

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program**

---

Type of School: (Check all that apply)     Charter  Title I  Magnet  Choice

Name of Principal: Mr. Rosario Villareal

Official School Name: Otay Elementary School

School Mailing Address:  
1651 Albany Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91911-5801

County: San Diego    State School Code Number\*: 382

Telephone: (619) 425-4311    Fax: (619) 425-2018

Web site/URL: http://cvesd.org/otay    E-mail: rosario.villareal@cvesd.org

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

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent\*: Mr. Lowell Billings

District Name: Chula Vista Elementary School District    Tel: (619) 425-9600

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

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Russell Coronado

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it 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.*  
The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173

## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

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 one or more of 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.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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: (per district designation)
- |           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 44        | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
|           | Middle/Junior high schools        |
|           | High schools                      |
|           | K-12 schools                      |
| <b>44</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>                      |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 6383

**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. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position 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	6	40	55	95
K	28	44	72	7			0
1	26	47	73	8			0
2	44	52	96	9			0
3	53	42	95	10			0
4	57	42	99	11			0
5	33	40	73	12			0
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b>							603

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:            % American Indian or Alaska Native  
      3 % Asian  
      3 % Black or African American  
     91 % Hispanic or Latino  
           % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
      3 % White  
           % Two or more races  
     100 % **Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year:   14   %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	35
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	55
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	90
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	629
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.143
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	14.308

8. Limited English proficient students in the school:   71   %

Total number limited English proficient   430  

Number of languages represented:   4  

Specify languages:

The four languages spoken are Chinese, Filipino-Tagalog, Lao, and Spanish.

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 79 %

Total number students who qualify: 478

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 free and reduced-price school meals 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: 6 %

Total Number of Students Served: 39

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

<u>2</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>0</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>32</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>5</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

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>29</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>
Support staff	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>53</u>	<u>8</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 21 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	96%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	99%	99%	99%	99%	98%
Teacher turnover rate	9%	10%	7%	7%	18%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

In 2004-2005, the school experienced a higher teacher turn-over rate due to retirements.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size	_____	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____	%
Enrolled in a community college	_____	%
Enrolled in vocational training	_____	%
Found employment	_____	%
Military service	_____	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	_____	%
Unknown	_____	%
<b>Total</b>	_____	%

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

“The words, ‘I Can’t’ do not exist at Otay Elementary, and this is what makes us shine above all.” These words belong to our secretary of 23 years, who has seen firsthand Otay Elementary’s dramatic transformation. Our school mission reads: “*The Otay School Community is committed to providing a safe, nurturing environment that creates high achieving, innovative thinkers who realize their potential and become self-confident, life-long learners. Students are viewed as the core of the community. The Otay School Community provides opportunities for all students and their families to take responsibility for learning and an active role in their education. We are devoted to the success of all.*” Clearly illustrated in our mission is our core belief in the capacity of all students to be self-sufficient thinkers, problem-solvers and world-changers. We also believe and thrive on parent and community involvement. Questions from any parent or community member are greeted with a prompt reply. Parents are welcomed as volunteers and learners. We honor our community through the delivery of a diverse and robust educational program that is inclusive. A steady stream of volunteers participates actively in the daily business of running the school. An English as a Second Language (ESL) class teaches parents to become proficient in the reading, writing, and speaking of English. Parents who are part of our English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) take tours of classrooms to see the rigorous teaching and learning. A family resource center on school grounds, Rayo de Esperanza, services the needs of parents, from child care to providing access to health care.

Otay Elementary has met many milestones because of this vigorous engagement of all stakeholders. When the Academic Performance Index (API) started in 1999, Otay’s API was 473. In 2008, it joined the 800 club (currently it is 824). Three years in a row, 2008-2010, Otay Elementary has been awarded the Title 1 Academic Achievement Award by the state of California. In 2008, the California Association of Bilingual Education (CABE) Seal of Excellence and the California Distinguished School Award was granted to Otay Elementary. Other recognitions include the California Business for Education Excellence Foundation Award (CBEE) and the Just for Kids-California Award (JFTK-CA). All these honors have been made possible by our commitment to our core beliefs and continually meeting No Child Left Behind (NCLB) academic benchmarks. Despite what some might perceive as impediments to progress—high poverty, high minority, and a high percentage of English Learners—the Otay Elementary community continues to rise above the expectation. Otay Elementary’s community is comprised of 90% Latino, 3% Anglo, 3% African-American, and 3% Asian students. Seventy-one percent of these students are classified as English Learners and 80% qualify for the free or reduced meal program. The average educational level of Otay parents is *some high school experience*. Many of these students also come from families where gang influences are prevalent. Regardless, with a committed parent base and a strong teaching cadre, all students can and do succeed.

