

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

---

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Mrs. Ann Sullivan

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

Official School Name Huntington Seacliff Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 6701 Garfield Avenue

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

City Huntington Beach State CA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 92648-1510

County Orange County State School Code Number\* 30-66530-6116065

Telephone 714-841-7081 Fax 714-841-4593

Web site/URL http://www.hbcd.k12.ca.us/Seacliff/ E-mail asullivan@hbcd.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\*Mr. Gregory Haulk E-mail: ghaulk@hbcd.us  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Huntington Beach City Elementary Tel. 714-964-8888

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 Mrs. Rosemary Saylor  
(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 (per district designation):
- 7 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
  - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
  - 0 High schools
  - 0 K-12 schools
- 9 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
  - Small city or town in a rural area
  - Rural
3. 15 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	0	0	0
K	52	38	90
1	62	63	125
2	56	63	119
3	53	72	125
4	71	61	132
5	59	45	104
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
<b>Total Students</b>	353	342	695

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
  - 20 % Asian
  - 1 % Black or African American
  - 12 % Hispanic or Latino
  - 1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - 56 % White
  - 9 % 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: 5%

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

<b>Steps For Determining Mobility Rate</b>	<b>Answer</b>
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	17
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	15
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	32
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	695
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.046
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	5

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 4 %  
27 Total number ELL  
 Number of non-English languages represented: 11  
 Specify non-English languages: Cantonese, Farsi, Japanese, Khmer (Cambodian), Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese, French.
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 2 %  
 Total number students who qualify: 25

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:  $\frac{11}{77}$  %  
 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.

- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 19 Autism               | 1 Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| 1 Deafness              | 6 Other Health Impaired                 |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness        | 6 Specific Learning Disability          |
| 0 Emotional Disturbance | 38 Speech or Language Impairment        |
| 0 Hearing Impairment    | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| 6 Mental Retardation    | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 Multiple Disabilities | 0 Developmentally Delayed               |

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

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	23
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.	1

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  $\frac{30}{1}$

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

<b>Required Information</b>	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	97%	97%	97%	97%	96%
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

<b>Post-Secondary Status</b>	
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**

---

Huntington Seacliff Elementary School Vision Statement: At Huntington Seacliff Elementary School, we empower each other to create, communicate, collaborate, and think critically in a technology-rich environment.

We envision a community of learners where:

- All children learn and achieve grade level standards.
- Clearly articulated, data driven/research based instruction is aligned with state standards.
- Positive values and strong character are encouraged within our students.
- Staff development, risk-taking, creativity, and collaborative decision-making are supported.
- Students feel secure, safe, and nurtured.
- Open communication and collaboration exists between all members of the school community.
- Students are prepared for participation in the culturally diverse, technologically rich, democratic society of the twenty-first century.

The enthusiasm and commitment to “Building a Community of Learners” to make a difference for each child, that accompanied the opening of Huntington Seacliff - Sea Stars in 1999, continues to be part of our school culture today. We embrace a diverse population of 700 students with 56% of our students being Caucasian, 20% Asian, 12% Hispanic, and 10% from two or more races. Our English Learners (EL) students speak 16 different languages, with the largest group speaking Vietnamese. We successfully integrate two Specialized Academic Instruction (SAI) programs serving K - 5th grade students. Currently, we serve 133 Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) identified students. The high value placed on education is evidenced by a phenomenal degree of parental involvement and generous participation by the school community. Volunteers contribute over 25,000 hours annually by assisting in classrooms, organizing school and community fundraisers, and contributing to decision making committees.

The classic story of the boy tossing stranded Sea Stars back into the ocean reminds us of our compelling responsibility to make a difference for every child. We judge our effectiveness by results. Seacliff's Academic Performance Index (API) has grown from 880 to 969 in the past seven years, and continues to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in all areas and subgroups. Seacliff teachers and principal collaborate as a Professional Learning Community to design and implement action plans targeted to improve students' learning. Assessment plays a pivotal role in our standards-based system by providing benchmarks for teaching and learning and by shaping the performance of educators and students. We believe that when staff are actively encouraged and provided opportunities to develop and grow professionally, dynamic learning takes place for both students and the entire school community. We strive to identify and develop the special abilities and talents of each child. All members of our school community implement instructional innovations that support the "at-risk" child and challenge our most talented students, ensuring each student's success in our mission: Making a Difference for Each One!

Seacliff's 27 classrooms surround three shared learning corridors that are each designed with 32 networked computer stations. The open architecture of the corridors allows resources of the “mind and materials” to be shared with ease. It facilitates building capacity as both teachers and students learn from each other. Our state-of-the art library media center serves as the resource and technology “heart” of the school. In addition to being well-equipped to “bring students to technology,” we now “bring technology to the student” with our dynamic iEngage 1:1 iPad program for all third through fifth grade students and in first and second grade pilot classes.

Stepping into a classroom at Seacliff, one immediately takes notice of the warm, positive, and supportive tone that permeates the school climate. The Seacliff Code of Conduct clearly defines behavior expectations and consequences, which support our purpose. Our school's "3 R's" - Respect, Responsibility, and personal Regard, stand as a goal for each student's character development, defining expectations for moral and ethical decision-making and acceptance of personal responsibility. Visitors often comment on the campus orderliness, engaging classroom environments, and comfortable spirit at Seacliff School.

Our Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) goals drive our program and reflect Seacliff's commitment of data driven programs, researched-based practices, differentiated instruction and on-going professional development, as we continue to strive to prepare our staff to make the shift to implementing the Common Core Standards.

As illustrated in the implementation of our highly effective signature instructional program and core curriculum, innovative practices have yielded impressive achievement outcomes for students and have led to Seacliff's mathematics instructional model being replicated across the district's six other elementary schools. Seacliff has led the way in emphasizing that the ongoing coaching of teachers has improved professional practice and contributed to even higher levels of achievement for students. This recognition has further impacted professional practice and prioritization of time and funding for teacher coaching throughout the district.

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

---

### **1. Assessment Results:**

A. Huntington Seacliff Elementary School students perform very well on California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) tests. In Spring 2013, 91.75% of tested students (grades two through five) were proficient or advanced in English Language Arts (ELA) and 96.25% were proficient or advanced in Mathematics on STAR tests. Grade-level scores reveal Seacliff students outperform state averages across the board. In language arts, 94.0%, 84.7%, 95.4%, and 92.3% of second, third, fourth, and fifth graders (respectively) scored at the proficient or higher performance bands, an average of over 30% above the statewide percentages at each grade level. Similarly in mathematics, Seacliff Sea Stars have shown high performance at an average of 28% above the state-wide percentages at grade levels with 96.0%, 93.6%, 97.7%, and 96.2% of second, third, fourth, and fifth graders (respectively) scoring proficient or higher on state testing.

In addition to school-wide success, significant subgroups at Seacliff are also achieving, with each subgroup outperforming their state-wide cohort in both language arts and mathematics in all grade levels assessed at Seacliff. For fourth and fifth grade subgroups, including Students with Disabilities (SWD), at least 92% of students scored proficient or better in mathematics and at least 87.0% were performed at that same high level in ELA in Spring 2013. The data revealed the performance of SWD nearly doubled those in the same subgroup throughout the state, with 92.9% and 100% of fourth and fifth graders with disabilities scoring proficient or advanced in mathematics and 92.9% and 93.8% of students scoring in those performance bands in ELA. For fifth grade, 100% of Hispanic students scored proficient or advanced in both ELA and Mathematics; every fourth grade student (100%) in this subgroup also scored proficient or advanced in ELA with 94.7% in these performance bands for Mathematics.

B. Longitudinal trend analyses show growth in cohorts over time. At Seacliff, gains are observed in every subgroup and in both mathematics and ELA as measured through the STAR program. In 2009, 85.9% of students were proficient or advanced in ELA, increasing to 91.75% in 2013 (+5.2%); similarly, in mathematics, 91.2% scored at least in the proficient performance band in 2009 with 96.25% doing so in 2013 (+4.6%).

In Spring 2009, 84.3% of fifth-graders achieved proficiency or better in ELA; in 2013, slightly over 92% of fifth graders scored at that high level, representing an 8% increase. Five-year data shows growth for third and fourth graders as well, with a 3.2% increase (92.2% to 95.4%) for fourth graders and a 3.5% increase for third graders (81.2 to 84.7%). In 2013, 93.6%, 97.7%, and 96.2% of third, fourth, and fifth graders (respectively) displayed proficiency on state assessments in mathematics. This represents a 4.7% increase for third grade, a 6.4% for fourth grade, and a 4.0% increase for fifth grade over the course of these five years.

Various instructional elements have contributed to the improvement over the years, including the collaboration amongst staff with community and other strategic partners. The implementation of several programs has contributed to the gains, including the MIND (Music Intelligence Neural Development) Spatial Temporal (ST) Math and Music Program in combination with Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) for mathematics, in addition to, Write From the Beginning and Thinking Maps for ELA.

Subgroup achievement increases indicate student growth for all students. Data from Spring 2013 indicated the achievement gap in ELA had closed for Hispanic students in fourth and fifth grade, with 100% of this subgroup attaining proficiency or advanced scores on state testing. In Mathematics, fifth graders in the Hispanic subgroup also reached 100% proficient or advanced. The scores from 2013 culminate a five-year growth period for Hispanic students at Seacliff; in Spring of 2013, 85.7% of Hispanic students scored proficient or advanced in ELA and 88.1% did so in Mathematics. This represents gains from 2009, where 80% were proficient or advanced in language arts and 84% in Mathematics, increases of 5.7% in ELA and 4.1% in Mathematics. Although proficiency scores for the Hispanic subgroup are slightly below school-wide scores for fourth grade in Mathematics, this demographic subgroup has shown a very large performance

increase from 66.7% proficient or advanced in 2009 to 94.7% in 2013, an increase of 28% in this time period.

Similar growth can be seen for SWD, with an achievement gap closed for fifth-grade students in this subgroup. In Spring 2013, 100% of fifth-grade SWD achieved proficiency or better on the CST in mathematics and 93.8% of the same students matched that performance in ELA; both of these percentages were greater than Seacliff's school-wide percentages for fifth grade. These proficiency rates also represented increases over the course of five years; in 2009, 83.3% of fourth-grade SWD achieved proficiency and this increased to 92.9% for this subgroup in Spring 2013. Additionally, fourth-graders in the SWD subgroup have improved their mathematics performance to 92.9% in 2013, an improvement of 9.6% from 83.3% in 2009.

Spring 2013 data reports an achievement gap for third grade students in the Hispanic and SWD subgroups in both mathematics and ELA. To support these students, staff continually undergoes professional development to differentiate instruction in the classroom; this year, Seacliff's focus has been continued implementation of Direct Interactive Instructive (DII) to differentiate and improve the productive language skills in a whole-class setting, increasing student discussions, and adding instructional best practices to address the diverse learning need of all students.

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

Seacliff is driven by data, utilizing various data sets to improve the instructional program provided to students. The California STAR system provides the Academic Performance Index (API) along with testing data gathered from standards-based assessment exams as well as a yearly language assessment, the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), for English Learners (EL). Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), a federal accountability system, also provides data to help set goals for each subgroup associated with No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Stakeholders, including teaching staff, School Site Council (SSC), and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) review the data provided to develop school-wide goals for the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA). The information from the CELDT is used to determine annual progress in EL student language development including gains made in reading, writing, listening, and speaking; data from the CELDT is also used to determine if EL students can be reclassified as fluent in English. Seacliff Elementary has met every AYP participation and proficiency goal for all statistically significant demographic subgroups since the reporting system has been in place with the Phase I Report of 2003. Additionally, school-wide API has increased from 933 in 2009 to 969 in 2013.

Seacliff staff utilize a variety of multiple measures to assess student achievement in addition to the high-stakes assessments of the STAR system. Teachers work collaboratively to analyze formative assessment data; using IlluminateEd, a data management system, teachers evaluate STAR and district benchmark assessment results tied to a standards schedule. These benchmarks are currently aligned to California state standards, but with the shift towards implementation of Common Core Standards, IlluminateEd will be able to provide benchmarks and item banks to assess students with standards-aligned, 21st-century assessment tools, including the potential use of computer-based testing. Working together, teachers analyze the benchmark data to gain an understanding of current levels of content mastery for students, informing their decisions on instructional adjustments that may be made in the classroom to address student needs.

Additionally, teachers utilize the Pearson Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) Inventory, a standardized reading test that determines a student's instructional level in reading. Teachers are provided release-time to assess each student individually at the beginning of each year and intermittently throughout the year. This assessment tool provides rich information for teachers and parents, allowing for a customized reading program with knowledge of a student's current reading level according to the Developmental Reading Continuum. Seacliff also utilizes the University of Oregon DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessments designed to be short fluency measures used to monitor the development of pre-reading and early readings skills. These assessments enable teachers to monitor student progress, plan instruction and determine the effectiveness of interventions. Grade level teams share and interpret the results together as well as with parents and the principal. The data is also used to determine EL reclassification and

monitoring of progress. DRA and DIBELS reading fluency scores are used to drive future classroom instruction, address Common Core standards, and create intervention groups.

### **3. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

Paramount to the success at Seacliff has been a continual focus on maintaining positive momentum. Modeling consistent reflection and improvement as a staff, Seacliff has committed to refining instructional practices that yield results for students. Although proficiency is the overarching goal of mandates from the federal government, pushing for annual growth on performance bands remains integral in the process at Seacliff. Raising the bar to the advanced performance band potentially serves as a gateway for students to continue to challenge themselves in coursework as they continue in middle and high school. Teachers continue to analyze student data not only to push them up performance bands to proficiency, but also beyond by attaining the higher-order thinking skills and depths of knowledge associated with advanced performance. The data supports this focus – an increasing percentage of students are moving from proficient to advanced performance.

Seacliff also continues to differentiate instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students by utilizing the DII framework of instruction to maximize student engagement. Teachers are able to further cater to the skills students develop and work on because the lesson design strategies and systematic approach to instruction offers pre-corrective and corrective routines to avoid error fossilization in students while continually developing content and academic vocabulary. Pairing these highly-strategic instructional practices with ongoing formative assessment to inform re-teaching and acceleration, Seacliff teachers efficiently and effectively facilitate learning experiences for students by crafting and customizing the instructional resources provided at school.

The implementation of Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) and MIND Institute’s innovative practices associated with ST Math has yielded impressive achievement outcomes for students. Professional development in CGI engages teachers to consider the development of a child’s mathematical thinking while building upon their prior knowledge and exploring frameworks for problem-solving. This research is central to implementation of Common Core State Standards depth in mathematical understanding.

Seacliff’s mathematics instructional model is being replicated across the District’s six other elementary schools. Seacliff has led the way in emphasizing that the ongoing coaching of teachers has improved professional practice and contributed to even higher levels of achievement for students. This recognition has further impacted professional practice and prioritization of time and funding for teacher coaching throughout the District. CGI training is now conducted district-wide with support from the Orange County Department of Education, providing Seacliff teachers the additional opportunity to collaborate with county facilitators and other grade-level-alike teachers throughout the District.

### **4. Engaging Families and Community:**

Two-way communication between home and school is an integral part of family involvement. Each fall, the principal’s “Welcome Back” newsletter arrives home followed by a phone call or “Good News from School” postcard from teachers welcoming new students to class. For kindergarten parents anxious about their child’s first formal school experience, the kindergarten “Kick-Off” provides a reassuring and informative initiation. During the first week of school, family-school compacts are formed when the Parent/Student Handbook is sent home. One hundred percent of our students and parents agree to support Seacliff’s Code of Conduct and classroom expectations. Our award-winning PTA/school newsletter is mailed home four times a year. The principal emails a weekly Sea Star eNews bulletin to our community. Both the school and district maintain well-informed web sites with email links readily accessible; also, ConnectEd phone call-out notification program, Remind 101 text message app, and an electronic marquee enhance communication.

Collaborative goal-setting occurs between teachers, parents, and students in December. These meetings

provide students an opportunity to share their learning plans and outcomes with their parents, creating stronger stakeholder ownership and accountability of learning at multiple levels.

Individual STAR reports are sent home annually. Grade level standards and expectations are provided to all parents at Back-to-School Night and at parent/student goal setting conferences. This information can also be found on the district and school web site with a section that offers suggestions on how parents can assist their children at home. A principal's report is presented to SSC, ELAC, PTA, and GATE parent meetings providing an overview of student achievement. Staff uses weekly newsletters, e-mail, school web site, and phone calls to report academic growth illustrating objectives for learning in ELA, math, science, and social science. Tips, strategies, and techniques to reinforce key curriculum concepts are shared with parents to help students move toward Proficient and Advanced Levels. Families of EL students receive information in their primary language regarding assessments and student achievement. Standards-based report cards are provided in the families' primary language when needed and translators are available to assist with conferences.

During the kindergarten "Round-up" in February, parents meet the kindergarten teachers, principal, and key PTA members at a Kindergarten Orientation Meeting where they then tour classrooms and observe the program. Later in the month, Open House is a spectacular celebration and a proud expression of student achievement.

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

---

### **1. Curriculum:**

Huntington Seacliff provides a balanced, comprehensive, standards-aligned curriculum, combined with best instructional practices and sound student engagement strategies for all students in every subject area. Purposeful and rigorous, the curriculum is designed to provide a balance of content knowledge, creativity, collaboration, critical thinking, and communication.

The state-adopted Medallion Edition of Houghton Mifflin serves as the cornerstone of our ELA instruction. In addition, the following research-based programs and materials are systematically integrated school-wide: Thinking Maps, Write from the Beginning, Pathways to Proficiency, and Rebecca Sitton Spelling. English Language Development (ELD) instruction uses HM "EL Support Materials" and SRA's Language for Learning, Thinking and Writing Program when needed. All teachers are EL authorized and have received training on Thinking Maps, and Pathways to Proficiency - EL training; forty percent are trained in Guided Language Acquisition Development (GLAD) strategies, which emphasize Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional techniques.

The state-adopted Houghton Mifflin California Math series is the core mathematics program. Seacliff has developed a highly successful mathematics program through the systematic integration of the MIND's (Music Intelligence Neural Development) Spatial Temporal (ST) Math and Music Program, MIND's ST Math Fluency Program, Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI), and Number Talks.

To bring Social Studies to life, teachers use Houghton Mifflin's History-Social Science as a foundation and integrate multiple subject areas into a meaningful learning experience. For example, in fourth grade, students read critically, research, outline and summarize information using their iPads to create a state report aligned to district writing standards. To enhance understanding of historical times, places, and people, students read and discuss literary works, textbooks, articles, and primary sources. Teachers engage students in a simulation of the California Gold Rush by looking at the trends, patterns, ethical issues, and changes that formed the state. A musical integrates performing arts in the study of California history. The style, technique, and life of western artist Remington is explored through the Art Masters program. Students participate in the California Time Capsule Overnight Program through a tour of San Juan Capistrano Mission followed by hands-on simulations at the Lazy W. Ranch to experience the daily lives of those who lived in California. The journey begins with pre-historic Indian survival and threads through four different cultural periods to the 21st century.

Scott Foresman Science books and hands-on science kits bring the rigorous California Science Standards to life. (Science is further described in the Additional Curriculum Area.)

A sequential PE/Health education curriculum, SPARK (Sports, Play, and Recreation for Kids) is an exemplary physical education program that provides a standards-based, health-related program. SPARK focuses on the development of healthy lifestyles, motor skills and movement knowledge, as well as, social and personal skills. The program is aligned with the 40 Developmental Assets resiliency qualities. All teachers are trained in the SPARK curriculum. Nutrition education is integrated in the health and science curriculum. Fitness is enhanced through lunch time intra-mural sports activities, a Sports Day, and a PTA sponsored Marathon Kids program. Fifth grade students participate in the state-wide Fitnessgram testing program and performance levels have steadily increased over several years.

Throughout the year there are multiple opportunities for students to participate in Visual/Performing Arts. The popular Art Masters program experience begins with a multi-media assembly where children learn about the lives and works of six famous Artists. Students then practice the techniques which made each artist's work revolutionary. Students create works of art in the style of the master, gain a new understanding of art, enhance their creativity, and acquire an art vocabulary. Vocal music instruction is offered weekly, and students in second through fourth grade receive weekly piano keyboard instruction. Students participate

in grade level musical performances, chorus, afterschool orchestra and band, PTA Reflections, assemblies, and an annual art fair.

Technology is embedded school-wide. Smart Boards, Apple TVs, and document cameras are depended upon in all classrooms. Students have access to four computer labs; however, since 2011, Seacliff “brings technology to the student” with the dynamic iEngage 1:1 iPad program for all third through fifth grade students and is being piloted in first and second grade classes. Our technology-supported curriculum enables students to develop deep understanding and complex thinking within and across disciplines.

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

The Medallion Edition of Houghton Mifflin Reading series delivers explicit, systematic instruction aligned with the California ELA standards. Comprehensive lessons help students acquire foundational reading skills. “Universal Access” provides extensive strategies to reinforce, support, and extend instruction. Resources such as the “Challenge Handbook” and EL Support Materials allow teachers to meet the needs of every student.

District-wide common benchmark assessments based on pacing guides and state standards are administered to all students three times a year. Using DRA and DIBELS assessments and Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) teachers are provided release time to assess students individually at the beginning of each year and intermittently throughout the year. The principal collects all the data, meets with individual teachers and grade level PLC’s, and collaboratively they determine intervention groups. The frequent analysis of student work drives our reading program.

Seacliff is committed to a reading and language arts block during which teachers provide direct instruction to whole class and small, flexible groups, and implement shared, guided, and independent reading and writing lessons. Students read from the adopted textbook, supplemental fiction and non-fiction books independently as well as in literature circles. The language arts program is supported by classroom aides and parent volunteers. Using Thinking Maps, Write from the Beginning and Pathways to Proficiency, students are explicitly taught the writing process. Language arts skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking are integrated throughout the curriculum. There is equal access to literacy for all students. English Learners are supported in accordance with their proficiency levels in the classroom with Into English, SDAIE methods, and small group instruction. Our GATE students are provided with a differentiated and accelerated language arts instruction.

Students who require extra ELA support in grades K-3 receive 30 minutes daily of extra time working in small groups with a Literacy Coach. Students may focus on explicit word attack skills using the Earobics Language Literacy Program to strengthen their phonemic awareness, phonics, and decoding skills or Read Naturally to increase fluency and comprehension.

Scholastic’s System44/READ 180, a comprehensive, researched-based intervention program for fourth and fifth grades uses adaptive technology to individualize instruction for students and gives teachers immediate data to help differentiate instruction. The program provides struggling readers with high interest, relevant non-fiction and academic vocabulary to become proficient readers across the content areas. Students work at individual levels and speed to master reading, writing, spelling and vocabulary skills.

## **3. Mathematics:**

MIND’s ST Math, a state-adopted, research-based program is implemented at Seacliff. Students participate in twice weekly lessons using ST Math’s web-based spatial-temporal learning software which visually represents mathematical ideas to improve conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills. The visual aids and language-free presentation of the curriculum has made ST Math particularly effective with the EL and SWD populations. This program continues to increase student achievement by:

- Presenting a challenging format that is intuitive/engaging
- Scaffolding learning modules at a student's own pace, advancing only after achieving mastery
- Giving students immediate feedback
- Providing student performance data for teachers to drive classroom instruction
- Allowing access from home so parents can support their child's learning

The ST Music program works in conjunction with ST Math and students receive piano keyboard sessions twice weekly. Studies demonstrate a causal relationship between music and certain spatial-temporal tasks, and that music training can further increase students' test scores in proportional math and fractions.

After careful analysis, it became evident that students were building strong conceptual understanding of mathematical reasoning, but the need to increase students' automaticity of math facts continued to exist. As a result, the ST Math Fluency program was adopted. This individualized system uses adaptive training, continuous assessment, and feedback.

To develop students' skills in solving real-life problems, Seacliff implements CGI (Carpenter, Fennema) educational methodology. Built on more than thirty years of research, CGI encourages the development of the Common Core Mathematical Habits of Mind. The premise of CGI math is that students enter school with an intuitive knowledge of mathematics. Capitalizing on this knowledge, teachers create environments where students solve complex problems by struggling, persevering, and using flexible thinking to develop strategies and ideas about math. Students report their strategies, defend and justify their solutions, and connect their ideas with others allowing them to construct viable solutions to rigorous problems.

As teachers identified a need for efficient and accurate computational fluency in our students, Seacliff tapped into the power of Number Talks-Helping Children Build Mental Math and Computation Strategies by Sherry Parrish. A "number talk" is a short, daily, five to fifteen-minute guided lesson. Using number relationships and the structures of the numbers, students share problem solving strategies with one another, contributing to flexible thinking about numbers.

These high-quality researched-based programs increased Seacliff's student performance at the proficient or advanced levels on the STAR consistently from 68.75% in 2002 to 96.25% in 2013.

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

Science: In 2005, 66% of our 5th grade students were advanced or proficient on the STAR test in science, in 2013, 94% of students were proficient or above. This success can be attributed to the balanced, comprehensive science program. Teachers use the standards-aligned Scott Foresman California Science books along with inquiry-based, hands-on science kits. All students participate in inquiry-based science curriculum funded through ScienceWorks Consortium with Kids@Science STEM Specialists. To ensure high-quality implementation of each standards-correlated module, teachers receive training in three full-day comprehensive workshops presented by Seacliff lead science teachers. Through this inquiry-centered learning program, children "think like a scientist" as they question, experiment, develop theories, research and communicate orally and in writing. As teachers guide students through the series of experiments, using fully stocked science kits, students integrate skills across the curriculum. For example, third grade students study plant growth and development. They are challenged to expand their understanding of science concepts, skills, and attitudes through hands-on exploration of the growth cycle of a plant. Students collect and record data in their notebooks using task-specific rubrics, while they perform the scientific, analytical, and mathematical skills of observation, measurement, graphing, prediction, and reflection. Learning is extended through guided on-line research. As an assessment and culmination to the unit, students use scientific models to write and perform short skits that demonstrate the growth cycle.

In fifth grade, students use technology and hands-on activities to review both 4th and 5th grade science standards. Students utilize the app, Explain Everything, to create, annotate, and orally illustrate diagrams using academic language to explain their scientific understanding of concepts such as human body systems

or the rock cycle. Additionally, the apps Subtext and iBooks allow students to read and interact with scientific text while practicing non-fiction informational reading strategies. Students can highlight text, view video clips, and engage in scientific discussions with their peers regarding the concepts within the text. The 4th and 5th grade standards are further reinforced with an annual scavenger hunt featuring a series of interactive stations and activities. Students build models of the digestive system and the lungs, create electric circuits and compasses, and identify mineral samples using an identification chart. Students must demonstrate mastery of the concepts at each station before progressing through the scavenger hunt.

## **5. Instructional Methods:**

Direct Interactive Instruction (DII) serves as the framework for instruction at Seacliff. Focusing professional development on engaging students in a continuous, high-level of expectations and interactions with teachers and other students, teachers have begun the process of unpacking the Common Core Standards into measurable objectives to begin implementation into routinized lesson structures.

Seacliff's GATE teachers have attended the annually-held California Association for the Gifted summer institute in Santa Barbara. Following Dr. Kaplan's lectures, teachers observe model classrooms where differentiating the curriculum includes depth, complexity, acceleration, and novelty. After the conference, teachers are provided summer planning time to vertically plan for the implementation of differentiation of the curriculum based on standards.

Students with Disabilities (SWD) are provided full access across a variety of settings to the standards-aligned core curriculum through a full inclusion model. Support systems are in place to ensure SWD success in meeting or exceeding high academic and non-academic skills. The specialists collaborate with general education teachers to assist with differentiating instruction and provide academic support by using both "pull-out" and "push-in" models. During the first week of school, teachers are provided release time to meet individually with the special education staff to discuss the details of each child's IEP or 504 plan. Children who qualify for the Resource Specialist Program (RSP) receive services through collaborative models of instruction. Last year, 95% of our RSP students met or exceeded their IEP goals. Our fully included students are achieving outstanding success in regular education classrooms.

Technology is used in various ways to support student learning. One technology intervention group uses Read 180, a computer-based program to increase students' fluency and comprehension in a manner that increases self-esteem and confidence. Teachers use Accelerated Reader to assess student comprehension at students' independent reading levels. Individual results from our ST Math Program inform teachers' instructional decisions when teaching math. Our technology-supported curriculum enables all students to develop deep understanding and complex thinking within and across disciplines. We continue to challenge both teachers and students in their use of more intricate and sophisticated apps as we move into year three of our implementation of tablets in the classroom. Our teachers research apps to find engaging ways to strengthen skills through technology, as evidenced with Explain Everything, Subtext, and Google Drive. iEngage increases student's engagement, active participation, and critical skills to reach the highest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

## **6. Professional Development:**

As part of the SPSA, Seacliff has a comprehensive, long-range professional development plan that focuses on building staff efficacy and increasing student learning. As a Professional Learning Community (PLC), Seacliff uses a multiple step process to design professional growth. Goals in the SPSA are developed using analysis of student performance data, recommendations from the leadership cadre, and incorporation of district/state-mandated requirements. A proposed plan for professional development is presented to the SSC for approval and resource allocation. On modified Thursdays, teachers meet as a whole staff, in grade level teams, or in cross-grade level teams. The district provides three professional development days annually.

Through an intentional staff development delivery model focused on intensive targeted instruction and sustained training and support for all teachers, Seacliff has significantly increased student achievement. For

example, the implementation of CGI has been a steady, continuous, and deliberate process over the course of eight years. Grade levels built upon the foundation set by the previous grade level until all teachers became part of the systemic change. Teachers new to CGI embraced an intensive three-year training program. Annually, they attend five days of training, followed by four scheduled coaching sessions throughout the year where they received feedback and support individually and in grade level teams. The majority of Seacliff teachers have completed the initial training; however, they continue to receive support from two on-site CGI coaches and one coach from Orange County Department of Education.

To integrate technology effectively, Seacliff uses a “trainer of trainers” model. This model provides rigorous staff development and support in implementing iPads and applications along with powerful instructional practices. In-class observations and modeling opportunities are systematically scheduled within all classrooms. This support arms teachers with the skills and resources to confidently integrate new technologies. For example, technology coaches schedule an observation as teachers prepare to integrate their iPad cart of tablets with their students. The coach models management, organizational techniques, and instruction on how to be a good digital citizen when using tablets. Teachers debrief and plan next steps.

In addition to CGI and the integration of technology, coaching and observation opportunities for teachers are on-going for “Number Talks,” SPARK PE lessons, and Direct Interactive Instruction (DII).

The principal also participates in comprehensive training related to the implementation of: California Common Core State Standards, DII, TalentEd employee evaluation system, Doc-Tracking for creating the SPSA, and Progress Adviser for targeted classroom walk-throughs.

## **7. School Leadership**

The principal recognizes the unique talents and strengths of teachers, support staff, parents and community members and fosters an atmosphere of trust among all stakeholders. However, true leadership is a shared responsibility. At Huntington Seacliff, many leadership teams work together to create a safe, trusting environment where students and staff are supported to achieve. The principal ensures that the voices of all stakeholders are heard and shared in the decision making process.

The Seacliff staff serves as a model for instructional leadership. Collaboration and innovation are the hallmark characteristics of Seacliff's approach to instructional practice and professional development and the related impact on student learning, achievement outcomes, and continual improvement efforts. The adults model themselves as a community of learners and routinely share instructional methods, standard-aligned curriculum resources, and conduct observations in colleagues' classrooms to demonstrate and model best instructional practices. District professional development initiatives, such as Direct Interactive Instruction (DII), are actively embraced and best practices are shared openly through the PLC process. The coaching of colleagues is highly encouraged and supported by the principal. This creates a proactive, risk-taking environment where teachers engage students and facilitate academic experiences to encourage problem solving and higher order thinking. In turn, this creates even higher expectations for teachers to support students as learners to meet individual needs and to build the capacity of educators. This impact has subsequently benefitted the entire school district as these innovative practices have been shared and replicated to serve our 7,000 students.

Partnerships among families and community are vital and a source of great pride at Seacliff. Families are encouraged to be involved in the educational process and are actively recruited as volunteers. They also serve in important leadership roles on the SSC which is charged with the responsibility of monitoring our SPSA and allocating resources toward its implementation. The PTA leadership is strongly supported and trained through their organization and they, in turn, train a cadre of volunteers. Annually, more than 250 volunteers donate over 25,000 hours of time, sharing their talents in the classroom and in curricular and extracurricular activities. Parents also participate in decision making by joining our English Learner Advisory Council, and Huntington Beach Educational Foundation and by participating in various committees e.g., text book adoption, safety, curriculum, and technology.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** CA Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR)

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** Educational Testing Service (ETS)

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	89	89	86	88
% Advanced	71	69	65	66	62
Number of students tested	125	127	100	127	103
Percent of total students tested	100	99	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
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	93	100	78	90
% Advanced	44	53	50	61	60
Number of students tested	18	15	10	18	10
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	95	100	92	83
% Advanced	63	70	50	75	33
Number of students tested	16	20	6	12	6
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	100	91	83	92
% Advanced	89	65	71	71	71
Number of students tested	26	26	21	24	24

<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	84	87	84	87
% Advanced	69	68	62	61	64
Number of students tested	73	68	61	80	63
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:**

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4  
**Publisher:** ETS

**Test:** STAR  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	96	92	94	91
% Advanced	88	82	77	80	76
Number of students tested	129	102	132	109	103
Percent of total students tested	99	100	99	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
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	83	81	100	83
% Advanced	50	83	69	83	50
Number of students tested	14	12	16	12	12
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	100	92	75	67
% Advanced	90	86	83	58	50
Number of students tested	19	7	12	12	6
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	91	95	90
% Advanced	93	78	78	86	85
Number of students tested	28	23	23	21	20
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	95	91	96	94
% Advanced	85	83	75	82	75
Number of students tested	68	60	88	55	71
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:**

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5  
**Publisher:** ETS

**Test:** STAR  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	89	92	86	92
% Advanced	73	54	66	62	63
Number of students tested	104	125	110	107	115
Percent of total students tested	100	98	99	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
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	94	91	92	67
% Advanced	69	56	55	42	42
Number of students tested	16	16	11	12	12
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	82	73	75	92
% Advanced	71	55	47	63	54
Number of students tested	7	11	15	8	13
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	92	100	77	96
% Advanced	67	65	81	59	82
Number of students tested	24	26	21	17	27
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	88	94	88	91
% Advanced	76	48	61	63	57
Number of students tested	62	80	54	68	70
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:**

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3  
**Publisher:** ETS

**Test:** STAR  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	86	78	73	81
% Advanced	56	46	37	41	44
Number of students tested	124	127	100	127	101
Percent of total students tested	99	99	100	100	98
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	73	90	67	67
% Advanced	41	40	30	33	22
Number of students tested	17	15	10	18	9
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	90	100	75	67
% Advanced	50	35	50	58	17
Number of students tested	16	20	6	12	6
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	85	71	79	83
% Advanced	69	54	48	54	42
Number of students tested	26	26	21	24	24
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	87	77	71	82
% Advanced	51	46	36	35	50
Number of students tested	72	68	61	80	62
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:**

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4  
**Publisher:** ETS

**Test:** STAR  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	97	94	91	92
% Advanced	80	78	70	75	65
Number of students tested	130	102	132	109	103
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	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
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	92	100	83	83
% Advanced	57	75	75	58	67
Number of students tested	14	12	16	12	12
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	75	83
% Advanced	84	100	75	50	33
Number of students tested	19	7	12	12	6
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	91	96	91	95
% Advanced	82	70	74	86	70
Number of students tested	28	23	23	21	20
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	98	92	93	92
% Advanced	80	78	69	76	68
Number of students tested	69	60	88	55	71
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:**

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5  
**Publisher:** ETS

**Test:** STAR  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	91	88	84	84
% Advanced	62	56	61	47	52
Number of students tested	104	125	111	107	115
Percent of total students tested	100	98	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
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	94	82	92	67
% Advanced	44	53	55	42	33
Number of students tested	16	17	11	12	12
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	73	80	75	85
% Advanced	86	64	53	25	54
Number of students tested	7	11	15	8	13
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	89	91	77	93
% Advanced	58	65	62	41	74
Number of students tested	24	26	21	17	27
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	94	87	87	81
% Advanced	60	50	64	54	44
Number of students tested	62	80	55	68	70
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:**