U.S. Department of Education
2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I   [ ] Charter   [ ] Magnet   [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Ms. Eduwiges (Vicka) Llamas

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

Official School Name Calistoga Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1327 Berry Street

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

City Calistoga   State CA   Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 94515-1605

County Napa County   State School Code Number* 28-66241-6026744

Telephone 707-942-4398   Fax 707-942-0970

Web site/URL   http://www.calistoga.k12.ca.us   E-mail vllamas@calistoga.k12.ca.us

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

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

_____Date_____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Esmeralda Mondragon   E-mail: emondragon@calistoga.k12.ca.us

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

District Name Calistoga Joint Unified School District   Tel. 707-942-4703

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

_____Date_____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Ms. Indira Lopez

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

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

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

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

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school's application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) 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 configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) 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, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be 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.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.

6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.

7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.

8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

9. The 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.

10. 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.

11. 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 (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district   <u>1</u> Elementary schools (includes K-8)
    (per district designation):   <u>0</u> Middle/Junior high schools
                                                <u>1</u> High schools
                                                <u>0</u> K-12 schools

                                                <u>2</u> TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

    [ ] Urban or large central city
    [ ] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
    [ ] Suburban
    [X] Small city or town in a rural area
    [ ] Rural

3. <u>1</u> Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	5	3	8
K	33	31	64
1	27	34	61
2	42	33	75
3	45	34	79
4	33	29	62
5	27	35	62
6	24	33	57
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	236	232	468

5. Racial/ethnic composition of
   the school:

   0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
   1 % Asian
   0 % Black or African American
   85 % Hispanic or Latino
   0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   13 % White
   0 % Two or more races
   100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report 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.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 4%

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

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	**Answer**
(1) Number of students who transferred *to* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	16
(2) Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	5
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	21
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	468
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.045
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 65 %
   305 Total number ELL

   Number of non-English languages represented: 1
   Specify non-English languages: Spanish

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 76 %

   Total number students who qualify: 358

If this method is not 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.

9. Students receiving special education services: <u>9</u> %

                                                      <u>50</u> Total number of students served

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

1 Autism	1 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	2 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	23 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	20 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
2 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0 Multiple Disabilities	0 Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	2
Classroom teachers	21
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	4
Paraprofessionals	11
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	2

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1   <u>22:1</u>

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	98%	97%	95%	98%	90%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**
    Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

Post-Secondary Status	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.
    Yes   No X

    If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

Calistoga Elementary School (CES) is the sole elementary school in the Calistoga Joint Unified School District. The school is nestled in the rural town of Calistoga (pop. 5,208) in the northernmost region of Napa Valley, California. Students often come from homes of immigrant parents with limited formal education who lack English language skills and resources. Many of the local families are employed in domestic, hospitality or agricultural industries that abound within and around the Napa Valley. The Calistoga community is dependent upon their contributions to sustain the local economy. In response, close community partnerships have been forged with local non-profit groups and agencies including the Calistoga Family Center. A dedicated staff committed to closing the achievement gap supports Calistoga's high poverty, low literacy student population. Throughout the district, the presence of a strong collaborative environment allows all staff, parents and community to participate in a united support system that maintains a rigorous learning environment. This type of environment results in a student centered, data driven environment with a strong foundation in cohesive professional development, the use of technology as an integral teaching tool and the belief in the innate curiosity and love of learning inherent in all children.

Since the 2002-2003 school year CES had been identified as an under-performing school based on our performance on State Standardized Tests in English Language Arts and Math. Over 65% of the Calistoga students are English Language Learners (ELLs). Greater than 76% of all elementary students are identified as socio-economically disadvantaged. Demographically, the student population is stratified with greater than 88% of entering kindergartners identified as ELLs. These students are at the highest risk of school failure and they struggle to acquire basic skills for academic success. Strategic plans have been established to address student needs and fulfill the promise of our new motto: "Every Child by Name and Need". Plans included data analysis with accompanying SMART goals and actions, weekly collaboration focused on best practice and administrative monitoring of data and progress to focus professional development for the benefit of student achievement. The adopted strategies and practice have resulted in successfully reaching academic performance targets, measured by standardized tests, in all sub groups through a responsive, challenging instructional program that provides differentiated student support. The District mission statement was developed collaboratively by all stakeholders, and it is published in school communications and utilized as a reference for all school goals, planning and evaluation. Calistoga Elementary embraces our District mission:

We are a collaborative, culturally rich educational community where a rigorous and innovative curriculum prepares our students to be successful contributors to our global society.

Every student receives a rich and high quality education in a safe, supportive environment that promotes self-discipline, motivation and excellence in learning. The Calistoga teaching team and support staff joins with parents and the Calistoga community in assisting all students to become independent, self -supporting adults who will succeed in and responsibly contribute to the global community.

Administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, specialists and program leaders work collaboratively and dynamically together to analyze and support student learning. A school-wide commitment is ubiquitous within the realm of cohesive professional development with the expansion and refinement of Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) as a collegial environment for teachers to access and share innovative, research based instructional strategies that mirror the expectations of college and career readiness called for in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Teachers have four release days per year to meet as a grade level to analyze assessment data and develop strategic academic goals. In addition, instructional minutes were added to four school days to provide a one hour block of time per week for grade level collaboration time. This collaboration time is used to plan, refine and share strategies of best practice directly related to academic goals. Through this collaborative process three areas of emphasis have been identified as Calistoga's overarching work: targeting early childhood literacy, building a strong local accountability and assessment system, and moving to a data informed instructional model. For all students to be college and career ready for the 21st century, a vital and visible embodiment of the mission statement is the implementation of educational technology beginning with 1:1 iPads in kindergarten, leading to the rapid

adoption and purposeful use of educational technology throughout the school. Students experience the engaging, challenging, and engage in the rich in-depth knowledge that becomes accessible through the use of digital technology. Also contributing to the success are specialized programs for project based learning, after school homework, music, art, accelerated learning and physical fitness. All students participate in project based learning planned and implemented through teacher collaboration and supported by an Instructional Technology Coach. Teacher teams are flexible and may be organized by single grade level or cross-grade level. This flexibility encourages innovation and sharing of ideas, strengths and experience. After school homework support is organized by grade level in coordination with the robust on-site after school program provided by Boys and Girls Club. Often, teachers provide the academic manpower during a specific, dedicated homework time. Additionally, adult volunteers from the community provide tutoring in reading and math to individual and small groups of students after school. Accelerated learning is focused on technology and includes writing code, use of Google applications, and producing multi-media presentations. Accelerated learners are identified according to strategic plan guidelines as well as teacher nomination. Parents are encouraged to volunteer by assisting in their child's classroom or participating in several active parent organizations including the English Language Advisory Council. Once per month the principal hosts a morning Coffee and Conversation hour where parents learn about programs and engage in conversation with the principal and other attending administrators. The established professional protocols evidenced in PLC's, school wide integration of educational technology, and implementation of rigorous, strategic goals for academic success have become among the greatest strengths and foundation for future success of Calistoga Elementary students.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

A. The Standardized Testing and Reporting Program (STAR) consists of several key tests that are designed for the student's age and individual needs. These tests include the California Standards Test (CST). Standardized assessments identified for testing special education students with modifications are the California Modified Assessment (CMA) and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). The Standardized Testing and Reporting Program (STAR) results are evaluated and compared to state content standards using the following five performance levels: Advanced (exceeds state standards), Proficient (meets state standards), Basic, Below Basic and Far Below Basic. Students scoring at the Proficient or Advanced level meet state standards in that content area. Calistoga Elementary grades 2-6 were tested in ELA and Math. In addition, CST Science assessments were administered in 5th grade. Data for grades 3- 6 for the years 2010 through 2013 is presented. Beginning in 2011, and for the following two years, faculty members read, discussed, planned and implemented strategies and ideas taken from three books, "Brain Rules" by John Medina, "Mindset" by Carol Dweck and "Teach Like a Champion" by Doug Lemov. Teacher/administrator teams also attended trainings on the power of direct, explicit instruction. Instructional practice was modeled after these readings and trainings and formed a basis from which a common language and practice evolved at CES. Successful strategies were shared with colleagues at staff meetings, in weekly grade level collaboration and in subsequent Professional Development trainings. More recently teachers are adopting innovative best practices in inquiry based learning through PBL and CCSS strategies.

To ensure access to the curriculum taught exclusively in English, CES needed to focus on building English language vocabulary and determined that an English Language Development curriculum would be implemented. In the primary grades, there would be a dedicated time and systematic delivery method. In intermediate grades ELD would be integrated with ELA vocabulary curriculum. ELD instruction would be weighted heavily on vocabulary instruction, taught in both isolated and contextual forms.

Teacher/administrator teams also attended trainings on the power of direct, explicit instruction. Instructional practice was modeled after these readings and trainings and formed a basis from which a common language and practice evolved at CES. Successful strategies were shared with colleagues at staff meetings, in weekly grade level collaboration and in subsequent Professional Development trainings. More recently teachers have adopted innovative best practices in inquiry based learning through PBL and CCSS strategies.

ELD instruction evolved in 2011, when CES, responding to research that indicted a potential to build vocabulary in young children by the purposeful use of technology for ELD instruction, began the Kindergarten iPad program. CES adopted and adapted iPad technology specifically to address literacy in young children. The Digital Early Literacy (DEL) project began as a community partnership between NapaLearns, a non-profit organization, Calistoga Family Center, a family resource center, private community members and the Calistoga Joint Unified School District. Teachers used iPads to access digital story books, foundational skills applications and design activities to develop their receptive and expressive language. Teachers were also able to differentiate instruction for a single student based on individual language needs. At nearly the same time, intermediate teachers began to implement technology into ELD instruction through contextual research, projects and presentations. Technology allowed teachers and students to access visual and virtual resources that engaged students with the vocabulary they were learning. Teachers taught thematic lists of words to single groups of students using language scaffolds appropriate to their particular CELDT level, songs, chants, and total physical response. In grade level collaboration, teachers shared and refined ELD instructional strategies.

Local formative and benchmark assessment data is gathered monthly in ELA and Math and entered into an online reporting system. Student performance levels for local assessments are identified in the following groupings: Challenge (Advanced), Benchmark (at level), Strategic (approaching benchmark), and Intensive (far below benchmark/ at risk of failure). Students scoring at Benchmark or Challenge meet school standards for ELA.

B. Between the years of 2008 and 2013, Calistoga Elementary posted an overall API increase of +70 points. We believe this growth, and the stair step growth of each of our subgroups, particularly the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) and English Language Learner (EL), students is directly correlated to the shift in classroom teaching practices that were developed through the collaborative work we accomplished within our PLCs and our commitment to ongoing professional learning. In July of 2013, after 10 years of identification as an under-performing school, CES exited Program Improvement. With the addition of our focus on early literacy, improved progress on local assessments and English Language Development assessments in grades TK-3 has been evidenced.

In 2009 the gap in achievement between our White English Only students and our SED and EL students was addressed. As the data was carefully analyzed, clear inconsistencies were apparent. A significant variation from grade level to grade level was noted, with inconsistent fluctuations within cohort groupings. This school wide inconsistency indicated a need to standardize and refine instructional practices with a focus on meeting the needs of our predominantly EL and SED student population.

As a result, three areas of emphasis as our overarching work were identified: targeting early childhood literacy and English Language Development, building a strong local accountability and assessment system, and moving to a data informed instructional model.

One of the first steps to address the inconsistencies and the overall gap in achievement was to provide teachers with common formative assessments and training in data analysis and the development of Specific Measurable Attainable Realistic Timely (SMART) goals. Instructional pacing guides were established for both English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. Each grade level was released several times each year to participate in a full day of formative data analysis concluding with the development of specific grade level SMART goals. Students at academic risk were identified and intervention groups were formed. A structure to support differentiation was established and teachers were trained in how to develop "Universal Access" (UA) time. UA was scheduled in every classroom to support small group instruction. The needs of all students were met including students in need of intervention, students on grade level, and students in need of acceleration. This UA period was extended into both ELA and Math.

A renewed emphasis on teacher learning through the development and refinement of Professional Leaning Communities became our school wide norm. Both vertical and horizontal articulation provided teachers with significant insight and created a shared knowledge base.

Over the past five years we continued the development of annual pacing guides, grade level data analysis release days and SMART goals. Simultaneously, teachers participated in professional development to support the refinement of instructional practices and developed a peer observation protocol that provided rich insight into school wide instruction and improvement.

In 2011 the Digital Early Literacy program was introduced and unrolled in Kindergarten classrooms in order to provide the foundational vocabulary skills necessary for our EL students to succeed academically as they matriculated forward. Using iPads, students were provided targeted intervention through daily differentiated instruction in enhanced English vocabulary acquisition.

These combined factors have contributed to the significant gains in the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) as well as the local benchmark assessments. We expect continued growth in student achievement as students in the Transitional Kindergarten and Kindergarten progress through the academic program at Calistoga Elementary. In addition, we are currently exploring methods to assess and analyze student mastery of 21st century skills: communication, collaboration, critical thinking and creativity for all students.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Critical analysis of formative and summative assessments anchors the work of our collective team of district leaders, teachers, students and parents. Data is used to guide decision-making regarding resources, staff

development, instructional practices, and interventions. This will be accomplished by using student data to identify academic progress and provide strategies for differentiated instruction to support the specific needs of our students. In addition to CST and curriculum based formative assessments, student achievement is monitored through the use of technologically adaptive assessments, and performance tasks in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math.

A key element of our Strategic Action Plan is to provide a systematic and analytic approach to monitor student achievement. Since 2009, teachers have been meeting regularly to review student data and progress where HM Reading Lions formative assessments are used to monitor progress in ELA. In addition curricular summative assessments, performance task analysis, and Inspect assessments for Math are analyzed. Benchmark data is entered into a database that is reviewed throughout the year during weekly teacher collaboration meetings and data release days (3-5 per year).

The Annual CES Strategic Action Plan is based on recent CST data. For example, after analysis of 2012 CST data, three areas of focus for improvement were identified: comprehension, written expression and number sense. Resources and staffing were leveraged to focus on narrowing the achievement gap between subgroups in order to promote academic growth in each area. Short-term targets for improvement and long-term targets were identified and monitored based on CST and benchmark assessments. Within the Strategic Action Plan strategies were also identified to target professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals and to enhance parent and community communication and support.

Between 2009-2012, SMART Goals were identified targeting 10% growth in ELA and Math. Data was used to create intensive, skill mastery groups. Accelerated groups were also formed to support students meeting or exceeding benchmarks.

Since 2013 digital programs have been implemented in all grades to support acquisition of foundational skills in ELA. Quantitative data from LexiaCore 5 and DreamBox are adaptive integrated online programs, currently used to monitor performance and provide immediate intervention lessons in ELA and Mathematics. Teachers, parents, and administrators can easily view personalized instruction/intervention data and provide timely re-teach opportunities. Digital programs are used as Response to Intervention (RTI) and as a differentiation tool to accelerate advanced learners.

Strategies for interpreting assessments and supporting goals are shared at parent conferences and meetings such as our English Language Parent Advisory Committee (ELAC). Each trimester parents receive student progress reports with customized comments targeting learning goals and support strategies. Additional conferences are held whenever students are performing in the basic or strategic levels in ELA or Math. The Principal communicates with parents weekly through a bilingual newsletter regarding goals, assessments and community based strategies for closing the achievement gap.

In addition to in-school interventions, students participate in after school tutoring taught by credentialed teachers and sponsored by the Boys and Girls Club. Students performing in the basic level receive extra support. Students in the Special Education program also receive progress reports each trimester in addition to an annual parent conference/IEP.

3. **Sharing Lessons Learned:**

During the past 5 years, CES focused aggressively on building English literacy and providing rigorous instruction for our students. Based on research by Reardon on the Income - Academic Achievement Gap, poverty and low literacy are primary indicators for school failure in US children. 80% of the student population represents a demographic that historically has shown a 12% chance of school success in the US. CES's strategic response to closing the achievement gap through staff development, a focus on English Language Development, and technology-enhanced transformative best practices is yielding positive results as evidenced through improving student achievement and literacy on multiple measures. Our focused approach is research-based, data-informed and dynamically responsive to meet the needs of all students.

CES teachers are at the forefront of elementary technology integration and innovative educational transformation. Every classroom is a model for transformative practices and strategic technology integration. In addition to frequent site visits, teachers provide training and support for colleagues in local districts and beyond.

Visitors from around the country and India have come to witness the student success and engagement inherent in the Digital Early Literacy initiative. In an interview with the local newspaper, after visiting the pilot iPad kindergarten program, California Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson said; "It's magical... a great way to begin to learn languages in a rich way and it also teaches 21st Century skills to use technology to improve themselves." Torlakson incorporated lessons from the Digital Early Literacy Project in his statewide school transformation plan: "A Blueprint for Great Schools."

Teachers have been invited to facilitate workshops and present implementation strategies throughout the state on the iPad program, integration of 21st Century Learning, and Cross-Age Partnerships. The target audience for Digital Early Literacy and technology implementation workshops includes teachers, administrators, and stakeholders including parents and non-profit agencies working with schools to close the achievement gap. In January 2014, the Kindergarten team presented a strand of workshops on iPad Implementation at the California Kindergarten Association PK-1 Conference. Topics included; Digital Storytelling, Differentiated Instruction, Foundational Skills and the Common Core, Cross-Age Partnerships and Project Based Learning (PBL). Research, Background, and Rationale for Early Intervention was also presented.

Workshops are also presented for intermediate teachers (grades 3-6) on the use of an online interactive Techbook, and PBL. CES teachers at all grade levels participate in mentoring and research and are inspired and empowered to actively participate in PLC's, higher education and transformative leadership.

4. **Engaging Families and Community:**

Calistoga Elementary School is proud of its ties to families, the community, and the on-site partnership maintain with Calistoga Family Center. Parent and community engagement is a multifaceted, collaborative effort targeted to improve student achievement and well-being.

The majority of Calistoga students come from homes of immigrant parents with limited formal education who lack English language skills, literacy, and resources. A majority of families are employed in domestic, hospitality or agricultural industries within and around the Napa Valley. Many do not have consistent employment, benefits, or housing. In response, close community partnerships have been developed with local non-profit groups and agencies including the Calistoga Family Center, Boys and Girls Club, Calistoga Education Foundation, Calistoga Soroptomists, Calistoga Rotary, NapaLearns, Napa Valley Vintners Early Learning Initiative, and individual community members.

Families have many opportunities to become meaningfully involved. Parents are encouraged to volunteer by assisting classrooms, tutoring, or participating in several parent organizations that meet regularly on-site. Parents actively participate in the English Language Advisory Council, and representatives play a vital role on the School Site Council. Principal hosts a 'Coffee and Conversation' monthly gathering where parents learn about school programs and opportunities. They engage in conversation with the principal and discuss a wide range of topics relevant to improving student success. Communication continues through weekly bilingual newsletters from the principal, websites and teacher involvement. Paraprofessionals also play a key role in fostering strong relationships with families and the community.

In addition to these opportunities for parent engagement, District leaders expect and support creating a strong parent and community engagement. In collaboration with parent and community partners, innovative approaches to closing the achievement gap are identified and implemented, a positive school culture is nurtured, and opportunities for early childhood intervention are provided.   This partnership has forged a unique and cohesive relationship with our Calistoga Family Center a school based family resource center. NapaLearns, a non-profit, and Napa Valley Vintners Association: Early Learning Initiative all serve to

support and maintain community ties. Each of these organizations collaborates with the District to improve access and equity to services and resources that will support school readiness through family outreach, intervention and staff development in technology transformation. Services to families offered through collaborative partners and the school are early childhood outreach, student assistance, counseling, ESL classes, literacy classes, parenting classes, classes for fathers, parent advocacy and leadership trainings, economic resources, tax filing, housing assistance, cultural enrichment experiences, and community celebrations.

As a school community, Calistoga Elementary continues to seek new ways to enhance and develop strong partnerships with parents and the community. In addition to parent workshops, strategies for strengthening engagement of families and the community are a focus in staff development. Innovative communication and outreach models and exemplars are discussed, considered and implemented to support the closing of the achievement gap.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Calistoga Elementary School utilizes state adopted standards-based curriculum in all content areas. This curriculum reflects a continuum of skills and concepts organized by content subject area. Within each grade level content area, specific key grade level expectations are identified which reflect the critical learning, forming the foundation for continued academic success. Instructional time is allocated for students performing below grade level. This flexibility allows teachers and administrators to set the guidelines for instructional time that best meet the needs of the students they serve.

The integration of science, social studies, physical education, technology, and performing arts into English Language Arts and Math enriches the educational experiences of our students. Science and social studies pacing is done in such a way as to support and extend English language arts. Students with special needs are guaranteed modifications to ensure their success in accessing the core curriculum. The Individual Education Plan (IEP) serves to guide the program of the special education student. English Language Learners are required by law to participate in daily English Language Development (ELD) instruction above and beyond the English Language Arts instruction in the classroom. The goal for each ELL is to acquire English language fluency to function successfully in the regular classroom as a Fluent English Proficient (FEP) student, with achievement comparable to English Only (EO) students in all content areas. The purposeful and deliberate delivery of instruction in all content areas allows for continuous learning opportunities that are relevant and meaningful and offer students rich and varied opportunities for success.

In addition to core curriculum, Premier Instructional Programs have been implemented at the appropriate grade levels. A school wide music enrichment program provides Kindergarten through 2nd grade classroom music instruction, 3rd grade instrumental recorder instruction, and a 4th through 6th grade band program. The music teacher also produces winter and spring band and choral performances, facilitates an after school chorus program, and leads her students in local and regional music competitions. The Academy, another Premier Instructional Program, was instituted to engage and challenge advanced students who demonstrate mastery of specific content areas.

Additionally, the Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) Program is offered to 4th through 6th grade students. The students participating in this program build and extend an appreciation and awareness of the arts and culture while fostering teamwork, collaboration, and interpersonal communication skills.

Calistoga Elementary Physical Education Program provides physical education to all students using the nationally recognized SPARKS Program. Students learn basic skills while working collaboratively in teams. Approximately 40% of each class is spent working on various components of the President's Challenge/Presidential Youth fitness Program which focuses on developing, improving and assessing muscular strength, endurance, aerobic capacity, body composition and flexibility.

Fifth and sixth grade students participate in an Outdoor Education program. These programs offer learning opportunities to a student population who may not otherwise have access to the depth of knowledge experiences the programs provide. Fifth grade students participate in a several night adventure in environmental stewardship. Sixth grade students participate in a week long environmental program with an emphasis on teamwork, stewardship, and geography/geology at Yosemite National Park.

The purpose and function of instructional technology, has evolved dramatically over the past five years. Digital Early Literacy, implemented at the Kindergarten level first, created a strong foundation for school wide adoption of technology. By thoughtful, purposeful implementation utilizing digital curriculum and other forms of technology, learning and thinking skills of the 21st century area supported and promoted throughout the grade levels. Calistoga Elementary will continue to define and understand its purposeful classroom applications.

At the forefront of our instructional practices is the intention of structuring knowledge around major concepts and principles. Because Common Core Standards are intentionally aligned with 21st century learning skills, it is imperative for students to develop a sense of process over product, multiple ways to solve problems and become efficient and effective in the use of collaborative and metacognitive strategies.

2. Reading/English:

In Calistoga Elementary the practice of teaching reading is based on the clear evidence that the future success of all students hinges upon their ability to become proficient readers. ELL and children from families of poverty are known to enter school with a significant deficit in vocabulary and literacy skills. The focus of English Language Arts instruction is at the forefront of our Strategic Action Plan. A school-wide culture of high expectations applies to all students. Within the past five years English Language Development has been a primary focus establishing and building foundational skills and providing evidence based differentiated instruction.

Reading is taught through a combination of strategies and practices founded in evidence-based pedagogy. Foundational skills and reading strategies are taught in all grades, Transitional Kindergarten through 6th grade with an emphasis on building academic vocabulary.   Teachers have developed a strong foundation for reading programs through extensive high quality staff development that emphasizes brain-based and behavioral research behind how children learn to read. Teachers also know how to monitor student progress through frequent assessments and utilization of this data provides differentiated instruction. Current staff development focuses on strategies aligned with the CCSS, and integration of technology (iPads, computers, chrome books) to reinforce key literacy skills while extending these skills through meaningful applications in reading, writing and expression. Students learn to read analytically through regular practice with complex text, developing skills to improve reading, writing and speaking grounded in evidence from text, and finally building knowledge through content rich non-fiction.

Foundational reading skills are taught and reinforced throughout all grades in an organized systematic way using well-designed instruction. Pedagogy is based on building foundational skills, language structure (morphemes, phonics, word study), linguistic awareness, word recognition ability, fluency, and reading comprehension. Teachers use multiple strategies and technologies that are designed to explicitly teach students through a disciplined study of language systems and forms, both spoken and written.

With the transition to the CCSS and 21st Century learning, web based programs and programs such as LexiaCore 5 and DreamBox, teachers deliver personalized, adaptive learning experiences that build foundational skills, fluency and automaticity while monitoring student progress. These digital learning tools deliver a customized learning experience that provides differentiation through re-teaching struggling students or accelerating advanced learners. These programs are becoming more instrumental in preparing students for the future of the Smarter Balanced assessments digital literacy.

3. Mathematics:

Calistoga Elementary School defines and delivers math instruction for concept development, numeracy, operations fluency and problem solving using standards based curriculum, daily practice and application of interventions and enrichment. Grade level teams identify critical learning to be assessed. Data is collected from assessments to measure progress and inform instruction. This data becomes the rationale for intervention and enrichments.

Daily practice in key concept areas is accomplished through whole class, single strand discussion and problem solving. Students are encouraged to share multiple methods for approaching problems. Teachers and paraprofessionals provide additional instructional time on target skills for struggling students. For homework help, individual teachers have formed math clubs that meet before school or during after school structured homework time.

For accelerated learners, Project Based Learning (PBL) presents opportunities for mathematics to be integrated into the teaching of other content areas such as English Language Arts, Science, Social Science, Health, and the Visual and Performing Arts.

Document cameras, projectors and digital curriculum support teacher/student interaction during explicit instruction. Teachers continue to learn how to draw upon the innate ability of technology to provide differentiation, enrichment and engagement throughout the content.

Studying Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Professional Development (PD) settings, principals and teachers connect the learning within and across grade levels so students can build new understandings onto foundations built in previous years. Daily fluency practice continues to ensure that students have speed and accuracy with simple calculations. The use of traditional and digital white boards as a response method in whole class direct explicit concept instruction allows teachers to see individuals who may need re-teaching or pre-teaching for upcoming performance tasks. Emphasis is placed on explaining mathematical process and thinking. Math discussions are framed by Depth of Knowledge questioning strategies rather than right or wrong answers. Teachers continue to develop performance tasks and assessments that challenge students to defend thinking, attempt multiple solutions and clarify reasoning.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

More than 85% of children entering kindergarten are English Language Learner Students (ELLS). They face a multitude of challenges daily as they enter classrooms that may provide their only context for English language acquisition each day. A national literacy study found the greatest predictor of academic success is a child's level of literacy (vocabulary) upon entering kindergarten (U.S. DOE, 1996). To ensure access to the curriculum taught exclusively in English, the school needed to focus on building English language vocabulary and determined that an English Language Development curriculum would be implemented. In the primary grades, there would be a dedicated time and systematic delivery method. In intermediate grades ELD would be integrated with ELA vocabulary curriculum. ELD instruction would be weighted heavily on vocabulary instruction, taught in both isolated and contextual forms.

Scores from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), administered annually beginning in Kindergarten, were the basis for grouping. Students are categorized by CELDT as beginning, intermediate, early advanced or advanced. Teachers taught thematic lists of words to single groups of students using language scaffolds appropriate to their particular CELDT level, songs, chants, and total physical response. In grade level collaboration, teachers shared and refined ELD instructional strategies.

ELD instruction evolved in 2011 in response to research that indicated a potential to build vocabulary in young children by the purposeful use of technology for ELD instruction, began the Kindergarten iPad program. iPad technology was adopted and adapted to specifically address literacy in young children. The Digital Early Literacy (DEL) project began as a community partnership between NapaLearns, a non-profit organization, Calistoga Family Center, a family resource center, private community members and the Calistoga Joint Unified School District. Teachers used iPads to access digital story books, foundational skills applications and design activities to develop their receptive and expressive language. Teachers were also able to differentiate instruction for a single student based on individual language needs. At nearly the same time, intermediate teachers were beginning to implement technology into ELD instruction through contextual research, projects and presentations. Technology allowed teachers and students to access visual and virtual resources that engaged students with the vocabulary they were learning. A high student population of ELLs means that literacy in English will continue to be a challenge that must be met using tools students will need for college and career readiness in the 21st century.

5. Instructional Methods:

Beginning in 2011, and for the following two years, faculty members read, discussed, planned and implemented strategies and ideas taken from three books, "Brain Rules" by John Medina, "Mindset" by Carol Dweck and "Teach Like a Champion" by Doug Lemov. Teacher / administrator teams also attended

trainings on the power of direct, explicit instruction. Instructional practice was modeled after these readings and trainings and formed a basis from which a common language and practice evolved. Successful strategies were shared with colleagues in a variety of settings such as staff meetings, weekly grade level collaboration and subsequent Professional Development trainings. More recently teachers are adopting innovative best practices in inquiry based learning through PBL and CCSS strategies.

The faculty was also given collaboration opportunities to discuss and plan instruction using comprehensive data collected each trimester. During once per trimester release days, grade levels identified and grouped students for various interventions or enrichments designed to help students grow academically during subsequent trimesters.

Interventions were designed by the teams to address low performance standards and skills. Action plans with specific strategies were produced during these release days. Teachers and trained paraprofessional staff targeted small groups of students for direct instruction, re-teaching and fluency practice in both math and English language arts.

One full time teacher and a paraprofessional became a team assigned to implement a language arts intervention program for students identified as most at risk. On a daily rotating schedule, this team provided targeted instruction to small groups of students in foundational reading and comprehension.

Enrichments were designed to offer opportunities to extend learning through creative projects infused with technology. Students participated in grade level enrichment for part of their language arts block. These programs were housed in the computer lab and all projects were infused with technology for research, production and presentation. With the advent of technology came a new infusion of engagement strategies. Every classroom was equipped with a projector and document camera. Teachers used this technology to model, demonstrate and provide visual support for lessons. With the addition of iPad and laptops, connection to the internet provided access to resources for direct instruction, new strategies, creative applications, and background knowledge. Beginning in the primary grades, iPads were integrated into daily instruction. Using iPads, differentiation occurred on a student by student basis using applications to build foundational language arts and math skills as well as creativity and technical skills. In all cases, adopting instructional methods followed careful evaluation of data.

6. **Professional Development:**

Calistoga Elementary School success can be attributed in large part to the work of teachers and administrators in Professional Development (PD) settings, both formal and informal. Professional Development provided the foci, resources and discourses that fueled a dedicated and motivated staff. Professional speakers, data review, local and distance classroom observations, staff meeting presentations, and shared readings offered a variety of avenues to address the goals of closing the achievement gap, engaging students, and standardizing instructional practice.

Much time was devoted to building a collaborative environment that was structured for examination of data and translating that analysis to SMART goals. PD included training in digital assessment and reporting systems, administrator facilitated goal setting and one hour a week collaborative planning time. A continuity of purpose was woven within formal PD. Curriculum experts provided insights into, and applications of, differentiation supports contained in their programs. Professionals with classroom experience shared research based, practical approaches to establish a continuum of understanding across grade levels. "Know your piece, do your part" was a memorable phrase to describe how to ensure English Language Learners received a comprehensive set of foundational skills in increments at each grade level. Groups of teachers and administrators observed exemplar classrooms both on campus, off campus and even out of county, then shared their excellent reflections from those experiences. In line with PD goals, some of those observations led to subsequent trainings in the practices known as Direct Explicit Instruction (DEI). Shared readings, especially the book "Teach Like a Champion" became the reference for short presentations at staff meetings and planning in collaboration meetings.

As we move forward, Professional Development continues to be part of the successful formula. Most recently, 23 of 26 teachers and the Principal attended trainings in Project Based Learning. A Technology Coach / Coordinator position has been created to provide both digital curriculum implementation support and PBL planning. Ongoing peer to peer sharing of strategy, experience and research strengthens our Professional Learning Community into a foundation to build upon for the future.

7.   School Leadership

The school leadership philosophy for success follows a data informed model that includes all stakeholders in the planning and implementation process. The Principal and Assistant Principal preside over committees, teams and training sessions designed to provide a climate of collaboration and participation in curriculum, instruction, and strategic decisions.

The school leadership team, consisting of the Principal, Assistant Principal and teachers representing each grade level, examined data and analyzed the academic performance of all student groups. The Strategic Action Plan was developed from this analysis with a goal of raising achievement for all students, narrowing achievement gaps and ensuring that students meeting or exceeding grade level standards are challenged to reach their fullest potential.

The leadership team facilitates observations of exemplar best practice in the areas of accelerated learning, digital curriculum, comprehension and writing instruction. They then provided an opportunity to share and discuss these observations .

The Principal designated resources with a focus on student needs and with intent for academic growth. Highly trained paraprofessionals, enrichment teachers, curriculum and programs were guided by the overarching goal that students would meet or exceed established state standards of performance through a responsive and challenging instructional program providing differentiated student support.

The Principal and Assistant Principal provide research based trainings specific to the goals of student academic growth. They support innovation in the use of technology as teaching and learning tools and as a means to support enrichment and differentiation. Through the transition to Common Core Standards, the focus remains on improvement of academic achievement through development of 21st century skills. The Leadership team actively seeks and evaluates curriculum and strategies that will promote critical and creative thinkers, innovators and problem solvers who can effectively communicate and collaborate. Digital age literacy, inquiry, data analysis, and innovative use of technology anchor the shared work of the leadership team, grade level teaching teams, students and parents.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	79	61	57	46
% Advanced	39	44	34	28	24
Number of students tested	62	63	62	60	50
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	76	58	49	46
% Advanced	36	38	27	21	18
Number of students tested	53	55	52	33	39
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	67	25	50	0
% Advanced	17	17	0	50	0
Number of students tested	6	6	8	6	5
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	74	60	49	46
% Advanced	31	35	29	20	17
Number of students tested	49	46	52	41	35
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	74	56	52	46
% Advanced	35	37	25	23	18
Number of students tested	55	49	52	44	39
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	1	0
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	33	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	3	0	0	0
7. American Indian or					

Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	100	86	64	40
% Advanced	71	82	71	43	40
Number of students tested	7	11	7	14	10
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	100	0	100
% Advanced	0	0	100	0	100
Number of students tested	0	0	3	0	1
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced	0				
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	45	73	52	71
% Advanced	38	16	41	26	43
Number of students tested	63	58	56	54	65
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	43	71	44	67
% Advanced	31	12	37	16	41
Number of students tested	55	51	41	43	46
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	11	67	60	50
% Advanced	50	11	33	20	50
Number of students tested	6	9	9	5	8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	44	68	49	61
% Advanced	28	12	32	23	36
Number of students tested	43	50	37	39	33
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	40	70	45	66
% Advanced	28	10	35	19	42
Number of students tested	47	50	40	42	50
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	100	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	100	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	1	0	0
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	50	0	100	0
Number of students tested	0	2	0	1	0
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	1	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	80	80	70	87
% Advanced	71	60	53	40	47
Number of students tested	14	5	15	10	15
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	50	0	0	100	0
Number of students tested	2	0	0	1	0
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	80	47	58	53
% Advanced	24	41	20	19	23
Number of students tested	55	51	51	74	66
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	78	44	54	44
% Advanced	20	38	18	17	17
Number of students tested	49	37	39	54	52
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	63	17	63	38
% Advanced	27	63	0	50	25
Number of students tested	11	8	6	8	8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	76	46	46	34
% Advanced	20	33	24	14	16
Number of students tested	45	33	33	44	44
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	78	44	54	41
% Advanced	19	38	22	17	16
Number of students tested	48	37	36	59	51
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	0	100
% Advanced	0	100	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	1	0	0	1
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	100
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	1
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	1	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	85	50	73	92
% Advanced	75	46	14	27	54
Number of students tested	4	13	14	15	13
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	100	0	0
% Advanced	50	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	2	0	1	0	0
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	59	48	39	69	32
% Advanced	20	7	13	27	8
Number of students tested	49	44	72	55	62
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	55	41	32	58	27
% Advanced	13	3	11	18	5
Number of students tested	38	34	56	40	44
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	25	50	17	50	15
% Advanced	25	0	17	25	15
Number of students tested	8	4	6	8	13
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	44	11	57	27
% Advanced	9	6	3	23	2
Number of students tested	32	32	36	35	41
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	54	38	31	59	31
% Advanced	14	6	9	21	2
Number of students tested	37	34	55	39	48
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	100
% Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	0	0	1	1
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	2	0	1	0
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	1	1	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	71	69	100	31
% Advanced	40	14	25	46	31
Number of students tested	10	7	16	13	13
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	1	0
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

Subject: Reading/ELA　　　　　　　　　　　**Test:** California Standards Test
All Students Tested/Grade: 3　　　　　　　**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	57	44	27	38	32
% Advanced	24	16	11	12	8
Number of students tested	62	63	62	60	50
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	38	19	33	50
% Advanced	15	9	6	6	30
Number of students tested	53	55	52	33	10
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	33	17	50	50	20
% Advanced	33	0	38	50	0
Number of students tested	6	6	8	6	5
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	37	19	29	23
% Advanced	14	9	6	7	3
Number of students tested	49	46	52	41	35
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	55	37	15	34	26
% Advanced	20	10	4	11	3
Number of students tested	55	49	52	44	39
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	1	0
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	67	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	3	0	0	0
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	73	86	50	50
% Advanced	57	46	57	7	30
Number of students tested	7	11	7	14	10
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	100	0	100
% Advanced	0	0	33	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	3	0	1
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	40	61	59	65
% Advanced	38	16	30	24	39
Number of students tested	63	58	56	54	65
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	37	51	56	63
% Advanced	31	12	20	19	33
Number of students tested	55	51	41	43	46
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	44	22	40	50
% Advanced	17	33	22	0	50
Number of students tested	6	9	9	5	8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	38	46	54	45
% Advanced	26	12	14	21	24
Number of students tested	43	50	37	39	33
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	34	50	55	60
% Advanced	26	10	18	19	34
Number of students tested	47	50	40	42	50
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	100	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	100	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	1	0	0
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	50	0	100	0
Number of students tested	0	2	0	1	0
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	1	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	80	87	70	80
% Advanced	79	60	60	30	53
Number of students tested	14	5	15	10	15
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	50	0	0	100	0
Number of students tested	2	0	0	1	0
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA **Test:** California Standards Test
All Students Tested/Grade: 5 **Edition/Publication Year:** 2013
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	56	63	49	47	46
% Advanced	13	24	12	20	20
Number of students tested	55	51	51	74	66
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	51	49	44	39	35
% Advanced	6	11	8	13	14
Number of students tested	49	37	39	54	52
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	27	63	17	63	25
% Advanced	9	38	0	38	13
Number of students tested	11	8	6	8	8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	49	42	39	27	25
% Advanced	7	6	9	11	9
Number of students tested	45	33	33	44	44
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	49	39	39	31
% Advanced	4	8	8	15	12
Number of students tested	48	37	36	59	51
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	0	100
% Advanced	0	100	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	1	0	0	1
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	100
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	1
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	1	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	71	80	92
% Advanced	100	62	21	40	46
Number of students tested	4	13	14	15	13
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	100	0	0
% Advanced	50	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	2	0	1	0	0
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: Educational Testing Services

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	45	52	29	62	44
% Advanced	20	11	13	22	15
Number of students tested	49	44	72	55	62
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	34	47	25	50	34
% Advanced	11	6	9	8	9
Number of students tested	38	34	56	40	44
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	38	0	17	38	23
% Advanced	25	0	17	0	15
Number of students tested	8	4	6	8	13
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	28	47	3	49	29
% Advanced	6	3	3	11	2
Number of students tested	32	32	36	35	41
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	32	47	20	51	40
% Advanced	11	3	7	8	8
Number of students tested	37	34	55	39	48
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	100
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students tested	1	0	0	1	1
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	100	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	50	0	100	0
Number of students tested	0	2	0	1	0
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	1	1	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	71	63	92	54
% Advanced	60	43	31	62	31
Number of students tested	10	7	16	13	13
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other 1: Filipino					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	1	0
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: