

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 Mrs. Alicia Aceves

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

Official School Name Andrews School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1010 South Caraway Drive

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

City Whittier State CA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 90601-1121

County Los Angeles State School Code Number* 19-65110-6023709

Telephone 562-789-3140 Fax 562789315

Web site/URL http://andrews-wcsd-ca.schoolloop.com/ E-mail aaceves@whittiercity.net

Twitter Handle

https://mobile.twitter.com/WCSD_Andrews Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

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

Date

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Ron Carruth E-mail: rcarruth@whittiercity.net

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

District Name Whittier City School District Tel. 562-789-3000

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. Ken Henderson

(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):
- 9 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 0 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools

11 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. 5 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	38	32	70
1	35	21	56
2	26	39	65
3	43	37	80
4	35	31	66
5	29	38	67
6	32	35	67
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	238	233	471

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 3 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 85 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 5 % White
 - 6 % 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: 8%

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	16
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	21
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	37
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	471
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.079
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	8

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 14 %
66 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 3
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 57 %
 Total number students who qualify: 268

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: 9 %
44 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.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 8 Autism | 5 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 Deafness | 8 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 6 Specific Learning Disability |
| 0 Emotional Disturbance | 14 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 2 Mental Retardation | 1 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	17
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	1
Paraprofessionals	13
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	0

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 31:1

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	96%	97%	96%	96%	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

At the core of our work at Wallen L. Andrews Elementary School is a shared responsibility to prepare every child to lead successful and productive lives. All of the staff, families, and surrounding community share in a vision that all students can achieve high levels of success:

Andrews Elementary School is admired throughout the community as a school committed to excellence. Every student is respected as an individual and taught to value independence in learning. Students are provided with a well-rounded, rigorous curriculum that allows them to experience multiple perspectives, develop critical thinking skills, and collaborate in learning. Students leave Andrews with the skills and confidence to become impactful leaders in the 21st century.

Andrews Elementary School lies in the tight-knit community of Whittier, California, 13 miles east of Los Angeles. The pride of the community, Andrews School has been trusted to serve multiple generations of families. Grandparents, parents, and former parents serve as classroom volunteers and reading tutors. The Andrews' Harvest Festival, Fine Arts Festival, and Family Academic Nights are annual traditions that bring together the staff, family and community partners. The neighborhood community serves a unique role as the school's advocate; an example is their work with the Los Angeles County Supervisor's office to secure funding for projects such as a 1:1 iPad program for grades 4th – 6th grade students and a walking track on campus.

Andrews Elementary School is a Title I Program School and serves a diverse population of students with three significant subgroups: Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and English Learners. Approximately 480 students in grades K-6 of varying ethnicities, socioeconomic backgrounds, home languages, and diverse learning needs attend Andrews. A majority of students, 85%, are Hispanic. Over 60% of students qualify for free or reduced lunch and 17% of students are identified English Learners. All subgroups over the past two years have met Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) in accordance to NCLB legislation. In 2013, Andrews Elementary School was one of 17 schools in California to exit program improvement, California's criteria for identifying schools that do not meet AYP.

Andrews has experienced exceptional academic growth over the past five years. The school's Academic Performance Index (API), California's accountability system for schools, has increased 75 points to an overall score of 870. Of those 75 API points gained, 64 were achieved in the last two school years. The overall achievement data shows that 69% of all students at Andrews met proficiency requirements in English Language Arts and 78% of students met proficiency requirements in Mathematics.

Two years ago, after close analysis of five year data, the educators at Andrews noticed little growth and, more concerning, a widening achievement gap. After many conversations regarding the data and performance, the staff determined that the culture needed to change from one that accepted the status quo to one that focused on the learning of every student. Fundamental changes were made in order to raise the level of learning for every child and the educators at Andrews developed a comprehensive action plan to increase student achievement for every student in every subgroup.

First, the staff committed to developing as a Professional Learning Community and structures were put into place to support teamwork. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) brought teachers together with new norms for collaboration to plan high quality lessons, analyze student work, and share in instructional strategies. As part of the PLC process, Andrews openly embraced the use of student achievement data to closely monitor student progress. Teachers systematically used both summative and formative data to determine progress towards meeting end of year standards, identifying individual student needs and classroom trends. The use of data has ensured that every student in every subgroup is considered, instruction is adjusted, and progress is made.

Through all of this work, a culture of mutual accountability was created. Through trusting relationships developed during PLCs and the open and honest use of data, every teacher took ownership of the success of

the school. The leadership team researched new ideas and methodology, shared with grade level colleagues, and accepted responsibility in making instructional decisions. Teachers realized the need to focus on one area of instruction to deepen knowledge and student learning. Over the past two years, all professional development, leadership team meetings, and grade level planning work focused on increasing the achievement of every student in writing.

Andrews will sustain and experience academic growth for all students in years to come as professional structures and systems have created a culture that expects excellence. Educators are knowledgeable, share in leadership, and have developed into a community of learners. The entire staff at Andrews takes ownership and responsibility for the success of every child and fully expects through the efforts of the entire staff and community, the achievement gap will continue to close.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

A. Student achievement results show that Andrews has made exceptional growth over the past five years. Andrews' Academic Performance Index (API) has increased 75 points since 2008-2009 to an overall score of 870. In just the last two school years, Andrews' API has increased an impressive 64 points. API is the measure of academic progress of individual schools in California. Andrews surpassed the API performance target of 800 for all schools in California five years ago.

The students at Andrews achieve at remarkable levels in the area of English Language Arts (ELA). In the 2012-2013 school year, 69% of all students scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the California Standards Test (CST) while 67% of Hispanic students, 64% of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and 54% of English Learners met proficiency.

The students at Andrews also achieve at impressive levels in the area of Mathematics. In the 2012-2013 school year, 78% of all students scored proficient or advanced on the Mathematics portion of the CST while 77% of Hispanic students, 72% of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and 70% of English Learners met proficiency.

Andrews met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) within NCLB measures for every subgroup. More specifically, AYP was accomplished by increasing the number of students within every subgroup Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and English Learners performing proficient or advanced for two consecutive years.

The statewide average for English Learners performing proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the CST is 39%. The English Learners at Andrews outperform this average by 15%. Furthermore, over the past two years 25% of English Learners met English Language proficiency requirements as determined by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and are no longer identified as English Learners. Andrews is closing the achievement gap.

B. Andrews is committed to closing the achievement gap between all demographic groups. As a result, every subgroup at Andrews has made significant growth over a five-year period. Data tables of performance trends show that on the English Language Arts section of the California Standards Test (CST) the percentage of all students who scored proficient or advanced increased by 12%, Hispanic students increased by 11%, socioeconomically disadvantaged students increased by 15%, and English Learners increased almost 12%. Data tables of performance trends show that the percentage of all students who scored proficient or advanced on the Mathematics section of the CST also increased. The number of all students who scored proficient or advanced increased by 14%, Hispanic students increased by 17%, socioeconomically disadvantaged students increased by 19%, and English Learners increased a remarkable 25%. Performance trends show that the needs of the diverse student population at Andrews are being addressed.

The significant gains in student achievement at Andrews can be attributed to the careful implementation of new systems and strategies. First and foremost, the focused, collaborative work in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) has changed the manner in which teachers plan together, share best practices, monitor student progress and develop strategies to address the needs of our students. Within PLCs, teachers use data to monitor the progress of students in every subgroup. Teachers share instructional strategies and best practice to design lessons that are aligned to standards and meet the diverse needs of students. PLCs bring teachers together with new norms to support productive, professional conversations about student learning.

The educators at Andrews use student achievement data to closely monitor progress to ensure that every child learns. Through the use of data, teachers hone in on the specific learning needs of each student and tailor instruction within the classroom to provide good first teaching for every child. When a child

demonstrates specific learning needs that require additional support, targeted instruction is provided within our tiered Response to Intervention Model.

Another key factor to which Andrews' remarkable success can be attributed is the emphasis on focused professional development, coupled with coaching, reflection and feedback. After close analysis of student achievement data, the educators at Andrews determined a need to focus on writing instruction to raise the level of learning for all students. Teachers engaged in systematic professional development, researched best practice, and made commitments about further implementation. The literacy coach, Cotsen Mentor, and principal provided timely feedback to teachers and planned professional development based on the needs of teachers. Within this instructional focus, teachers studied lesson design and planning practices. Teachers developed clear teaching points or lesson objectives. As a result, Andrews' teachers are intentional planners who deliver clear lessons to support the learning of every child.

The number of English Learners (ELs) performing at proficient or advanced has increased 12% over the past five years in the area of English Language Arts but there remains a discrepancy between their performance and the overall performance of Andrews students. Within the classroom, instruction is differentiated and the needs of ELs are carefully considered in planning. Teachers utilize Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies to ensure ELs' access to good first teaching. Within the classroom, teachers provide additionally support through the use of sentence frames, "accountable talk", and visual supports in all subjects. ELs are given daily small group, targeted instruction based on English proficiency levels and are given opportunities to progress through language proficiency levels by developing oral language, explicit instruction in the forms and functions of English, and mastery of academic vocabulary.

2. Using Assessment Results:

The educators at Andrews systematically use a variety of assessment data throughout the school year to monitor the progress of every student. Formal assessment results from the California Standards Tests (CSTs) and the District Benchmarks are pieces of summative data used to set goals and determine areas of growth for a class, grade level, and school. Informal assessment data collected from common formative assessments and student work are used to determine student progress towards meeting established goals.

Structures are clearly established at Andrews to support the use of data to monitor the academic progress of every student. At the beginning of the school year, teachers at Andrews use the results from the previous year's CSTs or end of year District Benchmark data (grades K-2) to determine a baseline proficiency level for every student in both ELA and Mathematics. Teachers create a class chart on which to display individual student results and track progress throughout the year. At the close of every trimester, grade level teams meet with the principal and literacy coach to analyze the achievement of every child based on the District Benchmark assessments in both ELA and Mathematics. Teachers use the student achievement charts to code each student's growth or decline based on the recent benchmark assessment. Teachers use item analysis to uncover noticeable trends that indicate both areas of strength and weakness. The team creates Measurable Attainable Results-Oriented Time Specific (SMART) classroom and grade levels goals for the next trimester in both English Language Arts and Mathematics based on trends. SMART goals are designed to increase the number of students meeting proficiency and decrease those who are not. Finally, within SMART goals, teachers determine a specific, high priority standard on which to plan instruction and develop a common formative assessment to monitor student progress.

Both formal and informal student achievement data are used to improve instruction and student learning. Teachers closely analyze data to identify trends and determine an instructional focus for a school year. Within the informational reading and writing focus, teachers develop common constructed response prompts. Teachers share in analyzing student work against a standards-based checklist and use data collected to design instruction.

Parents are kept informed of student progress towards meeting end of year standards throughout the school year. At the beginning of the school year, parents attend information sessions to review CST results, student

goals for the year, and discuss strategies to support at home. Parents are provided with district benchmark results, a standards-based report card, and parent-teacher conferences every trimester to remain informed of their child's progress.

Monthly newsletters provide families with important information to support the academic programs. Monthly newsletters include information about testing schedules, benchmark assessments, and units of study in the classrooms. Banners proudly display the school's academic growth to share successes with the greater community. School topics and information are shared at various community meetings, i.e. Neighborhood Watch, hosted at Andrews.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

The educators at Andrews have long studied best practice and shared successful instructional strategies with other teachers in the district, state, and professional associations. When Andrews emerged as a model for Writer's Workshop, teachers from throughout the Whittier City School District visited Andrews to observe classrooms, consult with Andrews' teachers, and gain support in developing a similar program at their school. Andrews' teachers shared teaching points, student writing checklists, and units of study. Andrews' classrooms were used as demonstration classrooms for teachers throughout the District through the use of videotaped lessons. The District organized a learning walk for a team of administrators to visit classrooms and learn how to implement and support a comprehensive writing program.

Within the District's collaborative structures, Andrews' teachers have the opportunity to share the successful practices Andrews has implemented. Andrews' teachers participated in Curriculum Improvement Teams (CITs) in the Whittier City School District in the areas of Writing, Reading, Mathematics, English Language Development, and Response to Intervention. Andrews' teachers shared model lessons, specific strategies, and best practice.

The staff at Andrews committed to partnering with the Cotsen Foundation to participate in the Art of Teaching program to further professional growth. A majority of teachers at Andrews applied to the elite fellowship program for a two-year study in a self-selected, specific content area. Six fellows and one mentor were chosen to participate. Fellows intensely study pedagogy and methodology in reading, mathematics, and science. At Cotsen sponsored institutes, Andrews' fellows meet with other teachers throughout California to share best practice and instructional strategies. The Cotsen mentor at Andrews regularly presents to colleagues within the Cotsen network the work of the Andrews' fellows in best practices in Balanced Literacy and Cognitively Guided Instruction.

Andrews was one of two schools in the district to embrace a 1:1 technology device program. The 1:1 iPad program spans across three grade levels. When other schools were planning to follow this path, principals sent teams of teachers to observe Andrews' classrooms to gain ideas and strategies to integrate technology across the curriculum.

Andrews has partnered with Growing Educators, a professional development organization. Through custom designed professional development, labsite classrooms have been created at Andrews. Labsites provide opportunities for teachers to observe a demonstration lesson and dialogue with other educators to grow instructional practices in teaching. Labsites are open to teachers throughout the Whittier City School District and other schools affiliated with Growing Educators.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

The staff at Andrews believes that informed parents are empowered parents and that student achievement is improved when parents are partners in their child's learning. The educators at Andrews constantly work to engage families to raise the level of learning for every student.

The most effective strategy found to engage parents in academic programs are parent information sessions about end of year expectations in reading, writing, and mathematics. Parents look at their child's individual

achievement on the California Standards Test in both Language Arts and Mathematics. They also review their child's established goals for performance and learn ways to support learning at home. Parents are informed of grade level standards, try sample test items, and examine school-wide achievement data. As the state of California transitions to the Common Core State Standards and Smarter Balanced Assessments, study sessions have evolved into a close study of the Common Core State Standards. In Common Core Study Sessions, parents examine new expectations for student learning in reading, writing, and mathematics. Parents are also given the opportunity to complete practice exams.

Any student, in any subgroup, who is struggling to meet end of year standards is offered intervention services. Parents of 'at-risk' students must attend a conference with the principal. The principal and parent closely examine achievement results and the principal shares student learning goals. This practice has ensured that parents of at-risk students are engaged in the school process.

Parents are further connected to students' academic life through Literacy, Science, and Math Family Nights. Furthermore, parent orientation is offered for web-based academic support programs, i.e. Accelerated Reader and Spatial-Temporal Math. Parents are given the opportunity to preview the programs, create parent log-ins to monitor their child's progress, and taught how to use these programs at home. The PTA and Dad's Club work tirelessly to provide resources such as books, classroom materials, and incentives for student academic progress.

A majority of Andrews' students will be first generation college graduates. Andrews' parents and staff develop strong, supportive relationships to ensure that all children have a solid academic foundation to promote future successes in college and career.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

For several years, Andrews Elementary School used the state adopted standards-aligned reading curriculum with fidelity but all efforts yielded little growth in students. Close analysis of student achievement data and a careful review of the curriculum showed students needed support in comprehension of informational text as well as explicit teaching of writing. Andrews committed to an instructional focus of writing across all content areas. Teachers deconstructed informational reading standards to develop long-range plans. As a result, teachers also chose to implement close reading as a practice to teach students to carefully read and understand complex, high-quality texts. Standards-based lessons were carefully crafted to develop critical thinking skills about new information. Constructed response writing prompts about texts were developed to solidify learning.

Teachers at Andrews built on that work and committed to strengthen pedagogical knowledge through the Writer's Workshop approach. Teachers planned standards-aligned units of study, lesson design, and the developed clear teaching points within Writer's Workshop. Students study the writing process within narrative, opinion/argument, and information writing and develop pieces. Through close reading and Writer's Workshop, teachers at Andrews cultivated skilled planning practices based on standards and student need.

Andrews teachers' close study of pedagogy and the practice of standards-based planning based on student need laid a strong foundation for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards. Andrews transitioned to the Balanced Literacy approach to teaching reading and writing this year to design curriculum that meets the rigors and demands of the Common Core State Standards. At the core of this approach are the daily Reader's and Writer's Workshop. Other components of Balanced Literacy are interactive read aloud, shared reading and writing, close reading, and word work that, combined together, provide students with a rigorous and relevant literacy program.

Providing opportunities for students to use a variety of strategies to solve contextual mathematical problems is the cornerstone of the mathematics program. The more traditional adopted mathematics curriculum is supplemented in every classroom to include opportunities for students to develop into skilled problem solvers. Spatial-Temporal Math (ST Math) is a web-based individualized, supplemental program designed to provide additional problem solving support to all students. In the primary grades, teachers at Andrews emphasize foundational skills such as identifying patterns and developing visual representations of numbers. In the upper grade classrooms, teachers utilize Cognitively Guided Instruction as an approach to teaching mathematics.

