



## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

11CA8

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 2010-2011 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 2005.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.
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

1. Number of schools in the district: 6 Elementary schools  
 (per district designation) 1 Middle/Junior high schools  
0 High schools  
0 K-12 schools  
7 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 8637

## SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Small city or town in a rural area
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 6
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade                            | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |  |           | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|----------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK                             | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | <b>6</b>  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| K                                | 38         | 30           | 68          |  | <b>7</b>  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 1                                | 25         | 34           | 59          |  | <b>8</b>  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 2                                | 25         | 28           | 53          |  | <b>9</b>  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 3                                | 32         | 22           | 54          |  | <b>10</b> | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 4                                | 32         | 26           | 58          |  | <b>11</b> | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 5                                | 30         | 16           | 46          |  | <b>12</b> | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| <b>Total in Applying School:</b> |            |              |             |  |           |            |              | <b>338</b>  |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
0 % Asian  
1 % Black or African American  
97 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
2 % White  
0 % 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 2009-2010 school year: 16%

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, 2009 until the end of the school year.   | 32   |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year. | 22   |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].                                                      | 54   |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009                                                      | 338  |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).                                       | 0.16 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.                                                                              | 16   |

8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school: 80%

Total number of limited English proficient students in the school: 270

Number of languages represented, not including English: 1

Specify languages:

Spanish

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 100%  
 Total number of students who qualify: 338

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-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 10%  
 Total number of students served: 34

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>0</u> Autism                | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>0</u> Deafness              | <u>0</u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>20</u> Specific Learning Disability         |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>14</u> Speech or Language Impairment        |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment    | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation    | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed               |

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

|                                       | Number of Staff  |                  |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                       | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
| Administrator(s)                      | <u>1</u>         | <u>0</u>         |
| Classroom teachers                    | <u>19</u>        | <u>0</u>         |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>1</u>         | <u>1</u>         |
| Paraprofessionals                     | <u>0</u>         | <u>3</u>         |
| Support staff                         | <u>2</u>         | <u>16</u>        |
| Total number                          | <u>23</u>        | <u>20</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: 19:1

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

|                             | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance    | 97%       | 98%       | 97%       | 96%       | 96%       |
| Daily teacher attendance    | 94%       | 98%       | 96%       | 96%       | 96%       |
| Teacher turnover rate       | 12%       | 0%        | 13%       | 6%        | 13%       |
| High school graduation rate | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

1. Data not available for daily teacher attendance in years 2007-2008, 2006-2007, 2005-2006 so estimates from average of 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 were used.
  2. Turnover rate in 2009-2010 due to teacher layoffs triggered fiscal cutbacks.
  3. Turnover rate in 2007-2008 due to teacher transfers.
  4. Turnover rate in 2005-2006 due to one transfer and one resignation.
14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

|                                            |                  |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Graduating class size:                     | <u>0</u>         |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | <u>0%</u>        |
| Enrolled in a community college            | <u>0%</u>        |
| Enrolled in vocational training            | <u>0%</u>        |
| Found employment                           | <u>0%</u>        |
| Military service                           | <u>0%</u>        |
| Other                                      | <u>0%</u>        |
| <b>Total</b>                               | <b><u>0%</u></b> |

Grace S. Thille Elementary School is 65 miles northwest of Los Angeles in Santa Paula, California, 14 miles east of Ventura. The small town is located in the agriculturally rich Santa Clara River Valley surrounded by rolling hills and mountains and circled by citrus and avocado groves beside. Highway 126 bisects the community as it links the Pacific Coast to Magic Mountain in Valencia.

This rural K-5 school was built in 1940 and named for one of the first female doctors in California, a longtime resident of Santa Paula. Thille currently serves 368 students. Student subgroups reflect 97% Hispanic, 80% English Language Learners, 1% African American, and 2% Caucasian populations. 100% of students are considered Socio-economically disadvantaged and eligible for free/reduced meal programs.

In 2006, Thille School was one of the lowest performing schools in the district. At the time, AYP reflected 28% of grade 2-5 students testing Proficient or Advanced in English/Language Arts and 40% Proficient or Advanced in Mathematics. Over a five-year period, English/Language Arts jumped from 28% to 60%, a 32% increase; Mathematics increased to 83%, a 43% jump. English Learner progress reflected the same growth rate as the total school.

Success for students is reflected in a Triple A culture emphasizing Academics, Attitude, and Attendance. Staff members routinely recognize students for both achievement and improvement in academics, citizenship, sportsmanship, and perfect attendance. The School Mission statement reads: "At Thille Elementary School we provide all students with a positive and challenging learning environment which empowers them to become life-long learners. All students are taught skills that will support them as they make choices directly affecting their lives through high expectations, a strong integrated standards-based curriculum, and implementation of programs that address the needs of the whole child assuring student success now and in the future. We encourage students to value and pursue their current and future educational goals."

The staff focuses on success rather than excuses. Most students arrive daily with challenges tied to poverty, lack of English language skills, gaps in prior knowledge and family hardships, but staff members are committed to making Thille a home to every student, encouraging them daily to learn, grow and turn dreams into productive plans that can become their reality.

The school has received multiple awards recently, including the California Department of Education's California Distinguished School Award, the Shining Star Award for an exemplary Outreach Program and the Academic Achievement Award. Thille was also honored as a Title I Achieving School, California Business for Education Excellence Honor Roll School in 2009 and was a featured achieving school at the Summer 2010 California Association of Latino Superintendents and Administrators (CALSA) conference.

Changes occurred gradually as a new principal worked with staff members to identify academic achievement problems, explore solutions and set a new direction and expectations. As a result, staff committed to a course of action that included release time for professional development and coaching from expert instructional consultants who joined staff efforts as active team members and partners. Together they built collaborative systems and structures designed to improve student achievement. This included grade level specific pacing plans for teaching priority standards, aligning rigorous trimester assessment of ELA and Math standards and dedicated time for data analysis and action planning by teachers.

Analysis and data revealed that inadequate English language skills and academic vocabulary created major gaps and barriers to learning at all grade levels and that inconsistent schoolwide practices were diluting hard work and focus.

Staff received training, time and support in how to: make complex standards accessible to students, analyze and use data to make instructional decisions, embed academic vocabulary instruction and implement high impact teaching strategies, especially direct instruction. Grade level teams had help with initial collaborative planning sessions and, as processes became routine, facilitation passed to trained grade level leaders who then developed new grade level leaders. Structured planning focused on quality first instruction. Next, targeted interventions began to spread across classrooms providing new levels of support for identified students. Students falling one or more years behind receive additional support during and after school instruction offered by nearly every member of the faculty, each one making sure that students from all classes are included.

The principal took an active lead in establishing schoolwide expectations in every classroom, meeting with teachers and grade level teams to discuss progress and problems while nurturing innovative, research-driven strategies to close the achievement gap. Her primary tools were focus, modeling and communication as she championed an urgent agenda for students. Staff celebrated success, shared problems and analyzed every initiative for impact and results.

Culture and community perceptions shifted positively as students made academic progress and individual accountability became measureable and tangible. This school has turned the corner and there is no going back!

## 1. Assessment Results:

Thille assessment results for the past five years are available online at the district website, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/> under the Curriculum & Instruction link. From the C&I home page, access the link listed in the box of bulleted categories on the right, Adequate Yearly Progress Reports. Included there are School Reports for Thille (Grace) School for 2005-06 through 2009-10 are posted.

Student achievement trends over the past five years at Thille School have shown dramatic improvement in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics based on annual CA Content Standards Test (CST) scores. California students are tested in Grades 2-11 in English/Language Arts and Mathematics. Fifth grade students also take the CST Science Test. Scores are divided into five performance bands that include Advanced and Proficient levels and non-proficient levels (Basic, Below Basic and Far Below Basic). State API and federal AYP targets for elementary schools are tied to these results and demand not just overall scores that meet targets; every subgroup deemed significant (typically 10 or more students) must also reach the same targets.

The state permits two alternative assessments for special education students. The CA Modified Assessment (CMA) is an alternative for special education students who have scored Below Basic or Far Below Basic on CST assessments in the prior year and may have taken the CST with modifications. Fluctuation over three years varied between 4 and 12 students based on eligibility criteria and current enrollment. A second alternative test is the CA Alternative Performance (CAPA) for special education students who have taken the CAPA Level 2-5 the past two years and have received either a Proficient or Advanced score in both years. No Thille students were tested using CAPA in the past five years.

Over the past five years, Thille's state test scores have more than doubled in ELA and Mathematics. ELA scores on CST jumped from having 22% of students Proficient or Advanced to 60%. Mathematics scores on the CST increased from 32% of students Proficient or Advanced to 83% five years later.

In analyzing EL performance which includes 80% of our students, Thille has increased its three Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) targets for EL students. In California, AMAO 1 measures the percent of students making adequate annual progress in learning English at the rate of one level per year. AMAO 2 measures the percent of EL students reaching English proficiency on the CELDT (CA English Language Development Test) assessment. AMAO 3 monitors EL student progress on state CST assessments in both ELA and Math in relation to both test participation rates and proficient or above performance scores:

AMAO 1: Over the past four years, EL students have exceeded state targets for CELDT by at least 7% every year with 71% of EL students making appropriate annual progress.

AMAO 2: The percent of students achieving English proficient levels on the CELDT for the past four years have also exceeded state targets by at least 9% and as much as 22%.

AMAO 3: For the past five years the EL student subgroup has met or exceeded state AYP performance targets with Proficient or Advanced scores in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics.

The special education population at Thille has remained fairly stable over the past five years, fluctuating between 15 to 18 students with specific learning disabilities who are served through a Resource Specialist Teacher. The RSP teacher works collaboratively with general education teachers during English Language Arts instruction and provides small group and individual intervention support primarily in Language Arts and Mathematics.

