U.S. Department of Education   November 2002

2002-2003 *No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program* Cover Sheet

Name of Principal   Mr. Ross Swearingen

Official School Name   Brentwood Elementary School

School Mailing Address   15579 8th Street,   Victorville,CA   92392-3348

Tel.   (760) 243-2301   Fax   (760) 243-4675

Website/URL http://www.vesd.net/schools/brentwood Email   rswearingen@vesd.net

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

                                                                  Date   3/1/03
_____
(Principal's Signature)

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

Name of Superintendent   Dr. Ralph Baker

District Name   Victor Elementary School District   Tel.   (760) 243-4675

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

                                                                  Date_____
_____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson   Mr. Willie Davis Pringle

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

                                                                  Date_____
_____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

DISTRICT

1. Number of schools in the district: 15   Elementary schools
                                              0   Middle schools
                                                0   Junior high schools
                                                0   High schools

                                              15   TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: $6,673 per enrolled student

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: $6,092 per pupil

SCHOOL

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

   [   ]   Urban or large central city
   [X]   Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [   ]   Suburban
   [   ]   Small city or town in a rural area
   [   ]   Rural

4.   7   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

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

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	63	60	**123**	7			
1	71	69	**140**	8			
2	75	67	**142**	9			
3	83	71	**154**	10			
4	62	76	**138**	11			
5	66	73	**139**	12			
6	82	64	146	Other			
				TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL			982

6. Racial/ethnic composition of   32.2   % White
   the students in the school: 19.6   % Black or African American
                                         41   % Hispanic or Latino
                                         1   % Asian/Pacific Islander
                                         0.7   % American Indian/Alaskan Native

                        100% Total

7.   Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 32.67 %

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred *to* the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	155
(2)	Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	128
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	283
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	866
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.3267
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	32.67

8.   Limited English Proficient students in the school: 13.1 %

130   Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 9
Specify languages: Spanish, Arabic, Korean, Punjabi, Cambodian, Tagalog, Japanese, Vietnamese, and Chinese

9.   Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 57.3 %

567 Total Number Students Who Qualify

10. Students receiving special education services: 8.4 %

   83   Total Number of Students Served

   Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

	Autism	1	Orthopedic Impairment
	Deafness	3	Other Health Impaired
	Deaf-Blindness	30	Specific Learning Disability
	Hearing Impairment	47	Speech or Language Impairment
2	Mental Retardation		Traumatic Brain Injury
	Multiple Disabilities		Visual Impairment Including Blindness

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

Number of Staff

	Full-time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	0
Classroom teachers	37	6
Special resource teachers/specialists	1	3
Paraprofessionals	0	6
Support staff	5	17
Total number	44	32

12. Student-"classroom teacher" ratio: 25.8 students per FTE

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

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Daily student attendance	94.6%	94.37%	94.16%	94.66%	98.32%
Daily teacher attendance	95.3%	96.4%	94.4%	95.3%	92.6%
Teacher turnover rate	2.2%	6.25%	3.7%	1.7%	8.6%
Student dropout rate					
Student drop-off rate					

PART III – SCHOOL SUMMARY

Brentwood Elementary School in Victorville, California has a "Bulldog" attitude. The "**bulldog attitude**" exemplifies a hard working, nose to the grindstone, roll up your sleeves and get the job done approach to student learning and academic success. The bulldog mascot typifies the attitude that our staff and community display, allowing us to **Leave No Child Behind** in achieving our mission: "All students will perform at or above grade level in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics". Whether we are implementing effective teaching strategies in the classroom or offering student and parent interventions before, during, or after school, the attitude is always the same... If it will help students learn, then it is worth the work involved.

The school is on a beautiful, neatly maintained campus that was built through the passage of Local Bond Measure Y in 1996. Our school serves a community of learners from an array of cultures mirroring the diversity of the city that we live in. Brentwood's success is a source of pride to the region-- giving all a sense of what this community is capable of achieving.

"Learning for All, Whatever it Takes" is the predominant theme at Brentwood. The staff worked hard to overcome many obstacles on the road to success. We have developed intervention programs tailored for struggling readers, English Language Learners, and their parents. We have also created a balanced curriculum through computer education, vocal music instruction and after-school art and chess clubs. In addition to this we have continued to develop, adjust, and maintain quality educational programs for a student population that has grown from 420 to 990 students over the past 7 years.

The achievement that our school is most proud of is that we are **making a difference** in children's lives. We have built solid, effective programs that have allowed all students the opportunity to move forward rather than to be left behind. Through effective analysis of data and research-based interventions, at risk students are able to perform at or above grade level standards. Students who are meeting or exceeding standards continue to be challenged with differentiated instruction and student directed teaching and learning. The partnership of a hard working, highly trained staff and a supportive parent population has created a learning environment where excellence is the expectation and every student's academic needs are addressed.

It's the Brentwood community's **bulldog attitude** to **make a difference** in our children's lives by doing **whatever it takes** to improve achievement that has made Brentwood Elementary the best learning environment for each one of our students.

PART IV – SCHOOL ASSESSMENT RESULTS

School Data Narrative

Student achievement at Brentwood school has shown continuous improvement for students on both state and district level assessments. The state of California has established an accountability system called the Academic Performance Indicator (API). The system for elementary level students has evolved from use of only the Stanford 9 norm referenced achievement test to also including the recently developed California Standards Test, a criterion referenced test in language arts and mathematics aligned to state standards. All Brentwood students are tested with the exception of a few special education students who have alternative assessments specified in their Individual Education Plan.

The **Academic Performance Indicator (API)** is a score on a scale of 200 to 1000 that annually measures the academic performance and progress of individual schools in California. On an interim basis, the state has set 800 as the API score that schools should strive to meet.

The annual **growth target** for a school is 5% of the distance between its base API and 800. Actual growth is the number of API points a school gained between its base and growth years. Growth points are gained by moving students up through the five quintiles with more points given to students moving from the lower quintiles to close the achievement gap. In addition to a whole-school API, schools also receive API scores for each numerically significant racial/ethnic and socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup in the school. Schools receiving an API score are given a **statewide rank** of 1 (low)-10 (high) and a **similar schools rank** which is a comparison of each school with 100 other schools with similar demographic characteristics.

School data is included for four years of Stanford 9, three years of API, two years of California Standards Test and two years of California English Language Development Test (CELDT). During this time period, the overall population grew 39%, the white population grew 1%, Hispanic population grew 58% and the African American population grew 109%. In addition the low socioeconomic population grew 25% and English Learners 81%.

School test scores and API results show a population that has shown significant growth while closing gaps for minority and socioeconomically disadvantaged children. Examples from the data include:

- SAT 9 scores showing the percent of increase of students meeting the 50th %tile as 22% for all students, 18% for white, 29% for Hispanic 24% for African American, 33% for English Learners and 29% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students.
- SAT 9 math scores showing an increase at the 50th percentile of 28% for all students, 28% for white, 38% for Hispanic, 18% for African American, 49% for English Learners and 22% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students.
- California Standards Test in Language Arts showing growth in the % of students at the proficient level as 10% for all students, 4% for white, 14% for Hispanic, 25% for English Learners and staying the same for African American.
- API growth over the two previous years shows 80 points for the overall population, 76 for African American, 124 for Hispanics, 53 for white and 85 for socioeconomically disadvantaged students.
- CELDT testing showing an increase from 2001 to 2002 of 20%, scoring at the advanced level which meets the criteria of a native speaker and 52% scoring at the proficient level.

The school has consistently exceeded API growth targets and last year achieved the state target of 800. In addition Brentwood achieved the top rating of 10 when compared to similar schools.

The staff is aware of the achievement gap for African American students which has been affected by student mobility and the large increase of new students. Because this a small sub-group, changes in numbers of students have a greater impact on the comparability of results from year to year. Knowing this, teachers are actively reaching out to involve the parent group, attending conferences to gain knowledge of strategies shown to be effective for this group of students and offering intensive interventions.

School Use Of Student Achievement Data

The Brentwood Staff works together in collecting, organizing and using data from the state, district, and classroom level. A year-end district student assessment matrix is used for each grade level that defines the year-end performance goals for students to achieve. These year-end results are disaggregated and analyzed to identify trends in student performance. School teams use this information to revise schoolwide student performance goals and develop related action plans.

The Brentwood Staff has expanded this matrix to include on-going measures at the classroom level including STAR tests for reading and math, publisher and teacher developed unit tests, weekly grade level instructional focus quizzes, monthly running records, and trimester benchmark assessments. At Grade Level and Principal/Grade Level Team meetings the results of the assessments are used to determine the level of progress for each student toward the achievement of grade level standards. Some of the assessments like STAR Reading and Math, the SAT 9 and Running Records indicate to teachers specific skills within each curriculum area that need further instruction and practice. This led to the establishment of reteaching periods according to the specific needs of students. Brentwood teachers systematically leave space within their instructional plans for review and reinforcement of the concepts in which their students need additional practice.

In addition teachers identify students needing extra assistance each month in grade level meetings and contact the parents to initiate a plan for acceleration. The intensive intervention programs for students include time with the Miller-Unruh Reading Specialist, extended day program for targeted curricular areas, summer school, and grade level skills groups for targeted instruction.

In addition to student achievement data the principal does regular classroom walkthroughs and collects data concerning effective practices. This is communicated back to staff, discussed in grade level meetings and used to plan next steps.

School Communication of Data

Brentwood parents receive regular reports about the academic success of their students and are enlisted as full partners in the education of their children from the first contact. Each entering Kindergarten student is assessed based on the Diagnostic Skills Checklist and a parent conference is held prior to the beginning of school to convey their readiness for Kindergarten and the skills that still need reinforcement.

For all students K-6, standards-based report cards, portfolio parent conferences, Student Study Team meetings, progress reports, and other communication from the classroom teachers keep them informed of the needs and successes of their students. Teachers also use student work samples with scoring guides to show parents the quality of work that is expected from their children. Parents of English learners receive annual results of their child's English Language Development tests and are involved in decisions about program placement. During parent conferences the results of entry-level assessments are shared and parents and students are involved in setting achievement goals.

Students receive data that informs them of their progress on weekly focus area quizzes in language arts and math. Students know if they do not score at the mastery level, they can receive re-teaching in a morning tutoring session. They receive feedback about their writing on the district-scoring guide which helps them identify areas of strength and needed improvement. A student favorite is the data they receive back on their Accelerated Reader Assessment. This gives them the information they need to set and attain reading goals. This has had a significant positive affect on student motivation to read.

The community is informed of student progress by reading school newsletters, accessing the school website, reports in the local paper, the district report card that is mailed to the community and on the School Accountability Report Card. The site administrator regularly meets with the School Site Council and other parent/community groups where achievement results are a major topic of discussion.

Sharing of Success

Due to their many accomplishments, the Brentwood staff has been actively involved in sharing information about their school and its programs. Within district there are multiple avenues to share with other school sites. Brentwood teachers are regular presenters on district in-service days. Teachers also participate in district grade level council meetings where they discuss curriculum and assessment issues and share best practices. The principal meets monthly with other site principals where plans to meet achievement targets are discussed in depth. Principals also work together in four school squads and walk through each campus using a site review process. Through the teacher staff development center, teachers can request subs to visit a campus of their choice and many visit Brentwood.

  The school reaches outside of the district by presenting at conferences such as the Title I Achieving Schools Conference and volunteering its site for outside administrators to receive walk- through training. Teacher experts on staff are also involved in presenting at conferences and at specific schools by request.

  Brentwood staff and students have become accustomed to the numerous school tours from the local area and out of area school teams that walkthrough classrooms, talk to students and meet with staff. Visiting teams gather ideas from classroom observations as well as opportunities to meet with staff for a more in-depth discussion of program effectiveness.

  The site administrator has presented at county schools workshops to assist principals of Program Improvement Schools. He also teaches classes at a local university.

  The staff will continue to share their success in these ways, is always available to assist when asked and always open to looking at successful strategies from others.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Curriculum Design

The Brentwood staff uses a curriculum design process that begins with the rigorous California State Standards and District expectations that are included in district curriculum guides. District grade level councils have developed curriculum guides that articulate essential elements from the state standards into a K-6 continuum. The guide includes content, effective strategies and monitoring systems.

Brentwood has a teacher representative for each grade level that contributes to the development of the guide by representing the colleagues in their grade level team at council meetings.

When using the curriculum to develop trimester plans, the grade level teams personalize the curriculum to the needs of their students by meeting and discussing three questions:
- What do we expect students to learn?
- How will we know they have learned it?
- What will we do for those students who do not learn it?

This leads to a discussion about prioritizing the standards according to what is tested, those that are essential to prepare students for the next grade and essential skills that cross disciplines – reading and writing in the content areas and the use of organizers and graphs. All teachers, when planning lessons, know that the integration of the language arts standards with all content areas of the curriculum is an essential part of the curriculum design.

Grade level teams use this information to develop pacing plans that organize the essential content into meaningful instructional units. Each unit has an aligned monitoring plan to ensure students are learning the content. One schoolwide strategy that has effectively engaged students in all curricular areas is the use of "Thinking Maps". This is a series of eight organizers that assist students in monitoring their comprehension and other thinking skills such as brainstorming, the ability to determine cause and effect, the use of analogies, developing vocabulary, going from part to whole and whole to part and developing flow maps to understand and communicate their work. Building this process into the curriculum has increased access to the core for all students.

Another effective part of the curricular design process is an agreed upon schoolwide weekly focus in language arts. Students receive direct instruction daily in the focus area and are assessed each week. Results of these assessments are used the following week to organize the content that was not mastered. Teachers allow time in their delivery system to reteach content for students who need more time and different approaches. Teachers also differentiate instruction for GATE students and English Learners in cluster classrooms using the same core curriculum to develop lessons that accelerate, enrich and provide alternative paths to the core.

The mathematics curriculum builds on an early focus on the development of number sense and procedural skills to a more comprehensive program in middle and intermediate grades. Curriculum design incorporates a daily review, mastery of basic facts, lessons to develop conceptual understanding and procedural skills while teaching structures for problem solving activities. Integration of technical reading and writing is used to develop mathematics vocabulary and assist with problem solving and test taking skills.

The academic curriculum is supported with weekly lessons in music and computer skills. Student technology skills are in the process of being defined and articulated K - 6. Before and after school opportunities are offered for struggling students but also include additional opportunities in the arts and a chess club. Students have opportunities to participate in the district extra curricular events – Mathematics Competition, Student Author's Celebration, Science Fair and Junior Olympics.

This approach to curriculum design maintains the rigorous content while providing for the varying interests and learning needs of the students.

School Reading Program

Brentwood students have experienced success in reading using a well-defined and articulated system based on the research of the "Put Reading First" panel. Kindergarten students participate in whole class shared reading and small group instruction to learn and practice phonemic awareness skills, recognize high frequency vocabulary words and develop an understanding of story structure and concepts of print. This foundation is built upon in grades 1-2 using a systematic phonics program along with word sort activities and opportunities to apply this knowledge in phonics based readers. Students work in small-guided reading groups where comprehension strategies and vocabulary are taught as teachers monitor for fluency and understanding. Teachers use monthly running records to monitor progress and to assist in planning next steps for individual and small group instruction. Beginning in grade three, students advance from a focus on decoding systems into the effective use of comprehension strategies and vocabulary development. Use of graphic organizers is one of the top strategies identified by the research of Robert Marzano to improve student achievement. Brentwood students use Thinking Maps as organizing guides while reading and also to respond to text. The reading strategies of reciprocal teaching and literature circles provide opportunities for students to work cooperatively in small groups to practice essential skills, discuss and respond to literature and learn to use the text structures needed to comprehend non-fiction text.

A schoolwide success has been the implementation of Accelerated Reader. This program has been aligned to the school library, used in before school extra assistance programs and to establish schoolwide goals. Because the program matches students to appropriate leveled text and provides incentives to move ahead, the amount of independent reading has greatly increased. Staff has seen a relationship between use of this program and increased test scores.

School Writing Focus

When entering the Brentwood campus it is immediately evident that the school has a strong focus on writing. This focus began at the inception of the school based on the 90 90 90 research study done by Douglas Reeves showing that a strong writing program increases student achievement in all areas. The success of Brentwood writing program is the result of clear expectations for student achievement, effective mini lessons to teach specific criteria and student and teacher involvement in the scoring process. Teachers model and share through literature and content text the six traits of effective writing – ideas-content-organization- sentence fluency-voice-and conventions. Students understand what each of these traits looks like in quality writing and have scoring guides that identify student performance levels. The schoolwide use of Thinking Maps provides the organizational structures to help students with the prewrite stage of the writing process and also to identify missing components of a completed piece. For example, the use of a tree diagram assists first grade students with basic sentence structure and is used in middle and upper grades to organize the sentences in a paragraph and the paragraphs in an essay. A newly implemented program called Write From the Beginning articulates the K-6 writing program, provides specific scoring criteria for each genre of writing and assists teachers with mini lessons for structure and content. Teachers regularly collaborate to score papers and share effective lessons. Students use student friendly scoring guides as self assessment tools to assist with revising and editing their work. They also receive specific feedback from teachers to help them improve their writing.

By putting the structure of writing solidly in place in the primary grades, intermediate teachers are able to concentrate on using writing for effective communication and research. Staff monitors progress through the use of quarterly grade level prompts that are scored collaboratively. Evidence of success is the increasing scores on writing assessments as well as on multiple-choice standardized tests.

Instructional Strategies

The Brentwood staff is committed to a learning program where high standards are the constant and time is the variable; one where students are held accountable working within a system that provides the needed support. Staff embraces the importance of using a research base when making decisions about which strategies to use, but also has the flexibility to use those aligned with the specific needs of students.

To accomplish this teachers use instructional strategies that balance the development of discrete skills with higher order thinking. Strategies that include the use of:

- Teacher directed instruction in the delivery of daily schoolwide focus lessons with weekly diagnostic assessments to determine if the mastery level has been met
- Flexible groupings to target specific learning needs and use alternative approaches
- Differentiated strategies according to interest and ability for GATE, English learners and Special Education students clustered in regular education classes with support staff
- Graphic organizers, charts and graphs to assist students in accessing prior knowledge and to organize their thinking as they gain new knowledge
- Student involvement in setting goals and monitoring their progress
- Specific feedback and recognition of achievement and effort to sustain motivation
- Technology for skills instruction and research projects
- Opportunities to work in cooperative groups to learn teamwork skills and share strategies
- Mathematic strategies that balance procedural and problem solving skills

In addition teachers model the use of reading and writing strategies and assist students in practicing them so they are able to select appropriate strategies and use them independently For students needing more time, staff has many intervention strategies during and beyond the school day that include the use of peer and cross age students tutors, small group instruction, use of technology and strategies to address different learning modalities. This comprehensive system is designed to ensure that no student is left behind.

Professional Development Plan

Brentwood School has developed a professional development plan that is aligned with school goals and also allows for the individual needs and interests of staff. The staff receives training through four primary methods: 1) school/district training workshops: Renaissance Reading and Math, Write from the Beginning and Thinking Maps trainings are provided to all teachers to nurture a schoolwide focus on research-based academic programs; 2) outside conferences: Teachers are allotted an annual budget which they can use based on their own professional development and classroom needs; 3) staff development at faculty meetings: A focus area and program is selected by the school leadership team and monthly trainings are provided (Write from the Beginning, CPR, Disaster Preparedness, etc.); 4) individual coaching from the site administration: Data is collected by the principal and given to teachers who use it for Self reflection of teaching patterns and habits.

Permanent teachers can participate in a reflective evaluation. The teacher selects an area of their teaching in which they seek to become more effective. They present a plan for improving instruction that includes review of student data, classroom implementation, reflective writing and discussion. The evaluation is reviewed and discussed by the teacher and principal throughout the school year.

Implementation of the staff development plan has caused a consistent growth in student achievement in all core curricular areas. Teachers are able to apply the skills they have learned effectively inside the classroom and our students are reaping the benefits academically.

Brentwood Elementary Academic Performance Indicator

School Wide API

API Base Data				API Growth Data			
	1999	2000	2001		From 1999 to 2000	From 2000 to 2001	From 2001 to 2002
Percentage Tested	100	100	100	Percentage Tested	100	100	99
API Base Score	626	729	782	API Growth Score	729	790	801
Growth Target	9	4	1	Actual Growth	103	61	19
Statewide Rank	5	7	8				
Similar Schools Rank	7	10	10				

API Subgroups - Racial/Ethnic Groups

API Base Data				API Growth Data			
	1999	2000	2001		From 1999 to 2000	From 2000 to 2001	From 2001 to 2002
African-American				African-American			
API Base Score		659	765	API Growth Score		780	720
Growth Target		3	1	Actual Growth		121	-45
Hispanic or Latino				Hispanic or Latino			
API Base Score	568	683	728	API Growth Score	683	736	799
Growth Target	7	3	1	Actual Growth	115	53	71
White (Not Hispanic)				White (Not Hispanic)			
API Base Score	674	785	825	API Growth Score	785	831	832
Growth Target	7	3	A	Actual Growth	111	46	7

API Subgroups - Socioeconomically Disadvantaged

API Base Data				API Growth Data			
	1999	2000	2001		From 1999 to 2000	From 2000 to 2001	From 2001 to 2002
API Base Score	597	687	740	API Growth Score	687	748	764
Growth Target	7	3	1	Actual Growth	90	61	24

Stanford 9 Norm Referenced Achievement Test Results
Percent of Students at Grade Level (50th percentile)

READING ONLY ---TOTAL SCHOOL

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	63	61	51	41
Number of students tested	652	600	557	458
Percent of total students tested	98.6	98.4	97.2	98.9
Number of students excluded	9	10	16	5
Percent of students excluded	1.4	1.6	2.8	1.1
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	67	70	61	49
2. Hispanic	63	53	41	34
3. African-American	55	56	39	31
4. English Language Learners	51	43	28	18
5. Free/Reduced	53	52	40	33

LANGUAGE ONLY ---TOTAL SCHOOL

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	73	71	63	50
Number of students tested	652	600	557	458
Percent of total students tested	98.6	98.4	97.2	98.9
Number of students excluded	9	10	16	5
Percent of students excluded	1.4	1.6	2.8	1.1
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	78	77	75	63
2. Hispanic	74	66	53	38
3. African-American	61	64	46	36
4. English Language Learners	78	57	41	28
5. Free/Reduced	69	61	54	43

MATH ONLY ---TOTAL SCHOOL

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	78	77	64	50
Number of students tested	652	600	557	458
Percent of total students tested	98.6	98.4	97.2	98.9
Number of students excluded	9	10	16	5
Percent of students excluded	1.4	1.6	2.8	1.1
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	85	83	73	57
2. Hispanic	79	74	59	41
3. African-American	62	70	46	44
4. English Language Learners	85	69	47	36
5. Free/Reduced	72	69	54	44

Stanford 9 Norm Referenced Achievement Test Results
Percent of Students at Grade Level (50th percentile)

GRADE 2 ONLY

READING ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	69	73	58	47
Number of students tested	140	116	116	101
Percent of total students tested	95.9	97.5	97.5	95.3
Number of students excluded	6	3	3	5
Percent of students excluded	4.1	2.5	2.5	4.7
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	75	74	60	59
2. Hispanic	68	66	62	31
3. African-American	58	81	40	35
4. English Language Learners	63	71	60	33
5. Free/Reduced	60	63	44	38

LANGUAGE ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	71	74	61	51
Number of students tested	140	116	116	101
Percent of total students tested	95.9	97.5	97.5	95.3
Number of students excluded	6	3	3	5
Percent of students excluded	4.1	2.5	2.5	4.7
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	79	69	71	66
2. Hispanic	71	73	54	38
3. African-American	58	76	40	35
4. English Language Learners	73	65	40	56
5. Free/Reduced	64	63	53	43

MATH ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	79	81	69	61
Number of students tested	140	116	116	101
Percent of total students tested	95.9	97.5	97.5	95.3
Number of students excluded	6	3	3	5
Percent of students excluded	4.1	2.5	2.5	4.7
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	88	81	76	76
2. Hispanic	80	76	72	42
3. African-American	61	81	40	47
4. English Language Learners	71	82	60	56
5. Free/Reduced	74	73	59	55

Stanford 9 Norm Referenced Achievement Test Results
Percent of Students at Grade Level (50th percentile)

GRADE 3 ONLY

READING ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	63	60	44	34
Number of students tested	129	123	117	105
Percent of total students tested	99.2	98.4	99.2	100
Number of students excluded	1	2	1	0
Percent of students excluded	.8	1.6	.8	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	61	67	71	38
2. Hispanic	69	63	18	39
3. African-American	52	45	29	13
4. English Language Learners	76	55	17	13
5. Free/Reduced	55	44	36	27

LANGUAGE ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	68	63	57	32
Number of students tested	129	123	117	105
Percent of total students tested	99.2	98.4	99.2	100
Number of students excluded	1	2	1	0
Percent of students excluded	.8	1.6	.8	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	71	76	81	34
2. Hispanic	76	58	35	36
3. African-American	48	48	32	20
4. English Language Learners	84	45	50	13
5. Free/Reduced	63	45	48	24

MATH ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	79	76	59	49
Number of students tested	129	123	117	105
Percent of total students tested	99.2	98.4	99.2	100
Number of students excluded	1	2	1	0
Percent of students excluded	.8	1.6	.8	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	87	80	76	49
2. Hispanic	81	74	44	50
3. African-American	57	71	42	47
4. English Language Learners	100	73	67	38
5. Free/Reduced	72	64	52	43

Stanford 9 Norm Referenced Achievement Test Results
Percent of Students at Grade Level (50th percentile)

GRADE 4 ONLY

READING ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	63	60	46	35
Number of students tested	126	126	116	94
Percent of total students tested	97.7	99.2	98.3	96.9
Number of students excluded	3	1	2	3
Percent of students excluded	2.3	.8	1.7	3.1
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	73	78	53	49
2. Hispanic	62	39	32	11
3. African-American	46	52	40	22
4. English Language Learners	44	33		
5. Free/Reduced	42	56	34	32

LANGUAGE ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	79	74	58	55
Number of students tested	126	126	116	94
Percent of total students tested	97.7	99.2	98.3	96.9
Number of students excluded	3	1	2	3
Percent of students excluded	2.3	.8	1.7	3.1
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	88	87	63	73
2. Hispanic	79	59	54	30
3. African-American	58	66	45	22
4. English Language Learners	89	67		22
5. Free/Reduced	66	70	51	51

MATH ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	75	72	62	37
Number of students tested	126	126	116	94
Percent of total students tested	97.7	99.2	98.3	96.9
Number of students excluded	3	1	2	3
Percent of students excluded	2.3	.8	1.7	3.1
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	81	83	73	49
2. Hispanic	75	61	54	11
3. African-American	62	62	40	33
4. English Language Learners	83	67		
5. Free/Reduced	59	70	51	32

Stanford 9 Norm Referenced Achievement Test Results
Percent of Students at Grade Level (50th percentile)

GRADE 5 ONLY

READING ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	56	46	45	39
Number of students tested	136	120	109	76
Percent of total students tested	98.6	96.8	96.5	97.4
Number of students excluded	2	4	4	2
Percent of students excluded	1.4	3.2	3.5	2.6
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	68	47	60	40
2. Hispanic	49	49	18	36
3. African-American	54	39	28	41
4. English Language Learners		14	13	25
5. Free/Reduced	50	41	37	28

LANGUAGE ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	67	52	65	48
Number of students tested	136	120	109	76
Percent of total students tested	98.6	96.8	96.5	97.4
Number of students excluded	2	4	4	2
Percent of students excluded	1.4	3.2	3.5	2.6
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	68	47	60	40
2. Hispanic	61	49	39	41
3. African-American	62	46	39	41
4. English Language Learners	50	14	38	25
5. Free/Reduced	67	45	55	40

MATH ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	71	67	61	49
Number of students tested	136	120	109	76
Percent of total students tested	98.6	96.8	96.5	97.4
Number of students excluded	2	4	4	2
Percent of students excluded	1.4	3.2	3.5	2.6
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	84	73	76	46
2. Hispanic	64	72	43	46
3. African-American	59	50	39	50
4. English Language Learners	60	29	25	50
5. Free/Reduced	69	59	49	43

Stanford 9 Norm Referenced Achievement Test Results
Percent of Students at Grade Level (50th percentile)

GRADE 6 ONLY

READING ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	63	68	63	51
Number of students tested	120	115	99	81
Percent of total students tested	100	97.5	94.3	100
Number of students excluded	0	3	6	0
Percent of students excluded	0	2.5	5.7	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	58	85	62	62
2. Hispanic	67	50	68	47
3. African-American	68	70	55	44
4. English Language Learners	36		25	22
5. Free/Reduced	58	56	52	41

LANGUAGE ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	82	94	76	69
Number of students tested	120	115	99	81
Percent of total students tested	100	97.5	94.3	100
Number of students excluded	0	3	6	0
Percent of students excluded	0	2.5	5.7	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	79	98	76	93
2. Hispanic	87	92	82	47
3. African-American	82	91	69	67
4. English Language Learners	82	86	75	22
5. Free/Reduced	84	84	72	60

MATH ONLY

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month				
SCHOOL SCORES				
Percent at/above 50th Percentile	87	91	66	51
Number of students tested	120	115	99	81
Percent of total students tested	100	97.5	94.3	100
Number of students excluded	0	3	6	0
Percent of students excluded	0	2.5	5.7	0
SUBGROUP SCORES				
1. White	84	98	56	66
2. Hispanic	98	87	76	50
3. African-American	73	91	62	33
4. English Language Learners	100	71	75	44
5. Free/Reduced	86	82	58	43

California Standards Test - Language Arts

School wide totals

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	83%	78%
At or Above Proficient	48%	38%
At Advanced	14%	8%
Number of students tested	643	598
Percent of total students tested	98.6%	98.4%
Number of students excluded	9	10
Percent of students excluded	1.4%	1.6%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White		
At or Above Basic	86%	87%
At or Above Proficient	58%	54%
At Advanced	18%	14%
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	84%	75%
At or Above Proficient	45%	31%
At Advanced	12%	5%
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	71%	72%
At or Above Proficient	35%	35%
At Advanced	12%	7%
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	84%	66%
At or Above Proficient	47%	22%
At Advanced	9%	4%
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	80%	74%
At or Above Proficient	41%	34%
At Advanced	6%	6%

California Standards Test - Mathematics

School wide totals

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	76%	75%
At or Above Proficient	47%	46%
At Advanced	15%	13%
Number of students tested	649	596
Percent of total students tested	98.6%	98.4%
Number of students excluded	9	10
Percent of students excluded	1.4%	1.6%
1. White		
At or Above Basic	86%	*
At or Above Proficient	56%	*
At Advanced	19%	*
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	75%	*
At or Above Proficient	46%	*
At Advanced	13%	*
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	61%	*
At or Above Proficient	33%	*
At Advanced	8%	*
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	80%	*
At or Above Proficient	47%	*
At Advanced	18%	*
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	67%	*
At or Above Proficient	38%	*
At Advanced	6%	*

* Official results not available from State - Pilot Year 2000-2001

California Standards Test - Language Arts

GRADE 2

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	78%	80%
At or Above Proficient	49%	44%
At Advanced	21%	13%
Number of students tested	143	118
Percent of total students tested	98%	97%
Number of students excluded	3	4
Percent of students excluded	2%	3%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White		
At or Above Basic	84%	83%
At or Above Proficient	65%	44%
At Advanced	29%	20%
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	80%	76%
At or Above Proficient	49%	31%
At Advanced	18%	4%
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	61%	81%
At or Above Proficient	27%	62%
At Advanced	15%	14%
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	85%	73%
At or Above Proficient	69%	27%
At Advanced	23%	0%
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	NA	74%
At or Above Proficient	NA	33%
At Advanced	NA	7%

NA - Group too small to report results

California Standards Test - Mathematics

GRADE 2

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	83%	83%
At or Above Proficient	60%	59%
At Advanced	29%	13%
Number of students tested	143	118
Percent of total students tested	98%	97%
Number of students excluded	3	4
Percent of students excluded	2%	3%
1. White		
At or Above Basic	94%	*
At or Above Proficient	65%	*
At Advanced	40%	*
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	81%	*
At or Above Proficient	58%	*
At Advanced	25%	*
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	66%	*
At or Above Proficient	50%	*
At Advanced	19%	*
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	80%	*
At or Above Proficient	60%	*
At Advanced	53%	*
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	NA	*
At or Above Proficient	NA	*
At Advanced	NA	*

* Official results not available from State - Pilot Year 2000-2001
NA - Group too small to report results

California Standards Test - Language Arts

GRADE 3

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	76%	74%
At or Above Proficient	43%	43%
At Advanced	10%	7%
Number of students tested	129	122
Percent of total students tested	98%	96%
Number of students excluded	3	5
Percent of students excluded	2%	4%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White		
At or Above Basic	76%	83%
At or Above Proficient	42%	51%
At Advanced	16%	9%
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	83%	75%
At or Above Proficient	47%	43%
At Advanced	7%	8%
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	61%	53%
At or Above Proficient	30%	27%
At Advanced	13%	3%
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	95%	70%
At or Above Proficient	62%	40%
At Advanced	0%	10%
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	81%	63%
At or Above Proficient	41%	31%
At Advanced	7%	3%

California Standards Test - Mathematics

GRADE 3

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	71%	83%
At or Above Proficient	43%	58%
At Advanced	9%	13%
Number of students tested	129	122
Percent of total students tested	98%	96%
Number of students excluded	3	5
Percent of students excluded	2%	4%
1. White		
At or Above Basic	79%	*
At or Above Proficient	34%	*
At Advanced	11%	*
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	72%	*
At or Above Proficient	52%	*
At Advanced	7%	*
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	52%	*
At or Above Proficient	30%	*
At Advanced	9%	*
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	81%	*
At or Above Proficient	52%	*
At Advanced	5%	*
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	70%	*
At or Above Proficient	48%	*
At Advanced	7%	*

* Official results not available from State - Pilot Year 2000-2001

California Standards Test - Language Arts

GRADE 4

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	86%	77%
At or Above Proficient	58%	26%
At Advanced	22%	1%
Number of students tested	120	125
Percent of total students tested	98%	97%
Number of students excluded	2	4
Percent of students excluded	2%	3%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White		
At or Above Basic	96%	91%
At or Above Proficient	76%	67%
At Advanced	26%	18%
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	82%	68%
At or Above Proficient	55%	23%
At Advanced	23%	3%
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	71%	71%
At or Above Proficient	33%	29%
At Advanced	8%	4%
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	82%	67%
At or Above Proficient	36%	25%
At Advanced	27%	8%
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	81%	76%
At or Above Proficient	43%	42%
At Advanced	10%	6%

California Standards Test - Mathematics

GRADE 4

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	76%	72%
At or Above Proficient	47%	50%
At Advanced	21%	21%
Number of students tested	120	125
Percent of total students tested	98%	97%
Number of students excluded	2	4
Percent of students excluded	2%	3%
1. White		
At or Above Basic	88%	*
At or Above Proficient	65%	*
At Advanced	29%	*
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	74%	*
At or Above Proficient	45%	*
At Advanced	19%	*
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	58%	*
At or Above Proficient	19%	*
At Advanced	4%	*
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	73%	*
At or Above Proficient	36%	*
At Advanced	18%	*
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	74%	*
At or Above Proficient	30%	*
At Advanced	9%	*

* Official results not available from State - Pilot Year 2000-2001

California Standards Test - Language Arts

GRADE 5

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	84%	71%
At or Above Proficient	38%	25%
At Advanced	5%	5%
Number of students tested	139	124
Percent of total students tested	98%	96%
Number of students excluded	3	5
Percent of students excluded	2%	4%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White		
At or Above Basic	87%	79%
At or Above Proficient	49%	32%
At Advanced	8%	2%
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	81%	68%
At or Above Proficient	29%	21%
At Advanced	2%	3%
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	79%	68%
At or Above Proficient	31%	18%
At Advanced	7%	9%
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	69%	50%
At or Above Proficient	23%	0%
At Advanced	0%	0%
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	78%	70%
At or Above Proficient	33%	20%
At Advanced	0%	3%

California Standards Test - Mathematics

GRADE 5

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	67%	64%
At or Above Proficient	38%	35%
At Advanced	7%	8%
Number of students tested	139	124
Percent of total students tested	98%	96%
Number of students excluded	3	5
Percent of students excluded	2%	4%
1. White		
At or Above Basic	74%	*
At or Above Proficient	56%	*
At Advanced	5%	*
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	63%	*
At or Above Proficient	22%	*
At Advanced	5%	*
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	57%	*
At or Above Proficient	33%	*
At Advanced	7%	*
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	77%	*
At or Above Proficient	23%	*
At Advanced	8%	*
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	53%	*
At or Above Proficient	28%	*
At Advanced	6%	*

* Official results not available from State - Pilot Year 2000-2001

California Standards Test - Language Arts

GRADE 6

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	88%	90%
At or Above Proficient	52%	51%
At Advanced	13%	14%
Number of students tested	118	117
Percent of total students tested	100%	98%
Number of students excluded	0	2
Percent of students excluded	0%	2%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White		
At or Above Basic	88%	98%
At or Above Proficient	54%	75%
At Advanced	7%	21%
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	95%	86%
At or Above Proficient	51%	36%
At Advanced	17%	8%
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	82%	92%
At or Above Proficient	59%	44%
At Advanced	9%	8%
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	83%	57%
At or Above Proficient	17%	0%
At Advanced	0%	0%
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	83%	89%
At or Above Proficient	54%	46%
At Advanced	13%	13%

California Standards Test - Mathematics

GRADE 6

	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month		
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	85%	81%
At or Above Proficient	49%	47%
At Advanced	7%	8%
Number of students tested	118	117
Percent of total students tested	100%	98%
Number of students excluded	0	2
Percent of students excluded	0%	2%
1. White		
At or Above Basic	90%	*
At or Above Proficient	54%	*
At Advanced	5%	*
2, Hispanic		
At or Above Basic	90%	*
At or Above Proficient	58%	*
At Advanced	8%	*
3. African-American		
At or Above Basic	71%	*
At or Above Proficient	29%	*
At Advanced	0%	*
4. English Language Learners		
At or Above Basic	100%	*
At or Above Proficient	67%	*
At Advanced	0%	*
5. Free / Reduced		
At or Above Basic	80%	*
At or Above Proficient	52%	*
At Advanced	4%	*

* Official results not available from State - Pilot Year 2000-2001

California English Language Development Test (CELDT)

English Proficiency Report - All Students

Students Meeting State Board of Education Criterion for English Proficiency

Grades	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total Tested
# of Students	0	9	6	7	16	9	5	52
% of Students	0%	64%	55%	35%	73%	69%	26%	52%
Number Tested	1	14	11	20	22	13	19	100

Longitudinal Analysis - All Students

2001 Assessment

Grades	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total Tested
Overall Proficiency		Number and Percent of Students at Each Overall Proficiency Level												
Advanced	**********	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Early Advanced	**********	1 14.0%	3 19.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 42.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 16.0%
Intermediate	**********	1 14.0%	6 38.0%	8 67.0%	3 50.0%	5 42.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	23 42.0%
Early Intermediate	**********	3 43.0%	6 38.0%	3 25.0%	3 50.0%	2 17.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	19 35.0%
Beginning	**********	2 29.0%	1 6.0%	1 8.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 7.0%
Number Tested	2 100.0%	7 100.0%	16 100.0%	12 100.0%	6 100.0%	12 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	55 100.0%

2002 Assessment

Grades	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total Tested
Overall Proficiency		Number and Percent of Students at Each Overall Proficiency Level												
Advanced	0 0.0%	**********	2 29.0%	4 25.0%	1 8.0%	2 33.0%	2 17.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	11 20.0%
Early Advanced	0 0.0%	**********	2 29.0%	3 19.0%	7 58.0%	3 50.0%	1 8.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	16 29.0%
Intermediate	0 0.0%	**********	1 14.0%	1 6.0%	3 25.0%	1 17.0%	3 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 18.0%
Early Intermediate	0 0.0%	**********	1 14.0%	5 31.0%	1 8.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 13.0%
Beginning	0 0.0%	**********	1 14.0%	3 19.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	11 20.0%
Number Tested	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	7 100.0%	16 100.0%	12 100.0%	6 100.0%	12 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	55 100.0%

*** Summary data is not provided for groups of three or less.