Science and social studies are essential components of our curriculum. All grade levels participate in three science units each year with FOSS hands-on, inquiry based science kits. Students develop theories, test hypotheses, collect data and observations, and write about the scientific process in their science notebooks. A science lab enrichment course enhances curriculum to further engage students in the scientific process. In addition, every grade level plans social studies units in which the Common Core State Standards for Literacy in Science and Social Studies are embedded. Teachers use primary sources and informational texts to support units of study. Students write about social studies topics and respond to new information learned. Academic vocabulary, content knowledge, and appreciation for careers within science and social studies provide all students with valuable learning experiences to close the achievement gap.

At Andrews, technology is used as a tool for both teaching and learning. Every teacher at Andrews uses iPad applications to collect student data and conference records to design instruction. Students have access to a fully upgraded lab and 4th, 5th, and 6th grade classrooms have 1:1 iPad programs. The 1:1 iPad program allows students to communicate through internal social media applications, collaborate to create shared projects, and have immediate access to new information. Technology is embedded into instruction and 21st century skills are integrated into the daily lives of students.

Students at Andrews are exposed to enriching experiences that enhance the rigorous academic program. Students study the work of various artists and mediums in the art program and display their work at an annual Fine Arts Festival. Students participate in music education and study composers in history, learn how to read music, and apply music skills in a violin program. All teachers use the CATCH curriculum to teach physical education, nutrition, and promote a healthy lifestyle in students.

2. Reading/English:

For several years, Andrews Elementary School used the state adopted, standards-aligned reading curriculum, Houghton Mifflin, a traditional basal series. Andrews experienced initial success upon implementation of the program but quickly experienced a plateau in student performance. Teachers closely analyzed English Language Arts results from the California Standards Tests over the course of several years. A noticeable trend emerged: reading comprehension scores were weak. More specifically, the results showed that a majority of students did not demonstrate understanding of informational texts.

Andrews' teachers made the decision to augment the reading curriculum to include constructed response writing about the close reading of informational texts. Teachers utilize the close reading approach and choose high interest, complex informational texts around which to build lessons to develop critical thinking and textual analysis skills for all students. Teachers lead structured discussions using sentence frames and provide students opportunities to synthesize and develop new ideas about information learned. Students then craft well-developed writing to constructed response questions to solidify learning. Through the implementation of close reading, planning practices were strengthened and teachers recognized the need to create curriculum that was rigorous, relevant, and based on student need. The Andrews' staff transitioned to the Balanced Literacy approach this year to provide students with rich reading and writing experiences aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

Explicit instruction of foundational skills is provided to students learning how to read. Beginning in kindergarten, students are immersed in language-rich classrooms with significant exposure to a variety of texts. Specific time is set aside to teach phonemic awareness in kindergarten through songs, poems, rhyming, and nonsense words. In first and second grade, teachers continue to build early reading skills with direct instruction in phonics. In the primary grades, a great deal of emphasis is placed on explicit vocabulary instruction to ensure that students can derive meaning from words. With this solid foundation, every student in every subgroup will transition from learning to read to reading for meaning.

Through good first teaching, students are given ample time to practice reading and build reading stamina every day. During independent reading, students performing above and below grade level are matched to texts to ensure practice with appropriate complexity. During conferences, teachers assess progress and provide tailored instruction to support the specific needs of the reader. For students performing below grade level, targeted tier two intervention services within the Response to Intervention model are provided.

3. Mathematics:

Andrews Elementary School uses the state adopted, traditional Mathematics curriculum, Harcourt. The program provides teachers a framework to teach math skills across all mathematical strands, i.e. numbers sense, algebra & functions. The curriculum is very broad in scope but does not offer students enough depth to develop strong conceptual understanding.

Andrews' teachers participated in the District's Math Curriculum Improvement Team. Teachers restructured the existing math program to provide more opportunities for students to develop important mathematical concepts based on identified priority standards. Several teachers participated in a math grant that focused on strengthening conceptual mathematical instruction. This understanding was the impetus for change in instruction to strengthen mathematical concepts. In grade level team meetings, teachers developed a shared knowledge of how to explicitly teach students to analyze a problem and determine an appropriate problem solving strategy.

Modest gains were made before the implementation of Spatial Temporal Math (ST Math), a research based, online program designed to develop logical and spatial reasoning in students. ST Math is a visual program and designed to move at an individual pace. The program allows students, regardless of home language or English proficiency, access to mathematical concepts free from reading. Significant growth was made across all subgroups in mathematics. After only the first year of implementation, 11% of English Learners increased proficiency as measured by the CST. Furthermore, upper grade teachers use the Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) approach to teaching mathematics. CGI develops math skills through contextual problem solving. Within this approach, students are supported in development of visual representation of numbers and problem solving efficiency.

There is explicit instruction in foundational skills for our youngest mathematicians. Time is set aside to teach patterns and number sense. In first and second grades, a mathematical foundation is built through direct instruction in place value and a visual representation of numbers. Students move from concrete problems to abstract ideas with a strong conceptual understanding of mathematics.

During instruction, teachers carefully monitor students' progress and differentiate based on student need within good first teaching, tier one instruction. For students performing below grade level, teachers provide on the spot support through questioning and small group strategy work. Teachers offer extension activities for current concepts such as more rigorous problems that may include complex numbers or multi-steps for students performing above grade level. For struggling students, targeted tier two intervention services are provided within the school day.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Andrews is a school committed to excellence. Students will leave Andrews with the skills and confidence to be impactful leaders in the 21st century. In order for students to be competitive in college and career, they must be able to think critically about new information and write well to communicate. Through writing instruction, the Andrews' teachers provide experiences for students to analyze new material, address points of view, and effectively convey information.

Several years ago, the educators at Andrews committed to the workshop approach to teaching writing. Within Writer's Workshop students are provided with explicit, daily instruction in writing. Students grow as writers within units of study that instill genre knowledge and are taught specific strategies to support writing development. The four specific skills most important to 21st century learning: critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity are developed in and through Writer's Workshop.

The units of study at Andrews provide students the opportunity to develop pieces aligned with genres required by the Common Core State Standards: narrative, argumentative/opinion, and information. All of our writing work requires students to demonstrate knowledge at levels 3 and 4 as outlined in Webb's Depth of Knowledge, i.e. create, revise, synthesize, cite evidence. For example, our upper grade students develop personal essays, a form of narrative non-fiction writing. Students must develop a logical argument about a topic of choice and cite specific evidence to support their point of view. Students must synthesize information as well as communicate their ideas and information in a well-organized structure. Another example of a unit of study at Andrews is our All-About Books writing in grades K-2. Every child must construct a book of knowledge about a chosen non-fiction topic, differentiate between important information, and make connections among information. Students at Andrews produce writing of relevance and significance to the world.

Daily, explicit writing instruction and independent writing time has positively impacted all students at Andrews. Students take great care in their work as writers. Children have internalized the writing process and independently develop pieces over time. Students think deeply about topics on which they write and develop critical thinking skills when writing about new information. Students have confidence, write more, and are connected to writing. The students at Andrews are strong writers and this foundation support success in all future endeavors.

5. Instructional Methods:

The educators at Andrews spent several years developing curriculum to supplement state adopted programs. Student achievement results showed positive growth as rigorous learning experiences were created in reading, writing and mathematics. Andrews' teachers reflected on possible next steps to continue an upward trajectory in student achievement. Educators determined next steps to include designing and constructing standards-based curriculum responsive to student need to increase rigor in academic programs and ensure that all student learning is the focus of all instruction.

Andrews' teachers embarked on a year-long study of lesson design, choosing to study the architecture of a lesson within the workshop approach to instruction. The architecture of a lesson within this approach is built upon an intentionally crafted teaching point based on the standards. In every lesson, teachers name the lesson objective and explicitly demonstrate a strategy. Students talk about and practice the objective before they engage in independent work. Within the lesson, teachers utilize a variety of strategies to reach the diverse population of students in the classroom. Teachers create charts to visually support instruction, particularly for students who may need additional references.

The workshop approach is used in reading, writing and math instruction and allows teachers opportunities to check for understanding and differentiate based on student need. Throughout the workshop lesson, teachers observe, question, and listen in on student conversations to check for understanding. Independent work time is intentionally designed to support differentiation. Teachers meet with small groups of students during workshop to reteach the lesson when needed. During reading, students are matched to texts based on individual students' reading levels. In writing, students develop pieces based on choice and interest, moving through the writing process at an independent pace. During mathematics, teachers provide students with problems of varying complexity based on student need. Individual conferences with students are held in every subject area to provide immediate feedback and offer additional support or extension to differentiate instruction for all students.

Technology is meaningfully integrated into academic programs to support student learning. Teachers utilize iPad applications to collect student data and conference notes to inform instruction. Students have access to a fully upgraded lab and our 4th, 5th, and 6th grade classrooms have 1:1 iPad programs. Spatial-Temporal Math (ST Math) is a web-based individualized, supplemental program designed to provide additional problem solving support to all students. Students utilize e-tools in mathematics, such as online manipulatives, to support independent work.

6. Professional Development:

Establishing and maintaining a culture of ongoing learning is a core principle of Andrews School. Professional Learning Communities, which focuses on embedding teacher collaboration and instructional planning into the daily schedule, ensures sustained professional development for Andrews teachers. In addition, the educators at Andrews recognize that it is imperative to collaborate around an agreed upon instructional focus in order to increase student achievement. Through collaboration, teachers engage in shared planning, reflective dialogue, and research best practice. All professional development at Andrews is collaborative and the responsibility for learning is shared among all staff members.

The catalyst for professional development is always student achievement data. Each year, all teachers at Andrews examine student performance to identify an instructional focus. Two years ago, Andrews chose writing as the area in which to focus all collaborative conversations, shared planning, and the study of best practice. The instructional leadership team drives research and are responsible for disseminating information and new learning to grade level teammates.

Collaboration is formalized through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Within PLCs, norms are established to provide a framework by which grade level teams work. Grade level leaders and the principal work closely together to plan detailed agendas during leadership team meetings in order to guarantee productive team meetings. Teachers develop common formative assessments to closely monitor student

progress. Through the analysis of data and student work, teams identify student need and share strategies to differentiate instruction. Furthermore, grade level teams share in the development of clear teaching points and planning of effective lessons.

Lesson Studies and Learning Walks are other embedded professional development opportunities that enhance the effectiveness of instruction at Andrews School. In Lesson Study, teams of teachers plan a standards-aligned lesson, implement the lesson in the classroom, and reflect on its effectiveness. Student work produced during the lesson is analyzed and next steps are determined. During collaborative Learning Walks, a lead teacher facilitates classroom observations around a chosen topic such as environment, instruction, or student engagement. Learning Walks create consistency, build capacity, and allow teachers to find evidence within classrooms that support shared commitments.

Andrews' teachers participate in collaborative professional development within established labsite classrooms. In the labsite classroom, teachers observe a demonstration of best practice, immediately analyze observations, and hold reflective, collaborative conversations about learning. Teachers collaborate within labsites to grow best practice and share in learning.

7. School Leadership

At Andrews there is a shared belief that all students can learn and that it is the collective responsibility of every educator to ensure that every child is successful. The responsibility to safeguard this vision is shared and distributed among every staff member. Achieving our vision requires high quality curriculum and instruction and is dependent upon a high level of collaboration forged around a shared commitment to our common purpose.

At Andrews, all instructional decisions begin with the leadership team. The leadership team is comprised of grade level leaders and the principal. Every leadership team agenda includes time for the team to reflect on work accomplished during grade level team meetings, research best practice, make commitments about sharing with grade level teammates, and strengthen facilitation skills. At every leadership meeting, grade level leaders discuss next steps to further progress in the instructional focus.

At the same time, the principal's knowledge of the standards-based instructional program, developing teacher expertise, as well as supporting the professional development needs of teachers are critical elements of a successful school. The principal provides ongoing support for the learning of all teachers, ensuring that teachers have opportunities to participate in a wide range of professional development opportunities, collaborate and share best practice with peers. The principal participates in a variety of professional development opportunities along with teachers and is committed to being co-learner with teachers, modeling the continuous improvement practices she seeks to nurture and support.

Decisions about policies, procedures, and programs are shared and responsibility is distributed at Andrews. The vision statement guides every decision. The leadership team works collaboratively with the principal to implement policies to protect instructional time, develop procedures for grade level team meetings and collaboratively plan agendas to enhance productivity during PLCs. The leadership team shares in the responsibility to build professional relationships to better support student achievement. Grade level leaders develop team norms for their work in PLCs and further develop facilitation skills to lead effective team meetings.

The leadership team and principal determine resources needed to support the instructional focus and student achievement. School leaders make recommendations to the School Site Council about materials, i.e. books, technology applications, teacher resources to support student achievement. The School Site Council is comprised of the principal, teachers, staff members, and parents whose primary responsibility is to determine how resources will be allocated within the school budget.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: California Standards Test

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	79	69	83	72
% Advanced	54	49	35	54	45
Number of students tested	72	72	77	65	71
Percent of total students tested	27	26	26	23	27
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	6	19	10	9	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2	7	3	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	74	62	71	51
% Advanced	51	39	24	49	28
Number of students tested	35	39	45	35	39
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	80	54	67	67
% Advanced	50	27	23	50	50
Number of students tested	14	15	13	12	12
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	80	65	70	70
% Advanced	53	47	34	45	45
Number of students tested	61	60	65	56	56
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: California Standards Test

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	81	70	70	63
% Advanced	46	49	37	35	33
Number of students tested	65	72	71	77	67
Percent of total students tested	24	26	24	27	25
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	19	7	13	8	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	7	3	4	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	74	63	68	51
% Advanced	43	43	38	27	28
Number of students tested	40	42	32	41	39
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	71	73	50	40
% Advanced	25	36	33	0	30
Number of students tested	12	14	15	12	10
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	80	68	66	58
% Advanced	45	43	34	28	32
Number of students tested	58	60	59	61	57
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Pearson

Test: California Standards Test
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	75	75	48	41	64
% Advanced	30	37	18	11	34
Number of students tested	67	67	77	75	70
Percent of total students tested	25	24	26	26	26
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	13	9	6	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	5	3	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	68	48	27	46
% Advanced	18	29	20	9	22
Number of students tested	38	31	40	44	37
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	57	39	9	54
% Advanced	25	21	8	0	31
Number of students tested	12	14	13	11	13
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	73	48	39	62
% Advanced	26	33	18	9	30
Number of students tested	57	55	61	67	60
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: Pearson

Test: California Standards Test
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	56	64	47
% Advanced	36	25	24	28	14
Number of students tested	66	68	70	69	57
Percent of total students tested	24	24	24	24	22
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	9	5	5	2	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	3	2	2	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	65	63	48	62	37
% Advanced	29	26	20	18	10
Number of students tested	31	35	40	39	30
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	38	50	40	25
% Advanced	21	13	20	10	13
Number of students tested	14	8	10	10	8
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	58	55	63	48
% Advanced	34	22	23	22	13
Number of students tested	53	55	62	59	48
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Pearson

Test: California Standards Test
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	63	57	44	55	48
% Advanced	31	24	17	39	10
Number of students tested	72	72	77	65	71
Percent of total students tested	27	26	26	23	27
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	6	19	10	9	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2	7	3	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	51	51	33	47	54
% Advanced	26	13	16	32	17
Number of students tested	35	39	45	38	35
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	57	40	15	42	50
% Advanced	29	7	8	33	0
Number of students tested	14	15	13	12	12
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	59	53	40	54	47
% Advanced	25	20	15	33	9
Number of students tested	61	60	65	54	56
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Pearson

Test: California Standards Test
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	74	73	66	66
% Advanced	34	43	42	33	34
Number of students tested	65	72	71	77	67
Percent of total students tested	24	26	24	27	25
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	19	7	13	8	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	7	3	4	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	69	66	59	62
% Advanced	38	43	22	34	23
Number of students tested	40	42	32	41	39
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	57	67	50	30
% Advanced	25	21	27	17	10
Number of students tested	12	14	15	12	10
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	70	73	66	63
% Advanced	31	43	37	30	33
Number of students tested	58	60	59	61	57
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Pearson

Test: California Standards Test
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	72	79	58	52	60
% Advanced	22	34	21	24	16
Number of students tested	67	68	77	75	79
Percent of total students tested	25	24	26	26	26
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	13	9	6	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	5	3	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	61	72	60	41	38
% Advanced	13	19	20	16	8
Number of students tested	38	32	40	44	37
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	71	62	27	39
% Advanced	8	7	8	0	8
Number of students tested	12	14	13	11	13
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	76	59	49	55
% Advanced	19	27	18	24	15
Number of students tested	57	55	61	67	60
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: Pearson

Test: California Standards Test
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	71	63	56	67	61
% Advanced	44	25	33	31	21
Number of students tested	66	68	70	69	57
Percent of total students tested	24	24	24	24	22
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	9	5	5	2	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	3	2	2	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	61	66	50	56	43
% Advanced	32	29	30	18	13
Number of students tested	31	35	40	39	30
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	57	50	40	20	50
% Advanced	36	13	40	0	0
Number of students tested	14	8	10	10	8
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	66	53	63	63
% Advanced	40	22	32	27	19
Number of students tested	53	55	62	59	48
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: