

2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Public Private

Cover Sheet

Type of School
(Check all that apply)

Elementary Middle High K-12
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal Ms. Janan Rai Hughes

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

Official School Name Albert Baxter Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 14929 S. Cerritos Ave.

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

Bellflower

California

90706-2827

City

State

Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Los Angeles

State School Code Number* 19-64303-6011605

Telephone (562) 531-1602

Fax (562) 531-4073

Web site/URL busd.k12.ca.us

E-mail JHughes@busd.k12.ca.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

Principal's Signature

Name of Superintendent Mr. Rick Kemppainen

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

District Name Bellflower Unified School District

Tel. (562) 866-9011

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Dr. Paul Helzer

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

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

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

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

Mail by commercial carrier (FedEx, UPS) or courier original signed cover sheet to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5E103, Washington DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

The signatures on the first page of this application 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 has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2007-2008 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2002 and has not received the No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district wide compliance review.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

DISTRICT (Question 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: _____ 11 Elementary schools
 _____ Middle schools
 _____ Junior High Schools
 _____ 2 High schools
 _____ 1 Other
 _____ 14 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 4527
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 4743

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located
 Urban or large central city
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban are
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural are
 Rural
4. _____ 2 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 _____ 4 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
Pre K			0	7			0
K	34	45	79	8			0
1	38	37	75	9			0
2	37	37	74	10			0
3	37	41	78	11			0
4	37	41	78	12			0
5	43	42	85	Other			0
6	39	39	78				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							547

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 2 | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 9 | % Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 10 | % Black or African American |
| 73 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 6 | % White |

100 % TOTAL

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year 11 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year	29
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	31
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	60
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	547
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.11
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	11

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 34 %
- | | |
|-----|---|
| 187 | Total Number Limited English Proficient |
|-----|---|

Number of languages represented 10

Specify languages: Spanish, Cambodian, Tagalog, Cantonese, Hindi, French, Pashto, Gujarati, Tongan, and Other Filipino.

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

Total number students who qualify: 413

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low income families, or the school does not participate in the federally supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: $\frac{14}{74}$ %
 Total Number of Students Serve

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>0</u>	Autism	<u>0</u>	Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u>	Deafness	<u>10</u>	Other Health Impairment
<u>0</u>	Deaf-Blindnes	<u>29</u>	Specific Learning Disabilit
<u>0</u>	Emotional Disturbanc	<u>30</u>	Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u>	Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u>	Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>3</u>	Mental Retardation	<u>0</u>	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>2</u>	Multiple Disabilities		

11. Indicate number of full time and part time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>24</u>	<u>2</u>
Special resource teachers/specialist	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Support Staff	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>
Total number	<u>33</u>	<u>18</u>

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

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Please explain a high teacher turnover rate. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy in attendance, dropout or the drop-off rates. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates, and only high schools need to supply drop-off

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Daily student attendance	96 %	96 %	97 %	96 %	97 %
Daily teacher attendance	98 %	98 %	97 %	98 %	97 %
Teacher turnover rate	1 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
Student drop out rate (middle/high	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
Student drop-off rate (high school	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

Please provide all explanations below

PART III - SUMMARY

Albert Baxter Elementary School's vision is to provide a safe, positive, and challenging learning environment which maximizes opportunities for our diverse student population to develop academically, socially, emotionally, and physically into responsible and productive citizens through a comprehensive, standards based curriculum provided by a highly trained, professional staff in active partnership with families. Our staff is guided by a shared commitment to educate all students to reach their fullest potential. We are dedicated to the recognition of the unique value of each person and the inspiration of each student to give his/her personal best effort to achieve individual success at school.

Before the first student arrives each day, our dedicated staff is busy preparing to carry out our vision. Each school day begins by bringing the school community together for our flag salute. As student council members raise the flag, we share a moment of silence. Our school pledge reminds us of the value of every new day of learning. A strong positive school culture promotes responsible behavior and mutual respect between students and staff.

