2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education   [X] Public   ☐ Private

Cover Sheet   Type of School
(Check all that apply)

[X] Elementary   ☐ MIddle   ☐ High   ☐ K-12
☐ Charter   ☐ Title I   ☐ Magnet   ☐ Choice

Name of Principal   Ms. Jane Futrell
<small>(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)</small>

Official School Name   J. X. Wilson School
<small>(As it should appear in the official records)</small>

School Mailing Address   246 Brittain Lane
<small>(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)</small>

Santa Rosa	California	95401-5810
City	State	Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County   Sonoma   State School Code Number* CDS 49-71035-6096721

Telephone (707) 525-8350   Fax   (707) 525-0116

Web site/URL www.jxwilson.org   E-mail   jfutrell@wrightesd.org

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 _____
<small>Principal's Signature</small>

Name of Superintendent   Dr. Casey D'Angelo
<small>(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)</small>

District Name   Wright Elementary   Tel. (707) 542-0550

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 _____
<small>(Superintendent's Signature)</small>

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson   Ms. Karen Irwin Magee
<small>(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)</small>

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 _____
<small>(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)</small>

*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: _____3_____ Elementary schools

    _____ Middle schools

    _____ Junior High Schools

    _____ High schools

    _____ Other

    _____3_____ TOTAL

2.   District Per Pupil Expenditure: ____7131____

    Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: ____7379____

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
    [X]   Suburban
    [   ]   Small city or town in a rural are
    [   ]   Rural

4.   ____6____   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

    _____   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	43	37	80		8			0
1	30	47	77		9			0
2	39	41	80		10			0
3	36	40	76		11			0
4	35	30	65		12			0
5	30	43	73		Other			0
6	27	24	51					
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL								502

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

      1   % American Indian or Alaska Native
     10   % Asian or Pacific Islander
      3   % Black or African American
     46   % Hispanic or Latino
     40   % 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 yea   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	21
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	39
(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	523
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row	0.11
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	11

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 46   %

                                                          229   Total Number Limited
                                                                 English Proficient
     Number of languages represented   8

     Specify languages: Spanish, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Filipino, Chinese, Asian Indian, Japanese, Swahili

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals   48   %

                    Total number students who qualify: 254

     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: 7   %

                                                      36   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.

1	Autism	0	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	0	Other Health Impairment
0	Deaf-Blindnes	22	Specific Learning Disabilit
0	Emotional Disturbanc	12	Speech or Language Impairment
1	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
0	Mental Retardation	0	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0	Multiple Disabilities		

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

Number of Staff

	Full-time	Part-time
Administrator(s)	1	0
Classroom teachers	22	2
Special resource teachers/specialist	1	5
Paraprofessionals	0	17
Support Staff	3	3
Total number	27	27

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1   23   **: 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	98	%	95	%	98	%	97	%	98	%
Daily teacher attendance	97	%	97	%	96	%	96	%	97	%
Teacher turnover rate	11	%	4	%	14	%	27	%	0	%
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

It is the mission of J.X. Wilson School to prepare children academically and socially to function responsibly in society and to envision and achieve their goals in life.

J.X. Wilson School is one of three elementary schools in the Wright Elementary School District, located in Santa Rosa, approximately 60 miles north of San Francisco. The school opened in 1976, and this year it serves approximately 500 students in grades K ' 6. The neighborhood surrounding the school is largely suburban, with a mix of single-family homes, condominiums, apartments and mobile home complexes. The demographics have changed dramatically over the past five years in this southwest quadrant of Santa Rosa, and currently 46% of our students are English Language Learners and 48% participate in the Federal Free and Reduced Lunch Program.

At J.X. Wilson School (JX) we begin with the firmly-held belief that all students can succeed in school, and that the whole staff, working together, shares in the responsibility of helping all students achieve this success. We support this belief by holding high expectations for every student, both academically and behaviorally. We start with the basic premise that student learning drives our work, and that our fundamental purpose is to plan and prepare powerful curriculum, and provide targeted instruction in the most effective ways to ensure that each student has access to, and is fully supported in meeting, rigorous grade level standards.

