

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 Mr. Mario Marcos

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

Official School Name Thomas Jefferson Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 2508 East 133rd Street

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

City Compton State CA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 90222-2723

County Los Angeles County State School Code Number* 19 73437 6012298

Telephone 310-898-6190 Fax 310-537-3421

Web site/URL http://tjes-compton-ca.schoolloop.com E-mail mmarcos@compton.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*Mr. Darin Brawley E-mail: dbrawley@compton.k12.ca.us
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Compton Unified School District Tel. 310-898-6190

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 Mr. Micah Ali
(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):
- 22 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 8 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 4 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 34 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. 3 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	11	15	26
K	53	65	118
1	44	48	92
2	41	38	79
3	44	50	94
4	54	49	103
5	44	48	92
6	25	26	51
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	316	339	655

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 2 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 0 % Asian
 - 4 % Black or African American
 - 94 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 0 % 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: 10%

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 <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	28
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	31
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	59
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	574
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.103
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	10

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 57 %
356 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 1
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 95 %
 Total number students who qualify: 621

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: 8 %
50 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.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 2 Autism | 0 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 Deafness | 0 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 35 Specific Learning Disability |
| 0 Emotional Disturbance | 13 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 0 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	1
Classroom teachers	23
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	3
Paraprofessionals	4
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 28:1

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	95%	93%	91%	95%	97%
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

Thomas Jefferson said, “If a nation expects to be ignorant and free...it expects what never was and never will be.” We at Thomas Jefferson Elementary School believe in a rigorous education and are committed to program excellence. As a community of learners that shares a clear vision, we challenge and motivate all our students to accept responsibility for their achievements and to develop the skills necessary to become responsible, productive, caring, active members of our global community. We don’t make excuses for not learning at Jefferson. We believe that Excuses Perpetuate Failure. Our staff knows that every child can and will learn because of us. We strive to provide each one of our scholars the best education possible and staff works hard to increase their own expertise to serve the children and families of our community. We want every child to have many vocational choices in the future.

At Jefferson we work as a team to overcome the challenges that we face in a school where all students qualify for free and reduced lunch, and educational resources outside of campus are very limited. The surrounding community feels love and admiration for their school and several generations have completed elementary education here. It is not surprising that parents were disheartened when, over a decade ago, the funding that was originally intended to rebuild Jefferson ended up being used to build a new school on the other side of town. However, parents came together and beautified the longstanding portable classrooms with fantastic murals and added green areas. Due to budgetary constraints and the economic impact of sustaining a school of aging portable classrooms, Jefferson was almost closed in 2011. It was the enormous pushback from the community that kept the school open.

Jefferson has many strengths. Teachers provide a rigorous curriculum that emphasizes reading, writing, and math skills aligned to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Serving a high percentage of English Learners in the district, our school additionally focuses on the importance of proficiency in English. Teachers and staff work together to make the curriculum relevant for the students. Curriculum is reviewed and developed with the CCSS at the center, and through careful analysis of assessment data we ensure that gaps in student learning are quickly and strategically addressed. Grade level teams meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to standardize instruction and align the curriculum to CCSS to ensure that all students meet or exceed proficiency levels. Students who fall behind in any area receive additional tutoring or homework support through Response to Intervention (RTI), Saturday Academy, and/or the After-School Education and Safety Program (ASES), which has become one of our signature practices. Our Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) students benefit from advanced learning opportunities throughout the school year.

Students at Jefferson are guided by specific rules and classroom expectations that promote respect, responsibility, and safety. We use the Positive Behaviors and Interventions Support System (PBIS). The school’s discipline philosophy promotes a safe learning environment and demonstrates that good discipline is a solid foundation upon which to build an effective school. As a result, our suspension rate is among the lowest in the district (1% \lt). Jefferson’s Student Recognition Program contributes to the positive environment of the school, and includes classroom and school wide awards. Students are recognized throughout the school year for academic achievements, citizenship, and perfect attendance.

Staff and parents play an important role at Jefferson. They participate on teams that ensure instructional programs are consistent with students’ needs and comply with district goals. Opportunities for involvement include School Site Council (SSC), PLCs, Leadership and Safety Committees, English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), and PTA. Parents actively participate in the Parent Center’s activities, volunteer in classrooms, and help supervise students for special events. Additionally, community partnerships with the LA Food Bank, the Getty Museum, Art to Go, and Operation Teddy Bear provide valuable contributions to our school.

With the help of the community and the trust that parents place in us, we have been able to set the wheels in motion for continued success. Jefferson received the California Association of Bilingual Education Seal of Excellence in 2011. In the last two years, the school moved from fifteenth in academic achievement to third

in the district. We are currently awaiting the validation team visit for California Distinguished School on March 25. This recognition by the State of California, has filled all of us with excitement because of the hard work of teachers, parents, community partners, and of course, our students. It has inspired us to continue teaching students to their highest potential. There are many aspirations ahead of us, including becoming a K-8 bilingual school, and reaching our goal of receiving the National Blue Ribbon Award, which would bring recognition to the community, students, and teachers in a school district where no school has ever received such an honor.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Jefferson Elementary students have made significant academic gains during the past three years as reported in California's Accountability Progress Reporting (APR) System. APR System complies with both the state and the federal mandates of accountability outlined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The three reports that comprise the APR are: (1) The state Academic Performance Index (API), with a state goal of 800 points or higher, (2) The federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and (3) Program Improvement Status.

The STAR Assessments have been administered to second through fifth graders yearly since NCLB was adopted by the federal government. Test scores have been used over time for calculating our API and AYP, figures associated with school success for all of our significant subgroups, including Hispanic, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners. Other subgroups, although not numerically significant, are African-Americans and Students with Disabilities.

In the years prior to 2011, Jefferson student academic scores had reached a plateau. Beginning in the 11/12 school year, a significant transformation began to take place. Stakeholders came together during the summer of 2011 with new leadership to address academic challenges and plan a stronger instructional program. As a result, in the last two school years (11/12 and 12/13) the school grew 107 API points, to our current API score of 865, one hundred points more than in 09/10. Jefferson improved from ranking 15th to ranking 3rd in the district, and has clearly surpassed the state goal of 800, which we consider a great achievement.

Jefferson also met its AYP in English Language Arts during the last five years, with the exception of 09-10. Our current AYP in ELA is 57.3%, with no more than a 2-point gap between significant subgroups (Hispanic/Latino, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, and English Learners) and also when compared to the total student population. In the last two years the school has increased 13 percentage proficiency points as measured by the California Standards Test (CST). But academic growth is not just measured by the number of students reaching proficiency and advanced; the number of students scoring in the Far Below Basic (FBB) and Below Basic (BB) Bands was reduced significantly. For example, in 2009 the percentage of students who scored FBB and BB on the CST was 14% in grade 2, 33% in grade 3, 28% in grade 4, and 21% in grade 5. In 2013 this number was significantly lower: 10% in grade 2, 28% in grade 3, 7% in grade 4, and 9% in grade 5. A clear focus on daily guided reading, comprehension strategies, vocabulary building, computer-based reading programs (Waterford, Successmaker, Study Island, Imagine Learning, Accelerated Reader), and daily English-Language Development contextualized through science and social studies have contributed to this steady improvement in reading.

In Mathematics, Jefferson did not meet its AYP in 09/10 or 10/11. Scores had stagnated. However, when stakeholders met in 2011, it sparked a sense of urgency to focus in this area. Before the school year started, teachers and administration conducted a deep analysis of data and identified areas of weakness. All agreed that a change in math teaching practices was necessary, and they committed to fidelity in the District's SWUN Math program. Fidelity to program implementation, ongoing coaching, and grade level planning and collaboration have not only improved results, but have significantly closed the achievement gap. In addition, after-school interventions and Math Saturday Academy have played an important role in our success. In just two years, Jefferson's math AYP moved from 56% to 87.2%, (+ 31 points) placing Jefferson in the lead of all schools in the district in the area of mathematics. It is important to highlight, also, that all significant subgroups are performing within an achievement gap of <1 percentage points. As in Language Arts, the improvement in mathematics performance can be determined not just by the number of scholars passing the CST with proficiency and advanced scores, but also by the significant increase in the number of students exiting the lower performing bands. In 2009 the percentage of scholars who fell in the FBB and BB bands was as follows: 26% in grade 2, 15% in grade 3, 24% in grade 4, and 21% in grade 5. Five years later we were able to reduce the number to 1% in grade 2, 5% in grade 3, 0% in grade 4, and 1% in grade 5. We are extremely pleased with the way our students closed the achievement gap in this area.

Finally, it is important to note that Jefferson was able to exit Program Improvement status permanently in 2008. We are currently one of only four schools in the district in this position. According to the California Department of Education, when compared to all schools in California we moved from scoring a 3 to scoring a 6, and when compared to similar schools in the state we improved our score from a 5 to a 10, which is the highest.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Jefferson's approach to the use of data revolves around four guiding principles: What do we want students to learn? How do we know that they have learned it? How do we respond when they haven't learned it? And how do we respond when they do learn it? Data truly permeates our school and the way we operate. We administer all California mandated tests including the STAR test and the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) for English Learners. All state assessments combined with our own initial diagnostic assessments help us organize our English Language Development (ELD) groups, and design an early RTI program that addresses students' academic needs.

In English Language Arts, teachers administer bi-weekly assessments and quarterly district assessments. Aimsweb diagnostic assessments are administered three times a year in order to measure students' progress in fluency and comprehension. In addition, a variety of computer-based programs (Waterford, Successmaker, Study Island, Imagine Learning, Accelerated Reader) provide teachers with reports that allow them to monitor their scholars' progress on a regular basis. Additionally, the district administers quarterly writing assessments. In mathematics we also use curriculum-based assessment such as SWUN Math unit assessments and trimester tests. In science we administer district quarterly summative assessments.

Jefferson teachers meet on a weekly basis to analyze, disaggregate, and review school site and district benchmark data. Parents are informed on a regular basis of their students' progress, through bi-weekly progress reports, quarterly report cards, and parent-teacher conferences. Assessment results help teachers guide their instruction, take advantage of re-teaching opportunities, create fluid small intervention groups to target the specific deficits of individual students, and find opportunities to challenge students to extend their learning. The administration holds individual teacher data conferences as needed and our data is presented to the entire staff. Based on our data, we provide assistance to teachers needing individual support. Twice a year all district school teams hold district data conferences attended by the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents, principals and central office curriculum specialists. At these conferences ideas for next steps are shared among schools.

Our school wide focus on data and accountability for both students and adults is evident throughout the school. Evidence of this practice, for example, is the display of assessment results for each class in our professional development room. We believe that transparency is necessary in our efforts to identify our needs and find solutions to improve our practice. In addition, data boards are displayed in each classroom, and teachers find multiple ways to celebrate scholars who are making progress or are excelling. With the assistance of the teacher, students learn to interpret their own results, set goals for themselves, and chart their progress in a variety of ways; for example, students use reading fluency recording sheets and multiplication facts tracking charts. Academic achievement is rewarded and celebrated with classroom rewards, Principal's rewards and incentives, and School Quarterly Awards Assemblies. This practice also allows for transparency to all on our campus, including parents, students, staff, and community members.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

At Jefferson we are a community of learners, and our goal is to ensure that knowledge gained is shared. Sharing lessons learned starts within us. Our staff participates in ongoing professional development and grade-level Professional Learning Communities. We greatly value our collaborative planning time when we analyze data, find solutions to enhance learning, and share best practices. Teachers visit each other's classrooms, coach each other in different initiatives, and learn from one another. Our teachers' practice is always improving with the assistance of outside consultants and district coaches who provide training on

different programs and techniques that support the implementation of district initiatives and transition into Common Core.

As enthusiastic as we are to learn from others, we also look forward to sharing our successes with other schools and statewide. We have presented our programs to participants at the annual California Association of Bilingual Educators. Administrators and teachers from other schools (e.g. Mayo, Carver, Foster, and Bunche Elementary Schools) have walked our classrooms on multiple occasions to observe lessons and student work in ELD/SDAIE, close reading, guided reading, and instructional reading workshop. In addition, other schools have come to see the implementation of the English Language Arts advancement program Jefferson Spirals, a standards-review program that was spearheaded by our Jefferson teachers, and created with collaboration from several other district schools (Anderson, Emerson, McKinley, Bunch, and Carver). With full support from the central office, the creation of the Jefferson Spirals was a communal effort made by over 20 teachers throughout the district to make improvement in the area of English Language Arts. We are convinced that our 13 proficiency-points growth (AYP) over the last two years is in part due to this program.

At Jefferson, we look forward to monthly Principal's Network Walkthrough visits to our school. The vertical articulation team is comprised of principals from elementary, middle, and high schools. They observe and give feedback from their observations. The principal is also part of a district principal cohort being coached by previous administrators and superintendents. The lessons learned in this cohort are, in turn, shared with the rest of the faculty with the ultimate goal of improving our practice and increasing academic achievement. The principal has also participated as a member of the Distinguished School County Validation team, bringing to Jefferson teachers other best practices and successful programs that will ultimately be duplicated at our school site.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Following the saying that "It takes a village to raise a child" we are committed to quality programs that encourage parent and community involvement. In this sense, the contributions of our Parent Center have been pivotal. Jefferson's Parent Center is led by an extremely resourceful Community Relations Specialist. Its programs have helped strengthen ongoing communication with the community while promoting meaningful parent participation. The Parent Center hosts trainings and workshops on a variety of topics such as literacy, preparation for test taking, understanding test scores, the CCSS, PBIS, Local Control Funding Formula, nutrition, health, and attendance.

Parents are encouraged to participate in school committees such as our School Site Council (SSC), English Learners Advisory Committee (ELAC), and School Safety and Grade 5 Promotion Committees. Additionally, many parents are very active PTA members, and assume other important roles in the school – Girl Scout facilitators, field trip chaperones, safety leaders, and coordinators of special events such as our campus beautification projects. Parents also assist with our breakfast in the classroom program, take care of the green areas at the school, and help facilitate our yearly book fairs. They help coordinate events such as Back to School Night, and parent-teacher conferences. Some of our bi-lingual parents help as language brokers during these special events.

We have sponsored math and literacy evening workshops that include games, strategies, and take-home manipulatives for our families to continue strengthening at home learning. Parents are also invited to After-School Program (ASES) events such as Field Day, or quarterly presentations around a central academic theme (e.g. Science, Technology and Mathematics (STEAM), Students Are Authors, College Bound, Cultures around the World).

Jefferson has also reached out to the community in an effort to better our school. Our long-term partnership with the Los Angeles Getty Museum and the organization Art to Go, promote the love for the arts amongst our students. The Jester and Pharley Phund is a literacy program partnership that has helped boost character development while igniting a love for reading among our scholars. St. John's Clinic is a partner that provides health workshops for parents and staff, parenting classes, and mental health services for our

families. A local recycling company and long-time partner Demenno Kerdoon has not only donated instructional materials to our school, but also help with yearly school beautification.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Jefferson Elementary uses the district adopted core curriculum, enriched with research-based supplementary materials implemented through effective instructional practices. In English Language Arts we use Open Court, which focuses on a balance of phonics, comprehension skills, strategies, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, and writing. The transition into the CCSS makes it necessary to increase the rigor of the program. K-1 teachers are currently piloting Imagine It, a program already aligned to CCSS. Our 2-6 grade teachers are supplementing the core program with narrative and informative materials, which include sources such as Scholastics Guided Reading library, and exemplary lessons from Achieve the Core and Engage New York. Grade level teams analyze the standards, gather resources, and “backwards plan” their instruction beginning with the CCSS Anchor Standards. Response to Intervention individual and small group work and numerous software programs are available for students at risk or in need of additional support.

English Language Development instruction is offered in the context of Science and Social Studies (Scott Foresman) instruction. While the focus of the ELD block is language development in the four language domains, it is also true that the most efficient way to learn a language is in context, and not in isolation. During ELD/Science/Social Studies, teachers utilize a variety of strategies to promote language acquisition as well as access to content knowledge. Visuals, realia, videos, and hands-on projects bring meaning to language and content.

In mathematics, we use California Mathematics, a curriculum that meets the diverse learning styles of all students. It is enhanced with manipulatives, and hands-on, conceptual learning. Jefferson’s instruction is supported with the use of SWUN Math. SWUN is an instructional delivery tool that provides teachers with a 9-component lesson design along with strategies to incorporate mathematical reasoning, procedural skills and conceptual learning. The strength of our math program has been the consistent use of lesson design. Students who need additional support benefit from our Saturday Math Academy Program.

As much as possible, instructional technology is integrated across the curriculum. Our goal is for students to learn computer literacy skills and use technology as a means to enhance learning. In grade levels K-2, technology is used to reinforce foundational reading skills and improve comprehension. In upper grades technology is used to research and expand learning. Activities are designed to develop technical skills (Microsoft Office Suite and behaviors required in today’s collaborative, web-based workplace). Scholars also practice the habits of digital citizenship as they navigate the Internet.

Jefferson teachers provide daily physical education through organized activities, sports and games. We emphasize the importance of teamwork and sportsmanship. Physical education is also extended as part of our After-School Enrichment Program (ASES). In nutrition/health education, for years our students were encouraged to foster healthy eating habits by participating in the district-adopted Harvest of the Month program, which allowed students to sample and learn about new fresh fruits and vegetables every month. Although the program is currently not in the district, we still embrace the importance of healthy eating habits through classroom mini-lessons during our Breakfast in the Classroom Program, and by offering our students fresh new fruits and vegetables during lunch. On a yearly basis, ASES offers Healthy Habits themes.

Visual and performing arts are integrated into all curricula and in the ASES program our scholars find many opportunities to develop their artistic talents. We have a partnership with Art to Go and the Getty Museum. Students have created art for a “recycled art” show and portrait painting exhibit. They have had lessons in such varied subjects as cubism, Picasso, stained glass and Frank Lloyd Wright. We have offered a piano class after school and we started an animation class where students created animation projects on oceanography and the Sochi Olympic Games. The videos are on our ASES website <http://tjes-compton-ca.schoollloop.com/videos>.

Our curriculum, like our instructional practice, is in continuous refinement and always evolving in order to adjust to the needs of our scholars. We are encouraged by the gains that students have made and excited about the possibilities ahead of us as we transition into the Common Core Standards.

2. Reading/English:

Jefferson's teachers and support team work strategically to meet the academic needs of every student in every classroom. Our primary goal is to ensure that all students build strong foundational reading skills, and are working at grade level by the end of each academic year. Jefferson has successfully implemented a language arts/reading program differentiated to target the needs of our diverse learners. Core and supplementary materials as well as research-based instructional strategies are utilized to support the different academic and language needs of our students.

Open Court has been the core-reading program for over a decade. It was chosen for its comprehensive and research-based reading/language arts component for grades K-5. Building strong foundational skills such as phonics, phonemic awareness, and comprehension strategies through this program has been the ultimate goal in our earlier grades (K-2). In addition to our core program, a wide variety of supplementary materials (e.g. Florida Center for Reading Research) and researched-based strategies are also available to teachers to enhance reading and comprehension skills. Some of these strategies include close reading, small-group guided reading, instructional reading workshop, and text-dependent questioning.

Part of ELA instruction is devoted to English Language Development (ELD). We utilize an ample repertoire of SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English) strategies. SDAIE includes pre-reading strategies (link-word-web, visual reading guide), during reading strategies (graphic organizers, note taking), and after reading strategies (summarization). ELD lessons are taught within the context of Science and Social Studies, which helps build content-specific academic vocabulary while developing English language in the four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In 2013 English Learners at Jefferson met all state Annual Measureable Academic Objectives targets in all three categories (AMAO1, AMAO2, and AMAO3).

Identified students participate in our Gifted and Talented Program (GATE), and are challenged through rigorous, extended learning activities. Students who need additional assistance participate in a systematic Response to Intervention program (RTI). School Curriculum Specialists, classroom teachers, instructional assistants, and future teacher college students have worked in a systematic way with those students who needed additional interventions. Both "push-in" and "pull-out" interventions in small groups have been implemented daily since 2011. We also use a variety of computer-based programs, which include Waterford Reading (K-2), Successmaker (3-6), and Imagine Learning (for English Learners).

Our core program, supplementary materials, instructional strategies, and computer-based programs have resulted in a 13 proficiency-point growth during the last two years, and we are confident that improvement will continue.

3. Mathematics:

Jefferson Elementary has shown consistent growth in mastering the California state standards for mathematics. Part of our success stems from lessons within our curriculum, California Mathematics. The curriculum meets the diverse learning styles of all students. It is enhanced with manipulatives, realia, and hands-on conceptual learning. In addition to our core curriculum, in 2011 Jefferson began implementing the SWUN Math Program, which incorporates daily math facts practice as well as both procedural and conceptual lessons.

Our math block starts with SWUN Math Facts for 30 minutes with the goal of building automaticity. This automaticity is fundamental to success in many areas of higher mathematics. After working on math facts, teachers move into the daily lesson. First, they introduce the lesson objective for the day as well as the target vocabulary. From that point on, instruction flows through the explicit direct instruction lesson design model

(EDI): I do it – we do it – you do it. The lesson is enhanced by frequent checking for understanding, the opportunity for the students to work cooperatively while solving problems in pairs/groups (reaching consensus), and the expectation that a student representative from each group shares his or her findings with the rest of the class (presentation). Other scholars in the classroom have the opportunity to critique and provide feedback. The lessons are wrapped up (closure) with a quick synthesis (oral or in writing) in which students explain what they learned during that particular lesson.

The SWUN Math program has helped arm our teachers with the necessary tools to better prepare our scholars for success. In grades K-2 lessons have already been aligned to the Common Core Standards. In grades 3-6, the focus is on embedding one or more of the eight core mathematical practices in daily lessons and providing our teachers with deeper content knowledge and questioning techniques aligned to the CCSS. Constructive responses and performance tasks are being incorporated, which increases the rigor in the lessons.

We also supplement our core math program with a tutoring/intervention component: our Saturday Math Academy. We have offered over 40 Saturday sessions in the last three years to hundreds of students in grades 2-6. Teachers use SWUN Math lessons, videos, and manipulatives. In 2013-2014, the program continues as strong as it has always been, but it has evolved and improved as we are learning to meet the demands of CCSS.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Science is a very important curriculum area at Jefferson. According to our State Board of Education, “Scientific innovation remains at the core of California’s economy and schools play a huge role in equipping the workforce of tomorrow.” Our students are naturally curious and we use the science curriculum to spark their love of exploration and learning about new things. Instruction focuses on helping students develop scientific concepts within and across the scientific disciplines. We want our students to understand the workings of science and the natural world. Teachers plan science activities that are hands-on and investigative, which makes science well suited to active younger children.

Teachers plan their lessons using the California Science Standards, and also use science as a context for English Language Development (ELD). Lessons are carefully designed to guarantee that students learn the core content and develop their language skills in the four language domains (listening, speaking, reading and writing). Lessons include pre-reading (link-word-web, visual reading guide), during reading (graphic organizers, note taking), and after reading strategies (analysis and summarization). Teachers engage students in academic conversations, and use multiple sentence frames to scaffold language production. They use a variety of visuals, videos, and realia that bring meaning to concepts introduced. There are multiple opportunities for hands-on activities, experiments, and real-life application projects that keep students focused and highly motivated.

Yearly, scholars look forward to our school science fair. The top three projects at every grade level compete at the district science fair. These science projects become a crucial learning experience. Students can work independently or in groups, do library or Internet research, and all learn the scientific method. The projects also help students develop and apply essential skills and content knowledge. Projects may involve the use of word processors and spreadsheets, and many involve a good deal of math. Students present their projects in formal sessions, which helps their presentation and communication skills.

The science focus is reflected on our state CST/CMA science scores. In 2013, 55% of students scored proficient and advanced, which placed Jefferson in the lead in our district. Our focus on ELD through science has also given us very positive results. In 2013 our English Learners met all three Annual Measurable Academic Objectives established by the state of California: AMAO 1 (74.9%); AMAO 2 Cohort 1 (24.3%) & Cohort 2 (47.5%); AMAO 3 or AYP for ELs (met under Safe Harbor).

5. Instructional Methods:

Explicit Direct Instruction has been our core instructional method during the last three years, although necessary changes are made to meet the language and academic needs of all students. Data provides teachers the baseline to differentiate instruction. Students meeting expectations are provided with instruction and activities that are designed to challenge their ability level. Students who are approaching benchmark expectations are monitored and provided with additional instructional support. Students who do not progress at the expected rate are provided with more intensive interventions to overcome their deficits.

A combination of whole group, small group, and individualized instruction is provided on a daily basis. While the core lessons are delivered for the whole group, teachers always find opportunities to meet with small groups to reteach ideas or skills as well as to further enhance the thinking skills of advanced learners. A good example of this would be daily workshop time (K-1), guided reading (grades 3-6), or the small-group reteaching segment embedded in our daily math lessons. In addition, teachers also find opportunities to conference with students who need individualized attention.

English learners receive English Language Development instruction tailored to their language proficiency levels. Most of our teachers are certified in the ELD/Universal Access/SDAIE model offered by Coaching Alongside, thereby providing uniform lesson delivery for our English Learners. Our students with special needs (SWD) also benefit from active differentiation provided by both their regular classroom teacher as well as our Resource Specialist Teacher.

The CCSS are requiring more Cooperative Learning activities with real-life application opportunities. Evidence of this is, for example, the performance tasks that have been developed in the area of mathematics in grades 3-6. While we are still in the beginning stages of implementation, we are excited to see how our scholars are obtaining content knowledge, acquiring skills, and developing work habits as well as practicing the application of all three in “real world” situations.

As we focus on teaching essential 21-century skills, we are making titanic efforts to integrate more technology throughout the curriculum. Many of our teachers integrate videos and slides in lessons to enhance the teaching and learning. Daily visits to the computer lab for lessons are an ongoing practice. We use a variety of software programs that differentiate instruction for students, and help them build skills, conceptual understanding and comprehension.

Other methods of instruction that we use to enhance teaching and learning include student debates, guest speakers, role-playing, music, chants, and poems.

6. Professional Development:

The Jefferson Team has embraced the idea that we are ALL a community of learners committed to ongoing improvement. Our goal is to refine our practice in order to better meet the needs of our scholars. The Principal, as the instructional leader of the school, has been able to benefit from going professional development and coaching sessions provided by Pivot Learning, a non-profit organization of K-12 experts that is helping our district as we transition into the Common Core Standards.

The district and/or the school have provided and will continue providing ongoing professional development for teachers both during the school year and in the summer months. Current training is focused on the CCSS implementation and the core instructional programs. In addition, training has also been provided on the many district initiatives including EDI, creating text-dependent questions, close reading, academic conversations, vocabulary building (Vocabulary Toolkit by Kate Kinsella), Thinking Maps, SDAIE strategies, writing, guided reading, and classroom management. Many of these trainings are differentiated and tailored to the teachers’ needs, since we understand that we all move at a different pace in the learning continuum.

Technology resources require training in order to maximize full implementation and efficacy. Teachers have been provided training in how to implement different curricular computer-based programs, how to generate and interpret reports, and how to effectively tailor instruction to students' needs. The most significant programs implemented at Jefferson include Imagine Learning, Waterford, Success Maker, Accelerated Reader, Study Island, and AimsWeb. Data provided by these programs helps teachers organize their instruction, group their students for differentiated instruction, and align students' needs with school interventions (RTI).

The school instructional program is supported by the school administration and our two Curriculum Specialists who perform lesson observations to identify needs, provide support, and ensure that program implementation is practiced with fidelity. Teachers receive support and coaching sessions from our SWUN Math Coach, who models lessons for teachers in need on a monthly basis and provides ongoing training. Our PAR (Peer Assistance and Review) teacher also works very closely with some of our teachers.

The school facilitates and fully supports professional learning. Teachers and the principal meet and collaborate in their PLCs and discuss instruction and student progress. In addition, we are beginning to use PD360, an internet-based site that provides the content, tools, and resources to improve the practice of our educators. Through access to exemplary lessons, pedagogical theory, and ongoing reflections teachers can increase their own instructional capacity.

7. School Leadership

At Jefferson we truly believe that "it takes a village to raise a child" and we embrace a culture of shared leadership and collaboration. Since our primary focus is student achievement, the role of our Instructional Leadership Team is crucial. The Principal as the instructional leader of the school works closely with stakeholders to guarantee a well-functioning organization focused on student achievement. Working closely with the principal, two full-time Curriculum Specialists observe and demonstrate lessons to coach teachers through ongoing professional development. The Leadership Team is completed by grade level chairs who provide direct input regarding teaching practices and resources.

Jefferson has a strong School Site Council (SSC), composed of teachers, parents, our Community Relations Specialists, and the Principal. The SSC addresses topics related to school programs, budget, and resources. In a school with almost 60% English Learners, the leadership provided by our English Learner Advisory Council is important and their input is highly valued when considering resources and materials needed for scholars. Equally important is the guidance provided by our School Safety Committee, which ensures facilities comply with state requirements and we maintain a safe and secure campus.

Jefferson's leadership has unquestionably put teaching and learning at the center of our practice. Our School Site Council, for example, decided to eliminate categorically funded clerical positions and invest in supplementary curriculum materials and technology (e.g. Scholastics Guided Reading Book Room, new computer lab, classroom technology to enhance learning, supplementary reading materials, etc.). Funding was also allocated to provide more assistance for teachers and students in the classroom (e.g. two curriculum specialists, and future teacher college students), intervention for students at risk (e.g. Saturday Math Academy Program), and planning and collaboration for teachers (e.g. substitutes and extra duty). All this is reflected in our School Plan for Student Achievement.

At Jefferson we know that the involvement of parents and community are vital to increasing academic achievement. The leadership body at the school has established and nurtured relationships with parents and community members to enhance our academic program. There have been parent workshops and trainings (safety, nutrition, policies), literacy and math nights, quarterly ASES presentations for parents, annual safety fairs, and yearly school beautification events. Partnerships with the Getty Museum, Art-to-Go, The Jester and Pharley Phund, Demenoo Kardoan, and Los Angeles Food Bank show that Jefferson Elementary and its community believe education is everybody's business!

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: State Criterion-Reference Tests

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Educational Testing Service

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	70	45	40	70
% Advanced	28	28	20	16	32
Number of students tested	95	94	94	94	87
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	3	4	3	3
% of students tested with alternative assessment	4	3	4	3	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	70	46	39	68
% Advanced	29	28	21	17	30
Number of students tested	87	94	91	87	76
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66	67	46	43	70
% Advanced	29	30	21	18	35
Number of students tested	73	69	70	79	71
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	68	46	40	70
% Advanced	30	29	21	15	32
Number of students tested	90	87	89	92	87
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or					

Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: The 6% of students tested with alternative assessments had IEPs specifying the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

Test: State Criterion-Reference Tests
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	81	57	62	48
% Advanced	72	55	24	27	21
Number of students tested	89	100	88	81	95
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	6	4	6	8
% of students tested with alternative assessment	5	6	5	7	8
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	81	55	61	47
% Advanced	73	55	22	25	23
Number of students tested	82	100	85	76	83
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	81	58	65	47
% Advanced	76	57	23	28	20
Number of students tested	58	74	77	65	75
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	82	57	63	47
% Advanced	74	57	24	28	20
Number of students tested	80	95	86	80	89
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: The 6% of students tested with alternative assessments had IEPs specifying the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

Test: State Criterion-Reference Tests
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	88	79	78	63
% Advanced	51	63	46	49	33
Number of students tested	94	92	76	94	80
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	8	6	6	6	4
% of students tested with alternative assessment	9	7	8	6	5
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	88	79	80	59
% Advanced	52	63	46	52	31
Number of students tested	93	92	72	89	64
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	90	85	83	65
% Advanced	47	62	54	52	36
Number of students tested	71	77	61	77	66
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	88	80	79	65
% Advanced	50	61	47	52	35
Number of students tested	92	88	75	87	75
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: The 6% of students tested with alternative assessments had IEPs specifying the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

Test: State Criterion-Reference Tests
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	41	35	31	19	31
% Advanced	17	6	11	10	7
Number of students tested	95	94	94	94	87
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	5	3	5	3	3
% of students tested with alternative assessment	5	3	5	3	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	41	35	32	18	29
% Advanced	17	6	11	10	7
Number of students tested	87	94	91	87	76
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	38	36	33	20	31
% Advanced	16	7	13	10	7
Number of students tested	73	69	70	79	71
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	41	36	33	20	31
% Advanced	18	7	11	10	7
Number of students tested	90	87	89	92	87
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: The 6% of students tested with alternative assessments had IEPs specifying the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

Test: State Criterion-Reference Tests
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	60	52	44	34
% Advanced	47	34	19	22	12
Number of students tested	89	101	88	81	95
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	7	3	6	8
% of students tested with alternative assessment	5	7	3	7	8
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	60	52	45	35
% Advanced	48	34	19	22	12
Number of students tested	82	101	85	76	83
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	56	52	45	28
% Advanced	53	36	18	25	8
Number of students tested	58	75	77	65	75
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: The 6% of students tested with alternative assessments had IEPs specifying the California Modified Assessment (CMA).

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

Test: State Criterion-Reference Tests
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	65	50	45	54
% Advanced	26	27	16	11	20
Number of students tested	94	92	76	94	80
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	8	6	8	6	4
% of students tested with alternative assessment	9	7	10	6	5
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	54	65	51	46	53
% Advanced	26	27	17	11	19
Number of students tested	93	92	72	89	64
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	49	65	51	44	53
% Advanced	25	26	18	12	23
Number of students tested	71	77	61	77	66
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	52	66	51	45	53
% Advanced	26	26	16	12	21
Number of students tested	92	88	75	87	75
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: The 6% of students tested with alternative assessments had IEPs specifying the California Modified Assessment (CMA).