Our students are actively engaged in classrooms that are places of high expectations and responsibility. These classrooms are equipped with multi-media resources to enhance instruction and learning. All students benefit from computer-assisted learning time. The prominent role of technology helps our school run more efficiently, improves the instructional program delivery, and accelerates student learning. Using our Data Director system, teachers have access to disaggregated assessment results that help them better understand and improve student and school performance.

Our commitment to continuous improvement is reflected in our district's mission: 'Together moving from good to great.' Teachers are dedicated to delivering an excellent education that gives all students the opportunity to reach mastery of rigorous academic standards. Every member of the staff faces challenges positively and holds the belief that every student can learn. This enables our students to make great academic gains. Since 1999, Baxter's API scores have improved 271 points, gaining an average of 33 points each year!

To continue this upward trend in student achievement, we implemented the Response to Intervention system. Our school's RTI model emphasizes the purposeful, efficient use of research-based technology programs to present standards aligned instruction in areas of difficulty. Teachers and administrators analyze the data and use it to identify student needs, differentiate instruction, and plan appropriate interventions.

The hard work and dedication at Baxter School has not gone unnoticed. Our school received the Title I Academic Achievement Award in 2006 and 2007. This award is presented to Title I schools that are closing the achievement gap among numerically significant subgroups. Baxter School was one of only 127 schools named a 'Star School' by the California Business for Education Excellence Foundation. Named as a 'Star School' in their 2006 and 2007 Honor Roll, Baxter School was honored as a school that serves a significant population of socio-economically disadvantaged students and consistently meets high expectations. In fact, all significant subgroups at our school have shown considerable increases in grade level proficiency since 1999. We applied for the California Distinguished School Award and in March will receive a validation visit.

Recurring success at our school is not the product of one person's efforts, nor accomplished in one year, but the sum of our school programs and processes over time. The school works in partnership with the community to support our student's achievement of high academic standards. Everyone--teachers, administrators, parents, community partners, and support staff--is committed to helping our students succeed.

Albert Baxter School is truly a wonderful place to learn. We are very proud of the accomplishments of each individual. We build futures one student at a time.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

In California, the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program uses the California Standards Tests (CSTs) to measure student progress in academic content areas in grades 2 through 11. Annually, each school is assigned an Academic Performance Index (API) rating from 200 to 1000, with a statewide API goal of 800 for all schools. The API is calculated to measure student achievement and yearly growth. API scores are a component of a school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. CST results are reported using five performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. Performance levels are reported for each grade level and subject, as well as for specific cultural, economic, disability and language learning subgroups. To make AYP, a specific number of students in each significant subgroup must be Proficient. California's intent is for every student to achieve Proficient status or better by the year 2014. 2007 Assessment results can be accessed from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/>

Since API scores were first reported in 1999, Baxter School's overall API score has grown from 555 to 826, an increase of 271 points, and an average yearly gain of 33 points. This far exceeds state established growth targets. Since the No Child Left Behind legislation was enacted, this upward trend has continued. Baxter's API score of 826 confirms that we are well on our way to accomplishing full performance mastery. The percentage of Baxter students performing Proficient/Advanced in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics has grown dramatically over the past five years. In ELA, we realized a growth of nearly 10% in the past year alone. The school wide percentage of students achieving Proficient/Advanced status in ELA was 25% in 2002. In 2007, these levels more than doubled, rising to 59%. Statewide averages of Proficient/Advanced were 46% in ELA in 2007. In math, more than 72% of our students reached Proficient or Advanced levels of performance, which increased from 43% in 2002. Last year, statewide averages of Proficient/Advanced were 49% in math. Baxter also produced dramatically higher numbers of Proficient/Advanced students than state averages in each of its other subgroups.

Baxter School has three significant subgroups, Hispanic/Latino, Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED), and English Learners (EL). A subgroup is considered significant if either: (1) it has at least 100 valid scores; or (2) it comprises at least 15% of the school's population (based on the number of valid scores), and has at least 50 valid scores. Students are categorized as SED if they participate in the free and reduced-price lunch program or if their parents did not graduate from high school. In our Hispanic/Latino subgroup, 53% of students reached Proficient/Advanced levels in ELA in 2007, up from 19% in 2002. Last year, statewide averages of Proficient/Advanced in this subgroup were 31%. In math, the number of our Hispanic/Latino students reaching Proficient/Advanced levels increased from 42% to 70% since 2002. Last year, statewide averages in this same subgroup were 37% Advanced/Proficient. We realized similar growth patterns in the SED and EL groups.

It is worth noting the significant gains made by our African American subgroup. The number of students scoring Proficient/Advanced in ELA increased from 24% in 2002 to 57% last year. In ELA statewide, the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Advanced in this subgroup was 33% last year. In math, the percentage of Baxter students in this subgroup reaching Proficient/Advanced levels was 63%, which is up from 36% in 2002. Last year, in math, the percentage of students in this subgroup attaining Proficient/Advanced levels was 31% statewide.

At Baxter, we meet challenges by setting measurable goals and holding high expectations for student achievement. Our successes are the result of highly effective, research-based, best practices and a sustained focus on standards aligned instruction for all students. We are extremely proud of these successes.

2. Using Assessment Results:

High quality, targeted assessment data in the hands of teachers trained to use it effectively has produced school-wide improvement. Data-based decision-making is used to design and pace instruction, prescribe and monitor interventions, identify professional development needs, and strategically allocate personnel and resources. Our school's dramatic gains in test scores reflect our consistent efforts to align instruction and assessment with state standards. As a school community, we remain focused on the goals outlined in our Single School Plan for Student Achievement (SSP). Based on evaluation of assessment results, these goals were collaboratively developed by our leadership team, grade level teams, English Learner Advisory

Committee (ELAC) and our School Site Council (SSC).

A range of formative and summative assessment tools is used to monitor student progress and measure the effectiveness of our school programs. The use of Data Director, a software system for managing, aggregating, and publishing student data, allows teachers to easily access school-wide and individual student data. To begin the school year, administrators and grade level teams analyze CST reports, California English Language Development Test (CELDT) results, English Language Development rubrics, and district benchmark scores. They look closely at CST content cluster analyses and multi-year comparisons of test scores. Using this data, Baxter teachers collaborate within and across grade levels to set curriculum pacing guides, plan differentiated instruction, and specifically target interventions for those who are not proficient. The Response to Intervention (Rtl) model is a well-coordinated, tiered system of interventions offered before, during, and after school by paraprofessionals, specialists, intervention teachers, and classroom teachers. Rtl assessment data is used to monitor each student's progress and the effectiveness of the interventions. Analysis of achievement data also guides our selection of supplemental materials and instructional technology, which is explicitly designed and used to assist students to reach or exceed the standards.

For example, in 2006-07, consistent use of the Success Maker Math and Language Arts program accelerated our third graders' achievement: the percentage of students scoring proficient or above on the third grade CST increased from 33% in 2006 to 52% in 2007 in ELA and from 67% (2006) to 78% (2007) in math. This is a single example of how our school uses analysis of assessment results in decision-making and instructional delivery.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

We regularly communicate student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community. Through our school newsletter and morning announcements, we communicate school-wide achievement. Parents and community members can visit the district and school web sites where the School Accountability Report Card and STAR results are available. At SSC and ELAC, parents review our SSP, which outlines school goals and assessment results. The school community is notified of performance results at Open House, Title I parent meetings, ELAC, SSC, and reports to the Board of Education. Local newspapers and the state website report Baxter student performance and assessment results. Home-school communication is done in Spanish and English to stay closely connected to our school community.

Our high expectations are routinely conveyed to students. Teachers confer with students regarding their progress toward academic goals. Content standards and daily learning objectives are posted visibly in the classrooms. Students are taught to self-monitor their progress using rubrics and anchor papers. Intermediate grade students set test performance goals, based on their previous assessment data.

It is important to us that parents are meaningfully informed about their child's progress. At Back-to-School Night, teachers discuss performance expectations and provide parents individual copies of grade level standards in English and Spanish. During fall conferences, parents are informed of previous assessment results and encouraged to collaborate with teachers to set student learning goals. Interpreters assist in this process. Teachers present Data Director reports, student work samples, performance exemplars, grade level rubrics, and assessment of current achievement of the state standards. On a daily basis, Baxter School planners are used in grades 4-6 to communicate about homework status and upcoming tests. Communication with parents is accomplished with weekly progress reports, graded class work, and tests. Teachers are available for additional conferences with parents before and after school. Standards-based report cards and mid-trimester progress reports are provided in Spanish and English. Parents of students enrolled in Rtl receive reports of their student's progress. In the spring, teachers hold conferences with parents to discuss concerns about students who are not proficient.

4. Sharing Success:

Baxter's staff enjoys sharing its successes by opening our campus to fellow educators from other schools and by serving as leaders and mentors in our district. Our principal serves on an administrative team and shares Baxter's formula for educational excellence with other schools in the district. Teachers and administrators from around the district often tour our campus and observe lessons given by skilled Baxter teachers. These teachers share expertise in employing best teaching practices in specific areas such as literacy, educational technology or intensive interventions. Many of our staff members serve as master teachers for student teachers from several local universities. Teacher Track college students often observe and interview our staff. Baxter teachers act as Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Support Providers (BTSA), CELL demonstration teachers and literacy coordinators, APPLE after-school

program coordinators, Gifted and Talented Education Teachers (GATE), and Technology Trainers. They collaborate with other educators on district curriculum development and adoption committees. At Focus On Student meetings, Baxter teachers come together with our Superintendent and teachers from around the district to share knowledge, expertise and experience in specific areas.

As the first school in our district to develop and implement a Response to Instruction (Rtl) intervention model, Baxter has been called upon to share our expertise and organizational plan with many visiting educators. Last fall, our staff presented our model at an area symposium hosted by Cerritos Community College. Educators from surrounding districts learned about Baxter's unique approach to providing a tiered system of interventions.

The staff at Baxter works with other schools to prepare students for successful transitions into, and out of our school. Every spring, our school hosts a campus tour for local pre-schools. Sixth grade teachers work in partnership with the middle school to provide tours and informational meetings with the intent of easing students' transition to middle school.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

At Baxter, we provide a balanced, comprehensive, standards-aligned curriculum to all students. The curriculum is comprised of state-adopted textbooks, best practices in instruction, and strategic selection of standards-based supplemental materials. Teachers develop pacing guides using state and district standards, testing blueprints, student needs, and our school's rigorous academic expectations. Our district participates in California's Class Size Reduction program to improve education. All primary grade students receive instruction in classrooms of 20 or fewer students.

Our comprehensive English Language Arts (ELA) program is presented through the core Houghton Mifflin (HM) series which engages students to comprehend and appreciate recreational, functional, and informative text. The series also addresses speaking, listening, grammar, spelling, phonemic awareness, handwriting, word attack, vocabulary, writing, and reading skills. The HM Universal Access Handbooks provide resources to address the full range of learners in our classrooms. Reading and writing are further developed within all core disciplines where students read to learn and write to fortify their learning.

Baxter's mathematics curriculum prepares all students to master the state standards for each grade level. The Scott-Foreman series systematically builds computational and procedural skills, conceptual understanding, and problem solving in number sense, algebra/function, measurement/geometry, statistics/data analysis/probability, and math reasoning. The computerized Waterford Math and Science Program and the Success Maker Math Program are research-based programs designed to teach the state standards. These programs allow students to remediate/accelerate their learning, to review concepts, and to develop automaticity in procedures.

