

2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Public Private

Cover Sheet

Type of School
(Check all that apply)

Elementary Middle High K-12
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal Dr. Irene Renee Eister

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Golden Empire Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 9045 Canberra Drive

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Sacramento

California

95826-4414

City

State

Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Sacramento

State School Code Number* 34 67439 6097083

Telephone (916) 228-5890

Fax (916) 228-5838

Web site/URL www.scusd.edu

E-mail ireneei@sac-city.k12.ca.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

Principal's Signature

Name of Superintendent Dr. M. Magdalena Carrillo Mejia

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Sacramento City Unified School District

Tel. (916) 643-9000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. Manny Hernandez

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

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

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

Mail by commercial carrier (FedEx, UPS) or courier original signed cover sheet to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5E103, Washington DC 20202-8173.

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 for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not 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 2007-2008 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have 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 2002 and has not received the No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district wide compliance review.
6. 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 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. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: _____ 59 Elementary schools
 _____ 8 Middle schools
 _____ 0 Junior High Schools
 _____ 13 High schools
 _____ 16 Other
 _____ 96 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 7986
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 7584

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 are
 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.
 _____ 0 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
Pre K	11	10	21	7	0	0	0
K	40	35	75	8	0	0	0
1	29	43	72	9	0	0	0
2	45	44	89	10	0	0	0
3	34	31	65	11	0	0	0
4	42	42	84	12	0	0	0
5	43	30	73	Other	0	0	0
6	44	40	84				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							563

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 2 | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 9 | % Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 17 | % Black or African American |
| 32 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 40 | % White |

100 % TOTAL

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 19 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year	48
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	60
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	108
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	563
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.19
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	19

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 30 %
- | | |
|-----|---|
| 172 | Total Number Limited English Proficient |
|-----|---|

Number of languages represented: 13

Specify languages: Spanish, Vietnamese, Filipino/Tagalog, Arabic, Armenian, Farsi/Persian, Hindi, Hmong, Punjab, Russian, Ukranian, Mien, Other Non-English

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 60 %

Total number students who qualify: 329

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: $\frac{9}{48}$ %
Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

0	Autism	1	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	0	Other Health Impairment
0	Deaf-Blindness	14	Specific Learning Disability
0	Emotional Disturbance	42	Speech or Language Impairment
0	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
0	Mental Retardation	0	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
1	Multiple Disabilities		

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	0
Classroom teachers	29	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	1	0
Paraprofessionals	5	1
Support Staff	8	8
Total number	44	9

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 $\frac{22}{1}$: 1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Please explain a high teacher turnover rate. 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 in attendance, dropout or the drop-off rates. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates, and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Daily student attendance	96 %	94 %	95 %	96 %	96 %
Daily teacher attendance	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
Teacher turnover rate	0 %	0 %	0 %	6 %	0 %
Student drop out rate (middle/high)	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
Student drop-off rate (high school)	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

Please provide all explanations below

PART III - SUMMARY

Vision: We inspire and provide opportunities for all students to achieve high standards of performance for success in life and work.

Founded in 1978, Golden Empire Elementary School is nestled in the Rosemont Community, a well-established area of the south-eastern portion of Sacramento County. The school serves 575 pre-school through sixth-grade students and has built its reputation on excellence in learning through parent-community involvement as well as highly experienced and skilled staff. These concepts are woven throughout the school's environment and culture.

Golden Empire Elementary consistently promotes high academic standards for all students. With a growth score of 853 on California's 2007 Academic Performance Index (API) and a state rating of 10 out of 10 for like schools, Golden Empire was named an 'Exemplary School' by the Sacramento City Unified School District. The school was also granted the prestigious 'Title I Achieving School' award by the California State Department of Education in 2004, 2007, and again in 2008. In January 2008 we were also recognized by the National Center for Urban School Transformation as one of 20 national finalists for the Excellence in Education Award. Golden Empire is proud of its many school wide academic awards and accomplishments.

Academics are a priority at Golden Empire. We have found that with relentless focus on the California State Standards, our students succeed. Assessment is a critical component of our instructional program. Assessment data are regularly gathered and analyzed to focus and direct instruction in every classroom.

The 20:1 ratio of students to teachers in grades Kindergarten through 3 enhances learning opportunities for all. We are extremely proud that our intermediate grades (4-6) participate in Class Size Reduction, thus lowering class size to only 28 students, instead of the normal 33 student class size. This ensures intermediate students receive increased 1-to-1 instruction as do our primary students. While this is rare in other schools, Golden Empire has committed financial resources to this initiative, helping to ensure every child succeeds.

Our teaching staff is the finest group of educators and are committed to student success. The staff's dedication goes beyond the classroom. They possess empathy for each child and are unyielding in their efforts to ensure all students meet or exceed the grade level standards set by the state. With systematic instruction, high expectations, and curriculum alignment to the state standards, Golden Empire students and staff strive for academic excellence.

The Golden Empire community believes that, by working together, we not only meet the needs of our students, but also ensure they will reach their full potential. By working as partners we provide our students with the means to develop into creative, exemplary learners with the skills and enthusiasm to shape our changing world. Golden Empire Elementary offers students a 'Golden Opportunity' for achievement, and a safe, nurturing, accepting environment for all.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

All California public school students in grades two through eleven participate in the state's Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program (for more information please visit the California Department of Education's assessment website: www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/). The STAR consists of the following components: the California Standards Test (CST) and the California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition (CAT/6). The CSTs were developed specifically for California public schools and determine how well students are achieving state-adopted content standards in English/language arts, math, history/social science, and science. The CSTs are criterion-referenced tests. Students receive scaled scores which are classified into five performance levels: 1. advanced, 2. proficient, 3. basic, 4. below basic and 5. far below basic. It is the state's expectation that, in order to demonstrate grade level proficiency, students must perform at the advanced or proficient levels. The CAT/6 is an achievement test using a nationwide normed reference group. Scores for the CAT/6 are reported in national percentile ranks. In the 2007 school year, only third grade students participated in CAT/6 testing.

In addition to the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) that all schools must meet as part of the No Child Left Behind Act, California has an additional ranking and rating scale. The Academic Performance Index (API) is a numeric index or scale ranging from a low of 200 to a high of 1000 that reflects a school's performance level based on the results of statewide testing. Schools are expected to reach a target score of 800. Golden Empire's current API score is 853 demonstrating a growth of 57 points over the last four years. Additionally, similar schools in California are ranked on a scale from 1-10, lowest to highest, based on school demographics and academic performance. When compared to all California elementary schools, Golden Empire ranks 8 out of 10, while compared to similar schools, we rank 10 out of 10.

	2004/2005	2005/2006	2006/2007
API Base	796	816	835
API Growth	816	835	853
Growth	+20	+19	+18

Our goal at Golden Empire is to ensure that all children are scoring in the proficient to advanced ranges. In 2007, 62% of all Golden Empire students tested at proficient or advanced levels in English/Language Arts, compared to the state average of 44%. In mathematics, 73% of Golden Empire students scored at the proficient or advanced levels, compared to the state average of 52%. Golden Empire Elementary's most recent AYP results show a 100% participation rate.

We are very proud of our improvement in both English Language Arts (ELA) and in Math. The most recent assessment results show an increase in ELA from a proficiency rate of 44% in 2004, to 51% in 2005, to 55% in 2006, to our current level of 62%. In mathematics the proficiency rate has increased from 56 in 2004, to 62% in 2005, to 72% in 2006, to the current level of 73%.

Because Golden Empire is a diverse school, our assessment data can be divided into five subgroups: 1. African American, 2. Hispanic, 3. White, 4. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged and 5. English Learners. The African-American subgroup population achieved 56% proficient or advanced in ELA and 58% proficient or advanced in math. Our Hispanic sub-group population shows achievements of 60% proficient or advanced in ELA and 67% proficient or advanced in math. Our White subgroup population scored 64% proficient or advanced in ELA and 80% proficient or advanced in math. This group is Golden Empire's highest achieving subgroup. The Socio-Economically Disadvantaged subgroup earned 56% proficient or advanced in ELA and 70% proficient or advanced in math. The English Learners (EL) subgroup tested at 43% proficient or advanced in ELA and 59% proficient or advanced in math. Our EL subgroup's lower performance in ELA at the proficient and advanced levels leads the staff to recognize the need for further intervention for this population.

2. Using Assessment Results

Golden Empire uses the Cycle of Inquiry approach to guide our instructional program and to

measure progress toward helping students master the state standards as indicated below:

Identify students' progress toward achieving standards: All assessment data are continuously analyzed and discussed by staff, providing a detailed picture of which students are attaining grade-level proficiency. Data are examined and strengths and weaknesses are identified.

Identify students who need additional instruction/ intervention: Using CST data together with district benchmark assessments and other curricular data, teachers further disaggregate data to determine which students will benefit from instructional interventions and/or extensions.

Prescribe a reteaching or intervention focus for individual students: Using data from the two previous steps, teachers make instructional decisions for each student. The principal meets with each teacher during one-to-one meetings to review data and determine which interventions/ extensions will be most appropriate. Teachers implement interventions for each child. Teachers implement instructional plans for students needing more academic support.

Identify professional development needs for teachers and the school: One of the many positive outcomes of constant data disaggregation and analysis is our ability to identify professional development needs of the staff. This is a fluid process; needs arise as data are analyzed. Professional dialogue identifies goals for student improvement and adjustments needed to instruction (Cycle of Inquiry). Scores are shared among grade levels, students, and parents.

Provide information that helps target school and district resources to areas of need: Through the use of assessments, we target resources to provide for staff and student needs. Student interventions and/or extensions are based on data; high achieving and/or GATE students are selected for our enrichment programs based on CST and curricular based results. Data are utilized to determine which students need additional support and are shared with leadership committees as needed.

Golden Empire staff use disaggregated standardized testing data to analyze our achievement gap and determine our school-wide effectiveness. All subgroups are exceeding their projected annual growth targets. Because of our rigorous, standards-aligned instruction, students continue to show progress in all areas. We expect the same results in the years to come.

3. Communicating Assessment Results

At Golden Empire, we continuously keep our parents and community informed of our students' academic progress and performance. Beginning the first week of school, the community is invited to a 'Coffee with the Principal', an informal gathering where parents and community members can learn about the school's achievement levels. The school's API, CST achievement results, and subgroup information are described and explained. This data review also occurs at the annual Back to School Night and at the first meeting of all leadership committees. Also, school data are reviewed, analyzed and presented to parents and the community via official CST reports (mailed to the student's home), school newsletters, assemblies, special meetings, website, newspapers, progress reports, report cards, and through conferences (parent and student). Data are regularly reviewed at leadership committees such as the School Site Council (SSC), English Learner Advisory Council (ELAC) and the school's Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). Parents are mailed their child's state, CST, and California English Language Development Test (CELDT) reports in their home language. Teachers discuss and interpret CST, CELDT, district benchmark exams, and various assessments with parents during conferences. Translators/ translations (Spanish, Russian, and Ukrainian) are always available to assist non-English speaking parents in understanding their student's progress.

Parents and families are continually informed of their student's progress toward meeting grade-level standards. Parents receive current information on their child's progress via student report cards, district benchmark results, and curricular embedded data at formal parent conferences which occur biannually. Additionally, parents are informed with weekly letters and progress notices which address concerns, provide immediate feedback, and ensure collaboration in giving students adequate support at school and home. Our Home-Visit Teachers inform families of student progress by conferencing in their home environment. Progress is communicated frequently via phone/email, and before/after-school conversations.

API and AYP information is thoroughly discussed at staff meetings, grade level meetings, and SSC/ELAC meetings, explaining disaggregated scores and rankings (state-wide and similar

schools rankings), helping target programs and resources to support student learning. Throughout the year the principal holds discussions with individual 2nd/6th grade students regarding their personal assessment results and the goals they will be setting for the current school year. Parents and community members are informed of these goals through newsletters, leadership committees and community meetings.

4. **Sharing Success:**

The Golden Empire staff welcomes opportunities to participate in professional dialogue and collaboration, and to share best practices and new insights regarding student achievement with other schools. Golden Empire's principal has the opportunity to share school-wide successes with other district principals during bi-monthly principal meetings. These collegial conversations allow principals to learn about other school's best practices and how these practices could be implemented to effect student achievement in his/her own school. Principal colleagues, along with the assistant superintendent and district administrators make formal visits to each others' schools in order to learn how schools with diverse needs are achieving success. The principal then shares these new insights, learned skills, and strategies with the staff during staff meetings, leadership meetings, and academic conferences. The principal provides curricular and delivery advice, strategies, monitoring, and feedback that assist with lesson delivery and congruency. Additional opportunities to share successes and reflect on what is working takes place among principal 'mentors' of which the principal is a member.

Golden Empire Elementary's faculty and staff work closely with other district schools and school districts to share successes and strengthen instructional strategies. Principals from other school districts have visited Golden Empire, analyzing our instructional practices effecting student achievement. Teachers dialog at the district level by serving on committees in all curricular areas. Teachers from Golden Empire hold a variety of leadership positions within the Sacramento City Unified School District. These include technology coordinator and membership on textbook adoption committees. Several of our teachers serve on state and district-wide committees, such as math, science, and PE. These committees are a vital way in which we articulate our successes with other schools in the district.

As professional educators, we welcome any opportunity to share best teaching practices and curriculum with other schools and districts.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The state standards drive our instruction at Golden Empire, creating an overarching structure, through the frameworks, to determine what must be taught to our students. Teachers utilize the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted materials and curriculum, coupled with effective instruction, to deliver the standards content to our students.

Golden Empire provides a comprehensive core curriculum emphasizing reading, writing, and mathematics as shown below:

Reading, Writing, Oral Language: The Open Court language arts curriculum is taught daily in thematic units integrating the arts, science, and history. Daily instruction encompasses practice in all strands including oral language and reading. Writing strategies are embedded in the Open Court curriculum, with the staff recently implementing the standards-aligned Write Tools curriculum to augment the writing component.

English Language Development (ELD): State Board of Education-adopted instructional materials are used in all classes for English language development. Grades K-3 use Into English and grades 4-6 use the Avenues curriculum along with Open Court's ELD lessons. All EL students receive 30-minutes of daily ELD instruction.

Mathematics: All students receive math instruction through the standards-aligned Saxon Mathematics program. Students find success with this program due to its 'spiraling' of content throughout lessons. Components include content knowledge taught in increments, application of basic skills, daily problem solving, and comprehension, including a self-test analysis. Fourth-6th grade teachers differentiate instruction by placing students in levels most conducive to their learning needs, allowing for remediation and extension opportunities.

History/Social Studies: Utilizing our newly adopted, standards-aligned McGraw-Hill History/Social Studies texts, students are exposed to a variety of history related themes. Teachers also integrate living history day themes such as 4th grades '49er Day,' where students dress as and participate in activities that occurred during the Gold Rush era. Students can access electronic text books for remediation/extension activities via our computer lab and at home.

Science: The district recently adopted the standards-aligned McGraw-Hill Science curriculum, a hands-on, manipulative-based program. The series focuses on the scientific method to test hypotheses through experiential learning, as demonstrated by our 6th grade Science Fair.

Physical/Health Education: We have a credentialed Physical Education (PE) specialist who provides curriculum to students based on state standards. Students learn locomotor skill development, endurance, movement patterns, aerobic activities, and the principle of physical activity being critical to the development and maintenance of good health.

Visual and Performing Arts: The visual and performing arts are integrated into our curriculum. Art is integrated through all subject areas as evidenced by the displays in teachers' classrooms supporting a specific concept. Music is enjoyed through daily chants and songs illustrating a specific skill area. Our after-school band, taught by a credentialed music teacher, is an opportunity for our students to develop their musical skills.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

The Sacramento City Unified School District adopted the Open Court Reading program as it is directly aligned with both State and District Reading/Language Arts Standards. Open Court is a comprehensive elementary basal reading program for grades K-6. The four main instructional components of the program are 1. decoding, 2. comprehension, 3. inquiry and investigation, and 4. writing. Within these four instructional components students master phonemic awareness, phonics, word knowledge, and research strategies and skills. There are also applications for teaching spelling, vocabulary, grammar, penmanship, listening, and

speaking. Students are encouraged to ask questions, discuss, research, write about, and think about the concepts and ideas centered on the themes they read.

The following reading techniques and strategies can be observed in all classrooms at Golden Empire: read aloud, shared reading, partner reading, independent reading, guided reading, and literature circles. Phonics instruction is a crucial component in grades K-2.

Quality, differentiated instruction is crucial in instructing our students needing additional support or intervention, English learners, and gifted and high achieving students. Each class offers 'Workshop' periods each day. During Workshop, students can complete independent projects, or receive individual help on specific concepts in reading and writing. Reading selections are literature-rich and engaging and expose students to a variety of writing styles and genres.

English Learners are an integral part of Golden Empire's student population. Teachers utilize specialized instructional materials (provided by the publishers) and strategies to work with students. For example, reading comprehension for a second-grade student at a beginning ELD level would be to listen to a story and respond with a few words, while a student at the early intermediate level would read the story and respond in simple sentences.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

(Curriculum Support Through Technology) We place great pride in our technology program which greatly supports learning for all students. We view technology and the use of our computer lab as an extension of the classroom rather than a separate entity. In our 29-computer lab, our credentialed computer teacher ensures all students receive 45 minutes a week of technology instruction using standards-based software programs. Students receive instruction via Orchard, Cornerstone, Math Blasters, and other standards-based software programs to continue their work towards meeting standards proficiency. What is so powerful about these software programs is the ability for the instruction to be highly individualized and prescriptive for each student. For example, a 5th grade student who is facing challenges with a particular math standard will receive individualized lessons on her computer that may or may not look different than her classmate's assignment. Furthermore, teachers utilize the Orchard software to create lessons, worksheets, and assessments to provide instruction, remediation, and extension activities during Workshop time. Our Dyn-Ed software is specially designed for the unique learning needs of EL students, especially at the intermediate levels. English instruction, including phonemic awareness, is presented to our newly arrived intermediate EL students at a very basic level, but with a level of maturity that is more suitable for the students.

In grades three through six, PowerPoint presentations are created in the computer lab then shared back in the classroom to demonstrate learning from research units. Students have access to the Internet through district filtered websites and portals, including electronic textbooks, featured components of the new science and social studies adoptions. These electronic textbooks are accessed at home via school passwords so the entire family can log-on to their home computer and learn about the student's science curriculum via a highly-engaging format. Additionally, every teacher uses a computer for data analysis and accessing the web. Data Director and Just for the Kids are electronic data systems that allow teachers to organize, analyze, and manage student assessments in one data system.

4. Instructional Methods:

Throughout our curricular areas, Golden Empire teachers use a wide range of instructional methods. Students work independently and in groups, and in teacher-directed and student-directed learning activities. There is a strong emphasis on oral and written communication across the curriculum, on cooperative learning, modeling, and curriculum spiraling. Students participate in class projects, hands-on learning, writing, and ongoing problem solving. We actively use research-based instructional methods to support student learning:

Direct Instruction: Emphasizes well-developed, carefully planned lessons designed around small learning increments. Tasks are clearly defined and teachers can easily assess students' mastery of the objective quickly.

Active Participation/Checking for Understanding: Teachers implement these strategies to hold students accountable for their learning, including pair/share, use of white boards, and choral response to continuously check for understanding.

Differentiation: This strategy allows teachers to accommodate individual learning needs by modifying, accelerating, or chunking lessons so students can best meet standards proficiency.

Flexible grouping: The use of whole class, small group, 1-to-1, peer, and independent instruction support the varied needs of learners.

To further support learning, teachers use intensive, strategic and benchmark strategies:

Intensive strategies: Students who are between 2-3 years behind academically need longer and more intensive specialized instruction. These students are candidates for our Learning Center, tutoring, and our Interventionist.

Strategic strategies: Students who are between 1-2 years behind benefit from peer/cross-age tutoring, one-to-one instruction via teachers and/or parent volunteers, individualized lessons in the computer lab, and after-school tutoring.

Benchmark strategies: Students who are at grade level or above are challenged with higher order thinking and problem solving skills to reach beyond their current academic levels.

5. **Professional Development:**

As part of our ongoing development and evaluation of our professional development plan, we carefully consider student achievement results, student performance, teacher reflection, and assessments. All staff attends quality professional development opportunities through on-site training, workshops, staff and grade level meetings, study groups, and district sponsored classes.

The teachers and principal engage in professional development that provides the opportunity to gain knowledge in instructional strategies to increase student engagement and achievement, differentiation, assessment, classroom environment and other topics addressed in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Through reflective surveys, collaboration and the principal's monitoring, the following trainings were recently incorporated into the school's professional development plan: Standards-Aligned Writing Strategies, EL Language Development, Student Engagement and Active Participation, Saxon Math Program Updates, Classroom Management, Data Analysis to Drive Standards Instruction, Instructional Strategies to Support Students with Special Needs, The Use of Technology to Support Instruction, and Differentiated Instruction.

Consultants, content coaches, and our own principal's support are highly utilized for ongoing professional development. The principal also provides ongoing curricular and delivery advice via professional development trainings, staff, and curricular meetings on site, focusing on lesson delivery and lesson congruency.

Golden Empire's professional development enables staff to develop instructional strategies for addressing students' needs. Our API has increased 57 points in four years, a strong reflection of the continuous training and exemplary instructional skills acquired and implemented through professional development.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (ELA) Grade 2 Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year 2007 Publisher State of California

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	61	64	56		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	28	16		
Number of students tested	67	85	73		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced		58			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		8			
Number of students tested		12			
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	66	56	59		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	9	20	11		
Number of students tested	23	25	27		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	50	52	44		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	17	19	8		
Number of students tested	24	21	25		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	59	60	47		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	17	23	11		
Number of students tested	48	52	47		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	53	49	40		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	14	11	15		
Number of students tested	77	71	80		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced			43		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced			14		
Number of students tested			14		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	54	40	14		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	9	16	9		
Number of students tested	22	25	22		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	53	26	25		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	4	8		
Number of students tested	19	23	24		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	54	44	30		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	18	7	13		
Number of students tested	44	43	47		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	76	60	54		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	35	24	25		
Number of students tested	75	83	79		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	75	46	53		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33	23	33		
Number of students tested	12	13	15		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	76	55	40		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	36	13	15		
Number of students tested	25	24	20		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	48	46	26		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	19	5	5		
Number of students tested	21	22	19		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	66	49	45		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	30	22	16		
Number of students tested	44	45	45		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	59	54	59		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	19	17	23		
Number of students tested	83	82	83		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	50	53	69		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	33	13		
Number of students tested	14	15	16		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	52	37	53		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	8	14	42		
Number of students tested	25	22	19		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	35	16	41		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	9	0	0		
Number of students tested	23	19	22		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	53	39	59		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	20	17	18		
Number of students tested	46	41	56		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	59	50	44		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	28	23	14		
Number of students tested	75	84	81		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	53	67	39		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	18	20	11		
Number of students tested	17	15	18		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	53	42	6		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	16	29	0		
Number of students tested	19	24	16		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	31	25	11		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	8	0	0		
Number of students tested	13	16	18		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	49	47	35		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	16	8		
Number of students tested	39	49	49		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	55	72	53		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33	33	21		
Number of students tested	67	85	73		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced		66			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		33			
Number of students tested		12			
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	57	68	55		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	22	32	11		
Number of students tested	23	25	27		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	38	67	32		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	17	24	12		
Number of students tested	24	21	25		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	54	69	49		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33	29	11		
Number of students tested	48	52	47		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	79	74	69		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	45	37	32		
Number of students tested	77	71	80		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced			58		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced			29		
Number of students tested			14		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	77	64	43		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	27	28	19		
Number of students tested	22	25	22		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	74	47	56		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	53	30	26		
Number of students tested	19	23	24		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	77	63	65		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	43	37	24		
Number of students tested	44	43	47		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	82	79	63		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	47	41	25		
Number of students tested	75	82	79		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	58	75	54		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33	33	27		
Number of students tested	12	12	15		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	76	67	55		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	40	38	15		
Number of students tested	25	24	20		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	76	73	58		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	38	14	16		
Number of students tested	21	22	19		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	77	70	56		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	41	36	18		
Number of students tested	44	44	45		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	83	73	64		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	43	35	29		
Number of students tested	83	82	83		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	78	67	63		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	40	19		
Number of students tested	14	15	16		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	72	59	53		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	28	27	37		
Number of students tested	25	22	19		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	70	64	63		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	22	11	18		
Number of students tested	23	19	22		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	82	70	64		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	41	29	23		
Number of students tested	46	41	56		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	65	62	61		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	32	23	23		
Number of students tested	75	84	81		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	53	60	50		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	29	7	17		
Number of students tested	17	15	18		
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	53	54	37		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	32	25	6		
Number of students tested	19	24	16		
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	38	63	44		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	15	0	11		
Number of students tested	13	16	18		
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	59	59	61		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	28	16	16		
Number of students tested	39	49	49		