

**2005-2006 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program**

*U.S. Department of Education*

**Cover Sheet**

Type of School: (Check all that apply)  Elementary  Middle  High  K-12  Charter

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

Official School Name Lemay Street Elementary  
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 17520 Vanowen Street  
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Van Nuys CA 91406-4314  
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Los Angeles State School Code Number\* 19-64733-6017842

Telephone (818) 343-4696 Fax (818) 708-0549

Website/URL <http://search.lausd.k12.ca.us/cgi-bin/fccgi.exe?w3exec=school.profile.content&which=4849>  
E-mail [cwg0440@lausd.k12.ca.us](mailto:cwg0440@lausd.k12.ca.us)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Superintendent\* Governor Roy Romer  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Los Angeles Unified School District – District 1 Tel. (818) 654-3600

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of School Board  
President/Chairperson Ms. Marlene Canter  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

# **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

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

The signatures on the first page of this application 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 with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or 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 2005-2006 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has 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 2000 and has not received the 2003, 2004, or 2005 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the 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.

**DISTRICT** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

- Number of schools in the district:
  - 578 Elementary schools
  - 185 Middle schools
  - N/A Junior high schools
  - 221 High schools
  - 106 Other \*Early Education Centers

1,090 TOTAL
- District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,987  
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,919

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

- Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
  - Urban or large central city
  - Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
  - Suburban
  - Small city or town in a rural area
  - Rural
- 13 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.  
N/A If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
- 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
PreK Special Education Mixed Class	7	3	10	7			
EED (includes early Special Education)	4	5	9	8			
K	24	30	54	9			
1	25	36	61	10			
2	20	36	56	11			
3	35	31	66	12			
4	34	31	65	Other			
5	27	33	60				
6	-	-	-				
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b>							<b>381</b>

*[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]*

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- 9% White
  - 8% Black or African American
  - 77% Hispanic or Latino
  - 5% Asian/Pacific Islander
  - 1% American Indian/Alaskan Native
  - 100% Total**

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

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 5% (entered after 10/4/05)

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	11
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	9
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	20
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	372
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	.05
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	5

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 33% (Does not include 10 students in the Special Education Pre-school Mixed Class)
- 121 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 8

Specify languages: Spanish Armenian Farsi Thai  
Ilocano Russian Vietnamese Tongan

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 75%

Total number students who qualify: 279

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: 14% \*list of kids in RSP, Special Ed.& Special Services  
51\* Total Number of Students Served  
 \*Includes 10 pre-school mixed

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>4</u> Autism	<u>    </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>    </u> Deafness	<u>5</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>    </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>25</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>    </u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>3</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>    </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>    </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>14</u> Mental Retardation	<u>    </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>    </u> Multiple Disabilities	

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

	<b>Number of Staff</b>	
	<b><u>Full-time</u></b>	<b><u>Part-Time</u></b>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>    </u>
Literacy (1) and Math Coach (.5)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Classroom teachers *K includes 2 Special Education teachers one Preschool Mixed and one Early Education	<u>19</u>	<u>    </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff (clerical, custodial, cafeteria & supervisory)	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number	<u>44</u>	<u>8</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers: 21:1\*

\*17 register carrying teachers excluding 4 Special Education itinerant support staff: psychologist, speech therapist, adaptive P.E., and occupational therapist

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. 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 between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Daily student attendance	96%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	93%	92%	91%	89%	92%
Teacher turnover rate	10%*	8%*	8%*	4%	0%
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	N/A%	N/A %	N/A %	N/A %	N/A %
Student drop-off rate (high school)	N/A %	N/A %	N/A %	N/A %	N/A %

\*Teacher turnover rate reflects promotions to other types of certificated and leadership positions.

**PART III - SUMMARY**

Lemay Elementary is a small Title I urban school located in a culturally diverse neighborhood in Van Nuys, California. We are proud members of the Los Angeles Unified School District and have been providing PreK-5 education for 54 years. Our enrollment is predominantly Hispanic with a dynamic mix of White, African-American, Asian, and American Indian heritages. Parents, teachers, students, and community members have all contributed to our 210-point growth over the past five years on our state’s Academic Performance Index. All stakeholders are fully aware of our vision that is reflected and communicated in our mission statement, “We seek to empower our students to reach their academic potential through a rigorous curriculum, collaboration, technology, and respect for diversity to become productive citizens of the world.”

We use local and state disaggregated student data to guide our daily instruction. Faithful implementation of Resnick’s “Nine Principles of Learning” is a contributing factor to our success. Principles such as academic rigor, accountable talk, and clear expectations completely permeate our core instructional programs. We develop precise rubrics and criteria charts to ensure that all students know what is expected of them and what they must do to meet grade level standards. We regularly hold case conferences and Student Success Team meetings in order to meet the needs of our struggling students. Our gifted/high achieving students receive differentiated instruction through independent work time, challenging activities and projects emphasizing depth and complexity as delineated by Sandra Kaplan. Our *Character Counts!* Program helps us promote respect, mutual understanding, and an appreciation for diversity strengthening our school culture and contributing to a positive school climate.

We provide an assessment driven, standards-based curriculum using state adopted texts such as Open Court Reading, Scott Foresman Math, Houghton Mifflin Social Studies, Harcourt Science, FOSS and Carolina Biological Science Kits, and Hampton Brown “Into English”. Our teachers, literacy and math coaches, special education staff, and administrators meet weekly by grade level and across grade levels to examine student work and use the results to plan instruction accordingly. Our focus is to differentiate instruction to ensure that all students meet and even exceed grade level standards in all curricular areas. Parents are kept informed of their student’s progress through conferences, newsletters, and their participation on various councils and committees. All communication is provided in both English and Spanish.

Technology permeates all areas of our school. Internet access is available in each classroom, our library, and our administrative offices. This facilitates communication with the central district, our local district, and our school in sharing student information and data. Teachers submit report card grades electronically and access their students' data on local and state assessments for diagnostic purposes. In addition, we have a fully operational computer lab where all students gain content knowledge through the use of programs and where upper grade students routinely perform Internet research during weekly computer classes.

Recently, we were the recipients of a Wonder of Reading Library grant to renovate and modernize our library. With the establishment of this library we are training a group of volunteers who will work with students in a tutorial reading program.

Collaboration, consistency, accountability, and high expectations are key ingredients in our recipe for success. But what makes Lemay Elementary unique is that every decision made and each program adopted enhances our capacity to maximize the growth of every child.

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

### **1 - Assessment Results**

Lemay is a part of the California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program (STAR), which includes the California Standards Test in grades 2 - 5 and the California Achievement Test (CAT6) in grades 1 and 3. The Academic Performance Index (API) is a numeric index or scale ranging from a low 200 to a high 1000 that reflects a school's performance level based on the results of statewide testing. The target score for schools in our state, by the year 2013/14, is 800. Our current API score is 792 reflecting a growth of 210 points over the last 5 years. In addition similar schools in the state are ranked from 1-10, lowest to highest, based on their academic performance and similar social/economic demographics. Our 2004 statewide ranking is an 8 and our similar schools ranking is a 10.

<b>Year</b>	2000/2001	2001/2002	2002/2003	2003/2004	2004/2005
<b>API (Base)</b>	611	652	685	769	791
<b>API (Growth)</b>	663	701	770	792	792
<b>Growth</b>	+52	+49	+85	+23	+1

To close the achievement gap, we use the disaggregated standardized testing data to determine our school wide effectiveness. All subgroups, English Learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged, Hispanic, gifted, and students with special needs are exceeding their projected annual growth targets. The data proves there is no major disparity among any of our Lemay subgroups.

In interpreting the California Standards Test, student performance indicators are divided into 5 bands: Far Below Basic, Below Basic, Basic, Proficient and Advanced. According to No Child Left Behind, Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO), the goal for 2005/06 English Language Arts Proficiency is 24.4%: Lemay's average last year was 47%, with 47% of our students in grades 2-5 being either proficient or advanced in language arts. The AMO goal for mathematics is 26.5%. Lemay's average last year was 66.5%, with 66.5% of our students in grades 2-5 being either proficient or advanced in math. We far exceed the national targets in both academic areas.

In addition to the STAR Program, we meet the needs of our diverse student population by using a wide range of assessments. Our bilingual students are tested annually using the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) to monitor adequate progress in the acquisition of their second language. Local assessment measures include reading, math, and science periodic assessments, teacher observations, kindergarten readiness tests, and writing portfolios.

## **2 - Using Assessment Results**

Assessment data is the foundation for decision-making by the school community. At the beginning of each school year, teachers meet with administrators and instructional coaches to analyze standardized test results to determine school wide and grade level strengths and weaknesses in the core curriculum. Students are identified as being advanced, proficient, basic, below basic and far below basic with the purpose of differentiating instruction and developing strategies for improving their academic performance. This is an ongoing activity that is reinforced through periodic language arts and math assessments that pinpoint mastery of the California standards and monitor student progress.

Teachers use this information to provide differentiated small group instruction during independent work time (for language arts and math) to serve the needs of our English learners, gifted and talented, and students with special needs. This data is also used for initial identification of possible gifted or students with special needs. After school and Saturday intervention classes provide additional support for those students who are performing at far below basic and below basic levels to preteach and reteach key standards. The Student Success Team reviews individual student records and offers special placement or accommodations to the regular curriculum when appropriate.

Weekly grade level meetings provide numerous opportunities for collaboration, reflection, and test analysis. During these meetings teachers pay special attention to the language development needs of English learners using scaffolds such as *Thinking Maps*, graphic organizers for writing, and manipulatives for developing major mathematical concepts. They engage in conversations about how to strategically integrate these tools into daily lesson plans to maximize student learning. Assessment data is collectively analyzed. Our literacy and math coaches provide alternative strategies in reteaching key standards. Furthermore, our resource teachers co-teach using a collaborative model within the classroom as well as providing a pullout program.

## **3 - Communicating Assessment Results**

In August a detailed profile of each child's performance on the California Standards Test is mailed to the student's home. A second copy is mailed to the school and becomes part of the classroom portfolio to be revisited at parent conferences. Although the results of the test are graphed, it has been our experience many parents do not see the relationship between students' classroom performance and test performance until these conferences take place. Utilizing disaggregated data, the overall school performance is presented to the parents in English and Spanish at Back to School Night and during the School Site Council meetings showing our students' annual yearly academic growth. In assessing our growth we continually gauge our progress to similar schools in our area, schools within our district, and across the state. Parents are made aware not only of our state testing results but how our periodic assessments in Open Court Reading and math are used to monitor each student's progress every 6-8 weeks in key component areas. These district assessments in English language arts and mathematics provide parents with an ongoing picture of how well students are mastering specific content that will be measured on the statewide standardized tests.

Teachers have their students graph their individual progress on these periodic assessments to involve students in this partnership of becoming lifelong learners and to help them reach their academic goals. Standards are presented to the students in "kid friendly" language and are internalized through daily use. We teach students to make connections not only to their daily lives but also to the assessment data.

Community members can access detailed information about our school through the Los Angeles Unified School District and the California Department of Education websites. California's "School Accountability Report Card" is an annual report to the community regarding test results, student and teacher attendance, opportunities for parental involvement, and other significant school information.



#### **4 - Sharing Success**

Our school shares many innovative ideas and practices throughout the District. We are at the forefront in implementing the Special Education Collaborative Model, Lauren Resnick's *9 Principles of Learning*, *Thinking Maps*, graphic organizers for writing, and the use of technology.

Our Special Education Collaborative Model combines co-teaching with small group instruction in the regular education classroom. Resource students receive intensive instruction with their peers. Program specialists from our district routinely bring teachers from other schools to observe and replicate this model.

Lauren Resnick's *9 Principles of Learning* are the foundation for our daily instruction. Academic rigor, accountable talk, and clear expectations are evident in student work and classroom instruction. We have hosted several "learning walks" for principals, literacy and math coaches, and teachers in order to demonstrate the *Principles of Learning* in the actual classroom setting. Educators from several other states and Canada have visited our school to observe lessons using "best practices."

At the Title I Academic Achievement Conference we discovered a way to enhance our writing program using graphic organizers and *Thinking Maps*. Through intensive training over the last two years, we have been able to strategically integrate *Thinking Maps* into the curriculum to scaffold the writing process for all learners. Teachers at Valley Alternative have attended numerous workshops at our school to learn more about the ways in which we teach writing to students.

Another effective method of sharing is videotaping. Several of our teachers demonstrated Open Court lessons to increase fluency, plan and implement independent work time (IWT), and teach the proper procedures for spelling and dictation. These tapes are used to train both new and veteran teachers throughout the district.

We look forward to sharing our successes with other schools. The benefit of sharing is two-fold. As we exchange ideas with colleagues from other schools we reflect on our own best practices and gain valuable insights that further strengthen our "Professional Learning Community."

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

### **1 – Curriculum**

The foundation for Lemay's curriculum is the California content standards. These standards were formulated by a cadre of university professors, teachers, administrators, parents, and other community members to establish a world-class educational program in our state. Our teachers are well versed in the content standards that guide our daily instruction in the areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, science, English language development, social studies, visual and performing arts, and physical education. All students, regardless of language, special needs, or ability are held to the same academic standards and have access to the core curriculum.

Our school uses the standards based Open Court Reading Program. The implementation of OCR across the entire district is part of a large-scale reform effort to ensure consistency. The Open Court Program is phonics based and uses explicit systematic instruction. Open Court is a well-rounded program that includes spelling and dictation, grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, and the writing process.

The math program focuses on the development of key standards and concepts. Using Scott Foresman as a textbook we integrate Marilyn Burns' activities, John Van De Walle's developmental teaching theory, and SRA's Steps to provide a comprehensive program. Students have math journals that are used

extensively not only to record solutions to problems but also to explain their mathematical reasoning.

Keeping with our philosophy, the Harcourt Science Program utilizes hands-on experiences in physical, earth, and life science. Teachers in grades 4 and 5 received extensive training on implementing the program and coaching students to answer more elaborate constructed response questions. Foss kits were purchased for grade K-5, also.

The Houghton Mifflin social studies program builds concepts about the community, city, state, and country incrementally through grades K-5. We have coordinated school journeys to match the curriculum at each grade level. For example, fourth grade visits a “rancho” and experiences mission life while kindergarten visits the city zoo as a place in their community. Another type of involvement includes first graders who invite community workers to speak about their jobs.

Every class uses the Hampton Brown *Into English* materials for English Language Development (ELD). One of our teachers is participating in a district-wide training to maximize the delivery of the new ELD curriculum and provide staff development for fellow teachers.

We are addressing the national concern about rising obesity rates through meaningful physical education activities and The Nutrition Network. This is our third year for our nutrition grant, which introduces students to new fruits and vegetables on a monthly basis. Our teachers developed activities to help their students gain the necessary skills to pass the President’s Physical Fitness Challenge. We also encourage our families to participate in our local councilman’s semi-annual “Kids Fitness Challenge” which involves walking, running, biking, and skating. This program gives them and their families the knowledge to make healthy choices.

This is our sixth year of involvement in the visual and performing arts program. This grant has allowed us to incorporate drama, music, art, and dance into the core curriculum. Guest teachers instruct students in the standards while modeling demonstration lessons in the arts for host teachers to use in the future. The goal of the grant is to train teachers to learn the techniques to eventually replicate the program independently.

Lemay’s main goal is to provide many avenues to the core curriculum. We offer activities that are of high interest, interactive, challenging, and fun. Our wide variety of programs within the curriculum is evidenced through the great number of student artifacts displayed on bulletin boards, display cases, and auditorium walls. Numerous culminating activities highlight exceptional academic achievement and celebrate our ongoing successes.

## **2a - Elementary Schools Reading**

The Los Angeles Unified School District adopted Open Court Reading in the year 2000 for grades K-5. Our superintendent wanted uniformity in teaching standards-based instruction among classrooms and schools across Los Angeles Unified. The purpose of this vast reform movement was to ameliorate student performance within this large and multiethnic district. All teachers were required to attend a 5-day grade-level specific training, in the implementation of the Open Court Reading Program. Every teacher in our school continued the optional advanced training. Our strength and success lies with the faithful and cogent implementation of our standards-based reading program.