The Social Studies curriculum uses the Harcourt Reflections series to develop understanding in history, government, geography, economics, civic responsibility, and the use of natural resources. Universal Access materials, mnemonics, chants, graphic organizers, digital video media lessons, and project-based learning help our students learn important concepts. Baxter students participate in grade level plays, readers' theatre, and Career Day. Extended learning happens during field trips, such as the fourth grade visit to a mission or kindergarteners visiting the farm.

The Houghton-Mifflin Science series presents the state standards in earth, life, and physical sciences. Our program includes investigation, direct instruction, expository reading, and use of technology for presentation and research. Strategies for developing academic science language are a critical component for the success of our students, especially for our English learners. Field trips, such as the first grade visit to the zoo, second grade rock-collecting trip, and the sixth grade week at Outdoor Education camp enhance learning of science concepts.

The Harcourt Health and Fitness series addresses areas of human development, character education, personal and community health, and safety. Red Ribbon Drug Awareness Week, the Character Counts focus, Safety Week, assembly presentations, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and after-school & summer fitness activities improve the overall well being of our students. The standards based P. E. curriculum has a strong fitness emphasis and teaches a variety of sports skills. Our school Wellness Policy fosters healthful food choices. Local law enforcement officers provide instruction to fifth and sixth grade students about the dangers of bullying, gang involvement and drug abuse.

The Visual and Performing Arts standards are integrated into the instructional program and through elementary chorus and band, Performing Arts Center fieldtrips, art and music activities, and dramatic presentations. Art lessons not only teach art techniques and appreciation, but also involve students in learning about other subject areas and cultures. Partnerships with local art agencies provide students in the after-school program with opportunities to perform and experience instrumental music, musical theatre, and the visual arts.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

Our challenging, balanced English Language Arts program focuses on achieving mastery of the standards in a positive, supportive environment that encourages the habit of life-long reading. The core Houghton Mifflin (HM) series provides standards-based, direct instruction in reading, integrally linked to the domains of writing, listening, and speaking. As specified by the California Reading Task Force and further supported

by the National Reading Panel (NRP), our approach has a strong literature, language, and comprehension component. It also includes an explicit skills program of phonemic awareness and decoding for beginning readers, ongoing diagnosis to inform instruction, assessment that ensures accountability, and an early intervention program. This emphasis on good first teaching of reading promotes our school's preventative, rather than remedial, approach. The research-based Waterford Early Reading Program of leveled reading books and standards-aligned, computerized lessons is used daily in grades K-2. Fluency, a critical component of reading, (Shaywitz) is developed through shared reading, timed and practiced reading of HM curriculum passages, and the Read Naturally program. Accelerated Reader (AR) promotes fluency through independent reading practice in the student's Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky). The AR program motivates readers to advance their skills in comprehending text; it provides data of students' progress.

Baxter teachers use the HM Universal Access Handbooks to differentiate reading instruction. English learners are instructed daily at their language proficiency level on a continuum of English Language Development standards that are aligned to the ELA standards. District benchmarks, CST results, fluency measures, norm-referenced STAR results, AR and Waterford diagnostic reports, and HM assessments are used to measure progress, plan instruction, and to diagnose intervention. Our reading program is enhanced with additional standards-based materials such as leveled books, poetry, readers' theatre, literature circles, and current event publications such as Weekly Reader. Teachers realize opportunities to teach and reinforce reading strategies throughout the curricula. The school library, cross-age reading buddies, PTA Book Fairs, and the Read Across America celebration support our reading program.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

To further develop literacy competencies that 'will maximize opportunities for our students to develop academically,' Baxter School has focused on developing a strong writing program to meet the specific needs of our students, including English learners. During professional development and early release days, teachers analyze student writing samples to plan instruction for the various writing domains, ensuring that expectations progress across multiple grade levels. Training with nationally recognized writing consultant, Nancy Fetzer, has provided teachers with many strategies for teaching writing, including a scaffolding approach for developing sentence fluency, interactive composing, repeated retelling of oral narratives prior to writing, use of graphic organizers and sketching to plan writing, and application of content vocabulary and literary terms. We also incorporate research-based practices in modeled, shared, and interactive writing instruction from GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) training, HM curricular materials, CELL (California Early Literacy Learning, K-2) and ExLL (Extended Literacy Learning, 3-6). Students learn to progress through the writing process, as well as how to organize ideas and respond to writing prompts. School wide, students and teachers use grade-appropriate, standards-aligned rubrics. Writing instruction is integrated across curricular areas.

This year the Imagination Machine acting troupe interacted with our students to improvise 'Who/What/Where' plays and returned, at a later date, to perform fictional stories written by our students. In accordance with our mission 'to educate all students to reach their full potential,' Baxter's writing program gives our students a strong foundation of writing skills and strategies so that they may communicate effectively in English and, ultimately, participate fully in society.

4. Instructional Methods:

Our school's success in helping all students achieve, lies in our commitment to learn, share, and utilize research-based instructional strategies. Teachers use a balance of whole-group direct instruction and flexible grouping, learning centers, think-pair-share, discussion groups, guided reading, assistance from an instructional aide, and targeted small group or individualized instruction. Our curriculum is differentiated for students in the GATE program, English language learners, and special needs students. Sheltered instruction supports concept and vocabulary development for our English learners. Math skills and concepts are developed through the use of manipulatives, math challenges, systematic re-teach/review of basic facts, and interactive technology. Our instructional program delivery is improved by the prominent use of technology such as classroom microphones, networked classrooms and lab computers, and a United Streaming online video library. Technology-based programs present standards aligned instruction at the student's optimal learning level, adjust the sequence of instruction based on student response, provide multiple opportunities to master each concept, and periodically activate retention checks. Content areas are taught through a variety of instructional methods appropriate to the subject matter and the specific needs of students, such as experiments, observations, project-based learning, and presentations.

Parent volunteers, assemblies, and field trips in the community also enhance our curriculum. Baxter teachers collaborate to review pacing guides, share lessons, analyze student work, review student progress, and discuss benchmark results to improve student achievement. Most importantly, each classroom is orchestrated by a highly trained, professional teacher, dedicated to implementing best practices in a dynamic classroom environment.

5. Professional Development:

Baxter School's long-range professional development plan focuses on improving the ability of our teachers, specialists, paraprofessionals, and administrators to prepare all students to meet high academic standards. We select research-based professional development opportunities determined by staff needs and school-wide analysis of student achievement results. Time is dedicated for teachers to participate in decision making, to devise instruction to meet the standards, and to develop further plans for professional development. During regular release time, grade level teams meet to analyze student work, reflect upon classroom practices, adjust the curriculum, share resources, and plan lessons collaboratively. Teachers put into practice the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) when they combine their collective knowledge of subject matter and instructional strategies. New teachers participate in the two-year Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program, which links them to highly trained support providers. This teacher induction program provides time for coaching, observation, seminars, and formative assessment based on the CSTP. To implement the RTI intervention model, teachers were trained to use technology for diagnosis, remediation, and acceleration of learning. Teachers received training in Data Director, GLAD, Working with English Language Learners (WELL), and in-depth training and peer coaching in the CELL/ExLL literacy frameworks. All teachers have been trained to skillfully utilize the Waterford and Success Maker technology programs. All K-6 teachers were trained in the implementation of the new ELA curriculum and the effective use of the Universal Access materials to differentiate instruction. The principal and assistant principal completed AB75 training for leadership, ELA curriculum components, and technology. Nancy Fetzer, presented on-site training and demonstration lessons, working with students in our classrooms. Ongoing collaboration and participation in researched-based professional development continues to make a positive impact on Baxter's instructional program. No matter what the challenge, our staff is dedicated to providing a rigorous and engaging learning environment, resulting in dramatic gains in our students' achievement.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (ELA) Grade 2 Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year 2007 Publisher ETS

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	65	62	47	40	29
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	30	13	11	9	7
Number of students tested	71	83	89	80	89
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic or Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	55	58	40	38	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	23	12	8	9	5
Number of students tested	47	57	71	56	62
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	63	58	46	33	24
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	28	9	11	3	6
Number of students tested	57	53	75	56	67
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	57	60	29	31	17
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	31	10	6	3	4
Number of students tested	39	42	31	29	30
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	52	33	24	20	22
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	8	7	5	2	1
Number of students tested	86	82	77	77	77
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	46	26	23	14	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	8	8	4	1	2
Number of students tested	61	65	54	47	59
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	44	32	16	14	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	7	8	3	3	0
Number of students tested	59	63	61	53	58
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	15	19	12	13	9
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	0	4	4	0	0
Number of students tested	27	27	24	24	35
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	56	48	61	33	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	22	20	5	7
Number of students tested	85	82	71	78	88
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	50	48	55	29	12
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	20	14	5	0
Number of students tested	68	54	44	59	50
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	56	47	54	25	17
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	19	17	12	5	4
Number of students tested	67	60	52	60	70
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	36	19	25	21	5
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	4	6	0	3	0
Number of students tested	25	16	16	39	21
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	53	63	40	36	26
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	25	6	15	2
Number of students tested	75	65	77	80	72
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	54	49	35	31	16
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	14	8	5	2
Number of students tested	52	37	62	42	43
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	49	47	33	34	25
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	19	19	6	12	0
Number of students tested	53	43	64	60	57
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	23	14	3	18	6
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	8	7	0	0	0
Number of students tested	13	15	26	17	18
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	61	40	27	35	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	11	11	8	4	9
Number of students tested	64	83	78	62	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	56	33	20	23	20
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	7	13	2	3	10
Number of students tested	43	64	39	35	42
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	51	34	22	34	18
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	5	9	6	5	9
Number of students tested	39	57	63	42	56
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	18	10	0	7	4
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	11	21	11	14	23
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	79	76	62	68	48
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	42	33	29	30	18
Number of students tested	71	83	89	80	89
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	72	74	59	70	50
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	36	28	25	34	10
Number of students tested	47	57	71	56	62
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	63	77	62	63	42
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	28	28	27	25	12
Number of students tested	57	53	75	56	67
3. English Learner					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	57	67	46	62	40
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	31	31	23	24	7
Number of students tested	39	42	31	29	30
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	78	67	53	41	39
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	40	30	19	14	3
Number of students tested	86	83	77	77	77
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	74	68	52	43	39
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	31	27	19	13	3
Number of students tested	61	66	54	47	59
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	73	70	48	34	37
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	32	32	20	8	4
Number of students tested	59	63	61	53	58
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	45	59	46	34	29
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	19	22	21	13	0
Number of students tested	27	27	24	24	35
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	72	52	46	35	36
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	31	28	25	4	4
Number of students tested	85	82	71	78	88
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	71	52	45	36	30
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	25	26	18	5	0
Number of students tested	68	54	44	59	50
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	70	53	33	33	34
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	30	23	12	5	3
Number of students tested	67	60	52	60	70
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	52	32	19	31	38
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	12	13	6	3	0
Number of students tested	25	16	16	39	21
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	64	67	62	54	37
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	25	38	19	21	8
Number of students tested	75	65	77	80	72
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	67	65	60	43	30
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	27	38	21	19	9
Number of students tested	52	37	62	42	43
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	61	65	58	52	39
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21	30	19	20	9
Number of students tested	53	43	64	60	57
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	38	26	43	30	12
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	0	13	8	12	6
Number of students tested	13	15	26	17	18
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient/Advanced	61	56	46	31	43
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	22	16	18	10	11
Number of students tested	64	82	78	62	66
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	58	57	39	26	46
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	23	16	13	6	10
Number of students tested	43	63	39	35	42
2. Socio-Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	48	57	45	33	36
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	15	16	16	7	7
Number of students tested	39	56	63	42	55
3. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient/Advanced	9	39	18	7	35
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	0	10	9	0	0
Number of students tested	11	21	11	14	23
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					