Otay Elementary teachers are team players. Through collaboration and mutual respect, we have become an Accountable Community which places student needs above those of adults, is not afraid to confront conflict, addresses behaviors not beneficial to the group or students, and uses data to make informed decisions. We have established a culture where there are no barriers—no limitations; we embody the teaching of S. Gilbert’s The Land of I Can where you are reminded of what is truly important to help you say “I Can!” Beating the odds, Otay Elementary is worthy of flying the Blue Ribbon colors.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. Assessment Results:

Otay Elementary demonstrates great gains in academic achievement for both math and reading (language arts) over the past five years. In order to better understand our test data, we will briefly explain our state assessment system. The California Department of Education (CDE) provides API reports as part of its Accountability Progress Reporting (APR) system. The information that forms the basis for calculating the API comes from the results of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program which, at the elementary level, includes assessment results from California Standards Test (CST), California Modified Assessment (CMA) and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). Students' performance levels on the CST, CMA, or CAPA are assigned a performance level weighting factor of Far Below Basic (FBB), Below Basic (BB), Basic (B), Proficient (PRO) or Advanced (ADV). The levels of Proficient and Advanced demonstrate "meeting the standard". A look at our data tables will confirm that Otay Elementary is worthy of Blue Ribbon Award status for "meeting the standard" over the years; in fact, we pride ourselves in "exceeding the standard".

For math, Otay Elementary rose from 37% proficient and advanced in 2005 to 70% in 2009. Remarkably, each grade level and subgroup made significant gains over the five years. For example, the percentage of second graders who were Limited English Proficient (LEP) and Advanced rose steadily over the years: 22%, 27%, 38% and 39%. Third graders who were also Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED) surpassed the AYP target each year with 42%, 51%, 61%, 72%, and 71%. Fourth graders who were Proficient also increased from 26% in 2005 to 82% in 2009—this represents systematic gains of more than 10% per year. Fifth graders surpassed the AYP target for all years except 2005 where they achieved 18% Proficiency. Since 2005, Fifth graders have dramatically improved for a combined 53 percent increase to 71% in 2009. Sixth graders also surpassed the AYP target each year. Although LEP scores dipped in 2006 to 8%, they rebounded to 40% in 2007 and finished at 62% in 2009.

In the area of reading, Otay Elementary met the AYP target for all grades in years 2006-2009. In 2005, all grades with the exception of 4<sup>th</sup> struggled to meet AYP goals. The struggles of the 2004-2005 school year fueled Otay Elementary's path to success. Desiring to exit Program Improvement (PI) status, Otay Elementary turned a new leaf and passionately pursued results. The data tables manifest how the year 2006 marks Otay's transition to a high-performing school in reading (language arts). Never again did Otay fail to meet an AYP target as a school or for a grade level. The AYP targets were the following: 24.4% for 2006, 2007; 35.2% for 2008; 46% for 2009. Otay Elementary's AYP Proficiency scores for reading from 2006-2009 were 37%, 43%, 47% and 50%. Significant gains include sixth grade scores rising from 17% proficient in 2005 to 61% in 2009. For that same grade, LEP scores rose from 6% proficient in 2005 to 53% proficient in 2009. Fourth grade SED students consistently rose in proficiency over the past 5 years: 30%, 35%, 46%, 50%, and 64%. Looking at the data tables, you notice a disparity among some grade levels—especially third grade in reading. It must be noted that this disparity can also be seen over the years when looking at statewide results for all schools in California. (For further information on California Department of Education assessment data, please visit <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest>.)

Truly, the Otay community is mindful and proud of the challenges it faced and has overcome through perseverance and the belief that all children can and do succeed.

### 2. Using Assessment Results:

Otay Elementary systematically uses assessment data to differentiate instruction so that truly no child is left behind. First, California Standards Test (CST) summative assessment data is used to paint an overall landscape. Data is disaggregated within and across grade levels for all students and for significant subgroups

such as Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), English Learners (ELs) and Students with Disabilities. We ask ourselves: What were our areas of strength and weakness? What best practices led to success? How can we modify our teaching?

We also set ambitious academic goals—this year 68% Proficient/Advanced in English Language Arts (ELA)—well above the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) target. Teachers subsequently use CST data to target instruction for whole and small group settings. We use it to set individual student academic goals, referring to specific learning strands. More importantly, Otay Elementary uses formative assessment data, from our ELA Grade Level Assessment of Standards (GLAS) administered every six to eight weeks, to monitor student learning, modify instruction, realign resources, and refer students to appropriate extended learning opportunities such as before/after school programs and Saturday 350 CLUB. Teachers use OARS, an online data and assessment system, to further analyze student achievement data. As per results, teachers dialogue in collaboration teams about what the data is telling them. As a result, they shift students for small group instruction during Guided Reading, Universal Access (UA), and/or intervention groups. Teachers plan for individual students. They share the data with students; students graph their overall scores over time. To improve teaching, the literacy coach works with individual teachers. The teacher/coach teamwork is crucial to improving school performance. They plan around data, and follow up with lesson observations to further dialogue about student academic improvement. Throughout the year, formative assessments in the core areas guide teachers in closely monitoring student learning.

### **3. Communicating Assessment Results:**

We believe in the importance of immediately communicating assessment results to parents and students; they deserve to know. For this to occur, teachers are kept updated with the most recent disaggregated assessment data. The school and home are one team so we want our families to feel free to ask questions, and help us make their child's education superior.

Mediums such as School Messenger, an automated telephone system that makes mass phone calls, personal telephone calls, e-mail, our school website, and flyers are used to communicate with parents. Through these means of communication parents are encouraged to attend formal and informal conferences to dialogue about student data and understand what implications it has on their child's academic progress.

These mediums also inform community members about events where assessment results are continually reviewed: School Site Council (SSC) meetings, ELAC meetings, Parent forums, Curriculum Nights, and Awards/Attendance Assemblies. As a policy making committee, SSC is continually updated on assessment results in order to make informed decisions. During ELAC meetings, assessment results from CST, California English Language Development Test (CELDT), Math Benchmark and GLAS are deconstructed to a level where exact student needs, such as vocabulary, comprehension, number sense, and algebra, are pinpointed for parents.

We want parents and students to know what to do with such knowledge. Family Literacy and Math nights afford them the opportunity to synthesize the data with instructional strategies. Students themselves are made aware of their formative assessment, Accelerated Reader, SuccessMaker, and Imagine Learning English results, chart their progress, and create attainable goals.

Lastly, every fall season during our Achievement Festival, assessment results become very real for students and families. Students receive achievement medals for meeting proficiency on the CST. Otay Elementary's goal is to communicate the message that all things are possible for our students.

### **4. Sharing Success:**

Otay Elementary is proud to share its successes with others. We believe that our earned accolades such as California Distinguished School, Title I Achievement Award, CABE Seal of Excellence, and California Business for Education Excellence Foundation Award place us in a position of credibility and influence.

Furthermore, we embrace the remarkable responsibility that comes with being a school that continually beats the odds. We believe that the best practices that exist at Otay Elementary are indeed replicable, and we are eager to prove to others that all students can learn at the highest level! We have a maxim we live by: Otay School is “The Land of I Can!” We are enthusiastic about convincing others that “They Can”, too.

Otay Elementary has a track record for sharing its successes with others and will continue to do so upon being awarded Blue Ribbon School status. For example, schools that we are in cohort with as a Professional Learning Community frequently walk through our campus. Our cohort leadership teams, which include teachers, coaches, and administrators, share insights with one another. We are able to discuss our best practices in detail and are fully transparent and open to questions and constructive feedback. We help teachers from our cohort of schools analyze and plan the implementation of practices that are tailored to the needs of their particular school and students.

In addition, we have showcased our school to Governor Schwarzenegger and the former US Department of Education Secretary Margaret Spellings. Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA) officials interested in finding and sharing the factors that create success frequently visit Otay Elementary—few QEIA schools have been as successful as Otay Elementary in being able to surpass the California target API of 800. As a Blue Ribbon School, Otay’s plan is to share!

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. **Curriculum:**

Otay Elementary possesses a rich and vibrant curriculum for English Language Arts and Mathematics. For English Language Arts, Otay implements Houghton-Mifflin (HM) Reading. In order to ensure all California grade level standards are fully taught, we have created a curricular Grade Level Assessment of Standards (GLAS) scope and sequence that details where Houghton-Mifflin can be enhanced with supplementary standards-based lessons. Teachers continue to utilize Houghton-Mifflin as the basis for providing a balanced literacy. Teachers conduct read alouds and shared readings of grade-level text to model specific fluency and reading strategies. Houghton-Mifflin leveled readers are used for targeted and differentiated instruction in small groups. Teachers also supplement the narrative-based HM readers with expository texts—Scott Foresman Science Leveled Readers and “Time for Kids” Non-Fiction Readers. Explicit vocabulary instruction captures students’ interest during small group instruction while also building their knowledge of academic language and content standards. Teachers infuse targeted comprehension strategies during guided reading. UA is key to providing access to multiple and varied learning opportunities that build upon the curriculum. English Learners gain vital language skills through the technology of Imagine Learning English. Students gain mastery of fundamental literacy skills through SuccessMaker’s Reading Readiness, Initial Reading, Reader’s Workshop, and Reading Adventures courses. Independent learning stations, such as listening centers and our independent reading program, AR, provide students with opportunities for independent practice and self-monitoring.

Otay Elementary utilizes Mc-Graw Hill Mathematics, a content standards-based series, as the core curriculum. We customized a pacing guide that tailors instruction in a way that ties mathematical concepts and skills in an integral way. Key concepts are sequenced to systematically build student understanding. Conceptual understanding is highly emphasized with the use of the Lesh translation model, and time is given to develop lessons that ground students in the fundamental ideas of mathematics. Our math curriculum also involves a constant monitoring of student learning. Students are given assessment dipsticks every other week, and take a formative benchmark assessment every six to eight weeks. Teachers use data from these assessments to plan small group lessons during UA and Guided Instruction. Students independently practice their knowledge of mathematical skills using SuccessMaker’s Math and Concept Skills course. Students engage in hands-on exploration of math concepts, working in small groups to build and test hypotheses in areas such as measurement and geometry, algebra and functions, and number sense.

Otay Elementary staff employs the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) framework for delivering good teaching using an established set of Quality Indicators. The premise of GRR is that the responsibility for creating learning shifts over time from teacher to student. Thus, it is imperative for the teacher to create a sufficient and effective model of the expected learning outcome. Teachers apply this teaching framework across the curriculum. Teachers observe and give each other feedback on the use of the Quality Indicators of a Focus Lesson. Within the context of the “I Do” phase of explicit instruction, the teacher is responsible for writing and stating the lesson’s Content and Language Objectives, stating the Purpose of the lesson, highlighting and explaining Key Vocabulary, providing Language Frames for facilitating Accountable Student Talk around the content, modeling through the use of Meta-cognition, and Checking for Student Understanding. We believe that this pedagogy helps Otay Elementary teachers become proficient in delivering purposeful, intentional and explicit lessons.

#### 2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading:**

(This question is for elementary schools only)

Otay Elementary’s reading curriculum is driven by the California ELA Content Standards and the ability of our teachers to teach them. The reading program utilized across all grades is Houghton Mifflin (HM) which is

guided by our GLAS scope and sequence to ensure complete coverage of the content standard concepts students need to master. Houghton Mifflin was chosen because it is comprehensive, most closely aligned to standards, and it provides balanced literacy. This program addresses reading comprehension in Kinder thru Sixth grade through explicit teaching of reading strategies and skills.

In all phases of reading, whole and guided, teachers use the HM strategies Monitor/Clarify, Question, Predict, Infer, Phonics Decoding, Evaluate, and Summarize to reinforce reading comprehension. It addresses phonics through the use of sound/spelling cards that are used K-6, systematic spelling lessons, and vocabulary development. The grammar component is addressed through daily lessons.

There are several handbooks that are utilized to support instruction and the needs of all students, such as Extra Support with preteaching and reteaching lessons, English Learners, Workbook Plus, Reteaching Workbook, Classroom Management, and Challenge Handbook.

Reading instruction is differentiated through Universal Access to address the group and individual needs of students who experience difficulty with core concepts. Leveled Readers—Below, On-Level, Challenge, and Language Support—are utilized daily for small group reading instruction during Guided Reading to address fluency, vocabulary and comprehension skills and strategies at the students’ instructional level. Read Aloud and Shared Reading are embedded into each selection to model proficient reading and to allow students to practice their reading skills.

Student progress in comprehension is evident in the various reading assessments that are administered throughout the year. Students take assessment dipsticks every other week and every six to eight weeks through our formative GLAS Theme Test.

### **3. Additional Curriculum Area:**

A “Balanced Model” describes mathematics instruction at Otay Elementary. The model consists of three components—Procedure, Concept, and Problem Solving. Mathematics lesson planning involves carefully unpacking the standards to create explicit and purposeful objectives, and establishing a balanced treatment of key standards. The Lesh Math Processing Mat is used at each grade level. This learning tool contains separate fields for each of the three components, and a fourth field that invites students to consider how mathematics concepts are applied in the real world. Teachers use the Lesh Math Processing Mat for group or individual processing of mathematics concepts, or as an optional assessment. A series of algebra mats are also utilized at each grade level as an important part of the mathematics curriculum to promote algebra readiness.

To support the needs of English Learners, every Focus Lesson in mathematics includes two key Quality Indicators: (1) explicit frontloading of mathematics vocabulary, and (2) carefully constructed Language Frames that feature the necessary academic language for the concepts being studied. “Reflection Journals” are utilized as a tool to capture student processing of mathematics concepts, and provide teachers with a qualitative snapshot of student progress.

While mathematics instruction is founded on the California standards, it is guided by a customized pacing guide created by grade level teams at the beginning of the school year. Each pacing guide is composed of five instructional blocks delineated by site benchmark assessments and district measures. The format and design of the pacing guide document enables teachers to see the “big picture” of the school year, and allows them the flexibility to lengthen or shorten the treatment of concepts within any instructional block. Teachers are empowered to control their pacing based on students’ needs.

### **4. Instructional Methods:**

Good instruction starts with a core belief in an overarching versatile instructional method. The Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) model, illustrated in Doug Fisher and Nancy Frey’s Better Learning Through Structured Teaching, establishes a framework of good teaching that is purposeful, intentional and explicit. The GRR delivers quality differentiated instruction through four phases: The Focus Lesson, Guided Instruction, Collaborative Group Work and Independent Practice. This year Otay Elementary agreed to

become proficient in the delivery of the Focus Lesson. The measure of a quality Focus Lesson starts with the identification of a content standard. The lesson first introduces the Content Objective, Language Objective, and Language Frames which guide students toward proficiency.

Students who have not mastered the standard embodied in the Content Objective are given opportunity for reteaching in small group instruction during Guided Reading, Universal Access, push-in-support, one-on-one, or Building Academic Language (BAL). Guided Reading provides a format for instructional level teaching. Universal Access time allows teachers to provide additional access to the core concepts in the form of both homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. One-on-one opportunities are provided to students during whole group independent work, computer lab time, and whole group assessment. Push-in certificated teachers provide struggling students with scaffolded academic support.

BAL is based on the study of Dr. Doug Reeves' High Performance in High Poverty Schools: 90/90/90 and Beyond. BAL is an opportunity for teachers to spiral the teaching of expected grade level content standards. During BAL, teachers explicitly model strategies that help students gain the academic language needed to be successful on assessments. The aforementioned instructional methods support the diverse needs of our ELs, SED, and Students with Disabilities by providing multiple opportunities to process and absorb content standards. All Otay classrooms clearly depict the consistent use of these instructional strategies across grade levels.

#### **5. Professional Development:**

Our professional development program is comprised of several layers: one-on-one coaching, grade level collaboration, Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) planning, staff development, and teambuilding in a Professional Learning Community. As a school-wide community, our focus was how to support student learning through targeted professional development. Overwhelmingly, staff agreed on building professional capacity with the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework, Guided Reading, Step-Up-To-Writing and Universal Access. In all aspects of professional development, content standards and assessment data are what dictate action.

Our Literacy and Math Coaches are key players in working with teachers on a one-to-one basis. They observe lessons and provide teachers with constructive feedback that impacts and improves student achievement. Daily, coaches facilitate three hours of collaboration with a specific grade level; this builds consistency of practice among teachers.

The ILT targets initiatives for the whole staff. They work at a deeper level to ensure that all professional development positively impacts student achievement by evaluating student data results. On a bi-monthly basis, the ILT meets to evaluate the implementation of our initiatives.

The ILT also belongs to a powerful Professional Learning Community. We meet four times a year with other cohort schools in order to exchange ideas and engage in professional discourse.

Also, school-wide staff professional development occurs during minimum school days and teacher prep days. These workshops address the learning needs of the whole staff and allow for horizontal and vertical dialogue. In a recent staff development meeting, each grade level reviewed Theme Test assessment data, evaluated the curriculum's alignment to particular content standards where students struggled, and explored how to improve our curriculum by creating standards-aligned lesson content objectives. Then we crafted lessons and assignments that helped students attain mastery of the standard as measured by the CST Released Questions.

#### **6. School Leadership:**

This year, Otay Elementary was assigned a new principal. As in the past, the present leadership ensures that all stakeholders are involved in the decision making process. Jim Collins expresses in From Good to Great,

“Regardless of the structures of the system, one central fact stands out above all others: the pilot has ultimate responsibility for the airplane and the lives of the people in it.” The people, Otay’s stakeholders, as in Collins’ analogy, did not panic in the brief uncertainty that came with change in leadership. The Principal simply reassured Otay’s community and kept the course.

Otay Elementary’s shared leadership structure is key to ensuring that decisions are made in cohort with those affected. The ILT, comprised of Literacy and Math coaches, Project Specialist, teacher representatives from each grade level and Principal, communicate constantly to ensure that changes to educational policy are embraced by all because their input is sought from the onset, creating a greater probability for buy-in. At a recent ILT meeting, with four other schools in our Professional Learning Community, the ILT embarked on a decision whose implication would affect the school’s entire teaching community. The ILT knew the school needed to move towards student journaling where students’ thought processing could be further analyzed. It was decided that before moving forward, input and buy-in would need to be solicited from all teachers. Decisions that involve the input of everyone help to build relationships among colleagues and ensure follow through.

As Otay strives to build an Accountable Community of students, teachers, administration, and parents with the goal of continued student achievement, it is paramount that all voices are heard. As with any change, realignment of resources are taken more in stride when the vision realized is created and accepted by all.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	64	64	62	57
% Advanced	40	37	25	36	27
Number of students tested	101	89	69	78	97
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	67	60	61	62
% Advanced	39	39	21	36	
Number of students tested	80	67	47	61	78
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	61	64	63	60	55
% Advanced	39	42	24	33	
Number of students tested	94	77	63	75	84
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		18	18		
% Advanced		9	0		
Number of students tested		11	11		
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	60	60	44	49
% Advanced	39	38	27	22	
Number of students tested	80	60	45	50	73
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 2

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	46	39	39	22
% Advanced	16	6	19	15	6
Number of students tested	101	88	69	78	97
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	47	34	38	25
% Advanced	13	5	19	13	
Number of students tested	80	66	47	61	78
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	44	48	36	39	19
% Advanced	13	5	17	15	
Number of students tested	94	76	63	75	84
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		10	0		
% Advanced		0	0		
Number of students tested		10	11		
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	45	39	29	32	18
% Advanced	15	3	16	8	
Number of students tested	80	59	45	50	73
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

ETS publishes the CST every year. In 2008, one student took the STS or Spanish-based Test in Spanish. Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	78	66	53	41
% Advanced	54	39	33	27	9
Number of students tested	89	70	80	94	95
Percent of total students tested	96	92	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	6	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	8	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	72	61	51	42
% Advanced	52	39	29	25	
Number of students tested	69	49	59	75	73
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	78	64	54	38
% Advanced	55	39	28	25	
Number of students tested	73	64	74	81	84
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50				
% Advanced	25				
Number of students tested	12				
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	75	62	54	38
% Advanced	47	33	30	22	
Number of students tested	58	51	50	69	64
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

In 2007-08, 6 students were alternatively tested using the CMA. In 2008-09, 4 students were alternatively tested using the CMA. Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	37	35	31	25	9
% Advanced	12	10	5	7	0
Number of students tested	83	68	80	94	94
Percent of total students tested	89	90	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	10	8	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	11	10	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	40	30	25	24	7
% Advanced	11	11	3	9	
Number of students tested	63	47	59	75	72
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	39	35	28	23	7
% Advanced	12	11	3	6	
Number of students tested	67	63	74	81	83
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	28	28	24	23	0
% Advanced	0	8	2	6	
Number of students tested	53	51	50	69	64
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

In 2007-08, 8 students were alternatively tested using the California Modified Assessment (CMA). In 2008-09, 9 students were alternatively tested using the CMA and 1 student using the Standards-based Test in Spanish (STS). Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	65	52	48	27
% Advanced	57	27	22	22	3
Number of students tested	89	81	93	86	86
Percent of total students tested	93	95	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	6	4	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	7	5	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	61	50	42	26
% Advanced	59	26	25	22	
Number of students tested	49	62	67	60	66
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	63	51	48	28
% Advanced	56	27	21	21	
Number of students tested	68	77	80	77	80
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	66	47	48	20
% Advanced	55	32	14	20	
Number of students tested	56	50	66	61	54
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

In 2007-08, 4 students were alternatively tested using the CMA. In 2008-09, 6 students were alternatively tested using CMA. Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	55	49	42	34
% Advanced	34	21	14	9	6
Number of students tested	74	77	93	86	86
Percent of total students tested	90	90	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	8	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	10	10	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	50	46	35	30
% Advanced	32	17	15	7	
Number of students tested	47	85	67	60	66
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	61	54	51	43	31
% Advanced	34	20	13	9	
Number of students tested	67	74	80	77	80
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	59	46	47	43	20
% Advanced	30	20	14	10	
Number of students tested	56	50	66	61	54
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

In 2007-08, 8 students were alternatively tested using the CMA. In 2008-09, 8 students were alternatively tested using the CMA. Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	55	56	52	18
% Advanced	28	20	15	22	4
Number of students tested	86	84	92	87	90
Percent of total students tested	93	91	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	6	8	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	7	9	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	50	56	48	20
% Advanced	26	21	18	13	
Number of students tested	58	63	60	62	74
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	54	57	49	15
% Advanced	28	13	14	22	
Number of students tested	79	77	83	77	74
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	52	54	46	6
% Advanced	33	17	13	16	
Number of students tested	54	63	69	50	48
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

In 2007-08, 8 students were alternatively tested using CMA. In 2008-09, 6 students were alternatively tested using CMA. Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	47	48	39	41	14
% Advanced	16	14	7	9	4
Number of students tested	83	86	92	87	90
Percent of total students tested	89	94	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	10	6	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	11	6	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	43	43	33	37	16
% Advanced	10	13	3	8	
Number of students tested	58	64	60	62	79
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	47	36	40	17
% Advanced	14	13	6	10	
Number of students tested	77	77	83	77	90
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	41	41	33	32	6
% Advanced	13	13	4	4	
Number of students tested	54	64	69	50	53
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

In 2007-08, 6 students were alternatively tested using CMA. In 2008-09, 8 students were alternatively tested using the CMA and 2 students using STS. Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	65	56	51	29	32
% Advanced	36	17	15	3	4
Number of students tested	86	93	94	90	98
Percent of total students tested	88	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	12	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	12	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	41	43	29	29
% Advanced	30	6	14	4	
Number of students tested	66	68	69	72	79
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	46	47	26	31
% Advanced	35	11	15	1	
Number of students tested	80	88	81	74	90
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	44	40	8	21
% Advanced	33	13	9	0	
Number of students tested	66	72	55	49	98
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				50	
% Advanced				20	
Number of students tested				10	

Notes:

In 2008-09, 12 students were alternatively tested using CMA. Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services (ETS)

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	61	46	49	25	17
% Advanced	27	12	14	9	5
Number of students tested	90	93	94	90	98
Percent of total students tested	92	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	8	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	56	41	47	23	16
% Advanced	24	6	12	8	
Number of students tested	68	68	69	72	79
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	46	47	23	31
% Advanced	24	11	12	8	
Number of students tested	82	88	81	74	90
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	44	38	2	6
% Advanced	25	13	13	0	
Number of students tested	68	72	55	49	53
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				40	
% Advanced				20	
Number of students tested				10	

Notes:

In 2008-09, 8 students were alternatively tested using the CMA. Largest other subgroup for 2005-06 is white (not of Hispanic origin). Percent advanced per subgroup for 2005 was unavailable on the state website; LEA was contacted and was unable to produce these numbers/percentage.