English Language Learner Acquisition and Development Pilot Program (ELLPP)

Interim Report #1

September 30, 2009

Submitted by:

Public *Works*, Inc.
90 N. Daisy Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91107
(626) 564-9890
(626) 564-0657 fax

Project Team:

Patricia O'Driscoll
Mercy Sanchez
Mikala L. Rahn PhD
Albert Chen
Michael Butler
Mario Garcia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

This first interim report is submitted to the California Department of Education's English Learner and Curriculum Support Division (ELCSD) by Public *Works*, Inc. as the first in a series of five interim reports for the evaluation study of the English Language Learner Acquisition and Development Pilot Program (ELLPP). Public *Works*, Inc. (PW) was selected by CDE as the statewide evaluator as originally outlined in the ELLPP legislation and through a Request for Proposals process in February 2009. The evaluation study will ultimately result in a final report presented to the Governor and Legislature in November 2011.

Interim Report #1 includes the following sections: (1) overview of the ELLPP Program, (2) the ELLPP study design, (3) the results of the LEA/site survey administered in August-September 2009, (4) a summary of the literature review, and (5) next steps in the evaluation study. The following appendices, which are described in more detail in the study design section, are also incorporated in Interim Report #1:

- Appendix A: Evaluation Instruments and Protocols
- Appendix B: Promising Practice Site Data Tables
- Appendix C: Literature Review Bibliography
- Appendix D: Promising Practice Site Profiles
- Appendix E: ELLPP Study Research Questions

ELLPP Program Overview

The English Language Learner Acquisition and Development Pilot Program (ELLPP) was established through Assembly Bill 2117, Chapter 561, Statutes of 2006, to support or expand best practices in California schools related to curriculum, instruction, and staff development for teaching English learners (ELs) and promoting English language acquisition and development. To disperse the ELLPP grant funding to Local Education Agencies (LEAs), the California Department of Education (CDE), in conjunction with a Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI)-selected advisory committee, established a Request for Applications (RFA) due July 23, 2007.

In order to create an initial list of schools in California that were eligible to apply for grant funds, schools had to meet the following criteria established by the legislation and by the advisory committee that formulated the RFA:

- Have a "significant EL subgroup" for accountability purposes (100 or more EL students with valid Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program scores; or 50 or more EL students with valid STAR programs scores who make up at least 15 percent of the student population).
- Met the 2005-06 first Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO1) under Title III (English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which relates to the percentage of students making progress in English language acquisition.
- Have a minimum of 10 percent EL population.

- Met the California Academic Performance Index (API) EL Subgroup target for 2005-06.[1]

A list of eligible schools was posted on the CDE Website and included 1,762 schools meeting the above criteria. LEAs including school districts, county offices of education, and direct-funded charter schools applied for specific schools within their jurisdiction. County offices of education were allowed to apply as a consortium for eligible schools within their jurisdiction or for multiple eligible schools in various districts outside of their jurisdictional areas.

In order to apply, applicants submitted an intent to apply and then followed a two-part process to respond to the RFA. Part 1 of the RFA included an assessment and assignment of points by CDE for each eligible promising practice school based on the following outcome measures:

- AMAO1 growth from 2004-05 to 2005-06 (10 points)
- Schoolwide API growth above target for three years (5 points)
- EL subgroup API 2005-06 (5 points)
- EL subgroup API growth 2004-05 to 2005-06 (5 points)

Eligible schools were then ranked into quintiles and assigned a final score that sums the quintile scores for Part 1.

Applicants then completed Part 2 of the RFA, the narrative application for the promising practices that would be supported or expanded with grant funds. In the narrative application, LEAs could apply on behalf of both "eligible schools" based on the above criteria and "target" schools where the practice or practices would be expanded. Target schools did not need to be from the list of eligible schools in order to be included in the application.

The narrative application was also scored based on a total of 25 points in the following categories: (1) core elements-4 points; (2) description of the EL population-3 points; (3) meeting the needs of ELs-3 points; (4) evidence of effectiveness and replicability-12 points; and (5) use of funds-3 points. Part 1 was given a weight of 40 percent and Part 2 was given a weight of 60 percent of the final score. Two readers with expertise in working with ELs using a rubric provided in the RFA were assigned to score each application.

Through this RFA process, ELLPP identified promising practices in 44 LEA sites located throughout California. In making its final funding selection, CDE also considered the following factors: (1) statewide geographic balance of urban, suburban, and rural schools; (2) diverse mix of schools that include English immersion, bilingual instruction, dual language immersion, and mainstream instruction; and (3) enrollment of students of low socioeconomic status and varying levels of academic proficiency and performance as measured by the API.

The following programmatic approaches for the instruction of ELs are described in more depth in the literature review summary in this report:

[1] Note that schools in Program Improvement (PI) Years 4 and beyond were not eligible to apply for grant funds. Lowest performing schools in the state are not a target in these grant awards.

(1) *English immersion or Structured English immersion programs* generally are characterized by maximizing instruction in English (ranging from approximately 70-90% in English) with English Language Development (ELD) designed at the appropriate level of each student's English competency. English immersion programs also use specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) as a teaching approach intended for teaching academic content (such as social studies, science or literature) using the English language to students who are still learning English. SDAIE requires the student to have intermediate fluency in English as well as mastery of their native language;
(2) *Mainstream instruction* for ELs incorporates sheltered instruction to help serve the needs of ELs in mainstream content-area classes. Sheltered instruction is a research-based instructional framework that provides clear and accessible content and academic language to ELLs in pre-K-12 grade-level classes;
(3) *Dual immersion* or *Two-Way Immersion* (TWI) programs are designed to integrate native English speakers with native speakers of another language in core instruction while becoming fluent in both languages; and
(4) *Bilingual instruction* provides ELs significant amounts of instruction in reading and/or other subjects in their native language, most often in Spanish.

In an initial review of documentation from the sites that PW received from CDE that included copies of the original grant applications, promising practice sites include:[2]

- One direct-funded charter school, four county consortia, and 39 districts.
- 35 sites serve elementary schools, 13 serve middle schools, and eight serve high schools.
- All sites will serve Spanish-speaking ELs and at least seven sites have substantial numbers of ELs (more than 10%) who speak other languages.
- Nearly all sites will serve ELs in Structured English Immersion (SEI), over half of the sites indicated that they serve ELs in a mainstream program, seven sites have a dual immersion program, and 12 are providing bilingual instruction to a subset of students in the schools identified for implementation or expansion.

The funding period for the grants covers three state fiscal years (2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10). School year 2007-08 funding was received by the LEAs in the beginning of FY 2008-09. School year 2008-09 funding was received in the beginning of FY 2008-09, and school year 2009-10 funding will be received in the beginning of FY 2009-10.

ELLPP Evaluation Design

Study Overview

As set out in the evaluation study RFP, this evaluation is focused on identifying effective instruction for ELs both in acquiring English language proficiency and success in other content areas as it applies to the promising practices that are funded by ELLPP. The evaluation study will also identify promising professional development strategies that support teachers to acquire skills to assess and tailor instruction that meet the needs of

[2] This information is intended to provide general information about the grantees and was collected from initial documentation reported by the sites in the original application to CDE and will be refined and updated from surveys and site visit reports collected as part of the evaluation.

individual students who come with a variety of formal and informal educational experiences and language and reading skills in their home languages. Without comparing individual promising practices to one another, the evaluation study also focuses on the prospect for replicability in other settings and schools in California.

The study is framed by seven key areas and the research questions under each area identified in the RFP: (1) leadership, (2) organizational structures, (3) resources, (4) teacher preparation and support, (5) teaching and learning, (6) student placement, monitoring and support, and (7) effectiveness and replicability. Appendix E has all research questions for each area. Four additional interim reports will be provided to CDE prior to drafting and finalizing the report to the Governor and Legislature by November 2011. The interim reports will be submitted in January 2010, August 2010, January 2011, and August 2011.

In addition to regular conference calls and in-person meetings with CDE staff to discuss the status of the evaluation, the evaluation incorporates meetings with the ELLPP Evaluation Committee (formerly called the Stakeholder Advisory Committee). An initial meeting was held July 14, 2009 to provide information about the evaluation and to introduce PW to the committee members. In addition, PW held a video/teleconference in conjunction with CDE for grantees on July 22, 2009 to provide similar information and to inform the sites of upcoming evaluation activities. The next meeting of the ELLPP Evaluation Committee will be held on November 4, 2009.

To further encourage communication between the sites, PW, and CDE staff, PW has also set up a link to the study on its Website (www.publicworksinc.org). The ELLPP evaluation Website link will include contact information for PW staff, site profiles and contact information, CDE administrative documents, and evaluation study information including the design and data collection instruments.

The study design blends qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis by incorporating three broad tasks:

- **Task 1:** Document and literature review, an LEA survey, and a survey of teachers involved in the promising practice.
- **Task 2:** Intensive case studies of each promising practice site including site visits, interviews, focus groups, and classroom observations.
- **Task 3:** A student outcome student at the state, LEA, school and student level.

The promising practices implemented by the sites selected for ELLPP grant funding are a combination of locally-created EL promising practices and more widely known and previously researched EL promising practices such as Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD), Systematic ELD, and Thinking Maps. In the initial review of proposals and site documentation, the promising practices funded by the ELLPP grant also incorporate a range of professional development opportunities, coaching, and data-driven collaborative time for teachers to review student data and identify instructional strategies to meet the needs of EL students. Professional learning communities were also identified in many sites as a promising practice that would be implemented and expanded.

Other strategies funded by the ELLPP grant include additional staffing to reduce class sizes or to work with smaller groups of students during ELD time. While there are several sites

with promising practices in dual immersion and bilingual programs, the vast majority of sites are implementing promising practices for ELs in structured English immersion and mainstream classrooms.

With the important requirement that the study not compare sites, the school and community context and the qualitative information collected in site visits and surveys will be a critical backdrop for the outcome study to identify the best practices that will be the most useful for closing the achievement gap for ELs and that are replicable in the variety of educational settings in California.

Status of the Evaluation Tasks

Task 1: Document Collection, Surveys, and Literature Review

Work on this task began after the first meeting with PW and the CDE ELLPP staff, which occurred in May 2009. CDE provided file folders with individual ELLPP grantee information including the narrative applications, completed forms, and scoring information. PW used this initial information to create a table identifying a number of dimensions for all the sites for use in initial discussions regarding site visit selection and instrumentation including the LEA survey and draft site visit protocols.

This review also helped the PW evaluation team to identify the areas in which additional data needed to be collected prior to the site visits to all grantees that will occur over the next two years. The LEA survey instrument was developed in July and approved by CDE in August. This survey was administered in August with a due date of mid-September.

An analysis of the results of the LEA survey are included in the section of this interim report that follows this description of the study design. The LEA survey incorporated the following topics: professional development; student placement; instructional delivery, assessment, and curriculum; and a section for information about individual schools including a self-rating of implementation at individual school sites. The instrument with summary results is included in Appendix A.

Individual school site data was also collected and summarized for each site including the eligible and target schools selected for implementation and expansion. The data charts included school wide API growth targets for 2004-08, EL subgroup API growth targets for 2006-08, CELDT levels in 2008-08 by number and percentage, EL enrollment as a percentage of overall enrollment, AMAO in ELA and mathematics both school wide and for the EL subgroup in 2004-08, and Title III AMAO 1 and 2. In addition, a data chart was created for each site and school for 2004-08 for ELA, Mathematics, 8th grade Algebra 1, 9th grade Algebra 1, and 10th grade geometry CSTs. These data charts provide the basis for the initial baseline data study to help in site visit selection and to identify individual schools with promising results for classroom observations. These data charts are included in Appendix B.

In addition to the review of CDE documents, PW has conducted a thorough literature review, which is summarized in this interim report in the section that follows the LEA survey section. PW will continue to collect relevant literature to ensure that the literature review is current and reflects all available research and studies related to EL education and the evaluation study. The literature review bibliography is included in Appendix C.

A site profile for each promising practice site was also developed as part of the review of documents. These profiles were included in the mailing of the LEA survey to individual sites for their review and approval. Sites were given the opportunity to provide additional information or to correct any information on the profile. Profiles are self-reported data and are considered non-evaluative for the purposes of this study. However, they provide useful background information for site visits and will also be posted on the PW Website so that sites can share information and contact each other regarding their promising practices. Site profiles are included in Appendix D.

Task 2: Case Studies and Site Visits

A case study for each promising practice site will be conducted that incorporates information from the LEA survey, survey of participating teachers, student demographic and outcome data, and a three-day site visit to each site. The site visits will include interviews of key administrators and personnel and focus groups of key stakeholders including teachers, students, parents, and others such as coaches or teacher leaders. In addition, PW staff will also observe classrooms implementing the promising practices. All sites will be visited in one of four site visit cycles (eleven sites in each cycle): Cycle 1: Fall 2009; Cycle 2: Spring 2010; Cycle 3: Fall 2010; Cycle 4: Spring 2011.

After the initial meeting with CDE staff and an in-house training and review of promising practice site proposal information, PW selected the five sites for an initial "pilot" site visit in September 2009. The pilot site visits were designed to refine draft site visit protocols, to establish selection criteria for the subsequent site visit cycles, and to create an approach for school and classroom observation selection during the three-day site visits based on initial interviews from the pilot site visits and review of school outcome data.

In addition to the selection of the five pilot site visits, PW developed draft interview protocols that have been finalized after the pilot site visits were completed. The interview guide was organized using the seven broad research areas from the RFP and included the research questions for each area. Stakeholders who will be interviewed as part of the site visit include the project director, district administrators, leadership team members, and other partners or organizations supporting the promising practice. A focus group protocol was developed for each of the following groups of stakeholders: teachers, site administrators, students, parents, school site leaders/coaches, and professional development trainers. The site visit protocols developed through this process are included in Appendix A.

Pilot sites were informed that they had been selected for an initial half-day site visit through a letter describing the purpose of the site visit and guidelines for setting it up. PW requested that the half-day pilot site visit incorporate an interview with the district administrator for the grant, a focus group of coaches and/or site leads, and a focus group of 4-6 school staff including principals and/or teachers involved in the grant.

In order to see a range of promising practices, sites selected for the pilot site visits included:

- Glendale—a large urban district in Los Angeles County with a large population of ELs with a variety of home languages implementing promising practices district wide through the use of Focus on Results, a data team approach to bring awareness

and action to EL achievement gaps, teacher leaders/coaches, and funding for reduced class sizes in the 4th to 6th grades in selected schools.
- Marysville—a northern California district implementing focused ELD-certificated staffing and regular collaborative planning time to support ELs in two high poverty elementary schools in the district with an additional district emphasis on training and professional development in instructional strategies for ELs and for ELD certification.
- Newhall—a district in northern Los Angeles County using Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD Project) professional development to build on district initiatives including professional learning communities and collaborative lesson planning time and coaching.
- Sonoma County Office of Education—a consortium of 10 schools from multiple LEAs implementing Thinking Maps professional development and multi-district collaboration through a coaching network aligned to other county office professional development efforts for ELs.
- Woodland—a district in northern California near Sacramento with a district-developed initiative that combined site leadership and professional development for principals, adoption of Academic Conferences at eligible and target schools (eventually district wide), district wide professional development to bring coherence to how teachers approach EL instruction (the Write Institute from San Diego County Office of Education, for example), development of benchmark assessments and use of data systems, and monitoring use of ELD time, placement and assessment of ELs.

The five pilot site visits described above were completed by PW staff by September 21, 2009. Initial findings across these five pilot site visits indicate that most sites are implementing structured English immersion with daily or regularly scheduled ELD by CELDT level. Mainstream instruction was also common. However, bilingual education and dual immersion programs, while present at schools in several of the sites, was not the focus of ELLPP implementation. In general, these sites are using grant funds to build on and more fully develop district initiatives at the site level and, in the case of the county consortium visited, larger professional development initiatives. Based on the research of effective practices in professional development, indications from the initial pilot site visits are positive and, in different degrees in each of the five sites, the following common themes emerged:

- Providing training in specific instructional approaches for ELs (GLAD, Systematic ELD, Thinking Maps, the Write Institutes, Explicit Direct Instruction, and others) to give teachers research-based strategies for use in their classroom and in collaborative planning time;
- Using data systems and building benchmark assessments for teacher collaborative time and improved placement and assessment systems for ELs;
- Using grant money to allow for classroom integration of professional development including additional staffing to work with small groups of students, the use of credentialed ELD teachers with the students at the lowest CELDT levels, and time for teachers to collaborate in grade level teams; and
- A sincere focus from district and school leadership on how to address the emerging and persistent needs of EL students and a proactive use of district and grant funding to provide support and structure for improved instruction, placement, and monitoring of individual student learning.

In subsequent PW meetings, a proposed list of site visits for the first cycle of site visits in Fall 2009 and the second cycle of site visits in Spring 2010 was created based on the following factors:

- Large districts with large numbers of schools including language diversity have been proposed to be visited in the first two site visit cycles in order to capture the impact of this factor in the overall study design.
- Review of student outcome data indicating success at closing the achievement gap between ELs and non-ELs based on API EL Subgroup growth and consistently meeting Title III AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 measures between 2004-08.
- Geographic diversity and implementing a variety of promising practice approaches including visits to middle and high schools and observations of content areas other than English language arts.

Proposed list for Site Visit Cycle 1 (Fall 2009) (including total number of schools) (*indicates participated as pilot site visit):

- Garvey (12)
- Glendale (15)*
- Imperial County Consortium (El Centro) (5)
- Livingston
- Marysville (2)*
- Newhall (4)*
- Oak Grove (8)
- San Jose (4)
- Santa Ana (19)
- Sonoma County Office of Ed (10)*
- Woodland (5)*

Proposed list for Site Visit Cycle 2 (Spring 2009) (including total number of schools):

- ABC (2)
- Bakersfield (3)
- Brentwood (2)
- Ceres (3)
- Chula Vista (8)
- Coachella (2)
- Evergreen (10)
- Mountain Empire (1)
- Petaluma (2)
- Sanger (3)
- Whittier (1)

Upon approval by CDE of the site visit lists, the next steps for the site visits includes a letter to the sites in the first site visit cycle describing the process and suggesting a proposed agenda and schedule. In addition, this letter will include the school sites that PW wishes to visit for classroom observations based on a data review if there are more than two to four schools included in the site. Two member teams from PW will visit each of the sites and

will conduct the district interviews and focus groups as well as visit individual school sites where additional interviews, classroom observations, and focus groups of multiple stakeholders will be scheduled.

Task 3: Student Outcome Study

In addition to the qualitative data collection strategies embedded in the surveys, site visits, and case studies, PW is conducting a student outcome study. PW proposed a quasi-experimental design to study the effect of the promising practices on EL students' school achievement including the CST and STAR testing programs, CELDT proficiency, and progress and re-designation rates for EL students using Title III AMAO 1 and AMAO 2.

A quasi-experimental design will accommodate for the nature of how the schools are selected and included in the study. For instance, there is no random assignment of schools to the "treatment," the schools are not necessarily representative of the general school population, and the level of treatment varies from school to school, teacher to teacher, and student to student. Further, the EL students served by ELLPP grants may not necessarily be representative of the general EL population in California and this must be accommodated in the outcome study.

The evaluation study will examine student outcome data from 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 with 2005-06 data considered the original baseline for most of the schools and students. Note that 2006-07 maybe considered baseline for some schools and LEAs. While the promising practices were proposed based on strategies already in place in eligible schools, the outcome study is complicated by several factors, including delays in funding until the 2007-08 school year, expansion of the promising practice to target schools (not on the original list of eligible schools), and expansion of the promising practice within schools from a subset of students to all ELs. In addition, the promising practice strategies include a wide range of "treatments." For example, while sites have used ELLPP grant funds to provide professional development, additional staffing, and collaborative time for teachers to meet and plan lessons, the funds are a small portion of the overall instructional strategy in place at participating schools for EL students. It may be difficult to determine the extent of the treatment on any individual teacher or student until additional data and information has been collected from the sites. PW will continue to collect data from individual sites in order to determine levels of treatment at particular schools, teachers, and students and design an accurate data request strategy.

While PW has access to data available from CDE at the statewide level for individual schools, teachers, and students, PW is currently in the process of determining the data that will need to be requested from each site in order to determine the students that would be classified as "treatment" versus "control" and whether a true "control" group exists either within promising practice schools or other schools in the district. If it is determined that a control group is unavailable within schools or school districts participating in ELLPP, PW will need to establish a process for selecting a control from non-ELLPP LEAs.

In order to prepare for the data request, PW has completed an initial baseline data study for each of the eligible and target schools for each site from data available from CDE. These profiles have been used in preparation for the pilot site visits and will also inform the process for scheduling the first set of site visits in the Fall 2009. PW is also considering how to collect rosters of students in prior years of implementation in order to do a true

longitudinal study. However, this data is difficult to collect from LEAs because of student and teacher transience and other complications related to identifying the level of implementation and, therefore, treatment.

As noted in Task 1, the initial baseline study included school wide API growth targets for 2004 through 2008, EL subgroup API growth targets for 2006 through 2008, CELDT levels in 2006 through 2008 by number and percentage, EL enrollment as a percentage of overall enrollment, AMAO in ELA and mathematics both school wide and for the EL subgroup in 2004 through 2008, and Title III AMAO 1 and 2. In addition, a data chart was created for each site and school for 2004 through 2008 for ELA, Mathematics, 8th grade Algebra 1, 9th grade Algebra 1, and 10th grade geometry CSTs. These charts are attached as Appendix B.

LEA Survey Results

PW administered the LEA survey to all promising practice sites in Fall 2009. The survey was directed at district personnel most knowledgeable about the promising practice implementation across the district. A total of 43 surveys were collected representing a response rate of 100%.[3]

Promising Practice Characteristics

- More than a quarter of LEAs are implementing an EL model/professional development plan district-wide with some variation between implementation at all schools (28% indicated) and/or expansion to a subset of schools (21%). About a fifth (21%) of LEAs reported expanding the promising practice within a single school.
- Nearly a majority of LEAs reported targeting all ELs through their promising practice, regardless of the number of years in the U.S. In addition, many indicated that CELDT level 3's (Intermediate) that had reached a plateau were the target. Respondents were least likely to target Newcomers or Redesignated ELs through their promising practice.[4]
- Similarly, promising practices were most likely to target improvement in English Language Arts and English Language Development (approximately 86%) and to a lesser degree Mathematics, Science, and Social studies.

Professional Development Approach

- Nearly all LEAs indicated that they were incorporating elements of professional development that include regular teacher meetings/collaboration around analyzing student data/work and/or planning lessons (93%). Similarly, more than half cited using structured coaching for modeling and/or demonstration lessons (64%) and professional development workshops (56%) to support the promising practice.
- A majority of staff members have received 25 or more hours of professional development (72%) through the ELLPP grant. Also, LEAs most commonly

[3] Vista Unified School District declined the funding for 2009-10 and declined to complete the survey. CDE is in negotiation with Vista regarding their role in the evaluation study as they did receive funding in previous years of the grant and, thereby, agreed to participate in the study.
[4] CELDT Levels: 1-Beginning, 2-Early intermediate, 3-Intermediate, 4-Early Advanced, and 5-Advanced.

reported using grant funds to offer English learners district and/or site based ELD coaches and/or district/school coordinators for EL/instructional support and, to a lesser degree, teacher leaders. More than half (60%) of LEAs are using external consulting services through university, county offices of education, or programs such as Focus on Results, Action Learning Systems, and the like.

Student Placement

- When placing students in mainstream and/or structured English immersion (SEI) programs, districts indicated using CELDT level (95%) and to a slightly lesser degree CST scores and teacher recommendations. In contrast, dual immersion and bilingual programs were most likely to report the use of parent waivers (100% in bilingual programs and 91% in dual immersion) then CELDT level for determining placement in the programs.
- In an open-ended question regarding the local EL population and context, most LEAs reported serving two very distinct EL populations: (1) a small-medium size of migrant and/or newcomers from indigenous areas of Mexico and Central America and (2) the population of ELs that were either born in the United States or have been in the US for several years and have reached a plateau in language acquisition. The most common trait that both EL types share is low socio-economic background. Also note that four LEAs reporting having a diverse population of ELs that include students from India, Iran, Iraq, and Vietnam. Also, three LEAs reported a reduction in the percentage of EL students.

Instructional Delivery, Assessment and Curriculum

- According to 84% of survey respondents, English learners most commonly receive SDAIE instructional strategies. Approximately, one-third of LEAs are also using Thinking Maps, Cooperative groupings, and special attention to front-loading of material.
- Approximately half of LEAS use *Hougton Mifflin* for core instruction or *SRA Open Court* – A few LEAs indicated using a combination of both at various schools within their district. Also, seven districts reported using *Lectura* or *High Point* with specific groups of EL students. Nearly all Secondary Middle and High Schools reported using Holt and/or McDougal Littell.
- Approximately 80% of elementary schools are using a combination of *Avenues, High Point, and Open Court*. A smaller number also cited *Carousel: Houghton Mifflin*. Districts with Middle and High schools most are most commonly using *High Point* as their ELD curricula.
- There was great variety in the supplemental materials mentioned by LEAs for use with EL students; common responses included, *Rosetta Stone, Carousel, SRA Materials*, and *Into English*.
- Approximately, two-thirds of LEAs incorporate a technology component into their promising practice that includes programs such as, *Rosetta Stone, Read 180, Success Maker*, and/or Smart Boards/LCD projectors.
- Nearly all schools are providing EL instruction according to CDE guidelines. For example, districts noted that schools were providing daily ELD instruction (97%), for 30-45 minutes (93%) by CELDT level (93%).

- All LEAs are utilizing the CELDT test to measure EL proficiency. Additionally, many use Benchmark/Periodic assessments (87%) and the CST (83%). Slightly more than half also use teacher recommendations (63%) and a smaller percentage administers a home language survey (49%).
- English learners are provided additional instructional minutes before and/or after school (63%) and/or an extended year through intersession programs (68%) at nearly two-thirds of LEAs. LEAs were least likely to cite a pull-out model for serving ELs additional minutes (less than one-third).

Literature Review Summary

English learners (ELs) comprise about one-quarter of California's K-12 population, representing more than 40 percent of the nation's ELs. In California, most ELs speak Spanish (85%). However, over 50 other languages have been identified in California schools. While it is a widely held perception that students' limited English skills are because of recent immigration, 85% of EL students are born in the United States of immigrant parents (PPIC, 2005).

With the relatively rapid rise of the EL population in public schools in the last two decades coinciding with numerous efforts to improve the performance of American school children, the challenges of EL instruction intersect with a range of policy and political issues that touch nearly every aspect of public education—from accountability, assessment and measurement issues to teacher quality and professional development to the politics of the English language and the controversies inherent in the integration of new populations within American society.

In order to capture the range of influences on the education of ELs in California, the literature review begins with a historical framework of the legal and policy issues that have influenced how immigrants and the language diversity inherent in the development of the United States interplay with politics and the evolution of the modern public education system. This framework is an important backdrop to what will be observed in promising practice sites, reflecting both the impact of this history and more recent efforts in public education centered on federal and state accountability, standards-based instruction, testing, and improved data collection and reporting. In addition, the study is examining how promising practices may be replicated in other settings in California. Therefore, the case studies will also consider regional, community, and contextual issues that have supported implementation.

In order to document the current framework that all schools are working under for educating ELs, the literature review summarized in this interim report provides the history and current legal landscape and is organized under the following broad topics: (1) legal and policy framework, (2) research related to programmatic approaches for ELs (3) federal and state accountability requirements related to ELs, and (4) teacher preparation and certification mandates.

The next interim report (January 2010), will incorporate the following topics: (1) status of teacher preparation and licensure for teaching ELs, (2) research-based strategies for teacher support and professional development, (3) theoretical frameworks and research base for

implementing standards-based instruction for ELs especially those identified most commonly by ELLPP sites, and (4) EL assessment, placement, and family support.

Legal and Policy Framework

Colonial History and Language (1600-1800s)

Americans have long identified with the idea that immigrants to the country eventually will blend into a "melting pot"—a place where many races, cultures, and individuals assimilate into a cohesive whole. Often described as a nation of immigrants, Americans have struggled with the ideas of integration, race, culture, and language since the country's founding. Many Americans identify with the concept of "Americanization" as a goal for all, most often symbolized by use of the English language, contrasted with "multi-culturalism," which posits respect for countries of origin, language, and culture as a key unifier of American society.

The notion that early immigrants to the United States assimilated into this country without the need for special programs, the political backdrop for the most recent push to educate ELs predominantly in English, was not necessarily the experience in early American history. For example, the Continental Congress actively courted groups of non-English speakers during the Revolutionary War through publishing official documents in German and French, and emphasized liberty over the promotion of linguistic homogeneity.

By the mid-1800's public and parochial schools in major cities such as Baltimore, Milwaukee, and Cleveland were authorized to teach in German and/or English with parent permission. Further, in 1848, the territory of New Mexico provided Spanish-English bilingual education. In total, approximately a dozen States passed laws that allowed public schools to instruct students in language other than English (Crawford 1995).

In building the nation, with large waves of immigration, early European Americans were encouraged to preserve their cultural identities. Public institutions, including public schools helped to maintain linguistic and cultural ties to the new immigrants' homelands. In turn, bilingualism flourished, not as a tool for promoting English language acquisition, but as a means for European Americans to uphold the language and traditions of their homeland.

Implementation of Language Restrictions in the New Age of Immigrants (1900-1930)

In contrast to the earlier experience with immigration and a growing American population, the late nineteenth century was characterized by a dramatic rise in xenophobia towards new immigrant groups such as Italians, Jews, and Slavs that began entering the United States and settling primarily in the larger cities. As the new wave of immigrants began to increase, so did negative characterizations of their cultures within the media. In response, Congress issued a literacy test in order to restrict immigrants from entering the United States in 1906.

For the first time in history a link was created between patriotism and language proficiency. For instance, he cites the superintendent of New York City schools in 1918, as saying "Americanization would cultivate an appreciation of the institutions of this country [and] absolute forgetfulness of all obligations or connections with other countries" (Crawford 1995). Furthermore, Ellwood P. Cubberly, Dean of the Stanford University School of Education added in 1909:

> *Our task is to break up [immigrant] groups or settlements, to assimilate and amalgamate these people as part of our American race, and to implant in their children, as far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law and order, and our popular government, and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth.*

Americanization efforts were particularly harsh in the western United States where states like California held a long history of discrimination against Mexican and Chinese immigrants. In 1855, the California legislature mandated English-only instruction in all public schools. At that time, Texas also strictly enforced English-only instruction in all schools and went so far as to make it a crime to teach in any other language. In contrast, New Mexico's population of Spanish speakers were provided Spanish and Bilingual instruction in more than 90 percent of their schools. Even after achieving statehood in 1912, the New Mexico Constitution provided a guarantee of protection from discrimination based upon language differences, as well as training for Spanish-language teachers (Crawford 1995).

Entering World War I in 1917, several states passed laws banning use of the German language in public, a sentiment echoed by President Theodore Roosevelt through statements such as,

> *We should insist that if the immigrant who comes here does in good faith become an American and assimilates himself to us he shall be treated on an exact equality with every one else, for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed or birth-place or origin. But this is predicated upon the man's becoming in very fact an American and nothing but an American. If he tries to keep segregated with men of his own origin and separated from the rest of America, then he isn't doing his part as an American. There can be no divided allegiance here. . . We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding-house; and we have room for but one soul loyalty, and that is loyalty to the American people. (To President of the American Defense Society, January 3, 1919; last message, read at meeting in New York, January 5, 1919.)*[5]

In doing this, President Roosevelt framed the language debate around issues of loyalty and patriotism. Thus by the 1920's, many second and third generation Americans felt renewed pressure to abandon their language and assimilate.

The Civil Rights Era and Resurgence of Bilingual Education (1950-1979)

The 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Oliver L. Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* declared that racial segregation violated the 14th Amendment's guarantee to equal protections for all citizens under U.S. laws, striking down discriminatory "separate but equal laws" rooted in prejudice, racism, and stereotypes towards people of differing ethnic and cultural characteristics. Moreover, the decision served to not only galvanize those fighting for civil rights throughout the country, but also led to fundamental changes within

[5] http://www.theodoreroosevelt.org/tr%20web%20book/TR_CD_to_HTML280.html

the federal government including the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the creation of the office for Civil Rights (Ovando 2003).

Around this time, the Cuban revolution led to a large influx of formally educated Cubans into Miami, many of whom participated in re-certification programs through the federal Cuban Refugee program. Soon afterwards, formal bilingual programs were established that provided Limited English Proficient (LEP) students with English and Spanish instruction. Subsequent studies widely acknowledged the Bilingual experiment as a success, as students excelled in both languages and changes in public education nationally soon followed (Houchin, Flamenco, Merlos, and Segura 224-225; Kerper-Mora 2005).

Spurred by Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968 (Title VII), sought to "provide meaningful and equitable access for English-language learners to the curriculum, rather than serving as an instrument of language policy for the nations through the development of their native languages" (August & Hakuta, 1997 p. 16). Thus, at its core, the BEA, was aimed at addressing issues of equal access for English Language Learners (ELL) rather than setting policy on language acquisition programs.

In the beginning, the BEA was criticized for being too ambiguous and not providing enough direction for a recommended program of instruction. For example, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) could receive funds without providing instruction in languages other than English. In these cases, vague uses of funds such as dissemination of "instructional materials" and encouraging "parental involvement" were allowed (Crawford, 1995, Ovando 2003).

Despite its shortcomings the BEA was instrumental in the attempt by public education to harness the primary language, culture, and experiences of students in order to promote language acquisition. Furthermore, "As a result of the Bilingual Education Act, community activism, and litigation by Spanish speaking parents in the Southwest, many English as a Second Language (ESL) programs were implemented throughout the United States" (Crawford 1995).

Subsequent Court Rulings and Political Backlash in California (1980-1998)

The decision in *Lau v. Nichols* was the next important turning point in providing equal access to curriculum and learning to English Learners. *Lau* was a class action lawsuit on behalf of 1,800 Chinese students who cited discrimination on the basis that they could not achieve academically because they could not access English-only instruction at their school. The *Lau* decision can be seen as the most important enduring legal symbol through which the civil rights of language-minority students will continue to be deliberated in the years to come (Baker & Jones 1998; Hakuta 1986; Lyons 1990; Ovando and Collier 1998).

Speaking for the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Douglas stated:

> *There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education. . . .We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful. (*Lau v. Nichols *1974)*

Following this ruling, the Office for Civil Rights issued federal requirements for identifying English Learners and determining their English proficiency. The *Lau Remedies of 1975* were to serve as a structure for LEAs in terms of providing English Learners a program to assist with becoming proficient in English. School districts were now held accountable for preparing students academically, linguistically, and culturally. Failure to comply with the guidelines could result in school districts forfeiting federal funds (Ovando & Collier 1998; Teitelbaum & Hiller 1977).

Anti-bilingual education sentiments emerged during the Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations of the 1980s and 1990s providing a context for growing frustration with increasing numbers of second language learners in public schools and the perception that bilingual education had not been successful at transitioning to academic success in English.

In 1981, President Reagan stated in remarks at the Mid-Winter Congressional City Conference of the National League of Cities:

> *Now, bilingual education—there is a need, but there is also a purpose that has been distorted, again at the Federal level. Where there are predominantly students speaking a foreign language at home, coming to school and being taught in English, and they fall behind or are unable to keep up in some subjects because of the lack of knowledge of the language, I think it is proper that we have teachers equipped who can get at them in their own language and understand why it is they don't get the answer to the problem and help them in that way. But it is absolutely wrong and against the American concept to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market and participate.*[6]

The debate surrounding what role, if any, a child's native language should play in instruction intensified during this time, putting states such as California at the center of the debate. Below is a table of subsequent rulings from the 1980s upholding the spirit of *Lau v. Nichols (*Kerper-Mora 2005).

[6] http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=43473

Court Ruling	Action
Castaneda v. Pickard (1981)	Set the standard for the courts to examine programs for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students by requiring school districts to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers through: 1. A pedagogically sound plan for LEP students 2. Sufficiently qualified staff to implement the plan (including hiring and training for existing staff) 3. Establish a system to evaluate given programs
Idaho v. Migrant Council (1981)	Assigned legal responsibility to the State Departments of Education for monitoring implementation of programs for English Learners.
Denver v. School District No. (1983)	Used *Castaneda v. Pickard* as a precedent in order to evaluate the adequacy of the district's program for English Learners.
Illinois v. Gomez (1987)	Denoted that it was the States' responsibility to establish and enforce implementation of language remediation programs and/or requirements for the redesignation of students from LEP to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) status.
Teresa P. v. Berkeley Unified (1987)	Also used *Castaneda v. Pickard* for evaluating the district's program for English Learners.

Subsequent to these rulings, in California, an offshoot of an immigration reform lobby, dubbed the *English-Only Movement,* capitalized on the sentiments of alienation and apprehension of Anglo-Americans to rapidly growing Asian and Hispanic communities. As Crawford stated, "Newcomers were perceived to live in insular communities where they can work, shop, go to school, worship, watch television, and even vote in their own languages" (1995). Using patriotism as a central theme, the *English-Only* movement argued for the implementation of a common language that was protected from Bilingualism.

In 1998, 61% of California voters passed Proposition 227, which required that ELs be placed in English only classrooms that use sheltered English immersion or structured English immersion (SEI).[7] During the 10 years leading to the passage of the initiative, California experienced an increase in the population of ELs from less than 15% to nearly 25% of the K-12 population. Proposition 227 abolished all native language instruction and required transitional programs of "structured English immersion" (McField 2008). The law also required that ELs be redesignated in one year with three years maximum to transition to English proficiency.

According to the law, waivers out of the Structured English Immersion (SEI) program were provided based upon 1) the child already knew English, 2) the child was over 10 years of age and the school deemed that another approach might be more useful for the student,

[7] *Voter Support For Prop. 226 Ebbs, Poll Says, 61% back 227 to end bilingual education*, Ilana DeBare, Chronicle Staff Writer, Friday, May 29, 1998 reported Sixty-three percent of whites and 60 percent of Asians backed Proposition 227, while just 52 percent of Latinos and 48 percent of blacks supported it. http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/1998/05/29/MN61522.DTL&type=printable

and 3) the student had special needs that would be better served in another program (Parrish 2006). In subsequent court rulings regarding Proposition 227, the authority to choose programs for ELs was transferred from schools to parents. In an effort to stop the implementation of Proposition 227 based on challenges to the Equal Protection Clause, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and other federal initiatives that formed the underpinnings of bilingual education, the court ruled in favor of Proposition 227 and implementation was allowed to go forward despite the ongoing controversies in the field (McField 2008).

A study team of the American Institutes for Research (AIR) and WestEd conducted a longitudinal research evaluation examining the effects of this proposition over a 5-year period. The following key findings were published in, *Effects of the Implementation of Proposition 227 on the Education of English Learners, K-12:*

- The performance gap between ELs and native English speakers has decreased slightly, although it has remained relatively constant in most grades. This finding is especially significant given the substantial increases in ELs participating in statewide assessments under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Nonetheless, given that Proposition 227 was implemented during a climate of increased accountability and reforms (e.g., Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (IIUSP)) it is not possible to trace these gains to one particular reform.
- There is limited evidence that suggests the model of instruction (Bilingual versus SEI) is a significant indicator of EL performance. The evaluators attributed this to two variables: first, a selection bias exists when programming students for each program. Students receive various instructional services based upon their specific needs and these groups are often not comparable. Second, the data system at the state-level did not have the capability to measure student-level data across years at the time of the evaluation. However, there was data to suggest increased achievement among students that received Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)/ELD instruction.
- Despite the initiative's requirement that all students be transitioned to SEI within one year, the evaluation found an approximately 40% probability that an EL will be redesignated to fluent English proficient status after 10 years in California. The study noted that the odds for redesignation as English proficient vary across schools and districts based upon the size of the EL population, socio-economic status, ethnicity, and grade that students enter the district.

In order to determine the possible variables responsible for improvement in English language acquisition, the study team examined 66 schools and 5 districts for commonalities within schools that have high achieving EL populations. Although a majority of these schools offered SEI programs, there were a few with bilingual and/or multiple options for EL instruction. Interviews with administrators and district personnel identified the following factors as critical to success: (1) staff capacity to address needs specific to the EL population, (2) school-wide focus on English Language Development (ELD) and standards-based instruction, (3) shared priorities and expectations regarding the education of ELs, and (4) systematic, ongoing assessment and data-driven decision-making (Parrish 2006).

Research Related to Programmatic Approaches for ELs

A majority of the initial research on the pedagogical approaches of second language immersion programs was developed in Canada during the 1960's. This movement, largely a response to a growing community of bilingualism (English and French) in Quebec that many English-speaking parents felt their students were not prepared to adequately access (Genesee 1987). The French-Canadian model is dictated by the following four goals:

- Provide children with the practical expertise to communicate fluidly in English and French.
- Maintain and strengthen levels on English language development.
- Ensure that students' academic achievement remain on par with their appropriate grade-level.
- Promote an appreciation for the culture and language of both French and English-speaking Canadians.

In this model, students receive instruction exclusively in French (all subjects) and English is gradually introduced. Thus, for students learning a second language is paramount to learning and communicating. Moreover, English is introduced later as an additional language for enrichment, as students are expected to utilize both languages interchangeably (Genesee 1987).

Bilingual Programs

Bilingual education is fundamentally different from immersion programs in that it provides ELs significant amounts of instruction in reading and/or other subjects in their native language (usually Spanish). Although, bilingual programs in languages other than Spanish exist, they are rare due to the large amount of students who are Spanish speakers. Robert Slavin and Alan Cheung identify three primary models for bilingual education;

- An *early-exit* model that provides students with oral language proficiency and reading entirely in their native language through the primary grades and a gradual transition to English oral language proficiency, reading and writing in the second through fourth grades;
- A *late-exit* model that retains students in native language instruction for most of their K-5 to ensure they master native-language instruction.
- *Paired bilingual* models, which teach children to read in both English and their native language at different time periods each day or on alternating days. As ELs gradually develop the skills to become successful in English instruction the time they have in their native language can be paired down (2005).

Proponents of bilingual instruction contend that it is important for a child to learn to read in their native language, while acquiring a second language so as to avoid the experience of failure when attempting to learn to read and speak in English simultaneously. Moreover, Slavin and Cheung cite research that provides evidence that a child's reading proficiency in their native language is also a predictor of their eventual reading performance, and there is no evidence that indicates that bilingualism interferes with performance in either language (2005). Similarly, they note that bilingualism provides children essential skills that are valued in a more global society. Opponents of bilingual education note the imperativeness

of providing students more "time on task" to become proficient in English (Cummins 1992 and Crawford 1995) and otherwise circumvent any delays in language acquisition.

Dual Language Immersion or Two-Way Immersion (TWI)

Two-Way Immersion (TWI) programs are designed to integrate native English speakers with native speakers of another language in core instruction while becoming fluent in both languages. The first incarnation of TWI programs were developed approximately 40 years ago under Ecole Bilingue, a French-English program in Massachusetts and Coral Way, a Spanish-English program in Florida. Typically there are two main TWI program designs that are designed for grades K-5: a) a 90/10 model in which a majority of instruction in the primary grades is in the minority language, with gradual increases in English instruction as students enter upper grades (3rd and 4th), until a 50/50 balance of English and Spanish instruction is reached. The other model calls for 50/50 instruction in both languages regardless of grade level.

Since its inception TWI has become increasingly popular, with approximately 266 programs nationally in 2002, a dramatic increase from the roughly 30 programs accounted for in the mid-1980s (Parish 2006, Genesee 1996). In 2009, the Center for Applied Linguistics Directory of Two-Way Immersion Programs listed 346 programs in 27 states (plus Washington D.C.). The growth in popularity is attributed to the four central goals of all TWI programs:

1. Students must develop high levels of proficiency in their first language (also known as L1). Thus, English speakers will excel at listening, reading, and writing in English, as will the language minority students (e.g., Spanish, French, etc.) in listening, reading, and writing in their native language.
2. All students will become proficient in a second language or L2. Thus, unlike other language acquisition programs TWI programs are considered additive bilingual programs for both groups of students because they provide the opportunity to expand oral and written skills in their native language, while simultaneously acquiring those skills in another language.
3. The academic achievement for both groups of students must be at or above grade level and they must be held to the same accountability measures as other students in and/or outside the program.
4. All students participating in the program must exhibit positive attitudes and respect towards each other's culture.

Proponents of dual or two-way immersion indicate that it is important for students to remain in the program at least until 5th grade with evidence of fluency in both languages most apparent by the 8th grade. Although research is still scarce, indications are that the effectiveness of these programs also depends on the qualifications of staff to work effectively in both languages, professional development, and community support as essential to student success (Lindholm-Leary 2005).

Structured English Immersion (SEI)

The program characteristics for Structured English Immersion (SEI) were introduced in the U.S. by using the French-Canadian immersion model as a guide (Clark 2009). A widely

cited eight-year study, the Ramirez report, was released by the U.S. Department of Education in 1991 in order to examine English Immersion, Early-exit, and Late-exit Bilingual Programs (Ramírez, Pasta, Yuen, and Ramey 1991). The report noted that SEI programs within the study commonly shared two basic components: 1) teachers maximized instruction in English, which provided students more "time on task" and 2) students are taught and grouped according to their appropriate level (Cummins 1992). Increasingly school districts are moving towards SEI for several factors; laws passed through voter initiatives restricting bilingual education (California, Arizona, and Massachusetts), a climate of increased accountability that measures student achievement on high stakes assessments in English (NCLB), and penalizes districts for not producing results on standardized tests and accountability measures, and moreover a national trend that shows many ELs stop making progress after reaching an intermediate level of English proficiency (Clark 2009).

Nonetheless, according to Margaret Adams, several common misconceptions of SEI remain. In *Unmasking the Myths of Structured English Immersion,* she addresses common misconceptions such as those who define SEI as equivalent to "sink or swim" submersion. Similarly, an English Language Task Force in Arizona found that many school administrators had differing definitions of what constitutes SEI (Clark 2009). Both Clark and Adams provide a framework for SEI that includes the following components:

- Explicit English language instruction for significant amounts of the school day, with students grouped according to their level of English.
- The main component of SEI instruction is the English language, while academic content is intended to have a supportive but subordinate role.
- English is the language of instruction; thus, students and teachers must speak, read, and write only in English.
- Teachers utilize instructional methods that treat English as a foreign language; most commonly these include active, direct, and explicit modeling and/or differentiation.
- Students are overtly taught English grammar skills through listening skills, word building, word-order rules, vocabulary (synonyms, antonyms, etc.), verb tenses, and expressions and/or colloquialisms popular in the English language.
- Rigorous timelines for exiting SEI and becoming reclassified as fluent English proficient. A common approach is for students to exit into a *Mainstream* classroom and be monitored for a 2-year period according to federal guidelines.

Measuring Program Effectiveness

Ensuring the best method for instructing the nation's EL population is a question charged with politics and controversy that has plagued researchers, policy makers, and educators alike. Nonetheless, as Slavin and Cheung conclude, research on the achievement of a student in his/her native language versus English presents several issues (2005). The first concern is determining the appropriate timeline to measure program effectiveness. For example, if students in an early-exit bilingual program transition to English instruction by the fourth grade, at what grade should those students be assessed to truly measure English proficiency?

Researchers note the need for students to transfer the skills they acquired in their native language to English (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt). A related issue addresses the problem of

determining the appropriate pretest in order to establish a baseline in either the primary language or in English. Another problem is the inherent issue of character and selection biases. Many of the studies are retrospective, thus examining students that ended up in one program over another based on a variety of reasons including lack of success, parental preference, and/or openness to assimilation. These are all factors that can affect outcomes (Slavin and Cheung 2005).

With the requirement for research-based strategies embedded in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), the Institute of Education Sciences in the US Department of Education, was charged with creating the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth, selecting 13 experts in second-language development, cognitive development, curriculum and instruction, assessment, and methodology to review the quantitative and qualitative research on the development of literacy in language-minority students. The panel identified five research topics to investigate: (1) development of literacy, (2) cross-linguistic relationships, (3) sociocultural contexts and literacy development, (4) instruction and professional development, and (5) student assessment.

In 2006, noting the overarching finding that the research on acquiring literacy in a second language remains limited, the Panel released its final report with the following major findings:

- Instruction that provides substantial coverage in the key components of reading—identified by the National Reading Panel as phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension—has clear benefits for language-minority students.
- Instruction in the key components of reading is necessary—but not sufficient—for teaching language-minority students to read and write proficiently in English. Oral proficiency in English is critical as well—but student performance suggests it is often overlooked in instruction.
- Oral proficiency and literacy in the first language can be used to facilitate literacy development in English.
- Individual differences contribute significantly to English literacy development.
- Most assessments do a poor job of gauging individual strengths and weaknesses.
- There is surprisingly little evidence for the impact of sociocultural variables [such as immigration status; sociocultural factors; district, state, and federal policies and the like] on literacy achievement or development. However, home language experiences can have a positive impact on literacy achievement (August and Shanahan 2006).

In the second progress report, PW will provide a summary of the research base for specific instructional strategies, professional development approaches, materials, and other aspects of educating ELs not tied to the specific programmatic approaches described above.

Federal and State Accountability Requirements Related to ELs

In addition to the history of and the build up to Proposition 227 in California, which resulted in the placement of virtually all ELs in SEI or mainstream classrooms, state and federal standards-based accountability efforts have had large influences on the ways in

which California schools structures education for ELs, the materials that are commonly used, and the assessments for placement and re-designation as English proficient.

Since 1999, California has been developing a system for holding schools accountable for the achievement of their students as required in the Public School Accountability Act (PSAA). The California Accountability system and the Academic Performance Indicator (API) system for ranking schools and student performance builds on the standards-based reforms of the 1990s, incorporating content standards, curriculum frameworks, and textbooks aligned to the state's assessment or STAR system, which has undergone numerous changes and refinements over the years.

In August 2003, California further modified its system to meet the requirements of NCLB and its Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) school ranking system. Under the AYP, states must:

- Create "annual measurable objectives" (AMOs) for the percent of students that must show proficiency on standards-aligned tests (the California Standards Tests or the California High School Exit Exam, for example);
- Select an additional way to measure student progress (California uses the API);
- Attain specified high school graduation rates or improvement in the graduation rate; and
- Test 95% of their students (including specific subgroups of students).

School and district performance on the AYP can trigger "Program Improvement" status and a series of interventions for districts and schools mandated by CDE. Under the API system, California held schools accountable for significant subgroups based on ethnicity and poverty (Edsource 2009). NCLB added students with disabilities and English learners, triggering heightened attention to how these groups of students were performing under the new framework of Proposition 227.

Specifically, NCLB Title III Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students requires States to:

- Establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards aligned to state academic content standards, yet suitable for ELL students learning English as a second language;
- Annually assess the English language proficiency of each ELL student using a valid and reliable assessment of English-language proficiency aligned to ELP standards;
- Define annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to measure and report on progress toward and attainment of English proficiency and academic achievement standards; and
- Hold local education agencies (LEAs) accountable for meeting increasing Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) targets for English language proficiency (ELP) over time (NCLB 2002, Public Law 107-110, 115 Statute 1425).

Three specific AMAO target areas have been established under the law:

- AMAO 1: Progressing in English language acquisition (annual increases in the number or percentage of students making progress in learning English as measured by students progressing in CELDT levels)
- AMAO 2: Exiting or reaching English language proficiency (annual increases in the number or percentage of students attaining English language proficiency by the end of each school year and redesignation rates)
- AMAO 3: ELL-Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (AYP for the ELL subgroup (under Title I) in meeting grade-level academic achievement standards in English Language Arts (Reading and Mathematics California Standards Tests-CST)

In 2001, responding to NCLB Title III requirements, California implemented the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) to measure English proficiency and to serve as a placement and redesignation tool for local LEAs. Students who do not speak English at home are required to take the exam each year until they are designated Fluent English Proficient (FEP). In 2007, the CELDT was amended to authorize early literacy assessment of ELs in kindergarten and grade one beginning 2009-10.

The CELDT is based on the English Language Development Standards of July 1999, which include the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing with levels of beginning, intermediate, and advanced. The ELD standards "address the processes by which students develop proficiency in a second language differ from the experiences of monolingual English speakers. Grammatical structures that monolingual speakers learn early in their language development may be learned much later by students learning English as a second language."[8] ELD standards are designed for students who enter school in grades K to 2 or 3 to 12 literate in their primary language, or 3-12 not literate in their primary language. These standards function in addition to the English Language Arts standards for all students.

In California, standards-based adoption of textbooks occurs on a regular cycle. The last adoption for reading language arts (RLA) materials occurred in 2002, with a 2005 follow-up adoption in RLA (basic, intervention, and EL intervention). The most recent adoption in 2008 was intended to have a 2010 follow-up adoption for the additional intervention materials. However, because of the budget situation that California faced in 2009, the follow-up adoption has been suspended until 2013-14 (July 28, 2009, Assembly Bill X42). Many districts have chosen to delay purchase of RLA materials because of budget constraints and the option for "flexibility" in Assembly Bill X42.

Teacher Preparation and Certification Mandates

The late 1990s marked a shift regarding research on the role that teacher effectiveness plays in increasing student achievement. Specifically, several studies found that the performance of individual teachers could improve student performance even when the school was not highly effective at increasing achievement. Data from the Tennessee value-added approach is often cited for providing evidence that highly effective teachers can produce a gain of 53 percentile points among the lowest performing students, while a less effective teacher working with the same population will generate only 14 percentile points. Indeed the

[8] From page 12 of the ELD standards available from the CDE Website http://cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/index.asp.

Tennessee results are equally dramatic for middle and high achieving students. For instance, middle achievers increase twice as much with highly effective teachers and high achievers average a 25 percentile increase (only 2 percentile points with teachers that are effective teachers)(Haycock 1998).

A similar study in Dallas determined that growth made from high achieving teachers if sustained over an extended period of time could have a large impact on student achievement. In that case, a group of fourth graders were assigned to a highly effective teacher over a three-year period and those students rose from the 59th percentile in the fourth grade to the 76th percentile upon exiting the 6th grade. In contrast, a group of students that were slightly higher achieving were assigned to three consecutive ineffective teachers and fell from the 60th percentile in the fourth, to the 42nd percentile at the end of grade 6th (Haycock 1998).

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Requirements for Highly Qualified Teachers

In addition to the expectation that all students be performing at grade level in reading and mathematics by 2014 embedded in NCLB, the legislation mandated that states and districts provide a plan for all children access to "highly qualified teachers" (HQT) by 2005-06. Federal legislation defined HQT as:

- Have at minimum a bachelors degree from an accredited institution of higher education;
- Hold full state certification and/or a intern certificate/credential for not more than three years; and
- Demonstrate subject matter competence in the core academic subject that is being instructed.

In *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement,* Linda Darling-Hammond links research on teacher preparedness to increased student achievement. In fact, she found a stronger correlation between achievement and teacher's subject matter knowledge and knowledge of teaching and learning (accounts for 40% to 60%) than that of class size, teacher salaries, and overall spending. Clearly, teacher knowledge of subject-matter is critical to increasing student achievement.

According to California's State Accountability Report Card (SARC) consistent progress has been made in meeting NCLB requirements since the 2006 deadline. Since 2008, the percentage of teachers with full credentials has increased by 2%, while the percentage of alternative certifications has remained unchanged.

Table 1: Types of Credential, 2006-08

	2005-06	2007-08	Net
Full	93.3	95.0	1.7
Alternative routes to certification (District Internship/University Internship)	3.4	3.4	0
Pre-Internship	0.9	0.1	-0.8
Teachers with Emergency Permits (not qualified for a credential or internship but meeting minimum requirements)	3.5	3.3	-0.2
Waiver	0.4	0.4	0

Source: CDE State Accountability Report Card

In the past few years, more teachers (+2.5%) are also completing graduate level work, while the percentage of teachers holding a Bachelor's degree without additional semester units or less has decreased. Nonetheless, the typical teacher in California has a bachelor's degree, plus additional semester units and a teaching credential.

Table 2: Teacher Education Level 2006-08

	2005-06	2007-08	Net
Doctorate	0.8	0.9	0.1
Master's Degree + 30 or more semester hours	14.3	16.8	2.5
Master's Degree	18.3	18.6	0.3
Bachelor's Degree + 30 ore more semester hours	46.6	47.7	1.1
Bachelor's Degree	19.6	15.8	-3.8
Less than Bachelor's Degree	0.3	0.2	-0.1
None Reported	0	0.0	0

Source: CDE State Accountability Report Card

At the same time, the percentage of highly qualified teachers staffing core[9] classrooms (according to NCLB guidelines) has also improved since 2006. This year, more than 90% of core classrooms state wide were taught by highly qualified teachers. However, the percentage of highly qualified teachers that staff low-poverty schools still outnumbers that of schools with a larger number of socio-economically disadvantaged students.

Table: 3: Core Academic Courses Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers 2006-08

	2005-06	2007-08	Net
Statewide	86.0	92.33	6.33
In High-Poverty Schools	81.6	88.58	6.98
In Low-Poverty Schools	88.8	95.13	6.33

Source: CDE State Accountability Report Card

Nevertheless, the correlation between teacher quality and certification programs has proven difficult for researchers to establish. In *Tear Down This Wall: The Case for a Radical Overhaul of Teacher Certification,* Hess argues that the lack of an agreed upon "canon" or concrete set of skills and/or strategies to be an effective teacher are a primary impediment to attracting higher-caliber teachers. Furthermore, annual reports on teacher quality find varying rigor of teacher preparedness programs and inconsistent reporting. For instance, only one program was found to be low performing in the entire nation and many states report 100% pass rate for credentialing programs (Huang & Haycock, 2002).

Certification in California for Teachers of ELs

While fewer teachers in California were teaching under emergency credentials under NCLB, there were no specific provisions contained in the legislation related to the training and certification of teachers of ELs. In contrast, California has established and refined credentialing requirements for the teaching of ELs for many years. Teaching ELs falls into three primary categories of instruction: (1) SDAIE or specially designed academic instruction in English, (2) instruction through a students' primary language or bilingual instruction, and (3) ELD or English language development.

[9] California Department of Education defines core classes as, Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Foreign Language, Civics/Government, Economics, Arts, and Geography

In the past, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) has issued two EL credentials to ensure that teachers have the skills embedded in the above three categories of instruction: (1) the Bilingual, culture, language and development credential (BCLAD) and (2) the Culture, language and development credential (CLAD). The BCLAD is generally considered the most rigorous of the two and authorizes primary language instruction and content instruction in the primary language. In addition, many teachers in California hold earlier versions of these credentials that are generally considered equivalent in terms of instruction for ELs (Gandara et al. 2003). However, in 2003, only 5% of California teachers who instructed English learners have a full credential with BCLAD authorization.

Because of the focus on professional development, training, and in some cases, EL certification, embedded in many of the ELLPP promising practices, the aspect of training and certification will be a key dimension of the case studies and the outcome study. Most recently, Assembly Bill 1871 signed September 30, 2008 and effective July 1, 2009 changed the requirements for bilingual credentialing to include the following provisions:

- Additional options will be available to earn a bilingual authorization including the completion of a Commission-approved bilingual program as well as the option of combining coursework from these programs with Commission-approved bilingual examination subtest(s).
- Additional option is available to earn an English learner authorization by combining Commission-approved California Teacher of English Learner (CTEL) program coursework with passing scores on the CTEL examination subtest(s).
- Individuals will earn an "authorization" as opposed to a "certificate" for both the bilingual authorizations (formerly BCLAD certificate) and the English learner authorizations (formerly CLAD certificate).
- Authorizations will be added to the selected valid prerequisite document when minimum requirements have been met for new teachers.[10]

As California public education continued to be impacted by the implementation of SEI under Proposition 227, the availability of bilingual training and certification related to how the vast majority of ELs continued to cause concern among educators, particularly those with the most training specifically targeting ELs. In fact, Gandara et al. concluded that "the higher the concentration of English learners in the classroom, the higher the proportion of teachers who held at least some authorization to teach them. Yet among classrooms where a majority of students are English learners, only about half of the teachers held an appropriate EL credential." In addition, referring to the unintended consequences of the class-size reduction initiative in California, the authors found that "schools with the most English learners benefited the least from class-size reduction, at least in terms of access to fully credentialed teachers" (2003).

Next Steps

Next steps in the evaluation include a meeting with the CDE team scheduled for October 9, 2009 in which this report will be reviewed and the initial site list finalized. In addition, a meeting of the evaluation advisory committee has been scheduled for November 4, 2009. Planning for this meeting will also occur on October 9, 2009.

[10] From the Commission on Teacher Credentialing Coded Correspondence 09-06, April 1, 2009.

Immediately following the meeting with the CDE team, PW will send a letter to the sites in the Fall site visit cycle with information about the site visit, a draft agenda for interviews and focus groups, and information about how to schedule the classroom observations. PW staff will complete the first eleven site visits by mid-December. A protocol for the promising practice write-up will be developed in October 2009 so that all team members are writing to a similar format.

Next steps in the evaluation also include finalizing the outcome study design and the data request to all participating sites. In October to November 2009, PW will develop a survey instrument for all teachers participating in the promising practice. This survey will be provided to CDE for approval by the end of October. Administration of the teacher survey will begin in November 2009.

During this next phase of the evaluation, information from the initial phase of the evaluation will be added to the PW Website including the site profiles and contact information, CDE documents and contact information, and all protocols for the site visits including the interview guide and the classroom observation form.

Appendix A
Evaluation Instruments and Protocols

District Questionnaire
AB2117 English Language Learner Acquisition and Development Pilot Program (ELLPP) Evaluation
(N=43)

Through a Request for Proposals (RFP), Public *Works,* Inc. (PW) was selected by the California Department of Education (CDE) to conduct the AB 2117 English Language Learner Pilot Program (ELLPP) Evaluation. We are interested in gathering additional data on district practice and its relationship to school practice prior to visiting Promising Practice sites as well as in the development of a teacher and principal survey.

The scope of the Promising Practices varies in the 44 districts that received grants. Some are small districts that are funding efforts in one school while others are funding multiple target schools or are consortia of districts with multiple schools. This survey is directed at district personnel most knowledgeable about Promising Practice implementation district-wide and intends to collect data that PW can use to generalize across efforts. Please do the best you can in answering the following questions. Responses should be based on 2008-2009 efforts.

1) Is the EL model/professional development described in your proposal…

☐ Implemented District-wide (attempting to implement at all schools) **27.9%**
☐ Implemented District-wide with a strategy at a subset or selected group of schools **20.9%**
☐ Applicable to only one school **20.9%**
☐ Varied in approach at each school **18.6%**
☐ Other: **11.6%**

2) Does the Promising Practice named in your grant focus on a **specific** type of EL student? (check all that apply)

- o All English Learners regardless of level or years in U.S. **81.4%**
- o CELDT level 3 who have experienced no growth for one or more years **20.9%**
- o CELDT level 1-2 **14.0%**
- o CELDT level 3 new to this level **14.0%**
- o CELDT levels 4-5 **11.6%**
- o Newcomers (new to U.S.) **9.3%**
- o Redesignated ELs **9.3%**

3) Which content areas do you expect to improve the most as the result of this Promising Practice? (check all that apply)

- o English/Language Arts **88.4%**
- o English Language Development **83.7%**
- o Mathematics **23.3%**
- o Science **23.3%**
- o Social Science/History **23.3%**
- o Language Arts **23.3%**
- o Spanish **9.3%**
- o Other (please specify) **2.3%**

Professional Development Approach:

4) What are the primary elements of your professional development approach related to the Promising Practice?

- o Regular teacher meetings/collaboration/professional learning communities devoted analysis of student assessment data, student work, and/or planning lessons **93.0%**
- o Structured coaching/modeling/demonstration lessons **62.8%**
- o Professional development workshops (typically 6-8 hours) **55.8%**
- o Opportunities for teacher to participate in peer observations/ "walk arounds" **41.9%**
- o Professional development institute (typically 30-40 hours) **39.5%**
- o Lesson Study **18.6%**
- o Other (please specify): **16.3%**

5) Approximately how many hours of professional development do participants receive in a twelve month period (include one summer and one school year in your calculation)?

25-60	9-24	61-84	104 + over	Up to 8 hours	85-103
47.6%	**21.4%**	**11.9%**	**9.5%**	**7.1%**	**2.4%**

6) Are you using any **external** (i.e., non-district staff) partners/providers to deliver professional development, coaching, or other support services related to the Promising Practice named in your grant? *If yes, please name partner/provider*.

7) What internal school or district personnel exist to support services/programs for English Learners at the schools named in your grant?

- o Other (please specify): **58.1%**
- o District ELD coaches **51.2%**
- o Site-based literacy coaches **44.2%**
- o Site-based ELD coaches **37.2%**
- o District literacy coaches **32.6%**

Student Placement:

8) What criteria are used to place students into different EL instructional programs? Please check all that apply to each approach.

	CELDT level	CST Scores	Teacher Recom-mendation	Parent Waiver	Other
Mainstream	**94.7%**	**63.2%**	**55.3%**	**28.9%**	**34.2%**
Structured English Immersion (SEI)	**97.3%**	**45.9%**	**43.2%**	**21.6%**	**24.3%**
Dual Immersion	**72.7%**	**36.4%**	**36.4%**	**90.9%**	**27.3%**
Bilingual	**64.3%**	**21.4%**	**50%**	**100%**	**21.4%**
Other					

9) Please describe any special or unique components to your selection/placement process?

_____

10) Are there any unique characteristics of your EL student population? (e.g., newcomers, dialects, indigenous languages, etc.). *If yes, please describe below.*

_____

_____

Instructional Delivery, Assessment and Curriculum:

11) What core ELA curricula are used with students in your district? If there is a different ELA core used with English Learners please list too.

Elementary:_____

_____

Middle:_____

_____

High School: _____

_____

12) What core ELD curricula are used with English Learners in your district? Please name adopted textbook(s) or supplemental materials used with English Learners. *Please provide information if you differentiate by grade level/CELDT level as necessary.*

Elementary:_____

_____

Middle:_____

_____

High School: _____

_____

13) What supplemental materials are most prevalent/used most often with English Learners in your district or at the schools named in the grant?

_____

_____

14) Is your district and/or the schools named in your grant using any instructional technology programs/software to target instruction for EL students? *Please list and describe.*

_____

_____

15) Is there a set of instructional strategies/programs used specifically for English Learners at the schools named in your grant? (check all that apply)

- o SDAIE **83.7%**
- o Systematic ELD **46.5%**
- o Other (please specify): **41.9%**
- o GLAD **37.2%**
- o Reading First **16.3%**
- o Balanced Literacy **14%**
- o ExCEL **7%**
- o Reading Recovery **2.3%**

16) Is there a set-aside time where students receive English Language Development (ELD)?

Frequency:	**For how long:**	**How organized:**
☐ Daily **97.5%**	☐ 30 minutes **67.5%**	☐ By CELDT Level **92.5%**
☐ Weekly	☐ 45 minutes **32.5%**	☐ Other **32.5**
☐ Other **2.5%**	☐ 1 hour **10%**	☐ By CST Level **15.0%**
	☐ Other **20%**	☐ Not Leveled **2.5%**

17) Which assessments do you use to assess English Language proficiency of EL students?

- CELDT **100%**
- Benchmark/Periodic Assessment **87.8%**
- CST **82.9%**
- Teacher Recommendations **63.4%**
- Home Language Survey **48.8%**
- Other: **41.5%**
- Grades **39.0%**

18) Does your district require any targeted academic intervention that provides additional instructional minutes to EL students? (check all that apply)

- Push-in during regular school day **68.4%**
- Extended year (Summer School, Intersession, longer school year, etc.) **68.4**
- Before/after-school **63.2%**
- Pull-out during regular school day **36.8%**
- Shadow/parallel course during regular school day **15.8%**

ELLPP Site Visit Protocols
September 2009

Background: District and school sites, grade-levels involved, teachers and students participating in promising practice and expansion, overall goals and focus, other partners, organizations, or programs supporting promising practices

Stakeholders Interviews: Project director, district administrators, leadership team members, partners/organizations

Focus Groups: Teachers, site administrators, students, parents, school site leaders/coaches, professional development trainers

Interview Guide

I. **Leadership**-Describe how the leadership of the promising practice impacts and/or affects the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.

Design. Describe the initial implementation of the promising practice and how the programmatic approach was developed. How was the implementation designed originally and then expanded school-wide or to other sites?

Research. What research was used to design and refine the practice? How was the research gathered and synthesized in the development of the promising practice?

Vision. What is the vision for implementation? Who has been involved and how has support been generated and communicated among district and school site leadership? Staff? Parents and students?

Decision making. Who is involved in decision making related to planning and implementation of the promising practice? How are decisions communicated to key players and stakeholders? What decision-making and oversight exists for the promising practice?

Family and community support and communication. In what ways does leadership ensure support from key members of the district, school and broader community?

Community and school challenges. Describe particular challenges specific to your schools related to serving the instructional needs of EL students. In what ways has/does leadership overcome these challenges? How have these challenges been addressed in planning and/or expanding the promising practice?

II. **Organizational Structures**-Describe how the organizational structures of the promising practice impact and/or affect the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.

Scheduling and accommodations in the school day. In what ways is extended time/minutes of instruction for EL instruction accommodated at school sites? How has the organization of the school day at promising practice sites change since its initial implementation? And as it has expanded school wide or to other sites?

Nature of the organizational structures to support the promising practice. How are the different programmatic approaches integrated within or across school sites? What are the organizational structures used to integrate SEI, mainstream, dual immersion and bilingual education (as appropriate) within or across school sites?

District supports for organizational structures. In what ways have district policies (e.g., additional support for school site leadership and/or staffing, flexibility in scheduling, pacing guides, assessment and/or curricular materials) allowed the promising practice to be implemented and expanded either school wide or to other sites? Has the district and/or school site relied on state, regional or other administrative structures *outside of the district* to accommodate implementation (e.g., county offices of education, professional providers/organizations, research and/or consulting organizations)?

III. **Resources**-Describe how the use of restructuring of resources has supported the effectiveness of the promising practice and its ability to promote English language and academic English acquisition and development.

Use of ELLPP resources. In what ways has the ELLPP grant supported the implementation and expansion of the promising practice? To what extent have district funds provided further support?

Maintenance and expansion of promising practice. How could the promising practice be maintained at the school sites? What would be needed to sustain the efforts? Expand it to more students or sites? Leverage other funds to support the promising practice?

IV. **Teacher Preparation & Support**-Describe how teacher preparation and support are effectively implemented to support the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.

Describe the current staff and their qualifications in the promising practice sites. What are the qualifications of the current staff in place at promising practice schools and expansion sites? How has the district and the site identified the training needs of current staff related to the EL population? In what ways have those needs been addressed by the promising practice?

Professional development to support promising practice. Describe the professional development program that supports the promising practice at the original school sites and as it

was expanded. What is the duration, frequency and type of professional development offered to school staff? What is the level of participation? How are participants supported at the school site? *Probe: Coaching? Lesson study? Professional Learning Communities?*

Professional development research base. What research has been used to design the professional development? How has it been designed to specifically impact EL population? Support EL students in other academic content areas? What consultants or other organizations support the implementation of professional development?

District professional development priorities and support. In what ways has professional development for the promising practice been determined at the site level? Been integrated with overall district professional development priorities or programs? What site-based funds or resources are used to fund PD surrounding the promising practice? How is funding for school site follow-up provided or supported by district policies?

Support for data-driven instruction. How is student achievement data used to guide the implementation of the promising practice? What training have school staff received in data-driven instruction? What type of data is used and how often? What data is most "meaningful" in terms of guiding instruction for EL students?

V. **Teaching & Learning**-Describe how teaching and learning are effectively implemented to support the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development in this promising practice.

State Board of Education-adopted materials and programs. Describe the English/Language Arts materials and intervention materials adopted and in use by school sites. What core ELD curricula are used with English Learners in your district and promising practice sites? What intervention (if any) ELD curricula are used with English Learners in your district and promising practice sites? How are these materials and approaches integrated within promising practice sites and expansion sites?

EL population targeted by promising practice. Are there any unique characteristics of your EL student population? *Probe: multiple languages, dialects, migrant students, other parent/community needs, etc*. In what ways has the promising practice been designed to address these unique needs? Is your district and/or the schools named in your grant using any instructional technology programs/software to target instruction for EL students?

Curricular approaches for EL students. Is there a set-aside time where students receive ELD? How is this organized? How are students placed in this set-aside time? Does your district or school site require or use targeted academic intervention strategies to provide additional instructional minutes to EL students and when are these offered? **[Very similar to Organizational Structures questions in Section II above; may not be necessary]**

Outcomes. ***[Referring to AMAO data for the school/district]*** To what do you attribute the increase/decrease in AMAO 1 (moving EL students at least one CELDT level annually)? To

what do you attribute the increase/decrease in AMAO 2 (increasing the annual percentage of EL students who meet English language proficiency)?

VI. **Student Placement, Monitoring & Support**-Describe how placement and monitoring of EL students by teachers within the promising practice are effectively implemented to support the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.

Placement decisions for EL students and additional supports for students. How are placement decisions made? What types of intervention and/or support programs exist for students identified as not meeting English language and academic English language proficiency levels?

Assessments for EL students. What assessments do you use to assess English language proficiency of EL students? How is data collected about students used to make place decisions?

Improvements in performance. How effective has the promising practice been at moving EL students in terms of CELDT proficiency levels? Has the average length of time been reduced?

VII. **Effectiveness and Replicability**-What basic elements need to be in place to successfully replicate the promising practice, and how effective is the promising practice in the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development?

Replicability. What emerging trends are present in the promising practices that show the greatest level of effectiveness and replicability as measured by statewide as well as local formal and informal assessment measures? What features of the promising practice could be replicated in any setting? What challenges or unique characteristics of the educational setting might reduce the likelihood of replication at other sites? *Probe: Are there any unique school characteristics (i.e., master schedule, school size, setting, and location) that suggest that the promising practice might encounter difficulties in scale up to other schools?*

Questions for Participating Teacher Focus Group

Record names of teachers, school, grade level, subject taught, experience, credential

1. Please describe your participation in professional development or training offered through the ELLPP grant?
    a. How many sessions/hours have you participated in?
    b. What was the content focus of these trainings or workshops?
    c. How large were the trainings?
    d. Were the trainers organized and prepared? Engaging?
    e. Were there opportunities for small group and/or interactive exercises?

2. What follow-up training or coaching did you participate in after the initial training? Do you participate in a Professional Learning Community (PLC)? Please describe. *Probe: How different in your involvement in a PLC compared to traditional or previous grade level or departmental collaboration meetings?*

3. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with the professional development or training you have received to support English Learners?

4. In your view, how strong is your district's commitment to improving student achievement for ELs? What else could they be doing to support you or your school in improving student achievement for this group of students?

5. Have you received training in the use of data to make instructional and placement decisions for your students? What improvements are you seeing as a result of integrating the use of data in your instruction?

6. Describe the programs or other support or intervention strategies available to EL students in your school? Have they been effective at improving student achievement?

7. *[Referring to AMAO data for the school/district]* To what do you attribute the increase/decrease in AMAO 1 (moving EL students at least one CELDT level annually)? To what do you attribute the increase/decrease in AMAO 2 (increasing the annual percentage of EL students who meet English language proficiency)?

8. What are the greatest needs of EL students that are currently not being met in your school or district?

Questions for Principal

Name of principal, Name of School, number of years principal at this school

1. What is your philosophy/vision of education for EL students in your school? How close are you to the "ideal" and "practice" in this school? What would help?

2. How informed and involved are you of the activities of the promising practice at this school?

3. How has the promising practice affected the quality of teaching at your school for EL students?

4. Have the logistics of the professional development offered worked for you and your schools? For example, is the teacher out the classroom too much? Has the stipend been sufficient?

5. What support do you wish you had to improve the achievement of EL students in your school?

6. ***[Referring to AMAO data for the school/district]*** To what do you attribute the increase/decrease in AMAO 1 (moving EL students at least one CELDT level annually)? To what do you attribute the increase/decrease in AMAO 2 (increasing the annual percentage of EL students who meet English language proficiency)?

Questions for Trainers/Site Leadership

Name, Title, Organization

1. What is your role in the promising practice? How many days of professional development, coaching or lesson study are you providing?

2. What is the content and goals of the professional development? What curriculum, handouts or resources do you use in your professional development?

3. What research base do you use in your work? (Get actual sources or authors or other trainers)

4. How has your work with the district changed (or not) their work?

5. What impact do you think you will have on the classroom or teacher level? Will it be measurable and in what ways? *Probe: Where would you expect to see the greatest impact?*

6. What is the most effective component of this promising practice? What needs improvement?

Questions for Students

Opening Activities

- How often does your teacher provide a "hook" or a warm-up prior to the lesson in order to get students' attention and show you what you will be learning?
- Does your teacher usually explain what standard/lesson objective you are working on each day or week?

Direct Instruction

- Does your teacher talk about what you should already know? Do you discuss and review prior knowledge before starting to learn new material? Do you participate in brainstorming or review key vocabulary?
- During the actual lesson, how much time is devoted to the teacher talking or lecturing? *Probe: Do you feel that your teacher should talk less?*
- Does your teacher model/demonstrate what you are expected to do as part of a classroom assignment?
- Does your teacher provide visual tools, graphic organizers, or other charts to help organize what you are learning?
- Does your teacher make connections to previous learning or real life examples?
- How much oral language practice do you get in a typical class period/during ELD time?

Checking for Understanding & Differentiation

- Do you usually feel comfortable asking questions and sharing answers in class? *Probe: Does the teacher include non-volunteers during questioning or other methods of checking for understanding?*
- What does your teacher do to make sure that most students understand what is taught? *Probe: How does your teacher check to make sure that students are keeping up in class?*
- Is your teacher usually able to explain ideas and concepts in more than one way? *Probe: If many students are confused, does your teacher repeat it again or teach it in a new way?*
- Are students ever sorted into different groups? If so how or by what criteria? *Probe: Does your teacher spend more time with students who are struggling?*
- How often do you work in pairs or small groups to complete assignments or compare work?
- How often do you do hands-on activities or projects in your class?
- Do you ever present what you have learning or what your worked on to the class, either individually or as a group?

Assessment & Expectations

- Are your teachers clear about what they expect from you in class? *Probe: Do you know what you specifically need to do to advance to the next English proficiency level?*
- What does your teacher do to let you know that you are making progress or need to work harder? *Probe: What kinds of feedback do you get? How often?*
- If you are experiencing difficulty, what help is available from your teacher? Probe: Can you get tutoring and other help if you're having trouble in school? Are these services dependent on the teacher or available through the larger school?

Questions for Parents/Community Members

- In what ways have you been involved in the school?
- In what ways does the school communicate with you about your children or students, its programs, and how it plans to support English learners?
- Has the school improved during the past few years? *Probe: What evidence or data has been shared with you to showcase improvements in students' English language proficiency?*
- Does your child receive the support they need to improve? What programs have they participated in that you feel have been most beneficial?
- What opportunities are available to you to improve your ability to support your children's education?
- What would you like to see happen at the school to improve educational opportunities and achievement among EL students?

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
Demographic Data, School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- **Columns C-G measure the school-wide enrollment from 2004 to 2008 by school within each Local Education Agency. The following column H or Net is the difference in growth between 2008 and 2004.**
- **Total EL enrollment 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **Total percentage of EL enrollment 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables

In order to begin to profile the LEAs participating in the ELLPP Evaluation Study, Public *Works*, Inc. (PW) prepared data tables using data available from CDE through Dataquest for all the schools identified by the ELLPP sites as participating in the ELLPP grant. This information was compiled as a preliminary review of school and EL demographics, CELDT levels, and measures used for API, AYP, and NCLB Title III accountability systems. This data has been used in preparation for the site visits to each site and will be used in the development of the outcome study.

Tab #	Title	Description	Years
1	Enrollment	• School-wide enrollment, # of ELs enrolled, and % of ELs enrolled • Net difference in enrollment overall and for ELs 2007 to 2009	2004-08
2	CELDT	• # of EL students • % of ELs enrolled by California English Language Development Test (CELDT) level	2008
3	API	• School-wide API Growth • EL API Growth • Net difference in achievement school-wide and for ELs from 2007 to 2009 *To meet the API requirement for AYP purposes, an LEA or school must demonstrate a growth of at least one point or a minimum API score of at least 650.*[1]	2004-08
4 & 5	ELA AYP Math AYP	• School-wide AYP ELA and Math • EL AYP ELA and Math • Net difference in achievement school-wide and for ELs from 2007 to 2009 *To meet 2009 AYP, the required percentage of students proficient or above:* • *For elementary schools, middle schools, and elementary school districts in ELA is now 46.0, in mathematics 47.5.* • *For high schools and high school districts in ELA is now 44.5, in mathematics 43.5.* • *For unified school districts, high school districts, and county offices of education in ELA is now 45.0, in mathematics 45.5.*[2]	2004-08

[1] From the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Guide, California Department of Education.
[2] From the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Guide, California Department of Education.

Tab #	Title	Description	Years
6	Title III AMAOs	• AMAO 1 = % of ELs Making Annual Progress in Learning English (CELDT levels 1, 2, and 3 are expected to gain one level; CELDT levels 4 and 5 who are not yet proficient are expected to achieve proficiency on the CELDT; and ELs who are English proficient are expected to maintain that level) • AMAO 2 = % of ELs Attaining English Proficiency on the CELDT (Overall performance level of 4 or 5 overall and at least level 3 for each CELDT domain) *AMAO 1 and 2 are performance objectives, or targets, that Title III subgrantees must meet each year for ELs. All LEAs and consortia receiving a Title III-Limited English Proficient (LEP) grant are required to meet the two English language proficiency AMAOs. A third AMAO based on AYP information is also required. However, AMAO 3 was not used in the determination of funding for the ELLPP grant and is not included in the data tables. AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 are calculated based on data from the CELDT.*	2004-08
7-11	- ELA - Math - 8th Grade - - Algebra I - 9th Grade - - Algebra I - Geometry	• School-wide % proficient and advanced on the CST for each subject area • EL % proficient and advanced on the CST for each subject area • Net difference in achievement school-wide and for ELs from 2007 to 2009 on the CST for each subject area	2004-08

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
CELDT Enrollment by Level

Table Description

- **Percentage of EL by CELDT Level**

Name of LEA	School	N of EL Students	% of EL by CELDT Level				
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
ABC Unified	Artesia High	398	13%	14%	34%	29%	10%
	Willow Elementary	208	14%	17%	40%	24%	5%
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	54	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Atwater Elementary	Thomas Olaeta Elementary	184	11%	12%	40%	31%	6%
Bakersfield City	Casa Loma Elementary	285	24%	25%	34%	15%	2%
	Frank West Elementary	199	23%	24%	33%	18%	2%
	Munsey Elementary	164	17%	23%	41%	17%	2%
Brentwood Union Elementary	Brentwood Elementary	167	14%	15%	35%	30%	6%
	Edna Hill Middle	145	5%	12%	40%	37%	6%
Ceres Unified	Carroll Fowler Elementary	196	14%	18%	35%	28%	5%
	Don Pedro Elementary	259	19%	23%	34%	18%	6%
	M. Robert Adkison Elementary	274	15%	22%	44%	16%	3%
	Samuel Vaughn Elementary	259	12%	15%	41%	25%	7%
	Walter White Elementary	253	27%	19%	37%	15%	2%
Chula Vista Elementary	Valle Lindo Elementary	205	25%	21%	34%	18%	2%
Coachella Valley Unified	Bobby Duke Middle	218	11%	19%	33%	27%	10%
	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	551	7%	13%	38%	35%	7%
	Toro Canyon Middle	586	13%	22%	37%	26%	2%
	West Shores High	189	9%	17%	31%	35%	8%
Desert Sands Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	347	15%	21%	34%	27%	3%
	Dr. Reynaldo J. Carreon Jr. Academy	308	20%	24%	29%	23%	4%
El Monte City Elementary	Legore Elementary	250	10%	24%	40%	22%	4%
Escondido Union	Central Elementary	529	19%	20%	34%	20%	7%
Evergreen Elementary	Cadwallader Elementary	191	19%	20%	40%	17%	4%
	Carolyn A. Clark Elementary	189	4%	8%	39%	35%	14%
	Cedar Grove Elementary	219	12%	16%	32%	33%	7%
	Chaboya Middle	116	12%	15%	31%	31%	11%
	Dove Hill Elementary	298	15%	21%	37%	21%	6%
	Evergreen Elementary	172	11%	12%	21%	32%	24%
	Holly Oak Elementary	257	17%	16%	38%	21%	8%
	John J. Montgomery Elementary	278	24%	23%	31%	17%	5%
	O. B. Whaley Elementary	445	23%	18%	41%	15%	3%
	Quimby Oak Middle	151	4%	7%	22%	42%	25%
Garvey Elementary	Bitely (Arlene) Elementary	288	21%	23%	34%	19%	3%
	Dewey Avenue Elementary	164	16%	19%	43%	19%	3%
	Duff (Margaret) Elementary	200	23%	22%	37%	16%	2%
	Emerson (Ralph Waldo) Elementary	270	20%	23%	32%	20%	5%
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	210	15%	16%	31%	32%	6%
	Hillcrest Elementary	164	16%	20%	29%	28%	7%
	Marshall (John) Elementary	161	18%	23%	34%	21%	4%
	Monterey Vista Elementary	195	15%	16%	36%	25%	8%
	Rice (Eldridge) Elementary	301	19%	22%	39%	18%	2%
	Sanchez (George I.) Elementary	255	20%	19%	39%	19%	3%

Name of LEA	School	N of EL Students	% of EL by CELDT Level				
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	129	13%	7%	28%	45%	7%
	Willard (Frances E.) Elementary	314	17%	22%	40%	16%	5%
Glendale Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	115	12%	13%	30%	32%	13%
	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	118	0%	1%	9%	55%	35%
	Balboa Elementary	290	12%	12%	33%	25%	18%
	Benjamin Franklin Elementary	137	19%	18%	31%	24%	8%
	Cerritos Elementary	236	14%	15%	33%	29%	9%
	Columbus Elementary	327	20%	14%	32%	27%	7%
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	169	10%	8%	18%	40%	24%
	Daily (Allan F.) High (Continuation)	82	0%	8%	43%	40%	9%
	Dunsmore Elementary	53	10%	11%	20%	35%	24%
	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	278	25%	7%	21%	30%	17%
	Glendale Senior High	526	20%	16%	27%	28%	9%
	Glenoaks Elementary	139	14%	13%	36%	20%	17%
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	382	20%	15%	22%	35%	8%
	Horace Mann Elementary	436	19%	23%	35%	18%	5%
	John C. Fremont Elementary	145	13%	9%	24%	31%	23%
	John Marshall Elementary	295	15%	16%	38%	23%	8%
	John Muir Elementary	355	18%	16%	38%	21%	7%
	La Crescenta Elementary	115	17%	8%	24%	31%	20%
	Mark Keppel Elementary	307	21%	17%	34%	21%	7%
	Monte Vista Elementary	92	10%	7%	32%	29%	22%
	Mountain Avenue Elementary	64	14%	10%	32%	28%	16%
	R. D. White Elementary	359	17%	16%	30%	25%	12%
	Rosemont Middle	134	8%	6%	10%	31%	45%
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	301	15%	7%	23%	37%	18%
	Thomas Edison Elementary	360	16%	19%	36%	22%	7%
	Valley View Elementary	81	13%	11%	28%	33%	15%
	Verdugo Woodlands Elementary	161	6%	12%	35%	36%	11%
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	255	19%	7%	24%	31%	19%
Imperial County Office of Education	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	327	11%	16%	44%	25%	4%
	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**	722	19%	17%	33%	24%	7%
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**	185	8%	18%	45%	26%	3%
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary **(El Centro Elementary School District)**	271	27%	21%	32%	16%	4%
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	412	13%	19%	37%	27%	4%
Irvine Unified	College Park Elementary	208	31%	13%	24%	22%	10%
	Culverdale Elementary	244	31%	16%	28%	17%	8%
	Northwood Elementary	121	13%	20%	28%	26%	13%
	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	94	33%	24%	10%	16%	17%
	University High	203	18%	15%	20%	31%	16%
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante	185	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lennox Elementary	Buford Elementary	590	17%	21%	36%	21%	5%
	Campus Park Elementary	338	18%	23%	36%	21%	2%

Name of LEA	School	N of EL Students	% of EL by CELDT Level				
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Livingston Union Elementary	Selma Herndon Elementary	384	17%	23%	38%	19%	3%
	Yamato Colony Elementary	339	18%	21%	37%	20%	4%
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	374	14%	19%	35%	24%	8%
Marysville Joint Unified	Johnson Park Elementary	163	12%	17%	32%	27%	12%
	Olivehurst Elementary	210	11%	13%	39%	25%	12%
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	363	30%	16%	30%	17%	7%
Mountain Empire Unified	Potrero Elementary	117	24%	16%	33%	23%	4%
New Haven Unified	Searles Elementary	312	15%	22%	36%	21%	6%
Newhall Elementary	Dr. J. Michael McGrath Elementary	350	16%	24%	37%	19%	4%
	Newhall Elementary	339	16%	22%	42%	16%	4%
	Old Orchard Elementary	143	16%	17%	33%	26%	8%
	Peachland Avenue Elementary	205	23%	19%	24%	23%	11%
	Wiley Canyon Elementary	348	9%	16%	32%	30%	13%
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	206	10%	9%	38%	35%	8%
Novato Unified	Loma Verde Elementary	176	23%	22%	34%	19%	2%
	Olive Elementary	109	16%	21%	39%	21%	3%
Oak Grove Elementary	Baldwin (Julia) Elementary	145	7%	20%	48%	19%	6%
	Christopher Elementary	306	18%	23%	37%	20%	2%
	Del Roble Elementary	223	8%	21%	39%	24%	8%
	Edenvale Elementary	410	26%	24%	30%	16%	4%
	Glider Elementary	185	11%	19%	31%	28%	11%
	Hayes Elementary	181	11%	13%	32%	27%	17%
	Ledesma (Rita) Elementary	150	13%	20%	37%	22%	8%
	Miner (George) Elementary	211	11%	21%	41%	25%	2%
	Parkview Elementary	280	13%	16%	35%	29%	7%
	Stipe (Samuel) Elementary	302	16%	24%	40%	17%	3%
Oxnard Union High	Adolfo Camarillo High	256	7%	7%	23%	33%	30%
	Channel Islands High	798	8%	9%	39%	31%	13%
	Frontier High	146	1%	10%	26%	51%	12%
	Hueneme High	626	12%	14%	38%	31%	5%
	Oxnard High	493	17%	14%	36%	27%	6%
	Pacifica High	1,018	10%	15%	30%	30%	15%
	Rio Mesa High	420	5%	10%	30%	39%	16%
Pasadena Unified	Altadena Elementary	104	15%	16%	38%	27%	4%
	Jackson Elementary	173	9%	19%	45%	23%	4%
	Jefferson Elementary	285	7%	18%	42%	25%	8%
	Longfellow (Henry W.) Elementary	177	11%	15%	48%	23%	3%
	Madison Elementary	375	12%	20%	45%	20%	3%
	Washington Accelerated Elementary	373	9%	17%	45%	23%	6%
	Willard Elementary	180	8%	7%	18%	48%	19%
Petaluma Joint Union High	Casa Grande High	317	14%	11%	29%	33%	13%
	Kenilworth Junior High	194	11%	11%	19%	35%	24%
	Petaluma High	144	8%	10%	28%	40%	14%

Name of LEA	School	N of EL Students	% of EL by CELDT Level				
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Petaluma Junior High	93	5%	6%	23%	42%	24%
Salida Union Elementary	Salida Elementary	168	12%	14%	41%	23%	10%
San Diego County Office of Education	Cuyamaca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	271	36%	23%	27%	12%	2%
	Kimball Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	296	46%	18%	21%	12%	3%
	Las Palmas Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	456	28%	19%	30%	18%	5%
	Lilac School **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District)**	140	26%	21%	36%	14%	3%
	Naranca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	346	25%	23%	32%	17%	3%
	Olivewood **(National Elementary School District)**	544	23%	22%	34%	17%	4%
	Valley Center Elementary **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified)**	96	8%	16%	36%	34%	6%
San Jose Unified	Grant Elementary	300	22%	21%	39%	16%	2%
	Horace Mann Elementary	291	20%	21%	34%	20%	5%
	River Glen	132	13%	16%	32%	34%	5%
	Washington Elementary	445	29%	21%	29%	16%	5%
San Leandro Unified	Washington Elementary	190	23%	23%	33%	16%	5%
Sanger Unified	Del Rey Elementary	152	14%	25%	42%	17%	2%
	Fairmont Elementary	108	10%	19%	39%	27%	5%
	Jackson Elementary	110	24%	24%	30%	20%	2%
	Lone Star Elementary	238	13%	28%	41%	15%	3%
	Madison Elementary	145	13%	31%	41%	13%	2%
	Sanger High	444	6%	12%	33%	40%	9%
Santa Ana Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	935	24%	24%	33%	16%	3%
	Andrew Jackson Elementary	1,000	20%	19%	37%	19%	5%
	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	153	1%	1%	36%	53%	9%
	George Washington Carver Elementary	547	33%	26%	32%	8%	1%
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	388	2%	6%	42%	43%	7%
	Greenville Fundamental Elementary	367	10%	12%	35%	34%	9%
	Jefferson Elementary	595	20%	21%	38%	18%	3%
	Jim Thorpe Fundamental	372	8%	10%	42%	33%	7%
	John Muir Fundamental Elementary	305	6%	15%	36%	31%	12%
	Jose Sepulveda Elementary	465	23%	22%	39%	14%	2%
	Madison Elementary	698	19%	17%	38%	22%	4%
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary	691	25%	20%	35%	17%	3%
	Martin R. Heninger Elementary	620	22%	14%	38%	23%	3%
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	463	1%	8%	42%	36%	13%
	Santa Ana High	1,441	13%	13%	37%	32%	5%
	Santiago Elementary	421	13%	18%	43%	22%	4%
	Taft Elementary	411	16%	22%	38%	21%	3%
	Theodore Roosevelt Elementary	775	27%	20%	33%	15%	5%
	Wilson Elementary	706	27%	27%	31%	13%	2%
Sierra Sands Unified	Faller Elementary	46	17%	17%	32%	34%	0%
	Gateway Elementary	30	16%	22%	30%	24%	8%
	Inyokern Elementary	16	19%	19%	31%	31%	0%
	Las Flores Elementary	31	17%	14%	26%	34%	9%

Name of LEA	School	N of EL Students	% of EL by CELDT Level				
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Pierce Elementary	101	12%	25%	37%	23%	3%
	Richmond Elementary	27	38%	6%	32%	18%	6%
Sonoma County Office of Education	Bellevue Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	355	24%	21%	36%	16%	3%
	Jack London Elementary **(Piner-Olivet Union Elementary School District)**	90	6%	14%	40%	28%	12%
	Meadow View Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	322	10%	21%	35%	26%	8%
	Mountain Shadows Middle **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	131	7%	9%	38%	36%	10%
	Waldo Rohnert Elementary **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	166	15%	24%	38%	17%	6%
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Las Palmas Elementary	265	20%	24%	30%	21%	5%
Ventura Unified	De Anza Middle	207	11%	9%	31%	35%	14%
	E. P. Foster Elementary	271	24%	24%	36%	15%	1%
	Juanamaria Elementary	64	11%	18%	38%	30%	3%
	Montalvo Elementary	142	14%	26%	44%	14%	2%
	Sheridan Way Elementary	346	33%	24%	28%	12%	3%
Whittier City Elementary	Orange Grove Elementary	79	20%	29%	30%	14%	7%
Woodland Joint Unified	Beamer Elementary	210	28%	25%	30%	14%	3%
	Lee Middle	176	8%	6%	35%	42%	9%
	Ramon S. Tafoya Elementary	361	12%	22%	36%	24%	6%
	Rhoda Maxwell Elementary	202	16%	19%	41%	21%	3%
	Willow Spring Elementary	142	17%	20%	31%	26%	6%
	Woodland Prairie Elementary	422	24%	23%	36%	14%	3%

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
API Growth, School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- **School-wide API growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **EL API growth 2006-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL API achievement from 2006-08**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide Growth API						EL Subgroup Growth API						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Artesia High	577	595	641	665	672	**+95**			588	574	576	**-12**			-53	-91	-96	**-43**
	Willow Elementary	702	726	730	714	734	**+32**			726	681	709	**-17**			-4	-33	-25	**-21**
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	460	526	649	642	654	**+194**			615			**N/A**			-34	N/A	N/A	**N/A**
Atwater Elementary	Thomas Olaeta Elementary	713	757	759	767	759	**+46**			709	742	740	**+31**			-50	-25	-19	**+31**
Bakersfield City	Casa Loma Elementary	607	678	695	692	691	**+84**			664	682	687	**+23**			-31	-10	-4	**+27**
	Frank West Elementary	591	658	710	697	735	**+144**			685	676	727	**+42**			-25	-21	-8	**+17**
	Munsey Elementary	605	643	664	671	701	**+96**			630	683	708	**+78**			-34	+12	+7	**+41**
Brentwood Union Elementary	Brentwood Elementary	742	771	787	791	796	**+54**			669	683	686	**+17**			-118	-108	-110	**+8**
	Edna Hill Middle	718	766	791	770	778	**+60**			671	667	698	**+27**			-120	-103	-80	**+40**
Ceres Unified	Carroll Fowler Elementary	707	716	727	746	771	**+64**			659	691	720	**+61**			-68	-55	-51	**+17**
	Don Pedro Elementary	706	721	770	776	772	**+66**			760	754	753	**-7**			-10	-22	-19	**-9**
	M. Robert Adkison Elementary			697	711	734	**+37**			657	688	714	**+57**			-40	-23	-20	**+20**
	Samuel Vaughn Elementary	760	753	777	767	773	**+13**			729	711	732	**+3**			-48	-56	-41	**+7**
	Walter White Elementary	703	712	668	666	690	**-13**			653	641	673	**+20**			-15	-25	-17	**-2**
Chula Vista Elementary	Valle Lindo Elementary	704	719	742	754	764	**+60**			685	696	691	**+6**			-57	-58	-73	**-16**
Coachella Valley Unified	Bobby Duke Middle					631	**N/A**					615	**N/A**			N/A	N/A	-16	**N/A**
	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	569	583	602	612	631	**+62**			585	598	613	**+28**			-17	-14	-18	**-1**
	Toro Canyon Middle	509	525	552	580	596	**+87**			537	570	582	**+45**			-15	-10	-14	**+1**
	West Shores High	567	573	589	582	587	**+20**			547	569	595	**+48**			-42	-13	+8	**+50**
Desert Sands Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	728	777	756	778	831	**+103**			730	745	799	**+69**			-26	-33	-32	**-6**
	Dr. Reynaldo J. Carreon Jr. Academy	652	714	763	786	817	**+165**			752	771	801	**+49**			-11	-15	-16	**-5**
El Monte City Elementary	Legore Elementary	690	726	752	748	791	**+101**			742	718	734	**-8**			-10	-30	-57	**-47**
Escondido Union	Central Elementary	643	721	727	729	732	**+89**			709	710	713	**+4**			-18	-19	-19	**-1**
Evergreen Elementary	Cadwallader Elementary	801	796	815	778	811	**+10**			776	722	767	**-9**			-39	-56	-44	**-5**
	Carolyn A. Clark Elementary		897	918	916	915	**+18**			886		861	**-25**			-32	N/A	-54	**-22**
	Cedar Grove Elementary	782	800	815	812	820	**+38**			803	792	814	**+11**			-12	-20	-6	**+6**
	Chaboya Middle	830	843	846	840	870	**+40**			741	715		**-26**			-105	-125	N/A	**-20**
	Dove Hill Elementary	738	769	781	778	797	**+59**			779	765	788	**+9**			-2	-13	-9	**-7**
	Evergreen Elementary	881	891	878	893	913	**+32**			838	869	897	**+59**			-40	-24	-16	**+24**
	Holly Oak Elementary	771	801	811	786	797	**+26**			795	765	770	**-25**			-16	-21	-27	**-11**
	John J. Montgomery Elementary	762	768	766	768	776	**+14**			763	767	751	**-12**			-3	-1	-25	**-22**
	O. B. Whaley Elementary	775	795	806	795	815	**+40**			789	775	798	**+9**			-17	-20	-17	**0**
	Quimby Oak Middle	779	812	819	794	817	**+38**			759	714	722	**-37**			-60	-80	-95	**-35**
Garvey Elementary	Bitely (Arlene) Elementary	740	774	761	785	795	**+55**			731	764	773	**+42**			-30	-21	-22	**+8**
	Dewey Avenue Elementary	710	697	749	777	803	**+93**			757	776	805	**+48**			+8	-1	+2	**-6**
	Duff (Margaret) Elementary	657	703	714	718	743	**+86**			688	696	724	**+36**			-26	-22	-19	**+7**
	Emerson (Ralph Waldo) Elementary	733	720	762	757	762	**+29**			741	724	738	**-3**			-21	-33	-24	**-3**
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	709	711	729	733	765	**+56**			670	661	690	**+20**			-59	-72	-75	**-16**
	Hillcrest Elementary	763	781	793	791	828	**+65**			775	760	791	**+16**			-18	-31	-37	**-19**
	Marshall (John) Elementary	676	724	756	749	777	**+101**			748	740	753	**+5**			-8	-9	-24	**-16**
	Monterey Vista Elementary	808	832	825	834	873	**+65**			811	820	866	**+55**			-14	-14	-7	**+7**
	Rice (Eldridge) Elementary	721	732	761	764	773	**+52**			754	757	770	**+16**			-7	-7	-3	**+4**
	Sanchez (George I.) Elementary	709	723	769	765	798	**+89**			756	748	789	**+33**			-13	-17	-9	**+4**
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	691	691	721	737	798	**+107**			665	679	749	**+84**			-56	-58	-49	**+7**
	Willard (Frances E.) Elementary	725	759	738	757	775	**+50**			724	748	757	**+33**			-14	-9	-18	**-4**
Glendale Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	864	874	880	867	883	**+19**				853	864	**+11**			N/A	-14	-19	**-5**
	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	841	861	856	848	870	**+29**												
	Balboa Elementary	803	816	834	831	845	**+42**			813	810	819	**+6**			-21	-21	-26	**-5**
	Benjamin Franklin Elementary	753	783	771	801	816	**+63**			743	777	783	**+40**			-28	-24	-33	**-5**
	Cerritos Elementary	693	736	725	733	753	**+60**			689	694	713	**+24**			-36	-39	-40	**-4**
	Columbus Elementary	756	781	787	797	806	**+50**			781	781	786	**+5**			-6	-16	-20	**-14**
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	848	854	865	861	870	**+22**			786	788	811	**+25**			-79	-73	-59	**+20**
	Daily (Allan F.) High (Continuation)	471	535	547	677	626	**+155**												
	Dunsmore Elementary	909	895	915	907	895	**-14**												
	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	751	770	770	773	791	**+40**			706	723	773	**+67**			-64	-50	-18	**+46**
	Glendale Senior High	701	722	726	733	740	**+39**			662	663	680	**+18**			-64	-70	-60	**+4**
	Glenoaks Elementary	835	839	842	829	856	**+21**			813	796	820	**+7**			-29	-33	-36	**-7**
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	714	752	757	747	755	**+41**			695	686	695	**0**			-62	-61	-60	**+2**
	Horace Mann Elementary	689	702	744	772	794	**+105**			745	771	791	**+46**			+1	-1	-3	**-4**
	John C. Fremont Elementary	845	857	861	868	874	**+29**			828	847	858	**+30**			-33	-21	-16	**+17**
	John Marshall Elementary	727	753	773	783	822	**+95**			777	763	808	**+31**			+4	-20	-14	**-18**
	John Muir Elementary	731	743	761	784	798	**+67**			756	776	781	**+25**			-5	-8	-17	**-12**
	La Crescenta Elementary	861	862	875	898	900	**+39**			850	883	882	**+32**			-25	-15	-18	**+7**
	Mark Keppel Elementary	815	812	832	819	827	**+12**			809	794	802	**-7**			-23	-25	-25	**-2**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide Growth API						EL Subgroup Growth API						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
	Monte Vista Elementary	911	903	911	920	929	**+18**					897	**N/A**			N/A	N/A	-32	**N/A**
	Mountain Avenue Elementary	911	936	940	918	926	**+15**												
	R. D. White Elementary	785	804	817	831	835	**+50**			792	804	806	**+14**			-25	-27	-29	**-4**
	Rosemont Middle	863	876	893	888	912	**+49**					885	**N/A**			N/A	N/A	-27	**N/A**
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	686	734	726	730	739	**+53**			686	698	721	**+35**			-40	-32	-18	**+22**
	Thomas Edison Elementary	700	709	727	732	764	**+64**			720	717	744	**+24**			-7	-15	-20	**-13**
	Valley View Elementary	894	902	909	920	915	**+21**			902	905	905	**+3**			-7	-15	-10	**-3**
	Verdugo Woodlands Elementary	869	854	877	875	886	**+17**			837	832	838	**+1**			-40	-43	-48	**-8**
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	799	812	820	827	822	**+23**			745	777	789	**+44**			-75	-50	-33	**+42**
	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	614	673	703	673	702	**88**			643	593	635	**-8**			-60	-80	-67	**-7**
	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**	624	646	678	664	706	**+82**			681	650	699	**+18**			+3	-14	-7	**-10**
Imperial County Office of Education	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary **(El Centro Elementary School District)**	665	711	756	751	788	**123**			733	728	777	**44**			-23	-23	-11	**12**
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**		383	426	461	472	**+89**			382	377	418	**+36**			-44	-84	-54	**-10**
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	598	625	648	675	682	**84**			641	658	640	**-1**			-7	-17	-42	**-35**
	College Park Elementary	865	887	865	900	896	**+31**			869	891	874	**+5**			+4	-9	-22	**-26**
	Culverdale Elementary	844	854	850	861	851	**+7**			870	855	833	**-37**			+20	-6	-18	**-38**
Irvine Unified	Northwood Elementary	872	880	897	888	911	**+39**			866	855	871	**+5**			-31	-33	-40	**-9**
	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	882	911	905	919	939	**+57**												
	University High	872	890	891	881	897	**+25**			816	771	786	**-30**			-75	-110	-111	**-36**
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante	645	754	858	834	782	**+137**			811	798	739	**-72**			-47	-36	-43	**+4**
Lennox Elementary	Buford Elementary	654	700	705	717	738	**+84**			688	703	726	**+38**			-17	-14	-12	**+5**
	Campus Park Elementary	639	675	717	706	734	**+95**			706	690	720	**+14**			-11	-16	-14	**-3**
Livingston Union Elementary	Selma Herndon Elementary	668	701	721	729	758	**+90**			698	712	731	**+33**			-23	-17	-27	**-4**
	Yamato Colony Elementary	737	758	772	771	797	**+60**			760	751	776	**+16**			-12	-20	-21	**-9**
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	660	695	749	727	763	**+103**			740	712	752	**+12**			-9	-15	-11	**-2**
Marysville Joint Unified	Johnson Park Elementary	746	759	801	772	761	**+15**			812	804	795	**-17**			+11	+32	+34	**+23**
	Olivehurst Elementary	692	715	760	762	760	**+68**			706	726	748	**+42**			-54	-36	-12	**+42**
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	594	652	688	735	721	**+127**			653	704	698	**+45**			-35	-31	-23	**+12**
Mountain Empire Unified	Potrero Elementary	663	668	702	758	763	**+100**			699	730	751	**+52**			-3	-28	-12	**-9**
New Haven Unified	Searles Elementary	728	748	757	751	768	**+40**			736	742	751	**+15**			-21	-9	-17	**+4**
	Dr. J. Michael McGrath Elementary	706	726	745	776	833	**+127**			696	721	800	**+104**			-49	-55	-33	**+16**
	Newhall Elementary	753	798	812	803	793	**+40**			714	707	710	**-4**			-98	-96	-83	**+15**
Newhall Elementary	Old Orchard Elementary	834	856	859	862	864	**+30**				754	768	**+14**			N/A	-108	-96	**+12**
	Peachland Avenue Elementary	870	864	866	870	866	**-4**			757	752	772	**+15**			-109	-118	-94	**+15**
	Wiley Canyon Elementary	795	826	840	845	851	**+56**			763	788	793	**+30**			-77	-57	-58	**+19**
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	634	674	681	688	724	**+90**			616	653	665	**+49**			-65	-35	-59	**+6**
Novato Unified	Loma Verde Elementary	790	820	814	780	791	**+1**			770	716	739	**-31**			-44	-64	-52	**-8**
	Olive Elementary	781	798	831	817	805	**+24**			721	705	689	**-32**			-110	-112	-116	**-6**
	Baldwin (Julia) Elementary	785	778	797	781	799	**14**			788	733	770	**-18**			-9	-48	-29	**-20**
	Christopher Elementary	685	669	688	716	738	**53**			669	693	716	**47**			-19	-23	-22	**-3**
	Del Roble Elementary	727	734	762	737	750	**23**			743	709	695	**-48**			-19	-28	-55	**-36**
	Edenvale Elementary	699	720	751	740	731	**32**			734	717	705	**-29**			-17	-23	-26	**-9**
Oak Grove Elementary	Glider Elementary	798	815	809	813	831	**33**			787	782	796	**9**			-22	-31	-35	**-13**
	Hayes Elementary	758	777	789	786	799	**41**			760	763	752	**-8**			-29	-23	-47	**-18**
	Ledesma (Rita) Elementary	786	800	819	820	838	**52**			771	791	800	**29**			-48	-29	-38	**10**
	Miner (George) Elementary	726	741	769	795	791	**65**			751	790	778	**27**			-18	-5	-13	**5**
	Parkview Elementary	803	807	827	808	822	**19**			828	809	816	**-12**			1	1	-6	**-7**
	Stipe (Samuel) Elementary	697	718	717	763	730	**33**			692	741	702	**10**			-25	-22	-28	**-3**
	Adolfo Camarillo High	744	765	796	789	797	**+53**			637	639	730	**+93**			-159	-150	-67	**+92**
	Channel Islands High	616	648	649	666	665	**+49**			612	616	634	**+22**			-37	-50	-31	**+6**
	Frontier High	341	413	571	550	564	**+223**												
Oxnard Union High	Hueneme High	570	606	628	629	653	**+83**			576	600	631	**+55**			-52	-29	-22	**+30**
	Oxnard High	638	675	682	677	669	**+31**			601	600	608	**+7**			-81	-77	-61	**+20**
	Pacifica High	584	623	645	650	704	**+120**			582	592	670	**+88**			-63	-58	-34	**+29**
	Rio Mesa High	665	695	698	681	711	**+46**			609	598	644	**+35**			-89	-83	-67	**+22**
	Altadena Elementary	615	654	649	669	717	**+102**			696	676		**-20**			+47	+7	N/A	**-40**
	Jackson Elementary	649	679	687	713	718	**+69**			672	686	693	**+21**			-15	-27	-25	**-10**
Pasadena Unified	Jefferson Elementary	711	724	735	710	725	**+14**			713	682	684	**-29**			-22	-28	-41	**-19**
	Longfellow (Henry W.) Elementary	693	727	745	774	780	**+87**			722	755	756	**+34**			-23	-19	-24	**-1**
	Madison Elementary	647	687	712	716	709	**+62**			695	689	688	**-7**			-17	-27	-21	**-4**
	Washington Accelerated Elementary	655	725	740	744	779	**+124**			716	725	757	**+41**			-24	-19	-22	**+2**
	Casa Grande High	732					**N/A**												
Petaluma Joint Union High	Kenilworth Junior High	751					**N/A**												
	Petaluma High	710					**N/A**												

Name of LEA	School	School-wide Growth API						EL Subgroup Growth API						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
	Petaluma Junior High	748					**N/A**												
Salida Union Elementary	Salida Elementary	731	754	754	765	787	**+56**			702	706	725	**+23**			-52	-59	-62	**-10**
San Diego County Office of Education	Cuyamaca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	677	694	689	706	685	**+8**			640	652	616	**-24**			-49	-54	-69	**-20**
	Kimball Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	734	689	724	740	784	**50**			714	720	765	**51**			-10	-20	-19	**-9**
	Las Palmas Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	680	690	719	733	764	**84**			709	717	763	**54**			-10	-16	-1	**9**
	Lilac School **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District)**	733	811	842	835	848	**115**			714	689	720	**6**			-128	-146	-128	**0**
	Naranca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	676	686	707	738	761	**+85**			662	705	717	**+55**			-45	-33	-44	**+1**
	Olivewood **(National Elementary School District)**	743	737	743	727	756	**13**			718	705	745	**27**			-25	-22	-11	**14**
	Valley Center Elementary **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified)**	741	736	761	791	792	**+51**			620	690	694	**+74**			-141	-101	-98	**+43**
San Jose Unified	Grant Elementary	625	684	752	745	781	**+156**			707	712	751	**+44**			-45	-33	-30	**+15**
	Horace Mann Elementary	616	681	688	723	711	**+95**			664	720	680	**+16**			-24	-3	-31	**-7**
	River Glen	750	777	798	777	813	**+63**			726	691	741	**+15**			-72	-86	-72	**0**
	Washington Elementary	563	616	654	689	716	**+153**			651	673	706	**+55**			-3	-16	-10	**-7**
San Leandro Unified	Washington Elementary	649	679	690	729	687	**+38**			661	697	654	**-7**			-29	-32	-33	**-4**
Sanger Unified	Del Rey Elementary	577	635	685	762	753	**+176**			666	757	739	**+73**			-19	-5	-14	**+5**
	Fairmont Elementary	728	747	774	809	825	**+97**			685	750	765	**+80**			-89	-59	-60	**+29**
	Jackson Elementary	694	760	788	811	845	**+151**			702	747	776	**+74**			-86	-64	-69	**+17**
	Lone Star Elementary	707	787	789	774	817	**+110**			748	725	773	**+25**			-41	-49	-44	**-3**
	Madison Elementary	671	738	726	752	808	**+137**			644	726	775	**+131**			-82	-26	-33	**+49**
	Sanger High	668	716	735	725	750	**+82**			661	649	688	**+27**			-74	-76	-62	**+12**
Santa Ana Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	626	658	672	673	698	**+72**			670	666	695	**+25**			-2	-7	-3	**-1**
	Andrew Jackson Elementary	602	633	678	685	765	**+163**			670	670	753	**+83**			-8	-15	-12	**-4**
	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	767	782	804	798	815	**+48**			741	721	732	**-9**			-63	-77	-83	**-20**
	George Washington Carver Elementary	612	623	659	732	750	**+138**			660	730	740	**+80**			+1	-2	-10	**-11**
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	708	733	739	732	786	**+78**			708	673	731	**+23**			-31	-59	-55	**-24**
	Greenville Fundamental Elementary	855	855	868	854	857	**+2**			840	821	834	**-6**			-28	-33	-23	**+5**
	Jefferson Elementary	697	716	755	728	726	**+29**			736	714	710	**-26**			-19	-14	-16	**+3**
	Jim Thorpe Fundamental	793	810	818	815	847	**+54**			789	782	819	**+30**			-29	-33	-28	**+1**
	John Muir Fundamental Elementary	778	793	807	825	832	**+54**			779	802	807	**+28**			-28	-23	-25	**+3**
	Jose Sepulveda Elementary	598	633	656	636	666	**+68**			644	615	654	**+10**			-12	-21	-12	**0**
	Madison Elementary	690	726	741	784	794	**+104**			733	772	787	**+54**			-8	-12	-7	**+1**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary	579	621	641	675	759	**+180**			631	662	747	**+116**			-10	-13	-12	**-2**
	Martin R. Heninger Elementary	662	698	702	722	740	**+78**			696	695	726	**+30**			-6	-27	-14	**-8**
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	681	673	681	710	746	**+65**			660	669	701	**+41**			-21	-41	-45	**-24**
	Santa Ana High	611	642	662	622	618	**+7**			639	587	582	**-57**			-23	-35	-36	**-13**
	Santiago Elementary	745	757	751	776	778	**+33**			700	746	743	**+43**			-51	-30	-35	**+16**
	Taft Elementary	723	718	712	697	773	**+50**			691	673	759	**+68**			-21	-24	-14	**+7**
	Theodore Roosevelt Elementary	580	668	682	684	703	**+123**			677	679	697	**+20**			-5	-5	-6	**-1**
	Wilson Elementary	587	590	609	630	632	**+45**			607	628	625	**+18**			-2	-2	-7	**-5**
Sierra Sands Unified	Faller Elementary	777	798	824	814	812	**+35**												
	Gateway Elementary	812	841	813	824	824	**+12**												
	Inyokern Elementary	763	766	784	713	757	**-6**												
	Las Flores Elementary	830	842	831	808	814	**-16**												
	Pierce Elementary	706	747	742	789	774	**+68**			738	752	742	**+4**			-4	-37	-32	**-28**
	Richmond Elementary	830	846	783	755	796	**-34**												
Sonoma County Office of Education	Bellevue Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	654	693	674	675	702	**+48**			700	679	696	**-4**			+26	+4	-6	**-32**
	Jack London Elementary **(Piner-Olivet Union Elementary School District)**	776	802	806	821	826	**50**			756	765	782	**26**			-50	-56	-44	**6**
	Meadow View Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	658	685	720	741	740	**+82**			708	726	733	**+25**			-12	-15	-7	**+5**
	Mountain Shadows Middle **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	701	706	718	726	737	**+36**			640	637	647	**+7**			-78	-89	-90	**-12**
	Waldo Rohnert Elementary **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	717	734	754	725	731	**+14**			703	702	700	**-3**			-51	-23	-31	**+20**
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Las Palmas Elementary	712	695	710	722	734	**+22**			677	664	688	**+11**			-33	-58	-46	**-13**
Ventura Unified	De Anza Middle	635	670	691	701	698	**+63**			655	667	656	**+1**			-36	-34	-42	**-6**
	E. P. Foster Elementary	658	726	796	766	761	**+103**			782	744	717	**-65**			-14	-22	-44	**-30**
	Juanamaria Elementary	814	844	852	852	852	**+38**			730	752		**+22**			-122	-100	N/A	**+22**
	Montalvo Elementary	654	684	760	745	752	**+98**			689	686	655	**-34**			-71	-59	-97	**-26**
	Sheridan Way Elementary	669	676	698	700	682	**+13**			681	669	654	**-27**			-17	-31	-28	**-11**
Whittier City Elementary	Orange Grove Elementary	688	709	744	733	748	**+60**			743	728		**-15**			-1	-5	N/A	**-4**
Woodland Joint Unified	Beamer Elementary	648	713	725	731	768	**+120**			679	674	701	**+22**			-46	-57	-67	**-21**
	Lee Middle	632	655	691	696	704	**+72**			610	606	620	**+10**			-81	-90	-84	**-3**
	Ramon S. Tafoya Elementary	732	741	739	747	751	**+19**			670	689	691	**+21**			-69	-58	-60	**+9**
	Rhoda Maxwell Elementary	673	691	704	724	743	**+70**			691	701	723	**+32**			-13	-23	-20	**-7**
	Willow Spring Elementary	716	717	719	753	717	**+1**			664	706	685	**+21**			-55	-47	-32	**+23**
	Woodland Prairie Elementary	664	668	680	716	711	**+47**			635	689	690	**+55**			-45	-27	-21	**+24**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
AYP Growth (ELA), School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- **School-wide AYP growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **EL AYP growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL AYP achievement from 2004-08**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide AMAO in ELA						EL Subgroup AMAO in ELA						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Artesia High	27%	33%	37%	37%	45%	**+18%**	14%	18%	18%	15%	21%	**+7%**	-13%	-15%	-19%	-22%	-24%	**-11%**
	Willow Elementary	31%	37%	39%	35%	35%	**+4%**	21%	28%	36%	27%	27%	**+6%**	-10%	-9%	-3%	-8%	-8%	**+2%**
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	11%	13%	20%	19%	37%	**+26%**	4%	3%	8%	21%	29%	**+25%**	-7%	-10%	-12%	2%	-8%	**-1%**
Atwater Elementary	Thomas Olaeta Elementary	34%	39%	38%	45%	39%	**+5%**	16%	24%	23%	36%	33%	**+17%**	-18%	-15%	-15%	-9%	-6%	**+12%**
Bakersfield City	Casa Loma Elementary	19%	32%	35%	32%	32%	**+13%**	15%	21%	25%	28%	32%	**+17%**	-4%	-11%	-10%	-4%	0%	**+4%**
	Frank West Elementary	17%	25%	36%	33%	38%	**+21%**	6%	22%	32%	22%	38%	**+32%**	-11%	-3%	-4%	-11%	0%	**+11%**
	Munsey Elementary	18%	24%	24%	32%	29%	**+11%**	9%	13%	17%	34%	31%	**+22%**	-9%	-11%	-7%	2%	2%	**+11%**
Brentwood Union Elementary	Brentwood Elementary	40%	48%	50%	50%	53%	**+13%**	12%	20%	20%	24%	30%	**+18%**	-28%	-28%	-30%	-26%	-23%	**+5%**
	Edna Hill Middle	39%	48%	55%	49%	51%	**+12%**	15%	21%	26%	23%	32%	**+17%**	-24%	-27%	-29%	-26%	-19%	**+5%**
Ceres Unified	Carroll Fowler Elementary	26%	33%	36%	42%	42%	**+16%**	11%	17%	17%	29%	26%	**+15%**	-15%	-16%	-19%	-13%	-16%	**-1%**
	Don Pedro Elementary	30%	32%	46%	47%	46%	**+16%**	18%	21%	39%	39%	39%	**+21%**	-12%	-11%	-7%	-8%	-7%	**+5%**
	M. Robert Adkison Elementary			28%	27%	30%	**+2%**			16%	20%	23%	**+7%**			-12%	-7%	-7%	**+5%**
	Samuel Vaughn Elementary	37%	39%	44%	41%	44%	**+7%**	13%	22%	26%	25%	35%	**+22%**	-24%	-17%	-18%	-16%	-9%	**+15%**
	Walter White Elementary	27%	33%	30%	26%	32%	**+5%**	13%	24%	24%	21%	26%	**+13%**	-14%	-9%	-6%	-5%	-6%	**+8%**
Chula Vista Elementary	Valle Lindo Elementary	30%	36%	41%	43%	44%	**+14%**	12%	22%	28%	26%	29%	**+17%**	-18%	-14%	-13%	-17%	-15%	**+3%**
Coachella Valley Unified	Bobby Duke Middle		43%	29%		22%	**-21%**		29%	15%		18%	**-11%**		-14%	-14%		-4%	**+10%**
	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	12%	18%	18%	21%	26%	**+14%**	9%	14%	13%	18%	22%	**+13%**	-3%	-4%	-5%	-3%	-4%	**-1%**
	Toro Canyon Middle	9%		16%	19%	24%	**+15%**	7%		12%	18%	20%	**+13%**	-2%		-4%	-1%	-4%	**-2%**
	West Shores High	18%	26%		24%	26%	**+8%**	8%	19%		22%	25%	**+17%**	-10%	-7%		-2%	-1%	**+9%**
Desert Sands Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	31%	40%	41%	45%	50%	**+19%**	17%	27%	32%	36%	39%	**+22%**	-14%	-13%	-9%	-9%	-11%	**+3%**
	Dr. Reynaldo J. Carreon Jr. Academy	28%		41%	48%	52%	**+24%**	22%		38%	44%	49%	**+27%**	-6%		-3%	-4%	-3%	**+3%**
El Monte City Elementary	Legore Elementary	22%	28%	36%	38%	49%	**+27%**	11%	21%	32%	32%	35%	**+24%**	-11%	-7%	-4%	-6%	-14%	**-3%**
Escondido Union	Central Elementary	19%	35%	37%	36%	38%	**+19%**	10%	26%	33%	31%	33%	**+23%**	-9%	-9%	-4%	-5%	-5%	**+4%**
Evergreen Elementary	Cadwallader Elementary	48%	51%	53%	47%	53%	**+5%**	34%	44%	43%	32%	41%	**+7%**	-14%	-7%	-10%	-15%	-12%	**+2%**
	Carolyn A. Clark Elementary	40%	74%	79%	79%	79%	**+39%**	13%	68%	71%	71%	67%	**+54%**	-27%	-6%	-8%	-8%	-12%	**+15%**
	Cedar Grove Elementary	48%	49%	57%	53%	54%	**+6%**	42%	40%	53%	47%	50%	**+8%**	-6%	-9%	-4%	-6%	-4%	**+2%**
	Chaboya Middle	62%	69%	67%	66%	73%	**+11%**	33%	44%	38%	36%	45%	**+12%**	-29%	-25%	-29%	-30%	-28%	**+1%**
	Dove Hill Elementary	37%	44%	48%	47%	48%	**+11%**	25%	38%	46%	43%	44%	**+19%**	-12%	-6%	-2%	-4%	-4%	**+8%**
	Evergreen Elementary	71%	74%	72%	74%	78%	**+7%**	59%	60%	60%	67%	76%	**+17%**	-12%	-14%	-12%	-7%	-2%	**+10%**
	Holly Oak Elementary	46%	54%	56%	51%	55%	**+9%**	34%	41%	51%	43%	51%	**+17%**	-12%	-13%	-5%	-8%	-4%	**+8%**
	John J. Montgomery Elementary	41%	43%	42%	44%	43%	**+2%**	30%	35%	41%	45%	38%	**+8%**	-11%	-8%	-1%	1%	-5%	**+6%**
	O. B. Whaley Elementary	44%	51%	52%	51%	55%	**+11%**	38%	42%	49%	47%	49%	**+11%**	-6%	-9%	-3%	-4%	-6%	**0%**
	Quimby Oak Middle	52%	61%	100%	59%	62%	**+10%**	30%	38%	100%	41%	39%	**+9%**	-22%	-23%	0%	-18%	-23%	**-1%**
Garvey Elementary	Bitely (Arlene) Elementary	38%	46%	42%	48%	52%	**+14%**	28%	35%	36%	42%	48%	**+20%**	-10%	-11%	-6%	-6%	-4%	**+6%**
	Dewey Avenue Elementary	32%	33%	45%	48%	52%	**+20%**	31%	29%	41%	45%	51%	**+20%**	-1%	-4%	-4%	-3%	-1%	**0%**
	Duff (Margaret) Elementary	21%	30%	32%	36%	38%	**+17%**	15%	24%	27%	33%	33%	**+18%**	-6%	-6%	-5%	-3%	-5%	**+1%**
	Emerson (Ralph Waldo) Elementary	35%	37%	43%	41%	39%	**+4%**	26%	30%	36%	32%	32%	**+6%**	-9%	-7%	-7%	-9%	-7%	**+2%**
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	37%	40%	42%	44%	49%	**+12%**	22%	23%	24%	26%	29%	**+7%**	-15%	-17%	-18%	-18%	-20%	**-5%**
	Hillcrest Elementary	43%	50%	50%	50%	56%	**+13%**	30%	40%	42%	39%	45%	**+15%**	-13%	-10%	-8%	-11%	-11%	**+2%**
	Marshall (John) Elementary	29%	37%	48%	43%	46%	**+17%**	23%	31%	47%	39%	39%	**+16%**	-6%	-6%	-1%	-4%	-7%	**-1%**
	Monterey Vista Elementary	47%	57%	60%	56%	63%	**+16%**	45%	50%	56%	49%	60%	**+15%**	-2%	-7%	-4%	-7%	-3%	**-1%**
	Rice (Eldridge) Elementary	36%	38%	42%	44%	44%	**+8%**	32%	33%	38%	38%	40%	**+8%**	-4%	-5%	-4%	-6%	-4%	**0%**
	Sanchez (George I.) Elementary	32%	33%	46%	47%	51%	**+19%**	27%	31%	42%	44%	48%	**+21%**	-5%	-2%	-4%	-3%	-3%	**+2%**
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	35%	38%	45%	43%	47%	**+12%**	23%	26%	32%	30%	33%	**+10%**	-12%	-12%	-13%	-13%	-14%	**-2%**
	Willard (Frances E.) Elementary	28%	40%	40%	41%	48%	**+20%**	24%	31%	35%	35%	42%	**+18%**	-4%	-9%	-5%	-6%	-6%	**-2%**
Glendale Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	65%	68%	69%	68%	70%	**+5%**	50%	56%	61%	60%	65%	**+15%**	-15%	-12%	-8%	-8%	-5%	**+10%**
	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	86%	87%	83%	82%	89%	**+3%**	73%	69%	64%	69%	79%	**+6%**	-13%	-18%	-19%	-13%	-10%	**+3%**
	Balboa Elementary	47%	53%	58%	57%	61%	**+14%**	39%	46%	51%	51%	54%	**+15%**	-8%	-7%	-7%	-6%	-7%	**+1%**
	Benjamin Franklin Elementary	40%	47%	42%	50%	54%	**+14%**	24%	37%	32%	41%	45%	**+21%**	-16%	-10%	-10%	-9%	-9%	**+7%**
	Cerritos Elementary	25%	31%	35%	35%	39%	**+14%**	17%	24%	29%	28%	28%	**+11%**	-8%	-7%	-6%	-7%	-11%	**-3%**
	Columbus Elementary	39%	43%	48%	54%	55%	**+16%**	34%	40%	45%	50%	50%	**+16%**	-5%	-3%	-3%	-4%	-5%	**0%**
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	83%	79%	84%	79%	86%	**+3%**	61%	52%	59%	49%	63%	**+2%**	-22%	-27%	-25%	-30%	-23%	**-1%**
	Daily (Allan F.) High (Continuation)																		
	Dunsmore Elementary	77%	78%	81%	82%	77%	**0%**	59%	71%	77%	78%	75%	**+16%**	-18%	-7%	-4%	-4%	-2%	**+16%**
	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	42%	51%	49%	53%	57%	**+15%**	28%	33%	32%	42%	51%	**+23%**	-14%	-18%	-17%	-11%	-6%	**+8%**
	Glendale Senior High	54%	53%	57%	56%	99%	**+45%**	42%	35%	36%	37%	99%	**+57%**	-12%	-18%	-21%	-19%	0%	**+12%**
	Glenoaks Elementary	60%	63%	61%	61%	66%	**+6%**	44%	54%	55%	53%	60%	**+16%**	-16%	-9%	-6%	-8%	-6%	**+10%**
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	52%	49%	59%	53%	60%	**+8%**	36%	32%	39%	35%	45%	**+9%**	-16%	-17%	-20%	-18%	-15%	**+1%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	27%	29%	39%	47%	50%	**+23%**	23%	26%	38%	46%	49%	**+26%**	-4%	-3%	-1%	-1%	-1%	**+3%**
	John C. Fremont Elementary	62%	66%	68%	71%	71%	**+9%**	43%	52%	59%	62%	65%	**+22%**	-19%	-14%	-9%	-9%	-6%	**+13%**
	John Marshall Elementary	35%	42%	47%	46%	54%	**+19%**	26%	42%	46%	41%	51%	**+25%**	-9%	0%	-1%	-5%	-3%	**+6%**
	John Muir Elementary	34%	39%	44%	51%	52%	**+18%**	30%	36%	41%	49%	47%	**+17%**	-4%	-3%	-3%	-2%	-5%	**-1%**
	La Crescenta Elementary	64%	63%	70%	74%	76%	**+12%**	59%	59%	61%	69%	68%	**+9%**	-5%	-4%	-9%	-5%	-8%	**-3%**
	Mark Keppel Elementary	49%	54%	57%	58%	59%	**+10%**	37%	47%	51%	50%	51%	**+14%**	-12%	-7%	-6%	-8%	-8%	**+4%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide AMAO in ELA						EL Subgroup AMAO in ELA						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
	Monte Vista Elementary	78%	77%	78%	80%	82%	**+4%**	58%	67%	70%	73%	69%	**+11%**	-20%	-10%	-8%	-7%	-13%	**+7%**
	Mountain Avenue Elementary	75%	82%	83%	79%	83%	**+8%**	55%	75%	73%	69%	77%	**+22%**	-20%	-7%	-10%	-10%	-6%	**+14%**
	R. D. White Elementary	46%	50%	55%	59%	60%	**+14%**	35%	43%	48%	51%	53%	**+18%**	-11%	-7%	-7%	-8%	-7%	**+4%**
	Rosemont Middle	69%	75%	77%	77%	81%	**+12%**	41%	51%	58%	63%	72%	**+31%**	-28%	-24%	-19%	-14%	-9%	**+19%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	28%	41%	41%	43%	46%	**+18%**	16%	30%	29%	35%	42%	**+26%**	-12%	-11%	-12%	-8%	-4%	**+8%**
	Thomas Edison Elementary	29%	31%	33%	36%	45%	**+16%**	23%	26%	29%	32%	42%	**+19%**	-6%	-5%	-4%	-4%	-3%	**+3%**
	Valley View Elementary	71%	76%	79%	80%	79%	**+8%**	56%	67%	74%	75%	73%	**+17%**	-15%	-9%	-5%	-5%	-6%	**+9%**
	Verdugo Woodlands Elementary	65%	67%	70%	73%	74%	**+9%**	45%	61%	58%	61%	62%	**+17%**	-20%	-6%	-12%	-12%	-12%	**+8%**
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	53%	61%	62%	63%	63%	**+10%**	34%	39%	42%	51%	56%	**+22%**	-19%	-22%	-20%	-12%	-7%	**+12%**
	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	40%	43%	50%	41%	50%	**10%**	24%	25%	34%	19%	32%	**8%**	-16%	-18%	-16%	-22%	-18%	**-2%**
	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**	19%	25%	29%	30%	35%	**+16%**	18%	24%	26%	26%	32%	**+14%**	-1%	-1%	-3%	-4%	-3%	**-2%**
Imperial County Office of Education	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**	6%	13%	8%	14%	16%	**+10%**	2%	5%	0%	0%	8%	**+6%**	-4%	-8%	-8%	-14%	-8%	**-4%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary **(El Centro Elementary School District)**	19%	29%	38%	39%	46%	**+27%**	15%	22%	31%	33%	41%	**+26%**	-4%	-7%	-7%	-6%	-5%	**-1%**
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	15%	22%	29%	36%	100%	**+85%**	11%	18%	26%	31%	100%	**+89%**	-4%	-4%	-3%	-5%	0%	**+4%**
	College Park Elementary	66%	72%	70%	77%	79%	**+13%**	55%	62%	59%	70%	66%	**+11%**	-11%	-10%	-11%	-7%	-13%	**-2%**
	Culverdale Elementary	60%	64%	64%	65%	62%	**+2%**	51%	55%	60%	60%	52%	**+1%**	-9%	-9%	-4%	-5%	-10%	**-1%**
Irvine Unified	Northwood Elementary	65%	71%	75%	77%	80%	**+15%**	46%	65%	67%	67%	74%	**+28%**	-19%	-6%	-8%	-10%	-6%	**+13%**
	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	72%	81%	81%	83%	87%	**+15%**	44%	46%	61%	64%	65%	**+21%**	-28%	-35%	-20%	-19%	-22%	**+6%**
	University High	87%	87%	84%	85%	91%	**+4%**	55%	66%	62%	47%	56%	**+1%**	-32%	-21%	-22%	-38%	-35%	**-3%**
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante	14%	33%	60%	54%	100%	**+86%**	12%	21%	42%	43%	100%	**+88%**	-2%	-12%	-18%	-11%	0%	**+2%**
Lennox Elementary	Buford Elementary	17%	29%	30%	28%	33%	**+16%**	14%	24%	26%	26%	30%	**+16%**	-3%	-5%	-4%	-2%	-3%	**0%**
	Campus Park Elementary	19%	26%	32%	27%	100%	**+81%**	17%	24%	26%	23%	100%	**+83%**	-2%	-2%	-6%	-4%	0%	**+2%**
Livingston Union Elementary	Selma Herndon Elementary	26%	29%	36%	42%	41%	**+15%**	23%	25%	31%	37%	34%	**+11%**	-3%	-4%	-5%	-5%	-7%	**-4%**
	Yamato Colony Elementary	38%	41%	44%	44%	49%	**+11%**	34%	37%	40%	39%	43%	**+9%**	-4%	-4%	-4%	-5%	-6%	**-2%**
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	26%	29%	38%	38%	42%	**+16%**	25%	27%	36%	32%	40%	**+15%**	-1%	-2%	-2%	-6%	-2%	**-1%**
Marysville Joint Unified	Johnson Park Elementary	40%	45%	53%	46%	45%	**+5%**	37%	37%	51%	50%	47%	**+10%**	-3%	-8%	-2%	4%	2%	**+5%**
	Olivehurst Elementary	24%	32%	41%	43%	42%	**+18%**	13%	17%	27%	31%	35%	**+22%**	-11%	-15%	-14%	-12%	-7%	**+4%**
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	15%	20%	28%	33%	28%	**+13%**	5%	10%	18%	25%	20%	**+15%**	-10%	-10%	-10%	-8%	-8%	**+2%**
Mountain Empire Unified	Potrero Elementary	20%	20%	28%	39%	29%	**+9%**	12%	13%	22%	31%	26%	**+14%**	-8%	-7%	-6%	-8%	-3%	**+5%**
New Haven Unified	Searles Elementary	33%	38%	39%	42%	44%	**+11%**	20%	26%	33%	40%	38%	**+18%**	-13%	-12%	-6%	-2%	-6%	**+7%**
	Dr. J. Michael McGrath Elementary	28%	33%	43%	44%	58%	**+30%**	17%	16%	30%	31%	48%	**+31%**	-11%	-17%	-13%	-13%	-10%	**+1%**
Newhall Elementary	Newhall Elementary	36%	48%	54%	53%	51%	**+15%**	12%	19%	29%	33%	28%	**+16%**	-24%	-29%	-25%	-20%	-23%	**+1%**
	Old Orchard Elementary	57%	68%	66%	71%	68%	**+11%**	26%	46%	41%	47%	40%	**+14%**	-31%	-22%	-25%	-24%	-28%	**+3%**
	Peachland Avenue Elementary	64%	64%	64%	70%	67%	**+3%**	27%	31%	32%	44%	40%	**+13%**	-37%	-33%	-32%	-26%	-27%	**+10%**
	Wiley Canyon Elementary	50%	52%	57%	60%	63%	**+13%**	24%	30%	32%	47%	47%	**+23%**	-26%	-22%	-25%	-13%	-16%	**+10%**
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	18%	30%	32%	32%	40%	**+22%**	8%	19%	15%	22%	23%	**+15%**	-10%	-11%	-17%	-10%	-17%	**-7%**
Novato Unified	Loma Verde Elementary	51%	55%	55%	47%	48%	**-3%**	18%	37%	47%	25%	33%	**+15%**	-33%	-18%	-8%	-22%	-15%	**+18%**
	Olive Elementary	46%	50%	56%	55%	53%	**+7%**	14%	19%	30%	22%	24%	**+10%**	-32%	-31%	-26%	-33%	-29%	**+3%**
	Baldwin (Julia) Elementary	44%	46%	53%	49%	50%	**+6%**	24%	31%	47%	37%	42%	**+18%**	-20%	-15%	-6%	-12%	-8%	**+12%**
	Christopher Elementary	24%	25%	27%	34%	35%	**+11%**	17%	19%	24%	29%	31%	**+14%**	-7%	-6%	-3%	-5%	-4%	**+3%**
	Del Roble Elementary	37%	100%	47%	38%		**+1%**	30%	100%	38%	29%		**-1%**	-7%	0%	-9%	-9%		**-2%**
	Edenvale Elementary	26%	30%	37%	34%	41%	**+15%**	18%	25%	33%	28%	35%	**+17%**	-8%	-5%	-4%	-6%	-6%	**+2%**
Oak Grove Elementary	Glider Elementary	52%	55%	56%	56%	60%	**+8%**	42%	43%	51%	48%	51%	**+9%**	-10%	-12%	-5%	-8%	-9%	**+1%**
	Hayes Elementary	41%	48%	49%	52%	55%	**+14%**	21%	25%	39%	41%	43%	**+22%**	-20%	-23%	-10%	-11%	-12%	**+8%**
	Ledesma (Rita) Elementary	46%	54%	56%	57%	59%	**+13%**	26%	39%	41%	48%	50%	**+24%**	-20%	-15%	-15%	-9%	-9%	**+11%**
	Miner (George) Elementary	36%	42%	49%	51%	50%	**+14%**	28%	28%	44%	49%	41%	**+13%**	-8%	-14%	-5%	-2%	-9%	**-1%**
	Parkview Elementary	50%	56%	58%	53%	58%	**+8%**	44%	48%	55%	52%	54%	**+10%**	-6%	-8%	-3%	-1%	-4%	**+2%**
	Stipe (Samuel) Elementary	27%	31%	36%	41%	36%	**+9%**	18%	23%	26%	34%	28%	**+10%**	-9%	-8%	-10%	-7%	-8%	**+1%**
	Adolfo Camarillo High	72%	71%	70%	74%	74%	**+2%**	44%	26%	28%	27%	53%	**+9%**	-28%	-45%	-42%	-47%	-21%	**+7%**
	Channel Islands High	38%	41%	41%	36%	44%	**+6%**	30%	30%	32%	17%	36%	**+6%**	-8%	-11%	-9%	-19%	-8%	**0%**
	Frontier High																		
Oxnard Union High	Hueneme High	31%	39%	39%	36%	41%	**+10%**	19%	27%	26%	29%	33%	**+14%**	-12%	-12%	-13%	-7%	-8%	**+4%**
	Oxnard High	45%	49%	51%	47%	51%	**+6%**	24%	34%	26%	27%	34%	**+10%**	-21%	-15%	-25%	-20%	-17%	**+4%**
	Pacifica High	40%	40%	42%	41%	45%	**+5%**	25%	27%	21%	26%	37%	**+12%**	-15%	-13%	-21%	-15%	-8%	**+7%**
	Rio Mesa High	53%	52%	54%	52%	51%	**-2%**	22%	26%	26%	31%	36%	**+14%**	-31%	-26%	-28%	-21%	-15%	**+16%**
	Altadena Elementary	23%	26%	28%	25%	33%	**+10%**	21%	21%	28%	21%	17%	**-4%**	-2%	-5%	0%	-4%	-16%	**-14%**
	Jackson Elementary	17%	22%	25%	30%	33%	**+16%**	12%	17%	16%	21%	26%	**+14%**	-5%	-5%	-9%	-9%	-7%	**-2%**
	Jefferson Elementary	31%	31%	35%	33%	34%	**+3%**	20%	21%	27%	21%	24%	**+4%**	-11%	-10%	-8%	-12%	-10%	**+1%**
Pasadena Unified	Longfellow (Henry W.) Elementary	30%	35%	38%	47%	42%	**+12%**	20%	23%	29%	40%	34%	**+14%**	-10%	-12%	-9%	-7%	-8%	**+2%**
	Madison Elementary	14%	23%	32%	31%	31%	**+17%**	10%	19%	23%	24%	26%	**+16%**	-4%	-4%	-9%	-7%	-5%	**-1%**
	Washington Accelerated Elementary	20%	29%	35%	33%	39%	**+19%**	16%	23%	27%	25%	32%	**+16%**	-4%	-6%	-8%	-8%	-7%	**-3%**
	Willard Elementary	38%	45%	52%	56%	54%	**+16%**	27%	35%	40%	50%	39%	**+12%**	-11%	-10%	-12%	-6%	-15%	**-4%**
	Casa Grande High	69%	64%		61%		**-8%**	32%	22%		48%		**+16%**	-37%	-42%		-13%		**+24%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Kenilworth Junior High	45%	55%				**+10%**	12%	24%				**+12%**	-33%	-31%				**+2%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide AMAO in ELA						EL Subgroup AMAO in ELA						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
Petaluma Joint Union High	Petaluma High	70%	76%				**+6%**	19%	29%				**+10%**	-51%	-47%				**+4%**
	Petaluma Junior High	49%	53%				**+4%**	8%	20%				**+12%**	-41%	-33%				**+8%**
Salida Union Elementary	Salida Elementary	34%	39%	43%	41%	50%	**+16%**	12%	20%	30%	24%	31%	**+19%**	-22%	-19%	-13%	-17%	-19%	**+3%**
San Diego County Office of Education	Cuyamaca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	26%	31%	31%	33%	34%	**+8%**	8%	10%	16%	21%	25%	**+17%**	-18%	-21%	-15%	-12%	-9%	**+9%**
	Kimball Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	33%	27%	35%	36%	43%	**10%**	28%	22%	31%	30%	38%	**10%**	-5%	-5%	-4%	-6%	-5%	**0%**
	Las Palmas Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	25%	29%	34%	41%	41%	**+16%**	22%	26%	30%	36%	40%	**+18%**	-3%	-3%	-4%	-5%	-1%	**+2%**
	Lilac School **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District)**	40%	52%	59%	59%	60%	**+20%**	8%	19%	28%	25%	21%	**+13%**	-32%	-33%	-31%	-34%	-39%	**-7%**
	Naranca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	28%	32%	37%	40%	41%	**+13%**	18%	23%	28%	31%	30%	**+12%**	-10%	-9%	-9%	-9%	-11%	**-1%**
	Olivewood **(National Elementary School District)**	33%	33%	36%	32%	37%	**+4%**	25%	26%	30%	25%	33%	**+8%**	-8%	-7%	-6%	-7%	-4%	**+4%**
	Valley Center Elementary **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified)**	41%	45%	51%	53%	53%	**+12%**	11%	16%	19%	29%	28%	**+17%**	-30%	-29%	-32%	-24%	-25%	**+5%**
San Jose Unified	Grant Elementary	23%	31%	41%	42%	47%	**+24%**	15%	16%	30%	34%	41%	**+26%**	-8%	-15%	-11%	-8%	-6%	**+2%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	18%	29%	34%	35%	36%	**+18%**	8%	17%	26%	26%	26%	**+18%**	-10%	-12%	-8%	-9%	-10%	**0%**
	River Glen	39%	45%	53%	49%	55%	**+16%**	25%	25%	31%	28%	34%	**+9%**	-14%	-20%	-22%	-21%	-21%	**-7%**
	Washington Elementary	11%	13%	22%	29%	33%	**+22%**	11%	12%	19%	25%	30%	**+19%**	0%	-1%	-3%	-4%	-3%	**-3%**
San Leandro Unified	Washington Elementary	24%	31%	32%	39%	32%	**+8%**	11%	18%	24%	29%	24%	**+13%**	-13%	-13%	-8%	-10%	-8%	**+5%**
Sanger Unified	Del Rey Elementary	11%	18%	27%	39%	36%	**+25%**	4%	15%	21%	38%	33%	**+29%**	-7%	-3%	-6%	-1%	-3%	**+4%**
	Fairmont Elementary	37%	41%	49%	55%	56%	**+19%**	10%	20%	25%	36%	39%	**+29%**	-27%	-21%	-24%	-19%	-17%	**+10%**
	Jackson Elementary	29%	41%	49%	51%	55%	**+26%**	9%	30%	34%	38%	35%	**+26%**	-20%	-11%	-15%	-13%	-20%	**0%**
	Lone Star Elementary	32%	43%	98%	42%	52%	**+20%**	21%	33%	99%	30%	38%	**+17%**	-11%	-10%	1%	-12%	-14%	**-3%**
	Madison Elementary	25%	37%	100%	42%	48%	**+23%**	3%	24%	100%	40%	38%	**+35%**	-22%	-13%	0%	-2%	-10%	**+12%**
	Sanger High			50%	46%	50%	**0%**			27%	27%	35%	**+8%**			-23%	-19%	-15%	**+8%**
Santa Ana Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	15%	19%	23%	25%	29%	**+14%**	13%	17%	22%	23%	27%	**+14%**	-2%	-2%	-1%	-2%	-2%	**0%**
	Andrew Jackson Elementary	13%	18%	21%	25%	35%	**+22%**	9%	15%	18%	22%	33%	**+24%**	-4%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-2%	**+2%**
	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	45%	49%	55%	53%	57%	**+12%**	31%	26%	35%	31%	33%	**+2%**	-14%	-23%	-20%	-22%	-24%	**-10%**
	George Washington Carver Elementary	11%	15%	24%	34%	34%	**+23%**	7%	12%	22%	32%	30%	**+23%**	-4%	-3%	-2%	-2%	-4%	**0%**
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	27%	34%	37%	37%	45%	**+18%**	11%	19%	29%	21%	28%	**+17%**	-16%	-15%	-8%	-16%	-17%	**-1%**
	Greenville Fundamental Elementary	60%	64%	68%	62%	65%	**+5%**	53%	55%	54%	52%	58%	**+5%**	-7%	-9%	-14%	-10%	-7%	**0%**
	Jefferson Elementary	27%	32%	40%	36%	100%	**+73%**	19%	23%	32%	31%	100%	**+81%**	-8%	-9%	-8%	-5%	0%	**+8%**
	Jim Thorpe Fundamental	46%	53%	54%	51%	61%	**+15%**	38%	42%	44%	40%	52%	**+14%**	-8%	-11%	-10%	-11%	-9%	**-1%**
	John Muir Fundamental Elementary	46%	50%	54%	57%	60%	**+14%**	36%	38%	44%	54%	55%	**+19%**	-10%	-12%	-10%	-3%	-5%	**+5%**
	Jose Sepulveda Elementary	13%	17%	22%	20%	23%	**+10%**	9%	13%	19%	16%	23%	**+14%**	-4%	-4%	-3%	-4%	0%	**+4%**
	Madison Elementary	20%	25%	33%	41%	41%	**+21%**	15%	23%	30%	37%	39%	**+24%**	-5%	-2%	-3%	-4%	-2%	**+3%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary	10%	16%	16%	20%	37%	**+27%**	8%	14%	14%	18%	35%	**+27%**	-2%	-2%	-2%	-2%	-2%	**0%**
	Martin R. Heninger Elementary	19%	25%	27%	32%	40%	**+21%**	17%	21%	23%	24%	37%	**+20%**	-2%	-4%	-4%	-8%	-3%	**-1%**
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	24%	25%	26%	31%	37%	**+13%**	15%	17%	21%	19%	26%	**+11%**	-9%	-8%	-5%	-12%	-11%	**-2%**
	Santa Ana High	27%	32%	33%	27%	35%	**+8%**	21%	19%	25%	18%	27%	**+6%**	-6%	-13%	-8%	-9%	-8%	**-2%**
	Santiago Elementary	42%	41%	43%	44%	46%	**+4%**	23%	24%	32%	33%	36%	**+13%**	-19%	-17%	-11%	-11%	-10%	**+9%**
	Taft Elementary	35%	38%	41%	36%	44%	**+9%**	23%	23%	32%	29%	38%	**+15%**	-12%	-15%	-9%	-7%	-6%	**+6%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Elementary	12%	19%	23%	25%	28%	**+16%**	10%	18%	22%	24%	26%	**+16%**	-2%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-2%	**0%**
	Wilson Elementary	10%	10%	13%	17%	18%	**+8%**	9%	9%	12%	17%	16%	**+7%**	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	0%	**-1%**
Sierra Sands Unified	Faller Elementary	46%	53%	56%	58%	50%	**+4%**	20%	13%	20%	44%	33%	**+13%**	-26%	-40%	-36%	-14%	-17%	**+9%**
	Gateway Elementary	53%	55%	49%	51%	52%	**-1%**	32%	32%	31%	29%	36%	**+4%**	-21%	-23%	-18%	-22%	-16%	**+5%**
	Inyokern Elementary	43%	43%	40%	37%	44%	**+1%**												
	Las Flores Elementary	57%	58%	56%	55%	49%	**-8%**	45%	35%	27%	54%	47%	**+2%**	-12%	-23%	-29%	-1%	-2%	**+10%**
	Pierce Elementary	28%	41%	36%	44%	43%	**+15%**	11%	22%	27%	32%	34%	**+23%**	-17%	-19%	-9%	-12%	-9%	**+8%**
	Richmond Elementary	54%	58%	52%	47%	54%	**0%**	43%	46%	47%	27%	18%	**-25%**	-11%	-12%	-5%	-20%	-36%	**-25%**
Sonoma County Office of Education	Bellevue Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	20%	30%	33%	24%	29%	**+9%**	17%	21%	33%	22%	26%	**+9%**	-3%	-9%	0%	-2%	-3%	**0%**
	Jack London Elementary **(Piner-Olivet Union Elementary School District)**	44%	55%	57%		61%	**17%**	28%	39%	40%		51%	**23%**	-16%	-16%	-17%		-10%	**6%**
	Meadow View Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	20%		28%	31%	33%	**+13%**	13%		21%	26%	30%	**+17%**	-7%		-7%	-5%	-3%	**+4%**
	Mountain Shadows Middle **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	37%	38%	43%	44%	45%	**+8%**	14%	16%	24%	21%	23%	**+9%**	-23%	-22%	-19%	-23%	-22%	**+1%**
	Waldo Rohnert Elementary **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	39%	40%	46%	43%	37%	**-2%**	23%	21%	30%	33%	28%	**+5%**	-16%	-19%	-16%	-10%	-9%	**+7%**
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Las Palmas Elementary	35%	35%	36%	39%	42%	**+7%**	17%	19%	28%	30%	34%	**+17%**	-18%	-16%	-8%	-9%	-8%	**+10%**
Ventura Unified	De Anza Middle	25%	29%	32%	31%	38%	**+13%**	11%	17%	25%	22%	28%	**+17%**	-14%	-12%	-7%	-9%	-10%	**+4%**
	E. P. Foster Elementary	19%	37%	42%	39%	37%	**+18%**	15%	32%	35%	33%	25%	**+10%**	-4%	-5%	-7%	-6%	-12%	**-8%**
	Juanamaria Elementary	51%	56%	55%	62%	60%	**+9%**	13%	14%	20%	37%	29%	**+16%**	-38%	-42%	-35%	-25%	-31%	**+7%**
	Montalvo Elementary	20%	30%	44%	44%	39%	**+19%**	6%	15%	27%	26%	19%	**+13%**	-14%	-15%	-17%	-18%	-20%	**-6%**
	Sheridan Way Elementary	22%	23%	32%	31%	28%	**+6%**	18%	16%	28%	25%	22%	**+4%**	-4%	-7%	-4%	-6%	-6%	**-2%**
Whittier City Elementary	Orange Grove Elementary	27%	34%	41%	40%	39%	**+12%**	19%	24%	37%	37%	26%	**+7%**	-8%	-10%	-4%	-3%	-13%	**-5%**
Woodland Joint Unified	Beamer Elementary	20%	35%	31%	34%	40%	**+20%**	10%	20%	20%	20%	25%	**+15%**	-10%	-15%	-11%	-14%	-15%	**-5%**
	Lee Middle	30%	33%	38%	41%	43%	**+13%**	11%	15%	17%	22%	21%	**+10%**	-19%	-18%	-21%	-19%	-22%	**-3%**
	Ramon S. Tafoya Elementary	37%	37%	36%	41%	42%	**+5%**	19%	20%	21%	28%	29%	**+10%**	-18%	-17%	-15%	-13%	-13%	**+5%**
	Rhoda Maxwell Elementary	25%	35%	35%	33%	43%	**+18%**	14%	18%	29%	26%	36%	**+22%**	-11%	-17%	-6%	-7%	-7%	**+4%**
	Willow Spring Elementary	34%	34%	36%	40%	33%	**-1%**	22%	18%	20%	26%	22%	**0%**	-12%	-16%	-16%	-14%	-11%	**+1%**
	Woodland Prairie Elementary	27%	26%	29%	33%	29%	**+2%**	15%	17%	20%	26%	24%	**+9%**	-12%	-9%	-9%	-7%	-5%	**+7%**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
AYP Growth (Math), School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- **School-wide AYP growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **EL AYP growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL AYP achievement from 2004-08**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide AMAO in Math						EL Subgroup AMAO in Math						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Artesia High	32%	33%	43%	51%	48%	**16%**	27%	24%	30%	36%	34%	**7%**	-5%	-9%	-13%	-15%	-14%	**-9%**
	Willow Elementary	42%	43%	45%	45%	44%	**2%**	36%	39%	42%	43%	36%	**0%**	-6%	-4%	-3%	-2%	-8%	**-2%**
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	2%	3%	25%	14%	41%	**39%**	0%	0%	11%	17%	32%	**32%**	-2%	-3%	-14%	3%	-9%	**-7%**
Atwater Elementary	Thomas Olaeta Elementary	41%	54%	53%	52%	49%	**8%**	32%	46%	46%	49%	45%	**13%**	-9%	-8%	-7%	-3%	-4%	**5%**
Bakersfield City	Casa Loma Elementary	36%	45%	51%	47%	47%	**11%**	33%	37%	47%	49%	45%	**12%**	-3%	-8%	-4%	2%	-2%	**1%**
	Frank West Elementary	21%	34%	47%	46%	52%	**31%**	15%	36%	44%	48%	53%	**38%**	-6%	2%	-3%	2%	1%	**7%**
	Munsey Elementary	26%	34%	37%	32%	42%	**16%**	20%	27%	36%	36%	49%	**29%**	-6%	-7%	-1%	4%	7%	**13%**
Brentwood Union Elementary	Brentwood Elementary	42%	58%	56%	56%	57%	**15%**	17%	36%	28%	37%	41%	**24%**	-25%	-22%	-28%	-19%	-16%	**9%**
	Edna Hill Middle	36%	53%	55%	46%	47%	**11%**	15%	31%	29%	29%	29%	**14%**	-21%	-22%	-26%	-17%	-18%	**3%**
Ceres Unified	Carroll Fowler Elementary	33%	36%	41%	46%	55%	**22%**	23%	27%	30%	40%	43%	**20%**	-10%	-9%	-11%	-6%	-12%	**-2%**
	Don Pedro Elementary	38%	43%	53%	58%	58%	**20%**	32%	37%	49%	54%	56%	**24%**	-6%	-6%	-4%	-4%	-2%	**4%**
	M. Robert Adkison Elementary			37%	43%	41%	**4%**			31%	44%	39%	**8%**			-6%	1%	-2%	**4%**
	Samuel Vaughn Elementary	47%	51%	53%	53%	53%	**6%**	30%	36%	44%	41%	48%	**18%**	-17%	-15%	-9%	-12%	-5%	**12%**
	Walter White Elementary	40%	45%	35%	33%	46%	**6%**	23%	38%	33%	31%	45%	**22%**	-17%	-7%	-2%	-2%	-1%	**16%**
Chula Vista Elementary	Valle Lindo Elementary	37%	43%	48%	52%	49%	**12%**	28%	37%	33%	38%	34%	**6%**	-9%	-6%	-15%	-14%	-15%	**-6%**
Coachella Valley Unified	Bobby Duke Middle		41%	14%		27%	**-14%**		29%	13%		25%	**-4%**		-12%	-1%		-2%	**10%**
	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	11%	16%	23%	23%	28%	**17%**	10%	15%	20%	23%	26%	**16%**	-1%	-1%	-3%	0%	-2%	**-1%**
	Toro Canyon Middle	9%		14%	14%	19%	**10%**	7%		13%	13%	18%	**11%**	-2%		-1%	-1%	-1%	**1%**
	West Shores High	17%	18%		13%	20%	**3%**	14%	15%		11%	21%	**7%**	-3%	-3%		-2%	1%	**4%**
Desert Sands Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	52%	62%	57%	59%	71%	**19%**	42%	53%	51%	54%	68%	**26%**	-10%	-9%	-6%	-5%	-3%	**7%**
	Dr. Reynaldo J. Carreon Jr. Academy	31%		58%	63%	68%	**37%**	26%		59%	62%	65%	**39%**	-5%		1%	-1%	-3%	**2%**
El Monte City Elementary	Legore Elementary	41%	51%	52%	50%	60%	**19%**	33%	48%	51%	43%	51%	**18%**	-8%	-3%	-1%	-7%	-9%	**-1%**
Escondido Union	Central Elementary	32%	49%	50%	49%	48%	**16%**	25%	43%	47%	46%	46%	**21%**	-7%	-6%	-3%	-3%	-2%	**5%**
Evergreen Elementary	Cadwallader Elementary	56%	60%	65%	54%	62%	**6%**	46%	55%	56%	47%	53%	**7%**	-10%	-5%	-9%	-7%	-9%	**1%**
	Carolyn A. Clark Elementary	41%	77%	85%	81%	82%	**41%**	19%	74%	79%	77%	76%	**57%**	-22%	-3%	-6%	-4%	-6%	**16%**
	Cedar Grove Elementary	53%	60%	65%	64%	63%	**10%**	53%	58%	63%	59%	63%	**10%**	0%	-2%	-2%	-5%	0%	**0%**
	Chaboya Middle	64%	69%	69%	69%	73%	**9%**	51%	52%	53%	51%	52%	**1%**	-13%	-17%	-16%	-18%	-21%	**-8%**
	Dove Hill Elementary	45%	57%	58%	57%	57%	**12%**	42%	60%	59%	58%	57%	**15%**	-3%	3%	1%	1%	0%	**3%**
	Evergreen Elementary	76%	77%	76%	79%	82%	**6%**	69%	71%	70%	81%	80%	**11%**	-7%	-6%	-6%	2%	-2%	**5%**
	Holly Oak Elementary	48%	58%	59%	55%	55%	**7%**	48%	59%	60%	55%	55%	**7%**	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	**0%**
	John J. Montgomery Elementary	49%	56%	55%	56%	51%	**2%**	44%	51%	54%	53%	46%	**2%**	-5%	-5%	-1%	-3%	-5%	**0%**
	O. B. Whaley Elementary	61%	69%	69%	66%	63%	**2%**	57%	64%	65%	61%	62%	**5%**	-4%	-5%	-4%	-5%	-1%	**3%**
	Quimby Oak Middle	51%	61%	100%	54%	58%	**7%**	37%	52%	100%	42%	41%	**4%**	-14%	-9%	0%	-12%	-17%	**-3%**
Garvey Elementary	Bitely (Arlene) Elementary	55%	62%	64%	67%	62%	**7%**	50%	57%	60%	64%	59%	**9%**	-5%	-5%	-4%	-3%	-3%	**2%**
	Dewey Avenue Elementary	41%	41%	53%	64%	68%	**27%**	44%	41%	56%	67%	69%	**25%**	3%	0%	3%	3%	1%	**-2%**
	Duff (Margaret) Elementary	38%	48%	53%	44%	49%	**11%**	35%	48%	53%	43%	46%	**11%**	-3%	0%	0%	-1%	-3%	**0%**
	Emerson (Ralph Waldo) Elementary	48%	51%	65%	60%	59%	**11%**	42%	46%	62%	57%	56%	**14%**	-6%	-5%	-3%	-3%	-3%	**3%**
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	40%	47%	48%	48%	54%	**14%**	33%	39%	39%	40%	44%	**11%**	-7%	-8%	-9%	-8%	-10%	**-3%**
	Hillcrest Elementary	61%	61%	62%	62%	67%	**6%**	57%	66%	63%	60%	60%	**3%**	-4%	5%	1%	-2%	-7%	**-3%**
	Marshall (John) Elementary	30%	48%	52%	56%	54%	**24%**	27%	44%	54%	59%	53%	**26%**	-3%	-4%	2%	3%	-1%	**2%**
	Monterey Vista Elementary	66%	69%	68%	72%	78%	**12%**	67%	73%	70%	74%	80%	**13%**	1%	4%	2%	2%	2%	**1%**
	Rice (Eldridge) Elementary	51%	54%	58%	57%	57%	**6%**	53%	55%	59%	57%	60%	**7%**	2%	1%	1%	0%	3%	**1%**
	Sanchez (George I.) Elementary	41%	44%	59%	55%	61%	**20%**	38%	44%	56%	55%	58%	**20%**	-3%	0%	-3%	0%	-3%	**0%**
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	33%	40%	45%	44%	60%	**27%**	27%	31%	37%	37%	56%	**29%**	-6%	-9%	-8%	-7%	-4%	**2%**
	Willard (Frances E.) Elementary	53%	60%	52%	55%	59%	**6%**	51%	58%	51%	54%	57%	**6%**	-2%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-2%	**0%**
Glendale Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	72%	77%	76%	72%	79%	**7%**	66%	68%	75%	74%	77%	**11%**	-6%	-9%	-1%	2%	-2%	**4%**
	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	89%	87%	90%	94%	91%	**2%**	82%	76%	81%	91%	83%	**1%**	-7%	-11%	-9%	-3%	-8%	**-1%**
	Balboa Elementary	62%	66%	70%	67%	71%	**9%**	58%	61%	66%	62%	67%	**9%**	-4%	-5%	-4%	-5%	-4%	**0%**
	Benjamin Franklin Elementary	49%	56%	56%	64%	66%	**17%**	40%	50%	50%	59%	62%	**22%**	-9%	-6%	-6%	-5%	-4%	**5%**
	Cerritos Elementary	35%	49%	49%	51%	52%	**17%**	31%	43%	43%	41%	44%	**13%**	-4%	-6%	-6%	-10%	-8%	**-4%**
	Columbus Elementary	51%	60%	58%	57%	60%	**9%**	49%	58%	58%	55%	57%	**8%**	-2%	-2%	0%	-2%	-3%	**-1%**
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	84%	80%	84%	86%	88%	**4%**	73%	68%	71%	76%	81%	**8%**	-11%	-12%	-13%	-10%	-7%	**4%**
	Daily (Allan F.) High (Continuation)																		
	Dunsmore Elementary	81%	79%	82%	83%	77%	**-4%**	78%	74%	85%	83%	77%	**-1%**	-3%	-5%	3%	0%	0%	**3%**
	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	50%	57%	57%	58%	60%	**10%**	43%	44%	47%	51%	58%	**15%**	-7%	-13%	-10%	-7%	-2%	**5%**
	Glendale Senior High	60%	57%	63%	62%	98%	**38%**	54%	46%	50%	49%	98%	**44%**	-6%	-11%	-13%	-13%	0%	**6%**
	Glenoaks Elementary	66%	66%	68%	64%	71%	**5%**	58%	60%	65%	59%	61%	**3%**	-8%	-6%	-3%	-5%	-10%	**-2%**
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	59%	58%	62%	68%	65%	**6%**	49%	50%	48%	58%	55%	**6%**	-10%	-8%	-14%	-10%	-10%	**0%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	38%	46%	56%	61%	65%	**27%**	34%	45%	56%	61%	65%	**31%**	-4%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	**4%**
	John C. Fremont Elementary	64%	69%	66%	70%	71%	**7%**	53%	63%	65%	71%	74%	**21%**	-11%	-6%	-1%	1%	3%	**14%**
	John Marshall Elementary	44%	51%	59%	61%	72%	**28%**	39%	50%	59%	58%	70%	**31%**	-5%	-1%	0%	-3%	-2%	**3%**
	John Muir Elementary	48%	57%	53%	60%	60%	**12%**	46%	55%	52%	59%	55%	**9%**	-2%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-5%	**-3%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide AMAO in Math						EL Subgroup AMAO in Math						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
	La Crescenta Elementary	75%	80%	79%	82%	82%	**7%**	77%	81%	78%	83%	80%	**3%**	2%	1%	-1%	1%	-2%	**-4%**
	Mark Keppel Elementary	64%	65%	68%	65%	67%	**3%**	57%	64%	64%	62%	62%	**5%**	-7%	-1%	-4%	-3%	-5%	**2%**
	Monte Vista Elementary	83%	83%	85%	86%	86%	**3%**	79%	89%	79%	81%	82%	**3%**	-4%	6%	-6%	-5%	-4%	**0%**
	Mountain Avenue Elementary	82%	88%	89%	85%	83%	**1%**	71%	87%	83%	84%	75%	**4%**	-11%	-1%	-6%	-1%	-8%	**3%**
	R. D. White Elementary	58%	61%	67%	66%	66%	**8%**	52%	58%	61%	63%	62%	**10%**	-6%	-3%	-6%	-3%	-4%	**2%**
	Rosemont Middle	73%	78%	81%	79%	83%	**10%**	63%	70%	75%	74%	80%	**17%**	-10%	-8%	-6%	-5%	-3%	**7%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	43%	51%	47%	44%	45%	**2%**	35%	44%	40%	39%	44%	**9%**	-8%	-7%	-7%	-5%	-1%	**7%**
	Thomas Edison Elementary	43%	45%	49%	50%	54%	**11%**	39%	43%	47%	46%	52%	**13%**	-4%	-2%	-2%	-4%	-2%	**2%**
	Valley View Elementary	80%	84%	87%	86%	87%	**7%**	78%	79%	87%	83%	86%	**8%**	-2%	-5%	0%	-3%	-1%	**1%**
	Verdugo Woodlands Elementary	77%	75%	78%	78%	77%	**0%**	70%	69%	74%	73%	70%	**0%**	-7%	-6%	-4%	-5%	-7%	**0%**
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	61%	65%	66%	67%	64%	**3%**	49%	51%	54%	60%	59%	**10%**	-12%	-14%	-12%	-7%	-5%	**7%**
Imperial County Office of Education	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	31%	40%	42%	42%	46%	**15%**	25%	31%	38%	33%	38%	**13%**	-6%	-9%	-4%	-9%	-8%	**-2%**
	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**	21%	23%	37%	33%	44%	**23%**	19%	21%	36%	31%	42%	**23%**	-2%	-2%	-1%	-2%	-2%	**0%**
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**	4%	2%	5%	12%	13%	**9%**	0%	0%	0%	5%	9%	**9%**	-4%	-2%	-5%	-7%	-4%	**0%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary **(El Centro Elementary School District)**	33%	42%	53%	52%	56%	**23%**	27%	37%	50%	49%	56%	**29%**	-6%	-5%	-3%	-3%	0%	**6%**
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	24%	20%	32%	36%	100%	**76%**	22%	18%	30%	32%	100%	**78%**	-2%	-2%	-2%	-4%	0%	**2%**
Irvine Unified	College Park Elementary	74%	77%	75%	79%	80%	**6%**	80%	82%	79%	80%	79%	**-1%**	6%	5%	4%	1%	-1%	**-7%**
	Culverdale Elementary	70%	73%	74%	78%	74%	**4%**	72%	78%	81%	79%	77%	**5%**	2%	5%	7%	1%	3%	**1%**
	Northwood Elementary	74%	77%	81%	75%	80%	**6%**	74%	72%	79%	74%	71%	**-3%**	0%	-5%	-2%	-1%	-9%	**-9%**
	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	75%	80%	81%	80%	85%	**10%**	75%	70%	74%	79%	82%	**7%**	0%	-10%	-7%	-1%	-3%	**-3%**
	University High	90%	90%	88%	92%	93%	**3%**	77%	84%	79%	89%	85%	**8%**	-13%	-6%	-9%	-3%	-8%	**5%**
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante	38%	62%	80%	64%	100%	**62%**	37%	53%	75%	58%	100%	**63%**	-1%	-9%	-5%	-6%	0%	**1%**
Lennox Elementary	Buford Elementary	35%	43%	45%	55%	54%	**19%**	32%	40%	43%	53%	53%	**21%**	-3%	-3%	-2%	-2%	-1%	**2%**
Livingston Union Elementary	Campus Park Elementary	35%	41%	51%	50%	100%	**65%**	34%	41%	48%	46%	100%	**66%**	-1%	0%	-3%	-4%	0%	**1%**
	Selma Herndon Elementary	35%	40%	48%	48%	48%	**13%**	33%	38%	44%	45%	44%	**11%**	-2%	-2%	-4%	-3%	-4%	**-2%**
	Yamato Colony Elementary	47%	48%	57%	53%	60%	**13%**	45%	46%	53%	50%	55%	**10%**	-2%	-2%	-4%	-3%	-5%	**-3%**
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	32%	44%	55%	46%	54%	**22%**	33%	42%	53%	46%	54%	**21%**	1%	-2%	-2%	0%	0%	**-1%**
Marysville Joint Unified	Johnson Park Elementary	49%	61%	65%	60%	56%	**7%**	46%	62%	66%	71%	63%	**17%**	-3%	1%	1%	11%	7%	**10%**
	Olivehurst Elementary	33%	50%	63%	60%	60%	**27%**	25%	39%	54%	52%	57%	**32%**	-8%	-11%	-9%	-8%	-3%	**5%**
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	21%	33%	45%	50%	45%	**24%**	14%	27%	39%	47%	43%	**29%**	-7%	-6%	-6%	-3%	-2%	**5%**
Mountain Empire Unified	Potrero Elementary	39%	41%	55%	58%	58%	**19%**	35%	32%	54%	55%	58%	**23%**	-4%	-9%	-1%	-3%	0%	**4%**
New Haven Unified	Searles Elementary	43%	52%	49%	47%	48%	**5%**	35%	42%	48%	46%	45%	**10%**	-8%	-10%	-1%	-1%	-3%	**5%**
Newhall Elementary	Dr. J. Michael McGrath Elementary	39%	50%	56%	61%	71%	**32%**	30%	41%	46%	53%	67%	**37%**	-9%	-9%	-10%	-8%	-4%	**5%**
	Newhall Elementary	49%	60%	62%	61%	53%	**4%**	30%	37%	41%	44%	38%	**8%**	-19%	-23%	-21%	-17%	-15%	**4%**
	Old Orchard Elementary	66%	75%	73%	74%	69%	**3%**	43%	57%	46%	50%	53%	**10%**	-23%	-18%	-27%	-24%	-16%	**7%**
	Peachland Avenue Elementary	78%	75%	79%	75%	73%	**-5%**	57%	49%	63%	51%	53%	**-4%**	-21%	-26%	-16%	-24%	-20%	**1%**
	Wiley Canyon Elementary	56%	67%	68%	74%	70%	**14%**	35%	54%	56%	65%	61%	**26%**	-21%	-13%	-12%	-9%	-9%	**12%**
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	11%	21%	27%	24%	34%	**23%**	6%	13%	14%	19%	27%	**21%**	-5%	-8%	-13%	-5%	-7%	**-2%**
Novato Unified	Loma Verde Elementary	52%	66%	64%	53%	59%	**7%**	35%	54%	50%	39%	51%	**16%**	-17%	-12%	-14%	-14%	-8%	**9%**
	Olive Elementary	54%	62%	67%	62%	57%	**3%**	31%	38%	49%	41%	37%	**6%**	-23%	-24%	-18%	-21%	-20%	**3%**
Oak Grove Elementary	Baldwin (Julia) Elementary	48%	51%	55%	48%	55%	**7%**	34%	44%	49%	39%	48%	**14%**	-14%	-7%	-6%	-9%	-7%	**7%**
	Christopher Elementary	41%	36%	45%	46%	50%	**9%**	36%	34%	42%	43%	46%	**10%**	-5%	-2%	-3%	-3%	-4%	**1%**
	Del Roble Elementary	40%	100%	50%	43%		**3%**	37%	100%	44%	39%		**2%**	-3%	0%	-6%	-4%		**-1%**
	Edenvale Elementary	43%	50%	61%	52%	49%	**6%**	41%	48%	59%	49%	44%	**3%**	-2%	-2%	-2%	-3%	-5%	**-3%**
	Glider Elementary	57%	63%	63%	62%	68%	**11%**	59%	58%	56%	56%	65%	**6%**	2%	-5%	-7%	-6%	-3%	**-5%**
	Hayes Elementary	47%	52%	54%	57%	56%	**9%**	32%	39%	47%	54%	48%	**16%**	-15%	-13%	-7%	-3%	-8%	**7%**
	Ledesma (Rita) Elementary	57%	65%	69%	69%	73%	**16%**	39%	46%	60%	66%	71%	**32%**	-18%	-19%	-9%	-3%	-2%	**16%**
	Miner (George) Elementary	44%	52%	55%	58%	55%	**11%**	41%	47%	53%	62%	54%	**13%**	-3%	-5%	-2%	4%	-1%	**2%**
	Parkview Elementary	61%	63%	66%	66%	67%	**6%**	59%	60%	65%	67%	67%	**8%**	-2%	-3%	-1%	1%	0%	**2%**
	Stipe (Samuel) Elementary	43%	50%	49%	54%	47%	**4%**	38%	48%	44%	51%	43%	**5%**	-5%	-2%	-5%	-3%	-4%	**1%**
Oxnard Union High	Adolfo Camarillo High	70%	64%	69%	72%	72%	**2%**	48%	28%	47%	31%	54%	**6%**	-22%	-36%	-22%	-41%	-18%	**4%**
	Channel Islands High	40%	43%	45%	45%	50%	**10%**	35%	34%	38%	35%	45%	**10%**	-5%	-9%	-7%	-10%	-5%	**0%**
	Frontier High																		
	Hueneme High	26%	31%	29%	33%	33%	**7%**	18%	26%	21%	29%	30%	**12%**	-8%	-5%	-8%	-4%	-3%	**5%**
	Oxnard High	42%	45%	49%	49%	45%	**3%**	33%	37%	29%	33%	31%	**-2%**	-9%	-8%	-20%	-16%	-14%	**-5%**
	Pacifica High	32%	33%	37%	39%	47%	**15%**	24%	23%	22%	30%	39%	**15%**	-8%	-10%	-15%	-9%	-8%	**0%**
	Rio Mesa High	46%	49%	51%	53%	50%	**4%**	21%	27%	34%	32%	39%	**18%**	-25%	-22%	-17%	-21%	-11%	**14%**
Pasadena Unified	Altadena Elementary	27%	33%	38%	37%	48%	**21%**	31%	33%	46%	39%	53%	**22%**	4%	0%	8%	2%	5%	**1%**
	Jackson Elementary	27%	41%	42%	45%	45%	**18%**	29%	44%	40%	42%	40%	**11%**	2%	3%	-2%	-3%	-5%	**-7%**
	Jefferson Elementary	42%	50%	51%	44%	45%	**3%**	33%	39%	48%	42%	38%	**5%**	-9%	-11%	-3%	-2%	-7%	**2%**
	Longfellow (Henry W.) Elementary	38%	45%	51%	55%	55%	**17%**	35%	44%	47%	55%	49%	**14%**	-3%	-1%	-4%	0%	-6%	**-3%**
	Madison Elementary	32%	46%	49%	43%	42%	**10%**	28%	44%	46%	38%	38%	**10%**	-4%	-2%	-3%	-5%	-4%	**0%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide AMAO in Math						EL Subgroup AMAO in Math						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
	Washington Accelerated Elementary	32%	54%	57%	59%	61%	**29%**	29%	50%	52%	54%	57%	**28%**	-3%	-4%	-5%	-5%	-4%	**-1%**
	Willard Elementary	52%	62%	71%	75%	74%	**22%**	49%	57%	71%	80%	68%	**19%**	-3%	-5%	0%	5%	-6%	**-3%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Casa Grande High	65%	57%		58%		**-7%**	31%	19%		48%		**17%**	-34%	-38%		-10%		**24%**
	Kenilworth Junior High	47%	48%				**1%**	15%	24%				**9%**	-32%	-24%				**8%**
	Petaluma High	60%	63%				**3%**	26%	32%				**6%**	-34%	-31%				**3%**
	Petaluma Junior High	41%	42%				**1%**	11%	16%				**5%**	-30%	-26%				**4%**
Salida Union Elementary	Salida Elementary	41%	48%	51%	52%	53%	**12%**	16%	32%	43%	38%	40%	**24%**	-25%	-16%	-8%	-14%	-13%	**12%**
San Diego County Office of Education	Cuyamaca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	36%	43%	42%	50%	43%	**7%**	15%	25%	36%	45%	33%	**18%**	-21%	-18%	-6%	-5%	-10%	**11%**
	Kimball Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	50%	49%	57%	56%	63%	**13%**	44%	46%	55%	53%	61%	**17%**	-6%	-3%	-2%	-3%	-2%	**4%**
	Las Palmas Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	34%	38%	44%	49%	55%	**21%**	33%	37%	41%	46%	56%	**23%**	-1%	-1%	-3%	-3%	1%	**2%**
	Lilac School **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District)**	47%	72%	80%	75%	75%	**28%**	23%	48%	60%	51%	56%	**33%**	-24%	-24%	-20%	-24%	-19%	**5%**
	Naranca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	35%	38%	48%	57%	63%	**28%**	33%	32%	39%	52%	55%	**22%**	-2%	-6%	-9%	-5%	-8%	**-6%**
	Olivewood **(National Elementary School District)**	50%	54%	51%	49%	53%	**3%**	50%	52%	46%	46%	53%	**3%**	0%	-2%	-5%	-3%	0%	**0%**
	Valley Center Elementary **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified)**	36%	44%	48%	58%	53%	**17%**	11%	15%	25%	38%	34%	**23%**	-25%	-29%	-23%	-20%	-19%	**6%**
San Jose Unified	Grant Elementary	20%	40%	54%	57%	59%	**39%**	11%	33%	48%	51%	52%	**41%**	-9%	-7%	-6%	-6%	-7%	**2%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	32%	47%	50%	57%	47%	**15%**	22%	42%	48%	58%	46%	**24%**	-10%	-5%	-2%	1%	-1%	**9%**
	River Glen	39%	48%	55%	54%	58%	**19%**	29%	36%	42%	36%	43%	**14%**	-10%	-12%	-13%	-18%	-15%	**-5%**
	Washington Elementary	23%	34%	40%	42%	49%	**26%**	24%	34%	40%	42%	49%	**25%**	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**-1%**
San Leandro Unified	Washington Elementary	26%	41%	50%	50%	40%	**14%**	15%	36%	42%	48%	37%	**22%**	-11%	-5%	-8%	-2%	-3%	**8%**
Sanger Unified	Del Rey Elementary	14%	39%	41%	56%	56%	**42%**	12%	41%	44%	55%	53%	**41%**	-2%	2%	3%	-1%	-3%	**-1%**
	Fairmont Elementary	43%	48%	54%	57%	61%	**18%**	28%	32%	42%	52%	59%	**31%**	-15%	-16%	-12%	-5%	-2%	**13%**
	Jackson Elementary	42%	58%	67%	72%	78%	**36%**	24%	47%	57%	61%	63%	**39%**	-18%	-11%	-10%	-11%	-15%	**3%**
	Lone Star Elementary	40%	66%	98%	58%	64%	**24%**	36%	62%	99%	50%	53%	**17%**	-4%	-4%	1%	-8%	-11%	**-7%**
	Madison Elementary	34%	51%	100%	61%	65%	**31%**	17%	46%	100%	55%	65%	**48%**	-17%	-5%	0%	-6%	0%	**17%**
	Sanger High			47%	50%	54%	**7%**			32%	37%	43%	**11%**			-15%	-13%	-11%	**4%**
Santa Ana Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	30%	38%	37%	36%	39%	**9%**	29%	38%	37%	35%	39%	**10%**	-1%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	**1%**
	Andrew Jackson Elementary	19%	29%	39%	39%	58%	**39%**	17%	28%	38%	36%	56%	**39%**	-2%	-1%	-1%	-3%	-2%	**0%**
	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	40%	42%	51%	51%	55%	**15%**	30%	25%	38%	35%	35%	**5%**	-10%	-17%	-13%	-16%	-20%	**-10%**
	George Washington Carver Elementary	32%	31%	34%	48%	56%	**24%**	29%	28%	32%	48%	56%	**27%**	-3%	-3%	-2%	0%	0%	**3%**
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	29%	32%	36%	35%	49%	**20%**	14%	20%	30%	24%	38%	**24%**	-15%	-12%	-6%	-11%	-11%	**4%**
	Greenville Fundamental Elementary	73%	75%	78%	76%	74%	**1%**	70%	69%	72%	70%	70%	**0%**	-3%	-6%	-6%	-6%	-4%	**-1%**
	Jefferson Elementary	38%	45%	49%	45%	100%	**62%**	33%	39%	46%	42%	100%	**67%**	-5%	-6%	-3%	-3%	0%	**5%**
	Jim Thorpe Fundamental	51%	59%	61%	62%	70%	**19%**	44%	53%	55%	58%	64%	**20%**	-7%	-6%	-6%	-4%	-6%	**1%**
	John Muir Fundamental Elementary	43%	51%	54%	60%	63%	**20%**	37%	45%	51%	56%	58%	**21%**	-6%	-6%	-3%	-4%	-5%	**1%**
	Jose Sepulveda Elementary	16%	22%	30%	27%	35%	**19%**	12%	21%	28%	24%	32%	**20%**	-4%	-1%	-2%	-3%	-3%	**1%**
	Madison Elementary	45%	55%	63%	70%	71%	**26%**	42%	52%	61%	69%	71%	**29%**	-3%	-3%	-2%	-1%	0%	**3%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary	22%	26%	29%	39%	61%	**39%**	20%	25%	28%	37%	59%	**39%**	-2%	-1%	-1%	-2%	-2%	**0%**
	Martin R. Heninger Elementary	36%	45%	46%	51%	49%	**13%**	35%	43%	45%	46%	46%	**11%**	-1%	-2%	-1%	-5%	-3%	**-2%**
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	22%	24%	31%	31%	43%	**21%**	18%	18%	27%	24%	35%	**17%**	-4%	-6%	-4%	-7%	-8%	**-4%**
	Santa Ana High	35%	37%	38%	34%	39%	**4%**	31%	25%	32%	27%	33%	**2%**	-4%	-12%	-6%	-7%	-6%	**-2%**
	Santiago Elementary	45%	49%	48%	53%	58%	**13%**	28%	36%	39%	49%	49%	**21%**	-17%	-13%	-9%	-4%	-9%	**8%**
	Taft Elementary	41%	41%	41%	38%	55%	**14%**	31%	31%	35%	35%	50%	**19%**	-10%	-10%	-6%	-3%	-5%	**5%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Elementary	19%	37%	40%	45%	44%	**25%**	17%	37%	40%	45%	43%	**26%**	-2%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	**1%**
	Wilson Elementary	23%	23%	25%	29%	28%	**5%**	22%	22%	25%	30%	27%	**5%**	-1%	-1%	0%	1%	-1%	**0%**
Sierra Sands Unified	Faller Elementary	45%	56%	67%	58%	58%	**13%**	13%	19%	33%	50%	38%	**25%**	-32%	-37%	-34%	-8%	-20%	**12%**
	Gateway Elementary	56%	77%	70%	65%	62%	**6%**	32%	63%	31%	57%	43%	**11%**	-24%	-14%	-39%	-8%	-19%	**5%**
	Inyokern Elementary	41%	49%	49%	34%	39%	**-2%**												
	Las Flores Elementary	66%	71%	69%	58%	61%	**-5%**	64%	45%	67%	46%	63%	**-1%**	-2%	-26%	-2%	-12%	2%	**4%**
	Pierce Elementary	35%	47%	50%	59%	55%	**20%**	29%	42%	48%	53%	53%	**24%**	-6%	-5%	-2%	-6%	-2%	**4%**
	Richmond Elementary	59%	67%	63%	51%	57%	**-2%**	62%	77%	63%	46%	36%	**-26%**	3%	10%	0%	-5%	-21%	**-24%**
Sonoma County Office of Education	Bellevue Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	29%	40%	43%	39%	41%	**12%**	28%	35%	45%	40%	42%	**14%**	-1%	-5%	2%	1%	1%	**2%**
	Jack London Elementary **(Piner-Olivet Union Elementary School District)**	47%	56%	57%		61%	**14%**	28%	52%	50%		48%	**20%**	-19%	-4%	-7%		-13%	**6%**
	Meadow View Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	34%		51%	52%	46%	**12%**	32%		49%	50%	45%	**13%**	-2%		-2%	-2%	-1%	**1%**
	Mountain Shadows Middle **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	30%	32%	31%	33%	38%	**8%**	14%	14%	20%	20%	21%	**7%**	-16%	-18%	-11%	-13%	-17%	**-1%**
	Waldo Rohnert Elementary **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	32%	45%	53%	45%	45%	**13%**	19%	27%	38%	40%	38%	**19%**	-13%	-18%	-15%	-5%	-7%	**6%**
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Las Palmas Elementary	43%	40%	51%	50%	44%	**1%**	28%	28%	46%	42%	35%	**7%**	-15%	-12%	-5%	-8%	-9%	**6%**
Ventura Unified	De Anza Middle	26%	37%	35%	43%	30%	**4%**	15%	30%	29%	41%	25%	**10%**	-11%	-7%	-6%	-2%	-5%	**6%**
	E. P. Foster Elementary	32%	44%	72%	61%	59%	**27%**	28%	46%	72%	58%	55%	**27%**	-4%	2%	0%	-3%	-4%	**0%**
	Juanamaria Elementary	70%	81%	80%	78%	77%	**7%**	48%	63%	64%	63%	58%	**10%**	-22%	-18%	-16%	-15%	-19%	**3%**
	Montalvo Elementary	35%	42%	57%	46%	52%	**17%**	29%	33%	47%	37%	31%	**2%**	-6%	-9%	-10%	-9%	-21%	**-15%**
	Sheridan Way Elementary	45%	49%	49%	48%	44%	**-1%**	42%	46%	45%	42%	39%	**-3%**	-3%	-3%	-4%	-6%	-5%	**-2%**
	Casita Center for Science/Math/Technology	56%	62%	61%	64%	65%	**9%**	36%	40%	44%	49%	46%	**10%**	-20%	-22%	-17%	-15%	-19%	**1%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide AMAO in Math						EL Subgroup AMAO in Math						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
Vista Unified	Foothill Oak Elementary		41%	49%	53%	49%	**8%**		37%	40%	48%	43%	**6%**		-4%	-9%	-5%	-6%	**-2%**
	Roosevelt Middle	42%	46%	50%	58%	59%	**17%**	16%	19%	28%	31%	28%	**12%**	-26%	-27%	-22%	-27%	-31%	**-5%**
	Temple Heights Elementary	43%	52%	57%	57%	60%	**17%**	30%	41%	52%	47%	57%	**27%**	-13%	-11%	-5%	-10%	-3%	**10%**
	Vista Academy of Visual and Performing Arts	47%	53%	53%	50%	57%	**10%**	26%	30%	32%	31%	39%	**13%**	-21%	-23%	-21%	-19%	-18%	**3%**
Whittier City Elementary	Orange Grove Elementary	41%	43%	51%	43%	46%	**5%**	42%	36%	52%	43%	35%	**-7%**	1%	-7%	1%	0%	-11%	**-12%**
Woodland Joint Unified	Beamer Elementary	26%	43%	48%	53%	58%	**32%**	16%	35%	43%	47%	48%	**32%**	-10%	-8%	-5%	-6%	-10%	**0%**
	Lee Middle	16%	19%	28%	27%	30%	**14%**	7%	11%	17%	17%	19%	**12%**	-9%	-8%	-11%	-10%	-11%	**-2%**
	Ramon S. Tafoya Elementary	44%	49%	50%	54%	53%	**9%**	27%	38%	40%	44%	40%	**13%**	-17%	-11%	-10%	-10%	-13%	**4%**
	Rhoda Maxwell Elementary	28%	41%	41%	43%	48%	**20%**	14%	34%	41%	43%	51%	**37%**	-14%	-7%	0%	0%	3%	**17%**
	Willow Spring Elementary	41%	42%	40%	48%	39%	**-2%**	25%	33%	34%	40%	34%	**9%**	-16%	-9%	-6%	-8%	-5%	**11%**
	Woodland Prairie Elementary	26%	34%	41%	44%	43%	**17%**	16%	27%	34%	37%	39%	**23%**	-10%	-7%	-7%	-7%	-4%	**6%**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives Growth (Title III), Percentage met in AMAO 1-2

Table Description

According to Title III-Limited English language proficiency (LEP) all LEA's receiving grant monies are required to meet two English language proficiency AMAOs and a third academic achievement AMAO on AYP. Table 1 reflects the percentage of English Learner students meeting annual progress on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) or Annual Measurable Achievement Objective 1. This is measured by the number of ELs at Beginning, Early Intermediate, and Intermediate levels gaining one performance level, ELs at Early Advanced/Advanced achieving proficiency, and ELs at English proficient level maintaining achievement.

- **EL AMAO 2 growth 2006-08, including net difference in growth between 2006 and 2008**

Name of LEA	School	% Met AMAO 1 Annual Growth CELDT				% Met AMAO 2 Attain Eng. Proficiency			
		2006	2007	2008	Net	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Artesia High	48%	52%		**+5%**	25%	31%		**+6%**
	Willow Elementary	47%	55%	87%	**+40%**	24%	44%	77%	**+53%**
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	64%		63%	**-1%**	43%			**N/A**
Atwater Elementary	Thomas Olaeta Elementary	46%	68%	41%	**-5%**	32%	48%	24%	**-8%**
Bakersfield City	Casa Loma Elementary	48%	52%	62%	**+14%**	34%	27%	42%	**+8%**
	Frank West Elementary	44%	59%	71%	**+27%**	21%	45%	66%	**+45%**
	Munsey Elementary	50%	52%	59%	**+9%**	33%	30%	49%	**+16%**
Brentwood Union Elementary	Brentwood Elementary	55%	61%	67%	**+12%**	32%	48%		**+15%**
	Edna Hill Middle	50%	54%	80%	**+30%**	28%	31%	49%	**+21%**
Ceres Unified	Carroll Fowler Elementary	49%	59%	51%	**+3%**	25%	49%	34%	**+9%**
	Don Pedro Elementary	52%	60%		**+8%**	34%	38%		**+5%**
	M. Robert Adkison Elementary	39%	62%	64%	**+25%**	23%	34%	46%	**+23%**
	Samuel Vaughn Elementary	44%	59%	66%	**+22%**	31%	36%	51%	**+20%**
	Walter White Elementary	40%	51%	53%	**+13%**	15%	27%	25%	**+10%**
Chula Vista Elementary	Valle Lindo Elementary	51%	44%	58%	**+7%**	26%	35%	42%	**+16%**
Coachella Valley Unified	Bobby Duke Middle		58%	63%	**+6%**		30%	42%	**+13%**
	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	56%	54%	56%	**0%**	27%	26%	35%	**+7%**
	Toro Canyon Middle	36%	54%	63%	**+28%**	16%	26%	50%	**+34%**
	West Shores High	38%	57%	57%	**+19%**	13%	27%	35%	**+21%**
Desert Sands Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	61%	66%	52%	**-8%**	45%	45%	28%	**-17%**
	Dr. Reynaldo J. Carreon Jr. Academy	54%	60%	61%	**+7%**	35%	51%	27%	**-7%**
El Monte City Elementary	Legore Elementary	40%	53%	49%	**+9%**	19%	30%	37%	**+18%**
Escondido Union	Central Elementary	59%	60%	61%	**+2%**	40%	40%	41%	**+1%**
Evergreen Elementary	Cadwallader Elementary	52%	54%	69%	**+18%**	29%	39%	54%	**+25%**
	Carolyn A. Clark Elementary	77%	69%	55%	**-23%**	68%	62%	46%	**-22%**
	Cedar Grove Elementary	60%	61%	77%	**+17%**	46%	46%	69%	**+24%**
	Chaboya Middle	63%	52%	38%	**-25%**	37%	32%	15%	**-22%**
	Dove Hill Elementary	59%	60%	39%	**-21%**	42%	40%	16%	**-25%**
	Evergreen Elementary	77%	78%	71%	**-6%**	71%	69%	65%	**-6%**
	Holly Oak Elementary	53%	54%	58%	**+5%**	46%	36%	45%	**-1%**
	John J. Montgomery Elementary	52%	49%	46%	**-7%**	37%	38%	19%	**-18%**
	O. B. Whaley Elementary	48%	56%	88%	**+40%**	25%	38%	93%	**+68%**
	Quimby Oak Middle	65%	78%	85%	**+20%**	35%	47%	84%	**+49%**
Garvey Elementary	Bitely (Arlene) Elementary	47%	55%		**+8%**	32%	41%		**+9%**
	Dewey Avenue Elementary	59%	60%	59%	**0%**	41%	39%	43%	**+1%**
	Duff (Margaret) Elementary	46%	49%	55%	**+10%**	26%	26%	47%	**+21%**
	Emerson (Ralph Waldo) Elementary	55%	55%	57%	**+2%**	35%	42%	17%	**-18%**
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	48%	56%	61%	**+13%**	27%	32%	34%	**+7%**
	Hillcrest Elementary	48%	55%	56%	**+7%**	46%	47%	37%	**-10%**
	Marshall (John) Elementary	50%	57%	70%	**+20%**	26%	43%	49%	**+23%**
	Monterey Vista Elementary	63%	60%	75%	**+11%**	34%	51%	53%	**+19%**
	Rice (Eldridge) Elementary	56%	58%	73%	**+17%**	37%	35%	62%	**+25%**
	Sanchez (George I.) Elementary	45%	51%	67%	**+22%**	28%	42%	61%	**+33%**
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	59%	70%	67%	**+7%**	29%	49%	42%	**+13%**

Name of LEA	School	% Met AMAO 1 Annual Growth CELDT				% Met AMAO 2 Attain Eng. Proficiency			
		2006	2007	2008	Net	2006	2007	2008	Net
	Willard (Frances E.) Elementary	54%	53%	52%	**-2%**	35%	30%	33%	**-2%**
Glendale Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	43%	67%	72%	**+29%**	29%	55%	62%	**+33%**
	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	85%	94%	45%	**-39%**	61%	75%		**+14%**
	Balboa Elementary	63%	66%	69%	**+6%**	43%	41%	55%	**+12%**
	Benjamin Franklin Elementary	54%	48%	72%	**+19%**	33%	38%	65%	**+32%**
	Cerritos Elementary	50%	69%	65%	**+15%**	28%	54%	42%	**+14%**
	Columbus Elementary	57%	61%	58%	**+1%**	38%	48%	40%	**+2%**
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	76%	85%	90%	**+14%**	52%	79%		**+27%**
	Daily (Allan F.) High (Continuation)	69%	54%		**-16%**		30%		**N/A**
	Dunsmore Elementary	90%	73%	78%	**-12%**	89%		68%	**-21%**
	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	79%	68%	57%	**-22%**	50%	32%	37%	**-13%**
	Glendale Senior High	61%	57%	76%	**+15%**	32%	28%	71%	**+40%**
	Glenoaks Elementary	60%	61%	55%	**-4%**	43%	33%	38%	**-5%**
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	62%	71%	58%	**-3%**	34%	47%	44%	**+10%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	51%	56%	70%	**+19%**	31%	40%	65%	**+34%**
	John C. Fremont Elementary	76%	81%	69%	**-8%**	46%	67%	56%	**+10%**
	John Marshall Elementary	58%	65%	80%	**+22%**	41%	46%	73%	**+32%**
	John Muir Elementary	55%	59%	70%	**+15%**	33%	41%	42%	**+9%**
	La Crescenta Elementary	68%	82%	78%	**+10%**	55%	72%	64%	**+10%**
	Mark Keppel Elementary	56%	64%	65%	**+8%**	40%	49%	54%	**+14%**
	Monte Vista Elementary	80%	74%	70%	**-10%**	74%	53%	63%	**-12%**
	Mountain Avenue Elementary	67%	70%	69%	**+2%**		55%	43%	**-12%**
	R. D. White Elementary	62%	61%	0%	**-62%**	42%	49%		**+7%**
	Rosemont Middle	88%	90%	60%	**-29%**	66%	76%	43%	**-22%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	71%	73%	0%	**-71%**	39%	54%	0%	**-39%**
	Thomas Edison Elementary	58%	55%	70%	**+13%**	40%	42%	53%	**+13%**
	Valley View Elementary	75%	83%	83%	**+8%**	58%	72%	69%	**+11%**
	Verdugo Woodlands Elementary	72%	69%	75%	**+3%**	64%	47%	55%	**-9%**
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	79%	69%	59%	**-20%**	64%	41%	40%	**-25%**
Imperial County Office of Education	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	42%	47%	50%	**8%**	21%	21%	25%	**4%**
	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**	57%	63%	59%	**+2%**	35%	43%	52%	**+17%**
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**	45%	46%	43%	**-2%**	23%	18%	19%	**-4%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary **(El Centro Elementary School District)**	46%	52%	69%	**+23%**	17%	36%	74%	**+57%**
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	49%	46%	48%	**-1%**	27%	20%	23%	**-4%**
Irvine Unified	College Park Elementary	74%	67%	68%	**-6%**	60%	47%	52%	**-8%**
	Culverdale Elementary	69%	68%	68%	**-1%**	55%	54%	55%	**0%**
	Northwood Elementary	66%	74%	72%	**+6%**	49%	70%	66%	**+17%**
	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	78%	71%	79%	**+1%**			72%	**N/A**
	University High	78%	72%	78%	**0%**	54%	60%		**+6%**
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante								
Lennox Elementary	Buford Elementary	51%	53%	67%	**+17%**	33%	36%	54%	**+21%**
Livingston Union Elementary	Campus Park Elementary	53%	59%	57%	**+4%**	31%	50%		**+19%**
	Selma Herndon Elementary	55%	53%	60%	**+6%**	34%	37%	39%	**+5%**
	Yamato Colony Elementary	48%	57%	78%	**+30%**	25%	45%	77%	**+52%**

Name of LEA	School	% Met AMAO 1 Annual Growth CELDT				% Met AMAO 2 Attain Eng. Proficiency			
		2006	2007	2008	Net	2006	2007	2008	Net
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	61%	59%	55%	**-5%**	42%	42%	31%	**-11%**
Marysville Joint Unified	Johnson Park Elementary	50%	58%		**+8%**	36%	45%		**+9%**
	Olivehurst Elementary	56%	69%		**+13%**	40%	51%		**+10%**
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	60%	51%	67%	**+8%**	46%	44%	53%	**+7%**
Mountain Empire Unified	Potrero Elementary	50%	62%	71%	**+21%**	21%	48%	58%	**+37%**
New Haven Unified	Searles Elementary	59%	56%		**-2%**	48%	40%		**-8%**
Newhall Elementary	Dr. J. Michael McGrath Elementary	52%	55%	42%	**-10%**	29%	36%	33%	**+4%**
	Newhall Elementary	57%	51%		**-7%**	48%	24%		**-24%**
	Old Orchard Elementary	61%	66%	57%	**-4%**	37%	53%	35%	**-2%**
	Peachland Avenue Elementary	62%	56%	72%	**+10%**	51%	44%		**-6%**
	Wiley Canyon Elementary	55%	65%	49%	**-6%**	42%	47%	25%	**-16%**
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	60%	55%	92%	**+33%**	37%	27%		**-10%**
Novato Unified	Loma Verde Elementary	49%	57%	48%	**-1%**	33%	30%	22%	**-11%**
	Olive Elementary	53%	59%	58%	**+5%**	39%	47%	42%	**+3%**
Oak Grove Elementary	Baldwin (Julia) Elementary	49%	54%		**+6%**	31%	34%		**+3%**
	Christopher Elementary	44%	55%	64%	**+20%**	25%	41%	19%	**-6%**
	Del Roble Elementary	48%	52%	61%	**+13%**	44%	37%	32%	**-12%**
	Edenvale Elementary	47%	48%	69%	**+22%**	30%	34%	62%	**+32%**
	Glider Elementary	70%	64%	61%	**-9%**	60%	50%	41%	**-19%**
	Hayes Elementary	70%	60%		**-10%**	60%	47%		**-14%**
	Ledesma (Rita) Elementary	51%	62%		**+10%**	35%	45%		**+10%**
	Miner (George) Elementary	49%	51%	34%	**-16%**	30%	32%	0%	**-30%**
	Parkview Elementary	51%	69%		**+18%**	39%	57%		**+18%**
	Stipe (Samuel) Elementary	50%	50%	61%	**+10%**	34%	31%	42%	**+9%**
Oxnard Union High	Adolfo Camarillo High	68%	68%		**+0%**	27%	20%		**-7%**
	Channel Islands High	59%	58%		**-2%**	24%	23%		**-1%**
	Frontier High	62%	74%	57%	**-5%**	20%	35%	46%	**+26%**
	Hueneme High	53%	53%	53%	**+1%**	23%	28%	35%	**+12%**
	Oxnard High	52%	49%		**-3%**	18%	21%		**+3%**
	Pacifica High	63%	54%		**-9%**	29%	18%		**-11%**
	Rio Mesa High	81%	60%		**-21%**	45%	29%		**-15%**
Pasadena Unified	Altadena Elementary	51%	59%	55%	**+4%**	30%	46%	40%	**+10%**
	Jackson Elementary	54%	48%	49%	**-5%**	31%	34%	33%	**+2%**
	Jefferson Elementary	55%	54%	60%	**+5%**	37%	44%	47%	**+9%**
	Longfellow (Henry W.) Elementary	42%	57%	57%	**+15%**	22%	39%	27%	**+5%**
	Madison Elementary	49%	51%	59%	**+10%**	31%	33%	31%	**+0%**
	Washington Accelerated Elementary	54%	52%	44%	**-10%**	36%	38%	32%	**-4%**
	Willard Elementary	62%	86%	43%	**-18%**	51%	85%	37%	**-14%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Casa Grande High								
	Kenilworth Junior High								
	Petaluma High								
	Petaluma Junior High								
Salida Union Elementary	Salida Elementary	49%	70%	56%	**+7%**	28%	54%	30%	**+2%**
	Cuyamaca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	48%	38%	58%	**+10%**	29%	18%	43%	**+14%**

Name of LEA	School	% Met AMAO 1 Annual Growth CELDT				% Met AMAO 2 Attain Eng. Proficiency			
		2006	2007	2008	Net	2006	2007	2008	Net
San Diego County Office of Education	Kimball Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	48%	46%	57%	**9%**	42%	37%	37%	**-5%**
	Las Palmas Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	54%	49%		**-5%**	37%	30%		**-7%**
	Lilac School **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District)**	41%	60%	57%	**+16%**	17%	27%	40%	**+23%**
	Naranca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	49%	58%		**+9%**	34%	38%		**+4%**
	Olivewood **(National Elementary School District)**	50%	57%	48%	**-1%**	36%	38%	15%	**-21%**
	Valley Center Elementary **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified)**	56%	52%	53%	**-3%**	36%	31%	30%	**-6%**
San Jose Unified	Grant Elementary	66%	60%	51%	**-15%**	43%	40%	21%	**-22%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	47%	62%	65%	**+18%**	29%	49%	60%	**+31%**
	River Glen	55%	64%	50%	**-5%**	44%	55%	28%	**-16%**
	Washington Elementary	49%	45%	48%	**-1%**	37%	31%	26%	**-10%**
San Leandro Unified	Washington Elementary	54%	45%	68%	**+14%**	36%	27%	43%	**+7%**
Sanger Unified	Del Rey Elementary	57%	48%	67%	**+11%**	32%	32%	54%	**+22%**
	Fairmont Elementary	55%	48%	84%	**+29%**	28%	26%	80%	**+52%**
	Jackson Elementary	49%	58%	43%	**-6%**	32%	44%	35%	**+3%**
	Lone Star Elementary	57%	38%	59%	**+2%**	38%	23%	40%	**+2%**
	Madison Elementary	48%	55%		**+6%**	31%	29%		**-2%**
	Sanger High	55%	63%	61%	**+5%**	24%	35%	38%	**+14%**
Santa Ana Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	59%	52%	50%	**-9%**	38%	34%	26%	**-12%**
	Andrew Jackson Elementary	56%	63%	56%	**+0%**	37%	43%	37%	**+1%**
	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	60%	65%	49%	**-11%**	40%	41%	32%	**-8%**
	George Washington Carver Elementary	51%	52%	70%	**+19%**	20%	28%	45%	**+25%**
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	51%	56%	85%	**+34%**	25%	38%	74%	**+48%**
	Greenville Fundamental Elementary	66%	70%	67%	**+1%**	49%	56%	44%	**-6%**
	Jefferson Elementary	48%	56%	59%	**+11%**	25%	36%	45%	**+20%**
	Jim Thorpe Fundamental	60%	67%	85%	**+26%**	40%	51%		**+11%**
	John Muir Fundamental Elementary	54%	66%	60%	**+6%**	46%	55%	38%	**-8%**
	Jose Sepulveda Elementary	47%	54%	37%	**-10%**	22%	32%	17%	**-4%**
	Madison Elementary	58%	57%	57%	**-2%**	37%	38%	36%	**-1%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary	51%	64%	76%	**+25%**	28%	48%	54%	**+26%**
	Martin R. Heninger Elementary	57%	59%		**+2%**	36%	41%		**+5%**
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	60%	57%	76%	**+16%**	34%	33%	74%	**+39%**
	Santa Ana High	56%	47%	64%	**+8%**	27%	23%	47%	**+20%**
	Santiago Elementary	54%	59%	65%	**+10%**	41%	39%	51%	**+10%**
	Taft Elementary	51%	52%	50%	**-1%**	30%	36%	31%	**+1%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Elementary	54%	56%	54%	**+0%**	33%	41%	26%	**-8%**
	Wilson Elementary	49%	47%	74%	**+25%**	32%	27%	59%	**+27%**
Sierra Sands Unified	Faller Elementary		67%	52%	**-15%**			25%	**N/A**
	Gateway Elementary			58%	**N/A**			33%	**N/A**
	Inyokern Elementary			30%	**N/A**				**0%**
	Las Flores Elementary			73%	**N/A**			37%	**N/A**
	Pierce Elementary	51%	57%		**+6%**	31%	42%		**+11%**
	Richmond Elementary			60%	**N/A**				**0%**
	Bellevue Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	52%	48%	57%	**+5%**	31%	30%	33%	**+2%**
	Jack London Elementary **(Piner-Olivet Union Elementary School District)**	51%	68%	59%	**8%**	27%	41%	45%	**18%**

Name of LEA	School	% Met AMAO 1 Annual Growth CELDT				% Met AMAO 2 Attain Eng. Proficiency			
		2006	2007	2008	Net	2006	2007	2008	Net
Sonoma County Office of Education	Meadow View Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	59%	59%	57%	**-2%**	41%	41%	38%	**-3%**
	Mountain Shadows Middle **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	64%	63%	58%	**-6%**	37%	39%	39%	**+2%**
	Waldo Rohnert Elementary **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	54%	55%	59%	**+4%**	44%	39%	33%	**-12%**
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Las Palmas Elementary	41%	54%		**+14%**	22%	40%		**+18%**
Ventura Unified	De Anza Middle	60%	61%	61%	**+1%**	23%	37%	45%	**+23%**
	E. P. Foster Elementary	47%	39%		**-9%**	30%	31%		**+1%**
	Juanamaria Elementary	60%	44%	61%	**+1%**	36%	38%	31%	**-5%**
	Montalvo Elementary	52%	42%	57%	**+5%**	21%	22%	45%	**+24%**
	Sheridan Way Elementary	53%	48%	58%	**+5%**	35%	35%	45%	**+9%**
Whittier City Elementary	Orange Grove Elementary	37%	47%	60%	**+23%**	23%	34%	46%	**+23%**
Woodland Joint Unified	Beamer Elementary	55%	49%		**-6%**	28%	33%		**+5%**
	Lee Middle	64%	64%		**0%**	43%	40%		**-3%**
	Ramon S. Tafoya Elementary	59%	59%		**+1%**	46%	41%		**-5%**
	Rhoda Maxwell Elementary	60%	57%		**-3%**	38%	34%		**-4%**
	Willow Spring Elementary	47%	64%	51%	**+4%**	30%	49%	24%	**-6%**
	Woodland Prairie Elementary	49%	56%	47%	**-3%**	31%	28%	33%	**+2%**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
ELA CST, School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- **School-wide CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **EL CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL CST achievement from 2004-08**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide ELA CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup ELA CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Artesia High	21%	26%	26%	30%	35%	**+14%**	3%	4%	2%	2%	8%	**+5%**	-18%	-22%	-24%	-28%	-27%	**-9%**
	Willow Elementary	30%	35%	37%	32%	34%	**+4%**	15%	22%	30%	26%	20%	**+5%**	-15%	-13%	-7%	-6%	-14%	**+1%**
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	8%	14%	18%	22%	24%	**+16%**	3%	2%	8%	15%	0%	**-3%**	-5%	-12%	-10%	-7%	-24%	**-19%**
Atwater Elementary	Thomas Olaeta Elementary	33%	36%	37%	43%	40%	**+7%**	9%	16%	22%	27%	18%	**+9%**	-24%	-20%	-15%	-16%	-22%	**+2%**
Bakersfield City	Casa Loma Elementary	18%	29%	29%	30%	29%	**+11%**	6%	12%	14%	22%	18%	**+12%**	-12%	-17%	-15%	-8%	-11%	**+1%**
	Frank West Elementary	15%	24%	33%	31%	36%	**+21%**	1%	9%	22%	21%	26%	**+25%**	-14%	-15%	-11%	-10%	-10%	**+4%**
	Munsey Elementary	18%	23%	23%	29%	29%	**+11%**	8%	8%	9%	23%	20%	**+12%**	-10%	-15%	-14%	-6%	-9%	**+1%**
Brentwood Union Elementary	Brentwood Elementary	40%	47%	49%	50%	53%	**+13%**	10%	13%	13%	21%	26%	**+16%**	-30%	-34%	-36%	-29%	-27%	**+3%**
	Edna Hill Middle	39%	47%	53%	47%	51%	**+12%**	6%	13%	16%	7%	19%	**+13%**	-33%	-34%	-37%	-40%	-32%	**+1%**
Ceres Unified	Carroll Fowler Elementary	24%	32%	34%	41%	42%	**+18%**	8%	11%	12%	25%	24%	**+16%**	-16%	-21%	-22%	-16%	-18%	**-2%**
	Don Pedro Elementary	29%	30%	40%	42%	43%	**+14%**	12%	14%	27%	32%	34%	**+22%**	-17%	-16%	-13%	-10%	-9%	**+8%**
	M. Robert Adkison Elementary			25%	27%	29%	**+4%**			12%	18%	23%	**+11%**			-13%	-9%	-6%	**+7%**
	Samuel Vaughn Elementary	36%	37%	41%	39%	43%	**+7%**	9%	14%	19%	20%	31%	**+22%**	-27%	-23%	-22%	-19%	-12%	**+15%**
	Walter White Elementary	24%	30%	27%	25%	29%	**+5%**	8%	19%	16%	17%	20%	**+12%**	-16%	-11%	-11%	-8%	-9%	**+7%**
Chula Vista Elementary	Valle Lindo Elementary	28%	32%	39%	41%	43%	**+15%**	6%	11%	15%	18%	20%	**+14%**	-22%	-21%	-24%	-23%	-23%	**-1%**
Coachella Valley Unified	Bobby Duke Middle					21%	**N/A**					5%	**N/A**					-16%	**N/A**
	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	12%	17%	18%	21%	24%	**+12%**	5%	3%	6%	6%	7%	**+2%**	-7%	-14%	-12%	-15%	-17%	**-10%**
	Toro Canyon Middle	9%	12%	15%	18%	22%	**+13%**	3%	5%	4%	4%	6%	**+3%**	-6%	-7%	-11%	-14%	-16%	**-10%**
	West Shores High	18%	19%	23%	27%	22%	**+4%**	7%	8%	4%	15%	8%	**+1%**	-11%	-11%	-19%	-12%	-14%	**-3%**
Desert Sands Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	30%	38%	40%	44%	51%	**+21%**	13%	16%	20%	25%	33%	**+20%**	-17%	-22%	-20%	-19%	-18%	**-1%**
	Dr. Reynaldo J. Carreon Jr. Academy	26%	33%	39%	44%	50%	**+24%**	15%	23%	34%	37%	41%	**+26%**	-11%	-10%	-5%	-7%	-9%	**+2%**
El Monte City Elementary	Legore Elementary	20%	26%	35%	38%	47%	**+27%**	6%	13%	15%	18%	22%	**+16%**	-14%	-13%	-20%	-20%	-25%	**-11%**
Escondido Union	Central Elementary	19%	34%	34%	34%	36%	**+17%**	7%	24%	30%	27%	28%	**+21%**	-12%	-10%	-4%	-7%	-8%	**+4%**
Evergreen Elementary	Cadwallader Elementary	46%	48%	51%	46%	53%	**+7%**	28%	25%	24%	15%	22%	**-6%**	-18%	-23%	-27%	-31%	-31%	**-13%**
	Carolyn A. Clark Elementary		73%	78%	78%	78%	**+5%**		59%	57%	63%	54%	**-5%**		-14%	-21%	-15%	-24%	**-10%**
	Cedar Grove Elementary	47%	47%	55%	52%	53%	**+6%**	26%	29%	34%	37%	33%	**+7%**	-21%	-18%	-21%	-15%	-20%	**+1%**
	Chaboya Middle	61%	67%	65%	66%	71%	**+10%**	7%	21%	10%	13%	13%	**+6%**	-54%	-46%	-55%	-53%	-58%	**-4%**
	Dove Hill Elementary	35%	42%	47%	46%	47%	**+12%**	16%	26%	31%	29%	30%	**+14%**	-19%	-16%	-16%	-17%	-17%	**+2%**
	Evergreen Elementary	68%	71%	72%	74%	78%	**+10%**	43%	45%	37%	62%	68%	**+25%**	-25%	-26%	-35%	-12%	-10%	**+15%**
	Holly Oak Elementary	45%	52%	54%	50%	54%	**+9%**	25%	34%	41%	30%	41%	**+16%**	-20%	-18%	-13%	-20%	-13%	**+7%**
	John J. Montgomery Elementary	41%	42%	42%	44%	42%	**+1%**	25%	26%	28%	29%	30%	**+5%**	-16%	-16%	-14%	-15%	-12%	**+4%**
	O. B. Whaley Elementary	42%	47%	50%	48%	54%	**+12%**	29%	32%	39%	36%	33%	**+4%**	-13%	-15%	-11%	-12%	-21%	**-8%**
	Quimby Oak Middle	52%	59%	59%	57%	61%	**+9%**	11%	17%	14%	18%	15%	**+4%**	-41%	-42%	-45%	-39%	-46%	**-5%**
Garvey Elementary	Bitely (Arlene) Elementary	37%	44%	41%	47%	50%	**+13%**	15%	21%	11%	32%	25%	**+10%**	-22%	-23%	-30%	-15%	-25%	**-3%**
	Dewey Avenue Elementary	33%	34%	43%	47%	52%	**+19%**	21%	20%	28%	36%	46%	**+25%**	-12%	-14%	-15%	-11%	-6%	**+6%**
	Duff (Margaret) Elementary	20%	29%	31%	34%	37%	**+17%**	4%	15%	9%	13%	12%	**+8%**	-16%	-14%	-22%	-21%	-25%	**-9%**
	Emerson (Ralph Waldo) Elementary	35%	35%	41%	39%	40%	**+5%**	10%	17%	17%	13%	16%	**+6%**	-25%	-18%	-24%	-26%	-24%	**+1%**
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	37%	37%	39%	41%	47%	**+10%**	5%	10%	5%	5%	5%	**0%**	-32%	-27%	-34%	-36%	-42%	**-10%**
	Hillcrest Elementary	42%	49%	49%	48%	58%	**+16%**	20%	31%	22%	28%	38%	**+18%**	-22%	-18%	-27%	-20%	-20%	**+2%**
	Marshall (John) Elementary	27%	36%	46%	41%	48%	**+21%**	3%	18%	27%	26%	31%	**+28%**	-24%	-18%	-19%	-15%	-17%	**+7%**
	Monterey Vista Elementary	46%	54%	56%	53%	62%	**+16%**	26%	37%	43%	33%	52%	**+26%**	-20%	-17%	-13%	-20%	-10%	**+10%**
	Rice (Eldridge) Elementary	35%	36%	41%	42%	44%	**+9%**	23%	20%	14%	17%	27%	**+4%**	-12%	-16%	-27%	-25%	-17%	**-5%**
	Sanchez (George I.) Elementary	31%	32%	43%	45%	47%	**+16%**	18%	23%	24%	33%	34%	**+16%**	-13%	-9%	-19%	-12%	-13%	**0%**
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	34%	34%	42%	41%	46%	**+12%**	6%	10%	11%	7%	14%	**+8%**	-28%	-24%	-31%	-34%	-32%	**-4%**
	Willard (Frances E.) Elementary	27%	38%	37%	38%	47%	**+20%**	16%	18%	16%	20%	29%	**+13%**	-11%	-20%	-21%	-18%	-18%	**-7%**
Glendale Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	65%	67%	69%	67%	69%	**+4%**	38%	45%	41%	43%	51%	**+13%**	-27%	-22%	-28%	-24%	-18%	**+9%**
	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	66%	75%	74%	75%	80%	**+14%**	29%	46%	43%	38%	59%	**+30%**	-37%	-29%	-31%	-37%	-21%	**+16%**
	Balboa Elementary	47%	52%	55%	55%	57%	**+10%**	31%	28%	33%	37%	38%	**+7%**	-16%	-24%	-22%	-18%	-19%	**-3%**
	Benjamin Franklin Elementary	39%	46%	41%	49%	53%	**+14%**	14%	16%	22%	24%	32%	**+18%**	-25%	-30%	-19%	-25%	-21%	**+4%**
	Cerritos Elementary	23%	31%	34%	35%	38%	**+15%**	13%	17%	22%	24%	18%	**+5%**	-10%	-14%	-12%	-11%	-20%	**-10%**
	Columbus Elementary	40%	42%	46%	51%	52%	**+12%**	21%	26%	19%	22%	30%	**+9%**	-19%	-16%	-27%	-29%	-22%	**-3%**
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	67%	72%	73%	75%	76%	**+9%**	23%	25%	33%	33%	29%	**+6%**	-44%	-47%	-40%	-42%	-47%	**-3%**
	Daily (Allan F.) High (Continuation)	5%	6%	5%	9%	12%	**+7%**	0%	3%	0%	0%	6%	**+6%**	-5%	-3%	-5%	-9%	-6%	**-1%**
	Dunsmore Elementary	76%	77%	80%	80%	77%	**+1%**	58%	65%	92%	63%	47%	**-11%**	-18%	-12%	12%	-17%	-30%	**-12%**
	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	41%	48%	48%	50%	54%	**+13%**	10%	17%	16%	15%	13%	**+3%**	-31%	-31%	-32%	-35%	-41%	**-10%**
	Glendale Senior High	37%	42%	45%	48%	43%	**+6%**	11%	12%	15%	16%	9%	**-2%**	-26%	-30%	-30%	-32%	-34%	**-8%**
	Glenoaks Elementary	59%	61%	61%	60%	66%	**+7%**	35%	37%	35%	30%	39%	**+4%**	-24%	-24%	-26%	-30%	-27%	**-3%**
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	37%	44%	43%	45%	45%	**+8%**	10%	12%	14%	9%	9%	**-1%**	-27%	-32%	-29%	-36%	-36%	**-9%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	26%	28%	36%	44%	46%	**+20%**	16%	13%	24%	26%	29%	**+13%**	-10%	-15%	-12%	-18%	-17%	**-7%**
	John C. Fremont Elementary	61%	66%	68%	70%	70%	**+9%**	28%	38%	47%	49%	53%	**+25%**	-33%	-28%	-21%	-21%	-17%	**+16%**
	John Marshall Elementary	34%	40%	44%	43%	49%	**+15%**	15%	23%	25%	15%	35%	**+20%**	-19%	-17%	-19%	-28%	-14%	**+5%**
	John Muir Elementary	34%	37%	41%	48%	50%	**+16%**	14%	17%	19%	26%	19%	**+5%**	-20%	-20%	-22%	-22%	-31%	**-11%**
	La Crescenta Elementary	64%	61%	68%	72%	73%	**+9%**	54%	40%	41%	47%	46%	**-8%**	-10%	-21%	-27%	-25%	-27%	**-17%**
	Mark Keppel Elementary	48%	52%	56%	56%	57%	**+9%**	20%	20%	25%	22%	28%	**+8%**	-28%	-32%	-31%	-34%	-29%	**-1%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide ELA CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup ELA CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
	Monte Vista Elementary	78%	76%	77%	79%	80%	**+2%**	45%	56%	31%	56%	57%	**+12%**	-33%	-20%	-46%	-23%	-23%	**+10%**
	Mountain Avenue Elementary	76%	81%	82%	77%	83%	**+7%**	50%	63%	54%	41%	63%	**+13%**	-26%	-18%	-28%	-36%	-20%	**+6%**
	R. D. White Elementary	44%	47%	52%	56%	56%	**+12%**	22%	27%	29%	34%	35%	**+13%**	-22%	-20%	-23%	-22%	-21%	**+1%**
	Rosemont Middle	67%	74%	76%	76%	80%	**+13%**	21%	25%	36%	28%	39%	**+18%**	-46%	-49%	-40%	-48%	-41%	**+5%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	26%	39%	39%	41%	44%	**+18%**	7%	18%	16%	15%	17%	**+10%**	-19%	-21%	-23%	-26%	-27%	**-8%**
	Thomas Edison Elementary	28%	30%	31%	35%	44%	**+16%**	13%	11%	19%	21%	22%	**+9%**	-15%	-19%	-12%	-14%	-22%	**-7%**
	Valley View Elementary	69%	74%	76%	78%	77%	**+8%**	45%	52%	49%	56%	49%	**+4%**	-24%	-22%	-27%	-22%	-28%	**-4%**
	Verdugo Woodlands Elementary	65%	66%	68%	71%	73%	**+8%**	35%	51%	41%	39%	49%	**+14%**	-30%	-15%	-27%	-32%	-24%	**+6%**
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	52%	59%	60%	62%	60%	**+8%**	15%	14%	25%	14%	17%	**+2%**	-37%	-45%	-35%	-48%	-43%	**-6%**
Imperial County Office of Education	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	25%	34%	34%	38%	40%	**15%**	4%	5%	6%	5%	2%	**-2%**	-21%	-29%	-28%	-33%	-38%	**-17%**
	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**	19%	22%	27%	28%	34%	**+15%**	11%	15%	17%	17%	21%	**+10%**	-8%	-7%	-10%	-11%	-13%	**-5%**
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**	3%	9%	8%	8%	8%	**+5%**	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	**0%**	0%	-5%	-5%	-6%	-5%	**-5%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary **(El Centro Elementary School District)**	19%	29%	36%	37%	45%	**+26%**	9%	17%	18%	23%	37%	**+28%**	-10%	-12%	-18%	-14%	-8%	**+2%**
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	17%	23%	30%	40%	44%	**+27%**	5%	7%	11%	19%	14%	**+9%**	-12%	-16%	-19%	-21%	-30%	**-18%**
Irvine Unified	College Park Elementary	62%	71%	66%	71%	73%	**+11%**	41%	62%	46%	41%	49%	**+8%**	-21%	-9%	-20%	-30%	-24%	**-3%**
	Culverdale Elementary	60%	63%	59%	60%	57%	**-3%**	44%	54%	43%	44%	38%	**-6%**	-16%	-9%	-16%	-16%	-19%	**-3%**
	Northwood Elementary	65%	71%	74%	77%	80%	**+15%**	40%	66%	58%	61%	64%	**+24%**	-25%	-5%	-16%	-16%	-16%	**+9%**
	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	71%	79%	77%	79%	82%	**+11%**	33%	31%	22%	28%	25%	**-8%**	-38%	-48%	-55%	-51%	-57%	**-19%**
	University High	76%	76%	75%	75%	80%	**+4%**	31%	35%	28%	21%	30%	**-1%**	-45%	-41%	-47%	-54%	-50%	**-5%**
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante	17%	32%	58%	53%	48%	**+31%**	8%	11%	41%	36%	29%	**+21%**	-9%	-21%	-17%	-17%	-19%	**-10%**
Lennox Elementary	Buford Elementary	17%	28%	29%	27%	31%	**+14%**	8%	21%	24%	23%	25%	**+17%**	-9%	-7%	-5%	-4%	-6%	**+3%**
Livingston Union Elementary	Campus Park Elementary	17%	23%	30%	27%	34%	**+17%**	15%	20%	19%	18%	28%	**+13%**	-2%	-3%	-11%	-9%	-6%	**-4%**
	Selma Herndon Elementary	25%	26%	34%	39%	41%	**+16%**	15%	18%	25%	31%	31%	**+16%**	-10%	-8%	-9%	-8%	-10%	**0%**
	Yamato Colony Elementary	37%	39%	41%	43%	48%	**+11%**	31%	29%	31%	29%	34%	**+3%**	-6%	-10%	-10%	-14%	-14%	**-8%**
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	25%	25%	37%	37%	38%	**+13%**	22%	20%	31%	32%	31%	**+9%**	-3%	-5%	-6%	-5%	-7%	**-4%**
Marysville Joint Unified	Johnson Park Elementary	36%	45%	53%	46%	44%	**+8%**	50%	35%	48%	48%	40%	**-10%**	14%	-10%	-5%	2%	-4%	**-18%**
	Olivehurst Elementary	24%	32%	41%	41%	41%	**+17%**	7%	14%	29%	30%	31%	**+24%**	-17%	-18%	-12%	-11%	-10%	**+7%**
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	14%	20%	27%	33%	27%	**+13%**	4%	8%	13%	18%	14%	**+10%**	-10%	-12%	-14%	-15%	-13%	**-3%**
Mountain Empire Unified	Potrero Elementary	20%	19%	29%	38%	26%	**+6%**	8%	7%	22%	27%	16%	**+8%**	-12%	-12%	-7%	-11%	-10%	**+2%**
New Haven Unified	Searles Elementary	30%	37%	37%	41%	44%	**+14%**	9%	10%	10%	21%	21%	**+12%**	-21%	-27%	-27%	-20%	-23%	**-2%**
Newhall Elementary	Dr. J. Michael McGrath Elementary	27%	31%	38%	42%	55%	**+28%**	14%	12%	23%	29%	42%	**+28%**	-13%	-19%	-15%	-13%	-13%	**0%**
	Newhall Elementary	35%	47%	51%	51%	50%	**+15%**	6%	12%	21%	23%	18%	**+12%**	-29%	-35%	-30%	-28%	-32%	**-3%**
	Old Orchard Elementary	58%	65%	65%	70%	68%	**+10%**	24%	25%	23%	34%	32%	**+8%**	-34%	-40%	-42%	-36%	-36%	**-2%**
	Peachland Avenue Elementary	64%	64%	63%	69%	65%	**+1%**	25%	30%	27%	40%	36%	**+11%**	-39%	-34%	-36%	-29%	-29%	**+10%**
	Wiley Canyon Elementary	49%	51%	55%	59%	61%	**+12%**	19%	24%	28%	40%	42%	**+23%**	-30%	-27%	-27%	-19%	-19%	**+11%**
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	18%	28%	30%	31%	38%	**+20%**	1%	1%	4%	6%	10%	**+9%**	-17%	-27%	-26%	-25%	-28%	**-11%**
Novato Unified	Loma Verde Elementary	47%	52%	49%	47%	47%	**0%**	13%	34%	33%	24%	30%	**+17%**	-34%	-18%	-16%	-23%	-17%	**+17%**
	Olive Elementary	45%	50%	55%	54%	52%	**+7%**	5%	11%	22%	14%	22%	**+17%**	-40%	-39%	-33%	-40%	-30%	**+10%**
Oak Grove Elementary	Baldwin (Julia) Elementary	43%	46%	51%	47%	49%	**+6%**	12%	20%	30%	26%	34%	**+22%**	-31%	-26%	-21%	-21%	-15%	**+16%**
	Christopher Elementary	23%	23%	27%	34%	34%	**+11%**	9%	9%	14%	22%	19%	**+10%**	-14%	-14%	-13%	-12%	-15%	**-1%**
	Del Roble Elementary	36%	37%	45%	36%	39%	**+3%**	18%	22%	21%	14%	20%	**+2%**	-18%	-15%	-24%	-22%	-19%	**-1%**
	Edenvale Elementary	24%	28%	34%	34%	41%	**+17%**	9%	10%	18%	21%	25%	**+16%**	-15%	-18%	-16%	-13%	-16%	**-1%**
	Glider Elementary	52%	54%	56%	54%	58%	**+6%**	31%	32%	37%	42%	38%	**+7%**	-21%	-22%	-19%	-12%	-20%	**+1%**
	Hayes Elementary	42%	47%	47%	49%	53%	**+11%**	11%	26%	24%	34%	32%	**+21%**	-31%	-21%	-23%	-15%	-21%	**+10%**
	Ledesma (Rita) Elementary	46%	53%	55%	55%	55%	**+9%**	21%	23%	23%	35%	33%	**+12%**	-25%	-30%	-32%	-20%	-22%	**+3%**
	Miner (George) Elementary	33%	39%	48%	50%	48%	**+15%**	18%	19%	32%	40%	28%	**+10%**	-15%	-20%	-16%	-10%	-20%	**-5%**
	Parkview Elementary	49%	54%	55%	51%	55%	**+6%**	26%	33%	40%	42%	41%	**+15%**	-23%	-21%	-15%	-9%	-14%	**+9%**
	Stipe (Samuel) Elementary	26%	30%	34%	41%	36%	**+10%**	10%	12%	17%	26%	19%	**+9%**	-16%	-18%	-17%	-15%	-17%	**-1%**
Oxnard Union High	Adolfo Camarillo High	54%	57%	60%	62%	61%	**+7%**	4%	13%	16%	34%	39%	**+35%**	-50%	-44%	-44%	-28%	-22%	**+28%**
	Channel Islands High	25%	27%	29%	33%	31%	**+6%**	10%	9%	9%	11%	10%	**0%**	-15%	-18%	-20%	-22%	-21%	**-6%**
	Frontier High	4%	4%	5%	4%	2%	**-2%**	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	**+1%**	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-1%	**+3%**
	Hueneme High	20%	25%	25%	27%	27%	**+7%**	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	**-1%**	-13%	-18%	-18%	-20%	-21%	**-8%**
	Oxnard High	31%	38%	37%	38%	35%	**+4%**	6%	7%	9%	5%	6%	**0%**	-25%	-31%	-28%	-33%	-29%	**-4%**
	Pacifica High	20%	25%	27%	30%	37%	**+17%**	3%	6%	5%	9%	17%	**+14%**	-17%	-19%	-22%	-21%	-20%	**-3%**
	Rio Mesa High	37%	43%	42%	41%	44%	**+7%**	5%	8%	17%	18%	6%	**+1%**	-32%	-35%	-25%	-23%	-38%	**-6%**
Pasadena Unified	Altadena Elementary	22%	24%	26%	24%	33%	**+11%**	17%	18%	21%	5%	16%	**-1%**	-5%	-6%	-5%	-19%	-17%	**-12%**
	Jackson Elementary	17%	21%	25%	29%	33%	**+16%**	7%	10%	10%	16%	20%	**+13%**	-10%	-11%	-15%	-13%	-13%	**-3%**
	Jefferson Elementary	30%	30%	34%	32%	34%	**+4%**	17%	14%	14%	16%	17%	**0%**	-13%	-16%	-20%	-16%	-17%	**-4%**
	Longfellow (Henry W.) Elementary	30%	33%	37%	44%	42%	**+12%**	13%	10%	17%	26%	27%	**+14%**	-17%	-23%	-20%	-18%	-15%	**+2%**
	Madison Elementary	14%	23%	30%	30%	30%	**+16%**	9%	12%	13%	17%	22%	**+13%**	-5%	-11%	-17%	-13%	-8%	**-3%**
	Washington Accelerated Elementary	21%	28%	35%	30%	38%	**+17%**	7%	11%	20%	19%	26%	**+19%**	-14%	-17%	-15%	-11%	-12%	**+2%**
	Willard Elementary	38%	43%	51%	54%	51%	**+13%**	22%	23%	31%	42%	41%	**+19%**	-16%	-20%	-20%	-12%	-10%	**+6%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Casa Grande High	46%	49%	48%	50%	46%	**0%**	6%	9%	6%	9%	6%	**0%**	-40%	-40%	-42%	-41%	-40%	**0%**
	Kenilworth Junior High	43%	54%	57%	57%	62%	**+19%**	5%	11%	16%	18%	19%	**+14%**	-38%	-43%	-41%	-39%	-43%	**-5%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide ELA CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup ELA CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
Petaluma Joint Union High	Petaluma High	46%	55%	51%	52%	58%	**+12%**	2%	5%	4%	2%	10%	**+8%**	-44%	-50%	-47%	-50%	-48%	**-4%**
	Petaluma Junior High	48%	52%	61%	64%	64%	**+16%**	3%	10%	12%	14%	17%	**+14%**	-45%	-42%	-49%	-50%	-47%	**-2%**
Salida Union Elementary	Salida Elementary	33%	38%	41%	40%	48%	**+15%**	8%	12%	22%	14%	20%	**+12%**	-25%	-26%	-19%	-26%	-28%	**-3%**
San Diego County Office of Education	Cuyamaca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	26%	29%	29%	32%	32%	**+6%**	8%	2%	10%	15%	19%	**+11%**	-18%	-27%	-19%	-17%	-13%	**+5%**
	Kimball Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	31%	26%	33%	34%	43%	**12%**	17%	18%	25%	25%	33%	**16%**	-14%	-8%	-8%	-9%	-10%	**4%**
	Las Palmas Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	25%	27%	32%	37%	40%	**15%**	15%	18%	25%	30%	36%	**21%**	-10%	-9%	-7%	-7%	-4%	**6%**
	Lilac School **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District)**	38%	51%	57%	56%	58%	**+20%**	7%	16%	21%	20%	18%	**+11%**	-31%	-35%	-36%	-36%	-40%	**-9%**
	Naranca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	28%	30%	35%	38%	41%	**+13%**	13%	15%	16%	22%	26%	**+13%**	-15%	-15%	-19%	-16%	-15%	**0%**
	Olivewood **(National Elementary School District)**	32%	33%	36%	32%	37%	**5%**	18%	22%	29%	24%	30%	**12%**	-14%	-11%	-7%	-8%	-7%	**7%**
	Valley Center Elementary **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified)**	41%	43%	50%	53%	52%	**+11%**	3%	10%	9%	20%	15%	**+12%**	-38%	-33%	-41%	-33%	-37%	**+1%**
San Jose Unified	Grant Elementary	21%	31%	38%	38%	45%	**+24%**	7%	13%	25%	24%	32%	**+25%**	-14%	-18%	-13%	-14%	-13%	**+1%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	17%	28%	34%	34%	32%	**+15%**	4%	15%	24%	15%	17%	**+13%**	-13%	-13%	-10%	-19%	-15%	**-2%**
	River Glen	39%	45%	53%	49%	55%	**+16%**	4%	15%	24%	22%	18%	**+14%**	-35%	-30%	-29%	-27%	-37%	**-2%**
	Washington Elementary	11%	13%	21%	27%	33%	**+22%**	5%	10%	14%	17%	24%	**+19%**	-6%	-3%	-7%	-10%	-9%	**-3%**
San Leandro Unified	Washington Elementary	23%	31%	30%	38%	32%	**+9%**	10%	15%	14%	20%	21%	**+11%**	-13%	-16%	-16%	-18%	-11%	**+2%**
Sanger Unified	Del Rey Elementary	10%	15%	25%	37%	38%	**+28%**	2%	7%	11%	25%	21%	**+19%**	-8%	-8%	-14%	-12%	-17%	**-9%**
	Fairmont Elementary	35%	41%	47%	54%	56%	**+21%**	9%	16%	21%	30%	40%	**+31%**	-26%	-25%	-26%	-24%	-16%	**+10%**
	Jackson Elementary	28%	40%	46%	48%	55%	**+27%**	5%	18%	18%	21%	28%	**+23%**	-23%	-22%	-28%	-27%	-27%	**-4%**
	Lone Star Elementary	31%	41%	43%	41%	51%	**+20%**	18%	24%	19%	17%	30%	**+12%**	-13%	-17%	-24%	-24%	-21%	**-8%**
	Madison Elementary	23%	37%	35%	41%	49%	**+26%**	3%	25%	15%	34%	34%	**+31%**	-20%	-12%	-20%	-7%	-15%	**+5%**
	Sanger High	31%	36%	38%	41%	41%	**+10%**	3%	2%	5%	7%	8%	**+5%**	-28%	-34%	-33%	-34%	-33%	**-5%**
Santa Ana Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	14%	18%	22%	23%	28%	**+14%**	7%	11%	12%	17%	20%	**+13%**	-7%	-7%	-10%	-6%	-8%	**-1%**
	Andrew Jackson Elementary	12%	17%	19%	24%	34%	**+22%**	5%	9%	12%	18%	27%	**+22%**	-7%	-8%	-7%	-6%	-7%	**0%**
	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	45%	49%	55%	53%	57%	**+12%**	6%	8%	5%	8%	7%	**+1%**	-39%	-41%	-50%	-45%	-50%	**-11%**
	George Washington Carver Elementary	11%	15%	21%	33%	32%	**+21%**	7%	11%	19%	31%	28%	**+21%**	-4%	-4%	-2%	-2%	-4%	**0%**
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	27%	34%	37%	37%	45%	**+18%**	4%	7%	8%	6%	9%	**+5%**	-23%	-27%	-29%	-31%	-36%	**-13%**
	Greenville Fundamental Elementary	60%	63%	67%	61%	64%	**+4%**	22%	40%	41%	44%	47%	**+25%**	-38%	-23%	-26%	-17%	-17%	**+21%**
	Jefferson Elementary	25%	32%	38%	35%	32%	**+7%**	12%	17%	18%	22%	18%	**+6%**	-13%	-15%	-20%	-13%	-14%	**-1%**
	Jim Thorpe Fundamental	47%	51%	54%	50%	61%	**+14%**	18%	27%	33%	35%	43%	**+25%**	-29%	-24%	-21%	-15%	-18%	**+11%**
	John Muir Fundamental Elementary	45%	52%	55%	58%	62%	**+17%**	17%	27%	26%	49%	45%	**+28%**	-28%	-25%	-29%	-9%	-17%	**+11%**
	Jose Sepulveda Elementary	12%	16%	19%	19%	22%	**+10%**	6%	7%	9%	10%	15%	**+9%**	-6%	-9%	-10%	-9%	-7%	**-1%**
	Madison Elementary	19%	24%	29%	39%	39%	**+20%**	9%	14%	17%	30%	29%	**+20%**	-10%	-10%	-12%	-9%	-10%	**0%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary	9%	14%	15%	18%	35%	**+26%**	5%	9%	10%	14%	28%	**+23%**	-4%	-5%	-5%	-4%	-7%	**-3%**
	Martin R. Heninger Elementary	18%	25%	25%	30%	39%	**+21%**	11%	13%	16%	18%	28%	**+17%**	-7%	-12%	-9%	-12%	-11%	**-4%**
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	24%	25%	27%	31%	37%	**+13%**	6%	3%	2%	3%	5%	**-1%**	-18%	-22%	-25%	-28%	-32%	**-14%**
	Santa Ana High	17%	23%	24%	24%	21%	**+4%**	3%	5%	7%	7%	2%	**-1%**	-14%	-18%	-17%	-17%	-19%	**-5%**
	Santiago Elementary	41%	41%	42%	43%	44%	**+3%**	17%	12%	20%	27%	28%	**+11%**	-24%	-29%	-22%	-16%	-16%	**+8%**
	Taft Elementary	34%	37%	37%	34%	45%	**+11%**	15%	15%	25%	24%	24%	**+9%**	-19%	-22%	-12%	-10%	-21%	**-2%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Elementary	10%	18%	21%	22%	27%	**+17%**	7%	9%	15%	17%	17%	**+10%**	-3%	-9%	-6%	-5%	-10%	**-7%**
	Wilson Elementary	9%	8%	11%	16%	17%	**+8%**	8%	6%	8%	14%	11%	**+3%**	-1%	-2%	-3%	-2%	-6%	**-5%**
Sierra Sands Unified	Faller Elementary	44%	50%	54%	56%	51%	**+7%**												
	Gateway Elementary	52%	55%	50%	49%	51%	**-1%**												
	Inyokern Elementary	41%	43%	40%	34%	43%	**+2%**												
	Las Flores Elementary	56%	59%	56%	54%	47%	**-9%**												
	Pierce Elementary	27%	40%	35%	43%	41%	**+14%**	9%	22%	22%	20%	26%	**+17%**	-18%	-18%	-13%	-23%	-15%	**+3%**
	Richmond Elementary	50%	56%	49%	46%	58%	**+8%**												
Sonoma County Office of Education	Bellevue Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	20%	28%	30%	23%	26%	**6%**	14%	19%	27%	19%	22%	**8%**	-6%	-9%	-3%	-4%	-4%	**2%**
	Jack London Elementary **(Piner-Olivet Union Elementary School District)**	43%	53%	55%	60%	60%	**17%**	17%	36%	35%	44%	47%	**30%**	-26%	-17%	-20%	-16%	-13%	**13%**
	Meadow View Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	19%	26%	27%	30%	33%	**+14%**	11%	17%	17%	23%	25%	**+14%**	-8%	-9%	-10%	-7%	-8%	**0%**
	Mountain Shadows Middle **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	36%	37%	41%	43%	44%	**+8%**	4%	6%	6%	5%	3%	**-1%**	-32%	-31%	-35%	-38%	-41%	**-9%**
	Waldo Rohnert Elementary **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	37%	37%	44%	41%	35%	**-2%**	16%	16%	23%	24%	22%	**+6%**	-21%	-21%	-21%	-17%	-13%	**+8%**
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Las Palmas Elementary	35%	31%	35%	37%	41%	**+6%**	16%	15%	24%	19%	21%	**+5%**	-19%	-16%	-11%	-18%	-20%	**-1%**
Ventura Unified	E. P. Foster Elementary	18%	37%	40%	38%	36%	**+18%**	14%	29%	27%	25%	21%	**+7%**	-4%	-8%	-13%	-13%	-15%	**-11%**
	Juanamaria Elementary	51%	55%	55%	63%	60%	**+9%**	11%	11%	18%	40%	22%	**+11%**	-40%	-44%	-37%	-23%	-38%	**+2%**
	Montalvo Elementary	21%	29%	44%	43%	39%	**+18%**	7%	14%	25%	23%	16%	**+9%**	-14%	-15%	-19%	-20%	-23%	**-9%**
	Sheridan Way Elementary	22%	21%	30%	29%	27%	**+5%**	15%	13%	24%	21%	18%	**+3%**	-7%	-8%	-6%	-8%	-9%	**-2%**
Whittier City Elementary	Orange Grove Elementary	27%	33%	41%	39%	39%	**+12%**	18%	21%	24%	19%	14%	**-4%**	-9%	-12%	-17%	-20%	-25%	**-16%**
Woodland Joint Unified	Beamer Elementary	19%	34%	30%	34%	39%	**+20%**	5%	12%	10%	11%	13%	**+8%**	-14%	-22%	-20%	-23%	-26%	**-12%**
	Lee Middle	28%	32%	37%	41%	44%	**+16%**	2%	4%	9%	5%	5%	**+3%**	-26%	-28%	-28%	-36%	-39%	**-13%**
	Ramon S. Tafoya Elementary	37%	36%	36%	41%	42%	**+5%**	9%	13%	13%	14%	16%	**+7%**	-28%	-23%	-23%	-27%	-26%	**+2%**
	Rhoda Maxwell Elementary	25%	33%	33%	33%	41%	**+16%**	9%	12%	21%	19%	21%	**+12%**	-16%	-21%	-12%	-14%	-20%	**-4%**
	Willow Spring Elementary	33%	34%	36%	38%	32%	**-1%**	14%	10%	9%	19%	14%	**0%**	-19%	-24%	-27%	-19%	-18%	**+1%**
	Woodland Prairie Elementary	26%	24%	27%	33%	28%	**+2%**	7%	11%	13%	15%	12%	**+5%**	-19%	-13%	-14%	-18%	-16%	**+3%**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
General Math CST, School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- **School-wide CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **EL CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL CST achievement from 2004-08**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide Math CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup Math CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Willow Elementary	40%	42%	44%	43%	45%	**5%**	30%	36%	41%	41%	31%	**1%**	-10%	-6%	-3%	-2%	-14%	**-4%**
	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	5%	5%	7%	23%	36%	**31%**	0%	0%	0%		14%	**14%**	-5%	-5%	-7%		-22%	**-17%**
Atwater Elementary	Thomas Olaeta Elementary	41%	52%	51%	50%	50%	**9%**	23%	41%	38%	44%	39%	**16%**	-18%	-11%	-13%	-6%	-11%	**7%**
Bakersfield City	Casa Loma Elementary	33%	42%	46%	44%	44%	**11%**	26%	29%	39%	43%	35%	**9%**	-7%	-13%	-7%	-1%	-9%	**-2%**
	Frank West Elementary	20%	33%	44%	43%	49%	**29%**	6%	25%	38%	43%	42%	**36%**	-14%	-8%	-6%	0%	-7%	**7%**
	Munsey Elementary	24%	31%	35%	31%	41%	**17%**	15%	22%	29%	30%	40%	**25%**	-9%	-9%	-6%	-1%	-1%	**8%**
Brentwood Union Elementary	Brentwood Elementary	42%	57%	54%	56%	57%	**15%**	18%	27%	21%	34%	36%	**18%**	-24%	-30%	-33%	-22%	-21%	**3%**
	Edna Hill Middle	37%	54%	53%	45%	49%	**12%**	6%	26%	18%	15%	18%	**12%**	-31%	-28%	-35%	-30%	-31%	**0%**
Ceres Unified	Carroll Fowler Elementary	32%	34%	40%	46%	54%	**22%**	15%	20%	27%	38%	43%	**28%**	-17%	-14%	-13%	-8%	-11%	**6%**
	Don Pedro Elementary	37%	42%	48%	54%	55%	**18%**	29%	29%	41%	47%	53%	**24%**	-8%	-13%	-7%	-7%	-2%	**6%**
	M. Robert Adkison Elementary			36%	42%	41%	**5%**			25%	41%	36%	**11%**			-11%	-1%	-5%	**6%**
	Samuel Vaughn Elementary	46%	48%	51%	52%	53%	**7%**	29%	28%	41%	38%	46%	**17%**	-17%	-20%	-10%	-14%	-7%	**10%**
	Walter White Elementary	37%	42%	33%	31%	43%	**6%**	18%	30%	26%	26%	40%	**22%**	-19%	-12%	-7%	-5%	-3%	**16%**
Chula Vista Elementary	Valle Lindo Elementary	35%	41%	48%	52%	49%	**14%**	23%	28%	30%	34%	30%	**7%**	-12%	-13%	-18%	-18%	-19%	**-7%**
Coachella Valley Unified	Bobby Duke Middle					27%	**N/A**					17%	**N/A**					-10%	**N/A**
	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	11%	17%	19%	23%	24%	**13%**	8%	6%	11%	10%	14%	**6%**	-3%	-11%	-8%	-13%	-10%	**-7%**
	Toro Canyon Middle	7%	9%	13%	15%	17%	**10%**	3%	3%	5%	5%	6%	**3%**	-4%	-6%	-8%	-10%	-11%	**-7%**
	West Shores High	8%	21%	12%	5%	12%	**4%**	4%	8%	6%	2%	5%	**1%**	-4%	-13%	-6%	-3%	-7%	**-3%**
Desert Sands Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	51%	60%	55%	57%	70%	**19%**	39%	46%	43%	46%	63%	**24%**	-12%	-14%	-12%	-11%	-7%	**5%**
	Dr. Reynaldo J. Carreon Jr. Academy	30%	40%	54%	60%	65%	**35%**	21%	32%	55%	58%	58%	**37%**	-9%	-8%	1%	-2%	-7%	**2%**
El Monte City Elementary	Legore Elementary	38%	49%	50%	50%	59%	**21%**	27%	36%	30%	32%	46%	**19%**	-11%	-13%	-20%	-18%	-13%	**-2%**
Escondido Union	Central Elementary	32%	46%	46%	47%	47%	**15%**	24%	39%	44%	44%	42%	**18%**	-8%	-7%	-2%	-3%	-5%	**3%**
Evergreen Elementary	Cadwallader Elementary	54%	58%	63%	53%	62%	**8%**	41%	38%	38%	34%	43%	**2%**	-13%	-20%	-25%	-19%	-19%	**-6%**
	Carolyn A. Clark Elementary		76%	84%	79%	82%	**6%**		69%	82%	75%	71%	**2%**		-7%	-2%	-4%	-11%	**-4%**
	Cedar Grove Elementary	52%	58%	64%	63%	64%	**12%**	41%	48%	48%	54%	51%	**10%**	-11%	-10%	-16%	-9%	-13%	**-2%**
	Chaboya Middle	64%	63%	65%	63%	67%	**3%**	18%	26%	21%	19%	18%	**0%**	-46%	-37%	-44%	-44%	-49%	**-3%**
	Dove Hill Elementary	44%	54%	57%	55%	57%	**13%**	37%	48%	48%	42%	45%	**8%**	-7%	-6%	-9%	-13%	-12%	**-5%**
	Evergreen Elementary	73%	75%	76%	79%	83%	**10%**	55%	56%	49%	80%	79%	**24%**	-18%	-19%	-27%	1%	-4%	**14%**
	Holly Oak Elementary	47%	56%	58%	53%	55%	**8%**	42%	51%	54%	42%	49%	**7%**	-5%	-5%	-4%	-11%	-6%	**-1%**
	John J. Montgomery Elementary	49%	54%	55%	53%	51%	**2%**	40%	44%	41%	40%	37%	**-3%**	-9%	-10%	-14%	-13%	-14%	**-5%**
	O. B. Whaley Elementary	59%	66%	67%	64%	61%	**2%**	50%	56%	57%	56%	50%	**0%**	-9%	-10%	-10%	-8%	-11%	**-2%**
	Quimby Oak Middle	55%	62%	59%	55%	55%	**0%**	25%	40%	23%	14%	11%	**-14%**	-30%	-22%	-36%	-41%	-44%	**-14%**
Garvey Elementary	Bitely (Arlene) Elementary	54%	60%	62%	66%	61%	**7%**	39%	45%	42%	56%	47%	**8%**	-15%	-15%	-20%	-10%	-14%	**1%**
	Dewey Avenue Elementary	42%	43%	54%	64%	68%	**26%**	34%	40%	47%	62%	69%	**35%**	-8%	-3%	-7%	-2%	1%	**9%**
	Duff (Margaret) Elementary	37%	47%	50%	42%	49%	**12%**	24%	40%	34%	28%	36%	**12%**	-13%	-7%	-16%	-14%	-13%	**0%**
	Emerson (Ralph Waldo) Elementary	47%	47%	63%	59%	59%	**12%**	25%	31%	47%	44%	43%	**18%**	-22%	-16%	-16%	-15%	-16%	**6%**
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	36%	41%	48%	39%	54%	**18%**	13%	21%	22%	24%	28%	**15%**	-23%	-20%	-26%	-15%	-26%	**-3%**
	Hillcrest Elementary	60%	59%	64%	61%	69%	**9%**	47%	58%	48%	53%	58%	**11%**	-13%	-1%	-16%	-8%	-11%	**2%**
	Marshall (John) Elementary	29%	47%	51%	54%	56%	**27%**	15%	33%	42%	47%	47%	**32%**	-14%	-14%	-9%	-7%	-9%	**5%**
	Monterey Vista Elementary	65%	69%	65%	69%	78%	**13%**	57%	67%	61%	62%	74%	**17%**	-8%	-2%	-4%	-7%	-4%	**4%**
	Rice (Eldridge) Elementary	51%	51%	57%	56%	57%	**6%**	43%	40%	39%	35%	49%	**6%**	-8%	-11%	-18%	-21%	-8%	**0%**
	Sanchez (George I.) Elementary	41%	44%	56%	53%	59%	**18%**	30%	36%	42%	46%	48%	**18%**	-11%	-8%	-14%	-7%	-11%	**0%**
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	28%	32%	44%	41%	55%	**27%**	7%	15%	17%	18%	39%	**32%**	-21%	-17%	-27%	-23%	-16%	**5%**
	Willard (Frances E.) Elementary	52%	59%	50%	53%	58%	**6%**	43%	46%	36%	41%	46%	**3%**	-9%	-13%	-14%	-12%	-12%	**-3%**
Glendale Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	71%	77%	77%	71%	80%	**9%**	57%	61%	67%	67%	78%	**21%**	-14%	-16%	-10%	-4%	-2%	**12%**
	Balboa Elementary	61%	64%	69%	65%	69%	**8%**	50%	47%	53%	50%	56%	**6%**	-11%	-17%	-16%	-15%	-13%	**-2%**
	Benjamin Franklin Elementary	48%	54%	56%	63%	66%	**18%**	36%	38%	48%	46%	55%	**19%**	-12%	-16%	-8%	-17%	-11%	**1%**
	Cerritos Elementary	34%	48%	49%	50%	50%	**16%**	26%	38%	36%	37%	36%	**10%**	-8%	-10%	-13%	-13%	-14%	**-6%**
	Columbus Elementary	52%	57%	56%	54%	58%	**6%**	38%	44%	33%	32%	45%	**7%**	-14%	-13%	-23%	-22%	-13%	**1%**
	Dunsmore Elementary	81%	79%	81%	81%	78%	**-3%**	84%	79%	100%	83%	47%	**-37%**	3%	0%	19%	2%	-31%	**-34%**
	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	44%	52%	54%	54%	53%	**9%**	21%	28%	29%	26%	28%	**7%**	-23%	-24%	-25%	-28%	-25%	**-2%**
	Glenoaks Elementary	65%	66%	68%	63%	71%	**6%**	53%	50%	60%	41%	45%	**-8%**	-12%	-16%	-8%	-22%	-26%	**-14%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	37%	45%	55%	58%	62%	**25%**	31%	33%	46%	44%	50%	**19%**	-6%	-12%	-9%	-14%	-12%	**-6%**
	John C. Fremont Elementary	64%	69%	66%	70%	71%	**7%**	51%	59%	62%	64%	69%	**18%**	-13%	-10%	-4%	-6%	-2%	**11%**
	John Marshall Elementary	43%	50%	56%	59%	67%	**24%**	32%	36%	42%	45%	57%	**25%**	-11%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-10%	**1%**
	John Muir Elementary	48%	55%	52%	58%	57%	**9%**	34%	35%	35%	43%	33%	**-1%**	-14%	-20%	-17%	-15%	-24%	**-10%**
	La Crescenta Elementary	76%	79%	79%	82%	81%	**5%**	75%	74%	69%	73%	71%	**-4%**	-1%	-5%	-10%	-9%	-10%	**-9%**
	Mark Keppel Elementary	62%	64%	67%	63%	64%	**2%**	45%	41%	45%	38%	45%	**0%**	-17%	-23%	-22%	-25%	-19%	**-2%**
	Monte Vista Elementary	83%	83%	85%	86%	86%	**3%**	76%	81%	46%	77%	75%	**-1%**	-7%	-2%	-39%	-9%	-11%	**-4%**
	Mountain Avenue Elementary	82%	87%	88%	84%	84%	**2%**	62%	80%	83%	72%	71%	**9%**	-20%	-7%	-5%	-12%	-13%	**7%**
	R. D. White Elementary	57%	60%	66%	65%	63%	**6%**	46%	50%	47%	53%	50%	**4%**	-11%	-10%	-19%	-12%	-13%	**-2%**
	Rosemont Middle	71%	76%	79%	75%	78%	**7%**	54%	49%	66%	55%	59%	**5%**	-17%	-27%	-13%	-20%	-19%	**-2%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	40%	44%	43%	43%	36%	**-4%**	19%	25%	23%	22%	17%	**-2%**	-21%	-19%	-20%	-21%	-19%	**2%**
	Thomas Edison Elementary	42%	44%	47%	49%	53%	**11%**	30%	29%	39%	39%	35%	**5%**	-12%	-15%	-8%	-10%	-18%	**-6%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide Math CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup Math CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
	Valley View Elementary	80%	84%	86%	85%	87%	**7%**	74%	79%	76%	74%	75%	**1%**	-6%	-5%	-10%	-11%	-12%	**-6%**
	Verdugo Woodlands Elementary	76%	74%	77%	78%	77%	**1%**	63%	62%	59%	59%	58%	**-5%**	-13%	-12%	-18%	-19%	-19%	**-6%**
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	62%	62%	65%	62%	56%	**-6%**	33%	29%	41%	18%	23%	**-10%**	-29%	-33%	-24%	-44%	-33%	**-4%**
Imperial County Office of Education	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**	20%	22%	38%	34%	42%	**22%**	16%	17%	31%	25%	33%	**17%**	-4%	-5%	-7%	-9%	-9%	**-5%**
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**	4%	3%	5%	17%	4%	**0%**	0%			0%		**0%**	-4%			-17%		**-13%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary **(El Centro Elementary School District)**	31%	40%	52%	49%	54%	**23%**	23%	34%	43%	40%	53%	**30%**	-8%	-6%	-9%	-9%	-1%	**7%**
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	28%	22%	29%	34%	39%	**11%**	17%	12%	15%	23%	24%	**7%**	-11%	-10%	-14%	-11%	-15%	**-4%**
Irvine Unified	College Park Elementary	70%	77%	75%	77%	80%	**10%**	67%	83%	76%	72%	74%	**7%**	-3%	6%	1%	-5%	-6%	**-3%**
	Culverdale Elementary	71%	74%	73%	75%	72%	**1%**	70%	80%	74%	70%	70%	**0%**	-1%	6%	1%	-5%	-2%	**-1%**
	Northwood Elementary	73%	77%	80%	76%	80%	**7%**	80%	77%	79%	70%	66%	**-14%**	7%	0%	-1%	-6%	-14%	**-21%**
	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	79%	79%	74%	74%	75%	**-4%**	79%	61%	44%	56%	46%	**-33%**	0%	-18%	-30%	-18%	-29%	**-29%**
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante	38%	61%	79%	63%	48%	**10%**	29%	44%	72%	50%	31%	**2%**	-9%	-17%	-7%	-13%	-17%	**-8%**
Lennox Elementary	Buford Elementary	33%	42%	45%	55%	55%	**22%**	26%	37%	42%	51%	51%	**25%**	-7%	-5%	-3%	-4%	-4%	**3%**
Livingston Union Elementary	Campus Park Elementary	33%	40%	48%	49%	47%	**14%**	32%	38%	40%	41%	41%	**9%**	-1%	-2%	-8%	-8%	-6%	**-5%**
	Selma Herndon Elementary	33%	38%	48%	47%	46%	**13%**	26%	31%	40%	41%	37%	**11%**	-7%	-7%	-8%	-6%	-9%	**-2%**
	Yamato Colony Elementary	46%	47%	56%	51%	59%	**13%**	42%	40%	47%	41%	52%	**10%**	-4%	-7%	-9%	-10%	-7%	**-3%**
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	30%	43%	55%	48%	53%	**23%**	30%	38%	50%	48%	52%	**22%**	0%	-5%	-5%	0%	-1%	**-1%**
Marysville Joint Unified	Johnson Park Elementary	45%	59%	65%	58%	54%	**9%**	94%	73%	63%	67%	59%	**-35%**	49%	14%	-2%	9%	5%	**-44%**
	Olivehurst Elementary	31%	50%	61%	58%	58%	**27%**	21%	30%	57%	51%	54%	**33%**	-10%	-20%	-4%	-7%	-4%	**6%**
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	21%	33%	43%	48%	45%	**24%**	13%	24%	36%	41%	37%	**24%**	-8%	-9%	-7%	-7%	-8%	**0%**
Mountain Empire Unified	Potrero Elementary	35%	39%	54%	54%	55%	**20%**	29%	29%	50%	48%	49%	**20%**	-6%	-10%	-4%	-6%	-6%	**0%**
New Haven Unified	Searles Elementary	40%	51%	48%	47%	48%	**8%**	20%	25%	33%	34%	34%	**14%**	-20%	-26%	-15%	-13%	-14%	**6%**
Newhall Elementary	Dr. J. Michael McGrath Elementary	38%	47%	52%	58%	69%	**31%**	27%	37%	39%	50%	65%	**38%**	-11%	-10%	-13%	-8%	-4%	**7%**
	Newhall Elementary	48%	59%	61%	60%	52%	**4%**	22%	32%	35%	40%	32%	**10%**	-26%	-27%	-26%	-20%	-20%	**6%**
	Old Orchard Elementary	65%	72%	72%	74%	67%	**2%**	41%	42%	31%	41%	45%	**4%**	-24%	-30%	-41%	-33%	-22%	**2%**
	Peachland Avenue Elementary	76%	74%	77%	74%	71%	**-5%**	54%	48%	55%	48%	49%	**-5%**	-22%	-26%	-22%	-26%	-22%	**0%**
	Wiley Canyon Elementary	56%	65%	66%	73%	68%	**12%**	36%	51%	51%	63%	58%	**22%**	-20%	-14%	-15%	-10%	-10%	**10%**
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	14%	25%	32%	26%	35%	**21%**	3%	3%	5%	9%	12%	**9%**	-11%	-22%	-27%	-17%	-23%	**-12%**
Novato Unified	Loma Verde Elementary	49%	63%	60%	52%	59%	**10%**	28%	49%	41%	38%	50%	**22%**	-21%	-14%	-19%	-14%	-9%	**12%**
	Olive Elementary	53%	60%	67%	60%	57%	**4%**	24%	36%	49%	39%	39%	**15%**	-29%	-24%	-18%	-21%	-18%	**11%**
Oak Grove Elementary	Baldwin (Julia) Elementary	48%	51%	53%	48%	55%	**7%**	27%	45%	41%	38%	43%	**16%**	-21%	-6%	-12%	-10%	-12%	**9%**
	Christopher Elementary	39%	35%	45%	45%	49%	**10%**	29%	29%	34%	38%	35%	**6%**	-10%	-6%	-11%	-7%	-14%	**-4%**
	Del Roble Elementary	39%	43%	48%	41%	48%	**9%**	27%	33%	31%	30%	31%	**4%**	-12%	-10%	-17%	-11%	-17%	**-5%**
	Edenvale Elementary	40%	48%	57%	50%	49%	**9%**	30%	35%	48%	41%	36%	**6%**	-10%	-13%	-9%	-9%	-13%	**-3%**
	Glider Elementary	56%	60%	62%	60%	66%	**10%**	55%	49%	51%	54%	53%	**-2%**	-1%	-11%	-11%	-6%	-13%	**-12%**
	Hayes Elementary	48%	51%	53%	55%	55%	**7%**	38%	45%	37%	48%	35%	**-3%**	-10%	-6%	-16%	-7%	-20%	**-10%**
	Ledesma (Rita) Elementary	58%	63%	65%	67%	70%	**12%**	43%	30%	44%	56%	57%	**14%**	-15%	-33%	-21%	-11%	-13%	**2%**
	Miner (George) Elementary	42%	49%	55%	57%	55%	**13%**	36%	41%	44%	56%	45%	**9%**	-6%	-8%	-11%	-1%	-10%	**-4%**
	Parkview Elementary	60%	60%	64%	64%	65%	**5%**	46%	47%	56%	62%	59%	**13%**	-14%	-13%	-8%	-2%	-6%	**8%**
	Stipe (Samuel) Elementary	41%	49%	46%	54%	48%	**7%**	31%	40%	37%	46%	37%	**6%**	-10%	-9%	-9%	-8%	-11%	**-1%**
Pasadena Unified	Altadena Elementary	25%	32%	37%	36%	47%	**22%**	29%	31%	31%	29%	24%	**-5%**	4%	-1%	-6%	-7%	-23%	**-27%**
	Jackson Elementary	27%	41%	40%	45%	45%	**18%**	27%	40%	33%	39%	35%	**8%**	0%	-1%	-7%	-6%	-10%	**-10%**
	Jefferson Elementary	41%	49%	51%	44%	45%	**4%**	32%	32%	37%	34%	30%	**-2%**	-9%	-17%	-14%	-10%	-15%	**-6%**
	Longfellow (Henry W.) Elementary	37%	44%	50%	53%	57%	**20%**	28%	28%	33%	44%	43%	**15%**	-9%	-16%	-17%	-9%	-14%	**-5%**
	Madison Elementary	32%	45%	48%	42%	42%	**10%**	27%	36%	38%	32%	35%	**8%**	-5%	-9%	-10%	-10%	-7%	**-2%**
	Washington Accelerated Elementary	32%	53%	56%	54%	60%	**28%**	18%	38%	46%	46%	52%	**34%**	-14%	-15%	-10%	-8%	-8%	**6%**
	Willard Elementary	52%	60%	72%	74%	73%	**21%**	47%	52%	65%	71%	65%	**18%**	-5%	-8%	-7%	-3%	-8%	**-3%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Kenilworth Junior High	45%	42%	52%	48%	52%	**7%**	5%	9%	20%	14%	17%	**12%**	-40%	-33%	-32%	-34%	-35%	**5%**
	Petaluma Junior High	39%	46%	55%	46%	53%	**14%**	7%	13%	24%	6%	15%	**8%**	-32%	-33%	-31%	-40%	-38%	**-6%**
Salida Union Elementary	Salida Elementary	39%	49%	51%	50%	52%	**13%**	13%	34%	37%	30%	27%	**14%**	-26%	-15%	-14%	-20%	-25%	**1%**
San Diego County Office of Education	Cuyamaca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	36%	42%	39%	50%	41%	**5%**	16%	17%	28%	42%	29%	**13%**	-20%	-25%	-11%	-8%	-12%	**8%**
	Kimball Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	48%	45%	55%	52%	60%	**12%**	35%	40%	52%	47%	55%	**20%**	-13%	-5%	-3%	-5%	-5%	**8%**
	Las Palmas Elementary **(National Elementary School District)**	34%	36%	41%	47%	56%	**22%**	29%	32%	36%	44%	54%	**25%**	-5%	-4%	-5%	-3%	-2%	**3%**
	Lilac School **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District)**	47%	71%	77%	74%	73%	**26%**	23%	48%	52%	49%	49%	**26%**	-24%	-23%	-25%	-25%	-24%	**0%**
	Naranca Elementary **(Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District)**	34%	36%	47%	56%	62%	**28%**	27%	25%	31%	45%	51%	**24%**	-7%	-11%	-16%	-11%	-11%	**-4%**
	Olivewood **(National Elementary School District)**	49%	54%	51%	49%	54%	**5%**	45%	50%	46%	45%	51%	**6%**	-4%	-4%	-5%	-4%	-3%	**1%**
	Valley Center Elementary **(Valley Center-Pauma Unified)**	36%	42%	48%	57%	53%	**17%**	3%	8%	18%	27%	21%	**18%**	-33%	-34%	-30%	-30%	-32%	**1%**
San Jose Unified	Grant Elementary	20%	41%	52%	53%	59%	**39%**	9%	29%	46%	42%	46%	**37%**	-11%	-12%	-6%	-11%	-13%	**-2%**
	Horace Mann Elementary	30%	44%	51%	57%	44%	**14%**	17%	39%	48%	51%	38%	**21%**	-13%	-5%	-3%	-6%	-6%	**7%**
	River Glen	39%	46%	54%	58%	61%	**22%**	24%	31%	39%	42%	41%	**17%**	-15%	-15%	-15%	-16%	-20%	**-5%**
	Washington Elementary	22%	33%	38%	41%	48%	**26%**	20%	32%	34%	37%	44%	**24%**	-2%	-1%	-4%	-4%	-4%	**-2%**
San Leandro Unified	Washington Elementary	27%	39%	47%	49%	40%	**13%**	17%	31%	33%	40%	34%	**17%**	-10%	-8%	-14%	-9%	-6%	**4%**
	Del Rey Elementary	13%	36%	38%	53%	56%	**43%**	8%	32%	34%	42%	42%	**34%**	-5%	-4%	-4%	-11%	-14%	**-9%**
	Fairmont Elementary	42%	54%	56%	62%	65%	**23%**	31%	35%	42%	68%	65%	**34%**	-11%	-19%	-14%	6%	0%	**11%**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide Math CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup Math CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
Sanger Unified	Jackson Elementary	43%	56%	65%	70%	76%	**33%**	16%	37%	42%	46%	58%	**42%**	-27%	-19%	-23%	-24%	-18%	**9%**
	Lone Star Elementary	46%	64%	64%	56%	64%	**18%**	38%	53%	46%	38%	50%	**12%**	-8%	-11%	-18%	-18%	-14%	**-6%**
	Madison Elementary	34%	51%	51%	60%	67%	**33%**	18%	49%	38%	48%	64%	**46%**	-16%	-2%	-13%	-12%	-3%	**13%**
Santa Ana Unified	Abraham Lincoln Elementary	29%	35%	35%	34%	38%	**9%**	23%	32%	29%	31%	36%	**13%**	-6%	-3%	-6%	-3%	-2%	**4%**
	Andrew Jackson Elementary	18%	28%	37%	37%	57%	**39%**	13%	22%	31%	32%	51%	**38%**	-5%	-6%	-6%	-5%	-6%	**-1%**
	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	39%	43%	50%	49%	49%	**10%**	10%	6%	4%	16%	11%	**1%**	-29%	-37%	-46%	-33%	-38%	**-9%**
	George Washington Carver Elementary	32%	30%	35%	49%	56%	**24%**	29%	27%	31%	48%	55%	**26%**	-3%	-3%	-4%	-1%	-1%	**2%**
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	30%	34%	37%	34%	47%	**17%**	7%	9%	14%	9%	19%	**12%**	-23%	-25%	-23%	-25%	-28%	**-5%**
	Greenville Fundamental Elementary	73%	75%	77%	76%	74%	**1%**	51%	55%	57%	66%	66%	**15%**	-22%	-20%	-20%	-10%	-8%	**14%**
	Jefferson Elementary	36%	44%	48%	43%	40%	**4%**	27%	34%	38%	37%	30%	**3%**	-9%	-10%	-10%	-6%	-10%	**-1%**
	Jim Thorpe Fundamental	51%	58%	62%	62%	70%	**19%**	29%	41%	50%	55%	59%	**30%**	-22%	-17%	-12%	-7%	-11%	**11%**
	John Muir Fundamental Elementary	42%	54%	55%	61%	65%	**23%**	22%	40%	39%	55%	56%	**34%**	-20%	-14%	-16%	-6%	-9%	**11%**
	Jose Sepulveda Elementary	16%	21%	28%	26%	34%	**18%**	11%	17%	19%	19%	26%	**15%**	-5%	-4%	-9%	-7%	-8%	**-3%**
	Madison Elementary	43%	53%	57%	68%	67%	**24%**	34%	45%	46%	63%	62%	**28%**	-9%	-8%	-11%	-5%	-5%	**4%**
	Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary	22%	24%	29%	37%	58%	**36%**	20%	20%	26%	34%	52%	**32%**	-2%	-4%	-3%	-3%	-6%	**-4%**
	Martin R. Heninger Elementary	36%	43%	42%	48%	49%	**13%**	31%	36%	38%	39%	41%	**10%**	-5%	-7%	-4%	-9%	-8%	**-3%**
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	25%	28%	36%	37%	45%	**20%**	11%	6%	11%	9%	15%	**4%**	-14%	-22%	-25%	-28%	-30%	**-16%**
	Santiago Elementary	43%	48%	47%	52%	57%	**14%**	23%	23%	29%	42%	42%	**19%**	-20%	-25%	-18%	-10%	-15%	**5%**
	Taft Elementary	43%	42%	42%	40%	56%	**13%**	28%	27%	34%	35%	43%	**15%**	-15%	-15%	-8%	-5%	-13%	**2%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Elementary	18%	35%	38%	43%	43%	**25%**	14%	27%	31%	39%	36%	**22%**	-4%	-8%	-7%	-4%	-7%	**-3%**
	Wilson Elementary	21%	21%	24%	29%	25%	**4%**	20%	18%	22%	28%	21%	**1%**	-1%	-3%	-2%	-1%	-4%	**-3%**
Sierra Sands Unified	Faller Elementary	45%	53%	63%	56%	58%	**13%**												
	Gateway Elementary	55%	76%	69%	64%	62%	**7%**												
	Inyokern Elementary	40%	47%	49%	32%	40%	**0%**												
	Las Flores Elementary	64%	71%	68%	57%	60%	**-4%**												
	Pierce Elementary	35%	47%	49%	57%	53%	**18%**	26%	44%	41%	46%	46%	**20%**	-9%	-3%	-8%	-11%	-7%	**2%**
	Richmond Elementary	58%	65%	62%	51%	61%	**3%**												
Sonoma County Office of Education	Bellevue Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	27%	39%	40%	37%	38%	**11%**	23%	33%	39%	36%	37%	**14%**	-4%	-6%	-1%	-1%	-1%	**3%**
	Jack London Elementary **(Piner-Olivet Union Elementary School District)**	48%	55%	56%	58%	60%	**12%**	26%	50%	54%	44%	45%	**19%**	-22%	-5%	-2%	-14%	-15%	**7%**
	Meadow View Elementary **(Bellevue Union Elementary School District)**	31%	41%	49%	52%	45%	**14%**	28%	35%	44%	48%	40%	**12%**	-3%	-6%	-5%	-4%	-5%	**-2%**
	Mountain Shadows Middle **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	27%	33%	31%	30%	33%	**6%**	9%	6%	8%	9%	6%	**-3%**	-18%	-27%	-23%	-21%	-27%	**-9%**
	Waldo Rohnert Elementary **(Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District)**	31%	43%	51%	43%	45%	**14%**	19%	24%	33%	34%	35%	**16%**	-12%	-19%	-18%	-9%	-10%	**2%**
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Las Palmas Elementary	42%	39%	51%	49%	44%	**2%**	26%	28%	41%	30%	25%	**-1%**	-16%	-11%	-10%	-19%	-19%	**-3%**
Ventura Unified	De Anza Middle	25%	39%	39%	50%	35%	**10%**	12%	28%	22%	36%	19%	**7%**	-13%	-11%	-17%	-14%	-16%	**-3%**
	E. P. Foster Elementary	30%	43%	69%	59%	58%	**28%**	27%	43%	65%	52%	51%	**24%**	-3%	0%	-4%	-7%	-7%	**-4%**
	Juanamaria Elementary	70%	80%	80%	78%	77%	**7%**	46%	61%	62%	60%	54%	**8%**	-24%	-19%	-18%	-18%	-23%	**1%**
	Montalvo Elementary	35%	41%	55%	45%	53%	**18%**	29%	32%	44%	34%	29%	**0%**	-6%	-9%	-11%	-11%	-24%	**-18%**
	Sheridan Way Elementary	44%	47%	47%	46%	44%	**0%**	39%	43%	42%	38%	35%	**-4%**	-5%	-4%	-5%	-8%	-9%	**-4%**
Vista Unified	Casita Center for Science/Math/Technology	56%	61%	60%	63%	66%	**10%**	36%	39%	41%	48%	47%	**11%**	-20%	-22%	-19%	-15%	-19%	**1%**
	Foothill Oak Elementary		39%	48%	53%	47%	**8%**		34%	37%	45%	39%	**5%**		-5%	-11%	-8%	-8%	**-3%**
	Roosevelt Middle	40%	44%	52%	60%	55%	**15%**	3%	10%	12%	7%	12%	**9%**	-37%	-34%	-40%	-53%	-43%	**-6%**
	Temple Heights Elementary	42%	50%	56%	55%	61%	**19%**	26%	39%	46%	42%	55%	**29%**	-16%	-11%	-10%	-13%	-6%	**10%**
	Vista Academy of Visual and Performing Arts	45%	53%	52%	49%	55%	**10%**	20%	26%	29%	26%	34%	**14%**	-25%	-27%	-23%	-23%	-21%	**4%**
Whittier City Elementary	Orange Grove Elementary	40%	43%	50%	42%	47%	**7%**	43%	34%	36%	27%	34%	**-9%**	3%	-9%	-14%	-15%	-13%	**-16%**
Woodland Joint Unified	Beamer Elementary	25%	42%	48%	53%	56%	**31%**	14%	30%	36%	42%	36%	**22%**	-11%	-12%	-12%	-11%	-20%	**-9%**
	Lee Middle	22%	27%	32%	29%	24%	**2%**	5%	3%	11%	7%	10%	**5%**	-17%	-24%	-21%	-22%	-14%	**3%**
	Ramon S. Tafoya Elementary	43%	48%	49%	54%	53%	**10%**	18%	32%	31%	33%	32%	**14%**	-25%	-16%	-18%	-21%	-21%	**4%**
	Rhoda Maxwell Elementary	29%	40%	40%	41%	46%	**17%**	14%	29%	35%	35%	39%	**25%**	-15%	-11%	-5%	-6%	-7%	**8%**
	Willow Spring Elementary	40%	42%	40%	47%	39%	**-1%**	28%	24%	22%	34%	27%	**-1%**	-12%	-18%	-18%	-13%	-12%	**0%**
	Woodland Prairie Elementary	25%	33%	39%	43%	42%	**17%**	13%	21%	28%	30%	30%	**17%**	-12%	-12%	-11%	-13%	-12%	**0%**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
Algebra I (Grade 8) CST, School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- School-wide CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008
- EL CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008
- Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL CST achievement from 2004-08

Name of LEA	School	School-wide 8th Grade Algebra I CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup 8th Grade Algebra I CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
Brentwood Union Elementary	Edna Hill Middle	49%	79%	87%	53%	57%	**8%**			50%	23%	25%	**-25%**			-37%	-30%	-32%	**5%**
Coachella Valley Unified	Cahuilla Desert Academy Junior High	15%	27%	87%	90%	73%	**+58%**	10%	20%	73%	88%	81%	**+71%**	-5%	-7%	-14%	-2%	8%	**+13%**
	Toro Canyon Middle	28%	37%	55%	23%	56%	**+28%**												
	West Shores High	0%		0%			**0%**	0%					**N/A**	0%					**N/A**
Evergreen Elementary	Chaboya Middle	90%	99%	98%	100%	98%	**+8%**												
	Quimby Oak Middle	73%	79%	90%	79%	81%	**+8%**												
Garvey Elementary	Dewey Avenue Elementary			14%			**N/A**			17%			**N/A**			3%			**N/A**
	Garvey (Richard) Intermediate	66%	79%	78%	53%	52%	**-14%**		58%	71%	45%	35%	**-23%**		-21%	-7%	-8%	-17%	**+4%**
	Hillcrest Elementary			13%			**N/A**												
	Temple (Roger W.) Intermediate	59%	79%	69%	55%	65%	**+6%**			52%	43%	62%	**+10%**			-17%	-12%	-3%	**+14%**
Glendale Unified	Eleanor J. Toll Middle	76%	94%	90%	92%	95%	**+19%**			100%			**N/A**			10%			**N/A**
	Rosemont Middle	89%	90%	98%	96%	98%	**+9%**	85%	81%	94%		100%	**+15%**	-4%	-9%	-4%		2%	**+6%**
	Theodore Roosevelt Middle	78%	85%	97%	90%	96%	**+18%**												
	Woodrow Wilson Middle	82%	87%	97%	96%	98%	**+16%**	67%					**N/A**	-15%					**N/A**
Imperial County Office of Education	Heber Elementary **(Heber Elementary School District)**		21%	21%	47%	88%	**+67%**		9%	23%	30%		**+21%**		-12%	2%	-17%		**-5%**
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**		0%				**N/A**												
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	29%	23%	62%	64%	86%	**57%**	21%	9%	45%	43%	79%	**58%**	-8%	-14%	-17%	-21%	-7%	**1%**
Irvine Unified	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	84%	87%	94%	91%	97%	**+13%**	85%	89%				**+4%**	1%	2%				**+1%**
KIPP Adelante	KIPP Adelante				72%	25%	**-47%**				67%	13%	**-54%**				-5%	-12%	**-7%**
Luther Burbank	Luther Burbank Elementary	29%	9%	40%	22%	22%	**-7%**	20%	6%	32%	19%	11%	**-9%**	-9%	-3%	-8%	-3%	-11%	**-2%**
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	Los Alisos Middle	4%	9%	13%	18%	29%	**+25%**	0%	2%	2%	8%	16%	**+16%**	-4%	-7%	-11%	-10%	-13%	**-9%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Kenilworth Junior High	89%	87%	77%	83%	86%	**-3%**												
	Petaluma Junior High	60%	62%	68%	62%	62%	**+2%**												
San Jose Unified	River Glen	50%	76%	78%	60%	57%	**+7%**												
Sanger Unified	Fairmont Elementary	62%	50%	50%	43%	53%	**-9%**												
	Lone Star Elementary	0%					**N/A**												
Santa Ana Unified	Douglas MacArthur Fundamental Intermediate	54%	63%	80%	83%	90%	**+36%**												
	Gonzalo Felicitas Mendez Fundamental Intermediate	23%	27%	34%	31%	53%	**+30%**	7%	11%	13%	10%	15%	**+8%**	-16%	-16%	-21%	-21%	-38%	**-22%**
	Raymond A. Villa Fundamental Intermediate	21%	19%	27%	22%	46%	**+25%**	9%	1%	10%	5%	18%	**+9%**	-12%	-18%	-17%	-17%	-28%	**-16%**
	Taft Elementary	13%	42%	38%	15%		**+2%**	5%					**N/A**	-8%					**N/A**
Sonoma County Office of Education	Mountain Shadows Middle	59%	44%	34%	53%	66%	**+7%**												
Ventura Unified	De Anza Middle	52%	77%	41%	27%	15%	**-37%**			23%	25%	8%	**-15%**			-18%	-2%	-7%	**+11%**
Vista Unified	Roosevelt Middle	66%	77%	63%	73%	86%	**+20%**												
	Vista Academy of Visual and Performing Arts	79%	77%	91%	96%	91%	**+12%**												
Woodland Joint Unified	Lee Middle	10%	11%	32%	44%	32%	**+22%**	0%	0%				**0%**	-10%	-11%				**-1%**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
Algebra I (Grade 9) CST, School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- School-wide CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008
- EL CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008
- Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL CST achievement from 2004-08

Name of LEA	School	School-wide 9th Grade Algebra I CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup 9th Grade Algebra I CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Artesia High	20%	30%	15%	28%	20%	**0%**	16%	11%	4%	12%	13%	**-3%**	-4%	-19%	-11%	-16%	-7%	**-3%**
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High	0%	0%			0%	**0%**												
Coachella Valley Unified	West Shores High	0%	3%	0%	0%	6%	**6%**	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	3%	0%	0%	-6%	**-6%**
Glendale Unified	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	38%	46%	47%	47%	55%	**17%**	36%	61%	26%	21%	50%	**14%**	-2%	15%	-21%	-26%	-5%	**-3%**
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	51%	46%	67%	65%	67%	**16%**	62%	41%	83%	61%	91%	**29%**	11%	-5%	16%	-4%	24%	**13%**
	Glendale Senior High	16%	23%	34%	28%	32%	**16%**	14%	17%	22%	19%	17%	**3%**	-2%	-6%	-12%	-9%	-15%	**-13%**
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	54%	69%	65%	63%	29%	**-25%**	52%	69%	50%	67%	14%	**-38%**	-2%	0%	-15%	4%	-15%	**-13%**
Imperial County Office of Education	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	10%	16%	18%	33%	37%	**27%**	2%	4%	9%	7%	6%	**4%**	-8%	-12%	-9%	-26%	-31%	**-23%**
	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community **(ICOE)**		0%	11%	0%	0%	**0%**												
	William Moreno Junior High **(Calexico Unified School District)**	15%	11%	24%	58%	59%	**44%**	5%	7%	11%	46%	51%	**46%**	-10%	-4%	-13%	-12%	-8%	**2%**
Irvine Unified	University High	62%	78%	63%	68%	74%	**12%**	48%	89%	74%		58%	**10%**	-14%	11%	11%		-16%	**-2%**
Oxnard Union High	Adolfo Camarillo High	30%	35%	52%	40%	44%	**14%**			50%	29%	64%	**14%**			-2%	-11%	20%	**22%**
	Channel Islands High	15%	19%	19%	18%	17%	**2%**	9%	11%	18%	15%	8%	**-1%**	-6%	-8%	-1%	-3%	-9%	**-3%**
	Hueneme High	7%	12%	11%	8%	28%	**21%**	8%	5%	4%	5%	37%	**29%**	1%	-7%	-7%	-3%	9%	**8%**
	Oxnard High	21%	29%	25%	20%	13%	**-8%**	6%	30%	22%	10%	8%	**2%**	-15%	1%	-3%	-10%	-5%	**10%**
	Pacifica High	12%	25%	17%	20%	38%	**26%**	2%	15%	9%	15%	28%	**26%**	-10%	-10%	-8%	-5%	-10%	**0%**
	Rio Mesa High	30%	20%	30%	16%	23%	**-7%**	22%	2%	26%	14%		**-8%**	-8%	-18%	-4%	-2%		**6%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Casa Grande High	23%	23%	21%	28%	34%	**11%**	0%	13%	9%	8%	5%	**5%**	-23%	-10%	-12%	-20%	-29%	**-6%**
	Petaluma High	5%	14%	14%	11%	23%	**18%**		0%	23%	2%	3%	**3%**		-14%	9%	-9%	-20%	**-6%**
Sanger Unified	Sanger High	4%	11%	9%	16%	13%	**9%**	10%	4%	6%	7%	7%	**-3%**	6%	-7%	-3%	-9%	-6%	**-12%**
Santa Ana Unified	Santa Ana High	14%	7%	6%	5%	9%	**-5%**	10%	4%	4%	4%	3%	**-7%**	-4%	-3%	-2%	-1%	-6%	**-2%**

Appendix B
Promising Practice Site Data Tables
Geometry (Grade 10) CST, School-wide & for EL subgroup

Table Description

- **School-wide CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **EL CST growth 2004-08, including net difference in growth between 2004 and 2008**
- **Difference in achievement (i.e., Achievement gap) between school-wide & EL CST achievement from 2004-08**

Name of LEA	School	School-wide 10th Grade Geometry CST (%Proficient or Above)						EL Subgroup 10th Grade Geometry CST (%Proficient or Above)						Difference/Achievement Gap					
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Net
ABC Unified	Artesia High	14%	21%	19%	5%	8%	**-6%**	24%			0%	6%	**-18%**	10%			-5%	-2%	**-12%**
Alpaugh Unified	Alpaugh Junior-Senior High		0%	9%			**9%**												
Coachella Valley Unified	West Shores High	0%			0%	0%	**0%**												
Glendale Unified	Anderson W. Clark Magnet High	24%	34%	29%	18%	37%	**13%**	20%	27%	35%	13%	36%	**16%**	-4%	-7%	6%	-5%	-1%	**3%**
	Crescenta Valley Senior High	56%	53%	48%	49%	51%	**-5%**	67%	46%	44%	50%	36%	**-31%**	11%	-7%	-4%	1%	-15%	**-26%**
	Glendale Senior High	27%	30%	17%	28%	16%	**-11%**	25%	38%	10%	17%	11%	**-14%**	-2%	8%	-7%	-11%	-5%	**-3%**
	Herbert Hoover Senior High	56%	48%	47%	40%	25%	**-31%**	61%	56%	40%	28%	53%	**-8%**	5%	8%	-7%	-12%	28%	**23%**
Imperial County Office of Education	Brawley High **(Brawley Union High School District)**	4%	12%	16%	4%	8%	**4%**	1%	4%	10%	7%	0%	**-1%**	-3%	-8%	-6%	3%	-8%	**-5%**
Irvine Unified	University High	60%	57%	65%	56%	53%	**-7%**	90%	40%	55%	46%		**-44%**	30%	-17%	-10%	-10%		**-40%**
Oxnard Union High	Adolfo Camarillo High	33%	45%	44%	38%	34%	**1%**					29%	**N/A**					-5%	**N/A**
	Channel Islands High	10%	13%	12%	10%	5%	**-5%**	11%	18%	6%	8%	2%	**-9%**	1%	5%	-6%	-2%	-3%	**-4%**
	Hueneme High	5%	10%	6%	2%	2%	**-3%**	0%	13%	0%	4%	4%	**4%**	-5%	3%	-6%	2%	2%	**7%**
	Oxnard High	14%	24%	19%	10%	6%	**-8%**		23%	10%	0%	4%	**-19%**		-1%	-9%	-10%	-2%	**-1%**
	Pacifica High	8%	8%	11%	10%	6%	**-2%**	9%	3%	5%	0%	6%	**-3%**	1%	-5%	-6%	-10%	0%	**-1%**
	Rio Mesa High	23%	33%	17%	14%	10%	**-13%**		25%	6%	15%	9%	**-16%**		-8%	-11%	1%	-1%	**7%**
Petaluma Joint Union High	Casa Grande High	35%	29%	28%	24%	19%	**-16%**	0%	0%	27%	15%	0%	**0%**	-35%	-29%	-1%	-9%	-19%	**16%**
	Petaluma High	6%	14%	5%	12%	7%	**1%**					0%	**N/A**					-7%	**N/A**
Sanger Unified	Sanger High	12%	11%	13%	9%	9%	**-3%**		0%	6%	5%	10%	**10%**		-11%	-7%	-4%	1%	**12%**
Santa Ana Unified	Santa Ana High	14%	6%	3%	2%	1%	**-13%**	11%	5%	2%	1%	0%	**-11%**	-3%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	**2%**

Appendix C
Literature Review Bibliography

Appendix C—Bibliography

Abedi, J. (2004). "The No Child Left Behind Act and English-language learners: Assessment and accountability issues." *Educational Researcher*, *33*(1), 4-14.

Aburto S., P. Berman, B. Nelson, C. Minicucci, & G. Burkart (2000). *Going schoolwide: Comprehensive school reform inclusive of limited English proficient students: A resource guide.* Washington, DC: George Washington University, Center for the Study of Language and Education. http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/resource/comprehensive.pdf.

Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about reading.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Adamson, H.D. (2005). *Language minority students in American schools.* Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Amster, H. (1966). "Development of Concept Formation in Children." Berkeley, CA: (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED010290).

Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The architecture of cognition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Anderson, L. W., & Sosniak, L. A. (Eds). (1994). *Bloom's taxonomy: A forty-year retrospective: Ninety-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anstrom, K. (1997). *Academic achievement for secondary language minority students: Standards, measures, and promising practices.* Washington DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Arellano, A.H., C. Flamenco, M.M. Merlos, L. Segura (2001). "Has California's Passage of Proposition 227 Made a Difference in the Way We Teach?" *Urban Review*, v33, pp. 221-235 2001. New York, NY: (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED EJ631888).

Arias, B., Morillo-Campbell, M. (2008). Promoting ELL Parental Involvement: Challenges in Contested Times. Education Policy Research Unit. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED506652).

August, D. & K. Hakuta (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda.* Washington DC: National Academy Press: 1997.

August, D. & T. Shanahan, authors (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners.* Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children & Youth, funded by US Department of Education and the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Mahwah, NJ: 2006.

August, D. & T. Shanahan, editors (2008). *Developing reading and writing in second language learners: Lessons from the Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth.* Routledge, New York, NY: 2008.

Baker, K.A. & A.A. de Kanter (1981). *Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of the literature.* Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED215010).

Ballantyne, K.G., A.R. Sanderman & J. Levy (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity.* Washington DC: National Clearinghouse for Language Acquisition. http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/practice/mainstream_teachers.htm.

Bangert-Drowns, R.L., Kulik, J. & Kulik, C.L.(1991). Effects of Frequent Classroom Testing. *The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 85, No. 2, p. 89-99.*

Berman, P., J. Chambers, et al., (1992). *Meeting the challenge of language diversity: An examination of programs for pupils with limited proficiency.* Berkeley, CA: BW Associates.

Berry, B., M. Hoke, & E. Hirsch (May 2004). The Search for Highly Qualified Teachers. *The Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 85, No. 9, pp. 684-689.*
Block, J.H. & Burns, R.B. (1976). "Mastery Learning." *Review of Research in Education, Vol. 4, p. 3-49.*

Bloom, B.S., Engelhart, M.D. Furst, E.J., Hill, W.H. & Krathwohl, D.R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York, NY.: Longmans, Green.

Boyd, D., D. Goldhaber, H. Lankford & J. Wyckoff (2007). "The Effect of Certification and Preparation on Teacher Quality." *The Future of Children*, *Vol. 17, No. 1, p. 45-68, Spring 2007.*

Brisk, M. (1998). *Bilingual Education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brisk, M. (1999). *Quality Bilingual Education: Defining Success*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University.

Cadiero-Kaplan, K., J. Flores & M. Berta-Avila (2008). *Highly Qualified bilingual teachers: Developing standards for bilingual authorization*. The Multilingual Educator, CABE 2008 Conference Edition.

California Department of Education. State Accountability Report Card, 2007-2008. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/.

California Department of Education. State Accountability Report Card, 2006-2007. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/.

California Department of Education. State Accountability Report Card, 2005-2006. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/.

Carrell, P., Pharis, B.G., & Liberto, J.C. (1989). Metacognitive Strategy Training for ESL Reading. *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 4, p. 647-678.*

Carrell, P. L. (1985). Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 19, No. 4, p. 727-752.*

Carrell, P. L. (1987). Content and formal schemata in ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 3, p. 461-481.*

Robinson, A.H. (1975). *Teaching reading and study strategies.* (pp. 86-165). Boston, MA.,: Allyn and Bacon.

Christian, D. (1992). *Two-way bilingual programs in the United States, 1991-1992.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Chun, J. (1980). "A Survey of Research in Second Language Acquisition." *The Modern Language Journal, Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 287-296.*

Cole, M., J. Gay, J.A. Glick, & D.W. Sharp (1971). *The Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking: An Exploration in Experimental Anthropology.* New York, New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Collier, V. (1992) "A Synthesis of Studies Examining Long-Term Language Minority Student Data on Academic Achievement." *Bilingual Research Journal*, v16 n1-2 pp. 187-212. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED EJ460177).

Clark, K. (2009). "The Case for Structured English Immersion: Three states and many school districts are finding that emphasizing English language instruction offers ELLs an accelerated path to success." *Educational Leadership*, p. 42-46.

Clarke, M. (1980). The Short Circuit Hypothesis of ESL Reading – Or When Language Competence Interferes with Reading Performance. *The Modern Language Journal, Vol. 64, No. 2, P. 203-209, Summer 1980.*

Crawford, J. (1995) *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice.* Crane Publishing Company. Trenton, N.J; Crane Publishing.

Crawford, J. (2004). *No Child Left Behind: Misguided approach to school accountability for English language learners.* Washington DC: National Association of Bilingual Educators. http://www.nabe.org/documents/policy_legislation/NABE_on_NCLB.pdf.

Croddy, M. (1995) *The immigration debate: Public policy, Proposition 187 and the law.* Los Angeles, CA: Constitutional Rights Foundation. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED393784).

Cummins, J. (1992). "Bilingual Education and English Immersion: The Ramirez Report in Theoretical Perspective." *Bilingual Research Journal*, v16 n1-2, pp. 91-104. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. EJ460174).

Davis, G., & M.A. Thomas (1989). *Effective schools and effective teachers.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E. & Short, D.J. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English Learners: the SIOP model.* Boston, MA.: Pearson.

Edsource (2009). http://www.edsource.org/iss_sta_accountability_nclb.html (downloaded September 30, 2009).

Ennis, R.H. (1987). A taxonomy of critical thinking dispositions and attributes. In Baron, J. & Steinberg, R. (1987). *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory and Practice*. New York, N.Y.: Freeman

Epstein, J.L. (1991). "Effects on student achievement of teachers' practices of parent involvement." *Advances in Reading/Language Research*, *5*, 261–276. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED256863).

Eskey, D. (1988). Holding in the bottom: An interactive approach to the language problems of second language readers. In Carrell, P, Devine, J. & Eskey, D. *Interactive approaches to second language reading* New York, NY,: Cambridge University Press.

Eskey, D., & Grabe, W. (1988). Interactive models for second language reading: Perspectives on instruction. In Carrell, P, Devine, J. & Eskey, D. *Interactive approaches to second language reading* New York, NY,: Cambridge University Press.

Feldman, K. and K. Kinsella (2005). *Narrowing the language gap: The case for explicit vocabulary instruction.* Scholastic Professional Paper, New York, NY.

Faltis, C. (2001) *Joinfostering: Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Classrooms.* Merrill Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Flood, J., & Lapp, D., Squire, J., Jensen, J.M. (1987). "The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading and English." *National Conference on Research in English, Urbana, IL.*

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L.S. (2006). Introduction to Response to Intervention: What, Why, and How Valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 41, No. 1, p. 93-99.*

Fullan, M. G., & M.B. Miles (1992). "Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't." *Phi Delta*

Kappan, v.73 n10, pp. 744-752. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. EJ445727).

Gándara, P., R. Rumberger, J. Maxwell-Jolly, & R. Callahan (2003). "English Learners in California Schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes." *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, Vol. 11 n36. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. EJ680106).

Garcia, E. (1991). *Education of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students: Effective Instructional Practices.* National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, Center for Applied Linguistics. Washington, DC. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED338099).

Garmston, R.J. & B.M. Wellman (1999). *The Adaptive School: A sourcebook for developing collaborative groups* (p. 56). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Genesee, F. 1987. *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Genesee, F., K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, D. Christian (2005). *English language learners in US schools: An overview of research findings.* Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), Vol. 10, Issue 4, August 2005, pp. 363-386.

Genessee, F., K. Lindholm-Leary, B. Saunders, D. Christian (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY: 2006.

Gershberg, A., A. Danenberg & P. Sanchez (2004). *Beyond Bilingual Education: New Immigrants and Public School Policies in California*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Gibson, E.J. (1953). Improvement in Perceptual Judgments as a Function of Controlled Practice or Training. *Psychological Bulletin Vol. 50, No. 1, p. 401-431.*

González, L.A. 1985. *The effects of first language education on the second language and academic achievement of Mexican immigrant elementary school children in the United States.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Grabe, W. (1991). "Current Developments in Second Language Reading Research." *TESOL Quarterly, Vol, 25, No. 3, p. 375-406, Autumn 1991.*

Guha, R.C., A.D. Humphrey, P. Shields et al., (2006). "California's teaching force 2006: Key issues and trends." Santa Cruz, CA: *The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.* (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED495833).

Hammond-Darling, L., & DL Ball (1998). *Teaching for High Standards: What Policymakers Need to Know and Be Able to Do*. Nation Commission on Teaching & America's Future. University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED 426491).

Hammond-Darling, L. (2002). *Access to quality teaching: An analysis of inequality in California' public schools.* Expert report prepared for Williams v. State of California. http://www.mofo.com/decentschools/expertreports/darling-hammondreport.pdf.

Hammond-Darling, L. (2000). "Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence." *Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington, Washington.* (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED EJ605912).

Hakuta, K., Y.G. Butler & D. Witt (2000, January). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, Linguistic Minority Research Institute. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED443275).

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Harver, J.J. (2004) *Structured English Immersion: A Step-by-Step Guide for K-6 Teachers and Administrators.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Haycock, K. (1998). "Good teaching matters: How well-qualified teachers can close the gap." *Thinking K-16, 3*(2), 1-17. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED443275).

Haynes. J. (2007).*Getting Started with English Language Learners.* Alexandria, Virginia: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Henderson, A.T. & Mapp, K.L. (2002). A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement. Austin, TX.: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED474521).

Hess, F.M. (2002). "Tear Down This Wall: The Case for a Radical Overhaul of Teacher Certification." *The Progressive Policy Institute.*
http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=110&subsecID=135&contentID=3964.

Hill, J.D. & Flynn, K.M. (2006). *Classroom Instruction That Works with English Learners.* Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hillocks, G. (1987). "Synthesis of research in teaching writing." *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 44 N.8, p. 71-82.

Holland, D. & Cole, M. (1995). Between Discourse and Schema: Reformulating a Cultural-Historical Approach to Culture and Mind. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 475-489.*

Arellano-Houchin, A., C. Flamenco, M. Moises, L. Segura (2001). *Has California's Passage of Proposition 227 Made a Difference in the Way We Teach?* Urban Review, V33 n3. (ERIC EJ631888)

Huang, S., Y. Yi, & K. Haycock. (2002). *Interpret with Caution: The First State Title II Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*. The Education Trust. West Oakland, Ca.*Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 649-666.*

Jepsen, C. & de Alth, S. (2005). *English Learners in California Schools.* Report of the Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco, CA.

Jones, B. F., Amiran, M., & Katims, M. (1985). Teaching cognitive strategies and text structures within language arts programs. In Segal J.W., Chipman S.F., & R.
Glaser, *Thinking and learning skills: Vol. 1. Relating instruction to research* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jones, R. (1976). *Mainstreaming and the Minority Child.* Reston, VA: The Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Kaplan, L.S. and W.A. Owings (2003). "No Child Left Behind: The Politics of Teacher Quality." *The Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 84, No. 9, pp. 687-692.*

Kerper-Mora, J. (2005) *Legal History of Bilingual Education.*
http://coe.sdsu.edu/people/jmora/Pages/HistoryBE.htm.

Kinder, A. L. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available Educational Programs and services: 2000-2001 Summary Report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students. http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/states/reports/seareports/0001/sea0001.pdf.

Krashen, S., & D. Biber. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Krashen, S., K. Rolstad & J. MacSwan (2007). *Review of "Research Summary and Bibliography for Structured English Immersion Programs" of the Arizona English Language Learners Task Force*. http://www.asu.edu/educ/sceed/azell/review.doc.

Lachat, M. (2004). *Standards-Based Instruction and Assessment for English Language Learners.* Corwin Press, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Lau v. Nichols. 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Lee, D.M. & Bingham, A. (1959). Intellectual Processes. *Review of Educational Research, Vol. 29, No. 2, p. 185-196.*

Lenski, S. Ehlers-Zavala, M.C., Irminger, D.A.S. (2006). Assessing English-Language Learners in Mainstream Classrooms. *The Reading Teacher, Vol. 60, No. 1, p. 24-34.*

Lindholm-Leary, K.J. (2005) *Review of Research and Best Practices on Effective Features of Dual Language Education Programs.* San Jose State University, Draft 2005.

Lipman, M. (1991). *Thinking in education.* Cambridge, NY. Cambridge University Press.

Long, M.H. (1990). "The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain." *TESOL Quarterly, V.24, N.4, pp. 649-666.*

Martinez, M. (2006). What is Metacognition?. *The Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 87, No. 9, p. 696-699.*

Marzano, R. J. (1988). *Dimensions of thinking: a framework for curriculum and instruction.* Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED294222)

Marzano, R.J.(1993). How Classroom Teachers Approach the Teaching of Thinking. *Theory into Practice. Vol. 32, No. 3., p. 154-160, Summer 1993.*

McField, G. P. (2008). *Ten years of Proposition 227: History, practice, research, and policy implications.* The Multilingual Educator, California Association of Bilingual Educators, 2008 Conference Edition.

Mclaren P. & C.J. Ovando (2000). *The Politics of multiculturalism and bilingual education: Students and teachers caught in the cross fire* (pp. 126–147). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED393784).

McLaughlin, B. (1990). Restructuring. *Applied Linguistics, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 113-128.*

Mellard, D.F. & E. Johnson (2008). *RTI: A practitioner's guide to implementing response to intervention*. Corwin Press: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Milk, R. D. (1990). "Preparing ESL and bilingual teachers for changing roles: Immersion for teachers of LEP children." *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(3), 407-427.

Morrissey, M. S. (2000). "Comprehensive school improvement: Addressing the challenges." *Issues…about Change, v9, n1.* (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED449574).

Nagle, S.J. & S.L. Sanders (1986). "Comprehension Theory and Second Language Pedagogy". *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 9-26.*

Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education (1981*). Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework.* California State Department of Education, Sacramento. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED249773).

Olsen, L. (1997). *Made In America: Immigrant Students in Our Public Schools.* The New Press. New York, New York.

Olsen, L. (2005). "State Test Programs Mushroom as NCLB Mandate Kicks in." *Education Week, Vol. 25, No. 13, p. 10-12.*

Ovando, C.J. (2003). *Bilingual Education in U.S: Historical Development and Current Issues.* http://brj.asu.edu/content/vol27_no1/art1.pdf.

Ovando, C.J. and V. Collier (1998). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: teaching in multicultural Contexts,* 2nd ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Parrish, T., Merickel, et al., (2006) *Effects of the Implementation of Proposition 227 on the Education of English Learners, K-12: Findings from a Five-Year Evaluation.* http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/rs/804.

Pease-Alvarez, L., E.E. Garcia & K. Espinosa (1991). "Effective instruction for language minority students: An early childhood case study." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, v.6, n.3, pp. 347-363.

Perkins, D.N. (1984). Creativity by Design. *Educational Leadership, Vol. 42, No. 1, p. 18-25.*

PPIC (2005). Public Policy Institute of California, Research Brief. "The Progress of English Learners in California Schools." Issue #99, April 2005.

Ramírez , J., D. Pasta, S. Yuen, D. Ramey (1991). Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit bilingual education programs for language-minority children, Volume II. Prepared for the US Department of Education.

Reeves, D.(2000). *Accountability in Action*. Denver, CO: Advanced Learning Press.

Rossell, C. (2002). *Dismantling bilingual education, implementing English immersion:* T*he California initiative.*
http://www.bu.edu/polisci/CROSSELL/Dismantling%20Bilingual%20Education,%20July%202002.pdf.

Rossell, C.H., & K. Baker (1996). "The educational effectiveness of bilingual education." *Research in the teaching of English*, V.*30*, n.1.

Rumberger, R. W. & B. Arellano (2003). *Understanding and Addressing the Latino Achievement Gap in California*. Berkeley, CA: UC Latino Policy Institute.
http://www.lmri.ucsb.edu/publications/04_rumberger-arellano.pdf.

Rumberger, R.W., & P. Gándara (2004). "Seeking equity in the education of California's English learners." *Teachers College Record*, *106*, 2032-2056.

Rumberger R., & P. Gándara (2005, Winter). "How well are California's English learners mastering English?" *UC LMRI Newsletter, 14*(2), 1-2.

Segalowitz, D. (1991). Does advanced skill in a second language reduce automaticity in the first language? *Language Learning*, Vol. 41, No. 1, p. 59-83.

Slavin, R.E. & A. Cheung (2005). A synthesis of Research on Language of Reading Instruction for English Learners. *Review of Educational Research, v.75. n.2., pp. 247-284.*

Snipes, J., Soga, K., & Uro, G. (2007). Improving Teaching and Learning for English Language Learners in Urban Schools. *Council of the Great City Schools.* (Document located through WestEd)
http://www.aacompcenter.org/cs/smu/view/rs/12307

Thomas, W.P. & V.P. Collier (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/effectiveness/thomas-collier97.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education, 2006. http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep.

Vasquez, O.A., Pease-Alvarez, S. & Shannon, M. (1994). *Pushing boundaries: language and culture in a Mexicano community.* New York, NY,: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, T., Perry, M., Oregon, I., et. al. (2007). Similar English Learner Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better? *EdSource, Inc.* (Document located through WestEd) http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/rs/864

Wong-Fillmore, L. and C. Snow (2000). *What teachers need to know about language.* Washington DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Appendix D
Promising Practice Site Profiles

ELLPP Sites	
ABC Unified	Monterey Peninsula Unified
Alpaugh Unified	Mountain Empire Unified
Atwater Elementary	New Haven Unified
Bakersfield City	Newhall Elementary
Brentwood Union Elementary	Norwalk-La Mirada Unified
Ceres Unified	Novato Unified
Chula Vista Elementary	Oak Grove Elementary
Coachella Valley Unified	Oxnard Union High
Desert Sands Unified	Pasadena Unified
El Monte City Elementary	Petaluma Joint Union High
Escondido Union	Salida Union Elementary
Evergreen Elementary	San Diego County Office of Education
Garvey Elementary	San Jose Unified
Glendale Unified	San Leandro Unified
Imperial County Office of Education	Sanger Unified
Irvine Unified	Santa Ana Unified
KIPP Adelante	Sierra Sands Unified
Lennox Elementary	Sonoma County Office of Education
Livingston Union Elementary	Stanislaus County Office of Education
Luther Burbank	Ventura Unified
Marysville Joint Unified	Whittier City Elementary
	Woodland Joint Unified

Promising Practices Site: ABC Unified

Contact Information: Mike McCoy, Director of Special Projects
(562) 926-5566 x21136 | mike.mccoy@abcusd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
ABC Unified is a school district in an urban area of Los Angeles County, with two eligible promising practice elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion. The schools (one elementary and one high school) offer Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 637 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at both schools.

Project Description
At the high school, staff will implement an ELD intervention (4-Block schedule) and providing staffing, professional development, and monitoring intervention class for Level 1 dominant students.

Professional Development Activities
Release time for teachers to attend professional conferences (CABE, CRA, & CA TESOL). Additional professional development provided by consultants.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
An Intervention course at the high school will incorporate the following elements:

- Appropriate Language Use during ELD: ELD 1A, for example will include approximately 80% of class time devoted to listening and speaking practice and 20% to reading and writing. ELD Advanced will include the opposite language use: 80% reading and writing practice and 20% listening and speaking.
- Interactive Teaching Strategies: Teachers will implement a variety of strategies for eliciting engagement including – Think-Pair-Share or Heads Together, followed by Thumbs Up/Down and/or choral or white boards
- Visual Component: Poster Markers to make it easier to enlarge portions of text, LCD projectors, charts and other realia that will provide students with visual cues.
- Block scheduling: Students will rotate into and out of one of the following blocks on a regular basis – Oral Fluency and Correctness, Vocabulary Development, Writing, and Comprehension and Text-Handling.
- Cultural Identity: Interdisciplinary unit between ELD and Social Studies teachers on oppositional boundaries for African American and Hispanic students.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Analyzing Benchmark and California assessments.

Staffing
Staff development consultants and two part-time instructional aides that are bilingual in Korean and Chinese.

Promising Practices Site: Alpaugh Unified School District

Contact Information: Robert Hudson, Superintendent
(559) 949-8413 | robh@alpaugh.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Alpaugh Unified is a school district in a rural area of Tulare County, with one eligible promising practice junior high school and a high school that will be targeted for expansion. The school offers Structured English Immersion (SEI) and a Double-Dose of the High Point program to 60 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide.

Project Description
The program consists of providing all students a double-block intervention class for ELA in order to help students develop the necessary skills to access the core without losing minutes during primary instruction. Additionally, the school provides AVID courses to prepare students to enter the UC and CSU systems.

Professional Development Activities
Not indicated.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
During intervention, students use the High Point curriculum and teachers emphasize differentiated instruction (graphic organizers), collaborative learning through meaningful activities, and through the instruction of relevant vocabulary that reinforces concepts.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Benchmark assessments are regularly analyzed and provided through EduSoft, with Examgen providing the test question bank. Teachers meet with administrators quarterly to share assessment results and plans for re-teach.

Staffing
Funding will be used to assist with a salary for one teacher staffing the intervention class.

Promising Practices Site: Atwater Elementary School District

Contact Information: Michele McCabe, Asst. Superintendent of Educational Services (209) 357-6105 | mmccabe@aesd.org

General Characteristics
Atwater Elementary school district in a rural area of Merced County, with one eligible promising practice Elementary school that will be targeted for expansion. The Elementary school offers a Mainstream program to 156 EL's. The district plans on expanding the promising practice school-wide at both pilot schools.

Project Description
Atwater Unified would like to expand its Academic Conference process to all English Learners every eight weeks. This would include teachers regularly reviewing: 1) academic and Social Emotional Learning (SEL) strengths to determine and appropriate intervention 2) Specificity of the concern, described in behavioral terms and supported by data gleaned from multiple assessments 3) A responsive plan of action agreed upon after a quick examination of prior interventions and 4) choosing and outlining the chosen intervention. The team agrees on the support needed, evidence of success, and a date for review.

Professional Development Activities
Not indicated.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
School uses *Open Court* during its core and *Moving into English* during ELD.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Analyzing data is a part of the Academic Conference process.

Staffing
A facilitator will guide process of implementing Academic Conferences through providing professional development

Promising Practices Site: Bakersfield City School District

Contact Information: Monica Gallegos, Director of Learning Support
(661) 631-4744 | gallegosm@bcsd.com

General Characteristics
Bakersfield City (BCSD) is a school district located in an urban area of Kern County, with three eligible promising practice Elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer both Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 631 English Learners.

Project Description
Funds will be used to expand upon EPC requirements such as the following:

- Analyzing data: A program specialist will oversee data collection and evaluation of grant through administering CELDT testing, development of ELD groups, collaboration with classroom teachers and monitoring of English Learners progress on district and school site assessments.
- Teacher Support: Teachers will have extra time to collaborate and design specific standards-based lesson plans. Additionally, a Bilingual Aide will assist teachers by reinforcing instructional programs and guiding students in the development of positive work habits with small group instruction.
- Community Outreach: A Bilingual Family Advocate will conduct outreach to EL parents to promote academic success, resolve health issues, address financial problems, and promote safe communities.
- Instructional Materials: Possible material purchases include computers, supplemental core reading materials Standards Plus and Reading Mastery materials.

Professional Development
Professional Development has been provided by Data Works, Inc., and four teachers attended a Kate Kinsella EL conference.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Bakersfield will use the Pathway To Teaching and Learning as a framework for maintaining high quality instruction (intense scaffolding/differentiation and focusing on vocabulary). Plans are to expand program to include CELDT levels 1 and 4, as well as kindergarten to first grade.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Specific program not cited.

Staffing
A program specialist position will be created, as well as a Bilingual Family Advocate and Bilingual Aide.

Promising Practices Site: Brentwood Union Elementary

Contact Information: Liz Ybarra, EL Project Coordinator
(925) 513-6333 | lybarra@brentwood.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Brentwood Union Elementary is a school district in a suburban area of Contra Costa County that had one of two eligible schools selected to expand its promising practice. The selected school, Edna Hill Middle School, served 147 English learners through Structured English Immersion (SEI) or English Language Mainstream (ELM). Although, the Brentwood District has 10 schools that all have implemented staff development for SIOP for English Learners, the purpose for the AB 2117 funds was to fully implement and expand staff development at Edna Hill Middle School.

Project Description
The program will incorporate the following activities:
- Create a position for a teacher to coach other colleagues in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)
- Increase staff expertise in implementing SIOP model through feedback from SIOP coach
- Increase staff awareness of student performance of English learners by sharing the results of student work after students receive SIOP lessons
- Identify what aspects of SIOP were more effective than others for specific levels of English proficiency

Professional Development Activities
Staff development for teachers to enhance understanding of SIOP protocol, as well as analyzing student work, conducting teacher observations, and sharing results at staff meetings.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Staff implement state adopted curriculum (not mentioned by name) and differentiation strategies when implementing heterogeneous groupings

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Narrative mentions using assessment data to monitor EL progress, especially with regards to SIOP protocol however specific data management system is not mentioned.

Staffing
A teacher coaching position, as well as staff release time.

Promising Practices Site: Ceres Unified School District

Contact Information: Debra Bukko, Director of Curriculum and Instruction
(209) 556-1520 x1524 | dbukko@ceres.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Ceres Unified is a school district in a suburban area of Stanislaus County, with three eligible promising practice elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion, as well as two additional schools. The elementary schools offer Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 662 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the three pilot schools, then will expand to two additional schools.

Project Description
The promising practice at Ceres Unified has combined four core elements:

1. Targeted EL staff development
2. Differentiated Instruction Time (DIT)
3. Intensive small and large group ELD instruction before and after school
4. Grade level and cross-grade level collaboration and planning

Professional Development Activities
As mentioned below, professional development is centered on differentiating instruction and eliciting more student engagement, as well as promoting schools centered on student learning.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Areas of EL staff development include: direct instruction, differentiated instruction, student engagement (including questioning and checking for understanding), and the development of teacher efficacy through creating Learning Centered Schools, as modeled by Rutherford Learning. All students use *Open Court* during core instruction. *Language for Learning* and *Language for Thinking* is used for targeted students during ELD time.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
District administers quarterly assessments, using OARS, benchmarks and measures as a database

Staffing
Expand coaching model to assist new schools that will adopt core elements of promising practice.

Promising Practices Site: Chula Vista Elementary School District

Contact Information: Maria Teresa Corona
(619) 421-5151 | maria.corona@cvesd.org

General Characteristics
Chula Vista Elementary School District in a suburban area of San Diego County, with eight eligible promising practice Elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer Structured English Immersion (SEI) and Dual Immersion programs to 6304 EL's. The district plans on expanding the promising practice school-wide and to one other school.

Project Description
Chula Vista Elementary School District emphasizes Professional Collaboration Teams as part of a process that includes institutes and walkthroughs, as well as resources to support school-wide focus on reading comprehension and vocabulary.

Professional Development Activities
District personnel will be trained in mathematical reasoning, reading and writing and explicit attention to vocabulary and language development. They will also receive additional training in LAS Links and CELDT.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Students are enrolled in daily ELD using the State-adopted programs, *Avenues* and *High Point*, both by Hampton-Brown. Additionally, teachers plan front-loading lessons for vocabulary and language structures during access to language arts, as well as organize units of study using Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD). Students needing additional support are referred to the reading intervention program using a variety of instructional programs used after assessment with the TPRI.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
To ensure English Learners are placed appropriately in small group reading, the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) in English and Spanish has been implemented school wide.

Staffing
Collaboration teachers for staff release time to participate in training and collaboration.

Promising Practices Site: Coachella Valley Unified

Contact Information: Alma Gonzalez, Director of English Learner Services
(760) 399-4574 x201 | agonzalez@coachella.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Coachella Valley is a school district located in a suburban area of Riverside County, with two eligible middle school pilot programs, as well as two target schools. The schools offer both Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 1188 English Learners. The district plans to expand the current program school-wide at the existing schools, as well as to the other two target schools within the district.

Project Description
Use of ELLPP funds will be used to expand the Coaching Model process that began at Cahuilla Valley and Toro Canyon Middle Schools in 2005 through implementing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Specifically, this includes:

- Collegial Support: Teachers talk about their successes and failures with new teaching model.
- Feedback based on explicit learning goals: Teachers are given objective, non-judgmental feedback about the way the new teaching skills are being implemented.
- Analysis of evidence: Teachers learning how to analyze their new teaching approach and whether it is beneficial to students.
- Ongoing support: The coach provides needed support as the teacher begins to apply a new teaching method or strategy including demo lessons.
- Professional Development growth and leadership through PLCs.
- Assisting schools in placement of English Learners in ELD and content classrooms.
- Focusing on three research-based strategies: Thinking Maps, Structured Student Talk Techniques, and Direct Vocabulary Instruction.

Professional Development Activities
Coaching and Professional Learning Communities.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Not indicated.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Not indicated.

Staffing
Secondary ELD coaches and district Teachers on Special Assignment.

Promising Practices Site: Desert Sands Unified School District

Contact Information: Nelda Esmeralda, Principal – Adams Elementary
(760) 777-4260 | nelda.esmeralda@.dsusd.us

General Characteristics
Desert Sands Unified is a school district in an urban area of Riverside County, with two eligible promising practice elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary schools offer Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 712 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at both schools.

Project Description
Desert Sand's promising practice will expand on its existing intervention response program, Team Response to Achievement through Collaboration (TRAC), which facilitates Professional Learning Communities. This program will be expanded to promote demonstration lessons, observations, and professional development to teachers via the English Learner (EL) On-Site Coach.

Professional Development Activities
Professional Learning Communities and an English Learner Coach.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
The coach will guide and support the learning teams daily in the systematic implementation and mastery of sound, researched-based classroom SDAIE instructional practices and lesson development. Desert Sands will provide coach's training in Sheltered Instruction Observation protocol (SIOP) and Content for English Learner Opportunities (CIELO).

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
The EL coach will be charged with monitoring data through CELDT and district data management system.

Staffing
EL Coaching position.

Promising Practices Site: El Monte City

Contact Information: Oscar Marquez, Director of Student Support Services
(626) 453-3760 | omarquez@emcsd.org

General Characteristics
El Monte City is a school district in an urban area of Los Angeles County, with one eligible promising practice elementary school that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary school offers Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) to 250 English Learners.

Project Description
School has received support in developing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in order to:

- Assess student learning throughout the year
- Focus on analyzing student performance data
- Plan coherent standards aligned instructional programs based on results of student performance data
- Build staff knowledge through district wide staff development opportunities to support the work of PLCs
- Hire teachers in the EMCST that meet the criteria of NCLB Highly Qualified

Professional Development Activities
Teachers have received training through Center for Performance Assessment on developing data teams, as well as attended the PLC conference.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Staff were provided training in Marzano's *Instructional Strategies that Work*, which they use in conjunction with their Houghton Mifflin text.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Grade level teams examine data from leveled reading assessments in Mifflin text, as well as district benchmarks. In 2007-08, the schools intervention program was rolled into its existing Homework Club.

Staffing
Funds will be used for teachers directing after-school Homework Club and for substitute days that will provide teachers with time for administering and analyzing data from a triennial assessment.

Promising Practices Site: Escondido Union

Contact Information: Charlene Zawacki, Coordinator of Language Acquisition
(760) 432-2380 | czawacki@eusd4kids.org

General Characteristics
Escondido Union is a school district in an urban area of San Diego County, with one eligible promising practice elementary school that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary school offers Mainstream, and Structured English Immersion (SEI) to 572 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice within the school, as well as to other schools within the district.

Project Description
The BLITZ program will be supported and expanded to serve every English Learner at Central School through intensive reading intervention that has been developed over the past seven years. The core elements of the BLITZ program include: 1) core language arts curriculum support through pre-teaching or "frontloading" key concepts and vocabulary; and 2) the direct instruction of reading strategies that incorporates the use of narrative leveled readers.

Professional Development Activities
Training in BLITZ strategies.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
The primary goal of expanding BLITZ is to meet the differentiated needs of every English Learner (rather than serving only those significantly below grade level) towards reclassification to Fluent English Proficient. The second goal is the systematic and gradual increase in the role of the classroom teacher in learning and implementing BLITZ strategies. In subsequent years, funds will be allocated for teachers to observe BLITZ instruction (peer observations), collaborative planning of the scope and sequence of BLITZ instruction, as well as analyzing data.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Students must complete six-week language arts benchmark assessments, trimester DRA assessments, and on-going teacher observation of individual reading performance in small group settings.

Staffing
Intensive small group instruction will be expanded by the temporary addition of four, four-hour teachers. Consultants will work with the principal during the first year through observations and provide full day workshops on BLITZ strategies.

Promising Practices Site: Evergreen Elementary School District

Contact Information: Denise Williams, Director of Categorical Programs
(408) 270-6830 | dwilliams@eesd.org

General Characteristics

Evergreen is an elementary school district in an urban area of Santa Clara County, with ten eligible promising practice schools (8 elementary and 2 Middle) that will be targeted for expansion. The school offers a Mainstream program to 3750 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at all of the school s and others that have developed a need.

Project Description

The project goals are to provide a marriage of coaching with training on Step Up To Writing (SUTW) and Writer's Workshop in order to bolster the achievement of ELL students. The district coaches and site facilitators provide in-depth training on *SUTW,* model lessons, classroom observations, and coaching feedback. The goals for this best practice are evident in the student work that teachers have the opportunity to analyze in a collaborative setting. Writing scores are communicated to parents via report cards and are aggregated by class, grade, and school.

Professional Development Activities

Teachers and administrators have received professional development on Differentiated Instruction, Writer's Workshop, systematic ELD, vocabulary and academic needs.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

Systematic ELL instruction provides teachers with strategies on effectively frontloading lessons and differentiating instruction. Also, more technology has been integrated at the middle school level though the Criterion Online Writing Program. The program provides students in grades 7-8 with immediate feedback on their writing prompts. The utilization of Rosetta Stone is available at all sites.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

Teachers analyze student work enabling them to inform their instructional practices.

Staffing

Consultants and coaching support for professional development and release time for teachers.

Promising Practices Site: Garvey Elementary School District

Contact Information: Anita Chu, Asst. Superintendent of Instructional Services
(626) 307-3421 | achu@garvey.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics

Garvey is a school district is located in an urban area of Los Angeles County, with nine eligible schools (identified in 2006-07) for the promising practice. The schools offer two types of instruction programs for English learners, including Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI), to 1,219 students in grades 4 through 8 (based on current enrollment in 2009-10). The district plans on expanding the promising practice district-wide at all eleven schools, including nine eligible schools and two target schools.

Project Development Model

The promising practice is the institutionalization of a school-wide consistent (daily) ELD instruction program in grades 4-8 for 35-45 minutes per day. Quality of the program will be supported by the use of multiple assessment data to determine student grouping, the assignment of quality staff (including teachers with appropriate EL authorization and instructional assistants who receive extensive training), and the use of research-based ELD programs and strategies. Funds will be used to pay for additional instructional assistant hours to reduce adult-student ratio, particularly for students with intensive needs. In addition, on-going collaboration meetings and professional development will be provided for both teachers and assistants utilizing the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) protocol.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

Three ELD programs are currently used: Hampton Brown – High Point (grades 4-6); Glencoe McGraw Hill – California Treasures (grades 7-8 and grades 4-6 pilot teachers); and Scholastic – READ 180 (grades 7-8). They are supplemented by research-based instructional strategies for EL students, including GLAD, Thinking Maps, and Write…from the Beginning, and SDAIE strategies; and intervention programs such as Phonics for Reading, Elements for Reading, REWARDS and Making Connections.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

Student placement is based on multiple student assessment data, such as CELDT, CST, district ELD progress profile, and program-specific placement tests. Student progress is monitored through program-specific assessments, district benchmark assessments, and state assessments. Program implementation is supported through ongoing professional development, PLC opportunities, and coaching support.

Staffing

Academic Coaches, release time for teachers, and additional instructional assistants and professional experts.

Promising Practices Site: Glendale Unified

Contact Information: Maggie Carter
(818) 241-3111 x533 | mcarter@gusd.net

General Characteristics
Glendale Unified is a school district in an urban area of Los Angeles County, with fifteen eligible promising practice schools (13 Elementary, 1 Middle, 1 High) that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer Mainstream, Structured English Immersion (SEI), and Dual Immersion programs to 3,963 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at schools in the initiative.

Project Description
Glendale's promising practice is based on an organizational structure that involves a collaborative review of instruction and student learning, using a framework for school improvement. The outcome objective is for individual school teams to identify needs, set goals, research and implement "best practices" targeting teaching and learning strategies that will ensure that all students, especially EL students and significant sub-group populations are given targeted, differentiated instruction and practice that is based on multiple measure data analysis. For some of the schools, GUSD identified the promising practice of at least 30 minutes of Universal Access (UA), small group, targets, differentiated instruction for every EL, every day in a reduced class size setting in order to effectively and thoughtfully meet their needs.

Professional Development Activities
Teachers receive professional development in effective, scientifically-based instructional practices for English Learners. Teachers are provided release time to engage in training, observations, walkthroughs, articulation/collaboration meetings, in-depth data analysis of student achievement and work and the collaborative planning of meaningful, strategic instruction.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Teachers use the following curriculum:
ELA: K-5 uses *CA Reading* (Houghton Mifflin); 6-8 uses *Language for Learning* (McDougal Littell); 9th and 10th *Literature and Language Arts* (Holt); 11th and 12th *Language for Literature* (McDougal Littell).
ELD: Elementary uses *Into English* (Hampton Brown); Middle and High School use *High Point* (Hampton Brown)

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
District benchmark assessments, reading and writing (summative) and site-developed assessments (formative) are in place and used to help monitor effectiveness of instruction and to adjust instruction. Sites also use CARS (*Comprehensive Assessment of Reading Strategies*) as a baseline and quarterly to monitor skills achievement and IRIs (*Individual Reading Inventories*) and DORA (*Diagnostic Online Reading Assessments*) every 8-10 weeks to diagnose phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and reading comprehension awareness. Results of these assessments are used to plan classroom instruction and to offer extra support through intervention programs. Furthermore,

reports are created and analyzed using CST and CELDT data.

Staffing

Teacher/Teacher Specialists provide leadership for grade level articulation, assessment, professional development, data analysis, promising practice implementation, evaluation, and targeted, differentiated instruction and intervention for EL students.

Promising Practices Site: Imperial County Office of Education

Contact Information: Ninfa Vega, Math Coordinator
(760) 312-6580 | nvega@icoe.org

General Characteristics
Imperial County Office of Education is a County Consortium located in an urban area of Imperial County, with one eligible promising practice middle school and four target schools for expansion: one K-5, one K-8, and two high schools. One of the high school sites is a court and community school serving additional grades. The schools offer both Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 2,020 English Learners. The district plans to expand the current program within the existing schools - 100% implementation at the elementary and middle school levels and in cohorts at the high school and court and community schools.

Project Description
William Moreno Junior High piloted IMPACT EL, an in-depth multi-pronged approach to addressing teaching and student learning. Below is a description of the core tenets of IMPACT EL:

1. Standards Correlation: Unpacking content and ELD standards and comparing to text in order to identify gaps and strengths.
2. Course Pathway development: Identify pathway of course, spiral key concepts, and identify ELD standards within pathways.
3. Lesson Correlation: Match standards to specific lessons, use publisher and ancillary materials/text, and identify differentiation needed for EL students by CELDT proficiency levels
4. Development of Pacing Guide and Calendar: Identify days needed for lesson instruction, include 2 days of pre-assessment and 2 days of teach time, and overtly include time for ELD instruction in each lesson.
5. Development of Assessments and Timeline: Identify assessment window, create assessments (textbook embedded) and includes multiple questions per content standard.
6. Implementation and Ongoing Monitoring: Select teacher lead from each content area, establish communication and data sharing system, conduct data and strategy sharing meetings, monitor progress, and plan for re-teach.

Professional Development Activities
Occurring through IMPACT EL process that requires teachers to unpack content and ELD standards, lesson plan, and development of pacing guide. Staff received training on differentiating by proficiency level, identifying specific lessons per strand, mapping textbooks for gaps, and calibrating rigor.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Lead teacher will assist with on-going communication around the pacing guide, teaching strategies and data analysis

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Common assessments will be developed, as well as timeline and on-going monitoring.

Staffing

Teacher leaders at each school site and evaluation services of IMPACT EL's program by ICOE's Grants and Evaluation Office.

Promising Practices Site: Irvine Unified School District

Contact Information: Lisa Mennes, Coordinator of Language Minority Programs
(949) 936-8506 | lmennes@iusd.org

General Characteristics
Irvine Unified is a school district in a suburban area of Orange County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion, as well as three others. The schools offer various instructional programs offer Structured English Immersion (SEI) to 753 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot school and the three others.

Project Development Model
The pilot program offers a K-12 Newcomer Program for Beginning and Early Intermediate English Learners that offers placement for 1-2 semesters before entering mainstream instruction. Classroom teachers use differentiated instruction to provide ELD and SDAIE strategies in all content areas and students receive a minimum of 2 hours of ELD from a teacher and an instructional assistant. Importantly, they want to use the grant to link and integrate the Newcomer Program with the mainstream classroom to which EL students matriculate.

Professional Development Activities
Not specified.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
When working with English Learners, teachers use techniques including TPR, oral guided practice, GLAD, guided reading, use of realia, and Reader's Theater. Students also receive one hour of Mathematics instruction with an emphasis on the language of mathematical operations, logic problems, graphing, geometric concepts, and the like. Social science, Science, and Health instruction is delivered using thematic units that expand background knowledge and vocabulary. Thematic units are coordinated with ELA instruction. Computer supported instruction is also prevalent. At the high school, Newcomers are provided three periods of ELD, followed by Social Studies and Science.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Authentic, teacher-created assessments are used to monitor progress and guide instructional planning and provided through the district's Eagle/Aeries student data base and associated LARS and Plato data warehouse programs.

Staffing
Stipends for teachers and substitutes.

Promising Practices Site: KIPP Adelante Preparatory Academy

Contact Information: Elena Luna, Principal – KIPP Adelante Preparatory Academy
(619) 233-3242 | eluna@kippadelante.org

General Characteristics
KIPP Adelante Preparatory Academy is a district-funded charter school in an urban area of San Diego County, with one eligible promising practice Middle school that will be targeted for expansion. The school offers a Mainstream program to 151 English Learners. The district will expand the program school-wide.

Project Description
KIPP's promising practices expands on its four-pronged approach for increasing student achievement: More time on task, exposure to opportunities, team and family, and rigorous standards.

Funds will be directed towards assisting the school with maintaining 61% more instructional minutes (87,009 per year) than is required by the State.

Professional Development Activities
Not indicated.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
KIPP Adelante Preparatory Academy is a College Preparatory Academy that prepares students to successfully complete A-G requirements in high school. For example, all 8th graders must pass Algebra I. Also, English Learners are specifically targeted through Vocabulary Workshop class—the explicit instruction of vocabulary and literacy across content areas—and an afternoon enrichment class called College Prep English for students in need of basic support in English grammar, vocabulary, and writing.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Specific program not mentioned.

Staffing
Specific positions not mentioned.

Promising Practices Site: Lennox School District

Contact Information: JoAnn Isken, Project Director
(310) 695-4030 | joann_isken@lennox.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Lennox is a school district located in an urban area of Los Angeles County, with one eligible elementary school pilot program. Buford Elementary offers three instructional programs: Mainstream, Structured English Immersion, and Bilingual Education to 609 English Learners. The district plans to expand the current program school-wide.

Project Description
The English Bilingual Transition Program (EBTP) program was piloted in year two (2007-2008) at Buford Elementary in one class per grade level. A site leadership team was created charged with reviewing site-specific data on a formative basic, three times a year. The team identified specific needs, provided training, and applied strategies to support replicable lesson plans. Sample lessons are based on *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Meaning* and analyzing student work samples. The project includes time for teacher reflection through staff development notebooks and reflective journals, intensive parent involvement through workshops offered by the Academic Coach.

Plans for expansion of EBTP include implementation in all K-5 classrooms at Buford; the use of the Academic Coach that is charged with coordinating programs and activities including classroom observations, parent outreach, coordination and evaluation; more formalized parent training on supporting EBTP-aligned strategies at home; increased principal observations through program-specific observation protocol; and training of teacher assistants and key after-school staff.

Professional Development Activities
During 2005-06, the district received professional development from two WestEd consultants (Dr. Robert Linquanti & Linda Carstens), who spent a year training district administrators (Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, District Resource Specialists, and all principals) on Teaching Second Language Learners in a Mainstream Classroom. This yearlong process was directed toward using data to identify needs in four stands of English Language Development (Listening, Speaking, Reading, & Writing).

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
The district will implement D. Pauline Gibbons' curriculum cycle, presented in *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom,* which promotes English Learner's full linguistic academic potential. This will be implemented during the Language Arts block and teachers will use the core district reading program, Houghton Mifflin.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
All schools adhere to Essential Program Components guidelines for instructional minutes and heterogeneous class groupings. Students are placed in heterogeneous groupings to prevent any tracking of students. Buford uses a portfolio-type formative

assessment to track progress of students' English proficiency based on standards for listening, speaking, reading, and writing at each proficiency level. Teachers complete profiles three times a year and analyze results regularly.

Promising Practices Site: Livingston Union

Contact Information: Maria Torres-Perez, Director of DLA and Curriculum
(290) 394-5439 | mtorresp@lusd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Livingston Union is a school district in an urban area of Merced County, with three eligible promising practice elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary schools offer Mainstream, Structured English Immersion (SEI), Dual Immersion to 1036 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at all schools.

Project Description
Livingston Union is using the Guided Language Acquisition and Development (GLAD) model as its promising practice.

Professional Development Activities
Livingston Union will offer GLAD training in three parts. During the first part of the training teachers are provided with instructional strategies, theory and research that support the district and California frameworks and standards. The next part of the training consists of demonstration lessons of GLAD strategies, and lastly teachers receive on-going assistance and coaching within their classrooms, as well as their peers.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Grade-level core and ELD curriculum is Houghton Mifflin. The promising practice focuses on developing students' meta-cognitive use of high level, academic language and literacy skills.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Data from district-wide assessments, which include locally developed benchmark assessments, are distributed via a student data system and by OARS and LARS.

Staffing
GLAD Key trainers will facilitate the first and second parts of their training program to 40% of the teachers at the promising practice elementary schools. Additional funds will be used to expand the GLAD program to remaining teachers (an added 42 teachers, principals, and literacy coaches). Furthermore, teachers will receive the third part of GLAD training and those GLAD trained teachers will also receive a three-day coaching to implement the last stage of GLAD training at their respective schools.

Promising Practices Site: Luther Burbank School District

Contact Information: Jan Kaay, Director of Instructional Services
(408) 295-2450 | jkaay@lbsd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Luther Burbank is a school district in an urban area of Santa Clara County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 345 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot school.

Project Description
Luther Burbank's promising practice supports and expands leveled ELD and literacy instruction using software and Smart Boards using accelerated learning and differentiated curriculum using technology. The core elements of their program promote language acquisition and academic competency by accelerating learning and differentiating curriculum through technology.

Professional Development Activities
Professional development that promotes engaging and supporting learning and planning instruction and designing learning experiences will be provided to staff at the participating schools.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Direct instruction, interactive white boards and small group instruction will be used. Resources include Waterford Early Reading Program, SuccessMaker (Pearson Digital Learning) and interactive Smart Boards. They assign a 15/5 rotation so that 15 students are in the lab and 5 are working on strategic activities with teachers for 30 minutes daily.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
EduSoft to collect, analyze, and make decisions related to individual student data from tests administered every 6-8 weeks.

Staffing
Computer Lab Supervisor for SuccessMaker and Waterford Early Reading and teacher release time.

Promising Practices Site: Marysville Joint Unified

Contact Information: Lennie Tate, Executive Director, Educational Services
(530) 749-6902 | ltate@mjusd.com

General Characteristics
Marysville Joint Unified is a school district in a rural area of Yuba County, with two eligible promising practice elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary schools offer Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI), programs to 324 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at both schools.

Project Description
Providing teachers with training (ELD certification) and focus during Structured Teacher Planning Time (STPT) on pertinent EL strategies and data.

Professional Development Activities
The district focus of professional development is on visual scaffolding, graphic organizers, and peer interactions (think-pair-share, partner reading, and cooperative groups). ELD certification training will also be offered.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Teachers use Open Court transition and review lessons, provide a preview, and reinforce main ideas in each lesson. Each teacher will receive a copy of *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners* and will be expected to discuss strategies during STPT.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
District provides teachers access to data (benchmarks and California assessments) through the Edusoft data management system, as well as parent involvement logs, student attendance rates, retention and re-designation rates.

Staffing
Literacy coach provides Edusoft data and district EL consultant will review remaining data.

Promising Practices Site: Monterey Peninsula Unified School District

Contact Information: Laura Thorpe, Principal of Ord Terrace K-5
(831) 392-3922 | lathorpe@mpusd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Monterey Peninsula is a school district in a suburban area of Monterey County with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion as well as four others. The schools offer Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 366 English Leaner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot school, as well as to others in the district.

Project Description
Monterey Peninsula has redesigned their school schedule to provide specialized instruction at each grade level during the academic day and after-school to meet English Learner student needs. Students are leveled for one-hour (daily basis) based on district benchmarks, individualized results testing, CST, and IEP goals, then return to heterogeneous classrooms at end of reading hour. Each grade level also provides 30-60 minutes in Writer's Workshop.

Professional Development Activities
Training for K-3 in partnership with Hesperia ExCel trainers.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Teacher's utilize Houghton-Mifflin Universal Access materials and supplemental materials and students are leveled a second time for ELD based on CELDT scores. Teachers *Into English*, *A Focused Approach to Frontloading English Language Instruction*, Rosetta Stone, and Read Naturally, the last two of which are technology-based. Students in K-3 do Bilingual Education in transitional mode and use the Response to Intervention (RTI) ExCel model.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Benchmark and California tests regularly analyzed for student placement and to monitor progress.

Staffing
Teacher release time and consultants to support teachers.

Promising Practices Site: Mountain Empire Unified

Contact Information: Barbara Cowling, Principal, Alternative Ed. Programs
(619) 478-5930 | bcowling@meusd.net

General Characteristics
Mountain Empire Unified is a school district in a rural area of San Diego County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary school offers only Structured English Immersion (SEI) to 120 English Learners.

Project Description
The promising practice incorporates use of SRA materials for Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading. In addition, the school will use Reasoning and Writing for all classes and expand to Mathematics through the Math Connections text.

Professional Development Activities
Not indicated.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
In the 2005-06 school year, Potrero Elementary School adopted SRA's *Language for Thinking and Language for Learning* for its English language development program.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Students meet with teachers to review test results from DIEBELS, Measures of Academic Performance (MAP), Successmaker reports, as well as other measures of academic success.

Staffing
The teacher, the principal, the ASP coordinator and occasionally the special education teacher attend Student Study team meetings are held for students failing to progress. In these meetings, the staff meets with the parent, and a plan is written to focus and provide help for the student.

Promising Practices Site: New Haven Unified School District

Contact Information: Debi Knoth, Principal, Searles Elementary
Scott Pizani, Director, Instructional Support
(510) 471-2772 | dknoth@nhusd.k12.ca.us, scott_pizani@nhusd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics

New Haven Unified is a school district in a suburban area of Alameda County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary school offers various instructional programs such as Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI), which are offered to 319 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot school.

Project Description

Searles Elementary School has piloted Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and the *Excellence: A Commitment to Every Learner* (ExCEL) process which combines collaboration, scaffolding, and assessment focused on student literacy. Additionally, 95% of teachers have been trained in Guided Learning Acquisition Design strategies. Students are in a flexible grouping model for 30-60 minutes daily with smaller class size intended to individualize instruction. An ELD support teacher provides daily instruction for newcomers and English Learners not achieving growth. In 2007-08, Lesson Study was added to PLC work.

Professional Development Activities

GLAD training, Professional Learning Communities and Lesson Study with support from District literacy coaches.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

Most teachers have been trained in GLAD strategies to provide a "rich context for social language development by consciously encouraging opportunities for deliberate and systematically planned student-student and teacher-student talk." Also, PLCs are focused on reading and writing domains.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

Analyzing data is a regular component of the PLC process that will be incorporated in the meetings. For example, teachers examine formative data that is tied to power standards that are developed as school wide expectations.

Staffing

EL/Literacy Coordinator, Community Liaison for parent education, two paraprofessionals to lower student/teacher ratio for ELD. Also, partnership with Teacher's College and researchers from Columbia University offered professional development on supporting systemic change.

Promising Practices Site: Newhall School District

Contact Information: Nancy Copley, Asst. Superintendent to Instructional Services (661) 297-4177 ncopley@newhall.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Newhall is a school district located in a suburban area of Los Angeles County, with four eligible promising practice elementary schools all of which are targeted for expansion. The schools offer Structured English Immersion (SEI) to 1,122 English Learners. The district is expanding the program school wide to all schools.

Project Description
Newhall's promising practice utilizes Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) as an umbrella structure for synthesizing district initiatives such as, Thinking Maps and PLCs. The vision for Newhall's promising practice developed approximately 9-10 years ago through the superintendent's goal of having all teachers trained in GLAD strategies for differentiating academic content. Consequently, two teachers were designated as GLAD trainers for the district and were charged with providing training for other staff members at their school sites.

Professional Development Activities
The vision for implementation of GLAD instructional strategies includes an intense two-day training, followed by a five-day classroom training with teacher leaders at the school site that pairs modeling of GLAD strategies [by teacher leader] through demonstration lessons and development of GLAD units.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Project GLAD as an instructional model (i.e., the integration of listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Newhall has prioritized training and development of its teaching staff in order to adequately serve English Learner students. Currently, all pilot and target schools have teachers that are CLAD/BCLAD certified.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Newhall administers trimesters in ELA and Math through their Aeries data management system, as well as weekly teacher assessments through Data Wise system. Teachers are expected to identify key standards on a monthly-basis and use formative (teacher-generated) assessments to monitor student progress with grasping key concepts and re-teach accordingly. The district trimester assessments are a summative measure of teacher assessments, as well as practice for students with standardized tests (test questions are developed based upon CST released items).

Staffing
Seven GLAD trainers.

Promising Practices Site: Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District

Contact Information: Rosa Carreon, Director of Federal and State Programs
(562) 868-4031 x2059 | rcarreon@nlmusd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Norwalk-La Mirada is a school district in an urban area of Los Angeles County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion. The school offers Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 195 English Learners. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot school.

Project Description
The project incorporates professional development to support and align ELA and ELD curriculum. In addition, the project is designed to support teachers through individual coaching and Lesson Study. The focus of the project is on ELD level 3 students who get "stuck" and cannot make improvement over two years or more. These students get at least 90 minutes of scaffolded ELA and ELD instruction.

Professional Development Activities
Systematic professional development focused on content knowledge and skills needed to align ELA and ELD curriculum, while providing scaffolds and support. Teachers design common curricular maps and units of study aligned to ELA and ELD standards. Teachers get individual coaching (from Literacy Consultant and district literacy coaches) and time for twice yearly Lesson Study (i.e., time to observe one another, debrief, and refine practice, as well as analysis of common assessments).

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
In 2004-05, all ELA and ELD teachers received training in Focused Approach strategies, including analysis of ELD standards and specific skills needed for students to advance. Additionally, teachers have participated in SDAIE training to support EL students, including: training in GLAD strategies for all Social Studies and Science teachers, as well as in TCI History Alive! supplemental materials.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Funding will be used to expand training in the analysis of District Benchmark Assessments and common assessments to inform instruction.

Staffing
Coaching and consultants for professional development activities.

Promising Practices Site: Novato Unified School District

Contact Information: Eileen Smith, Principal – Loma Verde Elementary
(415) 883-4681 esmith@nusd.org

General Characteristics
Novato is a school district located in a suburban area of Marin County, with one eligible elementary school pilot program, which it is targeting for expansion. The school offers both Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 172 English Learners. The district plans to expand the current program school-wide at the existing school.

Project Description
Loma Verde Elementary School has focused its efforts for increasing English Learner achievement using the two-pronged approach of offering Strategic Support, which means grade-level team planning and collaborative sessions that examine student work and share strategies and provide Comprehensive Support (i.e., intervention) through Student Success Teams (SST). Additionally, the school governing board (ELAC) and staff will work with the community to develop a parent education component around supporting newcomers and learning at home.

Professional Development Activities
The ELLPP grant will expand their promising practice through implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Specifically, PLCs will enhance the use of data through the creation of Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) goals. The district will purchase and train teachers in the use of a comprehensive literacy curriculum, staff development on new curriculum and new student information systems, as well as a Data Director to manage the system.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
The district uses *Open Court* for English Language Arts and *Harcourt Brace* for Mathematics instruction. Plans are to use ELLPP funds to purchase Language! and provide training on its use.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
The district purchased the *Aries information* system and plans to hire a Data Director to manage the system and provide training for teachers.

Staffing
Teachers will receive stipends for staff development on developing common assessments PLCs, and teacher institute on EISES. Additionally, instructional assistants will be purchased.

Promising Practices Site: Oak Grove Elementary School District

Contact Information: Kim Anh Vu, Administrator of English Language Programs
(408) 227-8300 x268 | kim_anh_vu@ogsd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Oak Grove Elementary School District is a school district in an urban area of Santa Clara County, with eight eligible promising practice schools that will be targeted for expansion along with nine additional schools. The type of instructional program offered includes Structured English Immersion (SEI) and a Bilingual program at one of the schools, which is offered to 1821 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot schools, as well as to the other schools in the district (17 in total).

Project Description
Oak Grove Elementary School District offers structured collaboration that informs planning and modification of instruction. Teachers meet weekly with four additional release time meetings annually. Weekly meetings are devoted to the analysis of student work and discussion of best practices.

Professional Development Activities
Not specified.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Instruction focuses on culturally responsive pedagogy, front-loading of content instruction based on ELD level, and literacy academies (24 hours of instruction before or after school over six weeks). Schools use Houghton Mifflin Reading*: A Legacy of Literacy* during core and Houghton Mifflin: *Lectura* in K-3 Spanish Bilingual classes. For ELD, schools use High Point for 4-8. Carousel and Avenues are used for K-3 ELD.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Formal ELA assessments are given every 6-8 weeks and an ELD assessment (ADEPT) is administered periodically. Student and teacher goals are generated every 6-8 weeks.

Staffing
Site literacy and EL coaches and teacher release time.

Promising Practices Site: Oxnard Union High School District

Contact Information: Walt Dunlop, Director of Compensatory Education, (805)385-2533 | walt.dunlop@ouhsd.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics

Oxnard Union is a high school district in a suburban area of Ventura County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion. The school offers SEI, Mainstream, and Bilingual program options to 529 English Learner students. The district has expanded the promising practice school wide and to five other comprehensive high schools.

Project Description

The project goals are to accelerate high levels of academic language proficiency among English Learners to close achievement gaps of students enrolled in Science and Social Science courses by expanding best teaching practices through professional development in collaboration with the California Science Project and the California History-Social Science Project.

In Social Science, teachers will teach history to develop literacy -- plan lessons/units around a question/thesis, focus on the reading and writing of history to teach both language and historical content, build expository writing skills, and teach paragraph and essay development. Social Science Coaches will present model lessons and lead Professional Learning Communities. Social Science coaches will complete a portfolio documenting grant activities and analysis of outcomes. Similarly, Science Coaches will lead PLCs with a focus on academic literacy, and SDAIE strategies. Teachers will create and use sentence frames with embedded science discourse patterns for EL students.

Professional Development Activities

Up to 40 teachers will attend 24 hours of "Teaching Students to Change the Course of History" professional development. In Science, professional development will focus on the special challenges of scientific written and spoken discourse, as well as the vocabulary needed via the "Sheltered Science Instruction Observation Protocol." Teachers will learn how to make effective use of SDAIE strategies to access texts and to provide feedback to students on oral and written work.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

Rio Mesa High School implements school-wide change via universal application of Cornell note taking (AVID strategy), Jane Shaffer Writing techniques, and Robert Marzano strategies.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

School has access to a pacing calendar and student data from district wide assessments that are available through EduSoft.

Staffing

Consultants to support professional development and release time for teachers.

Promising Practices Site: Pasadena Unified

Contact Information: Joan Morris, Coordinator of English Learner Programs
(626) 396-3600 x88299 | jmorris@pusd.org

General Characteristics
Pasadena Unified is a school district in an urban area of Los Angeles County, with three eligible promising practice schools that will be targeted for expansion. The school programs offer Structured English Immersion (SEI) to 708 English Learners. The district will expand the program school-wide and to one other school within the district.

Project Description
The project seeks to strengthen and thoroughly evaluate the comprehensive programs at three schools. Specifically, the identification of needs and appropriate placement of English learners in SEI classes, comprehensive access to school and district curriculum, including dedicated block of time for ELD, use of Santillana's Intensive English Program; and Open Court EL Support Guide during the language arts block. The project will also support experienced and qualified teachers and instructional aides (many of whom are bilingual English/Spanish), Individual Learning Plans, Newcomer support, intervention strategies, reclassification and follow-up, as well as strong parent-teacher communication.

Funds will be used for 1) increasing time for teachers and instructional aides to offer intervention for individual English Learners who are struggling to master the curriculum and/or reading skills; 2) continuing to strengthen the professional development and coaching provided by the district Language Assessment and Development Department (LADD) Office which utilizes the models and staff from promising practice schools.

Professional Development Activities
Coaching provided by the Language Assessment and Development Department.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Pasadena uses the *Open Court* program during core and Santillana's *Intensive English* Program during ELD.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
LADD office will work with schools and Language Development Resource Teachers (LDRT). Specific software not mentioned.

Staffing
LADD project director, LDRT's to work with principal and individual grade levels.

Promising Practices Site: Petaluma Joint Union High

Contact Information: Ron Everett, Director of Educational Services
(707) 778-4613 | reverett@pet.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Petaluma Joint Union High is a school district located in a suburban area of Sonoma County, with two eligible school pilot programs (Kenilworth Middle School and Casa Grande High School). Both schools offer the Structured English Immersion (SEI) program to 434 English Learners. The district plans to expand the current program school-wide at both schools and to two other schools within the district.

Project Description
Prior to the ELLPP grant, the district focused on prioritizing English Learners within each school's master schedule. The high school offers SDAIE classes in Science, Social Studies, and Math, as well as a Spanish for native speakers class that culminates into AP Spanish and Literature. The development of these offerings culminated in the creation of an English Learner Academy that also integrates into the school's Smaller Learning Community (SLC) goals.

At the middle school, students in seventh and eighth grade share the same ELD period, which has provided the structure for creating an English Learner Academy similar to that of the high school, however, without differentiation or SDAIE.

Expansion will include the following:
- Supplemental staff so that ELD classes can be staffed with smaller class sizes (1-3 additional sections per site).
- Bilingual instructional assistant (14 hours per day at Kenilworth Junior High and 19 hours at Casa).
- After-school algebra tutoring
- Bilingual Coordinator to assist with translation needs, ELAC and DELAC support.
- Implementing "Aiming High" that unites district and community agencies in supporting EL needs in the community.

Professional Development Activities
The district has also contracted with Springboard Schools, a consultant to support implementation of a Professional Learning Community Cycle of Inquiry at all its schools. A release period for the Coordinator of the EL Academy at the high school and a stipend to the English Learning Resource Teacher (ELRT) at each site. This person will be charged with expanding training of teachers to support new ELD Power Standards (training, local assessment development, and reflection activities), developing a transition system for English Learners between junior high and high school (Kenilworth is Casa's only feeder school), coaching of counselors and administrators in developing new master schedule models, asset building activities at the high school, and expansion of a community mentoring program.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Both schools are implementing *High Point* materials for English Language

Development and recently some staff piloted *Language!* curriculum in the English Learner Academy tied to district course outlines for A-G courses. Power Standards in core content areas have been approved to assist teachers in focusing on essential knowledge and making interdisciplinary connections.

- Incorporating interactive white-boards for ELD at all 4 sites
- Piloting Read 180 at one middle school for ELD 2

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

Power Standards will be used to develop common formative assessments for district-wide usage. Currently, Edusoft provides software for data management.

Promising Practices Site: Salida Union Elementary School District

Contact Information: Julie Martin, District Learning Coordinator
(209) 543-0339 x3119 | jmartin@salida.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Salida Union is an elementary school district in a suburban area of Stanislaus County, with one eligible promising practice Elementary school that will be targeted for expansion of one program, as well as, the replication of another district program. The school serves 182 English Learners. Each program targets a different group of English learners with differing needs.

Project Description
Salida will expand its IMPACT program (structured 10 weeks for grades 2-5 ELs/RFEP) from 67 to 99 students in order to move English Learners who score near Proficient, to maintain RFEP students at the Proficient level, to empower English Learners to believe they can be successful, and to encourage English Learners and RFEP students to include college in their future, a path that leads to the middle school AVID program. Additionally, the school will replicate the district's Los Arcos Learning Center, a community-based education center, that provides a place to extend learning for English Learners and their families (Tutoring/Intervention – Kids, GED, Parent Ed).

Professional Development Activities
Not identified.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
All English Learners receive daily ELD using Houghton Mifflin EL materials and Rosetta Stone in English as supplemental material during the course of the day. Students receive AVID strategies during IMPACT program. This program focuses on math, reading comprehension and vocabulary, as well as, writing. Students receive a second dose of ELD, and intensive reading intervention and practice through computer assisted tutoring programs – AutoSkill: Academy of Reading and LeapTrack in the Los Arcos Learning Center.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
District software is used to monitor student progress through *Reroster Report with Standards Performance Index*. Additionally, curriculum embedded assessments in CARS/STARS reading curriculum are used to target reading comprehension. Both LeapTrack and AutoSkill software track progress in the computer assisted programs. In addition, classroom-based assessments are reviewed to monitor the effect the intervention is having in the classroom.

Staffing
Two IMPACT teachers – Classroom Teacher, Supplemental Teacher (intervention specialist) and a Bilingual paraprofessional facilitate the IMPACT program. The Los Arcos Learning Center program utilizes a credentialed teacher, bilingual paraprofessional and high school tutor.

Promising Practices Site: San Diego County Office of Education

Contact Information: Silvia C. Dorta-Duque de Reyes, English Learner Services Coordinator
(858) 571-7249 | sreyes@sdcoe.net

General Characteristics
San Diego County Office of Education serves a consortium of Districts in urban and rural areas of San Diego County, with six eligible promising practice elementary schools that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer Mainstream, Structured English Immersion (SEI), Dual Immersion at two of its schools, and Bilingual Education at four of its schools to 1,350 English Learners. San Diego County Office of Education would like to expand the program in all targeted schools and disseminate the identified best practices throughout the county and eventually statewide.

Project Description
San Diego County Office will create a professional development model using Professional Learning Communities, and Lesson Study focusing on differentiating instruction for English Learners based on the current promising practice of differentiation of instruction to students by level of language acquisition. Teachers will use the California Language Arts Content Standards: Side-by-Side document. Beyond the differentiation of content, product and outcome, standards-based differentiated instruction for English Learners is structured to provide access to the cognitive or content objective of a lesson while scaffolding language tasks through appropriate strategies explicit to students' language levels. This practice is also structured to provide systematic organization of skills transference and the reciprocal and integrated relationship of language processes and domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing and conventions).
On-line resources including web interface, staff development, model lesson video clips, log-ins, and server interface will be developed to facilitate replicability and sustainability.

Professional Development Activities

Through Professional Learning Communities (PLC) model and a cycle of inquiry process, teachers use state adopted materials to engage in curriculum mapping, lesson studies, and cognitive planning that promote substantive discussions, disciplinary ideas and relationships. The document entitled *California Language Arts Content Standards: Side by Side* articulates each of the English Language Arts Content standard explicitly by grade level and levels of language acquisition. This tool is used to clearly analyze the academic language and content tasks embedded in the content objective of each lesson and for planning systematic and sequential scaffolded instruction to ensure student access to English language content standards at higher levels of critical thinking and of English language proficiency. An observation protocol, implementation rubric and Cycle of Inquiry schedule guide and help forge the implementation and refinement of the of the best practice.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

This pilot project promotes a prioritized instructional sequence that incorporates specific strategies, teaching/instructional activities, routines and procedures, examples and opportunities for review and application consistent with current and confirmed research. During PLC's teachers will collaborate in lesson study of state adopted curriculum to plan scaffolded and differentiate instruction using California Language Arts Content Standards: Side-by-Side. Implementation and refinement of identified best practices is promoted through a cycle of inquiry, lesson demonstrations, classroom visits and analysis of student work.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

Ongoing assessment of student performance used to determine what students need to learn and what teachers need to teach. Careful analysis of summative and formative assessments is compiled and shared to plan monitor progress, and provide timely support and intervention.

Use of site level student information system and databases are used to record and compile student data.

Staffing

This pilot project uses existing district and site staffing and existing county level project director/coordinator. A temporary program secretary has been added with funding provided by this grant.

Promising Practices Site: San Jose Unified

Contact Information: Nancy Albarran, Director of Bilingual Education and Special Programs
(408) 535-6112 | nancy_albarran@sjusd.org

General Characteristics
San Jose Unified is a school district in an urban area of Santa Clara County, with four eligible promising practice schools (three elementary and one kindergarten to eighth grade) that will be targeted for expansion along with eleven other schools. The type of instructional program varies by school, with Structured English Immersion (SEI), Dual Immersion, and a Bilingual program named Academic Language Acquisition (ALA), which are offered to 1158 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot schools, as well as to other schools within the district.

Project Description
San Jose Unified is implementing results-oriented cycles of inquiry comprised of four components: 1) benchmark assessments in ELA and Math; 2) grade level collaboration and planning; 3) a focus on Blueprint and high priority standards; and, 4) instructional differentiation. The four original promising practice schools were characterized as "successfully implementing processes for analyzing data on a consistent basis and planning for instruction and interventions leading to improved EL student achievement."

Professional Development Activities
Universal Access (UA) in Language Arts and Consortium of Reading Excellence (CORE).

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
The four promising practice schools have participated in district-sponsored training on Universal Access (UA) in Language Arts, as well as strategies for improving EL student achievement and training on vocabulary development from the Consortium of Reading Excellence (CORE).

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Each site has a data team who provides grade levels and site staff with benchmark assessment results through EduSoft.

Staffing
Resource teacher, release time for teachers, and substitutes.

Promising Practices Site: San Leandro Unified School District

Contact Information: Tracey Lantz, Principal – Washington Elementary
(510) 895-4112 | tlantz@sanleandro.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
San Leandro Unified is a school district in an urban area of Alameda County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion. The elementary school offers various instructional programs such as Mainstream, Structured English Immersion (SEI) and Bilingual Education, which are offered to 186 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at the pilot school.

Project Description
Washington Elementary has contracted with the California Reading Literacy Project to receive training in front-loading (building Academic Language Development for English Learners) and on-going demos and coaching. They have also contracted with California Reading Literacy Project for training to administer the ADEPT and will receive on-going coaching this year for the implementation of this diagnostic assessment. School staff (teachers and principal) creates the grouping of students for ELD instruction. They also contracted with Center for Culturally Relevant Teaching & Learning for staff development, coaching and demos. Additionally, a part-time teacher/coordinator is employed to teach long-term EL students (fourth and fifth graders who are still CELDT 1 & 2), organize after school intervention groups and assist staff in the implementation of a data wall. Finally, a clerk is in place to help with re-designation paperwork and translation needs.

Professional Development Activities
Staff development to support strategies for Academic Language Development, Culturally Relevant Strategies and the use of the ADEPT (a formative diagnostic ELA/ELD assessment)

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Monthly staff development lessons will focus on front-loading/culturally relevant strategies.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Two staff development sessions every month will be directed towards analysis of EL achievement data, such as CELDT, STAR, and district formative assessments.

Staffing
Pull-out teacher, coordinator and EL clerk

Promising Practices Site: Sanger Unified

Contact Information: Silvia Hill, Director of Special Projects
(559) 875-6521 | sylvia_hill@sanger.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Sanger Unified is a school district in a rural area of Fresno County, with three eligible promising practice schools (2 Elementary and 1 High) that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer a Mainstream program to 708 EL's. The district plans on expanding the promising practice school-wide at pilot schools and to three other schools.

Project Description
Sanger Unified provides a promising practice that emphasizes Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) as part of a process that implores a Curriculum Support Provider (CSP) to work with schools on lesson development, analyzing data and student work and focusing on instructional strategies.

Professional Development Activities
Professional Learning Communities. Explicit Direct Instruction. Focused Approach – Houghton Mifflin systematic ELD.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
Schools have provided an emphasis on the essential elements of teaching using Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) and strategies from training on a Focused Approach to Houghton Mifflin and systematic ELD.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Analyzing data through the PLC using California assessments, as well as District Progress Assessments (DPA) from EduSoft.

Staffing
Recruit a CSP and EL site contact for capacity building.

Promising Practices Site: Santa Ana Unified

Contact Information: Frances Byfield, Administrator in Special Projects
(714) 558-5542 | frances.byfield@sausd.us

General Characteristics
Santa Ana Unified is a school district located in an urban area of Orange County, with 19 eligible promising practice schools all of which are targeted for expansion: 15 elementary, three middle and one high school. The schools offer Mainstream, Structured English Immersion (SEI), and Dual Immersion programs to 9,715 English Learners.

Project Description
SAUSD plans to support and expand the practice of data driven instruction at all 19 of its schools by focusing on the following elements:

- School-wide Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT) – Administrators, resource staff and counselors, grade level representatives/department chairs will meet on a monthly basis to monitor and support data team implementation.
- Data Driven Planning Teams – Teams will meet two times per month to analyze data gathered from formative, summative, and common assessments to create action plans. Teachers will collaboratively identify learning goals and instructional strategies within their action plans that serve the needs of students. Teachers will be supported in effective and efficient use of planning time through grant funded ELD Achievement Coordinators (EAC).
- Principal/Teacher Data Conferences – Site administrators and teachers will meet prior to each grade reporting period to review class data from multiple measures (class work, CELDT, ELD progress assessments, and benchmark assessments) to discuss trends and individual needs.
- Student Achievement Monitoring System – Key staff members will monitor student information gathered from achievement results and other indicators.
- Differentiated Instruction – Key strategies for English Learner success including frontloading (background knowledge, linguistic structures, vocabulary development, etc), SDAIE (Scaffolding, graphic organizers, visuals, etc), primary language support, systematic ELD instruction, and re-teaching.
- Parent Support – Using school governance bodies such as the English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), Title I, Parent Faculty Organization meetings as well as District and site specific parent trainings to regularly update parents on student progress and how best to advocate for their children.

Professional Development Activities
Teachers receive on-going training on data use, elementary identified Best Instructional Practices strategies and secondary Non-Negotiable strategies. Additionally, designated staff (including Teachers on Special Assignments (TOSA), ELD chairs, or site liaisons) participate in monthly language arts and/or mathematics trainings that enable them to help coach teaching staff.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

The district emphasizes Differentiated Instruction – Key strategies for English Learner success including frontloading (background knowledge, linguistic structures, vocabulary development, etc), SDAIE (Scaffolding, graphic organizers, visuals, etc), primary language support, systematic ELD instruction, and re-teaching.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

Using the District's new information system we will be able to identify every EL student by name and correctly place each student in an appropriate instructional program. We aim to identify each student by name, grade, CELDT score, CST score, benchmark scores, years in the district, years in EL program and current support programs that students receive their services. SAUSD strives to provide a comprehensive assessment/data collection plan to re-channel resources and structures (programs, interventions, and schedules) for each EL student.

Principals and the site TOSA monitors all students to ensure that appropriate student placement and progress. If an English Learner is not progressing in meeting academic expectations in the core, extended opportunities for intensive intervention in the area of need will be provided at the school site. This intervention can include extended time in the student's day and/or after school tutoring.

Staffing

Through various funding sources, Literacy Coaches and Bilingual Resource Teachers were in place at all schools until this school year. As a result of budget constraints, all schools now have one TOSA at each site. The TOSA along with site administrators assist and support individual teachers by providing, coaching, mentoring, pushing in, facilitating data discussions and demonstration lessons as needed. The site administrator and TOSA also help to facilitate grade-level collaboration while assisting teachers in Language Arts, ELD and Mathematics, and analyzing student data as appropriate. Site instructional Leadership Teams, Department chairs and District Curriculum Specialists lead, assist and facilitate site-based staff development.

Promising Practices Site: Sierra Sands Unified School District

Contact Information: Laura Hickle, Coordinator of Special Projects
(760) 499-1642 | lhickle@ssusd.org

General Characteristics
Sierra Sands Unified (SSUSD) is a K-12 school district located in a community of approximately 30,000 people in East Kern County. The community is located two hours from any urban area. EL practices at the one promising practice elementary school are targeted to expand to all teachers at that site. The school offers both Mainstream and Structured English immersion (SEI) to 144 English Learners. The district will be expanding the program district-wide

Project Description
Efforts at Pierce Elementary will be made to fully implement the CELL (Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning) and ExLL (Extended Literacy Learning) with Academic Language Development in all K-5 classrooms (and selected classes in grade 6-12). Initially the Pierce staff was trained in the Focused Approach – Systematic ELD Instruction (FA-SELD). The staff benefited from training because they gained a better understanding of forms, functions, and leveled ELD instruction; however, the staff determined that FA-SELD was only part of the strategy needed in order to cover all the required standards

The ELD Teacher Coordinator and two CELL/ExLL Literacy Coordinators have developed promising practices to be used by teachers of English Learners by using the concepts learned in FA-SELD, the CELL/ExLL elements and strategies along with the knowledge the teachers have gained about academic vocabulary instruction from the book entitled Robust Vocabulary Instruction, by Isabel L. Beck. The promising practices are entitled, *CELL/ExLL with Academic Language Instruction*. The project will encompass the following activities.

- Training of an initial group of teachers in FA-SELD
- Training staff in the ADEPT assessment
- Training staff in the CELL/ExLL elements/strategies with Academic Language Development (ALD) that incorporates leveled ELD instruction using forms and functions embedded within the grade level standards
- "Teachers in training" visited CELL/ExLL with Academic Language Development Demonstration Classrooms where the teachers had the opportunity to observe CELL/ExLL with ALD instruction and debrief following the observation
- Demonstration teachers developed and planned standard based CELL/ExLL instructional units with ALD that incorporated ELD standards
- Ongoing teacher training that included Demonstration Lessons
- Training implemented district wide in elementary schools (and selected middle and high school classes)
- Ongoing coaching support
- Implement CELL/ExLL with ALD classroom district wide K-12

Professional Development Activities

- 4 full days of CELL with Academic Language Development incorporating the observation of a demonstration classroom each training day.
- 4 full days of ExLL with Academic Language Development incorporating the observation of a demonstration classroom each training day.
- 3 follow-up (2 hours each) CELL/ExLL Trainings with the observation of a demonstration classroom.
- Monthly Guided Meetings or Collaboration Meetings focusing on the CELL/ExLL elements/strategies with ALD.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

Present district adopted curriculum using CELL/ExLL elements/strategies along with Academic Language Development that is based upon ELD standards and strategies.

Staffing

EL Teacher Coordinator, Literacy Coordinator/Coaches and Principal

Promising Practices Site: Sonoma County Office of Education

Contact Information: Patty Dineen, Regional Director
(707)524-2908 | pdineed@scoe.org

General Characteristics
Sonoma County Office of Education is a county consortium in a suburban area of Sonoma County, with five eligible promising practice schools (4 Elementary and 1 Middle) that will be targeted for expansion. The Elementary schools offer Mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) programs to 1136 EL's. The district plans on expanding the promising practice school-wide at pilot schools.

Project Description
Organizing Student Thinking (OST) best practice, which uses graphic organizers to support English-language learners and promote English language acquisition. OST was initiated as one part of a countywide effort known as *Aiming High*, which was established in 2003-04. The district plans the following to promote OST:

- Best Practice School Implementation: The five pilot schools are well on their way to school-wide implementation, however to achieve this they will need assistance with expanding across all content areas.
- Best Practice Expansion: Each of the five promising practice schools will identify one neighboring school interested in participating in OST and they will partner with those schools over a two-year period. Funding will provide opportunities for cross-school sharing, lesson-planning collaboration, and monitoring student work.
- Countywide Dissemination: Funding will support the dissemination of two *Aiming High* publications highlighting the EL practices at OST schools. District will also host a two-day professional development on OST for interested teachers and administrators, in order to expand process at other schools.

Professional Development Activities

- Professional Development in Organizing Student Thinking (OST) to support dissemination.
- Coaching model support to teachers on site
- Professional Development for Teacher Leaders to build coaching and EL achievement capacity.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
OST provides consistent use of a small, select set of graphic organizers aligned with the new Bloom's taxonomy that are implemented across grade levels content areas that provide consistent, yet flexible strategies. Districts utilize state adopted texts, Open Court and Houghton Mifflin. Pacing plans will be enhanced with instructional guides for applying Thinking Maps.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Achievement data will be collected and analyzed to determine successful implementation of OST strategies and student achievement. All districts are conduction implementations surveys. Each of the three districts within the consortium have specified assessments for analyzing student data based on EL increased language proficiency and in areas of focus for the district. Assessments include CELDT, CST ELA & Math, local writing samples, and standards-based benchmarks.

Staffing
Release time for staff and consultant services for implementation of OST strategies.

Promising Practices Site: Stanislaus County Office of Education

Contact Information: Kathy Pon, Asst. Superintendent of Educational Services
(209) 829-7700 x281 | kpon.patterson.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Stanislaus County Office of Education is located in a suburban area of Stanislaus County, with one eligible promising practice Elementary school that will be targeted for expansion. The school program offers Mainstreaming 313 English Learners. The district would like to expand the program school wide.

Project Description
The project will incorporate a Focus on Teaching and Learning through alignment of essential standards between California State standards in ELA and ELD and the school will focus on home grown pacing plan that is more carefully designed to meet ELA standards. Also, a focus on Writing based on the Every Child a Reader and Writer Initiative (ECRW) that shores ups literature genres to launch writing genres and small group instruction. Funds will be used for the following:

1. To buy 5 EL/Writing Literacy Coaches for demonstration lessons, support with lesson planning, lesson observations, and continuing professional development in ELD and writing.
2. Substitute time for teachers to do peer observations of writing lessons in their classrooms and follow-up with writing coach.
3. Mini class libraries for 35 teachers to support the genre /writing studies.
4. Compensation for teachers to attend Saturday trainings in the areas of ELD, SDAIE and writing.
5. An expanded program of Writing Workshops for parents including stipends for leads.
6. An additional cohort of staff to attend RSDSS and CABE conferences.

Professional Development Activities
English Learning/Writing Literacy Coach; peer observations; ELD, SDAIE and writing workshops; RSDSS and CABE conferences.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
ERWC initiative to focus on writing and shore up literature genres. Also, school has recently adopted *Avenues* for ELD time and utilizes *Open Court* during core instruction.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Specific software not mentioned.

Staffing
EL/Writing Literacy Coach (description of role above).

Promising Practices Site: Ventura Unified

Contact Information: Jennifer Robles, Bilingual Education Programs Director (805)658-6438 | jennifer.robles@venturausd.org

General Characteristics

Ventura Unified is a school district in a suburban area of Ventura County with five eligible promising practice schools that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer a variety of programs including Mainstream, Structured English Immersion (SEI), Dual Immersion and Bilingual to 1058 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at all pilot schools. Two elementary schools offer transitional bilingual programs and one elementary offers dual immersion.

Project Description

The project incorporates a five-part system of student placement, instruction, assessment, collaboration, and intervention. This includes:

- Strategic placement of English Learners in appropriate instructional settings.
- Standards-based classroom instruction;
- District benchmark assessments in ELA, English Language Development and Math;
- Regular opportunities for teachers to collaborate ,review student progress for modifying instruction, grouping, and assignment to intervention; and
- Intervention instruction provided by qualified staff to small groups of students with similar instructional needs on a daily basis.

Professional Development Activities

District provides regular opportunities for teachers to participate in student-focused collaboration time. Also, specific training in Systematic ELD, ADEPT and the Focused approach to Houghton Mifflin for K-5 teachers.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum

This program focuses on providing strong core instruction based on appropriate placement and taught by well-qualified teachers using ongoing assessments to monitor progress and guide instructional modifications. District teacher specialists in English Language Arts, Math and ELD provide liaison networks to promote best practices and to provide communication network for teachers throughout the district.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support

Assessments are given each trimester, scored at the District Education Services Center and reported back to teachers and school sites. Each teacher has a computer work station where he/she is able to review and design reports of student achievement data through EduSoft program. Also, district utilizes Zangle as a data management system.

Staffing

Additional hourly intervention teachers and support for teacher collaboration time.

Promising Practices Site: Whittier City

Contact Information: Laurie Baccus, Principal – Daniel Phelan Elementary
(562) 789-3210 | lbaccus@whittiercity.k12.ca.us

General Characteristics
Whittier City is a school district in a suburban area of Los Angeles County, with one eligible promising practice school that will be targeted for expansion. The school program offers Structured English Immersion (SEI) to 90 English Learners.

Project Description
The project will promote the use of Thinking Maps for reading comprehension, the writing process, problem solving, and thinking skills improvement. The purpose is to create and maintain a common visual language throughout the schools so that students learn ways to organize thinking.

Professional Development Activities
Expansion of Thinking Maps training, *Write From the Beginning* to all grade levels and curricular areas, as well as time for lesson planning. Teachers will receive *Tools for Learning Text, K-12* and a binder, *Thinking Maps, A Language for Learning.*

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
As a *Reading First School,* Orange Grove utilizes Office of Education Reading/Language Arts theme assessments (i.e., LIONS)

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
The Language Arts Reading Coach provides assistance with analyzing LION's assessments

Staffing
Teachers will be provided with release time in order to meet with Reading Coach to identify focus and design of their writing lessons and to focus on improving the English skills of EL students.

Promising Practices Site: Woodland Joint Unified School District

Contact Information: Elodia Ortega-Lampkin, Executive Director of Educational Services
(530) 749-6902 | ltate@mjusd.com

Overview:

General Characteristics
Woodland Joint is a unified school district in a suburban area of Yolo County, with six eligible promising practice schools (5 elementary and 1 Middle) that will be targeted for expansion. The schools offer Structured English Immersion (SEI), Dual Immersion, and bilingual programs to 1431 English Learner students. The district plans to expand the promising practice school wide at all elementary school beginning with eligible schools.

Project Description
The project goals are to provide a marriage of Academic Conferences (AC) with WJUSD's Academic English Language Development (AELD) campaign. During AC, grade level teams collaborate around assessment data, then establish goals and identify resources and needs for the next 6-8 weeks. This process will be coupled with the district AELD initiative that focuses on explicit instruction of word meaning and word learning strategies through writing.

Professional Development Activities
Staff development on AC and AELD that will provide for model lesson observations and coaching. Additionally, staff will meet as grade-levels for selecting key academic vocabulary from core and supplemental curriculum (WRITE Institute Program) and identifying language structures for instructional grade level focus.

Instructional Delivery & Curriculum
AELD draws from strategies from the WRITE Institute Program that highlights the need for talking or interacting around words and language. Moreover, giving students time to reflect on their learning. The narrative did not reference a core curriculum.

Student Placement, Monitoring, and Support
Teachers analyze data during AC through data management system by Data Director every 6-8 weeks using the "Cycle of Inquiry Process".

Staffing
Consultants and coaching support for professional development on AC and AELD, as well as release time for teacher collaboration.

Appendix E
ELLPP Study Research Questions

Appendix E—ELLPP Study Research Questions

Leadership – Without comparing promising practices, describe how the leadership of the promising practice impacts and/or affects the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.
How are vision and expectations for EL achievement communicated to staff, students, and families?
What leadership structures and processes are used to monitor the progress of EL students?
How is involvement from EL student families and communities ensured by leadership? What EL family supports are in place? What educational partnerships are in place and supported by school site leadership?
What specific challenges exist for the promising practice from EL student families and communities, and how were these challenges overcome?
In evaluating each promising practice, who were the key players in making decisions? How were policy decisions made? From the key players' perspective, what major decisions had significant impact on the promising practices?
What research was used in designing the promising practice?
Organizational structures - Without comparing promising practices, describe how the organizational structures of the promising practice impact and/or affect the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.
How is extended learning time for EL instruction accommodated within the school day schedule?
What special organizational structures support the promising practice?
What organizational structures had to be overcome in order for the promising practice to be effective?
What, if any, unique school characteristics (i.e., master schedule, school size, setting, and location) are critical to the success of this promising practice?
What state, regional, and/or local administrative structures are in place to support implementation of the promising practice?
Resources - Without comparing promising practices, describe how the use or restructuring of resources has supported the effectiveness of the promising practice and its ability to promote English language and academic English acquisition and development.
What resources, including staffing, time, and materials are used or were necessary for implementing this promising practice?
What resources would be required to maintain the promising practice?

What type of district and/or school support is needed for the promising practice?
What are the funding levels in place that support implementation of the promising practice?
In what ways were the ELLPP grant funds utilized to support the promising practice?
To what extent were resources, other than the ELLPP grant funds, utilized or leveraged for the success of the promising practice?
Teacher Preparation and Support - Without comparing promising practices, describe how teacher preparation and support are effectively implemented to support the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.
What professional development did teachers and resource staff require and receive to implement the promising practice?
How professional development was identified (use of student achievement data, teacher data, program requirements, etc.)?
To what extent did teachers and resource staff utilize unique teaching strategies?
How did the school fund the professional development?
Who provided the professional development?
Is there ongoing support available for teachers (i.e., coaching, extra planning and collaboration time, additional professional development as needed)?
What impact does the diversity, or lack thereof, of the teaching staff appear to have on student achievement, if any?
What barriers were encountered and how were they addressed?
How do the schools use student achievement data to guide the implementation of their promising practice?
What type of data is used and how often?
How is the data used for placement decisions?
How is data used for progress monitoring?

Do teachers receive training on the use of data?
What barriers were encountered and how were they addressed?
Teaching and Learning - Without comparing promising practices, describe how teaching and learning are effectively implemented to support the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development in this promising practice.
Identify the educational setting of the promising practice.
To what extent did or did not current research play a role in determining the educational setting?
How is a systematic approach to the structural elements of English delivered to students (i.e., State Board of Education-adopted instructional materials or other specified and approved programs)?
How are oral proficiency, fluency, and comprehension addressed?
How is instruction assessed and modified to meet EL academic needs on an ongoing basis?
To what extent is the teaching and learning different or unique in the promising practices?
To what extent, in the opinion of the on-site participating teacher(s), school leader(s) and district administration, was the success of the promising practice attributed to the teaching practices, strategies, educational setting, etc.?
Student Placement, Monitoring and Support - Without comparing promising practices, describe how placement and monitoring of EL students by teachers within the promising practice are effectively implemented to support the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development.
How are EL student placement decisions made?
What type of summative and formative assessments will be used to determine EL student placement? How will this data inform instruction to meet EL academic needs?
How effective is the promising practice at moving EL students from the CELDT proficiency levels (i.e., 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 5), and what is the average length of time it takes to move EL students through the proficiency levels?
How many of the EL students are scoring proficient in English/language arts and mathematics once they reach levels 4 and 5?
In what ways were all EL students monitored during the educational process?

What support mechanisms are in place for EL students who are not meeting English language and academic English proficiency levels?
Effectiveness and Replicability - Without comparing promising practices, what basic elements need to be in place to successfully replicate the promising practice, and how effective is the promising practice in the promotion of English language and academic English acquisition and development?
Describe the features of each promising practice that could be replicated in any setting.
Describe the features of each promising practice that would pose a challenge for replication.
What emerging trends are present in the promising practices that show the greatest level of effectiveness and replicability as measured by statewide as well as local formal and informal assessment measures?
In the promising practices that were studied, which seemed the most replicable regardless of school setting?
What are some of the barriers to the overall effectiveness and replicability of promising practices, and how are these barriers being overcome?
To the extent possible to determine, what unique qualities of the context of the promising practice, staff and resources were present and contributed to the success of the practice?