

2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Public Private

Cover Sheet

Type of School
(Check all that apply)

Elementary Middle High K-12
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal Ms. Janis D. Keene

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

Official School Name Georgia O'Keeffe Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 11701 San Victorio NE

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

Albuquerque

City

New Mexico

State

87111-5947

Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Bernalillo County

State School Code Number* 01011328

Telephone (505) 293-4259

Fax (505) 293-4586

Web site/URL www.okeeffe.aps.edu

E-mail keene@aps.edu

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 Ms. Linda Sink

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

District Name Albuquerque Public Schools

Tel. (505) 880-3713

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 Ms. Paula Maes

(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: _____ 84 Elementary schools
 _____ 26 Middle schools
 _____ 0 Junior High Schools
 _____ 12 High schools
 _____ 11 Other
 _____ 133 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 9588
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 9588

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
 Urban or large central city
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban are
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural area
 Rural
4. _____ 5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 _____ 0 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	0	0	0
K	56	47	103	8	0	0	0
1	59	40	99	9	0	0	0
2	47	47	94	10	0	0	0
3	52	45	97	11	0	0	0
4	64	44	108	12	0	0	0
5	58	65	123	Other	0	0	0
6	0	0	0				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							624

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 2 | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 8 | % Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 3 | % Black or African American |
| 16 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 71 | % White |

100 % TOTAL

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

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year 19 %

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	59
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	50
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	109
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	582
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.19
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	19

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 4 %
- | | |
|----|---|
| 23 | Total Number Limited English Proficient |
|----|---|

Number of languages represented: 26

Specify languages: American Sign Language, Arabic, Bosnian, Chinese, Croatian, Farsi, Filipino, French, German, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Marathi, Polish, Russian, Serbian (Serbish), Spanish, Swiss-German, Taiwanese, Tamil, Telugo, Urdu, Zuni

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 12 %

Total number students who qualify: 70

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

10. Students receiving special education services: $\frac{8}{47}$ % Total Number of Students Served

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

<u>1</u>	Autism	<u>0</u>	Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u>	Deafness	<u>3</u>	Other Health Impairment
<u>0</u>	Deaf-Blindness	<u>19</u>	Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u>	Emotional Disturbance	<u>23</u>	Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u>	Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u>	Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u>	Mental Retardation	<u>1</u>	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u>	Multiple Disabilities		

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

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>26</u>	<u>6</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>
Support Staff	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>46</u>	<u>10</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of 21 : 1 students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1

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

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Daily student attendance	96 %	96 %	96 %	95 %	95 %
Daily teacher attendance	93 %	94 %	93 %	92 %	95 %
Teacher turnover rate	36 %	20 %	29 %	20 %	20 %
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

Included in the percentage of teacher turnover rates are those teachers applying for a leave of absence, new hires, resignations, transfers, and retirements. Our district only reports these figures for the past three years. During the 2006-07 school year, our school enrollment grew resulting in the hiring of 3 new staff members. In addition, we had three

teachers take maternity leave, and three other teachers return from leave.

PART III - SUMMARY

Georgia O'Keeffe Elementary School (GOK) has been a model for change in New Mexico for the past 15 years. Years ago, a small group of school leaders served as catalysts for accountability, goal alignment, and shared governance. These early change agents served to create a learning system in which all stakeholders take ownership of mutually agreed upon goals. All educational leaders within our school are empowered to take ownership of the systems that drive the success of our students. This systems thinking involves our entire learning community; teachers, administrators, parents, students and our community at large, as we develop strategies that will produce desired change.

The governance system used to initiate quality change at GOK reflects continuous improvement principles adopted from the Baldrige Criteria and Quality Concepts. This framework serves to create an integrated system which drives our school, our classrooms, and ultimately, student achievement. Teachers and students are considered partners in the process of teaching and learning. All of our students are involved in goal setting, the development of individualized action plans, and the process of 'Plan-Do-Study-Act' (PDSA). Children are active participants in their learning, taking responsibility for implementing specific changes aligned to their personal goals. This process is very powerful, and performance results bear witness to both ownership and learning.

Each fall, the staff at Georgia O'Keeffe spends time revisiting our school Mission, Vision, Goals and Core Values. Teachers help create our school 'Educational Plan for Student Success' (EPSS), which is aligned with our district and cluster goals. In addition, teachers then take these goals back to their classrooms, where students are involved in the same process. The Core Values generated by the students and those of the staff are remarkably similar. Our school Mission is 'to work collaboratively to foster life-long learning, stimulate curiosity, celebrate diversity and encourage personal growth.' The Mission of our students, which they share daily on our video transmission of announcements, is 'learning for today and tomorrow.'

Transformational Leadership is practiced at Georgia O'Keeffe. Goal Teams, which are comprised of all staff members, are aligned with our school goals, and are charged with; conducting research, making school-wide recommendations for teaching and learning strategies, creating short cycle assessments, and providing professional development for their peers. In addition, grade levels collaborate monthly and share best practices to ensure consistent, quality instruction. Vertical conversations have begun to ensure alignment throughout our school and within our cluster of schools.

Decisions are based upon our system of accountability. All staff members are trained to analyze student performance results and to use that information to drive instruction. Our Baldrige Goal Team has developed a process now known throughout our district as 'Data Meetings'. All short cycle assessment results are collected and analyzed by grade levels and across grade levels. Teachers identify students who are not yet proficient, create fluid groupings, and provide targeted interventions to close the achievement gap. Our school has created an enormous capacity for change, for learning, and for taking risks. School climate is measured and the entire staff generates ideas for improvement. This selfless group of professionals has shared all they have learned with educators from around the world as GOK has served as a Baldrige in Demonstration School for many years. It is this desire to improve others that truly sets our school apart.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Four years ago, the New Mexico Public Education Department (PED) contracted with Harcourt Publishing to create a summative assessment aligned to our state standards. Prior to 2004, Albuquerque Public Schools participated in the administration of Terra Nova and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. For comparison purposes, New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) results will be provided for the past three school years. NAEP results in New Mexico are not reported by individual school.

Analysis of GOK's NMSBA results indicate positive growth trends. Most recent data reveals that approximately 80% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient or advanced in Math, and approximately 90% are proficient or advanced in Reading. Two years ago, our Math Goal Team designed an all-encompassing professional development series for our instructional staff. Math results were immediately impacted by these efforts, with scores improving 9 percentage points that first year. The staff at GOK attributes this growth to comprehensive Professional Development, parent involvement, the use of Math rubrics, and differentiated instruction for those students not yet proficient. In addition, analysis of Reading results show that 95% of all fifth grade students are proficient or advanced. These results suggest that our Balanced Literacy program and school-wide literacy enrichment opportunities positively impact student learning.

Subgroup analysis is revealing in that our Hispanic and Native American subgroups score significantly lower than 'all students', particularly in the area of Mathematics. Our English Language Learners and Asian students score higher than Caucasian or 'all students'. Seventy-five percent of our Economically Disadvantaged students are proficient or advanced in Reading and 65% are proficient or advanced in Math. Special Education students met the annual measurable objective (AMO). Our school's EPSS addresses the needs of all students scoring below proficiency, by providing additional intervention targeted to meet individual student needs. During the 2005-2006 school year, two students participated in an 'Alternative Assessment'. Both 5th grade students are in the 'Mentally Retarded' range of ability. The assessment, administered over a three week period of time, identifies strengths and gaps in the application of basic math skills, self help skills, independent living skills and vocational skills.

Extensive discussions have focused on subgroup disparities however subgroup numbers are relatively small. Students are often identified in more than one category. For example, Hispanic students make up a large percentage of our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup, and are also our most mobile students. Also of interest, is that those students who have attended school at GOK for two or more years score 20% points higher than children new to our learning system. This in-depth, school-wide analysis has also served to identify those at risk students who are eligible to participate in our extensive after school program. Offerings include; Homework club, Computer club, Chess club, Science club, Fitness club, to name a few.

In New Mexico, the State PED has identified annual goal cut scores for student achievement. Student scale score intervals identify those students (by grade level) scoring at beginning steps, nearing proficiency, proficient or advanced. Percentages of students scoring proficient or advanced determine if a school meets Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). In New Mexico, the AMO increases incrementally each year, until 100% of students must achieve proficiency in 2014. Beginning in school year 2004-2005, 24% of New Mexico students had to achieve proficiency for a school to meet AYP. The following year, the AMO was raised to 28% proficiency, followed by 33% proficiency in the 2006-2007 school year. Results for the 2007-2008 school year will require that 44% of students achieve proficiency. In comparison, as previously mentioned, most recent results for GOK have 80% of all students achieving proficiency in Math and over 90% proficiency in Reading. These results indicate that our learning system continues to exceed expectations, and that this focused community is committed to continuous improvement.

2. Using Assessment Results

As a 'continuous improvement school', GOK staff members utilize several different assessment tools to track student progress and help us make sound instructional decisions. Short-cycle assessments, created by our school Curricular Goal Teams are aligned with our state standards.

Teachers also analyze results from the summative New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) and our district formative assessment, Assess2Learn (A2L). The A2L is administered three times annually in order to make informed instructional decisions. In addition, several grade levels use weekly 'quick checks' or 'exit slips' to show evidence of student mastery.

It is important that the staff understand our whole school data and the implications for teaching and learning. Our Baldrige Goal Team has created a process that allows our staff to analyze whole school results. Teachers, Instructional Assistants, our Administration and Support Staff meet together three times annually to analyze scores in Reading, Writing and Math. This allows for vertical articulation and alignment. Groups are asked to identify achievement gaps, celebrations and next step processes. Our school district has duplicated this process in many schools that are in need of improvement.

Grade level teams then create a PDSA based on student needs. At the classroom level, this process continues, as teachers and students have conversations about learning goals, analyze their classroom data together, and then create individualized action plans so that students can reach their personal goals. Grade level teams then collaborate to create focused lesson plans that reflect best practices. Individual student 'data portfolios' and PDSA's empower students to own their learning goals and to track their individual progress.

Using and understanding data has improved our staff's awareness of student needs. This awareness has focused instruction on student learning gaps and created a group of students who are partners in their learning. GOK's NMSBA scores have improved annually. We attribute these gains to our accountability system and the staff's sophisticated understanding of 'what the data is really telling us'.

3. Communicating Assessment Results

Each fall, schools receive assessment results from our Public Education Department (PED). The Albuquerque Journal publishes these results for the community-at-large. Our school administration shares these initial results during staff orientation, and once in depth student reports are received, our Baldrige Goal Team facilitates staff discussions that focus on the identification of gaps, strengths to celebrate, and any subgroup trends.

All results are shared with our parents and families via our weekly school newsletter, the Ram Gazette. These articles are also linked to our school website, and provide a detailed explanation of school and grade level results. Also described are our school-wide efforts to close these gaps. The staff creates goals for Reading and Math, as well as Parental Involvement based upon these results. Our 'Educational Plan for Student Success' (EPSS), specifically identifies intervention strategies designed for those groups of students who are not currently 'proficient'.

Our Principal, Instructional Coach, and Goal Team Leadership present these results at a meeting of our Parent Teacher Association (PTA). Student performance is celebrated and trend data explained. Our school EPSS and grade level 'action plan strategies' are also shared. Our PTA often supports these efforts by providing essential classroom volunteers and resources, spearheading our 'Book Clubs' program and other literacy efforts.

In addition, our families are apprised of the professional efforts designed to address these learning gaps. The whole staff participates in the analysis of 'data' (student performance results from our school-designed assessment system). This is an ongoing process we use to more frequently study student progress. This occurs at three pre-determined points in time. Standards Based Progress Reports (SBPR) identify each child's mastery of grade level standards three times annually. Parents conference with their teacher(s) on a bi-annual basis, 'midmester' progress reports are distributed, and student agendas serve to communicate student progress on a daily basis.

4. Sharing Success:

For the past seven years, Georgia O'Keeffe Elementary School has served as a 'Baldrige in Demonstration School'. Hundreds of educators from around the world have visited our school to better understand our systems approach to continuous improvement. Georgia O'Keeffe was selected to be a 'demonstration' or 'laboratory' school by 'Strengthening Quality in Schools', a state funded program designed to help schools implement a systems framework for quality improvement across New Mexico. Educators spend time visiting classrooms in which students and teachers model improvement principles and strategies, as well as the use of student

performance data to drive instruction. Staff and students take time to share the significance of students as 'active partners' in their learning. Each participant leaves with materials, references and resources they will need to assist with implementation. A video has been produced by our staff to share with schools that are just beginning their 'quality journey'. All visitors are asked to provide feedback so that we may better meet the needs of future visitors.

In addition, teachers and administrators have been invited to present best practices at numerous local, state and national conferences. By sharing these experiences and outlining classroom and school wide practices, the staff has supported dozens of schools across the country. Our Baldrige Goal Team members readily and willingly serve as consultants to local schools as well as via e-mail to teachers from coast-to-coast, helping administrators and staff brainstorm and problem solve. This support has resulted in improved student performance in a number of districts. Many of these schools have now been invited to present their 'journey' at the National Quality in Education Conference, and some have now been selected as Demonstration Schools. The O'Keeffe staff believes it is our collective responsibility to share our trials and successes so that all schools may benefit from the trail we have blazed and the lessons we have learned.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

It is our belief that students learn to read, write, speak and listen successfully when a range of instructional strategies are provided for them. Our reading and writing frameworks are based on balanced literacy principles, guided by our language arts standards. While our core program is the MacMillan McGraw-Hill series, teachers supplement with literature from our Literacy Lab in order to meet the needs of our diverse students. Student progress is continually measured and analyzed. State approved test results; Dibels, DRA2 and A2L drive our instruction. In addition, our Library Program allows students to check out books daily and students participate in Book Clubs and Battle of the Books programs. Six Trait Writing is the curriculum the staff has selected to create a community of writers. Lucy Calkins' Units of Primary Writing is also utilized. Written Language is assessed three times annually using our school's continuum writing rubric.

Our Mathematics philosophy is based on a constructivist theory in which children develop key mathematical concepts through hands-on problem solving activities. Our school recently adopted Everyday Math curriculum, which is a standards based spiraling curriculum. The staff also provides authentic, extended response tasks so that students learn to solve problems using multiple strategies and communicate their thinking in writing. In addition, there is an online home component used to reinforce targeted standards

Our state's Social Studies standards focus on grade level requirements. Teachers have been involved in backwards design in order to establish quality, consistent instruction. Students in grades 3-5 are involved in a school-wide Geography Bee, and representatives will compete in the State Bee.

Georgia O'Keeffe believes in an inquiry based Science curriculum. Students develop key scientific concepts through hands-on discovery supplemented by nonfiction texts that support conceptual understanding. We use Scott Foresman Science curriculum and we have also begun to develop backwards designed units of instruction at each grade level. Our staff and parent volunteers update our Science Lab and Hands On kits for use by all grades.

Our Physical Education curriculum is supported and enhanced by our school-wide 'Health and Wellness' initiatives. Students participate in lessons designed to meet grade level standards. In addition, our PE Teacher and community volunteers offer a competitive jump rope program. A running club is also offered after school.

Currently, our school offers music instruction from a full-time, endorsed Music teacher. Students are exposed to a variety of music standards, including; singing, instruments, rhythm and movement. Georgia O'Keeffe is proud to offer students opportunities to participate in after school band and dance programs. Our conductor is a member of the New Mexico Symphony Orchestra. Visual Arts standards are introduced in classrooms, and after school program offerings include; painting, ceramics, beading and tile work. A full time Visual Arts teacher will be assigned to our school next year.

Our Instructional Coach and certified staff work diligently to align our curriculum to the standards so that all children master what they need to learn and be able to do at every grade level. As we adopt new curricular materials, all teachers are involved in researching those materials that will best meet the needs of our students. Teachers participate in a cluster wide selection process so that we can establish and maintain curricular standardization.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

The instructional staff at Georgia O'Keeffe utilizes a balanced literacy framework for our Reading curriculum. To meet state standards and to ensure that all students are proficient in Reading, this extensive program facilitates the use of a core basal reading program in all

grades. In addition, teachers use a leveled bookroom or Literacy Lab for guided reading, shared reading and a daily, consistent phonics program in grades K-1, soon to extend to second grade. We have an extensive library collection which students may access daily. In addition, our Library Program encourages additional reading opportunities through a series of Book Clubs, Battle of the Books competitions, author visits and student re-enactments of award winning literature. The computerized, Accelerated Reader is used as a supplement by classroom teachers. All of these reading resources have evolved under the guidance of the Reading Goal Team, based on surveys that help identify student and teacher instructional needs.

Our core basal reading program was selected by the staff after a comprehensive review of publisher offerings. MacMillan McGraw-Hill was selected based upon the scope and sequence of the five components of reading instruction; phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency. As this core program was implemented, the need for a leveled bookroom was evident. Teachers use and value this resource as a means to differentiate reading instruction. Extensive grants have been written and monies awarded to increase the collection of leveled books. The staff recently identified the need for a school-wide consistent phonics program, and teachers in grades K-2 have attended extensive training in the use of a research-based phonics program. Wilson Foundations, (a phonological, phonics and spelling program) is being utilized in the primary grades. Children not meeting proficiency (based on state mandated assessments), receive additional instruction.

Finally, our Reading Goal Team and school Literacy Leaders have designed and provided a series of professional development topic offerings for the staff. Teachers identify these approaches based on students' instructional needs. School-wide 'Gallery Walks' are one way of sharing best practices. Mentor teachers open their classrooms to the staff and share ideas that are working for those students not yet proficient in Reading.

The six strategies of comprehension are based on the book *Strategies That Work* and *Mosaic of Thought*. The Reading Goal Team created a binder outlining the strategies and gave one to each classroom teacher. The binder includes: strategies, sample lessons, exemplars, and book lists. The Reading Goal Team also periodically conducts professional development sessions on using the strategies. During professional development, teachers have the opportunity to share lessons, successes, and ask questions.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Math has been the focus area of curriculum for Georgia O'Keeffe teachers and students the past few years. Georgia O'Keeffe students have always been very strong in reading and comprehension and have scored exceptionally well in those areas. Math was the area we identified as the curricular area most in need of additional training. A school-wide PD plan was developed, and a series of classroom strategies identified in our EPSS. For two consecutive years, our New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) Math results have improved.

The staff focused on more than calculation and number sense. We focused our efforts on extended responses and problem solving. Students began to talk and write about Math. Our students began to understand that we wanted to know the process they needed to use to solve a problem. We wanted them to start using Mathematics vocabulary in their written explanations. Students had to provide detailed explanations of their thought processes. What resulted was students using their Language Arts and Writing skills to demonstrate their understanding of Mathematical concepts. Students were using language rich problem solving strategies to solve complex Mathematical problems.

The approach we use is two fold. We provide teachers with research based professional development strategies and teachers use open ended response tasks with students. Teachers provide students with a minimum of two extended response problems each month.

In addition, we utilize a school wide assessment system in which grade level teams compare results three times annually. Areas of need for students are identified. Subgroup needs are addressed. Staff trainings involve working with math manipulatives, making concepts more concrete, and the introduction of teaching math vocabulary through the use of manipulatives. PD also focused on the development of rubrics that assess student understanding, use of strategies and communication. These are the three areas that continue to be our focus for students.

Our instructional staff is committed to working collaboratively for change. These collective efforts have resulted in improved student performance in Math.

4. Instructional Methods:

The staff employs a variety of instructional methods to improve student learning. A balanced literacy approach is used to instruct students in the areas of Reading and Writing. Many grade levels have developed literacy rotations to meet the needs of all students. For 30 to 45 minutes per day, students are grouped according to their instructional level and receive 'double dose' or enrichment instruction to better meet their individualized needs. Small groups instruction focuses staff efforts in specific areas of student need. Enrichment groups expand their knowledge through literature studies, writing projects and higher level Reading.

Our Math program is based on a spiraling curriculum which revisits concepts frequently throughout the year. Instruction consists of whole group, small group, and center based activities which include games and exploration as well as written tasks and facts drill. An online home component is accessible for home practice and parent guidance. Science and social studies are taught in thematic units using hands on materials from the science lab, projects and research as a basis for learning.

This year our school is implementing backwards design as a strategy for planning all instruction as part of our standards based learning system. Planning in each subject area is completed for each trimester and includes teacher directed lessons, group work and individual projects aimed at meeting grade level standards. Planning and lesson development is done during grade level collaboration time using assessment results and grade level standards to drive instruction. Rubrics are also designed to determine student mastery.

The staff is able to achieve this consistent, quality scope and sequence through monthly grade level collaborative unit and lesson planning. Our Instructional Coach facilitates these planning sessions, as well as study groups that address specific curricular practices. This teamwork has contributed to the balanced, extensive, enriching program offered here at Georgia O'Keeffe.

5. Professional Development:

For the past four years Georgia O'Keeffe has allocated one hour each week for professional development. This hour is added to our planning time on early release Wednesdays. This year we have also implemented two hours of grade level collaboration time per month during the school day.

Professional development topics are determined by student and staff need based upon survey results. Goal teams and school leadership present the trainings. Topics have included comprehension strategies across the curriculum, schoolwide implementation of math task bank problems, the development of consistent writing prompts, the use of technology to support the curriculum, the PDSA process, Student Assistance Team (SAT) training and backwards design implementation tied to the use of standards based progress reports.

Monthly collaboration time focuses on specific grade level needs such as the aligning of instruction to standards, scoring Math task banks and Writing assessments, and the analysis of trend data to help us align our instruction.

Professional development and collaboration efforts provide staff with instructional knowledge for classroom implementation, aimed at improved student achievement. Three times annually, the staff analyzes student performance in Reading, Writing and Math.

During these 'data meetings' we look for trends and develop action plans for improving student performance. We also celebrate student achievement at all levels.

Teachers at Georgia O'Keeffe are empowered with the knowledge and data to know what our students need and how to best provide timely, individualized instruction. Students are partners in achieving their academic goals by participating in the development of classroom and personal goals and action plans and taking responsibility for their learning.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (E) Grade 5 Test New Mexico Standards Based Assessment
 Edition/Publication Year 2004 Publisher Harcourt

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced/Proficient	95	84	92		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	40	36	54		
Number of students tested	82	97	95		
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		64	83		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		29	33		
Number of students tested		17	12		
2. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		75			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		17			
Number of students tested		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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced/Proficient	74	61	68		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	23	21	14		
Number of students tested	82	97	95		
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		47	50		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		12			
Number of students tested		17	12		
2. Economically Disadvantage					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		50			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		8			
Number of students tested		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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced/Proficient	83	86	81		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	28	27	31		
Number of students tested	122	92	103		
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian/Pacific Islander					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient	100				
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	46				
Number of students tested	13				
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient	79		75		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	21		25		
Number of students tested	19		16		
3. Special Education					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient			30		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced			10		
Number of students tested					
4. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient			67		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced					
Number of students tested			15		

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced/Proficient	75	78	67		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	25	28	24		
Number of students tested	122	92	103		
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Asian/Pacific Islander					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient	100				
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	46				
Number of students tested	13				
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient	58		44		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	16		13		
Number of students tested	19		16		
3. Special Education					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient			10		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient			60		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced/Proficient	85	88	89		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	13	27	15		
Number of students tested	94	124	90		
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient	76	89			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		24			
Number of students tested	21	17			
2. Asian/Pacific Islander					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		76			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		19			
Number of students tested		18			
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		75			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanc		17			
Number of students tested		12			
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March		
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced/Proficient	80	91	72		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	18	24	9		
Number of students tested	94	127	90		
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient	62	88			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	62				
Number of students tested	21	17			
2. Asian/Pacific Islander					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		90			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		33			
Number of students tested		127			
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Advanced/Proficient		83			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced					
Number of students tested		12			
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					