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)

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

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

Official School Name   La Entrada Middle School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address   2200 Sharon Rd
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Menlo Park   California   94025-6736
City   State   Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County   San Mateo   State School Code Number* 41-68957-6044093

Telephone (650) 854-3962   Fax   (650) 854-5947

Web site/URL LLESD.org   E-mail   pdullea@llesd.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 _____
Principal's Signature

Name of Superintendent   Mr. Eric Hartwig
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name   Las Lomitas Elementary   Tel. (650) 854-2880

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   Mr. Steven Sowiski
(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:

1	Elementary schools
1	Middle schools
0	Junior High Schools
0	High schools
0	Other
2	TOTAL

2.   District Per Pupil Expenditure: 14609

      Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 7745

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

          8   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	0	0		7	59	50	109
K	0	0	0		8	53	57	110
1	0	0	0		9	0	0	0
2	0	0	0		10	0	0	0
3	0	0	0		11	0	0	0
4	57	64	121		12	0	0	0
5	65	72	137		Other	0	0	0
6	60	48	108					
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL								585

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0	%	American Indian or Alaska Native
12	%	Asian or Pacific Islander
2	%	Black or African American
8	%	Hispanic or Latino
78	%	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 ___3___ %

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	9
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	8
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	17
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	586
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row	0.03
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	3

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: ___15___ %

___28___ Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented ___14___

Specify languages: Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese/Cantonese, Korean, Philipino, Portuguese, Chinese/Mandarin, Khmer, Lao,Arabic, Armenian, Burmese, Croatian, Dutch, Farsi, French, German, Greek, Charnorro, Hebew, Hindi, Hmong, Hungarian, Iiocano, Indonesian, Italian, Punjabi, Russian, Samoan, Thai, Turkish, Tongan, Urdu, Cebuano, ASL, Ukranian, Chaozhou, Pashto

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals ___1___ %

Total number students who qualify: ___9___

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.

N/A

10. Students receiving special education services: _____12_____ %

_____72_____ 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.

2	Autism	1	Orthopedic Impairment
1	Deafness	7	Other Health Impairment
0	Deaf-Blindnes	26	Specific Learning Disabilit
2	Emotional Disturbanc	30	Speech or Language Impairment
1	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
1	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)	2	0
Classroom teachers	37	2
Special resource teachers/specialist	2	1
Paraprofessionals	3	0
Support Staff	2	
Total number	46	3

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 _____16_____ **: 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	97 %	96 %	97 %	94 %	97 %
Daily teacher attendance	99 %	99 %	98 %	99 %	98 %
Teacher turnover rate	2 %	4 %	3 %	3 %	5 %
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

La Entrada has a high performing district where parents value their child's education and attendance at school.

PART III - SUMMARY

La Entrada School is located in the city of Menlo Park in San Mateo County, California. It is one of two schools in the Las Lomitas Elementary School District and includes grades four through eight. Graduates of LE attend Menlo Atherton High School or Woodside High School in the Sequoia Union High School District as well as private preparatory schools throughout the San Francisco Peninsula. LE participates in the Voluntary Transfer Program and receives approximately 5% of its population from East Palo Alto and East Menlo Park. The enrollment at LE is 585 students mostly from upper and upper-middle class professional families. LE attaches a high value to rigorous academic programs and positive social and emotional growth without sacrificing art, music, foreign language, and physical education. The parent community is well established and provides strong support to La Entrada School by contributing time and other resources to help achieve the school's educational goals. There is little transience. Most of the students entering La Entrada School in the fourth grade stay through eighth grade, and graduate as academically prepared, committed and well-rounded adults. Because we focus on assessed needs, offer strong standards-based courses in all core subjects, and provide a wide variety of elective courses, our students feel both emotionally and academically prepared to face the challenges of high school and beyond. Our successes are communicated to parents and community members on a daily basis. This meaningful communication among all members of the school community allows us to continuously revise our goals to better address the needs of our student body and fulfill our vision. The La Entrada Community fosters an educational program that exists within a safe and nurturing environment. This program promotes and supports the academic, social, emotional, and physical growth of all children. With consistently high expectations, we develop critical thinkers, life-long learners, and committed stewards of our global environment.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

In accordance with our Single School Plan, LE is committed to meeting the needs of all students through a variety of methods. First, LE has adopted California Sate Standards in all subject areas. California's state assessment system currently reflects a sequential addition of content areas in science at grades   One of our primary goals is to have our Far Below Basic (FBB), Below Basic (BB), and Basic (B), level students progress to the Proficient or Advanced levels on STAR, the state accountability and assessment program, the majority of which is based on the California Standards. These CSTs (California Standards Tests) include ELA and Math in grades two through eleven; Science in grades five, eight, ten, and eleven; and History/Social Science in grade eight, nine, ten, and eleven. Students' scores are reported as performance levels.. Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy, or to protect student privacy. We have many programs in place to meet the needs of all students, including those from the district's Voluntary Transfer Program. The use of assessment data to inform and improve program effectiveness is a continual process at LE. STAR results are used to assess mastery of standards in ELA, HSS, Math and Science. The Administration uses 'School City' software to create STAR data reports for teachers. These reports include data, disaggregated by specific student characteristics. With this information, teachers, administrators, the school site council, the Superintendent, and the governing board are able to identify areas of strength and need. The district is currently reviewing more user-friendly data systems to implement for the 08-09 school year. A task force has been formed to study various data applications for this implementation. Data analysis drives continuing curriculum review, use of appropriate instructional practices, implementation of appropriate interventions, and allocation of financial and human resources. In addition to the annual STAR program, our students take three standards-based writing assessments, and three ELA assessments each year. Teachers work in grade level and subject area groups to score these assessments, using the performance data to articulate goals for the grade level/subject and to inform their instruction in ELA. All data is used by teachers to monitor and evaluate program effectiveness and to target students who need intervention in order to succeed. Students also take two comprehensive and cumulative math placement tests at the end of each school year to determine their math placement for the following year. Our EL take the CELDT each September to determine levels of proficiency and appropriate ELD program placement. Eighth graders take placement tests to determine math and ELA placement in high school. Our standards-based curriculum, instructional strategies, and support classes in Math and ELA provide our students with the strong foundation they need to pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). Over 98% of our graduates pass this test on an annual basis. Administrators and grade eight content area teachers attend yearly high school articulation meetings to review placement requirements, analyze achievement data from previous years and determine activities to determine a smooth transition for our students.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

The comprehensive and well organized student assessment practices at LE are used to generate the data necessary to best address the needs of our entire student population. STAR data confirms the effectiveness of this system and of LE's educational program. Our API scores have remained stable with a current ranking of 951, placing us as number seven in the top ten middle schools in California. 88% of students in grades 4-8 achieved at the Advanced or Proficient levels for ELA on the 2006 STAR, and 89% of students in grade 4-8 achieved at the Advanced or Proficient levels for ELA on the 2007 STAR compared with the state average of 41% for both years. In 2006 and 2007 over 86% of our students achieved at the Advanced or Proficient levels in math, including grade 8 algebra students. Teachers compare student achievement to STAR results and to the specific content standards in place for ELA, ELD, math, science, HSS, physical education, and visual and performing arts. They also use specified formative and summative assessments at each grade level to inform instruction. This school-wide system of analysis of achievement and performance data, combined with the daily review of student work, provides an ongoing process for comprehensive monitoring of program effectiveness as well as consensus building by individual teachers, grade and subject matter teams, administrators and the School Site Council. Classroom tests as well as performance and summative assessments aligned to standards, enable teachers to plan curriculum and differentiate instructional strategies tailored to students' assessed needs and diverse learning styles. Pre-assessments provide information about standards, concepts, and skills students have already mastered; ongoing assessments measure growth over time and provide specific information for ongoing program planning. A variety of assessments is used to assist teachers in differentiating instruction for flexible student groups.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Communication with parents/guardians is ongoing. Parents meet with their children's teachers each fall at Parent Information Night to learn about grade-level expectations, content standards and interpretation of STAR data. Parents receive their childs' STAR reports before school begins; teachers, parents and students review these results collaboratively and use them to set goals for the year. Twice-yearly parent/teacher conferences include review of progress toward meeting grade level standards. Grade reports for all students are sent home at the end of each quarter; for grades 6-8, status reports are sent home mid-quarter as well, and interim progress reports are sent home bi-monthly.   SSTs are also utilized as a means of interpreting, understanding and communicating assessment results to parents. Teachers maintain consistent contact with parents/guardians of SNYP (Students Not Yet Proficient) to inform them of strategic interventions and instructional support. Communications are provided in the family's primary language through our school's Outreach program. Parents are also informed at bi-yearly Parent Coffees about best teaching and assessment practices, engagement of students in learning and the lessening of student stress associated with being part of a high performing district. On the district level, assessment results are discussed at monthly Leadership Team meetings and communicated to the community through the Governing Board meetings and minutes. The Superintendent's Newsletter also publishes the API rankings from the STAR tests.

4. **Sharing Success:**

LE highly values ongoing communication within our small district and beyond.   We are fortunate to have a collaborative and positive working relationship with our feeder elementary school and our local public high school. Monthly administrator meetings provide the forum wherein best practices and assessment tools are articulated and then shared with staff at both schools. Teachers as well as support personnel between the two schools meet regularly to discuss both successes and areas needing improvement. The district ELD coordinator meets regularly with teachers from both schools to ensure a high quality program at both schools for our ELD population. In addition, our School Site Council comprised of parents, administrators, teachers and students meets monthly to review current practices and establish goals in alignment with the district strategic plan. Beyond our small district, there are many opportunities to share our successes. Regular articulation with our feeder high school occurs. Administrators attend monthly CII (Curriculum Instruction and Improvement) and Gate meetings at the county where successful curricular practices, intervention strategies, reflective practices, assessment tools and data are shared, discussed, and refined. Our full time guidance counselor meets monthly at the tri-county counseling network, articulating academics, behavioral interventions, and site programs addressing social/emotional issues that arise. LE is in its fourth year as a member of the Stanford University SOS project developed by Denise Clark Pope of the Stanford University School of Education. This collaborative effort among the School of Education, the California Endowment, and the Packard Foundation focuses on uniting school communities to improve the health, academic and social engagement, and academic integrity of our students. LE representatives attend a yearly conference at Stanford and have worked to implement strategies to reduce student stress and increase engagement in learning.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

LE provides a balanced, comprehensive, rigorous curriculum that enables ALL students to work successfully to expand their knowledge, skills and experiences. Its high quality standards based core curriculum includes ELA, math, science, HSS, P.E., health education, foreign language and visual and performing arts. Our ELA program includes standards based texts at each grade level, team-selected core novels, comprehensive writing at each grade level, site-based triennial writing prompts and regular and on-going reading assessments. Students also may choose to participate in the Stanford Anthology for Youth program. Many inquiry-based collaborative efforts in HSS, ELA, math and science have resulted in project-based opportunities that are based on enduring understandings and essential questions.

Our math curriculum uses NCTM-endorsed materials and state adopted instructional materials, and is driven by frequent assessments keyed to state standards. Math students are assessed using grade level, committee-developed tests paired with STAR CST results and teacher recommendations. Composition of these classes is fluid, and student progress is monitored to ensure advancement. In grades 6-8, students may choose math electives and support classes. Instructional strategies for math are also designed to meet the needs of all students. For example, all grade 8 students take Algebra 1, SNYP on the grade 7 math CST and LE placement tests also take an algebra support class as one of their electives. In the support level class, scaffolded instruction using numerous visual aids and real life applications has resulted in 80% of grade 8 students scoring at the proficient level on the 2006, 2007 CSTs in algebra compared to the state average of 23%.

Our science curriculum includes the use of science labs with exceptional hands-on resources, and integrates technology with science to extend learning. The science curriculum is enriched with supplemental activities including a science fair, a grade 5 garden and curriculum based field trips.

Recognizing the importance of the 'whole child,' LE offers a fine arts program accessible to all students that includes classes in art, drama, music theory and visual and performing arts for all grades.

Our P.E. program enriches the academic curriculum and inspires all learners. A sequential, progressive and diverse P.E. curriculum for grades 4-8 meets and exceeds state and national P.E. standards. The physical education department conducts monthly physical fitness testing which allows teachers to measure students' physical fitness over time. Our physical fitness scores are well above the state average. New state-of-the-art facilities and equipment enhance the program of traditional and non-traditional activities. Students in grades 6-8 have the option of studying foreign languages at LE, choosing from among six sections of Spanish, three sections of French, and three sections of Latin .These are all year long programs. Students who complete the three-year sequence are eligible to be placed in second-year language courses in high school.

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

Our 4/5 reading program is based on rigorous content standards. The state adopted Open Court text serves as the basis for a strong foundation in comprehension, vocabulary, and reading of informational text and non-fiction.   At the same time, leveled reading is used to differentiate instruction specific to tested levels for each student. Reading logs encourage accountability and ownership while increasing interest and curiosity with text.   Assessments are used to provide the basis for differentiated, skill-based reading instruction both in the classroom and with the reading support teacher. Students identified as B, BB, and FBB as well as those identified through SSTs qualify for extra help with this support teacher. The Silvaroli Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) is used to determine each student's independent and instructional reading levels. In addition, the Scholastic Diagnostic Reading Assessment and the Developmental Reading Assessment are administered three times each year at grades 4-5, as are the benchmark ELA assessments. Spreadsheets with student scores and item analysis of all test items provide essential information to teachers for instructional planning and grouping. LE has initiated the Step Up to Writing program in core, ELD and RSP programs. Core literature books chosen from state framework recommendations extend an already rich curriculum. They provide the basis for teachers to begin instructing students in analysis of the text and elements of literature. These tools then enable all students to transition from learning to read, to reading to learn. LE's approach to teaching reading continues the literacy focus emphasized at our Primary feeder school.

2b. **(Secondary Schools) English:**

Our 6-8 ELA program includes an emphasis on writing as well as reading. The state adopted and approved standards-based text, Holt-Rinehart, serves as the foundation for this program; it includes a variety of genres: poetry, informational text, non-fiction selections and fictional excerpts. Team-selected core novels are also utilized and continue the emphasis of reading. Historical fiction, fiction, science fiction and fantasy are some of the genres represented in grade level selections. These novels provide opportunities for analytical reading, response to literature, and both real life and social science connections. Excerpts from core novels are also used to create writing prompts, thus building a strong foundation in writing through many genres. These writing experiences include response to literature, expository, creative, persuasive, and narrative writing. Targeting appropriate instructional methods is a critical component of successful ELA lesson planning and ensures that all students gain mastery of the writing standards. Many ELA teachers use peer editing during the writing process, structuring pairs to best meet student needs. A competent writer may team with a struggling writer one day, but the next day writers at comparable levels may work together. Similarly, students in ELA classes analyze mentor texts and student work samples in mixed ability groups. As a result of targeted instructional methods, the number of grade 7 students who scored an '8' on STAR ELA writing rose by 28% from 2005 to 2006 and another 12% in 2007. 88% of these 7th graders scored an 8 (maximum possible score). Rubrics, both student and teacher created, are utilized as tools to guide all writers through the writing process. These rubrics are shared before students begin to write. In this way, students take ownership of the process as they become familiar with the expectations for the assignment. The targeting of appropriate instructional methods is a critical component of LE's successful ELA lesson planning and ensures that all students gain mastery of the writing standards. Many ELA teachers use peer editing during the writing process, structuring pairs to best meet student needs. A competent writer may team with a struggling writer one day, but the next day writers at comparable levels may work together. Similarly, students in ELA classes analyze mentor texts and student work samples in mixed ability groups. Inquiry-based collaborative efforts in ELA have resulted in project-based opportunities that allow all children to experience success and form partnerships between grade levels.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

This visual and performing arts curriculum is aligned with the VPA Standards and is a necessary and valuable part of what we offer at La Entrada. All students are given the opportunity for instruction and participation in these programs. Education in the arts is important for our students as they discover themselves, their popular culture, and the cultural heritage of world civilizations. Our comprehensive and integrated arts curriculum is essential. The process of creation, which is its most integral part, requires the higher level thinking skills of decision making and creativity needed to educate students for the 21st century. Growing research indicates that the study of visual/performing arts strengthens students' abilities in the academic, cognitive and affective domains. Recognizing the importance of addressing the needs of the academic, social, emotional and physical growth of all children, this fine arts curriculum is accessible to all students.

Our students choose from a variety of visual and performing arts electives. Eight music electives include classes in music theory and visual and performing arts for all grades. The music program provides students with the skills to write simple compositions as well as the opportunity to hear and appreciate music from many periods (i.e.: Baroque, Classical). Instrumental music is available beginning at 5th grade. Chorus is offered to all 4th and 5th graders once a week and supports the social science curriculum. For example, 4th graders learn songs from the Gold Rush era and 5th graders sing songs from our early US history. Instrumentalists in grades 6-8 may participate in an after-school jazz band in addition to band class. An annual spring musical production includes over 85 students from all grades. In addition, the instrumental music program holds daytime and evening performances twice yearly.

12 arts and drama related electives are also offered to students grades 6-8. These may include ceramics, painting, photography, multimedia, television production, or drama production. Two drama performances are showcased each year in the fall and spring and our art students are consistently recognized and honored with awards from local community groups. Our 6-8 art specialists offer art bi-monthly to 4th and 5th graders. Art and drama are also integrated into the 4th and 5th grade curriculum and provided by the classroom teachers.

10 of 52 students in 4th and 5th grades and 30 of 103 in 6th, 7th and 8th grades actively participate in the visual and performing arts. Over 85 students are involved in the spring 4-8 musical. Art, music and technology teachers coordinate a visual and performing festival of the arts each spring to showcase student achievement.

Both course descriptions and student work reflect the positive aspect of these programs. Teachers note that enthusiasm is demonstrated across all content areas as students gain confidence, develop creativity,

expand their knowledge, and value and embrace their own cultural heritage through visual and performing arts.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

LE provides a challenging, balanced educational program that is data-driven and standards-aligned, and that meets the needs of all students. Using classroom, grade level, benchmark, and STAR program data, teachers design lessons that incorporate differentiated instructional strategies and scaffolded instruction. Specific practices that address the needs and learning styles of students successfully include hands-on activities, inquiry-based instruction, direct instruction, guided inquiry, whole class and small group instruction, field trips and simulations. Our Science department, for example, emphasizes hands-on and inquiry-based instruction through weekly labs and student-designed experiments. Teachers in grades 5-8 stress higher level thinking skills (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy) during lessons to challenge students at all levels of achievement. Across all curricular areas, teachers work with students to help them understand their individual assessment results. As a result of teachers' high expectations, their use of a variety of assessment tools, and ongoing conversations between students and their teachers, students learn to become reflective learners and are empowered to determine their own next steps to learning.

To address the needs of those students requiring extra support, teachers are available to assist before school, at lunch, and after school. Every opportunity is provided during and outside of the regular school day to reinforce, re-teach, and check for understanding so students will perform at or near grade level before high school. The continual monitoring makes it possible for teachers to support those students who require further instruction/intervention in a timely manner. Intervention and supplemental instruction strategies are in place to ensure that SNYP and SWD (Students With Disabilities) are provided the opportunities and support needed to succeed. Examples include differentiated instruction, the after-school Homework Center, SST referral system, peer and adult tutoring and support classes in reading, ELA, and math. Resource specialists, ELL, ELA support and math support teachers collaborate with classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators to address individual needs, including successful strategies to mainstream SWD. Articulation across grades 4-8 is unique to LE and has resulted in changes in instructional strategies, resources, and lesson planning to more effectively meet the needs of all students, regardless of placement.

5. **Professional Development:**

Aligned with the district's long term Strategic Plans for Professional Development (PD), LE's annual PD priorities, directly tied to student achievement data, are articulated in our Single School Plan (SSP). These priorities are: implementing standards-aligned curriculum, analyzing data to inform instruction, using research-proven instructional strategies (differentiation, student engagement in learning, etc.) and optimizing use of SBE (State Board of Education)/district adopted materials. PD in these areas enables staff to engage and challenge our high achievers as well as meet the needs of our EL, SNYP and SWD. Our ultimate goal is that all students will attain proficient levels on STAR by 2014. All school staff participates annually in PD. Our special educators attend PD with classroom teachers, as well as PD focused on targeted programs and services for EL, SNYP and SWD. Instructional aides attend PD to learn research proven strategies for working more effectively with students. In part due to our focused PD, our school's API scores increased as did the percent of students scoring at the Proficient and Advanced levels on the STAR CST for math and science. The percent of students scoring at the Basic, Below Basic and Far Below Basic levels decreased in all areas as well. Recent district PD days have focused on differentiation and the use of multiple assessment tools; curriculum teaching practices to foster student engagement; open-ended, authentic and complex performance tasks/projects based on 'Enduring Understandings' to build curriculum depth; and use of 'Backward Design Process' to identify desired results, determine acceptable evidence and plan meaningful experiences for all students. Seventy-five percent of teachers surveyed noted the beneficial impact of PD on classroom practice, curriculum planning and student achievement. Teachers regularly attend the CUE and NECC conferences and recently received training in the use of Smart Boards to enhance instructional practices. LE provides an early dismissal day once a week to allow for full staff meetings, subject area meetings, grade level meetings, special speakers, and school wide committee meetings. Collaboration has enabled teachers to articulate concerns and strategies across grade levels and content areas.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Math   Grade 4   Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher Educational Testing Service

	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	88	83	88	83	87
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	64	65	72	51	61
Number of students tested	138	107	124	126	107
Percent of total students tested	99	100	99	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	87	100	89	92	100
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	15	12	18	13	13
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced		56	58		42
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	10	16	12	6	12
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 5   Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher Educational Testing Service

	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	85	88	82	79	81
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	63	76	57	58	49
Number of students tested	107	113	122	114	124
Percent of total students tested	99	98	98	97	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	92	94	73	100	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	12	18	15	14	7
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	64	67		36	27
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	14	12	5	15	11
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 6   Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher   Educational Testing Service

	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	90	84	81	74	78
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	61	47	55	50	54
Number of students tested	110	122	108	108	108
Percent of total students tested	99	100	99	99	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	95	89	100		91
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	20	18	12	6	11
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced			50		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	10	5	12	10	8
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 7   Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____ Publisher Educational Testing Service

	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	91	92	86	85	78
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	59	56	61	61	43
Number of students tested	113	109	101	97	105
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	100	100		100	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	11	12	6	11	10
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced		73			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	4	11	10	7	10
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math   Grade 8   Test California Standards Test Algebra 1

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher   Educational Testing Service

	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	79	80	93	78	74
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	31	49	57	30	22
Number of students tested	109	99	69	67	67
Percent of total students tested	98	97	69	67	68
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient plus Advanced	100		100		
% "Exceeding" State Standards not available					
Number of students tested	12	5	11	6	3
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient plus Advanced					
% "Exceeding" State Standards not available					
Number of students tested	10	8	2	4	3
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (ELA)   Grade 4   Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher Educational Testing Service

	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	95	90	92	87	85
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	81	68	72	48	62
Number of students tested	138	107	124	126	107
Percent of total students tested	99	100	99	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	80	83	94	92	100
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	15	12	18	13	13
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced		75	75		58
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	10	16	12	6	12
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (ELA)   Grade 5   Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher Educational Testing Service

	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	84	87	86	79	82
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	54	72	47	59	54
Number of students tested	108	115	122	115	108
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	98	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient plus Advanced	100	89	93	93	
% "Exceeding" State Standards not available					
Number of students tested	12	18	15	14	7
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient plus Advanced	64	50		60	27
% "Exceeding" State Standards not available					
Number of students tested	14	12	5	15	11
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (ELA) Grade 6 Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____ Publisher Educational Testing Service

	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	87	88	84	79	77
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	61	59	55	53	60
Number of students tested	111	122	109	108	108
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	100	78	92		91
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	20	18	12	6	11
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced			58		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	10	5	12	10	8
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject   Reading (ELA)   Grade   7   Test   California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher   Educational Testing Service

	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	91	91	88	86	83
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	60	72	63	61	55
Number of students tested	113	109	101	97	105
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient plus Advanced	91	92		91	
% "Exceeding" State Standards not available					
Number of students tested	11	12	6	11	10
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient plus Advanced		73			
% "Exceeding" State Standards not available					
Number of students tested	4	11	10	7	10
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (ELA)   Grade 8   Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year _____   Publisher   Educational Testing Service

	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	85	84	88	83	68
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	57	60	59	45	45
Number of students tested	110	101	99	98	97
Percent of total students tested	99	99	100	98	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced	92		92		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	12	5	12	7	4
2. Hispanic/Latino					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient plus Advanced				36	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
not available					
Number of students tested	10	10	6	11	7
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					