside of the conventional box. We have adapted our instructional methodologies accordingly in order to better facilitate this higher order of learning.

#### **5. Describe the school's professional development program and its impact.**

Both the San Francisco Unified School District and JYC have placed a lot of importance on maintaining excellent professional development programs for all of our staff. Over the past four years, considerable effort and resources have been expanded toward better preparing our staff to help students achieve the state content standards across various curricular areas with a particular emphasis on our work with our English Language Learners.

New teachers are strongly encouraged to participate in the district's Beginning teachers Support and Assessment program (BTSA). As a part of the BTSA program, new teachers are partnered with more experienced mentors on-site and attend regular BTSA specific in-services held at the district level. Many of our district's Professional Development Institute sessions are designed specifically for the unique professional needs of our new teachers. As an example, two new teachers at JYC attended a series of Classroom Management Workshops that were offered as part of the district Professional Development Institute (PDI). Other subject matters that are discussed at these sessions include but are not limited to – parent communication, assessment, student motivation, special education, etc.

At the site level, many of these issues that were discussed in the previous paragraph are reinforced on an ongoing basis through site level in-services, collegial presentations, grade-level meetings, daily bulletins and other written communiqués, and planning sessions. JYC classroom teachers are always encouraged to learn from their colleagues (whether on-site or off-site) by seeing them in action.

All JYC stakeholders are encouraged to participate in staff development activities during the school year and during the summer months outside the district and site levels. Two years ago, one of our kindergarten teachers attended an Area Kindergarten Teacher's Conference. Two years ago, JYC's GATE Coordinator attended a GATE Conference that was organized by the Association for Accelerated Learning. Upon the conclusion of these conferences, these JYC teachers shared with their colleagues what they learned at these conferences. The instructional applications from having attended these Professional Developments have definitely translated to increased student achievement in all curricular areas.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School California Standards Test - English Language Arts Grade 2

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	83	84	64	88
% At or Above Proficient	53	51	29	35
% At Advanced	23	15	3	9
Number of students tested:	40	33	34	34
Percent of total students tested:	100	100	100	94
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
% At Proficient	33	41		
% At Advanced	17	17		
Number of students tested:	36	29		
LEP				
% At Proficient	33	41	27	25
% At Advanced	18	17	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	33	29	29	28
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	35	38	26	33
% At Advanced	16	16	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	31	32	23	27
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	65	68	63	61
% At or Above Proficient	35	36	32	32
% At Advanced	12	12	9	10

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School**  
**California Standards Test - English Language Arts Grade 3**

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	73	85	80	68
% At or Above Proficient	38	50	52	44
% At Advanced	5	15	21	6
Number of students tested:	40	40	39	34
Percent of total students tested:	100	100	98	89
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
% At Proficient	36	36		
% At Advanced	6	14		
Number of students tested:	36	36		
LEP				
% At Proficient	36	34	41	47
% At Advanced	6	14	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	36	35	31	28
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	34	38	43	41
% At Advanced	5	15	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	38	34	30	29
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	61	63	62	59
% At or Above Proficient	30	33	34	30
% At Advanced	9	10	11	9

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than

11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School**  
**California Standards Test - English Language Arts Grade 4**

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	83	93	77	73
% At or Above Proficient	61	67	33	32
% At Advanced	29	46	9	4
Number of students tested:	41	39	34	46
Percent of total students tested:	100	98	100	96
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
% At Proficient	32	23		
% At Advanced	30	43		
Number of students tested:	37	35		
LEP				
% At Proficient	31	24	29	33
% At Advanced	31	12	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	35	17	28	33
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	29	26	31	36
% At Advanced	29	42	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	34	31	29	39
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	73	74	71	66
% At or Above Proficient	39	39	36	33
% At Advanced	16	15	14	11

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than

11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School**  
**California Standards Test - English Language Arts Grade 5**

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	95	71	88	64
% At or Above Proficient	74	41	39	28
% At Advanced	53	8	13	11
Number of students tested:	38	40	47	36
Percent of total students tested:	97	100	98	100
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
African American				
Number of students tested:	0	1 *		
Asian				
% At Proficient	19	34		
% At Advanced	54	9		
Number of students tested:	37	32		
LEP				
% At Proficient	29	6	33	15
% At Advanced	24	0	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	17	17	34	27
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	19	34	45	27
% At Advanced	50	9	(prof. & +)	(prof. & +)
Number of students tested:	32	35	38	33
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	71	72	71	66
% At or Above Proficient	40	36	31	28
% At Advanced	16	10	9	7

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
California Standards Test - Mathematics Grade 2**

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	96	93	73	
% At or Above Proficient	81	75	52	
% At Advanced	38	36	26	
Number of students tested:	40	33	34	36
Percent of total students tested:	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
% At Proficient	42	45		
% At Advanced	39	41		
Number of students tested:	36	29		
LEP				
% At Proficient	45	38	59	
% At Advanced	39	41	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	33	29	29	30
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	45	41	65	
% At Advanced	39	38	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	31	32	23	28
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	76	76	68	
% At or Above Proficient	51	53	43	
% At Advanced	23	24	16	

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than

11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School**  
**California Standards Test - Mathematics Grade 3**

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	91	100	87	
% At or Above Proficient	83	91	69	
% At Advanced	50	73	33	
Number of students tested:	40	40	39	34
Percent of total students tested:	100	100	98	89
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
% At Proficient	34	14		
% At Advanced	57	75		
Number of students tested:	35	36		
LEP				
% At Proficient	36	14	64	
% At Advanced	50	74	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	36	35	31	28
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	32	18	66	
% At Advanced	53	74	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	38	34	30	29
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	73	71	65	
% At or Above Proficient	48	46	38	
% At Advanced	21	19	12	

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than

11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
California Standards Test - Mathematics Grade 4**

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	99	97	82	
% At or Above Proficient	91	97	53	
% At Advanced	73	79	15	
Number of students tested:	41	39	34	45
Percent of total students tested:	100	98	100	94
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
% At Proficient	19	17		
% At Advanced	70	83		
Number of students tested:	37	35		
LEP				
% At Proficient	20	29	54	
% At Advanced	71	71	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	35	17	28	33
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	15	13	55	
% At Advanced	74	84	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	34	31	29	38
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	73	72	67	
% At or Above Proficient	45	45	37	
% At Advanced	18	18	13	

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than

11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
California Standards Test - Mathematics Grade 5**

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	98	63	66	
% At or Above Proficient	95	33	40	
% At Advanced	79	5	17	
Number of students tested:	38	40	47	36
Percent of total students tested:	97	100	98	100
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
African American				
Number of students tested:	0	1 *		
Asian				
% At Proficient	16	31		
% At Advanced	78	6		
Number of students tested:	37	32		
Number of students tested:	0	2 *		
LEP				
% At Proficient	24	6	42	
% At Advanced	71	0	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	17	17	34	27
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
% At Proficient	13	31	44	
% At Advanced	81	6	(prof. & +)	
Number of students tested:	32	35	38	33
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
% At or Above Basic	65	61	59	
% At or Above Proficient	38	35	29	
% At Advanced	12	10	7	

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Reading Grade 2**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	43	40	42	59
Number of students tested:	40	33	34	34
Percent of total students tested:	100	100	100	94
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	43	41		
Number of students tested:	36	29		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	39	42	41	55
Number of students tested:	33	29	29	28
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	39	43	39	59
Number of students tested:	31	32	23	27
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	43	43	52	50

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Reading Grade 3**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	38	44	54	52
Number of students tested:	40	40	36	34
Percent of total students tested:	100	100	90	89
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	40	43		
Number of students tested:	31	36		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	39	43	43	50
Number of students tested:	36	35	29	28
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	38	45	49	50
Number of students tested:	38	34	28	29
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	39	39	47	46

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Reading Grade 4**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	46	56	54	44
Number of students tested:	40	39	31	45
Percent of total students tested:	98	98	91	94
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	45	56		
Number of students tested:	37	35		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	47	34	51	45
Number of students tested:	35	17	26	33
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	46	56	55	47
Number of students tested:	33	31	27	38
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	39	39	50	47

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Reading Grade 5**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	65	37	50	43
Number of students tested:	38	40	46	36
Percent of total students tested:	97	100	96	100
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
African American				
Number of students tested:	0	1 *		
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	65	39		
Number of students tested:	37	32		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	44	21	47	33
Number of students tested:	17	17	33	27
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	60	40	54	42
Number of students tested:	32	35	37	33
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	42	42	46	45

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Mathematics Grade 2**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	85	79	74	75
Number of students tested:	40	33	34	36
Percent of total students tested:	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	86	83		
Number of students tested:	36	29		
Filipino				
Number of students tested:	1 *	1 *		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	86	83	78	72
Number of students tested:	33	29	29	30
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	84	80	78	78
Number of students tested:	31	32	23	28
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	58	56	62	59

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than

11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Mathematics Grade 3**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	78	86	91	74
Number of students tested:	39	40	36	34
Percent of total students tested:	98	100	90	89
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	81	87		
Number of students tested:	31	36		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	80	87	90	73
Number of students tested:	36	35	29	28
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	81	88	91	74
Number of students tested:	37	34	28	29
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	56	55	64	61

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Mathematics Grade 4**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	86	86	77	65
Number of students tested:	40	39	31	45
Percent of total students tested:	98	98	91	94
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	86	88		
Number of students tested:	37	35		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	86	78	76	63
Number of students tested:	35	17	26	33
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	85	85	79	69
Number of students tested:	33	31	27	38
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	51	50	58	54

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11

**Chin (John Yehall) Elementary School  
Mathematics Grade 5**

	CAT/6		SAT-9	
	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	91	56	73	72
Number of students tested:	38	39	45	36
Percent of total students tested:	97	98	94	100
Number of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded:	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>				
African American				
Number of students tested:	0	1 *		
Asian				
National Percentile Rank	90	62		
Number of students tested:	37	31		
LEP				
National Percentile Rank	87	40	72	65
Number of students tested:	17	16	32	27
Socio-Economically Disadvantaged				
National Percentile Rank	89	59	77	72
Number of students tested:	32	35	37	33
<b>STATE SCORES</b>				
National Percentile Rank	49	48	58	55

\* Aggregate data not available for groups less than 11