Open Court is designed to ensure systematic instruction in all areas of reading and language arts using a spiral approach. This phonics based program uses spelling and dictation to help students grasp spelling patterns using the sound/spelling cards. Students are taught strategies such as word structure and context clues during vocabulary instruction to decipher unknown words. Comprehension strategies are directly and explicitly taught through extensive modeling and “think alouds.” Students are taught how to lead discussion groups through a technique called “handing off”. The teachers have augmented this program through the use of *Thinking Maps* to assist students in drawing conclusions, understanding cause and effect, using analogies, etc. Independent Work Time (IWT) allows teachers to differentiate instruction to

meet the needs of a targeted group of students (at risk/advanced) based on data from periodic assessments.

Our school continues to focus on teaching the writing process to students using graphic organizers and modeling writing in the classroom. Teachers have taken a leadership role in designing writing units with daily lesson plans. Writing genres that are dictated by the state standards are introduced and revisited yearly. Our goal is to have students who can write for many different purposes. Students use criteria charts and rubrics to self monitor their work during the writing process.

### **3 – One other curriculum area and how it relates to our mission statement**

We empower our students to succeed in a technology-driven world by providing them with a solid mathematical foundation. Staying faithful to our mission we teach major math concepts using manipulatives, computer programs, and cognitively demanding mathematical tasks.

District One adopted the Scott Foresman math textbook for general use. SRA Steps, Marilyn Burns' and John Van De Walle's activities are integrated into long-term planning and daily teaching. The math coach and teachers use multi-step problems to demonstrate higher level thinking skills. Teachers in grades K-5 were trained to "algebrafy" daily problems to add rigor. These problems allow students to engage in challenging mathematical discussions that prepare them for solving performance tasks. We also recognize the need for students to develop computational automaticity and encourage them to master the basic facts in the four operations by qualifying for the "By Heart Club."

One example of how we encourage students to take responsibility for their learning is our Math Field Day. Students work collaboratively in competing teams to solve problems that are based on the key standards for each grade level using a game show format. This event encourages students to polish their problem solving skills. Team learning pays off as evidenced by their performance on math standardized tests.

EduSoft is a cutting edge computer program that allows teachers to instantly generate grade level, classroom, and individual reports that highlight strengths and weaknesses in the various standards tested. This technology provides the tools to create instructional groups based on four levels of proficiency: far below, approaching, proficient, and advanced. This information facilitates the planning of Math Independent Work Time (MIWT) to differentiate instruction and meet the needs of every child.

We firmly believe that our rigorous mathematics curriculum, coupled with on going collaboration and cutting edge technology, helps every student meet the high standards necessary to become a productive citizen of the world.

### **4 - Instructional Methods**

The key to effective instruction is for classroom teachers to use a variety of modalities that match the students' strengths. Lesson planning includes attention to the visual, auditory, and kinesthetic means of learning.

We implement the Special Education Collaborative Model to provide the least restrictive environment for our students with special needs. An advantage of this method is that students remain in the classroom for the majority of the instructional time. Regular and resource teachers collaboratively plan to effectively maximize student learning. We received a District award for our full inclusion program this year.

To meet the needs of our English learners, LAUSD initiated the English Language Support Guide that supplements our reading program. This helps with students' expressive language and sentence structure.

Using Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English methodology teachers use pictures, realia, manipulatives, and dramatic presentations to make advanced core content comprehensible.

Culminating activities such as Word Wizard, Math Field Day, International Dance Festival, and a Science Fair give students an opportunity to demonstrate their academic expertise. Word Wizard is a fun activity where teams of students work together to define and use vocabulary words in context while Math Field Day allows collaboration among students to solve mathematical problems. During the International Dance Festival students showcase their talents in art, dance, music, and drama. This year, we're adding a science fair to offer students the opportunity to show their understanding of the scientific method, express experimental design, and share the results of their investigations. It's an opportunity to use expository writing in a real-life situation.

Selected teachers attended Sandra Kaplan's Gifted Training and use the elements of depth and complexity to extensively study subject matter and encourage the development of critical thinking skills. Independent Work Time is used as a vehicle to deliver differentiated instruction at many different levels. Challenge activities from the reading program provide our gifted students with daily enrichment.

## **5 - Professional Development**

Professional development at Lemay is multifaceted. After extensive test analysis, our school develops a calendar for staff development targeting identified areas of strengths and weaknesses for future study. We provide the latest instructional tools to facilitate the delivery of the core curriculum, refine methodology, and integrate theory and practice.

The math and literacy coaches introduce new research studies that impact student achievement. They demonstrate what these practices look like and check for implementation in the classrooms within the following week. All participants agree to put into practice one activity following each major staff development. Administrators, coaches, and teachers check for understanding at grade level meetings.

During grade level meetings teachers determine specific needs based on periodic test analysis and classroom observation. They utilize student work to reflect on their instructional practices, check for continuity, and share best practices. Our motto is "to work smarter, not harder." In this spirit, grade level teams collaborate in lesson planning and divide up routine tasks to use their time more efficiently and more effectively. These discussions frequently result in the selection of topics for future staff development.

Differentiated instruction is a theme that is woven into the fabric of our staff development. Several years ago we pioneered the use of Independent Work Time to differentiate instruction in math. As a result, no student scored far below basic in three grades on the California Standards Test that year. We experienced similar success after introducing the use of manipulatives to introduce major math concepts.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	81	86	90
% At or Above Proficient	59	52	53
% At Advanced	12	10	18
Number of students tested	73	71	57
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
<i>1. Hispanic</i>			
% At or Above Basic	76	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	60	41	56
% At Advanced	11	*	*
Number of Students Tested	55	46	48
<i>2. English Learner**</i>			
% At or Above Basic	66	75	100
% At or Above Proficient	48	28	47
% At Advanced	6	3	0
Number of Students Tested	33	29	15
<i>3. Economically Disadvantaged</i>			
% At or Above Basic	78	81	88
% At or Above Proficient	57	45	50
% At Advanced	14	9	19
Number of Students Tested	58	47	52
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	70	65	68
% At or Above Proficient	42	35	36
% At Advanced	14	12	12

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English learners are Hispanic.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	66	69	64
% At or Above Proficient	29	29	32
% At Advanced	4	3	16
Number of students tested	71	62	63
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	2
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
<i>1.Hispanic</i>			
%At or Above Basic	54	*	*
%At or Above Proficient	19	28	33
%At Advanced	2	*	*
Number of Students Tested	48	54	52
<i>2.English Learner**</i>			
%At or Above Basic	41	58	48
%At or Above Proficient	19	10	24
%At Advanced	0	0	16
Number of Students Tested	32	21	25
<i>3.Economically Disadvantaged</i>			
%At or Above Basic	59	69	62
%At or Above Proficient	25	30	30
%At Advanced	5	5	19
Number of Students Tested	57	44	47
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
%At or Above Basic	62	61	63
%At or Above Proficient	31	30	33
%At Advanced	10	9	10

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English learners are Hispanic.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	78	85	93
% At or Above Proficient	44	43	51
% At Advanced	12	13	9
Number of students tested	59	56	43
Percent of total students tested	98	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	3	3
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	5	7
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
<i>1.Hispanic</i>			
%At or Above Basic	77	*	*
%At or Above Proficient	44	43	45
%At Advanced	13	*	*
Number of Students Tested	52	44	33
<i>2.English Learner**</i>			
%At or Above Basic	69	82	78
%At or Above Proficient	16	35	0
%At Advanced	0	6	0
Number of Students Tested	19	17	9
<i>3.Economically Disadvantaged</i>			
%At or Above Basic	77	84	93
%At or Above Proficient	40	33	52
%At Advanced	13	7	8
Number of Students Tested	47	30	39
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
%At or Above Basic	77	73	74
%At or Above Proficient	47	39	39
%At Advanced	20	16	15

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English learners are Hispanic.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	86	80	68
% At or Above Proficient	56	44	30
% At Advanced	13	16	0
Number of students tested	46	50	40
Percent of total students tested	98	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	3	4
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	6	9
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
<i>1. Hispanic</i>			
% At or Above Basic	95	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	62	41	29
% At Advanced	14	*	*
Number of Students Tested	37	37	28
<i>2. English Learner**</i>			
% At or Above Basic	100	47	44
% At or Above Proficient	40	12	11
% At Advanced	0	0	0
Number of Students Tested	10	17	9
<i>3. Economically Disadvantaged</i>			
% At or Above Basic	88	75	65
% At or Above Proficient	50	37	27
% At Advanced	9	18	0
Number of Students Tested	34	38	37

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English learners are Hispanic.



Subject Mathematics Grade 2  
Edition/Publication Developed & Revised Annually  
Lemay Elementary

Test California Standards Test  
Publisher California Department of Education  
Los Angeles Unified School District

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	93	93	93
% At or Above Proficient	72	79	82
% At Advanced	40	52	47
Number of students tested	73	71	57
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
<i>1.Hispanic</i>			
% At or Above Basic	91	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	72	72	85
% At Advanced	39	*	*
Number of Students Tested	55	46	48
<i>2.English Learner**</i>			
% At or Above Basic	87	90	100
% At or Above Proficient	63	66	93
% At Advanced	28	38	33
Number of Students Tested	33	29	15
<i>3.Economically Disadvantaged</i>			
% At or Above Basic	93	90	93
% At or Above Proficient	71	79	85
% At Advanced	38	53	48
Number of Students Tested	58	47	52
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	78	76	76
% At or Above Proficient	56	51	53
% At Advanced	28	23	24

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English learners are Hispanic.

Subject Mathematics Grade 3  
Edition/Publication Developed & Revised Annually  
Lemay Elementary

Test California Standards Test  
Publisher California Department of Education  
Los Angeles Unified School District

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	83	83	73
% At or Above Proficient	60	56	54
% At Advanced	35	21	31
Number of students tested	71	62	64
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	2
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
<i>1.Hispanic</i>			
% At or Above Basic	79	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	50	57	55
% At Advanced	21	*	*
Number of Students Tested	48	54	52
<i>2.English Learner**</i>			
% At or Above Basic	76	67	68
% At or Above Proficient	38	48	50
% At Advanced	19	5	38
Number of Students Tested	32	21	25
<i>3.Economically Disadvantaged</i>			
% At or Above Basic	81	82	72
% At or Above Proficient	53	59	50
% At Advanced	30	23	24
Number of Students Tested	57	44	47
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	76	73	71
% At or Above Proficient	54	48	46
% At Advanced	24	21	19

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English learners are Hispanic.

Subject Mathematics Grade 4  
Edition/Publication Developed & Revised Annually  
Lemay Elementary

Test California Standards Test  
Publisher California Department of Education  
Los Angeles Unified School District

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	77	87	93
% At or Above Proficient	58	62	77
% At Advanced	34	32	47
Number of students tested	59	53	43
Percent of total students tested	98	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	3	3
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	5	7
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
<i>1. Hispanic</i>			
% At or Above Basic	81	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	58	64	73
% At Advanced	33	*	*
Number of Students Tested	52	44	33
<i>2. English Learner**</i>			
% At or Above Basic	64	83	88
% At or Above Proficient	42	48	44
% At Advanced	11	24	11
Number of Students Tested	19	17	9
<i>3. Economically Disadvantaged</i>			
% At or Above Basic	75	90	93
% At or Above Proficient	57	53	74
% At Advanced	30	20	49
Number of Students Tested	47	30	39
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	75	73	72
% At or Above Proficient	50	45	45
% At Advanced	26	18	18

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English learners are Hispanic.

Subject Mathematics Grade 5  
Edition/Publication Developed & Revised Annually  
Lemay Elementary

Test California Standards Test  
Publisher California Department of Education  
Los Angeles Unified School District

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	87	82	66
% At or Above Proficient	76	72	41
% At Advanced	52	34	13
Number of students tested	46	50	40
Percent of total students tested	98	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	3	4
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	6	9
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b> (Significant Groups)			
1.Hispanic			
% At or Above Basic	97	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	84	65	25
% At Advanced	59	*	*
Number of Students Tested	37	37	28
2.English Learner**			
% At or Above Basic	100	59	55
% At or Above Proficient	80	47	33
% At Advanced	30	12	0
Number of Students Tested	10	17	9
3.Economically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Basic	88	79	62
% At or Above Proficient	74	71	35
% At Advanced	47	32	11
Number of Students Tested	34	38	37
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
% At or Above Basic	67	65	61
% At or Above Proficient	44	38	35
% At Advanced	19	12	10

\*Complete data for Hispanic subgroup is only available for the 2004/2005 school year.

\*\*The majority of English Learners are Hispanic.