We are proud of our highly qualified, experienced and professional teaching staff and our recognized level of student achievement. We hold high academic standards for all students, and there is a school-wide, shared commitment to providing a wide safety net of support for struggling students through collaborative efforts at the classroom level as well as effective school-wide intervention services. Teachers collaborate extensively to examine student work and plan powerful curriculum and instruction for students. Our successful 'tiered' academic support system includes 'leveled' reading groups across classrooms as well as supplemental Reading and Math Intervention Programs taught by dedicated Instructional Assistants and certificated teachers. Students who need more time and or more intensive instruction receive the benefit of extra help beyond the regular school day. J.X. Wilson staff, both certificated and classified, work as a close-knit team to maintain constant focus on student growth, academic success, and 'doing what is best for kids.'

Student performance data collected over the past several years suggests that this systematic focus on continuous improvement at JX has resulted in a very positive, measurable impact on student learning. For 3 years in a row we have met or exceeded all of our growth targets and annual measurable objectives on the Annual Performance Index (API) and Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) reports, respectively. Between 2004 and 2007 our School-wide Academic Performance Index (API) grew from 783 to 848. While our demographics have changed dramatically during these same years, disaggregated results for our significant subgroups also show dramatic gains. Between 2004 and 2007 the API for our SED students grew from 723 to 815. Similarly, the API for our English Learners (ELs) increased from 790 to 822 between 2005 (when it was first calculated by the state) and 2007. In 2007, 48 % of our ELs in grades 2 ' 6 had reached proficiency in English Language Arts and 75% were proficient or above in Math. For the past two years JX has been recognized as an Honor Roll School in the Just for the Kids/California Business for Education Excellence Award Program, and in both 2006 and 2007 we received Title I Academic Achievement Awards for doubling the API growth target of our total school population as well as the socio-economically disadvantaged subgroup for two consecutive years. This growth in student achievement and our district's success at providing equity of access to both rigorous standards and high quality, effective curriculum and instruction for our EL students has been noted in a recent study by the Riverside County Office of Education. This study ranked our district 7th in the state for the achievement level of our EL students in English Language Arts and 2nd in the state for their achievement in Math.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

The assessment results included in the data tables reflect the performance of J.X. Wilson School's students over the last 5 years on California's Content Standards Tests (CSTs.) These standardized annual assessments are designed to measure students' proficiency in meeting rigorous grade level standards in English Language Arts and Math beginning in grade 2. The C.S.T. results form the centerpiece of the state's educational accountability program, STAR (Standardized Testing and Reporting System.) Student scores are reported numerically (as a scaled score) and in terms of one of five performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. Only students who score Proficient or above are deemed to be meeting grade level standards.

As part of STAR, the C.S.T. results of individual students are aggregated and reported for the whole school and by grade level. If the school includes a significant number of students representing specific demographic subgroups (e.g. ethnicity, English language proficiency, socio-economic status) the school's CST results are also disaggregated and reported separately for these (subgroup) populations. The significant achievement gains that J.X. Wilson School students have made over the past 3 years is evidenced by the dramatic increase in the number of students who are reaching proficiency levels on their CST's. In 2007 59% of the students, school-wide, scored 'proficient or above' in English Language Arts compared to 39% in 2004. Similarly, 76% were proficient in math in 2007, up from 56% in 2004. Disaggregated results by subgroup show that there has also been a significant increase in the number of Economically Disadvantaged, Hispanic/Latino, and English Learners who are reaching proficiency. In 2007, 48%, of our Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient in English Language Arts and 74% were proficient in Math.

As part of California's integrated accountability system, schools are assigned an Academic Performance Index (API) based on their CST results, with 1000 being the maximum and 800 being the state-wide target for all schools. Between 2004 and 2007 J.X. Wilson School's API grew from 783 to 848. Similarly, the API for our Economically Disadvantaged Students increased from 723 to 815, and the API for our English Learners grew from 790 to 822.

Schools also receive two API rankings annually, which range from 1- 10.   The state-wide rank compares all schools based on the absolute value of their API score, and the 'similar schools' rank is based on how a school's API score compares to 100 other statistically-matched 'similar schools.' A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API score in the lowest 10 percent of all schools in the state while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API in the highest 10 percent of all schools in the state. A similar schools rank of 1 means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing 10 schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of 10 means that the academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools. For the past two years J.X. Wilson has received a Statewide API Rank of 8 and a Similar Schools Rank of 10.

Information on the STAR assessment system can be found at http://star.cde.ca.gov and general information regarding California's testing and accountability system is available at http://cde.ca.gov/ta.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

At J.X. Wilson School there is a coordinated and well-articulated accountability system in place, linking rigorous curriculum with excellent instruction, and driven by a sustained focus on the cycle of continuous improvement. Assessment of student performance is a key component of this system. The ongoing process of collecting and analyzing data is used not only to monitor student progress in meeting grade level standards, but also to refine and improve the curriculum and instruction, evaluate needs for, and efficacy of, various student support programs, and ultimately to determine the effectiveness and success of the system itself.

Teachers and the principal meet at the beginning of each school year to assess student progress from the previous year and collaboratively plan for the upcoming year. Grade level teams evaluate the CST scores and year-end (summative) District Benchmark Assessment scores in Reading, Writing and Math of each incoming student. Using this data, teachers can begin to understand the academic profiles of individual students, evaluate their skill levels, identify any gaps in their learning, and create initial plans for grouping students in order to provide effective differentiated instruction. Also, through this initial collaborative effort at systematic analysis of prior year assessment data, any content standards that require greater

instructional emphasis and any professional development needs in specific content areas are identified. A plan to address student, curricular, and professional development needs is then incorporated into the school's yearly strategic planning document, the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SSP.)

Uniform, grade level Benchmark Assessments for Language Arts, Math and Writing are administered district-wide each trimester. The results of these common assessments, along with performance data from other curriculum-based tests and teacher evaluation of student work, is used to objectively measure student progress towards meeting grade level standards. Teachers also use these assessment results formatively, to determine which skills and concept areas they may need to focus on for re-teaching, and to identify which students may need further assistance through small group or 1:1 tutorial support, or by participation in the supplemental Reading and Math Intervention Programs.

Teachers meet weekly in grade level teams to collectively analyze classroom assessment results, evaluate student progress, and collaboratively plan and prepare curriculum and instruction based on this shared information. Teachers have full use of the Edusoft data management system, which has not only expanded their ability to create standards-based assessments, but also allows them to access, track and analyze student performance data, and disaggregate this data in ways that can be used more effectively to guide and improve instruction.

All ELL students are given the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) at the very beginning of the year. Results on this assessment are used to determine level of functional English proficiency and also for appropriate placement in the school's ELD Program. Students are grouped by proficiency level, and they receive differentiated instruction, depending on their level. For students scoring at the Beginning through Intermediate CELDT levels there is a supplementary pull-out English Language (ELD) Program taught by a trained ELD IA using a program and curriculum. For students scoring higher than Intermediate there is specific ELD instruction in the classroom, using research-based ELD materials. Supplementary support materials that are included in some of the adopted textbook series (e.g. Houghton-Mifflin's 'Extra Support Materials for English Learners') are also used to assist ELLs in fully accessing the curriculum across the content areas.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

A strong home-school partnership is vital to an academic program that is focused on high levels of achievement for all students, and at JX Wilson we are proactive in our efforts to engage parents in the teamwork necessary to ensure student success. This includes not only the wide dissemination of information regarding assessment results, but also outreach and inclusion in important decision-making processes that are based on these results.

The staff at JX prides itself on the level of involvement and communication that exists between the staff, our school families and the community at large. We establish and maintain open lines of communication through: a twice-monthly bilingual school newsletter; individual classroom newsletters; regularly-scheduled and as-needed parent conferences; weekly written progress reports; daily homework logs; school and classroom websites, phone calls; informal notes home; and e-mail (all teachers have district e-mail addresses.) These numerous channels of two-way communication between staff and families strengthen the shared commitment to students and their learning.

Within the first few weeks of school each year, at 'Back-to School Night', teachers explain their instructional program and go over the grade level content standards with parents. Formal Parent-Teacher Conferences are held twice yearly to further communicate expectations, discuss student progress, relay concerns and answer questions. The first one is scheduled for early October so that teachers can meet with all parents to review their children's previous year CST and end-of-year assessment scores and current formative assessment results. These personal, two-way conversations are crucial in developing and maintaining the mutual understanding that is necessary to foster academic success. Translation for non English-speaking parents is provided.

Each year the School Site Council, comprised of parents and staff members, develops and approves the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) and Single School Plan for Student Achievement (SSP.) The SARC reports data from the previous year and the SSP is designed to be the overarching 'strategic plan' for the current year, (JX has recently combined the SARC/SSP into a single unified document.) In preparing the SARC/SSP, the SSC analyzes the CST scores and end-of-year District Benchmark test results, as well as the state and federal Accountability Progress Reports (Academic Performance Index and Adequate Yearly Progress). With both parents and staff represented in this cyclical yearly process of

analyzing student assessment data, defining measurable performance goals, determining priorities, allocating fiscal and personnel resources, outlining specific strategies, and aligning school programs and activities, the SARC/SSP becomes a living document. It is a comprehensive and coordinated plan to maximize student achievement. that serves as the primary guide in maintaining focus on the cycle of continuous improvement. The SARC/SSP is posted on the school's website, (jxwilson.org) in both English and Spanish, and a bilingual Executive Summary of the document is also sent home to each family.

It is important to celebrate progress when the system is working well, goals are attained, and there is a measurable increase in student achievement. At Booster Club, School Site Council English Language Advisory Committee meetings, and through the J.X. Express newsletter information regarding our school's A.P.I. and A.Y.P reports, is shared. The school community is also apprised of recognition awards received for our increased achievement levels, such as the Title I Academic Achievement Award (2006 and 2007) and being named an Honor Roll School in the Just for the Kids California/ Business for Educational Excellence Foundation recognition program for schools that are effectively closing the achievement gap. In the spring of 2006 the local Santa Rosa Press Democrat newspaper also featured an article that highlighted JX's success in closing the achievement gap for ELL students.

4. **Sharing Success:**

J.X. Wilson School staff firmly believes that professional collaboration and the sharing of best practices is vital to the process of improving learning for all students.   For the past two years, as recipients of Honor Roll awards from Just for the Kids California (JFTK) and the California Business for Educational Excellence Foundation (CBEE,) teachers have opened their classroom doors to visitors from other local schools. In May, 2007 both certificated and classified staff shared their successes from our strategic, multi-level Reading Intervention Program with other schools in the county at the 'Spotlight on Success' presentation and roundtable discussion sponsored by the Sonoma County Office of Education. In summer, 2007 the principal was invited to speak by the Bay Area Council, a group of Northern California business leaders, and she presented 'The Power of Educational Data' at their meeting in San Francisco. Currently, as part of the local Aiming High initiative to close the achievement gap, J.X. Wilson School is opening its doors to professional colleagues in a series of school visitations sponsored by the Sonoma County Association of School Administrators (SCASA.)

As a Blue Ribbon School, we would welcome visitors and would continue to share our knowledge of best instructional practices, programs, and resources in any way that would be helpful to other schools and districts.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

All students are ensured access to high quality, state-adopted curriculum materials that are aligned to California's grade level content standards in the core curriculum areas.   In addition, students receive physical education based on the state's PE framework and enjoy enrichment opportunities in the visual and performing arts.

Language Arts: The Houghton-Mifflin Language Arts program has been adopted K-6, district-wide, and the teachers have been trained in its use. Teachers also use a variety of other supplemental curricula and programs to provide targeted skill development and practice, based on student needs. These include: Soundabet, K-Pals, Scholastic Readers, S.R.A. Reading Labs, Read Naturally, Vocabulary for Achievement, Text Talk, Great Source Spelling Spelling with Morphographs, and Six Minute Solution. A new writing curriculum, Writing by Design, which is articulated across grade levels, has been adopted and implemented this year. The teaching staff consistently monitors student progress, assesses student needs, and analyzes any learning gaps, looking for ways in which additional supplemental curriculum can provide for differentiated instruction to help students meet standards.

Math: The District has adopted the Harcourt Brace math curriculum for grades K and 1, and Houghton Mifflin for grades 2 ' 6. Other supplemental materials are used at each grade level, and most teachers at grades 3 ' 6 use the Math Steps workbook to reinforce the skills taught in the Houghton Mifflin series. Students begin taking timed 'math facts' tests in the first grade, and each grade level thereafter uses the Mad Minute or Beat the Clock materials to reinforce automaticity and memorization of basic computational skills.

Social Studies: The Houghton-Mifflin social studies curriculum has been adopted K-6 by the District for implementation in 2007-08. In addition, most teachers use supplementary materials and publications as Scholastic News, Weekly Readers, and Time for Kids to extend instruction and cover current events. Teachers plan extra activities, living history days, and field trips to extend learning beyond the classroom.

Science: The Macmillan/McGraw-Hill curriculum for grades K ' 5 and McDougal Littell curriculum for grade 6 has just been adopted, with full implementation by 2008-09.

Visual and Performing Arts: Weekly Classroom Music is provided by a credentialed music teacher for students in the third grade and fourth grades. The program offers students singing, music reading, ear training, instruction on the recorder and Orff instruments, as well as public performance opportunities. A twice- weekly Band Program is available for grades 5 and 6, with yearly performances. Creativity is nurtured through classroom art lessons that teachers plan, and a local artist works with all upper grade classes through a local 'Art Start' Grant.

2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading:**

Literacy is at the heart of powerful life-long learning, and as such, proficiency in reading is fundamental to both academic achievement and success for all students.   At J.X. Wilson all students receive rich and effective Reading instruction in the regular classroom that is based on grade-level standards, using the state-adopted Houghton Mifflin curriculum. However, many students display gaps in their attainment of critical reading skills, and thus need more time and/or more intensive instruction in order to fully develop their abilities with phonemic awareness, decoding, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension strategies and become successful readers.

In August, 2004, after two years of falling API scores, we devoted a day of staff development to analyzing disaggregated data for the first time, using Edusoft, and developing a strategic plan for how we could improve student learning for all students. We had become increasingly aware of the fact that we needed to begin 'working smarter, not just harder.' We framed our work and discussions on the 5 common strategies that high-performing schools share, according to the organization Just for the Kids: 1) Take initiative. Make no excuses and keep striving for success; 2) Develop and execute a clear strategy for improvement; 3) Continuously assess progress and intervene immediately when students are struggling; 4) Make high-quality teaching and research-based instructional practice the top priority; and 5) Collaborate, both inside and outside the school. This discussion was powerful, and it resulted in a unified resolve and shared commitment by all teachers to find as many ways as possible to improve student learning through the

expansion of classroom efforts and the implementation of a Reading Intervention Program to support our struggling readers. Since 2004 we have continued to expand and refine our initial efforts, and we have identified the following key strategies as instrumental to our success:

Grade levels have adopted a common Language Arts time and they 'share' students across classrooms for 'leveled reading groups' at least several days per week.

Every student who is below grade level in Reading, based on C.S.T. results or district grade level benchmark scores, is referred for additional assessment (using DIBELS) and inclusion in the Reading Intervention Program.

Intensive, supplementary instruction is provided for identified students in the Reading Intervention Program, taught by highly experienced paraprofessionals. Primary grade students receive 30 minutes of additional small group instruction 4 days per week after lunch, and upper grade students receive 1 hr. a day of supplementary instruction, 3 days per week after school.

Students in the supplementary Reading Intervention Program are grouped based on identified need: phonics & decoding, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

Collaborative time on Wednesday afternoon (minimum student day) each week is effectively used by grade level teams to plan curriculum and homework, analyze student assessment data, discuss individual student progress, and regroup students as needed.

Categorical funding is used to provide additional paraprofessional (ELD Aide) time to some classes with the lowest-level reading groups to allow for a higher adult: student ratio for the students who are struggling the most.

Specific supplementary curriculum and instructional materials are selected for use both in the classroom and in the Reading Intervention groups, depending on identified needs of the students (e.g. 'Six Minute Solution', 'Read Naturally,' 'Passageways', etc.)

Assessment data is analyzed and used in many ways, including qualifying students for intervention, monitoring ongoing student progress, identifying specific reading skills to effectively provide targeted supplementary instruction and re-teaching, and to measure overall student growth.

Students who are struggling the most receive the most intensive services: For example, some students in RSP also benefit from differentiated instruction in their 'leveled reading group', as well as attending the after-school Reading Intervention Program.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

Writing: Basic literacy includes the ability to express oneself and one's ideas through the written word. Thus it is imperative that any programmatic efforts to improve the literacy skills and academic achievement of all students must include a focus on delivering excellent, directed writing instruction and daily practice. This year J.X. Wilson School, and the district as a whole, has begun implementing the comprehensive and cohesive Writing by Design program, which provides grade level articulation and scaffolding of instruction in order to sequentially develop powerful student writing. All teachers received a full day of initial training before school started in the effective use of the program, and professional development included several follow-up training days during the year in which teachers observed the trainer teaching model lessons in classrooms across the district. Teachers learned new instructional strategies that they could use across the curriculum and using trade books that are available in the school library. They also came away with knowledge in using common rubrics to assess student writing as well as methods to teach students how to use these rubrics to improve their writing skills across different genres and curricular areas and become truly proficient writers.

Since there is a common academic language, and common instructional strategies are developed across the grade levels, students will benefit by building sequentially on prior learning. It is very exciting to see the Writing by Design program being implemented in classrooms and to see the way it has really engaged students in the writing process and improved their ability to express themselves, their ideas and what they've learned across the different subject areas. We believe that through this systematic and cohesive

focus on writing instruction, there will be an increase in student writing ability that will also translate into greater achievement gains in Language Arts for all students.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

Powerful instruction delivered by highly-qualified and well-trained teachers is at the heart of student learning. All of the JX certificated staff members are NCLB- certified and hold CLAD credentials as well. The use of research-validated best practices and effective instructional techniques and strategies is the norm in every classroom. The morning time block from 8:30 A.M. ' 12:00 noon daily is devoted to core instruction in Language Arts and Math, and any interruptions to this designated instructional time block (e.g. assemblies, pull-out programs, announcements over the loudspeaker) are strictly controlled in order to maximize time dedicated to student learning in the core content areas. Teachers are experienced and adept at utilizing both whole group instruction (often used for introduction of grade level concepts and skills) as well as instruction in small groups. Instructional Assistants (IAs) are assigned to designated classrooms during this morning time block, which allows for more small group instruction and 1:1 assistance to support student learning. Small group instruction is invaluable in providing opportunities to differentiate the curriculum, re-teach concepts and skills to students as needed, and provide extra guided practice for students. The strategic use of IA's during core instructional time also provides the teacher with an optimal opportunity to work individually with students, assess them, and monitor student progress.

In addition, all students who are struggling to meet grade level standards in Reading and Math are provided with supplementary instruction through the Reading Intervention and Math Intervention Programs. This allows students who need additional time and more intensive support the opportunity to receive targeted small group instruction beyond the regular classroom. Trained Instructional Assistants provide the Reading Intervention Program for primary grade students in the afternoon for 30 minutes, 4 days per week and for upper grade students after school, 3 days per week for 1 hr. Students are grouped based on their scores on the DIBELS assessments, and the program uses research-validated curriculum materials that have been selected to address their identified needs. The Math Intervention Program is taught by regular classroom teachers who work beyond the school day, either before or after school, to provide 1-1.5 hrs. weekly of additional instruction and support for students who are struggling to grasp grade level math concepts and/or need further help with their basic foundational math skills.

5. **Professional Development:**

Professional development is an integral part of the cycle of continuous improvement, and three full days of intensive professional development are scheduled into the academic calendar each year. Minimum-day Wednesdays are also used to provide both site and district-wide ongoing staff development opportunities throughout the year.

District-wide trainings are designed to assist classroom teachers in implementing new programs and curricula, as well as expand their knowledge base, their understanding of best-practice, and their repertoire of effective instructional techniques and strategies, including best use of new technology.

This year teachers have participated in training for the implementation of newly-adopted Social Studies, Science and Writing curricula, as well as the use of newly-purchased technology and software programs. Teachers from each school have also joined together as a district Leadership Team to pursue local trainings in Professional Learning Communities, and they have committed to sharing this promising practice with their respective staffs.

Both the school and district are committed to providing effective staff development opportunities to promote long-range goals for improving the instructional program, however we also realize that teachers share in the responsibility for their own professional growth. Both new and experienced teachers are encouraged to pursue their own professional development goals based on their individual needs. Throughout the year teachers attend trainings, workshops and conferences taught by well-respected practitioners to increase their content knowledge and expand their repertoire of research-based instructional skills and strategies. Additionally, all of our new teachers participate in the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program, which provides powerful training and ongoing support from mentor teachers for their first two years. They are assigned to an experienced support provider and they receive release time to observe other teachers. They work collaboratively with their support provider and principal, using the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, to identify areas of strength as well as areas for further growth as an educator. They learn to use assessment results to monitor student progress and fine tune their instruction. The BTSA Program is an invaluable tool in the induction process. It provides crucial collegial support to beginning teachers and it helps them focus on the cycle of continuous improvement, not only in their own development as a professional but also in student learning.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (LA)   Grade 2   Test CST

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher _____

	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 plus 'Advanced'	45	59	44	27	44
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	16	16	15	8	13
Number of students tested	75	76	83	60	78
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	98	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	40	60	41	25	28
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	11	16	7	4	6
Number of students tested	38	32	29	25	18
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	46	50	27	20	24
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	9	8	10	7	4
Number of students tested	35	24	29	15	25
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	50	52	15	12	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	9	14	0	0	0
Number of students tested	32	29	27	17	19
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 2   Test _____

Edition/Publication Year _____ Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	81	77	63	57	65
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	39	35	41	31	38
Number of students tested	74	76	82	60	77
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	98	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	77	73	68	52	50
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	32	30	43	30	22
Number of students tested	38	31	28	25	18
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	74	68	65	40	40
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	31	24	41	20	16
Number of students tested	35	25	29	15	25
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	78	71	60	47	26
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	34	32	30	0	0
Number of students tested	32	28	27	17	19
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (LA)   Grade 3   Test CST

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	42	39	35	36	46
% "Exceeding" State Standards	1	13	8	11	14
Number of students tested	69	76	59	85	66
Percent of total students tested	100	100	97	98	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	41	22	28	33	25
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	3	4	7	3	0
Number of students tested	29	28	29	30	21
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	17	24	23	19	35
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	4	12	6	3	16
Number of students tested	23	25	18	31	19
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	23	17	32	8	25
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	4	0	5	0	0
Number of students tested	27	24	22	25	16
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math Grade 3 Test CST

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	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' plus 'Advanced'	64	67	63	57	54
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	32	26	32	25	31
Number of students tested	68	76	59	85	66
Percent of total students tested	99	100	97	98	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	72	50	45	43	35
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	34	11	17	13	15
Number of students tested	29	28	29	30	21
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	73	64	44	48	58
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	30	20	22	19	37
Number of students tested	23	25	18	31	19
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	67	50	54	32	50
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	30	4	18	0	0
Number of students tested	27	24	22	25	16
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (LA)   Grade 4   Test CST

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	64	58	74	43	48
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	21	25	34	21	18
Number of students tested	76	55	68	73	61
Percent of total students tested	99	97	97	99	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	58	36	70	20	28
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	8	23	17	15	7
Number of students tested	26	30	31	20	29
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	55	39	67	8	13
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	7	17	17	0	0
Number of students tested	29	23	24	13	15
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	52	36	61	41	29
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	0	16	11	0	0
Number of students tested	29	25	18	17	14
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 4   Test CST

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	80	75	84	49	59
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	51	55	63	22	21
Number of students tested	77	55	68	73	61
Percent of total students tested	100	97	97	99	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	77	60	77	40	41
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	44	43	60	20	3
Number of students tested	27	30	31	20	29
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	77	65	79	38	34
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	40	43	58	15	7
Number of students tested	30	23	24	13	15
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	77	64	72	53	43
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	40	36	44	0	0
Number of students tested	30	25	18	17	14
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 5 Test CST

Edition/Publication Year _____ Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	56	57	56	45	50
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	17	23	13	15	9
Number of students tested	54	73	69	63	66
Percent of total students tested	98	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	1	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	45	53	37	24	41
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	13	9	11	12	5
Number of students tested	31	32	27	26	22
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	31	52	20	0	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	11	9	7	0	0
Number of students tested	19	23	15	15	14
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard 'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	39	48	44	18	29
% "Exceeding" State Standards 'Advanced'	9	4	11	0	0
Number of students tested	23	25	18	18	17
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 5   Test CST _____

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	74	64	55	56	65
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	35	38	22	19	14
Number of students tested	54	73	69	63	66
Percent of total students tested	98	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	1	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	74	71	44	40	64
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	26	48	7	8	14
Number of students tested	31	32	27	26	22
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	69	52	34	36	43
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	16	22	7	7	7
Number of students tested	19	23	15	15	14
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	65	48	44	35	50
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	17	20	11	0	0
Number of students tested	23	25	18	18	17
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (LA)   Grade 6   Test CST

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	69	63	37	47	58
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	29	21	9	9	25
Number of students tested	70	53	65	55	52
Percent of total students tested	97	98	99	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. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	57	50	27	35	40
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	14	20	8	0	5
Number of students tested	35	21	38	23	20
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	31	40	5	27	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	0	0	0	0	
Number of students tested	13	10	20	11	
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	56	50	24	43	25
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	13	14	0	0	0
Number of students tested	23	14	22	14	12
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 6   Test CST

Edition/Publication Year _____ Publisher _____

	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' plus 'Advanced'	76	72	50	62	64
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	31	25	11	27	31
Number of students tested	72	53	65	55	52
Percent of total students tested	100	98	99	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	61	63	48	52	40
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	19	21	5	13	15
Number of students tested	37	21	38	23	20
2. English Learners					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	57	70	32	45	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	0	10	11	18	
Number of students tested	14	10	20	11	
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
'Proficient' plus 'Advanced'	62	69	52	36	25
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
'Advanced'	8	31	14	0	0
Number of students tested	24	14	22	14	12
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					