

U.S. Department of Education
2015 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Ms. Heidi Smith

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

Official School Name Frank L. Huff Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 253 Martens Avenue

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

City Mountain View State CA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 94040-3220

County Santa Clara County State School Code Number* 43-69591-60479071

Telephone 650-526-3490 Fax 650-564-9046

Web site/URL http://huff.mvwsd.org/ E-mail hsmith@mvwsd.org

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. Kevin Skelly

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

E-mail: kskelly@mvwsd.org

Other)

District Name Mountain View Whisman School District Tel. 650-526-3500

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. Chris Chiang

(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 and National Blue Ribbon Schools requirements, are 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 2014-2015 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 2009 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: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014.
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):
- 6 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 0 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 8 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	0	0	0
K	63	44	107
1	48	46	94
2	47	51	98
3	52	48	100
4	48	47	95
5	46	43	89
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	304	279	583

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 32 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 12 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 40 % White
 - 15 % 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 2013 - 2014 year: 9%

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, 2013 until the end of the school year	27
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year	27
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	54
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	579
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.093
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	9

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 21 %
121 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 31
 Specify non-English languages: Arabic, Assyrian, Cantonese, Farsi (Persian), Filipino (Pilipino or Tagalog), French, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin (Putonghua), Marathi, Other non-English languages, Portuguese, Punjabi, Rumanian, Russian, Serbo-Croatian (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian), Spanish, Taiwanese, Tamil, Telugu, Tongan, Turkish, Urdu, and Vietnamese
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 42 %
 Total number students who qualify: 233

Information for Public Schools Only - Data Provided by the State

The state has reported that 42 % of the students enrolled in this school are from low income or disadvantaged families based on the following subgroup(s): Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals

9. Students receiving special education services: 6 %
32 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.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>10</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>7</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>11</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>3</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>1</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> 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	22
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	13
Paraprofessionals	5
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	2

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 27:1

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

Required Information	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Daily student attendance	96%	97%	97%	97%	96%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2014

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

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

15. Please summarize your school mission in 25 words or less: Huff Elementary School is a safe, creative, nurturing learning environment for all students that encourages risk taking, fosters grit, incites curiosity, and inculcates an appreciation for diversity. A Huff education embeds 21st Century skills and opportunities for social and emotional growth into every facet of students' learning experiences in the hopes of supporting the development of college, career, and community ready digital citizens.

PART III – SUMMARY

Mountain View, an originally agrarian town, now the technological capitol of the world in Silicon Valley, is home to Frank L. Huff Elementary School. The area, historically attractive to farmers has now become the mecca for innovators and those seeking opportunity in a multicultural setting. After being closed for almost twenty years due to low enrollment, Frank L. Huff Elementary School was reopened in 1998. It housed 240 students in grades K-5 at that time and was built upon the idea of bringing every piece of diversity present in Mountain View into one school. The school district made a concerted effort to bus students from outside of the neighborhood guidelines to ensure equal access to programming and to create a diverse learning environment for all students. Now servicing almost 600 students (double in size), Huff Elementary is situated in an affluent portion of Mountain View and although this is the case, a representative of the full socioeconomic, multicultural, and diverse community of Mountain View are present on campus. Economically, students come from a mix of home resource settings including middle class, affluent, and socioeconomically disadvantaged.

In addition to this economic variety within the composition of the student body, there are 37 countries represented on Huff's campus and 32 languages spoken by students and families. This international, global perspective adds to the overall teaching and learning experience and has become a hallmark of a Huff education. Anchored in the mantra of "All Children are our Children," Huff Elementary School prides itself on the commitment to meeting the needs of EVERY child in an educational environment comprised of a wide range of academic and social emotional needs in all classrooms. Huff Elementary School prides itself on the commitment to meeting the needs of every child in an educational environment comprised of a wide range of academic and social emotional needs. Twenty-one percent of our students are English Language Learners, approximately twenty percent are identified as gifted and talented, and forty-two percent are free, reduced, and students with disabilities eligible. This wide range of diversity presents a challenge in that school wide efforts must systemically focus on equity, engagement, individualized support, and enrichment for all of our students under one roof. This is quite a task and Huff Elementary School strives to work toward this goal daily as a learning community TEAM.

Huff is comprised of many stakeholders that include active and supportive parents, community organizations, and a dedicated instructional staff. Our teaching staff encompasses a mix of teachers of varying age and life experiences, those new to the profession, seasoned teachers with 10 or more years teaching experience, and teachers in the mid range with 5-9 years experience. Teachers are dedicated to supporting students' growth inside and outside of the classroom by supporting after school homework clubs, Honor Society, Student Council, Tech Squad, Lunchtime Language Buddy Club, spelling and geography bees, school wide community service projects/events, and just to name a few of the extra-curricular activities managed by teachers. Fee and scholarship based after school enrichment programs are available and include speech and debate, Spanish club, chess, drama, art, Wizbots, Math Olympiad, chorus, basketball, tennis, YMCA, and soccer.

The efforts of teachers are matched by our strong PTA and high level of parent involvement to support the success of every child. Through the PTA, the developmental asset based community building program, Project Cornerstone, is alive and well on our campus. Parent volunteers are trained and facilitate school-wide readings of select books focused on character education assets. Being an upstander not a bystander, staying away from negativity, and being a "bucket filler not dipper," are foundational school wide lessons promoted by this program. Project Cornerstone is a point of pride for Huff. Classroom parent volunteers are a significant feature of our school as on any given day, each of the 23 classrooms could host up to 3-4 parents helping children in small group sessions designed by classroom teachers allowing for increased individualized attention for students.

One unique day feature and philosophy of Huff (grounded in the idea that all children are gifted and talented in some way), is Huff's Enrichment for All program and philosophy. Two years ago, team Huff decided as a school community that the existing traditional GATE program was not supporting all students and in fact, contributed to low self efficacy among the children "left behind" when the gifted and talented students left class to engage in enrichment activities during the day.

The program includes during the school day enrichment opportunities for all students by way of speech and debate classes, push-in science lab enrichment, in class Destination Imagination, use of Sandra Kaplan's depth and complexity icons across all content areas, blended learning opportunities for every grade level, and instruction in coding. After transition, the morale of students improved during the day, students' arguments/positions in class were stronger, oral presentations are improving, students' critical thinking skills measured by benchmark and state assessment data continue to improve, and more importantly, all students participate in enrichment, not just a select few.

Each aforementioned aspect of a Huff education contributes to the culture of a "Huff Love" for learning and full support of students' success.

PART IV – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Core Curriculum:

Huff's core curriculum supports the success of every student. California State and Common Core Standards aligned lessons and tasks support our students' success.

Science--The entire science curriculum is supported by the school wide expectation of the standardized use of FOSS curriculum and standards based method of scientific inquiry. FOSS is a research-based, standards aligned, science program for grades K–8. Although FOSS science instruction is a district wide practice, the Huff SITE Plan created by teachers and administration included enhancements that reached far beyond district and FOSS program requirements and standards. In the spirit of a continuous improvement model and customization of FOSS delivery at Huff from its original model, the implementation included but is not limited to the following: a commitment to the posting of clearly written science objectives in grades k-5 classes, weekly grade level collaborations about science instruction and activities to support the FOSS framework, the non negotiable use of science notebooks/journals, increased time weekly of science instruction, pair shares during lab investigations (help with math problem solving), and teacher participation in refresher FOSS trainings. Supplemental nonfiction and fiction texts aligned to the curriculum (topics) provide additional literacy connections to the content while honing reading, note taking, and comprehension skills through this content area. In addition to the purchase of materials, additional hands on opportunities were added to 3rd grade classes (eight per year) last year over and above classroom curriculum. The opportunity to converse with peers during labs, hands on experimentation and written articulation of newly learned material and connections to prior learning are all directly linked to college, career, and community readiness skills and standards.

English Language Arts/Reading—Why write? According to Stephen King (2002), “Writing is thinking through the end of a pen.” As the newly appointed principal in 2012, I received countless requests from all stakeholders to improve students' writing. After closer investigation to this welcoming directive, it was revealed that most students at Frank L. Huff Elementary School traditionally performed well on state exams, but the data consistently pointed to inconsistent performance in the area of writing. A need for a focus on writing and students' effective expression of what they knew was clear. A balanced literacy approach is used and includes novel studies, contextualized grammar focus, and Write Tools implementation. An increase in non fiction materials is evident in all classrooms as well.

Math--Upon closer review of math benchmark and state assessment data, we found that overall, students did well on answering multiple choice and/or direct question prompts; however, struggled with explaining their answers or providing a deeper articulation of the concept behind solving a given problem or application of a skill. Pearson Envision and EngageNY are key curricula used at our school to support students learning. Math concepts and daily learning is supported by math journals in every classroom.

Social Studies—Social Studies curriculum is supported by standards based, aligned lessons heavy in the civic duty and California History content areas. ELA standards are addressed through social studies curriculum as well. Hands on experiences such as Colonial Day, California mission projects, community field trips, community partner engagement (local food service agencies) etc. is a staple to lessons shared with students.

2. Other Curriculum Areas:

To further support the success of every child, partnerships with community organizations such as the YMCA, Community School of Arts, Mountain View Educational Foundation, Girl Scouts, and Avenidas senior center contribute to the offerings on our campus through Playworks recess programming, before and after care (Kids Place), music, art, PE, Lunchtime Language Buddy Club, and push-in weekly 1:1 literacy tutoring for students in lower grades (k-2).

Music--Students participate in foundations of music and art classes for half a year each subject in grades k-five. Students in grades 4 and 5 have the option of choosing an instrument or participating in chorus for a

full year. The art program is standards based and aligned and is comprised of a variety of medium explorations, art form identification, and artists studies. Upper grade students have the opportunity to produce curriculum based plays in science and English Language Arts in grades 3-5, being exposed to general theatre structures and acting techniques.

Students in grades k-5 participate in physical education supported by a standards based approach and an emphasis on health, wellness, and positive prosocial skills.

Technology instruction currently includes two modules of digital citizenship training of students in grades 1-5 and one module for grade K with an emphasis on safety, respectful use of technology, and basic hardware care and use instruction. These modules have been adapted from Common Sense media curriculum and address ISTE standards and basic tenets of effective use of technology. In addition to digital safety instruction, every year, students k-5 engage in coding through the Hour of Code curriculum and intense, enrichment coding classes are delivered to all fifth grade students for seven months out of the school year once a week. Critical thinking skills are honed through the coding programs and tasks and are transferred to the core curriculum during mainframe instruction (critical thinking in math, science etc.).

Speech and debate classes are provided for third through fifth grade students as enrichment for all and is grounded in a sound curriculum that begins with basic public speaking and advances to argument and debate skills. Students engage in classes once a week for seven months out of the school year. Oral presentation projects presented in front of peers and structured debates take place in the classroom when students are ready. Students generalize these speaking skills in English Language Arts, science (presentation of science projects), math (explaining to peers solving of a problem), and social studies (debating ethical, social issues or presenting solutions to social issues).

3. Instructional Methods and Interventions:

Instructional methods at Huff include the strategic use of blended learning, balanced literacy approach in English Language Arts, and integration of English Language Arts skills in both science and social studies instruction. In all core subjects, a focus on writing across the curriculum and hands on learning opportunities is emphasized at every grade level. The use of a structured writing framework school-wide, Write Tools, has been implemented with fidelity and supports all core subjects and writing foundations skills and standards. The choosing of increased and enhanced science instruction as a practice to support overall academic achievement in all core areas is rooted in the understanding of the power of learning by doing, effectiveness of guided inquiry with ELL learners, using technical and or content areas to support students' success in the area of English Language Arts, and the opportunity for high levels of peer to peer interactions during scientific experiments and lab time. English language learner accountable talk stems and discussions frames are used to support discourse in the classroom as well. These reasons for selection of this strategy is best supported by the following quote from the National Science Teachers Association, "Through participation in effective science instruction that incorporates literacy skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and representing), all students can develop academic literacy in English (Bialystok 2008; Gee 2008; Snow 2008). Knowing how science can motivate, excite, and support students in all areas, team Huff concluded that science was "the way to go," to reach our goals. In addition to inquiry methods of instruction and integrated English Language Arts in the sciences (social studies and science), student success is supported by EDI, explicit direct instruction in math and strategically used for newly learned skills and concepts. The EDI approach of explicit learning objectives, accessing prior knowledge, and gradual release during instruction is coupled with an emphasis and process of mathematical processes through a daily math journal. Enrichment and intervention needs are met through the use of math centers and blended learning in classrooms designed to provide support and challenge (Marcy Cooke Tiles, math challenge problem cards, Khan Academy, ST Math, News ELA, and Lexia). Content driven word banks are used with lessons and students are encouraged to challenge themselves and use academic vocabulary when interacting with content and peers and in writing. To compliment what occurs in the classroom, pullout, targeted, intervention in reading, writing, and English language development is provided for students on a weekly basis--3 times a week approximately 30-45 minute sessions. Intervention teachers collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure alignment and clarity of foundational skills that need support and address. Overall, efforts of differentiation take place during instruction based on formative data during lessons. Small groups, both enrichment and support groups take place after mainframe instruction.

PART V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results Narrative Summary:

In recent years, more specifically, and related to science instruction changes and increase in lab time, the team noticed that qualitatively, classroom discussions were richer than before and revolved around science content. The increased guided inquiry was successful in that ELL students were strategically grouped during these sessions proving for beneficial interactions as observed by visitors and administration.

Qualitatively, all classrooms were enriched by the increased frequency of writing and displays of student work reflecting high levels of written aptitude at every grade level. Classroom discussions began to deepen after think and turn and talk time. Early grades were producing writing well above grade level standards.

Quantitatively, scores for classroom assessments improved and benchmark assessments showed growth. Administrative walk through data reflected consistency across grade levels and implementation with fidelity school-wide.

The results thus far have been astounding. A review of ELA CST data (see below chart) reflects significant gains across a three year span of implementation. An examination of the comparison of 2012 and 2013 overall writing cluster data shows strong gains. Surprisingly, math scores seemed to have been influenced as well due to the increased writing during math instructional time. Students being required to explain their answers in written form was a staple in every class. Huff believes that there is a direct correlation between this increase of writing during math instruction and significant gains for subgroups in both ELA and math. Please refer to chart data below. Huff anticipates a positive outcome for CELDT 2013 scores (official scores have not been published).

Team Huff looks forward to continued growth and improvement of this strategy of writing focus through the use of increased blended learning, instructional coaching, and the strengthening of the Huff Professional Learning Community. In addition, a higher frequency of benchmark writing prompt assessments will be included to provide formative data for classroom teachers.

Quantitative data from Science CST results revealed that team Huff exceeded its goal by 2 percentage points in 2013. Science scores rose from 77% to 84% proficient or advanced in one year since the FOSS practice enhancements were employed. Additionally, CELDT reclassification performance improved and more students were reclassified in comparison to the year prior (27 increased to 29). Student API targets were met for all groups. Additionally, CST and science scores continued to improve in 2014 with Science scores at 89% proficient and above.

The work is not done for Huff although goals were met. We still continue to see achievement gaps specific to our ELL Hispanic/Latino population and have rallied behind closing this gap. Evaluation of last year's data was used this current year to continue the focus on science with improvements through the use of push-in science lab enrichment supported by a grant received from the Tides Foundation (upper grades). The purchase of k-2 classroom copies of fiction and non-fiction texts was increased this year to add more reading and listening experiences for students and was also supported by funding from the Tides Foundation. Huff will be diligent and increase the use of technology to enhance instruction (blended learning), ensure devices and internet access in the homes of Hispanic and Latino families, utilize instructional coach support, and consider more rubric based evaluation of oral and written presentations going forward to further accelerate the impact of selected practices.

Huff has identified significant gains in both math and ELA due to our focus on writing and critical thinking through the sciences and hands on experiences (labs); However, a dip in achievement for our 5th grade math students in advanced standing is of concern along with the overall achievement gap for Hispanic and Latino students in both ELA and math.

2. Assessment for Instruction and Learning and Sharing Assessment Results:

A variety of data and techniques are used for the assessment of student progress and formative planning of instruction at Huff Elementary School. ELL progress monitoring occurs once a trimester in a full team discussion during staff meeting time where teachers review classroom, benchmark, and CELDT (English proficiency state assessment results over time). Assessment of students' writing samples also occurs once per trimester in a school-wide fashion. Teachers share and review anchor papers and calibrate assessment expectations (grading and feedback), identify trends, and create plans for grade level and school-wide improvement based on the data. Monthly staff meetings are designated to review student work and classroom artifacts. Teachers review vertically and same grade students work for progress and discuss next steps in instruction based on the learning evidence of students. Parents are informed of student progress in many ways. Individualized student reports are generated and given to parents each trimester. These reports from benchmark assessments highlight standards/strands of strength and needed growth. Parent conferences are scheduled to review individual student achievement and conversations are data based. At PTA and School Site Council meetings achievement data is shared and reviewed. Huff's annual SARC data is made available on the school and district's website. Systemically, teachers also use whiteboards, gesture signals, and non volunteer systems to assess student learning in the moment. Instruction is adjusted as needed based on formative data at that time. Teacher release days for entire grade levels are arranged and supported by benchmark data review with the outcome of collaborative curriculum mapping to support student cohort needs.

The monitoring and assessment process of this practice included trimester science benchmarks for grade 5 students that were reviewed by teachers and administration for next step planning with regard to lesson delivery and curriculum adjustments (enrichment/remediation support). Administrative walkthroughs were consistently conducted to evaluate posted learning objectives and science instruction, science journals/notebooks were collected and graded by teachers and reviewed by administration, and oral presentations and projects were assessed.

Part VI School Support

1. School Climate/Culture

The school culture supports a feeling of connectedness and feeling cared for among teachers in that the structures for input support teachers' moral and access to decision making and open communication. Plus delta Google Docs, Leaderships team, collaborative SITE Planning, weekly staff meetings, Unconference planning and execution by teachers for professional development, review and response to weekly collaboration notes by the principal, and an overall team spirit contribute to teachers' feeling of value and support. In addition, PTA and parent volunteers supports the needs of teaches through volunteering in classrooms and providing financial support for classroom supplies, programs, and substantiated teacher requests to support instructional needs. Teacher surveys based on the Five Dysfunctions of a Team are used annually to evaluate support and feeling of teachers.

The academic, social, and emotional growth is supported by a positive climate enhanced by many structures that include enrichment opportunities during the day for all children, effective community partnerships with parent organizations and community resources (YMCA and Community School of Arts).

Our Project Cornerstone program promotes a positive school environment as well. The efforts of teachers are matched by our strong PTA and high level of parent involvement to support the success of every child. Through the PTA, the developmental asset based community building program, Project Cornerstone, is alive and well on our campus. Parent volunteers are trained and facilitate school-wide readings of select books focused on character education assets. Being an Upstander not a bystander, staying away from negativity, and being a “bucket filler not dipper” are foundational school wide lessons promoted by this program that is a point of pride for Huff and support students' social emotional needs.

2. Engaging Families and Community

The most successful way we work with parents and organizations is through the volunteer networks and contract service providers. Living Classroom is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to inspire children to learn and value our natural world through garden-based education. Living Classroom offers hands-on lessons primarily based in the school garden that involve the study or experiments with living things. Besides labs and Living classroom visits, continued science camp overnight visits to Walden west were accompanied by written student reflections on the science learned and activities enjoyed. To further support the success of every child, partnerships with community organizations such as the YMCA, Mountain View Educational Foundation, Girl Scouts, and Avenidas senior center contribute to the offerings on our campus through Playworks recess programming, before and after care (Kids Place), music, art, PE, lunchtime language buddy club, and push-in weekly 1:1 literacy tutoring for students in lower grades. Synopsis, Google, and Mountain View Educational foundation support or science, Arts, and science fair needs with financial support.

3. Professional Development

Professional development is aligned to Common Core Standards in that 8 grade level collaborations, weekly staff meetings, and teacher release days focus on standards in some way. For example, use of data and review of standards during the year provides for an opportunity to plan standards aligned lessons and pacing adjustment. A full-time instructional coach supports professional development in that she collaborates with the building principal to align sessions with teachers to current instructional needs and recommended practices (Mathematical practices, standards review, number talks, Write tools, shifts in standards review etc.). Off-site training is another option for teachers and teachers may attend select conferences and report back to team members. In addition, inter class visitations is a staple in professional learning at Huff and learning walks support teacher and administrator capacity (principal visits other schools). Grade level teams have identified model schools and practices and conduct visits to these schools as well. We have a new teacher mentor program, BTSA that coordinates teacher inquiry projects, execution of general teacher practices, in situational coaching, and lesson plan development in partnership with

building level coaches. Huff also has a PTA supported technology coach who works with teachers to integrate technology into lesson planning and delivery.

4. School Leadership

Frank L. Huff leadership is comprised of one principal, PTA, School Site Council, ELAC (English Language Learner Committee), Student Organizations, parents, and students. Leadership is encouraged and evident in all stakeholder groups on our campus. Student Council, tech squad, National Honor Society, student recycling teams, recess equipment mangers, classroom helpers, rainy day recess helpers, are just a few of the opportunities students gain access to leadership roles and tasks. In addition to leadership within the school community, several community based relationships support overall student success. Huff' philosophy of leadership is that everyone is a leader and is responsible for supporting students success.

The School Site council ensures accurate planning and spending of resources to support learning. Decisions are made to support learning in an equitable fashion. For example, purchase of sound systems (amplifiers) was made to support ELL learners through this vehicle at our school. Enrichment for all funding and design is funneled through PTA. ELAC English language learner support is discussed, planned and executed. For example, the ELAC committee has planned several parent education opportunities for our Spanish speaking only families to enlighten and support greater understanding about learning standards and assessments. Avenidas elderly reading volunteers coordinate students support based on teacher input and a relationship with the school. Students Council and Honor Society have collaborated on suggestions for enrichment clusters in future years.

PART VIII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>CST</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher: <u>ETS</u>	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient and above	0	92	94	90	91
Advanced	0	79	73	79	76
Number of students tested		94	97	86	97
Percent of total students tested	0	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient and above	0	87	91	46	54
Advanced	0	73	63	18	31
Number of students tested	0	44	32	11	13
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and above	0	75	91	86	88
Advanced	0	89	64	64	72
Number of students tested	0	36	22	28	32
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and above	0	70	81	100	77
Advanced	0	60	50	67	54
Number of students tested	0	10	16	10	13
5. African- American Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient and above	0	97	100	95	97
Advanced	0	84	89	84	93
Number of students tested	0	32	26	19	30

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient and above	0	98	97	95	94
Advanced	0	88	78	85	74
Number of students tested	0	40	36	40	31
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient and above	0				
Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	0				
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient and above	0				
Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	0				
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient and above	0				
Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	0				

NOTES: No data are available for the 2013-2014 school year as California administered the SBAC field test with no reported results.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>CST</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher: <u>ETS</u>	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient and above		92	92	82	92
Advanced		79	74	64	76
Number of students tested		94	86	109	83
Percent of total students tested		100	99	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient and above		89	86	52	63
Advanced		73	61	32	38
Number of students tested		44	36	25	16
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and above		89	86	73	81
Advanced		75	57	50	72
Number of students tested		36	21	40	32
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and above		70	55	56	67
Advanced		60	18	26	61
Number of students tested		10	11	27	18
5. African- American Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient and above		97	90	96	100
Advanced		84	84	86	91
Number of students tested		32	19	28	21
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient and above		98	100	90	97
Advanced		88	82	73	78
Number of students tested		40	39	30	36
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 2013-2014 assessment data is not available for California due to SBAC field test administration with no published results.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>CST</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher: <u>ETS</u>	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient and above		90	81	82	70
Advanced		67	53	54	51
Number of students tested		88	99	85	82
Percent of total students tested		99	99	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient and above		83	79	41	29
Advanced		52	44	18	17
Number of students tested		42	48	17	24
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and above		83	78	73	61
Advanced		48	42	43	42
Number of students tested		29	36	30	38
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and above		64	63	50	36
Advanced		18	15	20	14
Number of students tested		11	27	20	22
5. African- American Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient and above		85	96	100	78
Advanced		65	88	77	72
Number of students tested		20	24	22	18
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient and above		95	89	86	96
Advanced		85	63	54	74
Number of students tested		41	27	35	27
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 2013-2014 assessment data not available due to California's administration of the SBAC filed test yielding no published results.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>CST</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher: <u>ETS</u>	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient and above		82	88	88	83
Advanced		52	66	67	53
Number of students tested		94	97	86	97
Percent of total students tested		100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient and above		80	88	64	46
Advanced		41	59	18	15
Number of students tested		44	32	11	13
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and above		81	86	86	81
Advanced		44	59	64	53
Number of students tested		36	22	28	32
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and above		80	75	70	54
Advanced		70	38	30	23
Number of students tested		10	16	10	13
5. African- American Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient and above		78	92	90	93
Advanced		47	89	63	63
Number of students tested		32	26	19	30
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient and above		90	92	90	87
Advanced		55	64	78	52
Number of students tested		40	36	40	31
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 2013-2014 assessment data unavailable due to administration of SBAC field test administration yielding no published results.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>CST</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher: <u>ETS</u>	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient and above		95	90	77	89
Advanced		86	79	61	71
Number of students tested		91	87	109	83
Percent of total students tested		100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient and above		89	87	44	69
Advanced		75	70	20	44
Number of students tested		28	37	25	16
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and above		91	91	70	88
Advanced		78	68	48	59
Number of students tested		23	22	40	32
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and above		86	64	44	78
Advanced		71	36	15	44
Number of students tested		14	11	27	18
5. African- American Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient and above		96	80	96	100
Advanced		92	75	86	86
Number of students tested		24	20	28	21
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient and above		97	97	83	92
Advanced		89	90	77	78
Number of students tested		35	39	30	36
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 2013-2014 assessment data unavailable due to California administration of SBAC field tests yielding no published results.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>CST</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher: <u>ETS</u>	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient and above		84	76	85	73
Advanced		63	54	59	59
Number of students tested		88	100	85	82
Percent of total students tested		99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment					10
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient and above		74	65	53	33
Advanced		48	41	18	17
Number of students tested		42	49	17	24
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and above		69	65	77	66
Advanced		48	46	50	42
Number of students tested		29	37	30	38
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and above		46	85	55	50
Advanced		18	59	25	14
Number of students tested		11	27	20	22
5. African- American Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient and above		75	92	96	78
Advanced		50	84	77	67
Number of students tested		20	25	22	18
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient and above		93	85	94	93
Advanced		73	59	69	85
Number of students tested		41	27	35	27
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient and above					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 2013-2014 assessment data unavailable due to California's SBAC field test administration yielding no published results.