As CST content scores were disaggregated and analyzed, teachers found that in ELA students typically have higher scores in specific strands or clusters including Literary Response and Analysis which is typically a lower priority strand when compared to others in state testing blueprints. Throughout the school, relatively lower scores are common in the Writing Strategies strand which is a high priority

strand. Teachers have responded by emphasizing and improving instruction in Writing Strategies and Reading Comprehension strands.

In Mathematics, teachers found higher performance across tested grade levels in Number Sense strands including Place Value and Addition and Subtraction and in Algebra and Functions in Grade 4. Relatively lower scores included the Statistics and Probability strand which is not as heavily weighted as other Mathematics strands in elementary grades but is now addressed specifically and strategically across grade levels. Measurement and Geometry scores have increased in recent years as teachers deliberately revised pacing plans to make sure material covered too late in the mathematics text is introduced and mastered earlier in the year.

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

Thille teachers first established collaborative schedules and protocols to analyze data in grade level and schoolwide settings. They continue to address facts and explore reasons why some students succeed while others do not and use these findings to make the instructional difference.

Initial data confirmed that lack of English language and academic vocabulary posed barriers to learning. Teachers found curriculum that was inconsistently implemented from class-to-class, materials insufficient to support struggling students and lessons that failed to provide appropriate cognitive rigor. To address these gaps, staff set goals to: 1) routinely analyze data and content standards, 2) align materials and instruction to target students and standards, 3) plan and implement together, and 4) adjust instruction, when and however necessary, to help every student succeed.

When personnel and/or contract issues arise, principal and staff work with district and union leadership to support teachers based on a belief that *No Teacher Left Behind* is as true as *No Child Left Behind*. Instruction is driven by “accountable” agreements, prioritized essential standards, current data, flexible pacing guides and best practices.

Benchmark assessments in reading, math and writing occur every 4-6 weeks. Teachers share classroom observations and student work. Grade levels conduct frequent planning sessions resulting in week-long lesson plans that articulate whole group, small group and individual instruction as well as common interventions. Lessons include content and language objectives with an emphasis on English language acquisition and academic vocabulary. In recent years, EL students scoring at CELDT Levels 1-3 received additional out-of-class instruction from an ELD specialist four days a week in addition to district-mandated 30 minutes a day. This support was eliminated because of fiscal constraints, but each teacher now commits to two 30-minute periods of differentiated instruction during Universal Access in Language Arts based on data analysis and need.

Teachers developed detailed matrices that identified where, how often and how well standards are addressed within adopted materials. Teachers use this information routinely to “tag and flag” teacher materials using deliberate, purposeful notes that fill gaps and eliminate non-productive repetition. Teachers add vivid and concrete examples, target academic vocabulary, raise cognitive rigor, build connections, develop comprehension skills and expand strategies for questioning, practice and application.

Data reports move beyond traditional summaries and are organized by student, class, subgroup, strand/standard and responses. Error analysis reveals common misconceptions and teaching challenges that teams target through prevention or targeted and differentiated intervention.

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

In the fall, staff members meet in grade level teams to celebrate and analyze state test results from the previous spring. This is followed by a Friends of Thille meeting attended by 80-100 parents just prior to distribution of individual student reports to families. The bilingual principal details specifically what the

state Content Standards Test (CST) measures, what specific results mean, what is included in individual student reports, and what gaps and goals have been identified for subgroups, grade levels, and the whole school.

Parents analyze this report to understand how their student/s have achieved compared to national, state, and school targets as well as areas identified for individual growth, e.g., Writing Strategies. Parents also receive resources and ideas about how to help their students in specific strands and standards. The principal explains which gaps must be addressed or filled if students are to succeed at current grade levels. Parents are made aware of intervention strategies and programs offered by the school and district.

Teachers identify areas of strength to sustain promising practices. They then identify growth areas and target standards, strands, students, and subgroups. These grade level and schoolwide goals are quantified and shared with families, e.g., 66% of students scored proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension and a schoolwide or grade level goal has been set to have 80% of students score proficient or advanced in Reading Comprehension.

Report cards and parent conferences focus on individual student strengths and needs. Students in grades 1-5 move trains, cars, or animals to monitor their own progress based on ongoing formative measures. Students in grades 2-5 share this progress with families during conferences. Additionally grade 4-5 students explain their progress to parents using the gradual release of responsibility model. All parent conferences focus on progress, problems, and interventions within and after school as well as resources and strategies for extended learning at home.

Prior to state testing, families again receive a letter detailing school and individual student results, progress, and goals. STAR Sprint strategies, designed by grade level teams, provide targeted interventions. Every family receives a bilingual flyer, "Helping Your Child Achieve."

Just prior to state testing, all students attend the CST Celebration which rewards students from the previous year who achieved Advanced with Gold, Proficient with Silver, and Basic with Bronze medals. K-2 levels are included to build schoolwide motivation and recognition for academic achievement.

#### **4. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

Thille staff is extremely proud of its accomplishments and sincerely believes that positive results are due to the conscious decisions, cognitive changes and hard work teachers have made in their planning and teaching. However, they do not presume to offer models that other schools can automatically replicate but instead have tried to provide opportunities for others to observe, collaborate and adapt what works at Thille to fit local neighborhoods, contexts and communities.

A small school in a small district offers both limits and possibilities for sharing within and beyond district boundaries. Although there are six elementary schools in Santa Paula Elementary School District, each one has a unique personality and distinct differences rooted in history, precedents, politics and needs. Thille is currently the smallest of the six K-5 SPESD schools reflecting a population that has increased from 336 in 2005-06 to 368 in 2010-11. Staff has noticed increasingly urgent student needs similar to many schools in the district based on poverty, lack of prior knowledge and experience and difficult behavior issues. Changes in neighborhood demographics, national economics and migrant/immigrant patterns affect what we are both able to do, and what we must do, to help our students learn.

Our rate of achievement growth has outpaced many schools within and beyond our district and we regularly welcome visitors to the site but typically request that visitors provide us with feedback so that such sessions move beyond "show and tell" to opportunities for reflection and improvement.

We have learned that, with success, often comes a spotlight. The California Distinguished School Award and Title I Achieving School titles thrust our school into new collaborative circles where sharing best practices is an expected part of the recognition. Speaking with staff members and leaders from other achieving schools has introduced us to new strategies or adaptations that continue to renew our energy

and focus.

The principal and QES consultant shared the journey from Program Improvement status to Distinguished School Award as a featured school at the Summer 2010 CALSA conference. The Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office also featured Thille's success in the current February edition of Focus on Education distributed countywide.

## 1. Curriculum:

Core content curriculum includes four areas: English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and History/Social Science which are aligned to CA state content frameworks and standards. At Thille, content instruction complies with instructional time guidelines for benchmark, strategic and intensive intervention students.

In addition Thille staff members incorporate Fine Arts, Physical Education and technology with core content. For example, classroom teachers typically include Arts in conjunction with specific core lessons, i.e., readers' theatre or artistic illustrations of fictional events. This broader curriculum expands students' perspectives and connections.

Classroom teachers use the SPARK Physical Education curriculum to deliver standards-based lessons to their own students focusing on framework goals of movement skills and knowledge, self-image/personal development and social development.

The district employs a part-time music specialist and a part-time band teacher who work with classroom teachers to deliver instrumental and choral instruction to K-3 students and band to grade 4/5 students. These programs engage and expose students to selections, genre, instruments and strategies that build not only skills but connections and appreciation of the arts. Band participation has more than doubled in five years.

In all classes English/Language Arts blocks include 2.5 hours of explicit, direct instruction in Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening. Math includes 1.5 hours of explicit direct instruction with embedded mathematical vocabulary, problem solving skills and mental math. Science and History-Social Science are taught on alternate days or weeks and focus not only on content standards for these disciplines, but include priority ELA and Mathematics wherever and whenever connections are appropriate, e.g. teaching cause and effect to describe historical events or using mathematical data charts and/or statistics to organize science experiment results.

Teachers are highly aware of academic attention span and have been trained, supported and held accountable for routinely using multiple student engagement strategies. Teachers rarely if ever ask the perennial question, "Do you have any questions?" or move on when students fail to respond. Every classroom includes evidence of alternative strategies: individual white boards for instant responses, student sticks to ensure a random/strategic questioning, physical cues such as thumbs up or thumbs down to indicate responses or sticky notes to ensure no spectators input during brainstorming or review sessions.

Instructional blocks are designed around a Direct Instruction model which builds in strong orientation to each lesson including sharing both content and language objectives with students. Teachers focus student attention, assess current and prior knowledge (or misconceptions) and adjust as necessary.

Teaching typically includes frontloading or generating key vocabulary and academic language as well as providing clear definitions, demonstrations, exemplars and descriptions of attributes or component skills. Teachers supplement with vivid and concrete examples, realia or compelling questions to build connections and cement learning for students who may not have prior knowledge, concepts or vocabulary.

Checking for understanding is an ongoing process leading into, during and beyond lesson chunks. Teachers know which students are following or learning material before a test or culminating project demands mastery. Teachers often use "engagement rings," multi-colored index cards that describe interactive strategies to engage students in reflecting, sharing, discussing and processing information and skills. Teachers use these tools and processes to also monitor which students may need additional

clarification, instruction or intervention.

Practice and application follow direct instruction lessons and are strategically designed to include shared practice, guided practice and independent practice. As every teacher checks for understanding during these processes, students have multiple chances to clarify learning, confront misconceptions, add new information and apply content and skills in multiple contexts and formats. Whenever practical or appropriate, teachers provide real world contexts for practice and application so that students see themselves as writers, artists, scientists or scholars with real world audiences, peer critics and admirers.

Classroom assessment includes multiple products and processes that allow students to show what they know. Although Thille teachers routinely use standards-based, common district and state assessment results to plan their instruction, they are keenly aware that monitoring each student's progress is more than a test result. Teachers use daily observation, informal student conferences, portfolios of student drafts and student work, quick quizzes and classroom presentations and projects to measure student learning and their ability to apply these skills in multiple settings or situations.

## **2. Reading/English:**

The district and Thille were participants in California's Reading First initiative for six years. Thille has continued to use Reading First Assurances to maintain a consistent approach to reading using the Houghton Mifflin Reading (HMR) program which was adopted eight years ago. Last year the district engaged in a selection process to adopt new materials, but statewide funding challenges have put this adoption on hold. Special education teachers recently adopted and implemented new intervention materials using district criteria, processes and funding from the Special Education Teacher Professional Development grant.

A district-funded literacy coach was provided on site for six years at district expense and for one year at site expense; the position was eliminated this year. This coach provided staff development, modeling, coaching and resource support to help teachers implement HMR schoolwide, but especially at K-3 levels. She also facilitated interim assessments and data analysis as each grade level monitored student progress using logs, benchmark tests, Structured Teacher Planning Time (STPT) sessions and instructional intervention planning. The Literacy Coach helped grade level teams identify targeted standards in the HMR program to expedite strategic adjustments in pacing, instruction and interventions including expanded use of expository text in reading and writing.

Thille also had two reading specialists: a K-1 Reading Teacher who focused on students reading below grade level (including current grade 2 students reading at a first grade level), and a Grade 2-5 Reading Teacher who provided similar small group instruction for students in grades 2-5 who read one or more years below grade level. Although funding cuts eliminated these positions this year, every teacher has agreed to focus an additional two 30 minutes daily sessions on targeted reading instruction using Universal Access strategies to provide differentiated support.

Instructional Walkthroughs with administrators, reading specialists and peer teachers are commonplace and focus on identifying patterns and trends across Thille classrooms. Individuals and teams from within and beyond the district visit classrooms to observe specific target strategies and implementation of resources and provide feedback about what works or could be improved.

During 2009-10 the district volunteered to work as a DAIT district with the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office which implemented additional training in data analysis. Mandatory professional development continues to emphasize implementation of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) strategies throughout the district which have been incorporated within existing collaborative instructional design, data analyses and instructional planning processes.

### **3. Mathematics:**

Thille teachers have implemented the district-adopted, state-approved curriculum Harcourt Math Program for the past three years. Quarterly assessments embedded within the curriculum program have become part of the district assessment system and K-5 teachers administer these tests three times a year and analyze disaggregated results quarterly to monitor student progress and plan instruction.

This curriculum aligns with and addresses state standards and is supplemented by both materials and strategies specifically designed to help Thille students access concepts, skills and vocabulary necessary to achieve mastery of mathematics. Teachers have designed grade level activities, realia, worksheets and graphic organizers so that students can “see” place value represented in many ways as they develop their understanding of what each digit in a number represents. Teachers use math manipulatives and simple tools like number lines and graph paper to help older students understand negative numbers and equations.

Analysis of the results of state and district math assessments as well as daily observation, convinced teachers that too many students were entering kindergarten with little or no numeracy knowledge or skills. Early pre-Kindergarten and beginning of year math assessments were reviewed and revised to pinpoint specific gaps that students had, including identification of numerals and number words and responding item sets, counting, estimating experience, etc. Teachers used this information to design or frontload basic number sense lessons and experiences daily to provide a foundation on which to concretely build math concepts.

In addition to gaps in prior knowledge in upper grade math, teachers discovered the obstacle that lack of reading skills posed for students facing increasingly complex word problems. Math word walls, strategies to “read” math and sequential graphic organizers have offered students strategies to move from finding the right answer to discovering an alternative strategy for solving problems. Discussion, justification and reasons for responses have become a focal point of math lessons and dissecting challenging word problems and solutions has resulted in increasingly more rigorous math conversations across classrooms.

Universal Access time is now incorporated schoolwide across all grade levels. Based on the needs of individuals and small groups, teachers design and deliver targeted lessons to preview, re-teach, review or extend math lessons for specific students. Teachers credit this differentiation as well as efforts to fill foundation gaps, maintain grade level rigor and support, and provide concrete, practical strategies for making the difference in increased mathematics scores.

### **4. Additional Curriculum Area:**

Thille Science curriculum is directly aligned to state standards and is supported by the California edition of FOSS (Full Option Science System) materials developed through Lawrence Hall of Science at University of California, Berkeley. Content focuses on hands-on investigations designed to develop science literacy.

Thille teachers have been diligent and creative in fitting science into a California curriculum that mandates 2.5 hours a day for Language Arts, one hour for Mathematics, 30 minutes for English Language Development, and Physical Education instruction each week. Science is only assessed by the state in grade 5, but Thille has made a commitment to teach science at every grade level.

Investigations, developed collaboratively at each grade level, are delivered twice a week. The schoolwide instructional focus includes explicit development of vocabulary, scientific observation, note-taking skills, analysis of data and evidence to establish findings, confirm or challenge scientific hypotheses, and rigorous written conclusions. To meet diverse needs, teachers were trained in and incorporate SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) strategies to ensure comprehensible input and scaffolded support for students in need.

Grade levels focus on an articulated sequence of concepts, including Physical, Earth, and Life sciences. Instruction is organized in clearly-written modules based on scientific questions. Students answer these questions while recording observation details in science notebooks. Embedded assessments, including teacher observation, notebook entries, and “I-checks,” are used routinely to monitor progress. Teachers use guiding questions to develop concepts, scientific protocols to develop or challenge theories, non-fiction and fictional science stories to extend or elaborate key ideas, and science notebooks for reflection, analysis, and summary conclusions.

In 2006, the District provided training for grade 4 and 5 teachers. At Thille, K-3 teams developed training using teachers’ editions, teacher preparation videos, online resources, and FOSS materials and processes to design and deliver high-quality content. Lessons maintain clear outcomes so that students become familiar with the natural world using Physical, Earth and Life sciences. They also focus on “Big Ideas” and academic vocabulary in science, the integration of science and math concepts, and the application of the scientific process in learning and life. Science materials provide rich expository text for students to access and comprehend information. At Thille, the scientific process includes appropriate development of four components: 1) important questions and investigations, 2) careful observation skills, 3) organization and analysis of data and evidence, and 4) articulation of supported conclusions.

## **5. Instructional Methods:**

A great deal of research and training went into developing, refining and personalizing strategies to improve teaching and learning at Thille. Over the past five years, teachers have worked to perfect a model of Direct Instruction that presumes every student needs explicit, rich instruction accompanied by models and examples that extend beyond what is provided in Teacher Editions. They also presume that it is the teacher’s job, not the student’s, to engage the learner and check for understanding.

Given that 80% of Thille students are ELs and 100% come from socio-economically disadvantaged homes, teachers prioritize the need to embed language acquisition into all instruction everyday. Teachers include specific Language objectives as well as Content Lesson objectives that not only define what students will learn and be able to do at the end of a lesson, but also describe how students will use reading, writing, speaking and/or listening to achieve these objectives.

Modeling moves beyond providing routine examples and demonstrations. Teachers show students what completed products or skills look like in finished form. Teachers use rubrics to paint clear targets that clarify what steps students must take to continuously improve their work. Students use rubrics to understand expectations, self-evaluations, peer feedback and class reflections. Because children of poverty have few available structures to develop high level, formal thought and language, teachers provide models and structures as a routine part of every instructional day.

Since students do not learn in the same way or on the same day, teachers have invested time and planning on how to differentiate instruction while managing classrooms. During weekly collaboration meetings, grade levels focus on how to differentiate instruction. Teachers work collaboratively to select or develop supplemental materials to address missing content or rigorous concepts or skills. Although Universal Access time began as a feature of the HMR program, it is now a dedicated component of every teacher’s daily plan and has spread to Mathematics. Universal Access time provides teachers with deliberately planned, structured focus on targeted content for specific students or groups.

Teachers assess and regroup students every 6-8 weeks based on assessments required by the district. This includes the Independent Reading Inventory (IRI), Basic Phonics Skills Test (BPST), HMR Theme Assessments, quarterly and end-of-chapter math assessments. Special education students are also assessed using DIBELS and DRP by special education teachers trained to analyze data and plan instruction collaboratively.

## **6. Professional Development:**

Tailoring professional development based on student needs and teacher needs was a critical first step on the road to instructional improvement. We find ourselves now reviewing habits of data analysis, collaborative planning and accountable instruction with new staff members.

District leadership hired QES consultant services for three Program Improvement (PI) sites which included 30+ days over a three-year period at Thille. QES consultants worked with district leadership to integrate support for Reading First, ELD standards, writing and math instruction, benchmark assessments and data analysis. Site leadership, including School Site Council, ensured that staff had resources to focus on practices reflected in research and model schools but that were adapted to maximize local impact.

Teachers were first trained in detailed data analysis within Structured Teacher Planning Time (STPT) sessions. These were initially facilitated by a QES consultant with individual grade levels using common analysis tools, protocols and reporting forms. These are now facilitated by the principal and grade level teams.

Teachers also learned to dissect content standards to clarify embedded content and skills. With heightened awareness, they reviewed pacing plans identifying instructional gaps and duplications. For example, math pacing was adjusted to reorder a math strand that failed to provide sufficient teaching time, practice and academic vocabulary before the state test. When core curriculum fell short of instruction in and application of problem solving skills, staff designed a daily schedule and strategies to explicitly incorporate these critical skills and strategies.

Through ongoing data analysis, teachers uncovered barriers to learning which in turn generated tailored QES training on how to:

- teach using the Direct Instruction Model,
- actively engage struggling and unmotivated students,
- embed and make explicit vocabulary development and academic language within every lesson,
- incorporate higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy to increase teachers' level of questioning and students' level of responses,
- implement high impact strategies such as QAR (Question-Answer Relationships) to develop comprehension skills, and
- examine research to create instructional opportunities, including, "How Memory Leads to Long-Term Learning."

QES specialists also presented districtwide professional development for all elementary schools on Improving Writing Instruction (2007-08) and Mathematics Problem Solving (2008-09). Thille followed each session with site-specific planning to maximize impact.

An informal teachers' Breakfast Club uses the trainer-of-trainers model to keep one another abreast of research and best practices. Staff has learned that good teaching is more than a workshop, it's a collaborative journey.

## **7. School Leadership:**

Thille's success has evolved despite a district adjusting to its sixth superintendent in six years and a seventh on the way. During most of that period the school has been led by one principal that exhibits

unwavering perseverance and commitment to collaborative teaching and student success. Although Thille's student scores have more than doubled over five years in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics, her urgency and messages to mobilize those around her to improve education for the sake of children has not subsided.

It seems that her own experiences as an EL student, a capable teacher, a trained literacy coach, and a skilled administrator have developed personal certainties and uncertainties that provide her colleagues with a unique blend of humble open-mindedness and confident courage. She wears trademark tennis shoes because she's always on the run be it to teach, talk, model, coach in classrooms or to pose tough questions to staff and colleagues in meetings. She allows no "spectators" at Thille. Everyone is expected to actively participate in personal reflection, detailed data analysis, alignment of standards-based materials, implementation of specific high impact strategies, deliberate planning and ongoing intervention within and across classrooms.

Under her lead, staff members have become their own best researchers by following three simple guidelines. They trust one another to: 1) confront the data, 2) question any precedent or practice, including mandates, that fails to yield instructional results, and 3) assume responsibility for making learning more effective for students by changing what we do as teachers.

Our principal has fostered a team of professionals that embrace passionate and competent colleagues; they welcome newcomers through example, candor and collaborative support. The staff has developed a culture that focuses on improving teaching and learning to the extent that staff members can easily articulate what it means to be a "Thille Teacher."

Despite economic and demographic challenges, local politics and educational trends, the staff has remained steadfast in filtering distractions and aligning resources to the singular focus on instructional improvement. When issues arise that threaten to undermine the staff agenda or efforts, teachers are met with the mantra "Filter!", a constant reminder that outside distractions should not interfere with internal focus or progress.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 67        | 70        | 54        | 56        | 40        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 31        | 34        | 20        | 19        | 14        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 55        | 59        | 56        | 52        | 66        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 67        | 73        | 53        | 57        | 34        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 30        | 30        | 19        | 20        | 13        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 46        | 37        | 53        | 51        | 54        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 67        | 70        | 53        | 55        | 40        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 29        | 34        | 20        | 16        | 13        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 52        | 59        | 55        | 49        | 63        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 67        | 69        | 51        | 49        | 36        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 30        | 31        | 16        | 15        | 9         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 43        | 52        | 49        | 41        | 45        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 2 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 58        | 61        | 40        | 39        | 29        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 18        | 17        | 15        | 4         | 6         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 55        | 59        | 56        | 52        | 66        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 56        | 55        | 38        | 39        | 25        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 15        | 14        | 13        | 4         | 4         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 46        | 37        | 53        | 51        | 54        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 55        | 61        | 41        | 37        | 29        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 17        | 17        | 15        | 2         | 6         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 52        | 59        | 55        | 49        | 63        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 59        | 59        | 42        | 34        | 30        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 19        | 15        | 15        | 2         | 5         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 43        | 52        | 49        | 41        | 45        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 92        | 82        | 66        | 68        | 61        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 54        | 35        | 33        | 23        | 20        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 50        | 56        | 45        | 57        | 49        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 89        | 95        | 98        | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                | 5         | 4         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               | 10        | 7         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 90        | 88        | 68        | 68        | 66        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 57        | 34        | 34        | 22        | 22        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 42        | 36        | 44        | 55        | 41        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 92        | 83        | 65        | 68        | 61        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 54        | 37        | 30        | 23        | 21        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 50        | 53        | 43        | 57        | 48        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 91        | 86        | 64        | 67        | 57        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 53        | 37        | 26        | 19        | 18        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 45        | 44        | 34        | 43        | 38        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 63        | 49        | 21        | 34        | 26        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 23        | 17        | 5         | 5         | 4         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 53        | 54        | 44        | 57        | 49        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 95        | 92        | 96        | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                | 2         | 5         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               | 4         | 9         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 62        | 56        | 21        | 34        | 26        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 22        | 15        | 5         | 4         | 2         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 45        | 35        | 43        | 55        | 41        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 63        | 50        | 16        | 34        | 25        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 23        | 18        | 2         | 5         | 4         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 53        | 51        | 42        | 57        | 48        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 61        | 49        | 12        | 24        | 21        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 23        | 20        | 0         | 5         | 0         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 48        | 42        | 33        | 43        | 38        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 94        | 65        | 43        | 44        | 21        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 37        | 19        | 7         | 13        | 13        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 55        | 49        | 59        | 45        | 54        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 97        | 98        | 98        | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                | 2         | 1         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               | 4         | 2         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 93        | 61        | 43        | 44        | 25        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 41        | 13        | 5         | 15        | 15        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 47        | 32        | 57        | 41        | 43        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 94        | 64        | 44        | 44        | 21        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 39        | 17        | 7         | 13        | 13        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 52        | 48        | 58        | 45        | 54        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 91        | 65        | 31        | 39        | 15        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 23        | 9         | 5         | 11        | 10        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 32        | 35        | 40        | 36        | 44        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 65        | 51        | 45        | 35        | 23        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 27        | 17        | 12        | 13        | 8         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 53        | 48        | 58        | 45        | 54        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 93        | 96        | 97        | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                | 4         | 2         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               | 8         | 4         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 62        | 46        | 44        | 37        | 21        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 30        | 13        | 11        | 15        | 7         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 45        | 31        | 56        | 41        | 43        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 66        | 50        | 47        | 35        | 23        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 29        | 17        | 13        | 13        | 8         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 50        | 47        | 57        | 45        | 54        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 48        | 42        | 36        | 30        | 21        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 10        | 9         | 3         | 8         | 5         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 30        | 34        | 40        | 36        | 44        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 66        | 69        | 63        | 49        | 37        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 32        | 22        | 28        | 21        | 7         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 47        | 55        | 45        | 59        | 46        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 100       | 92        | 100       | 98        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                |           | 3         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               |           | 5         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 63        | 59        | 63        | 47        | 37        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 24        | 22        | 28        | 20        | 5         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 38        | 27        | 42        | 56        | 38        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 65        | 68        | 63        | 49        | 37        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 30        | 22        | 28        | 21        | 7         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 46        | 54        | 45        | 59        | 46        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 60        | 61        | 58        | 43        | 35        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 21        | 11        | 16        | 15        | 9         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 33        | 36        | 33        | 47        | 34        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: State of California

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 44        | 46        | 48        | 31        | 30        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 6         | 11        | 10        | 10        | 2         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 47        | 55        | 44        | 59        | 46        |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 100       | 92        | 98        | 98        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                |           | 3         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               |           | 5         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 42        | 45        | 46        | 31        | 32        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 8         | 15        | 10        | 9         | 3         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 38        | 27        | 41        | 56        | 38        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 44        | 44        | 48        | 31        | 30        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 7         | 11        | 10        | 10        | 2         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 46        | 54        | 44        | 59        | 46        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 33        | 36        | 33        | 29        | 32        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 3         | 8         | 0         | 6         | 3         |
| Number of students tested                                                | 33        | 36        | 32        | 47        | 34        |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 0

|                                                                          | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                            | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 83        | 72        | 57        | 56        | 40        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 38        | 27        | 20        | 19        | 13        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 207       | 219       | 205       | 213       | 215       |
| Percent of total students tested                                         | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                | 7         | 8         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                               | 3         | 5         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 83        | 73        | 57        | 56        | 40        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 38        | 25        | 20        | 19        | 14        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 173       | 132       | 196       | 203       | 176       |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 83        | 72        | 57        | 56        | 40        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 38        | 28        | 20        | 19        | 13        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 200       | 214       | 201       | 210       | 211       |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             | 83        | 72        | 54        | 51        | 36        |
| % Advanced                                                               | 33        | 23        | 15        | 15        | 11        |
| Number of students tested                                                | 153       | 167       | 156       | 167       | 161       |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>                                                            |           |           |           |           |           |

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 0

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | May       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 60        | 54        | 39        | 35        | 28        |
| % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 19        | 15        | 10        | 8         | 5         |
| Number of students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 208       | 216       | 202       | 213       | 215       |
| Percent of total students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 6         | 12        | 4         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 3         | 7         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>                                                                                                                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 59        | 55        | 38        | 35        | 27        |
| % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 19        | 14        | 10        | 7         | 4         |
| Number of students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 174       | 130       | 193       | 203       | 176       |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 59        | 55        | 39        | 35        | 28        |
| % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 19        | 16        | 10        | 8         | 5         |
| Number of students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 201       | 211       | 198       | 210       | 211       |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 58        | 52        | 35        | 29        | 26        |
| % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 15        | 13        | 5         | 5         | 3         |
| Number of students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 154       | 164       | 154       | 167       | 161       |
| <b>6.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b> In 2008-2009 the number of students taking alternative assessments was 12 because our site followed district criteria and tested all special education students who previously scored Far Below Basic and Below Basic on CST. |           |           |           |           |           |