

U.S. Department of Education
2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) ☒ Elementary ☐ Middle ☐ High ☐ K-12 ☐ Other
☐ Charter ☒ Title I ☐ Magnet ☒ Choice

Name of Principal: Ms. Mary Estill

Official School Name: Florence Elementary

School Mailing Address:
3914 First Avenue
San Diego, CA 92103-3089

County: San Diego State School Code Number*: 37683386039572

Telephone: (619) 293-4440 Fax: (619) 725-4028

Web site/URL: <http://www.sandi.net/comm/schools/elem/florence.html> E-mail: mestill@sandi.net

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

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent*: Dr. Terry Grier

District Name: San Diego Unified Tel: (619) 725-8000

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Ms. Shelia Jackson

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), 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.*

Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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 one or more of 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.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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)

1. Number of schools in the district:
- | | |
|------------|---------------------|
| 128 | Elementary schools |
| 24 | Middle schools |
| | Junior high schools |
| 39 | High schools |
| | Other |
| 191 | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9708

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 8117

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 area
☐ Suburban
☐ Small city or town in a rural area
☐ Rural

4. 10 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-------------|------------|--------------|--|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | | | 0 | 7 | | | 0 |
| K | 35 | 46 | 81 | 8 | | | 0 |
| 1 | 32 | 25 | 57 | 9 | | | 0 |
| 2 | 28 | 26 | 54 | 10 | | | 0 |
| 3 | 25 | 21 | 46 | 11 | | | 0 |
| 4 | 21 | 16 | 37 | 12 | | | 0 |
| 5 | 19 | 20 | 39 | Other | | | 0 |
| 6 | | | 0 | | | | |
| | | | TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL | | | | 314 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | |
|---|
| 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 6 % Asian |
| 14 % Black or African American |
| 59 % Hispanic or Latino |
| 1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |
| 20 % White |
| 0 % Two or more races |
| 100 % Total |

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 21 %

This rate is 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. | 22 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 36 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]. | 58 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1. | 281 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4). | 0.206 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100. | 20.641 |

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 41 %

Total number limited English proficient 128

Number of languages represented: 11

Specify languages:

Arabi, Chinese, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Tagalog, Filipino other, Russian, Serbio-Croatian, Spanish, Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 77 %

Total number students who qualify: 242

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 free and reduced-price school meals 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: 19 %

Total Number of Students Served: 61

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>14</u> Autism | <u>1</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>4</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>9</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>18</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>12</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>2</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

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>17</u> | <u>1</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>1</u> | <u>5</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>0</u> | <u>10</u> |
| Support staff | <u>2</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total number | <u>21</u> | <u>16</u> |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 18 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 95% | 95% | 94% | 94% | 95% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 98% | 94% | 98% | 98% | 98% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 0% | 20% | 13% | 26% | 13% |

Please provide all explanations below.

In the 2006-2007 school year, one teacher left on family leave, one teacher transferred to another District site, and one teacher moved to Northern California for family reasons. That year our school had 15 FTE teachers. In the 2005-2006 school year, one teacher transferred to another District site and one teacher was reassigned due to seniority rights. That year our school had 15 FTE teachers. In the 2004-2005 school year, three teachers moved due to family relocation and one teacher transferred to another District site. That year our school had 15 FTE teachers. In the 2003- 2004 school year, two teachers transferred to other District sites. That year our school had 15 FTE teachers.

In the two years our daily student attendance dropped, we set goals to increase student attendance. That was successful as seen by our average daily rate in the following school years.

In the 2006- 2007 school year, one teacher was out for 100 days on Family Leave Act.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

| | | |
|--|------------|----------|
| Graduating class size | 0 | |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0 | % |
| Enrolled in a community college | 0 | % |
| Enrolled in vocational training | 0 | % |
| Found employment | 0 | % |
| Military service | 0 | % |
| Other (travel, staying home, etc.) | 0 | % |
| Unknown | 0 | % |
| Total | 100 | % |

PART III - SUMMARY

Florence Elementary School celebrated its 100th birthday last Spring. A review of historical school documents reflects the many societal and institutional changes over the first sixty years:

- Florence as one of only three schools in the city when established,
- Florence as a neighborhood school for K-8 children of founders of the city and for many Italian immigrants,
- Florence as a school where its' students participation in the World Exposition of 1915 in the newly created Balboa Park was part of the curriculum, and
- Florence as a community leader to provide support for our troops during the first and second World Wars.

The original school building of granite and wood was torn down in the early 1960s and a two story concrete school built to withstand California earthquakes was constructed. Due to voluminous business and medical facility growth in the area, community enrollment at Florence dropped considerably over the next forty years.

Over the last decade, Florence Elementary has fought this downward trend and grown into a strong vibrant Choice school serving students from communities stretching from the United States border with Mexico to thirty miles north of the city to Oceanside and east to Jamul and Temecula. We successfully educate students reflecting the multi-cultural and multi-lingual citizens of San Diego.

Florence Elementary is our formal name. The Florence Learning Community is our working name and the vision and structure behind all that we accomplish. We are a learning community where each member is expected to learn and grow each day. Our mission statement, "All San Diego students will graduate with the skills, motivation, curiosity and resilience to succeed in their choice of college and career in order to lead and participate in the society of tomorrow. ", is the foundation for the daily program at our school. Years of hard work and determination are bearing fruition. In 1999 our API was 679. By 2008, the students, staff, parents, and community's rigorous, disciplined efforts have earned an API of 863.

The Florence Learning Community has high expectations for all members. Teachers are provided professional development opportunities to maintain 'best practice' in all curricular areas. Students are motivated to develop goals with their teachers to scaffold their learning and meet all State Standards. Parents are integral partners in their child's learning and strong communication between home and school is provided through meetings, telephone calls, and individual conferences. Community members assist with tutoring, broadening world experiences for students, and provide additional staff training and resources. We at Florence value all members of our community. We celebrate the diversity of skill levels, ethnicity, socio-economic status, language plurality, and individualism.

To continue our upward trend in student achievement, the Florence Learning Community continues to hone several programs that have provided impetus to our growth. Florence has a school population of 318 K-5 students and 84 students in our Child Development center which serves students from 2-5 years old. An ACES/21st Century grant provides us with funding to operate a before and after school program for approximately 200 of our 318 elementary students. During this time the majority of our students receive small group instruction from certificated teachers in English Language Development, Literacy, Mathematics, and Writing. Other students work in small to large groups with classified staff on Physical Education, Homework Club, and community activities.

Careful monitoring of student growth is a key element to our success here at Florence. As a team we look at each individual student's learning pattern a minimum of once a month and provide specific feedback and suggestions to be implemented before the next meeting. The entire community works within the Response to

Intervention system to provide a strong basic program to all students and additional interventions, accommodations, specialized services for those in need.

The hard work and dedication of the Florence Learning Community has not gone unnoticed. The community has earned the Title 1 Academic Achievement Award for the past five years. We have been recognized as a 'STAR School' by the California Business for Education Excellence Foundation for the past three years. This award honors schools that serve a significant population of socio-economically disadvantaged students who consistently meet high expectations. With a community of 77% of our students meeting these criteria, it is indeed a hard earned honor.

The Florence Learning Community is a truly wonderful group of caring individuals where each nugget of learning is a hard won struggle but a struggle in which each person in our community has taken ownership.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

All students in the California public school system, grades 2 through 11, are required to participate in the state's *Standardized Testing and Reporting* (STAR) program. This program consists of four different tests: the *California Standards Tests* given to all general education students, the *California Achievement Test*, Sixth Edition which is given only to third graders at the elementary level, and two tests which may be given to students with special needs when meeting state criteria and indicated on the student's IEP. These are the *California Modified Assessment* (CMA) and the *California Alternate Performance Assessment* (CAPA). For further information visit the California State Department of Education's web site: www.cde.ca.gov.

The students at Florence have continued to grow academically over the past five years. All subgroups are over 50% proficient. The subgroups of African-American, Hispanic, and socio-economically disadvantaged students continue to close the gap with White students. The gap ranges from five to seven percentage points. The significance of the English Learner population's numbers varies widely depending on the English Learners' grade level. At times there are high concentrations at a grade level and at other grades the numbers are quite small. This variance shows in uneven growth over the last five years for English Learners when comparing grade to grade. If the data is looked at by individual student there is growth each year.

Curricular areas assessed with the *California Standards Test* include English/Language Arts, Mathematics, History/Social science, and Science. The test items were developed specifically to assess student progress in reaching the California State Educational Standards. The test is multiple choice with a writing component at grades 4 and 7. From the test results, each school is assigned an Academic Performance Index (API) rating from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide goal of 800. The API is calculated to measure the yearly growth of student achievement and a comparison ranking for 100 schools with like demographics. The school's API scores are a component of the federal Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) rating under the No Child Left Behind Act. CST results are reported using five performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. Performance levels are reported for each grade level and sub-group. Sub-groups are identified by ethnicity, English Language Learners, disability, and socio-economic rankings.

Strong academic growth at Florence Elementary is evident by the API and AYP rankings earned over the past ten years. Florence started with a base API score of 679 in the 1999-2000 school year. In 2008 students celebrated an API score of 863. For the last three school years Florence has succeeded in meeting the state threshold of API 800. Florence has for the last ten years reached the top score of ten in comparable school rankings. While the overall score for our school continues to grow the community celebrates its student's achievement because of the substantive increase in subgroup scores. Florence is a small school which makes the subgroup scores statistical significance vary from year to year with the exception of our socio-economically disadvantaged, English Learners, and Hispanic/Latino students. Each year the staff analyzes scores for our African-American and White subgroup. While we have small gaps between our subgroups, all subgroups are well above the Annual Measureable Objective. At times the subgroup score equals or exceeds the total score for a grade level.

2. Using Assessment Results:

In the Florence community, STAR scores are eagerly anticipated in mid-August each year. Teachers and the administrator gather in late August to celebrate growth and then get down to the business of disaggregating data for the school as a whole, each sub-group, and each student. We compare data from the STAR with District Benchmarks in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science. We also look at student rubric scores from their portfolios and their monthly monitoring reports. The staff looks at data from the STAR to analyze their teaching and the successful learning of their students. Test results from the California English Language

Development Test (CELDT) are analyzed to see growth for English Language Learners at all grade levels. Overall conclusions are documented to report to the SSC, parents, and the community. Formative and summative assessments which will produce measurable data for the year are determined and calendared. Meetings of the Instructional Leadership Team to monitor and analyze ongoing data collection are calendared as well as individual monthly monitoring of students with the principal and teachers. Teachers allocate time to meet with students in grades 3-5 to explain test scores and note areas of strength and areas to improve.

Data based decision making from the Instructional Leadership Team is used to design, re-align and pace instruction, identify professional development needs, and strategically allocate resources. The Instructional Leadership Team grade level and special education representatives and principal then meet with grade level teachers to specifically look at trends and target those students who are not proficient and Gifted and Talented students who are not reaching their potential. Our school's gains reflect the strength of our teachers' ability to use data for school wide improvement. This is the first year our district has used Data Director, a software system for managing, aggregating, and formatting data. Teachers have initial training on accessing class and individual student data and adding site based data to classroom files. Teachers are able to use this data to identify the needs of all students. Teachers look closely at content cluster analysis and then plan differentiated instruction to meet their student's needs. Teachers are able to create multiple measures for testing acquisition of those skills using Data Director.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

The Florence staff works continuously to communicate ongoing assessment results with parents throughout the school year. The district office mails individual STAR and CELDT test information to all parents. Our Back to School Night and general Title 1 meeting are held the second week of school. At that time the principal and SSC chairperson share results of the STAR testing by graphically displaying school wide data, grade level data, and subgroup data. Targets for all groups for the coming year are discussed. Teachers then meet with parents to review State Standards for their grade level and review the standards based report card. This meeting is held in English with translation service available for Spanish speakers.

Student conferences are held three times a year: November, March, and June. It is required for teachers to meet with each family at all three conferences. Teachers review student portfolios, District Benchmark testing, CELDT growth, IEP goals when appropriate, and the standards based Report Card. Learning Contracts are developed at this time for any student who requires extra support to meet grade level standards.

Between these conference times, parents and students are kept informed of progress by each student's Falcon Folder. The folder is sent home weekly with rubrics for effort, behavior, and homework. The folder also contains student work for the week and parent feedback is required. Progress is communicated frequently by telephone, e-mail, and before or after school meetings.

An SSC meeting is held monthly and student progress is discussed. Discussions are held on how best to provide for student growth. The diversity of our SSC is a strength when looking at the needs for all students.

Assessment results are also shared with one of our school partners, The School of Education at the University of California, San Diego. Professors from the University brainstorm with individual teachers and at times with the entire staff to analyze data and plan ways to increase student achievement.

Yearly, each school within our district compiles a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC includes a comprehensive picture of the Florence Learning Community including our test data. This document is available through the district web site.

4. Sharing Success:

The administrator and teachers share their professional achievements and those of their students with colleagues from other schools on an ongoing basis. Our administrator participates in a school principal visitation program which looks at best practices, coaching, and uses of data to increase students' achievement. Other principals visit Florence as part of this practice. The Florence principal also has ongoing conversations with schools within the state and nation on how and why Florence has made significant growth with a 77% Title 1 program.

Teachers participate on district wide committees and forums dealing with textbook adoption, calibration of student work in mathematics, literacy, and science, ensuring success of students with special needs, and selection of library materials for elementary schools. Teachers from other schools observe Florence teachers to bring best practices back to their classrooms.

We also have teachers who participate as mentors in the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program. This program is designed to provide mentorship to new teachers as they continue to increase their competencies as measured by the State of California Professional Teaching Standards.

Many of our general and special education teachers serve as Master teachers for students from the University of California, San Diego, San Diego State University, the University of San Diego, Chapman College, National University, and California State University, San Marcos.

Other district staffs visit Florence to see our terrific Prime Time program. This successful program correlates and contributes to the high academic achievement and social development of our students.

As professional educators, we welcome opportunities to share best teaching practices with other schools.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The Florence Learning Community provides a rigorous, balanced, standards-aligned curriculum to all students. Curriculum materials used at Florence are comprised of state-adopted textbooks, best practices in instruction, and strategic selections of standards-based supplemental materials. Teachers utilize district developed materials which include mathematic modules and Units of Inquiry for language arts. Teachers participate in the development and refinement of these materials. The State Frameworks provide teachers and administrators with guidelines in all curricular areas.

Reading/Language Arts: Our comprehensive English Language Arts program is taught through the Houghton Mifflin *Reading* series which engages students to comprehend and appreciate recreational, functional, and informative text. The series provides access to speaking, listening, grammar, spelling, phonemic awareness, word attack, vocabulary development, writing, and reading skills. An identified need at Florence was to increase word study skills especially for our English Learners. *Wordly Wise* was chosen to further build and reinforce vocabulary. Trade books are used for guided and independent reading at all grade levels. Best practices in reading and writing are incorporated from training with Lucy Calkins, Fountas and Pinnell, Lynn Reggett and other teacher leaders. Reading and writing are further developed within all core disciplines.

Mathematics: Florence's mathematics curriculum prepares all students to master the state standards for each grade level. The Harcourt *Math*, California Edition systematically builds computational and procedural skills, conceptual understanding, and problem solving in number sense, algebra/function, measurement/geometry, statistics/data analysis/probability, and mathematical reasoning. Teachers in the primary grades supplement their instruction with materials from Kathy Richardson and Marilyn Burns. Trade books with mathematical themes are used school wide.

History/Social Science: The Social Studies curriculum at Florence utilizes the Harcourt *Reflections* series to develop understanding in community, history, government, geography, economics, civic responsibility, and the use of natural resources. Florence teachers use weekly subscriptions to *Scholastic News* and *Time for Kids* to enhance understanding of world events. Students eagerly participate in the *Off Campus Integrated Learning Experience* in fourth and fifth grade. Fourth grade students spend a week exploring the historic beginnings of San Diego in Old Town State Park and the Presidio. Fifth graders spend one week learning from museum and nature based instruction in Balboa Park. Third graders learn at the Cabrillo National monument and other city based learning opportunities. *United Streaming* digital video media lessons, mnemonics, chants, graphic organizers, and project-based learning help our students acquire important concepts.

Science: Florence students explore the scientific world through the Harcourt *Science*, California Edition, series which presents the State Standards in earth, life, and physical sciences. We also use *FOSS* (Full Option Science System), a research based science curriculum developed at the University of California, Berkeley. *FOSS* gives students hands on experience which provide the foundation for concept development and produces complex thinking. Our program includes investigation, direct instruction, expository reading, and use of technology for presentation and research. Strategies for developing academic language are a critical component for the success of our students, especially for our English Learners. Field trips, such as the second grade visit to the zoo, visits to local tide pools and other preserves enhance student learning of science concepts. Teachers feel the teaching of science is vital for the development of our children's ability to protect our world's future.

Physical Education and Health: The Harcourt *Health and Fitness* series addresses areas of human development, character education, personal and community health, and safety. The standards based P.E. curriculum, *SPARKS* (Sports, Play and Active Recreation for Kids) has a strong fitness emphasis and teaches a variety of sports skills. Our school Wellness Policy fosters healthful food choices for snacks and when selecting from our Kid's Café

for breakfast and lunch. Local law enforcement officers provide instruction to fourth and fifth grade students about the dangers of gang involvement and drug abuse. Our kindergarten students tie in science and health by raising a garden full of vegetables. The students and teachers with community volunteers study life cycles, weather, and nutrition.

Visual and Performing Arts: The Visual and Performing Arts standards are integrated into the instructional program throughout our school day. Specific music curriculum is taught through *Share the Music* and through the elementary fifth grade instrumental program. Our entire school participates in Classics 4 Kids, where students attend local performances of the San Diego Symphony three times a year. Curriculum is taught to enhance student appreciation of these performances. Art lessons not only teach art techniques and appreciation, but also involve students in learning about other subject areas and cultures. Partnerships with local artists provide students in the after-school program with opportunities to perform and experience multicultural instrumental music, musical theatre, and the visual arts.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

Florence's reading curriculum is based on the grade-level content standards for all the domains of language – reading, writing, listening and speaking standards set by the State Board of Education. Our literacy curriculum supports a balanced, comprehensive, and research-based instructional model as described in the Reading/Language Framework for California Public Schools. It also emphasizes the importance of differentiated instruction, high expectations, interactive approaches, and flexible groupings to support student performance. These instructional approaches are combined with ongoing, systematic assessment of student learning to inform instruction. A variety of strategic supports for teaching and learning have been developed. These tools include Curriculum Maps, Units of Inquiry/Study, Instructional Guides, and rubrics for reading, writing, and listening and speaking. The instructional supports provide teachers with consistent guidelines for planning, differentiating instruction for English Learners and children with significant cognitive disabilities, and monitoring student progress toward grade-level standards. Systematic academic instruction provided by the educational specialist further supports the teachers and students through co-teaching, differentiating instruction, and providing modifications and accommodations to the general education curriculum to assure students access and progress towards grade-level standards.

Our staff believes that the balanced literacy model offers a range of reading and writing instructional approaches with varying levels of support. We get to know and use the child's strengths as well as gather information about the areas that need to be supported during independent reading, guided reading, word-language study, and writers' workshop. Leveled classroom libraries make it easier for children to choose appropriate books and to take on challenges of selecting from a range of books. Curriculum areas are integrated into the instructional process allowing children to construct meaning that imitates real world learning. For example in read aloud or shared reading the teacher models fluent reading and exposes the student to concepts, vocabulary, and text structures beyond their reading level. Complex ideas are made accessible to students through discussion and comparisons to other books, individual experiences, and real world experiences. This type of instruction models explicitly the thinking behind reading and writing decisions, strategies, and self corrections.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

The Florence Learning Community is more than just a place where children learn academics. It is truly a community. Together with staff, parents, students, and neighborhood support, we reflect the values and beliefs of diverse cultures brought together to enable students to grow to be productive, creative, and caring citizens of tomorrow. Therefore our math curriculum goes beyond teaching individual skills. We hold high expectations for all and provide hands on experiences for students to reason, solve complex problems, apply mathematical knowledge and compute.

Using the California Content Standards for mathematics and Harcourt *Math*, California Edition, the district has designed specific curricular and instructional strategies to support teaching and learning. These tools include pacing guides, modules or instructional guides, games and activities for the classroom and home and on going professional development at the district and site level. Teachers use daily math routines, launch their lesson, have the students explore, practice, and summarize. Math centers created from Kathy Richardson's *Developing Number Concepts* and Van de Walle's *Teaching Student-Centered Mathematics* further reinforce mathematical knowledge in Kindergarten through grade three.

Through a partnership with the University of California, San Diego, Professors Rusty Bresser and Caren Holtzman have worked with our teachers and students. They have demonstrated number talks, questioning techniques, routines, and lessons and have videoed classroom lessons that are used for Marilyn Burns *Math Solutions*. In addition, we have incorporated Rusty Bresser's strategies from his book *Supporting English Language Learners in Math Class*. At the Florence Learning Community, we have created learning environments where students problem solve together using their mathematical ideas.

4. Instructional Methods:

Differentiating instruction is an important tool for engaging students and addressing the individual needs of all students at Florence. For our English Learners one way that we differentiate instruction is by using Focused ELD. This is grade level specific with scope and sequences that are strategically linked to the Literacy Department's Units of Inquiry. Teachers scaffold instruction by front loading vocabulary, word walls, graphic organizers, sentence frames, story talk, shared writing and semantic mapping to name a few. However this is not only helpful with second-language learners, but also for students with learning disabilities or below-level vocabulary skills. In addition we might group English Learners in the same group as someone who can serve as a bridge. We also provide extended learning opportunities for our English Learners.

High-achieving and underachieving pupils who are identified as gifted and talented are served through the GATE Cluster model in grades 3-5. Differentiation may begin by varying the content, process or product for students. For example, fourth graders were pre-tested and students demonstrating understanding of electromagnetism were then directed to apply their knowledge to the task of solving a higher level problem. They had to explain their thinking process by using diagrams, models and in writing. Finally, they had to teach what they had learned to another group of students.

The staff at Florence differentiates instruction through tiered assignments, varying the product (i.e. an essay, art project, power point), varying question types, learning centers, flexible grouping, peer teaching, buddy reading at grade or across grade level, using a variety of text levels for a given unit of study, books on tape, and book clubs. For example, you might see students working with a partner to highlight the main ideas and supporting details in order to actively engage students and provide visual support.

5. Professional Development:

The Florence Learning Community is recognized for its high expectations. Not just for students but for all staff: classified, custodial, paraprofessionals, support providers for students with special needs, clerical staff, our nurse, our teachers and the administrator. High expectations drive results and results bring higher student achievement. The professional development plan at Florence is linked to the learning goals of the school as written in our Annual Site Plan for Student Success and approved by our SSC. The success of the professional development plan is measured by the success of our students' performance on site, district, and state testing.

Professional Development at Florence is the time for staff to study together in large and small professional learning groups. The Instructional Leadership Team consists of grade level teachers, staff representing special education teachers, representatives from the Child Development Center, and the site administrator. The teachers on the ILT represent both grade level colleagues and curriculum area expert teams of literacy, mathematics,

science, internationalism, and technology. Student data determines the areas of need for professional development. For example over the past three years we have not seen the growth in writing that was expected from our students. The ILT determined that students needed better skills in word study to help push their writing to deeper levels.

With that determination by the ILT, whole group training was developed in the area of word study to support writing. Grade level representatives from the ILT then helped lead work during grade level meetings. At these biweekly meetings teachers calibrate student writing and plan future student work. This common planning time ensures collaboration concerning daily learning objectives.

Over the past five years teachers have been involved with national and state professional development. In turn they share their gained knowledge with colleagues. This has helped develop teacher 'experts' in different curriculum areas. Teachers are able to pursue further training in their chosen fields. These teachers are then able to model lessons and share strategies with their colleagues.

The principal provides ongoing curricular and delivery advice through professional development trainings to increase student engagement and achievement, differentiation of instruction, assessment techniques and other topics addressed in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Professional book study is led by the principal and teacher leaders. The principal arranges opportunities for teachers to observe colleagues and discuss alternate strategies to provide support for teachers to improve instruction. In our learning community, everyone gains and shares knowledge to increase student achievement.

6. School Leadership:

School leadership in the Florence Learning Community has changed as dramatically over the last ten years as has the student achievement. The principal has guided, challenged, and pushed parents, teachers, community members, and other staff to take on leadership roles within our learning community and the district. As more members of the community take on leadership roles, so too student achievement increases.

The Florence Instructional Leadership Team is charged with wide range decision making which must lead to accelerated academic growth of all students in our school. The team is representative of teacher leaders at all grade levels and experts in basic curriculum areas. The principal guides the team to collaborative decisions in the areas of student monitoring, professional development, data aggregation and disaggregating data, budget support for learning, and community celebration.

Our learning community has school wide Title 1 status. Thus the planning and decision making of the Instructional Leadership Team is tied closely to the decision making of the Florence School Site Council. The SSC has grown in parent involvement and leadership over the past five years. The principal has advocated for the parents to represent the broad spectrum of households learning together at our school. Each year as the SSC increases its voice in the leadership of the school more parents come forward to ask questions and share their opinions. This increased parent involvement can only make our school community stronger.

Federal, state, and district policies are discussed at leadership meetings with the ILT and SSC. As policies change the two leadership groups are charged by the principal with adapting site decisions to reflect those policies. The funding for Title 1 schools has changed at the district level. Currently both the SSC and ILT are reviewing different scenarios to continue the increase in student achievement.

State school resources in California are at a record low. Our staff is collecting information to allow the leadership teams to make the best decisions while focusing on increasing student achievement. Additional partnerships with community businesses are being sought by the principal and parents to supplement available funding.

The principal of Florence Elementary embodies the belief that leadership and responsibility must be shared among all the stakeholders in a community in order for the community to continue to grow. Our principal reflects this belief in the relationships built with staff members and all members of the community. Our principal knows our students as individuals and our students know that the principal has every expectation that each will reach a proficient level for all standards.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 87 | 79 | 73 | 71 | 53 |
| % Advanced | 41 | 47 | 30 | 22 | 23 |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 34 | 37 | 41 | 30 |
| Percent of total students tested | 98 | 92 | 86 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 87 | 82 | 64 | 62 | 52 |
| % Advanced | 36 | 41 | 20 | 10 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | 31 | 22 | 25 | 29 | 23 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 86 | 73 | 61 | 67 | 45 |
| % Advanced | 35 | 40 | 11 | 17 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 20 |
| 3. (specify subgroup): White | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | 92 | | 80 | |
| % Advanced | | 62 | | 40 | |
| Number of students tested | | 13 | | 10 | |
| 4. (specify subgroup): English Learners | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 82 | | | 0 | 0 |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 17 | | | 10 | 10 |

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 80 | 82 | 54 | 61 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 39 | 44 | 24 | 15 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 34 | 37 | 41 | 30 |
| Percent of total students tested | 98 | 92 | 86 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 84 | 73 | 48 | 52 | 48 |
| % Advanced | 39 | 36 | 16 | 14 | 4 |
| Number of students tested | 31 | 22 | 25 | 29 | 23 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 79 | 73 | 33 | 56 | 45 |
| % Advanced | 35 | 40 | 11 | 28 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 20 |
| 3. (specify subgroup): White | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | 92 | | 90 | |
| % Advanced | | 69 | | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | | 13 | | 10 | |
| 4. (specify subgroup): English Learners | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 17 | | | 10 | 10 |

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 85 | 60 | 71 | 61 | 78 |
| % Advanced | 66 | 29 | 31 | 25 | 42 |
| Number of students tested | 32 | 42 | 35 | 36 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 89 | 88 | 90 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 11 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | 57 | 61 | 54 | 83 |
| % Advanced | 55 | 17 | 22 | 25 | 46 |
| Number of students tested | 20 | 30 | 23 | 24 | 24 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 71 | 61 | 71 | 57 | 74 |
| % Advanced | 64 | 22 | 29 | 24 | 47 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 19 |
| 3. (specify subgroup): African American | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | 83 |
| % Advanced | | | | | 33 |
| Number of students tested | | | | | 12 |
| 4. (specify subgroup): White | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | | | 70 | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 83 | | | 40 | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | | | 10 | |

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 72 | 31 | 51 | 31 | 44 |
| % Advanced | 28 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | 32 | 42 | 35 | 36 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 89 | 88 | 90 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 11 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 60 | 23 | 39 | 17 | 42 |
| % Advanced | 20 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 17 |
| Number of students tested | 20 | 30 | 23 | 24 | 24 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | 42 |
| % Advanced | | | | | 8 |
| Number of students tested | | | | | 12 |
| 3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 57 | 17 | 52 | 24 | 47 |
| % Advanced | 14 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 19 |
| 4. (specify subgroup): White | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 92 | | | 60 | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 58 | | | 20 | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | | | 10 | |

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 54 | 65 | 54 | 72 | 52 |
| % Advanced | 27 | 34 | 23 | 38 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 29 |
| Percent of total students tested | 85 | 88 | 85 | 100 | 97 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 15 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 3 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 50 | 65 | 46 | 74 | 55 |
| % Advanced | 17 | 30 | 18 | 44 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 23 | 28 | 23 | 22 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 55 | 67 | 48 | 60 | 40 |
| % Advanced | 18 | 33 | 19 | 27 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 15 |
| 3. (specify subgroup): African American | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 90 | |
| % Advanced | | | | 50 | |
| Number of students tested | | | | 10 | |
| 4. (specify subgroup): English Learners | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 46 | 64 | 45 | 0 | 54 |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 13 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 |

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 46 | 72 | 63 | 66 | 48 |
| % Advanced | 33 | 23 | 34 | 21 | 17 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 29 |
| Percent of total students tested | 85 | 88 | 85 | 100 | 97 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 15 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 3 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 42 | 70 | 57 | 65 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 25 | 26 | 36 | 17 | 9 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 23 | 28 | 23 | 22 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 90 | |
| % Advanced | | | | 30 | |
| Number of students tested | | | | 10 | |
| 3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 36 | 71 | 57 | 47 | 47 |
| % Advanced | 18 | 29 | 29 | 7 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 15 |
| 4. (specify subgroup): English Learners | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 23 | 55 | 55 | 0 | 62 |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 13 | 11 | 11 | | 13 |

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 63 | 49 | 65 | 75 | 21 |
| % Advanced | 20 | 10 | 38 | 34 | 12 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 31 | 26 | 32 | 33 |
| Percent of total students tested | 90 | 82 | 87 | 97 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 4 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 10 | 18 | 13 | 3 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 58 | 48 | 70 | 70 | 13 |
| % Advanced | 17 | 4 | 40 | 26 | 4 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 25 | 20 | 27 | 23 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 60 | 39 | 62 | 71 | 12 |
| % Advanced | 15 | 6 | 23 | 24 | 12 |
| Number of students tested | 20 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 17 |
| 3. (specify subgroup): African American | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | 60 | | |
| % Advanced | | | 40 | | |
| Number of students tested | | | 10 | | |
| 4. (specify subgroup): English Learners | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 58 | | | 71 | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 11 | | | 14 | |

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: State of California

| | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 77 | 64 | 46 | 66 | 42 |
| % Advanced | 17 | 19 | 23 | 19 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 31 | 26 | 32 | 33 |
| Percent of total students tested | 90 | 82 | 87 | 97 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 4 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 10 | 18 | 13 | 3 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | 68 | 50 | 59 | 39 |
| % Advanced | 17 | 20 | 20 | 11 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 25 | 20 | 27 | 23 |
| 2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | 70 | | |
| % Advanced | | | 30 | | |
| Number of students tested | | | 10 | | |
| 3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 70 | 72 | 23 | 71 | 35 |
| % Advanced | 10 | 28 | 8 | 6 | 12 |
| Number of students tested | 20 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 17 |
| 4. (specify subgroup): English Learners | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | | | 64 | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 11 | | | 14 | |

Notes: