

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. John Melvin, Jr.

Official School Name: Lincoln Elementary School

School Mailing Address:
225 11th Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4409

County: Alameda State School Code Number*: 01612596002018

Telephone: (510) 874-3372 Fax: (510) 874-3375

Web site/URL: www.lincolndragons.org E-mail: john.melvin@ousd.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. Tony Smith

District Name: Oakland Unified School District Tel: (510) 879-8200

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. Gary Yee

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)	65	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
	<u>20</u>	Middle/Junior high schools
	<u>25</u>	High schools
	<u> </u>	K-12 schools
	<u>110</u>	TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 4256

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. 2 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	61	47	108	7			0
1	45	55	100	8			0
2	46	60	106	9			0
3	49	53	102	10			0
4	42	53	95	11			0
5	51	41	92	12			0
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							603

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
92 % Asian
2 % Black or African American
1 % Hispanic or Latino
2 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
1 % White
2 % 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: 4 %

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.	13
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	9
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	22
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	579
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.038
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	3.800

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 55 %

Total number limited English proficient 334

Number of languages represented: 14

Specify languages:

Cantonese, Filipino, French, Japanese, Khmer, Mandarin, Spanish, Toishanese, Vietnamese, Nepali, Urdu, Wolof, Arabic, Thai

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 74 %

Total number students who qualify: 446

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: 7 %

Total Number of Students Served: 43

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>1</u> Autism	<u> </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u>1</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>6</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>35</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> </u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u> </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>2</u>	<u> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u>26</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>6</u>	<u> </u>
Support staff	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>
Total number	<u>48</u>	<u>6</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 23 :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	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Daily teacher attendance	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Teacher turnover rate	0%	10%	3%	6%	3%
Student dropout rate	%	%	%	%	%

Please provide all explanations below.

Note: In 2007-08 we had 2 teachers retire and 1 teacher transfer to another school (therefore there was a turnover of 3 of 30 teachers).

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	_____	%
Total	_____	%

PART III - SUMMARY

The journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step.

Confucius

Serving the urban, immigrant community of the Chinatown neighborhood of Oakland, California for decades, Lincoln Elementary School has a long, successful history. The story of Lincoln Elementary is the story of the many, many steps taken by parents, educators, and students toward helping generations of children build fulfilling and successful lives. It is the story of journeys across oceans into unknown territories, but full of hope and promise. 90% of the students at Lincoln are of Asian descent and almost all are from immigrant families. Our families make up an integral part of the Oakland Chinatown neighborhood. Other ethnicities include 4% Filipino/Filipino-American, 3% African/African American, 2% Hispanic/Latino, and 1% White. While 78% are from Cantonese speaking homes, fourteen other home languages are represented with an increasing number of students from Mongolia. 9% of the students are from English-only families, and 12% are fluent English speakers from homes where English is a second language. At present, 58% of the students are limited English proficient, and 34% have met the re-designation criteria and are now designated as Fluent English Proficient. With such a large number of Cantonese speaking students, Lincoln is fortunate to have twelve Cantonese-fluent teachers and an additional seven teachers familiar with the language at a conversational level. Their language facility lays the foundation for positive communication with parents.

Lincoln Elementary seeks to support the children in families who are starting lives in new places, as well as the children of the English speaking population who attend the school. We strive to provide them the opportunity to succeed academically and to develop as well rounded, caring individuals.

Our vision, created in partnership with parents and the community, is: Lincoln Elementary will be a model school where students, teachers, staff, parents and community members collaborate to promote student mastery of a challenging curriculum. Lincoln students will become creative, critical thinkers and blossom into caring citizens of a global community.

Our mission is: To inspire and challenge students to excel academically and socially through our guidance and positive modeling. We will continue to use our bilingual and English immersion programs to provide effective instruction in a nurturing environment where all students receive equal access to a rigorous curriculum.

Our school slogan is: Excellence, Creativity, Community

With the support of parents and the community, Lincoln is making great strides toward realizing its vision. Despite low income levels (77% of the students are eligible for free or reduced lunch) and the challenging second language needs, Lincoln School celebrates high academic achievement results with Academic Performance Index (API) scores progressing from 821 in 2001 to 933 in 2009, and it has met all Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria. In this past school year, 95% of our students were proficient in Math, the highest percentage of 65 elementary schools in Oakland. Also, 79% of our students were proficient in English and Language Arts, which is impressive in light of our high population of English Language Learners. Through our academic achievement and school success, we have been fortunate to be honored with several prestigious awards. Lincoln has been awarded the Title 1 Academic Achievement Award for the past six consecutive years, and was awarded the National Title 1 award in 2007. In addition, in 2008, we were awarded the California Distinguished School honor.

The vision and mission of our school guide us and provide a framework for school programs. We see that programs are most effective when they are developed by stakeholders in the community. Parents and staff members elected by their peers meet regularly as School Site Council members to develop the comprehensive school site plan. The school leadership, including the principal, the staff leadership team, the faculty council,

and the School Site Council coordinate the implementation of the site plan. Through the plan, strategies are developed to ensure effective teaching, significant academic progress for all students, and the development of a strong sense of partnership and shared leadership among school and community stakeholders.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

As our data tables show, we at Lincoln have made steady progress in both Math and Reading over the past five years. As was mentioned above, Lincoln's API score has grown from 821 in 2001 to 933 in 2009. Although Lincoln has a long history of academic success, this recent growth can be attributed to several factors.

In the past eight years, Lincoln has implemented the Open Court Reading/Language Arts curriculum. This curriculum emphasizes phonics in the primary grades and has proven to be effective in teaching English to our large population of English Language Learners. In addition to an effective curriculum, in the early grades we offer our large number of Cantonese families the option of bilingual instruction. 60% of our classes in grades K-2 are bilingual which allows native Cantonese speakers to transition more smoothly to an English only classroom. 40% of our third grade classrooms are bilingual, and by fourth grade, most of our students have transitioned into an English-only environment. The effectiveness of our English Language Arts curriculum is shown by the high percentage of students that are reclassified as "Fluent English Proficient" after second grade, as well as by the students' scores on the California Standards Test (CST).

In addition to the success of our Reading program, our students have excelled in Math. As previously mentioned, in the 2009 California Standards Test (CST), 95% of our students scored Proficient or Advanced. A factor in our success in Math (which could also be said of Reading) is the expertise and pedagogical skill of our teachers. Our teachers meet in teams to collaboratively plan their lessons and review the results of their instruction by analyzing student work and assessments. In addition, our Math curriculum has included innovative practices such as frequent use of manipulatives and real life applications.

In looking at our subgroups, there are several points worth mentioning. Because of our high percentage of Asian students (particularly Cantonese-speaking), we do not have any other numerically significant subgroups (more than 10 in any grade) in racial or ethnic groupings. In other categories mentioned above, both our English Language Learners (ELL) and English Only (EO) students have made significant progress over the past five years. Our Special Education students have also made noticeable gains. Our grade level data shows that from 2004-2008, our third grade lagged behind the other grades tested (Grades 2, 4 & 5) on the California Standards Test (CST). Looking back, the achievement drop in third grade seems attributable to several factors. In general, there is a drop in third grade state-wide due to a stark difference in testing format compared to second grade, as well as an increase in the number of tests third graders need to take. Lack of cohesion amongst the teaching staff in our third grade also accounted for the discrepancy. In 2008-09, we restructured our teaching assignments and created a new teaching team in the third grade. In addition, the State of California eliminated a second test that was given only to third graders. As a result, in the 2009 CST, the achievement of our third grade students increased dramatically from the previous year.

The rigor of California's assessment system is widely acknowledged as is the stringency of our definition of "meeting the standard." The state performance levels are as follows: 1. Advanced, 2. Proficient, 3. Basic, 4. Below Basic, and 5. Far Below Basic. California defines "Proficient" as "meeting the standard," which means a score of 66% or above on the California Standards Test (CST). The California Department of Education website can provide information related to the state assessment system and can be found @ <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/>

2. Using Assessment Results:

At Lincoln, assessment results are diligently analyzed on a routine basis. We expend much effort on looking at data to guide our instruction. Our unwavering focus on student learning and performance reaps huge rewards when coupled with our meticulous attention to data. Whereas in the past, our teachers have used end-of-unit assessments from our language arts anthology to gauge student learning, in the last few years, we have benefitted from district-generated assessments that are aligned to state standards. Administered every six weeks, these assessments created by the Oakland Unified School District are useful benchmarks of students' learning and are invaluable diagnostic tools to fine-tune our teaching and curriculum. The performance on the last district benchmark test is a good predictor of a student's upcoming CST result.

In the 2008-09 school year, we launched a cycle of inquiry about student learning using the new benchmark tests. Before each benchmark test, each teacher team answered the test questions and made predictions about student performance. Once the test results were available, they compared their predictions to actual results and analyzed any discrepancies. In addition, teachers engaged in item analysis and identified the most frequent student errors and misconceptions. Based on this, teachers formulated a reteaching plan whereby they would specifically address student deficiencies. Differentiated reteaching strategies allowed students who have mastered certain standards to be further challenged. This systematic analysis of student achievement data took place consistently throughout the year and this tireless effort yielded student performance improvements. Teachers affirmed that these standards-based assessments and the ensuing analysis empowered them to better understand student learning relative to curriculum standards.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

At Lincoln, we believe it is important to share information about student performance with the students themselves, as well as with their parents and the community. We are aware that as students move forward in their education and later in their careers, data from their academic performance and other measures will be used to represent their ability and will determine their access to important opportunities. In addition, as many of our students are from immigrant families and from families where English is not the primary language, it is important that we educate parents about the meaning of school assessments and their importance in a child's future.

Therefore we share with students and parents the results of student assessment as frequently as possible. With a large percentage of our students scoring proficient or advanced on the CST, we have frequent cause for celebration. At the beginning of each school year, we honor all of our students who score proficient or advanced on the Math or English/Language Arts section of the CST. We present these students with a certificate and a small prize. The students in turn share this success with their families. In addition, we actively share information about student performance throughout the year. We have four quarterly assessments in Math and English/Language Arts and we recognize their accomplishments in similar fashion by presenting at-grade level students with certificates. In addition, we acknowledge students who increased their performance by ten percent or above from the last benchmark. For our students who are struggling to meet benchmark, we diligently work with them to understand their areas of weakness and to create an intervention plan for improvement. For all students, we help them to understand their individual results and to set their own learning goals. Report cards are delivered to parents in conferences to communicate student progress. Teachers highlight successes and areas of concern for each student based on assessment data. In order to spread information about our results with the greater community, we use various forms of media such as the Internet (using our school website), local newspapers and television stations. We also publicly display our assessment results on bulletin boards throughout our school.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Lincoln Elementary School is fortunate to have had a long history of success in its mission to serve the children of Oakland. Through the hard work and determination of our staff, our students, our families, and our community, we have achieved success in many areas. As Oakland is a close knit community that is home to many diverse groups, at Lincoln we also feel an obligation to share our success and reach out to other schools in our city. Because of the academic success of our large Title 1 and English Language Learner population, many teachers and other Oakland school staff have requested to visit our school and observe our classrooms. Our teachers maintain a mentality of an “open classroom” where they are accustomed to their colleagues and visitors coming for observations. In addition, because of our reputation of using innovative instructional strategies in such areas as critical thinking and student engagement, others seek us out as a resource for new practices and often come to observe our teachers in action.

Finally, at Lincoln we have been through the process of several awards applications, such as the California Distinguished School Award. In preparing our application, we were greatly assisted by other schools that were familiar with the process and could lend us insight about the application and its requirements. In turn, we have assisted other schools that wanted to learn about our experience. Furthermore, at Lincoln, we do not view ourselves as a single entity, rather, we see ourselves as part of a greater community having a singular goal of educating children. We embrace every opportunity to reach out to others.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Our school implements our district adopted core curriculum in both English/Language Arts and Math. The Open Court Reading curriculum is a comprehensive phonics-based language arts curriculum that successfully meets the needs of our English Language Learners. In addition to Open Court Reading, we also use novels to teach literature units in upper grades. In writing, we employ thinking maps to help students plan their writing. Our fourth grade teachers prepare their students for the state writing assessment by delivering writing instruction in three genres: narrative, summary and response to literature. An accumulation of repertoires and a wealth of teaching resources over the years have been distilled and refined into a stellar writing program that enables even struggling writers to produce reasonable work. Writing conferences are an essential part of this program as well.

Our Math program is a hands-on curriculum that emphasizes solving real-life problems. In addition, the program effectively scaffolds Math vocabulary and solving word problems which are important to our English Language Learners. Both the English/Language Arts and Math curriculum are guided by a pacing plan that covers the state standards. Every quarter, students take an assessment to measure their learning in relation to the standards.

Science and Social Studies are rigorously implemented here at Lincoln. Our Science curriculum is activities-based and aligned to state standards. Further information about our Science program can be found under question #3.

Central to our instruction with the goal of improving student learning are four focus areas: 1. Standards-Based Instruction, 2. Student Engagement, 3. Critical Thinking, and 4. English Language Development.

Standards-based instruction is exemplified by standards-based lesson planning and delivery with a learning objective integrated throughout the lesson. Frequent assessments are used to measure our students' understanding of the standards.

Regarding student engagement, our staff has been trained on strategies proven nationwide to increase student interest and enthusiasm in classroom instruction. In all of our classrooms, our teachers incorporate cooperative learning structures to increase student learning, engagement and accountability. We believe that our students must be held accountable to fully participate in classroom learning. Our engagement structures contain clear and specific tools to give students opportunities to learn new material and procedures and to allow them to practice what they have learned.

In honing our students' critical thinking skills, our teachers use thinking maps across all curricula area. These maps are eight graphic models (maps) that represent common brain functions (i.e., sequencing, cause and effect, compare and contrast, classifying, making analogies, describing, defining in context, and whole-part relationship). Our teachers have integrated these maps into their lessons to maximize students' processing of content, encouraging students to think critically about subject matter. Furthermore, our teachers use prompts of depth and complexity (such as change over time, multiple perspectives, ethics) to encourage students to explore universal themes. These specific thinking strategies force students to probe deeper into subject content and draw connections to derive "Big Ideas."

In the area of English Language Development, "Language for Learning" for grades K-1 and "Language for Writing" for grades 2-3 are proven district curriculum that have continuously moved our English Language Learners towards English proficiency.

We are very proud of Lincoln's outstanding performing arts program. For the past fifteen years, we have been home to the Purple Bamboo Orchestra, the only elementary traditional Chinese music orchestra in the United States. Each year, 50 of our students participate in this program under the instruction of a master Chinese Music teacher who we retain on our staff. Many of our children, having graduated from the Purple Bamboo, have gone on to perform professionally. Additionally, a separate youth choral program, Cantare Con Vivo, comes to our school and instructs our children in singing, bringing music literacy to a higher level.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

Our district's reading curriculum, Open Court Reading (OCR) is a basal reading program that is designed to systematically teach decoding, comprehension, inquiry and investigation, and writing. Lincoln has been using this program for the past ten years with favorable results. We have found that certain components of the program, including sounds and letters, phonics, fluency and word knowledge, have been especially helpful for our students who are primarily English Language Learners. The curriculum also emphasizes reading for understanding with literature, comprehension, inquiry and practical reading applications. A final aspect of OCR focuses on communication skills such as spelling and vocabulary, writing process strategies, English language conventions, speaking and penmanship, and basic computer skills. This comprehensive curriculum addresses a myriad of needs and is a strong foundation upon which further enrichment is built.

Beyond OCR, supplementary literature units, English Language Development curriculum for newcomers, outside reading programs done in cooperation with local libraries, all play a part in making Lincoln's reading program a model that other schools aspire to. As previously mentioned, cooperative learning and critical thinking strategies are bread and butter at Lincoln to increase student literacy, particularly with regards to reading comprehension. Cooperative learning strategies have successfully engaged and encouraged students to use more oral language to process their learning and verbalize thought. This multi-faceted approach to reading instruction ensures that our students are successful.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

We take seriously the findings of the National Research Council* which informs us that early exposure to positive science learning experiences leads to higher degrees of success in high school science courses and beyond. We know that studying science provides our students with important 21st century skills, such as problem solving, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration.

Our Science curriculum is a standards-based, hands-on curriculum developed at the University of California, Berkeley that emphasizes experiential and inquiry-based learning. All grades work on the same science strand each trimester. During the life science cycle, for example, second graders may be monitoring the life cycle of various insects while third graders may be growing plants hydroponically and investigating the effects of various chemicals added to water. Through collaborative teamwork, students use scientific inquiry opportunities to develop creative, problem solving, and critical thinking abilities.

Our science room complements our curriculum with its collection of tools for investigative activities, science related objects, and many live animals. Students learn how to care for animals, solve problems, and design investigations. At the same time, they get to work on developing social skills, while their scientific curiosity is being nurtured and fed. The room is open to all classes during instructional time and accessible by students during recess. Students at Lincoln love the freedom to explore and learn amidst friends, animals, and a nurturing staff person in a kid-friendly atmosphere.

*The National Research Council (2007). Taking Science to School: Learning and Teaching Science in Grades K-8. The National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

At Lincoln, we believe in meeting the individual needs of all our students through creative instructional methods. After analyzing assessment data, teachers create groups for re-teaching and develop material and strategies to meet areas of deficiencies in language arts and math. Low-performing students receive intervention in the form of pull-out help provided by instructional assistants, peer teaching, use of two electronic intervention support programs called Waterford and SuccessMaker, and differentiated teaching and homework assignments.

Working in close partnership with coaches, our highly-qualified teachers use a wide variety of instructional strategies to optimally engage all students in crucial curriculum content. Most outstanding among the many excellent practices are the consistent use of Kagan Strategies across all grade levels, effectively increasing student engagement in a remarkable way. Also impressive is the employment of Thinking Maps as a tool to scaffold difficult content and to train up thinking skills, providing students with the tools to be successful in independent work. An example of how Thinking Maps are effective is the use of these organizers to break down word problems in Math. Step by step, English Learners move from untangling a jumble of incomprehensible words, to designing a strategy to solve the problem, to finally finding a solution. Through the use of Thinking Maps, students learn to break down large tasks into systematic small steps. Furthermore, for our GATE program, our teachers embrace the prompts of depth and complexity for those who are ready for greater challenge. Students are encouraged to delve deep into literature, science, mathematics, and social studies, and engage in inquiry-based investigations. Lower elementary teachers capture an enthusiastic audience by utilizing many hands-on teaching methods in math and science. In bilingual classrooms, use of first language instruction also makes content accessible to younger English Learners and newcomers to this country.

5. **Professional Development:**

At Lincoln, our dedicated staff meets every Wednesday as a whole school or within circuit groups to share ideas, align curriculum to state standards, expand our instructional repertoire, and improve our teaching in all sorts of ways. Our instructional leadership team gives input to plan a power-packed professional development schedule around our four instructional focus areas.

Standards-Based Instruction: Building on successes of previous school years, we use district benchmark assessment results to provide valuable information to drive our instruction. District benchmarks, which are standards-based diagnostic assessment tools, are administered three to four times a year. In each assessment cycle, circuits meet together to align our curriculum to the standards assessed during that cycle and to plan instruction accordingly. At the end of the cycle, when assessment results are available, teachers carefully analyze these results and identify areas of strength and weakness by standard strands. Then working in grade circuits during professional development time, teachers pull out their toolboxes of strategies and instructional resources to build an effective re-teaching plan to address needs. Through this continuous effort, we are able to reach our goal of school-wide standards-based instruction.

Critical Thinking: Lincoln School is the front-runner in our district in bringing prompts of depth and complexity to our classrooms. Our first encounter with this strategy was two years ago at a CAG (California Association of the Gifted) convention. This resulted in many subsequent training sessions at our school site with experts in this field. A number of our teachers and administrators have also visited schools in Southern California, known to be exemplary practitioners of these methods. These strategies can be easily integrated into all subject areas and add relevance to subject matter, resulting in increase in student learning. We have also had trainers for thinking maps visit us on many occasions and have provided tools to help us teach students to develop critical thinking.

Student Engagement: For several years, we have been practicing engagement strategies in our classroom to improve student engagement. Multiple training and coaching sessions later, our staff have mastered and consistently use many engagement structures in the classroom on a regular basis. During professional development time, circuits share successes and point out pitfalls in practices. (see discussion of engagement strategies in response to Question #1 – Curriculum)

Professional Development Focus—Professional Learning Communities

Our school has recently adopted the collaboration model of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and it is now wholeheartedly embraced by the faculty here. Whereas collaboration has always taken place at Lincoln, it has since taken on new meaning and structure. PLCs, now a necessary part of our professional development calendar, inspire exciting collegial discoveries and innovations in teaching. “How can we do this better? What worked and what didn’t? What is it that the students didn’t understand?” are questions we ask each other in the PLC meetings.

Since the inception of all these professional development initiatives, student achievement has risen steadily for both Math and Language Arts across all grade levels. In addition to site-based professional development opportunities, our staff engage in other learning options, such as weekend retreats, district and site-based training programs over the summer, attending conferences and conventions within the state, and engaging in personal professional development, such as going through the rigorous National Board Teacher Certification Program. At present, we have one National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) at our site.

6. School Leadership:

A school principal has to struggle with the competing demands of school operations and instructional leadership. While some stay mainly as an operations manager, I wholeheartedly embrace my role and responsibility as an instructional leader and consider student achievement my highest priority. In addition, in my leadership role, I am supported by an Assistant Principal and a Lead Teacher and we collaborate to guide the school in its decisions and policies. As an administrative team, we actively seek out input from our teachers, students, parents, and community. To encourage teacher leadership, we have created two leadership teams: an Instructional Leadership Team, and a School Climate Leadership Team. We meet regularly and make decisions about school policies. We also have a Student Council where student leaders are trained to be involved in school-wide decision making and events planning. Finally, we have an active Parent Club along with strong parent representation on our School Site Council, which makes decisions about school priorities and budgeting.

In all of our decisions, we keep student learning and achievement at the forefront of our consideration. As previously mentioned, our instructional program is guided by four focus areas that have been determined by student performance. When our School Site Council (SSC) meets at the beginning of the school year to begin to develop our school plan, we spend a lengthy period analyzing our students’ performance to understand strengths and needs.

Ultimately, our vision and mission statements are guiding beacons to steer us down the right path leading to high student achievement and success. We all believe that, given the right conditions, all of our students can learn and be successful. It is up to us, the adults, the leaders, to create the conditions for student learning and success. With every decision we have to make, we ask ourselves, "Will it benefit our students? Will it help them achieve?" We are never quite satisfied, knowing that there is always more that we can do, there are always ways we can help our students get a little farther ahead. Inspired by our community's thousand year old value of education, we are committed to help our students reach their future dreams through academic success.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Education Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	97	96	86	96	97
Advanced	73	68	71	80	79
Number of students tested	100	100	94	101	97
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	98	98
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	97	96	87	96	97
Advanced	69	29	69	80	79
Number of students tested	67	82	74	100	97
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	97	97	85	96	98
Advanced	73	71	72	79	84
Number of students tested	88	89	67	89	81
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: California's Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program is an important part of the state assessment and accountability system. Administered annually in the spring in grades two through eleven, the STAR Program was first authorized in 1997 and is updated annually. The principal developer of the STAR tests is the Educational Testing Service. Tests in the STAR Program measure how well students in California public schools are learning the knowledge and skills identified California's content standards. The STAR system consists of four assessments.

California Standards Tests (CSTs) measure students' achievement of California's content standards for English–language arts, mathematics, science, and history–social science. The CSTs are administered in grades two through eleven.

The California Modified Assessment (CMA) measures students' achievement of California's content standards for English–language arts, mathematics, and science. This assessment is for students with disabilities who meet CMA eligibility criteria approved by the State Board of Education.

The California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) measures students' achievement of California's content standards for English–language arts, mathematics, and science. This alternate assessment is for students who have significant cognitive disabilities and cannot take the CSTs or CMAs.

The Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS) measure students' achievement of California's content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics in Spanish. This assessment is for students who are Spanish-speaking English learners. The STS series is administered in grades two through eleven.

(this note applies to all data tables)

Subject: Reading

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Education Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	89	92	84	78	71
Advanced	66	55	55	56	35
Number of students tested	100	100	94	101	97
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	98	98
Number of students alternatively assessed				1	
Percent of students alternatively assessed				1	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	88	94	87	89	71
Advanced	61	55	53	55	35
Number of students tested	67	82	74	87	97
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	89	93	82	90	68
Advanced	67	56	48	56	35
Number of students tested	88	89	67	89	81
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: California’s Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program is an important part of the state assessment and accountability system. Administered annually in the spring in grades two through eleven, the STAR Program was first authorized in 1997 and is updated annually. The principal developer of the STAR tests is the Educational Testing Service. Tests in the STAR Program measure how well students in California public schools are learning the knowledge and skills identified California’s content standards. The STAR system consists of four assessments. The Standards-based Tests in Spanish (STS) measure students’ achievement of California’s content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics in Spanish. This assessment is for students who are Spanish-speaking English learners. The STS series is administered in grades two through eleven.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Education Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	98	89	94	86	87
Advanced	74	59	79	68	64
Number of students tested	95	95	97	99	120
Percent of total students tested	99	99	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	99	88	95	91	88
Advanced	75	59	78	71	64
Number of students tested	76	74	81	82	119
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	96	78	89	87	77
Advanced	63	43	63	62	43
Number of students tested	52	47	38	55	56
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: Note- the definition of "Socioeconomically Disadvantaged" changed from 2004-05 to 2005-06.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Education Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	67	51	69	50	48
Advanced	27	19	23	20	18
Number of students tested	96	95	97	99	120
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	67	48	66	53	48
Advanced	28	16	17	20	18
Number of students tested	76	74	81	81	119
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	48	23	39	37	27
Advanced	10	4	0	11	2
Number of students tested	52	47	38	54	56
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	96	92	87	85	79
Advanced	83	74	63	62	59
Number of students tested	87	93	93	123	103
Percent of total students tested	94	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	2				
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	94	92	90	85	79
Advanced	81	21	65	61	59
Number of students tested	70	78	80	108	103
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	92	89	75	68	58
Advanced	70	74	50	41	25
Number of students tested	37	34	20	49	36
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Education Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	85	85	73	72	56
Advanced	60	51	40	44	27
Number of students tested	85	93	93	123	103
Percent of total students tested	91	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	87	85	74	71	56
Advanced	59	49	40	40	27
Number of students tested	68	78	80	108	103
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	70	70	35	43	20
Advanced	31	32	0	8	3
Number of students tested	36	34	20	49	36
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Education Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	90	75	80	76	69
Advanced	61	46	40	46	40
Number of students tested	87	89	123	93	109
Percent of total students tested	98	98	100	99	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	2				
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	88	80	79	76	69
Advanced	56	47	37	45	40
Number of students tested	75	74	108	86	109
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	65	52	36	53	36
Advanced	15	14	4	19	6
Number of students tested	20	21	25	26	33
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Education Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient	79	62	61	60	57
Advanced	44	26	28	23	21
Number of students tested	85	89	123	93	109
Percent of total students tested	96	98	100	99	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	2				
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
Proficient	76	76	57	76	57
Advanced	38	38	32	31	21
Number of students tested	73	73	108	86	109
2. African American Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
Proficient	34	34	60	54	15
Advanced	6	6	26	19	3
Number of students tested	18	18	74	26	33
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
Proficient					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: