U.S. Department of Education **November 2002**

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

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

Official School Name _____Moreland Discovery School_____
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address _____801 Hibiscus Lane_____
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

San Jose CA 95117 + 2318
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (408) 874-3250 Fax (408) 556-1045

Website/URL ____www.moreland.k12.ca.us/Discovery____ Email__ mcirata@moreland.k12.ca.us_____

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

_____ Date_____
(Principal's Signature)

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

Name of Superintendent ____Dr. Leslie Adelson, Ed.D.
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Moreland Elementary School District Tel. (408) 874-2901

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

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

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

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

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

1. Number of schools in the district:
__7__ Elementary schools
__2__ Middle schools
_____ Junior high schools
_____ High schools

__9__ TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: __$6,934_____

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: __$6,360_____

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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. __5____Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

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

5. Number of students 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	25	35	**60**		**7**			
1	34	26	**60**		**8**			
2	29	30	**59**		**9**			
3	33	28	**61**		**10**			
4	28	24	**52**		**11**			
5	22	29	**51**		**12**			
6					Other			
			TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					**343**

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:

61 % White
2.2 % Black or African American
5.4 % Hispanic or Latino
31.1 % Asian/Pacific Islander
.3 % American Indian/Alaskan Native

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 6.6 %

(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.	**15**
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	**8**
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	**23**
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	**347**
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	**.0662**
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	**6.6**

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 6 %

21 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 14

Specify languages: **Cantonese, Dutch, Farsi, French, Gujarati, Hindi, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, Taiwanese, Telugu, Urdu, Vietnamese, Punjabi, and other non-English Languages**

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 7 %

12 Total Number Students Who Qualify

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

10. Students receiving special education services: __8.7%___
___30____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	____Orthopedic Impairment
____Deafness	__1_Other Health Impaired
____Deaf-Blindness	__4_Specific Learning Disability
____Hearing Impairment	_25_Speech or Language Impairment
____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___	_____
Classroom teachers	___14__	____4___
Special resource teachers/specialists	____1___	____2___
Paraprofessionals	_____	____2___
Support staff	___3__	____4___
Total number	___19__	____12___

12. Student-"classroom teacher" ratio: Grades K-3 = 20:1
Grades 4-5 = 25.75:1
Total Grades (K-5) = 21.4:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students. 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	97.25%	96.76%	97.12%	96.98%	96.03%
Daily teacher attendance	96%*	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
Teacher turnover rate	6%	12.5%	12.5%	7.6%	**
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* We only have figures for this year.
**We did not lose any teachers, instead we added 3 teachers to accommodate our growth from K-2 to K-3.

PART III – SUMMARY

Moreland Discovery School (MDS), San Jose, California, has a unique history unlike that of the other schools in the Moreland District. Rather than beginning with a neighborhood, our school began with a vision:

Moreland Discovery School, a cooperative partnership of parents, teachers, and community, serving the Moreland School District, is an innovative educational program. The program focuses on a curriculum that contributes to the maximum development of the "whole" child, and will equip each student with the confidence and skills necessary to meet future challenges.

As a result of the district's 1994 strategic plan, a committee of community representatives, parents, teachers, and administrators was formed to develop the guidelines for an early childhood center. The resulting recommendations were based on extensive discussion, planning, and research on how children learn. The culmination of the committee's work is the core of Moreland Discovery School, a developmental, parent participation school.

Located in Silicon Valley, MDS opened in the fall of 1995 with 100 kindergarten and first grade students. Due to the school's success and a yearly waiting list for admission, the community demanded the expansion of our original K-2 concept to our current K-5 school. Our school is multi-age in the primary grades, with six each K/1 and 2/3 classrooms. Two fourth and two fifth grades complete our configuration.

The goal of MDS is to develop a partnership between families and the school, and provide a program which focuses on each child's developmental needs. The partnership between home and school is extensive. Prior to enrolling their student, every family agrees to participate in the classroom two hours per week for each child, attend 7 parent education evenings, and one Saturday workday per year. As a model program within our district, county, and state, we have frequent visitors to our campus. California's Early Intervention for School Success program has named us as a demonstration school. From 1997-2001, MDS was a Leadership School in the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative, and we received funds from the Hewlett-Annenberg Challenge Grant. The local university, San Jose State University, places its practicum and student teachers at our campus to be trained in best instructional practices.

The staff is selected on the basis of their background, demonstrated expertise in teaching, and common philosophical beliefs. Teachers use their knowledge of child development as a framework in preparing the learning environment and providing appropriate experiences. Innovative teaching methods, shared leadership at the site, and a strong partnership of teachers and parents has resulted in creating a school on the cutting edge of education. We are a community of learners and leaders. This partnership has helped raise our California Academic Performance Index (API) scores from 842 in 1999 to 902 this year (based on a 1,000 point scale). Our statewide rank on the API is 10, which places us in the top 10% of California schools. Our similar schools rank is 9, which means we are in the top 20% of schools with similar demographics. As a center for excellence in education, we are honored to be a Blue Ribbon Nominee.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Narrative:

California's normed reference assessment is the Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition. All of our grade 2-5 students participate in the annual assessment, which consists of reading, language, spelling, and mathematics. MDS has two subgroups, Asian and white, meeting the California criterion of a subgroup (a minimum of 30 valid scores). Our Asian subgroup has met the state's definition only since 2000-01, however, their data has been included for all four years for consistency of reporting. Please note that there are no scores reported for fifth grade in 1998-99 because we were a K-4 school at that time.

The data tables at the end of the application clearly reflect achievement at a high level over 4 years for all grade levels and subgroups in both reading and math. While the Asian students' scores are oftentimes higher than our white students, the disproportionate size of the two groups limits our ability to draw significant conclusions.

The table below reflects another way of examining our assessment data. It is easier to see progress within subgroups and across time by moving diagonally from 1998-99, to 1999-00, to 2000-01, and then to 2001-02. With our low mobility rate, this table visually displays an increasing level of achievement as our '98-'99 second graders progressed through the grades to fifth grade in '01-'02.

Both subgroups show a notable dip in their fourth grade math scores in 1999-2000. That summer, our fourth and fifth grade teachers took a weeklong mathematics course at San Jose State University which emphasized building their personal knowledge and application of math concepts, and involved an additional 40 hours of math coaching during the 2000-01 school year. The resultant rise in math scores for that cohort of students the following year (fifth grade) validates that building teacher capacity is essential to student improvement. The investment of time and energy into our upper grade mathematics program paid off.

Scores are reported as Percentiles. Italics = not a true subgroup until 2000-01			**2001-2002**	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Total Reading	**SUBGROUP SCORES**					
	Second Grade	Asian	90	89	*79*	*69*
	Third Grade	Asian	87	79	*85*	*83*
	Fourth Grade	Asian	82	88	*93*	*92*
	Fifth Grade	Asian	78	90	*86*	N/A
	Second Grade	White	84	85	76	72
	Third Grade	White	84	82	81	78
	Fourth Grade	White	82	86	80	76
	Fifth Grade	White	86	82	78	N/A
Total Math	Second Grade	Asian	95	96	*91*	*83*
	Third Grade	Asian	96	90	*90*	*85*
	Fourth Grade	Asian	88	89	*79*	*99*
	Fifth Grade	Asian	91	91	*97*	N/A
	Second Grade	White	93	88	82	74
	Third Grade	White	90	85	82	77
	Fourth Grade	White	80	86	68	77
	Fifth Grade	White	90	89	82	N/A

The **California Standards Tests** are the state's criterion-referenced assessments, based on the California standards. Only the data for two years of Language Arts assessments, and one year for Mathematics assessments have been reported with performance standards (basic, proficient, advanced). The state performance target is "proficient." Schools have not been given the cut points for performance standards.

2. *Show in one-half page (approximately 200 words) how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.*

The purpose of our assessment program is to inform instruction and increase every student's success. Assessment data, including SAT9 and all other district assessments, is disaggregated annually by gender, ethnicity, language, categorical funding, etc., and examined by the teaching staff, principal, and School Site Council each fall. Reviewing this data assists us to evaluate and adjust our school program, and allocate our resources appropriately.

In the fall, every teacher receives a disaggregated analysis of his/her students from the results of the 6 multiple measure assessments given the previous spring – 3 for language arts and 3 for math. This gives teachers a baseline for each student in the incoming class, enabling teachers to identify students "at risk" early in the school year, and plan interventions. Multiple measures help us balance the "high stakes test" (SAT9) with actual applications of student learning, augmented further by authentic assessments such as portfolios, a district speech contest, fifth grade ROPEs (Rites of Passage Experiences), an independent I-Search project, presented before a panel of judges, and student led conferences. A standards-based language arts and mathematics assessment program allows teachers to target below grade level students with strategies designed to bolster student success such as lengthened instructional time, flexible groupings, peer/cross age tutoring, and individualized instruction. The principal receives frequent assessment updates in order to track student achievement through the year. Student achievement goals are included as a part of individual staff goals.

3. Describe in one-half page how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.

Teachers meet formally with every parent twice yearly in parent-teacher conferences. The developmental report card reflects student progress toward meeting end-of-year grade-level standards, progress in social and study skills, behavior, and physical skill development.

Our parent community and students understand the standards and performance expectations through classroom meetings beginning in September. In November, parents receive the writing and math rubrics that are used to assess student performance. In March, student-led conferences provide students the opportunity to showcase their work and explain it to their parents. Student portfolios, which include rubric scoring of written and math work, assist students in reflecting upon their achievements and progress.

Program and assessment information is shared with parents through weekly classroom and school newsletters, the school accountability report card, Parent Education Evenings, MDS Council, and School Site Council meetings. The community receives information through superintendent's letters to the community, our web page (www.moreland.k12.ca.us/Discovery), and the Great Schools Silicon Valley Website. A showcase at our local mall displays for the community what students know and are able to do. The principal offers an annual assessment evening to the community to explain the purpose of testing, the different assessments (multiple measures) which are given each year, and factors which influence testing results. Translators are available for ELL families as needed.

4. Describe in one-half page how the school will share its successes with other schools.

Sharing our success through visitations to our school, partnerships with universities, and technology has been our practice over the last five years, and we will continue these if named a Blue Ribbon School. As an Early Intervention for School Success (EISS) Model School, we receive EISS teachers and administrators from all over Northern California. We have hosted Open Houses for our community, and invited local business representatives and state legislators into our school. Recently, teachers and administrators visited MDS as a part of the California Association for the Gifted Conference. Visitors receive docent-led tours of our school with opportunities to visit classrooms and discuss the program with the principal and teaching staff. District Curriculum Specialists and principals bring struggling or developing teachers to our school to view our program. The teachers then return to their schools to apply what they have observed.

Increasing our partnership with additional universities would allow us to expand the number of student teacher placements at MDS. These beginning teachers can then replicate our instructional

practices in the schools where they are hired. Many of our staff members have become district teacher-leaders, facilitating learning teams, conducting staff development throughout the district, and otherwise sharing their work.

Our website provides snapshots of student work and activities. Video presentations are extremely effective in presenting our program, and we are in the process of developing a video to highlight the developmental aspects of our program. We look forward to the greater outreach possibilities that the high-profile Blue Ribbon honor would provide.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Describe in one page the school's curriculum, including foreign languages (foreign language instruction is an eligibility requirement for middle, junior high, and high schools), and show how all students are engaged with significant content, based on high standards.

Language Arts: Literacy is the backbone of the curriculum at MDS, and instruction is based upon California's rigorous standards. Students use reading, writing, listening, and speaking in every subject area and at every grade level. Literacy materials include Harcourt Brace textbooks, core literature selections, an extensive collection of leveled books, and high-interest, low-level selections for struggling readers. Teachers use data from a standards-based battery of literacy assessments to drive literacy instruction that specifically meets the needs of each student. Grade-level teams use writing rubrics and benchmarks to collaboratively assess student writing monthly. Our systematic sequence for the introduction, practice, and mastery of the writing process and genre writing over grades K-5 is aligned with state standards. Listening and speaking activities are integrated throughout the curriculum with daily opportunities to work in large and small groups and practice listening and responding to others' ideas.

Mathematics: Our program develops solid number sense and problem-solving skills through concrete experiences, using manipulatives, before moving on to more abstract concepts. Teachers use a variety of resources such as McGraw Hill Mathematics, Mathland, Investigations, TERC, Math Excursions, Box It and Bag It, teacher-created materials, and materials from experts such as Kim Sutton and Marilyn Burns. Math instruction is differentiated through flexible groupings, differentiated homework, opportunities to test-out of a concept, and extension activities. Math instruction is designed so that students revisit and practice skills they have not mastered, as well as use high-level problem solving skills in real-life math applications. Ongoing assessments give teachers crucial information in planning instruction.

History/Social Science and Science: Based on state standards, these curricula are presented in meaningful context through literature, content reading and writing, fine arts, research, hands-on activities, and field trips. In K/1 classrooms, social science and science themes such as *Oceans*, *Community* and *Rainforests*, based on grade-level content standards, are vehicles for cross-curricular thematic instruction. In our second through fifth grade classrooms, teachers develop expertise in a particular science or social science curriculum. Mixed groups of students then rotate through blocks of instruction presented by the staff expert. Classrooms maintain garden plots, and participate in cooking activities. Science education is enhanced in the fifth grade with a one-week outdoor camp experience.

Visual/Performing Arts: Our students hear and learn music from a variety of cultures. A wide variety of assemblies bring performances such the West Bay Opera, Taiko Drummers, and San Jose Symphony instrumental groups to our children. All students attend several of California Theater Center's plays during the year. Students have frequent opportunities to perform. For example, last year, our six K/1 classrooms presented *The Great Kapok Tree*, with music, spoken parts, dance, musical instruments and costuming as part of their rainforest theme. Students learn to play the song flute in fourth grade and then become eligible for the district's instrumental music program. Parents and teachers provide art education with a program that includes art appreciation, art history, and techniques using different media. Our children receive an education that is grounded in the core academics and completed with robust exposure to, and active involvement in, the arts.

Physical Education: All students participate two hours each week in a formal PE program with specialists from *Rhythm and Moves*, a contract agency. Instruction is aligned with the PE framework and emphasizes the development of healthy habits and a fit lifestyle. Students participate in structured games, fitness activities, self-assessment, and physical fitness testing. Health Education is included in our adopted science curriculum and supplemented with Lion's Quest "Skills for Growing," an alcohol, tobacco, and drug education and community-building program.

2. (Elementary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.

After careful consideration, the Moreland School District selected a research-based balanced approach to reading instruction, which includes explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics, as well as exposure to high quality literature, based on the very successful New Zealand model. The district Literacy Academy and ongoing professional development has provided teachers with knowledge about brain-based learning and reading development. Teachers learn specific instructional strategies to help them differentiate reading instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

Students in all grades are expected to read and comprehend text from a wide variety of genres including fiction, non-fiction, current events, poetry, and drama. Reading instruction includes daily opportunities for all children to read, discuss, analyze, and respond to text at their own instructional reading level. Teachers draw from many different resources to build a differentiated reading curriculum, such as materials from the district-adopted reading series, a large collection of leveled books, a core reading list, well-stocked school and classroom libraries, teacher-created books, newspapers, and other publications. In the primary as well as the upper grades, literature is often related to current science and social studies themes, helping students to move from *learning to read* toward *reading to learn.* Ongoing reading assessment through the use of the district's extensive standards-based assessment system allows teachers to flexibly group students according to changing needs and interests.

3. Describe in one-half page one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

Our mathematics curriculum is aligned with our mission. It is an *innovative* program, develops *the "whole" child*, and *equips children with the confidence and skills* necessary for the future. Through an Annenberg/Hewlett Challenge Grant, we filled our classrooms with extensive collections of manipulatives. Classroom instruction builds from many repeated experiences of concrete activities before moving to abstract work, even in the higher grades. Fourth and fifth graders solve complex algebraic equations using manipulatives. The grant also funded staff development opportunities, such as attending weeklong institutes, which focused on building teachers' math capacity in order to better teach the subject, as well as one-day workshops focused on specific skills and concepts.

Site-based assessments help us monitor student progress in mathematics. In order to get reliable, consistent data, we created a set of number sense assessments based on the K-5 standards. Every student is assessed in September, March, and May, and progress is charted in each of the assessment subtests.

To make math meaningful, real-life applications of math concepts are incorporated within the curriculum. For example, a team of fourth grade students learning about measurement, designed and measured the track for the school walkathon. As a result of our hands-on, meaning-centered curriculum, our students consistently outscore the other district students in problem solving, an essential skill for lifelong success. While rigorous problem solving and divergent thinking are cornerstones of the math program, the life skill of fluency in number facts at appropriate levels is not compromised.

4. Describe in one-half page the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

Teachers use a variety of instructional strategies, which allow for equal access of the curriculum by all students. Examples include parent volunteers, paraprofessional support, peer tutoring, group projects, cross-age tutoring, flexible grouping, one-on-one and small group instruction, cooperative learning, and use of technology. The curriculum is differentiated to provide for the different learning styles and ability levels within each class. Children, who are struggling, receive intervention services from a paraprofessional. Developmental assets in children are fostered through relationships, positive environments, programs, and practices.

Our primary classrooms are organized around two innovative organizational strategies based on resiliency factor research: the multi-age classroom and the opportunity to stay with one teacher for more

than a year. In the multi-age classroom, children have the rare opportunity to learn from regular interactions with students who are older and/or younger than they are. Because the relationships developed with teachers are of key importance to student success, children and parents stay with one teacher for two years, which leads to greater bonding, learning, and connection to the school.

The fourth and fifth grade classrooms are organized by grade level to ensure that teachers can meet the more structured curriculum standards. Students work in mixed groups in weekly enrichment workshops to promote positive cross-grade relationships. Periodic groupings within grade levels allow students to benefit from the diverse and unique teaching styles of each teacher. Upper grade teachers use a variety of strategies including cooperative learning, research methods, hands-on experiences, and simulations.

5. **Describe in one-half page the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement**.

Our highly successful staff development program focuses on a single curricular subject over an extended period of time. The focus area is chosen based on identified needs resulting from data analysis. We recently completed a cycle of intensive work on mathematics. Funds were allocated for teachers to attend week-long institutes as well as single day workshops in math. We purchased and trained teachers in a wide variety of support materials, such as manipulatives, TechPaths, a database of math problems and concepts, and replacement units.

Cross-grade level meetings improved articulation of math concepts across the school. Grade-level teams scored math assessments together and determined next instructional steps. A math consultant worked with our fourth and fifth grade teachers in designing instructional strategies to match the standards. A district math coach provided 40 hours of classroom coaching for 4th and 5th grade teachers. Our math data shows the incredible leap which occurred between the fourth grade class of 1999-00 and the fifth grade class of 2000-01. We extended training to the parents of our struggling students, who were invited to a Parent Education Evening to learn activities and games to help their students gain number sense. Our school began to and continues to outscore the other district schools in the district math assessment at all grade levels.

We are now in the beginning stages of a similar in-depth study of spelling and its integration in writing.

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Reading

Grade: **Second Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	58	54	62	49
Percent of total students tested	97%	96%	95%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	17 students	15 students	*7 students*	*9 students*
Scores	90	89	*79*	*69*
White	36 students	32 students	52 students	37 students
Scores	84	85	76	72

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Math

Grade: **Second Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	60	55	64	49
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	98%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	17 students	15 students	*7 students*	*9 students*
Scores	95	96	*91*	*83*
White	36 students	32 students	52 students	37 students
Scores	93	88	82	74

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Reading

Grade: **Third Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	53	58	46	64
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	18 students	10 students	*7 students*	*9 students*
Scores	87	79	*85*	*83*
White	29 students	44 students	35 students	47 students
Scores	84	82	81	78

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Math

Grade: **Third Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	53	58	46	49
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	18 students	10 students	*7 students*	*9 students*
Scores	96	90	*90*	*85*
White	29 students	44 students	35 students	47 students
Scores	90	85	82	77

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Reading

Grade: **Fourth Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	53	38	59	30
Percent of total students tested	100%	97%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	9 students	5 students	*6 students*	*1 student*
Scores	82	88	*93*	*92*
White	41 students	31 students	46 students	25 students
Scores	82	86	80	76

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Math

Grade: **Fourth Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	53	39	59	30
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	9 students	5 students	*6 students*	*1 students*
Scores	88	89	*79*	*99*
White	41 students	31 students	46 students	25 students
Scores	80	86	68	77

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Reading

Grade: **Fifth Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	No 5th grade
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	40	50	26	N/A
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	N/A
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	N/A
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	8 students	6 students	*2 students*	N/A
Scores	78	90	*86*	N/A
White	30 students	37 students	20 students	N/A
Scores	86	82	78	N/A

Normed Reference Achievement Test Data

Total Math

Grade: **Fifth Grade** Test: **Stanford Achievement Test**
Edition/publication year: **9th Edition/1995** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as Percentiles.
***Italics* = not a true subgroup until 2000-01.**

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**	**1999-2000**	**1998-1999**
Testing Month	May	April	April	No 5th grade
SCHOOL SCORES				
Number of students tested	40	50	26	N/A
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	N/A
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	0%	N/A
SUBGROUP SCORES				
Asian	8 students	6 students	*2 students*	N/A
Scores	91	91	*97*	N/A
White	30 students	37 students	20 students	N/A
Scores	90	89	82	N/A

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade: **Second Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**
Testing Month	May	April
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	91%	95%
At or Above Proficient	78%	78%
At or Above Advanced	36%	39%
Number of students tested	58	54
Percent of total students tested	97%	96%
Number of students excluded	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
Asian	17 Students	15 Students
At or Above Basic	94%	100%
At or Above Proficient	94%	87%
At or Above Advanced	53%	47%
White	36 Students	32 Students
At or Above Basic	94%	94%
At or Above Proficient	80%	75%
At or Above Advanced	31%	38%
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL – all students		
At or Above Basic	63%	61%
At or Above Proficient	32%	32%
At or Above Advanced	9%	10%

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

MATHEMATICS

Grade: **Second Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002
Testing Month	May
SCHOOL SCORES	
TOTAL	
At or Above Basic	95%
At or Above Proficient	90%
At or Above Advanced	68%
Number of students tested	60
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
Asian	17 students
At or Above Basic	100%
At or Above Proficient	100%
At or Above Advanced	88%
White	36 students
At or Above Basic	100%
At or Above Proficient	94%
At or Above Advanced	67%
STATE SCORES	
TOTAL - all students	
At or Above Basic	68%
At or Above Proficient	43%
At or Above Advanced	16%

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade: **Third Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**
Testing Month	May	April
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	98%	93%
At or Above Proficient	82%	64%
At or Above Advanced	45%	28%
Number of students tested	53	58
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
Asian	18 Students	10 Students
At or Above Basic	100%	90%
At or Above Proficient	94%	60%
At or Above Advanced	56%	30%
White	36 Students	44 Students
At or Above Basic	97%	93%
At or Above Proficient	76%	66%
At or Above Advanced	35%	27%
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL - all students		
At or Above Basic	61%	60%
At or Above Proficient	33%	31%
At or Above Advanced	16%	9%

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

MATHEMATICS

Grade: **Third Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002
Testing Month	May
SCHOOL SCORES	
TOTAL	
At or Above Basic	100%
At or Above Proficient	91%
At or Above Advanced	63%
Number of students tested	53
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
Asian	18 Students
At or Above Basic	100%
At or Above Proficient	94%
At or Above Advanced	78%
White	29 Students
At or Above Basic	100%
At or Above Proficient	86%
At or Above Advanced	57%
STATE SCORES	
TOTAL - all students	
At or Above Basic	65%
At or Above Proficient	38%
At or Above Advanced	12%

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade: **Fourth Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**
Testing Month	May	April
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	98%	100%
At or Above Proficient	72%	82%
At or Above Advanced	33%	36%
Number of students tested	53	38
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
Asian	9 Students	5 Students
At or Above Basic	100%	100%
At or Above Proficient	67%	60%
At or Above Advanced	33%	60%
White	41 Students	31 Students
At or Above Basic	98%	100%
At or Above Proficient	56%	90%
At or Above Advanced	34%	32%
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL - all students		
At or Above Basic	70%	66%
At or Above Proficient	35%	33%
At or Above Advanced	14%	11%

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

MATHEMATICS

Grade: **Fourth Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002
Testing Month	May
SCHOOL SCORES	
TOTAL	
At or Above Basic	94%
At or Above Proficient	53%
At or Above Advanced	24%
Number of students tested	53
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
Asian	9 Students
At or Above Basic	89%
At or Above Proficient	78%
At or Above Advanced	56%
White	41 Students
At or Above Basic	98%
At or Above Proficient	46%
At or Above Advanced	17%
STATE SCORES	
TOTAL - all students	
At or Above Basic	67%
At or Above Proficient	37%
At or Above Advanced	13%

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade: **Fifth Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002	**2000-2001**
Testing Month	May	April
SCHOOL SCORES		
TOTAL		
At or Above Basic	100%	98%
At or Above Proficient	75%	71%
At or Above Advanced	35%	29%
Number of students tested	40	50
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
Asian	8 Students	6 Students
At or Above Basic	100%	100%
At or Above Proficient	50%	100%
At or Above Advanced	50%	17%
White	30 Students	37 Students
At or Above Basic	100%	97%
At or Above Proficient	83%	70%
At or Above Advanced	33%	35%
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL - all students		
At or Above Basic	71%	66%
At or Above Proficient	31%	28%
At or Above Advanced	9%	7%

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

MATHEMATICS

Grade: **Fifth Grade** Test: **California Standards Test**
Edition/publication year: **2001 & 2002** Publisher: **Harcourt, Inc.**

No groups were excluded from testing.
Scores are reported as percent of students achieving at each level.
The state target for students is proficient or above.

	2001-2002
Testing Month	May
SCHOOL SCORES	
TOTAL	
At or Above Basic	95%
At or Above Proficient	83%
At or Above Advanced	50%
Number of students tested	40
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percentage of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
Asian	8 Students
At or Above Basic	88%
At or Above Proficient	75%
At or Above Advanced	50%
White	30 Students
At or Above Basic	100%
At or Above Proficient	87%
At or Above Advanced	30%
STATE SCORES	
TOTAL - all students	
At or Above Basic	60%
At or Above Proficient	30%
At or Above Advanced	7%