

**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: Ms. Sonya Cuellar

Official School Name: William W. Orr Elementary School

School Mailing Address:  
12130 South Jersey Avenue  
Norwalk, CA 90650-2316

County: Los Angeles    State School Code Number\*: 19 64717 6015101

Telephone: (562) 868-7988    Fax: (562) 863-2518

Web site/URL: www.littlelake.k12.ca.us/schools/williamorres    E-mail: sonya\_cuellar@littlelake.k12.ca.us

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\*: Dr. Phillip Perez

District Name: Little Lake Elementary School District    Tel: (562) 868-8241

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: Mrs. Lynn Berg

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 2004.
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)
- |          |                                   |
|----------|-----------------------------------|
| 7        | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| 2        | Middle/Junior high schools        |
|          | High schools                      |
|          | K-12 schools                      |
| <b>9</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>                      |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 8101

**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. 7 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			0
K	32	33	65	7			0
1	35	25	60	8			0
2	37	26	63	9			0
3	47	32	79	10			0
4	45	35	80	11			0
5	36	46	82	12			0
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b>							429

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
1 % Asian  
6 % Black or African American  
83 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
6 % White  
3 % 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: 10 %

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.	16
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	30
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	46
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	452
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.102
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	10.177

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 24 %

Total number limited English proficient 103

Number of languages represented: 2

Specify languages:

1. Spanish
2. Tagalog

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 67 %

Total number students who qualify: 287

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: 13 %

Total Number of Students Served: 54

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>19</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>4</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>14</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>16</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>1</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>22</u>	<u>1</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>
Support staff	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Total number	<u>32</u>	<u>16</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 20 :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%	96%	97%	96%	97%
Daily teacher attendance	83%	86%	83%	83%	83%
Teacher turnover rate	14%	9%	10%	22%	16%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

**Teacher Turnover Rate above 12%**

**2004-2005** - 3 out of 18 teachers were new to our school. At the end of the 2003-2004 school year, 2 teachers retired and 1 teacher took a leave of absence due to child care.

**2005-2006** - 4 out of 18 teachers were new to our school. At the end of the 2004-2005 school year, 1 teacher retired, 1 teacher moved out of the area, 1 teacher took a leave of absence due to child care, and 1 teacher was a nonrelect.

**2008-2009** - 3 out of 22 teachers were new to our school. At the end of the 2007-2008 school year, 1 teacher retired and 2 teachers transferred to the middle school.

**Daily Teacher Attendance**

The attendace rates for teachers is based on all absences including inservice trainings, jury duty, and illnesses. New teachers are scheduled to attend district staff development throughout the year during the school day and they also attend Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) training. Since we have had new teachers each year at William Orr, we have experienced teachers being out of the classroom to attend district trainings.

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	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0 %
Enrolled in a community college	0 %
Enrolled in vocational training	0 %
Found employment	0 %
Military service	0 %
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0 %
Unknown	0 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>0 %</b>

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

William Orr Elementary School was built in 1955, and serves approximately 435 students in grades K-5. There are 19 general education classrooms, 1 Special Day Class-Learning Handicapped and 2 Special Day Class-Severely Handicapped. The majority (83%) of our students are of Hispanic background. We provide supplemental services to students identified in the following programs:

- English Language Learners - 87 students
- Resource Specialist Program - 7 students
- Gifted and Talented Education - 34 students
- Speech and Language - 46 students
- Title 1 - 59 students

William Orr School is committed to the belief that every single student will learn. It is our mission to provide a positive learning environment that supports high expectations for both student achievement and student citizenship. We have implemented a balanced educational program that promotes growth in academics, social and physical education, visual and performing arts, as well as in technology education.

We utilize the most effective research-based strategies to improve reading, writing, and math skills of all students. To build a strong foundation, we start by providing a full day kindergarten program to our students. Building on that foundation, we have ensured that each teacher is fully trained in Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning, Comprehensive Extended Literacy Learning and A Focused Approach to Systematic English Language Development.

We pride ourselves on our ability to meet the needs of all students. Two of our school-wide practices are Response to Intervention and Data Reflection Sessions. These practices were implemented in order to ensure high levels of student learning at all grade levels and in all classrooms. Response to Intervention is our reading intervention and acceleration program. We target all students, with a focus on English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities, to help close the achievement gap. Data Reflection Sessions were implemented to increase student achievement and teacher accountability by providing teachers time to collaborate as a grade level to discuss and analyze student assessments, share instructional strategies and lesson ideas, and discuss interventions for students.

Our school community is dedicated to our students. We have an active Parent-Teacher Association as well as School Site Council. We involve parents and community members in all aspects of the school. The parent education programs that we provide help empower our parents to be active participants in their child's education.

The staff at William Orr has developed a long-standing tradition of excellence, maintaining our commitment to students, parents, and community by providing the best educational experience possible. We renew this commitment annually so that we can continue to improve our effectiveness in educating our students and preparing them to become productive citizens.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. Assessment Results:

The data for William Orr School over the past five years paints a picture of a successful school that has steadily increased the percentage of students who are proficient. Proficiency rates increase in line with the growing targets set by accountability requirement of No Child Left Behind. These targets, Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) increase each year and differ slightly for Language Arts and Mathematics. By 2009, William Orr has made significant gains over a variety of grade levels and across significant sub-groups.

Orr administers the California Standards Test to students in second through fifth grade each spring. The results are received in the latter part of the summer and are carefully reviewed by all staff and shared with all stakeholders. Students take assessments in the areas of Mathematics and Language Arts. Based on individual student performance in each of these areas, scores are converted into performance bands: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic and Far Below Basic. The Advanced and Proficient bands are the only two that are designated as meeting proficiency. A resource that is commonly used by Orr staff is the California Department of Education website: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/>

In second grade performance in Mathematics, there has been an increase of 24 percent over the past five years with the 2009 year's total of 60 percent proficient. All sub-groups have achieved at least a 48 percent proficiency rate. The scores reveal that fewer students in the Hispanic and Limited English sub-groups were scoring in the advanced band in 2009 than in the previous year. In Language Arts, performance has been consistent over the past three years for all students group showing improvement. For Hispanic and Limited English sub-groups, there was a slight decline in the number of students scoring in the proficient and advanced bands than the previous year.

Third grade Mathematics test scores have had a dramatic increase. For all students group in 2005, only 10 percent were proficient in contrast to 2009 in which 64 percent were at least proficient and 27 percent were advanced. In Language Arts, the gains were more modest but positive with 35 percent of all students group proficient and a slightly lower performance from the Socio-economic Disadvantaged and Hispanic sub-groups and Limited English sub-group scored considerably lower in 2009 than they had in 2005 through 2007.

Fourth grade out-scored all other grade levels in the proficient and advanced performance bands. Impressively, 80 percent of all students were proficient and above in Mathematics, with 53 percent also performing in the advanced band. Limited English students made considerable improvement in achieving proficiency in Language Arts with 46 percent proficient, a 36 percent increase over the previous year.

In Fifth grade, students have made steady progress in Mathematics each year to increase from 42 percent proficient in 2005 to 78 percent in 2009. Both the Socio-economic Disadvantaged and Hispanic subgroups performance was close to that of all students group. Language Arts scores for all students group meet AMO targets for the current year and if maintained, would meet next year's target.

There is an obvious trend of steady improvements for all grade levels. If the grade levels combined for all students group maintain their level of proficiency, they will meet the AMO targets for the next year. In summary, the results show that Orr students are performing beyond the AMO targets set for the current year.

## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

At William Orr we are diligent in using assessment data to drive instruction. We have established Data Reflection Sessions (DRS) where the staff is given time to discuss student outcomes and instructional practices in a structured and safe environment. DRS takes place every other week for each grade level. Each session is ninety-minutes. The goal of the DRS session is to increase student achievement by providing teachers the opportunity to discuss and analyze CST results, common assessments, and district benchmark assessments. Through this opportunity, teachers are able to assess and discuss what went well, and what didn't. The outcome of these reflections allows teachers the opportunity to reflect on their instructional strategies, lesson design, and student achievement. DRS helps create a small learning community where teachers unite with a common purpose to make changes and to adapt instruction to the needs of all students.

Through the use of the data that is analyzed during DRS, teachers are able to address individual and/or subgroup needs. Teachers create re-teach lessons to provide additional learning opportunities of students for those students who were not successful in the common assessment. Teachers also design after school tutorials for students who may need longer interventions based on their assessment data.

Gathering data results and discussing student proficiency and outcomes through the structured DRS meetings has enabled Orr staff to see continual improvement in student achievement. This is due to explicitly addressing the standards and student growth at meetings, and by sharing strategies and ideas to improve daily instructional practices.

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

Student performance and data is communicated to students, parents and community through a variety of methods. Throughout the school year students take several different types of assessments. Their assessments consist of state assessments, district assessments and grade level common assessments.

All students who took the California Standards Test (CST) or alternative assessment receive their results in the mail prior to school starting. The school's results are also published in the local newspaper to inform our community of our performance. The School Accountability Report Card is published on the school website and is available in the office in both English and Spanish. During School Site Council meetings and other parent group meetings CST and District Benchmark assessment results are shared with parents and community members along with the action plans to address the needs of the students.

At the beginning of the year, teachers explain to the parents the types of assessments that the students will be taking throughout the year and what signifies being proficient on an assessment. At the end of each trimester students receive a standards-based report card that informs parents of their child's performance in mastering grade level standards through achievement on assessments. Progress reports are sent out at mid-trimester to keep parents informed of student performance. Teachers schedule parent conferences to discuss student progress and explain assessment results. Parents also receive common assessment results from the teacher every two weeks.

Students are made aware of their common assessment and benchmark results immediately after taking the assessment. The upper grade students are also made aware of the class results. Each class is always striving for one hundred percent of the students proficient in every common assessment as well as District Benchmark assessments.

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

At William Orr School we are proud of our successes. These successes have garnered attention from other institutions. We have opened our classroom doors to schools within our district and outside of our district. As a staff, we are always willing to meet with teachers and administrators to discuss the practices and strategies that have assisted us in continuing to increase student achievement. We know how important observations are in the learning process.

Within the last few years, several grade level teams from surrounding districts have visited our school to observe Data Reflection Sessions, Response to Intervention and all-day kindergarten program. Our teachers are also used as demonstration teachers for the Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning and the Extended Literacy Learning Foundation. Throughout the year, several teachers from across the country visit our school to observe research-based instructional strategies and discuss instructional delivery. This year teachers from Honduras will join in the observations.

As a school eligible to apply for California Distinguished School, we needed to identify two signature practices that helped increase achievement and describe them as part of the application. Our signature practices – Data Reflection Sessions and Response to Intervention will be on the California Department of Education website available to other schools.

As a Professional Learning Community, we will continue to share our successes and commitment to increasing student achievement through collaboration, reflective teaching and a shared common purpose.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. Curriculum:

William Orr's K-5 curriculum aligns with the California State Content Standards. The adopted textbook in Language Arts is Houghton-Mifflin. The series is used as a resource making standards visible, accessible, and achievable for all students. Pearson-Scott Foresman is the adopted textbook publisher for Math and Science. The Math series provides 20 focused topics that are coherent, digestible groups of lessons focusing on California Content Standards. Incorporating technology and hands on manipulatives, students are motivated to engage in mathematical thinking and communication. Our Science series provides a cross-curricular connection with reading and writing support. The science lab activities structured within each lesson guide students through an inquiry process of active learning. The Harcourt History- Social Science series incorporates literature and historical events in a chronological and geographical context. Lessons begin with time lines that identify important events, and objective-based questions for student reflection. The English Language Development (ELD) program is supported through a focused approach using the Susana Dutro Systematic Instruction and District Instructional Guide. ELD lessons have clear and stated language objectives based on a scope and sequence of language skills and a focus on language function, language patterns and vocabulary, structured language practice, with engaging topics. Instruction includes listening, speaking, reading, and writing with an emphasis on listening and speaking. The adopted series supplement curriculum, however the Curriculum Alignment plans created throughout the grade levels for both Language Arts and Math drive the organization and planning of focused content standards.

In the area of instructional strategies, teachers are trained in using Thinking Maps, which create a common visual language for students, and aide in transferring thinking processes into their learning. District training in the elements of Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning (CELL) for grades K-3 and Extended Literacy Learning (ExLL) for 3-5 focuses on strategies for direct instruction in reading and writing. The elements provide a foundation and basic framework to help students comprehend and synthesize content, and are used across the curriculum creating an environment of independent learning. Also, teachers routinely use technology as a tool and a resource to deliver instruction, support student learning, and to differentiate instruction.

Our Visual and Performing Arts program allows students opportunities to engage in the arts. Through the Art Masters program, students become acquainted with both the artist and their art. Five of the world's finest artists are studied in depth each year, with presentations focusing on their lives, education, artistic genre, and technique. Coupled with classroom visits to the Art Lab, students create individual examples of an artist's most notable work.

Our Performing Arts program centers around a comprehensive music program. Children learn both instrumental and choral music including musical theory and notation, rhythms, multicultural music genre, and musical terminology and origins. Students perform in school programs, and may be involved in after school choir, which includes district wide performances. Our music program enhances academic performance by expanding reading and writing vocabularies, creating mathematical links to notation, theory, and connecting the rhythm of music with the rhythm of spoken and written language.

The districtwide Arts for All enrichment program provides additional art and music instruction. Students' artistic creations use a variety of media, and relate to current classroom curriculum. The music portion enhances our existing music program and focuses on both vocal and instrumental performance.

Orr's Visual and Performing Arts program enables our children to see the discipline, responsibility, and organization needed to succeed at every level and in all areas of life, and tap into the various learning styles of all of our students. They are part and parcel of what sets William Orr apart from other elementary schools.

## 2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

Many components are involved in the reading curriculum at William Orr Elementary. The Houghton-Mifflin Reading Series is the adopted program of the district. We use the Houghton-Mifflin text as a resource in teaching reading. We focus on teaching state Language Arts standards through research-based strategies. Teachers have developed long-range curriculum alignment plans that address standards, assessments, and instructional strategies. In order to ensure that all students are meeting the grade level standards in reading, teachers meet biweekly to discuss student progress and teacher practices. In addition, teachers meet annually to revise their curriculum alignment plans and common assessments to ensure increased student achievement.

All teachers at William Orr Elementary have been trained in the Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning (CELL) and Extended Literacy Learning (ExLL) strategies. The reading components of the CELL/ExLL framework include Read Aloud, Shared Reading, Direct Reading and Independent Reading. Through whole group and small group instruction, students receive daily reading instruction. Teachers use guided reading, book clubs, shared reading, read aloud and reciprocal teaching to address phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary development, text comprehension and oral/aural experiences.

Our students also participate in daily Response to Intervention (RTI). During this 45-minute period, the students are receiving additional reading instruction at their instructional level. There are three levels of RTI: Intensive, Benchmark, and Challenge.

Instructing students so that they acquire and master the English language is one of the most difficult undertakings for teachers, as children do not learn at the same time or in the same way. The teachers at William Orr Elementary have come together as a team, to align their curriculum and differentiate their instruction to meet the diverse needs of all students.

## 3. Additional Curriculum Area:

The staff at William Orr School has continuously put forth great efforts to improve student achievement in accordance to our school's mission of academically preparing students. One of our targeted subjects is Mathematics. Our teachers have participated in the University of California in Los Angeles (UCLA) program for Mathematics. William Orr also offers after school math programs that target Gifted and Talented (GATE) and mathematically advanced students and also at-risk students. In addition, teachers are given the opportunity to meet every two weeks to discuss student progress and develop strategies for differentiated instruction at Data Reflection Sessions (DRS).

Little Lake City School District was awarded a grant through the UCLA mathematics program at the inception of the 2007-2008 school year. From this grant, William Orr teachers were given the opportunity to take university level courses, learning an extensive variety of strategies to implement into daily lessons. These strategies were not only effective for at risk students, but also targeted advanced students.

In an effort to enhance our GATE and advanced students' math skills, we have developed an after school Advanced Math class where students are given the opportunity to explore mathematics beyond traditional skills. This class also serves as a motivating factor for many students to strive and improve in math. We also know that some students need additional time to understand concepts and skills, therefore we also provide after school tutoring to students who need additional support to master concepts.

Finally, the opportunity to meet bi-weekly at our DRS has become pivotal in establishing an effective mathematics program at William Orr. During these sessions, we are not only able to discuss student achievement, mark students' progress, and analyze data, but we are able to reflect, develop, and implement grade level appropriate strategies to ensure our students' academic success.

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

Through analysis of California Standards Test data, staff at William Orr Elementary determined during Data Reflection Sessions that while the progress of our students was significant and consistent, the need for differentiated instruction in Language Arts was evident to address the needs of our diverse student population. English Language Learners, Students With Disabilities, low performing students not identified as RSP, and students scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic were among those for whom intervention seemed most crucial. Opportunities for before and after school reading interventions were put into place, however student achievement was somewhat inconsistent due to student participation. It became clear that for our students to advance academically and become proficient in reading, we would need to provide differentiated during the school day for all students.

Response to Intervention (RTI) is a comprehensive, multi-tiered service delivery system that is intended to provide an educational experience focusing on early intervention and support for all students. It is based on the belief that successful academic outcome means not waiting for a student to fail. Rather, intervening early and effectively to provide all students with the tools needed to achieve academically. All groups are fluid, allowing students to move to a higher RTI proficiency level as they succeed, or to move down if they are faced with challenges. Such movement ensures both adequate and appropriate support and scaffolding while maintaining rigorous instructional standards

The target population at William Orr Elementary is all students, with a focus on English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities. Within that targeted student population, the needs of the Intensive, Benchmark, and Enrichment proficiency groups in each grade level are met. RTI provides differentiated instruction in Language Arts within each grade level, and is a proactive strategy to assist in closing the achievement gap.

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

Staff development is offered at district and site levels. District-required Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning (CELL) and Extended Literacy Learning (EXLL) training for first year teachers are invaluable. All teachers are expected to use the framework, which consists of Read Aloud, Shared Reading, Directed Reading, Independent Reading, Directed Writing, and Independent Writing. Additionally, the District provides staff development in Systematic English Language Development, and ninety percent of Orr teachers have participated. After school Math Mondays, part of a UCLA Math grant, have given the staff opportunities to learn and share new strategies to enhance the mathematics education of our students. With a site commitment to student health and wellness, the District training in the SPARKS physical education program has given our teachers tools to implement an effective physical education program.

Site level staff development has been varied and purposeful, and is specific to the needs of the staff and students of William Orr, ensuring that we have what is needed to support student learning. Staff development in Thinking Maps, a system of specific graphic organizers, has provided visual tools for learning. Combining flexibility and structure, they allow students to transfer and develop thinking processes across the curriculum. Site support has also been available for the new mathematics program, and to introduce the relevance of posting daily learning objectives. The site Literacy Coach is an integral part of Orr's staff development. Providing demonstration lessons, new teacher support, coaching sessions, and focused presentations, she layers confidence and competence to existing educational practice. Grade level collaboration has been exceptionally beneficial to grade level/span groups. Meeting twice each month, teachers plan, share strategies, and coordinate curriculum. Bi-monthly Data Reflection Sessions provide a small learning community where teachers unite with a common purpose to discuss and share lesson ideas and effective instructional practices.

## 6. School Leadership:

William Orr has embraced the philosophy of a Professional Learning Community. Recognized as the lead, Ms. Cuellar, site administrator, encourages a democratic, flexible and supportive system of leadership coupled with an atmosphere of trust, opportunity, and choice. Teachers are encouraged to tap into personal strengths and seek leadership roles in school and district committees. Freedom to grow should be our school motto because as we encourage our students to grow academically and socially so are we encouraged by our administrator to grow as leaders.

The success of Orr's leadership is built upon the principal's ability to guide and delegate. Language Arts, Math, Science, Technology and Parent Involvement committees are representative of leadership opportunities created by the principal, but participation is by teacher interest. Our School Site Council, consisting of parents, teachers and the school administrator, is there to make decisions that support funding and student programs. The Leadership Team acts as a liaison between administrator and staff keeping the lines of communication open and productive. Our School Plan is an additional example of democratic leadership. Teachers select an Action Team on which to serve and whose purpose is to create, modify and keep the needs of the school, students and community current. PTA's leadership and dedication support and enhance student learning through the purchase of books, technology, and transportation to field trips.

With establishing and maintaining a Professional Learning Community a personal goal, Ms. Cuellar has led the William Orr Staff to embrace the "What Ever it Takes Model", clearly illustrating the culture and drive for success that she has established. Validated by continually rising student achievement, it is apparent to even the casual observer that Ms. Cuellar's leadership ability is stellar.

## PART VI - PRIVATE SCHOOL ADDENDUM

---

This section is for private schools only

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	60	51	49	64	36
Advanced = exceeds state standards	14	16	15	21	15
Number of students tested	80	72	80	61	75
Percent of total students tested	99	96	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	2	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	3	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	62	50	44	63	36
Advanced = exceeds state standards	15	12	11	15	13
Number of students tested	55	50	57	40	52
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	48	48	45	62	32
Advanced = exceeds state standards	9	18	14	17	13
Number of students tested	69	60	64	47	63
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	0	0	0	38	33
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	0	0	13	33
Number of students tested	4	14	2	8	6
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	55	58	39	64	36
Advanced = exceeds state standards	11	25	10	35	12
Number of students tested	27	24	21	17	25
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The Alternative Assessment for 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 is the California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test  
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	48	48	43	51	32
Advanced = exceeds state standards	10	10	8	23	5
Number of students tested	81	69	80	61	75
Percent of total students tested	99	96	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	2	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	3	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	43	44	36	41	35
Advanced = exceeds state standards	7	8	4	18	6
Number of students tested	55	50	57	40	52
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	31	49	39	42	28
Advanced = exceeds state standards	9	12	6	21	6
Number of students tested	69	60	64	47	63
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	0	0	0	25	17
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	4	14	2	8	6
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	55	59	43	64	24
Advanced = exceeds state standards	7	17	0	29	0
Number of students tested	27	24	21	17	25
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The Alternative Assessment for 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 is the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA).

Subject: Mathematics  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test  
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	64	66	51	42	10
Advanced = exceeds state standards	27	35	20	19	2
Number of students tested	71	78	75	88	60
Percent of total students tested	90	88	100	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	11	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	10	12	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	59	56	42	38	28
Advanced = exceeds state standards	24	28	13	15	8
Number of students tested	46	50	52	62	50
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	64	63	46	40	29
Advanced = exceeds state standards	24	30	18	15	6
Number of students tested	62	61	61	75	53
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	29	50	24	12	0
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	0	12	6	0
Number of students tested	7	2	17	16	12
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	44	59	49	28	27
Advanced = exceeds state standards	13	18	19	4	0
Number of students tested	16	17	27	25	22
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The Alternative Assessment for 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 is the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test  
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	35	31	28	29	10
Advanced = exceeds state standards	6	5	0	6	2
Number of students tested	69	78	75	88	60
Percent of total students tested	87	88	100	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	10	11	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	13	12	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	24	22	25	27	10
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	2	0	6	2
Number of students tested	45	50	52	62	50
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	22	28	25	28	8
Advanced = exceeds state standards	5	7	0	5	2
Number of students tested	60	61	61	75	53
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	0	0	6	0	0
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	5	2	17	16	12
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	7	0	22	16	27
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	15	17	27	25	22
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The Alternative Assessment for 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 is the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

Subject: Mathematics  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test  
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	80	76	50	30	43
Advanced = exceeds state standards	53	34	18	7	14
Number of students tested	78	59	90	60	69
Percent of total students tested	93	83	100	95	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	6	12	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	7	17	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	79	73	46	26	39
Advanced = exceeds state standards	43	26	13	4	14
Number of students tested	42	38	67	49	44
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	77	77	34	25	40
Advanced = exceeds state standards	48	29	15	4	15
Number of students tested	63	48	73	53	60
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	100	75	12	0	11
Advanced = exceeds state standards	50	75	6	0	0
Number of students tested	2	4	16	11	9
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	69	40	18	11	20
Advanced = exceeds state standards	38	20	0	0	0
Number of students tested	13	10	22	19	15
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The Alternative Assessment for 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 is the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test  
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	64	56	37	30	37
Advanced = exceeds state standards	43	20	14	3	14
Number of students tested	76	59	90	60	69
Percent of total students tested	91	83	100	95	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	12	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	9	17	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	54	50	34	28	32
Advanced = exceeds state standards	34	18	10	4	9
Number of students tested	41	38	67	49	44
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	59	54	38	27	36
Advanced = exceeds state standards	39	19	12	2	13
Number of students tested	61	48	73	53	60
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards		50	6	0	11
Advanced = exceeds state standards		50	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	4	16	11	9
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	46	10	5	5	0
Advanced = exceeds state standards	23	0	5	0	0
Number of students tested	13	10	22	19	15
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The Alternative Assessment for 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 is the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

Subject: Mathematics  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test  
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	78	63	44	43	42
Advanced = exceeds state standards	33	24	10	16	8
Number of students tested	66	76	59	70	76
Percent of total students tested	89	100	98	100	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	0	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	11	0	0	0	1
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	77	63	39	38	43
Advanced = exceeds state standards	32	17	6	12	6
Number of students tested	44	52	49	43	52
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	74	63	42	41	41
Advanced = exceeds state standards	29	19	10	14	6
Number of students tested	55	62	50	63	65
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	100	100	17	14	11
Advanced = exceeds state standards	50	100	0	0	0
Number of students tested	2	1	6	7	9
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	44	11	20	0	11
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	9	9	15	6	18
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The alternative assessment used for

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test  
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	62	51	35	39	44
Advanced = exceeds state standards	20	14	8	10	5
Number of students tested	66	76	59	70	76
Percent of total students tested	89	100	98	100	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	0	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	11	0	0	0	1
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	59	45	35	32	44
Advanced = exceeds state standards	14	10	8	2	2
Number of students tested	44	52	49	43	52
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	60	47	36	37	45
Advanced = exceeds state standards	20	13	6	8	3
Number of students tested	55	62	50	63	65
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	100	100	0	0	11
Advanced = exceeds state standards	100	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	2	1	6	7	9
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards	33	0	20	0	28
Advanced = exceeds state standards	0	0	7	0	0
Number of students tested	9	9	15	6	18
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
Proficient = meets state standards					
Advanced = exceeds state standards					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The Alternative Assessment for 2004-2005 is the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA).

The Alternative Assessment for 2008-2009 is the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

