

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

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

Official School Name Richardson D. White Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 744 East Doran Street
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Glendale California 91206-2496
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (818) 241-2164 Fax (818) 409-8974

Website/URL www.gusd.net Email srisse@gusd.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.

(Principal’s Signature) Date

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

Name of Superintendent Mr. James R. Brown
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Glendale Unified School District Tel. (818) 241-3111

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.

(Superintendent’s Signature) Date

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mr. Chakib Sambar
(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.

(School Board President’s/Chairperson’s Signature) Date

PART II – DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 20 Elementary schools
 4 Middle schools
 0 Junior high schools
 5 High schools
 29 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,183

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,183

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

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

4. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

 5 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	54	43	97	7			
1	63	59	122	8			
2	55	73	128	9			
3	62	45	107	10			
4	59	70	129	11			
5	59	70	129	12			
6	58	70	129	Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING							835

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>61.1</u> | % White |
| <u>1.7</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>23.1</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>6.7</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>0</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 20.1 %

(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 <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year	70
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year	99
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	169
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	839
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) Divided by total in row (4)	203
(6)	Amount in row (5) Multiplied by 100	20%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 46.3%
392 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 4
 Specify languages: **Armenian** **Filipino** **Farsi**
Spanish **Korean**

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 48 %
399 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: $\frac{7.9}{67}$ % Total Number of Students Served

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

<u>14</u> Autism	<u> </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u> 3</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>19</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>22</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> 8</u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u> 1</u> 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)	<u> 2</u>	<u> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u> 37</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u> 2</u>	<u> 2</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u> 1</u>	<u> 17</u>
Support staff	<u> </u>	<u> 3</u>
Total number	<u> 42</u>	<u> 22</u>

12. Student-“classroom teacher” ratio: **Primary 20:1 and Upper Grades 31:1**

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

	2001-2002	2000 -2001	1999 -2000	1998 -1999	1997 -1998
Daily students attendance	88.6%	95.2%	95.3%	95.4%	96.5%
Daily teacher attendance	89.9%	90.6%	NA	NA	NA
Teacher turnover rate	10%	25%	29.2%	15.9%	15%
Student dropout rate					
Student drop-off rate					

Question # 13:

In 1999-00, the teacher turnover rate was 29.2%. That year 12 out of 41 certificated staff members left R. D. White for the following reasons:

- 1 move out of the area
- 1 transfer
- 1 resignation
- 2 promotional opportunities
- 2 retirements
- 5 child care leaves

In 2000-01, the rate was 25%. That year 10 out of 40 certificated staff members left R. D. White for the following reasons:

- 1 child care leave of absence
- 1 promotional opportunity
- 2 transfers
- 3 resignations
- 3 moved out of the area

The other years turnover rate ranges from 10% to 15.9%.

PART III – SUMMARY

R. D. White Elementary School is located in Glendale, California. The charming, old two-story building has a frontage walkway flanked by grass, redwood and oak trees. R.D. White opened its doors in 1915 with one principal and two classroom teachers. Over the last century, it has grown to a staff of 37 classroom teachers, eight education assistants, two administrators, and additional support staff. One of 20 elementary schools in the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD), it is a multi-track, year round educational learning center serving the needs of approximately 840 general and special education students, in grades K-6. The school has 30 classrooms, library, cafeteria, office space, large playground and separate kindergarten play yard with new equipment. R.D. White has an auditorium complete with refurbished seats, theatre lighting and a state of the art sound system.

Upon entering the school, visitors are visually drawn to a large mural of the school's mascot, the R. D. White Mustang. Bulletin boards display a variety of student work, special event notices, school news and photos of students both past and present. From the hallways to the playground, in every corner, student interaction and learning can be seen.

The various languages represented among our students and their families reflect our culturally diverse community. The student population consists of: White, including Middle Eastern - 62%, Hispanic - 23.5%, Asian - 6.7%, Filipino - 6.1% and African American - 1.7%. The school community is made up of local businesses and a residential area that consists of single-family homes, apartments and condominiums. Although challenged by unemployment, poverty, increasing single-parent families and budget cuts, our students continue to meet and exceed targets on statewide tests. Based on the belief that all students can achieve high and rigorous standards, a vision statement was created and is reflective of our school Culture, student strengths, needs and values of the community. The R. D. White community aspires to attain high academic achievement and promotes lifelong learning; fosters social responsibility, mutual respect and appreciation of diversity; and provides a safe and nurturing environment. The R.D. White 2005 Strategic Plan includes clear objectives to attain these goals.

One of the most important facets of our organization is parent involvement. Families repeatedly tell us that they have moved into the R.D. White area because of its reputation for excellent programs, dedicated teachers, and a high level of family participation. Parents volunteer in our classrooms, after school programs, fund raising events and participate in other various organizations such as the Dad's Club, Parent Teacher Association, Foundation, School Site Council, Gifted and Talented Education Advisory Board and Safety Committee. According to the Client Survey, parents have indicated a high approval rating for both the school and the challenging instructional programs offered.

Modernization and upgrades are currently taking place at R. D. White funded by Measure K funds. The entire school has internet access, and through renovation, a media center will be constructed with expanded library space and a computer lab.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. See appendices.

2. Assessment data is critical in understanding and improving student and school performance. Assessment of how well our students are meeting or exceeding grade level standards involves everyone from the district and site administrators to teachers, parents and students. Standardized, district and classroom assessments are aligned with the California Standards for Student Achievement. The *Multiple Measures Assessment Data* binder contains desegregated data which is reviewed by administrators, teachers and parents. The School Site Council and R. D. White Planning Team use this data to set learning objectives for the school and targeted student groups. Data is gathered to provide a framework for curriculum and instruction. Grade levels meet to analyze and evaluate student work. Data from district benchmarks in mathematics is used to target specific areas and standards of need which is disaggregated by standard so that instruction is focused on specific standards and skills. Assessment data provides the basis for our 2005 plan and helps us to establish targets, set objectives and goals, determine the best use of our resources and show where individual interventions are needed in terms of tutoring and intersession. As an integral part of classroom instruction, students assess their own work using checklists and rubrics.

As a result of last year's assessments in writing benchmark scores, staff determined that writing be the schoolwide goal for 2002-2003. Professional development in *Write From the Beginning* took place in July, followed by monthly grade level meetings used to discuss successes and challenges and to share student work. Teachers reviewed individual student results in writing and targeted classroom instruction based on student need. Monthly writing prompts indicate growth and further guide instruction. Through both formative and summative assessments, staff members make instructional decisions and refine their practice.

3. Assessment data is communicated to parents and students on a regular basis. Progress reports are sent home at the six week point, which are indicators of the progress made toward the trimester grades students receive in all academic areas. The SAT 9 standardized test results are sent home with translations as necessary to indicate each student's comparison to the national norm reference group. Parents receive benchmark scores and, for the first time, will receive CELDT (California English Language Development Test) results indicating progress towards fluency in English language development. Local newspapers report the results of our Academic Performance Index (API) score and SAT 9 scores. These results are also available on the district and California Department of Education web sites.

To ensure that all stakeholders understand the standards for judgment and the meaning of the data, we meet with the PTA and hold special parent meetings. Parents participate in School Site Council and also receive a detailed report and explanation of schoolwide assessment results. Teachers conference with parents regularly to report student progress. The Standards-Based Student Achievement Report is sent home each trimester and indicates progress made toward meeting state standards in all academic areas as well as effort, work habits and social skills. There is constant communication with parents via phone calls, contracts, teacher-generated reports and conferences. Many teachers have established classroom web sites so parents have access to homework, teacher tips and ideas for projects while off track. In upper grades, each student has a binder reminder used to record homework, project due dates and classroom progress. Parents are able to write back to the teacher with questions or concerns.

Finally, the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) is available on the GUSD website and on site. It gives detailed information to the community regarding students' achievement and testing as well as quality of instruction and leadership, services and school profile.

4. Forums for sharing successes with other schools already occurs within the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD). The district is divided into three clusters; each cluster includes the high school and the middle and elementary schools which feed into it. R. D. White is part of the Glendale High School cluster (GHS) and the administrators at each site meet monthly for administrator training,

information dissemination and to share successes. The meetings are held at each school site on a rotating basis, therefore, providing the opportunity for other site administrators to observe classrooms and teachers demonstrating exemplary practices. Site administrators regularly volunteer staff members who are experts in specific areas to provide demonstration lessons, model best practices or share curricular expertise.

Successes are also shared from school to school via teachers. There is regular articulation between our sixth grade teachers and the middle school; this will be a perfect forum for discussing and sharing strategies and programs which are linked to successful student outcomes. We are currently working with another site on our newest program, *Write From the Beginning*, to share challenges and successes. Successful programs are offered to other sites for training on their staff development days. The district encourages sites to communicate what we do well so that we all learn from each other.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. R. D. White is committed to providing a comprehensive and challenging learning experience for each student via a comprehensive curriculum. All curricular areas are based on the California State Standards and learning tools, which include adopted textbooks, are closely aligned. In Language Arts a holistic approach is used with attention focused on the developmental acquisition of skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing. The development of reading and writing includes phonemic awareness, fluency, decoding and comprehension. Students gain fluency and confidence over time and strength in reading and writing both narrative and expository text through the state adopted series *Harcourt Brace Signatures*, *Write From the Beginning* and high quality literature. English Language Learners (ELL) and struggling readers have access to the same curriculum with modifications.

The math curriculum is based on the premise that students will become proficient in the areas of basic computational skills, conceptual understanding and problem solving. Thus, students are immersed early on in activities which encourage high-level thinking. The *Everyday Math* program provides a rigorous course of study with engaging activities in a spiral format. Students have multiple opportunities for skills practice as well as problem solving, which help them see and experience the value and need for proficiency in math in the real world. The goal of our math program is that students learn math skills and develop mathematical intuition and understanding.

In Social Studies, the curriculum supports the belief that in order for students to become contributing citizens to their community they must develop an understanding and appreciation of our past and how it affects us today. The curriculum begins with building students' understanding of their place in their community, to their city, state, country and the world. Historical knowledge and skill development is emphasized through the district-adopted text, but teachers use a wide variety of activities to bring history to life including real life enactments, projects, dioramas, historical drama, and literature. The *Conflict Resolution* program provides for the development of concrete skills. The *History Alive!* in upper grades enables students to role play significant historical events. The *Character and Ethics Project* is dedicated to encouraging good character and ethical behavior at home and in our communities through "word of the month" activities. Field trips to the Museum of Tolerance, San Gabriel Mission and fire station also help students connect social studies concepts to their lives.

Hands-on investigation forms the core for which science instruction occurs. Students at all levels study the areas of life, earth and physical science with focus on utilization of the scientific method and technology to develop science projects. Enrichment opportunities are provided through field trips to the Los Angeles Zoo and Long Beach Aquarium. On-site assemblies such as Wild Life on Wheels enable students to discover and learn about the natural world. Investigation and experimentation are infused throughout each concept at all grade levels.

The Arts curriculum offers students opportunities to invent and imagine. Students K-6 learn about the history and importance of art, study famous artists and their styles, practice various artistic techniques and create their own artwork through a variety of media. In upper grades, students may choose to participate in the instrumental music program and the Bob Whites Choral and Drama program. Two yearly drama productions, two music presentations and monthly flag ceremonies take place on site. Students visit the Getty Museum, Los Angeles County Museum of Art and attend theater productions at the local Alex Theater.

The Health and Physical Education of our students is important in that healthy, fit bodies contribute to academic achievement. Students gain skills through explicit instruction and games. The ability to make healthy choices is taught through the DARE program in sixth grade in collaboration with the Glendale Police Department and through Here's Looking at You, a K-6 program designed to prevent drug abuse. The district provides support through the TUPE (Tobacco Use Prevention Education) program.

Students have multiple opportunities to use technology across the curriculum. The district strategic plan guides staff in teaching keyboarding, research and presentation skills.

2. At R. D. White, teaching reading is our highest priority. Our school offers a balanced, meaning-centered reading curriculum with the California Language Arts Standards serving as the foundation for

the program. The district curriculum addresses the integration of listening, speaking, reading and writing and the state-adopted series, *Harcourt Brace Signatures*, was selected based on its strength in these areas.

Through professional development and teacher preparation, our staff is equipped with the skills and underlying theory that supplies them with a repertoire of techniques that enable all students to learn to read. We use a holistic approach with emphasis on decoding and comprehension. Staff matches students with reading material at the correct instructional level in order to improve reading. In the primary grades, explicit skills instruction is used along with sharing literature and providing language-rich experiences that ensure students will be reading and writing proficiently by third grade. Through literature circles, author studies and continued emphasis on writing, upper grade students continue to sharpen their skills in preparation for middle school.

A focus this year is on professional development using the book *Strategies That Work* by Harvey and Goudis. The book highlights ten teaching strategies research has shown to have the greatest impact on students reading. These include helping students make personal connections to literature, question, visualize and make inferences. The computer-based Accelerated Reader program provides motivation for students, comprehension tests and detailed information on student strengths and suggestions for improvement.

Other contributors to our success is the well-stocked library and our annual Read-A-Thon. By reading over 2 million pages annually, our school has received \$5000 in new books through the Governor's Reading Program for the past three years.

We believe this holistic, meaning-centered approach best meets the needs of our diverse student population.

3. Our goal is to attain high academic achievement. Research indicates that improved writing skills leads to improved performance in all academic areas. Therefore writing was identified as an R.D. White schoolwide curriculum focus for the past two years based on student data. Staff chose *Write From the Beginning (WFTB)*, a developmental K-6 writing program, as the tool that gives both students and teachers the knowledge and skills necessary for age-appropriate writing instruction and achievement. Through *WFTB*, teachers have developed a common, targeted focus and shared accountability for schoolwide writing performance. Students are taught writing terminology, concepts and, through the use of graphic organizers (also known as thinking maps), are able to organize and plan for their writing. These graphic organizers help all students, but they are essential for English Language Learners and struggling students who need an even more explicit, visual tool. Teachers build and extend upon instruction from previous grade levels, using rubrics and focused mini-lessons. Self-assessment and editing skills enable students to self-assess and achieve high writing performance. Teachers are able to assess individual writing performance according to the GUSD developed essential standards, as well as the overall writing achievement of the classroom. *Write From the Beginning* addresses state writing standards with an emphasis on GUSD essential writing standards.

Writing takes place in every classroom everyday in a variety of ways. Students record their ideas and thoughts in journals. Writing takes place across the curriculum through responses to literature, biographies, student-generated books, science and math journals, creative writing, poetry, and expository test. Students are instructed according to individual levels of writing achievement. Regardless of grade level placement, they write regularly as homework assignments in all content areas. Teachers give monthly writing prompts to gauge learning and to guide instruction.

4. At R. D. White, varied instructional methods are used to improve student learning. Classrooms are highly interactive and provide instruction, constructive feedback, and high levels of engagement using appropriate materials and activities. In Language Arts, teachers utilize guided reading, shared reading and whole group instruction to develop fluency and comprehension. Teachers read to children and read with children in Reading Workshops and Literature Circles. Speaking and listening skills are taught and practiced during conferencing activities, Author's Chair and the publishing of written work. Teachers model good writing and facilitate student writing during Writer's Workshops and in the course of journaling. Mathematics instruction includes direct instruction, investigation, classroom discussion and drill and manipulatives. Social Studies incorporates the use of project learning, role playing, discussion and cooperative groups. Science instruction relies heavily on experimentation, investigation and

discovery. Problem solving and comprehension, with an emphasis on higher-order thinking skills, is emphasized in all our instruction.

Whole group instruction is used when objectives are appropriate for the range of learners in the classroom. Homogeneous groups may be used for specific skills and strategies in order to customize instructional delivery based on student needs. Group size is differentiated according to the needs of students with flexible grouping taking place throughout the day.

Instructional methods vary according to student need. Teachers provide English Language Learners with explicit instruction, modeling, practice, corrective feedback and encouragement. Overall, instructional practices at R. D. White can be said to be balanced, flexible and designed to accommodate student needs.

5. R.D. White staff recognizes the importance of ongoing professional development; it is integral to improved student achievement. Targeted areas for training are determined by staff needs assessment and student data results via the *Multiple Measures Assessment Data* binder. Thus, professional development is tied directly to student needs and supports our annual schoolwide instructional focus. Weekly banking days (students are dismissed early on Mondays) allow for grade level meetings and staff development opportunities.

Staff development may have a schoolwide focus or, at times, a grade level focus. This year, as a result of data analysis, we have instituted schoolwide the *Write From the Beginning* program that targets improving the writing skills of our students. However, staff recognizes the importance of ongoing training, therefore, monthly grade level meetings are utilized to share student results, successful strategies and ideas to hone practice. Staff also received training in strategies for working with special education/inclusion students during a full day of training last summer. Banking days have been used for ongoing training of all staff in *Strategies That Work*.

Teachers in grades 4-6 received training in Guided Reading for Upper Grades, *History Alive!*, and Math Content and Pedagogy. Primary teachers were trained in Early Literacy Inservice, Specially Designed Instruction in Academic English (SDAIE) and Differentiated Instruction. Several staff members have served as mentor or consulting teachers and train or give support to teachers.

All staff are trained in basic computer knowledge, accessing and using internet for research in the classroom and publication and presentation tools.

Peer collaboration and classroom observation are regarded as excellent models for sharing teacher strengths and assists teachers in their individual needs for staff development.

APPENDIX
ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Test: Stanford Achievement Test, 9th edition (SAT 9),_Form T: 1995, Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

What groups were excluded from testing? All students were tested except those exempted by parent waiver. Students with severe disabilities were tested using alternate assessments.

Scores are reported here as National Percentile Ranks. The subgroups included below are those that have been reported by the California Department of Education as part of their Internet results posting each August.

Grade 2 Reading	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	55	61	53
Number of students tested	96	115	109
Percent of total students tests	92.3%	95.8%	97.4%
Number of students excluded	8	5	3
Percent of students excluded	7.7%	4.2%	2.6%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	50	58	44
2. MALE STUDENTS	56	54	46
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	55	66	57
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	47	52	49
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	62	70	59

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	55	55	52

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	52	50	48

Grade 3 Reading	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	56	50	43
Number of students tested	117	113	136
Percent of total students tests	99%	99%	99%
Number of students excluded	1	1	1
Percent of students excluded	1%	1%	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	51	37	34
2. MALE STUDENTS	51	45	37
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	60	54	48
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	46	46	38
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	63	54	49

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	54	50	49

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	47	46	44

Grade 4 Reading	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	53	51	50
Number of students tested	117	128	116
Percent of total students tests	88.6%	94.8%	93.5%
Number of students excluded	15	7	8
Percent of students excluded	11.4%	5.2%	6.5%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	39	29	38
2. MALE STUDENTS	43	47	48
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	60	54	52
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	44	43	37
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	62	59	63

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	54	53	51

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	50	47	45

Grade 5 Reading	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	50	50	43
Number of students tested	131	119	112
Percent of total students tests	93.5%	96%	96.5%
Number of students excluded	9	5	4
Percent of students excluded	6.5%	4%	3.5%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	30	24	28
2. MALE STUDENTS	44	48	39
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	54	52	47
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	44	39	34
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	54	62	51

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	51	49	46

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	46	45	44

Grade 6 Reading	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	50	46	48
Number of students tested	119	113	138

Percent of total students tests	92.9%	96.5%	99%
Number of students excluded	9	4	1
Percent of students excluded	7.1%	3.5	1%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	27	27	22
2. MALE STUDENTS	49	47	44
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	51	46	52
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	41	36	40
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	59	55	60

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	56	54	56

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	49	48	47

Grade 2 Mathematics	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	65	66	67
Number of students tested	100	120	112
Percent of total students tests	96%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	4	0	0
Percent of students excluded	4%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	63	64	57
2. MALE STUDENTS	70	64	61
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	59	67	71
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	60	56	59
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	70	76	76

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	69	66	67

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	62	59	57

Grade 3 Mathematics	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	69	64	59
Number of students tested	118	114	137
Percent of total students tests	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES			

1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	68	56	53
2. MALE STUDENTS	63	64	56
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	73	64	61
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	58	59	54
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	77	69	64

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	72	65	65

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	64	61	57

Grade 4 Mathematics	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	70	64	58
Number of students tested	123	135	124
Percent of total students tests	93%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	9	0	0
Percent of students excluded	7%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	59	44	47
2. MALE STUDENTS	65	62	56
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	73	65	60
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	64	57	48
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	74	71	68

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	69	65	63

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	58	54	51

Grade 5 Mathematics	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	66	65	59
Number of students tested	133	124	116
Percent of total students tests	95%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	7	0	0
Percent of students excluded	5%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. ENGLISH LEARNERS	50	37	47
2. MALE STUDENTS	66	63	58
3. FEMALE STUDENTS	66	67	60

4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	66	58	51
5.NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	67	72	66

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	69	66	62

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	58	55	51

Grade 6 Mathematics	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 02	April/May 01	April/May 00
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score	66	68	63
Number of students tested	123	117	139
Percent of total students tests	96%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded	5	0	0
Percent of students excluded	4%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS	40	52	38
2.MALE STUDENTS	63	71	64
3.FEMALE STUDENTS	69	66	62
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	57	59	58
5.NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	73	75	71

DISTRICT SCORES			
District Mean Score	77	73	72

STATE SCORES			
State Mean Score	62	60	57

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS: CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS

These tests have been designed specifically to assess progress toward meeting California state standards. These tests were first administered in spring 1999. Raw scores only were provided until 2001 when performance levels for English Language Arts were first assigned. Performance levels for Mathematics were first provided by the state in 2002.

Data Display Table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics. The subgroups included below are those that have been reported by the California Department of Education as part of their Internet results posting each August.

English Language Arts: Grade 2	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	73%	86%	
At or Above Proficient	35%	40%	
At Advanced	13%	10%	
Number of students tested	95	115	
Percent of total students tested	91%	93%	
Number of students excluded	9	9	
Percent of total students excluded	9%	7%	
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	69%	81%	
At or Above Proficient	27%	35%	
At Advanced	8%	8%	
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	72%	80%	
At or Above Proficient	41%	32%	
At Advanced	14%	8%	
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	72%	91%	
At or Above Proficient	27%	46%	
At Advanced	11%	12%	
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	68%	77%	
At or Above Proficient	33%	23%	
At Advanced	7%	3%	
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	76%	95%	
At or Above Proficient	36%	57%	
At Advanced	17%	18%	

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	70%	70%	
At or Above Proficient	38%	38%	
At Advanced	11%	12%	

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	63%	61%	
At or Above Proficient	32%	32%	
At Advanced	9%	10%	

English Language Arts: Grade 3	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000

SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	77%	67%	
At or Above Proficient	39%	38%	
At Advanced	11%	9%	
Number of students tested	116	112	
Percent of total students tested	98%	98%	
Number of students excluded	2	2	
Percent of total students excluded	2%	2%	
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	75%	55%	
At or Above Proficient	35%	22%	
At Advanced	9%	1%	
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	69%	67%	
At or Above Proficient	31%	39%	
At Advanced	10%	9%	
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	85%	66%	
At or Above Proficient	47%	37%	
At Advanced	13%	9%	
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	71%	63%	
At or Above Proficient	25%	29%	
At Advanced	4%	4%	
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	82%	69%	
At or Above Proficient	51%	46%	
At Advanced	17%	14%	

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	73%	67%	
At or Above Proficient	42%	36%	
At Advanced	13%	12%	

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	62%	59%	
At or Above Proficient	34%	30%	
At Advanced	11%	9%	

English Language Arts: Grade 4	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	80%	81%	

At or Above Proficient	42%	38%	
At Advanced	12%	7%	
Number of students tested	115	127	
Percent of total students tested	87%	91%	
Number of students excluded	17	12	
Percent of total students excluded	13%	9%	
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	70%	61%	
At or Above Proficient	25%	17%	
At Advanced	1%	0%	
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	71%	74%	
At or Above Proficient	29%	27%	
At Advanced	6%	3%	
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	86%	86%	
At or Above Proficient	50%	48%	
At Advanced	16%	10%	
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	78%	75%	
At or Above Proficient	26%	29%	
At Advanced	10%	4%	
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	83%	86%	
At or Above Proficient	58%	48%	
At Advanced	14%	10%	

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	79%	76%	
At or Above Proficient	44%	39%	
At Advanced	18%	13%	

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	71%	66%	
At or Above Proficient	36%	33%	
At Advanced	14%	11%	

English Language Arts: Grade 5	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	83%	74%	
At or Above Proficient	32%	33%	
At Advanced	10%	9%	
Number of students tested	131	118	

Percent of total students tested	94%	92%	
Number of students excluded	9	10	
Percent of total students excluded	6%	8%	
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	70%	42%	
At or Above Proficient	10%	0%	
At Advanced	2%	0%	
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	77%	70%	
At or Above Proficient	22%	29%	
At Advanced	5%	8%	
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	88%	78%	
At or Above Proficient	40%	38%	
At Advanced	14%	11%	
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	81%	62%	
At or Above Proficient	27%	25%	
At Advanced	7%	3%	
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	86%	86%	
At or Above Proficient	37%	41%	
At Advanced	13%	16%	

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	78%	72%	
At or Above Proficient	37%	35%	
At Advanced	11%	9%	

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	71%	66%	
At or Above Proficient	31%	28%	
At Advanced	9%	7%	

English Language Arts: Grade 6	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	72%	72%	
At or Above Proficient	29%	25%	
At Advanced	8%	4%	
Number of students tested	119	112	
Percent of total students tested	93%	94%	
Number of students excluded	9	7	
Percent of total students excluded	7%	6%	

SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	50%	49%	
At or Above Proficient	2%	4%	
At Advanced	0%	0%	
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	70%	77%	
At or Above Proficient	28%	17%	
At Advanced	10%	4%	
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	75%	70%	
At or Above Proficient	31%	35%	
At Advanced	7%	5%	
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	69%	65%	
At or Above Proficient	22%	16%	
At Advanced	3%	0%	
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	74%	80%	
At or Above Proficient	36%	34%	
At Advanced	13%	8%	

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	78%	76%	
At or Above Proficient	42%	39%	
At Advanced	13%	11%	

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	66%	67%	
At or Above Proficient	30%	31%	
At Advanced	9%	9%	

Mathematics: Grade 2	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	81%		
At or Above Proficient	53%		
At Advanced	18%		
Number of students tested	100		
Percent of total students tested	96%		
Number of students excluded	4		
Percent of total students excluded	4%		
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	78%		

At or Above Proficient	49%		
At Advanced	17%		
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	78%		
At or Above Proficient	58%		
At Advanced	28%		
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	85%		
At or Above Proficient	48%		
At Advanced	7%		
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	74%		
At or Above Proficient	53%		
At Advanced	21%		
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	87%		
At or Above Proficient	53%		
At Advanced	15%		

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	76%		
At or Above Proficient	51%		
At Advanced	22%		

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	68%		
At or Above Proficient	43%		
At Advanced	16%		

Mathematics: Grade 3	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	80%		
At or Above Proficient	44%		
At Advanced	11%		
Number of students tested	117		
Percent of total students tested	99%		
Number of students excluded	1		
Percent of total students excluded	1%		
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	78%		
At or Above Proficient	42%		
At Advanced	13%		
2.MALE STUDENTS			

At or Above Basic	76%		
At or Above Proficient	42%		
At Advanced	8%		
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	85%		
At or Above Proficient	47%		
At Advanced	14%		
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	68%		
At or Above Proficient	35%		
At Advanced	4%		
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	90%		
At or Above Proficient	52%		
At Advanced	17%		

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	77%		
At or Above Proficient	50%		
At Advanced	18%		

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	65%		
At or Above Proficient	38%		
At Advanced	12%		

Mathematics: Grade 4	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	79%		
At or Above Proficient	52%		
At Advanced	16%		
Number of students tested	123		
Percent of total students tested	93%		
Number of students excluded	9		
Percent of total students excluded	7%		
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	69%		
At or Above Proficient	42%		
At Advanced	11%		
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	75%		
At or Above Proficient	43%		
At Advanced	15%		

3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	81%		
At or Above Proficient	58%		
At Advanced	17%		
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	77%		
At or Above Proficient	42%		
At Advanced	13%		
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	81%		
At or Above Proficient	63%		
At Advanced	20%		
DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	78%		
At or Above Proficient	50%		
At Advanced	19%		

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	67%		
At or Above Proficient	37%		
At Advanced	13%		

Mathematics: Grade 5	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	82%		
At or Above Proficient	43%		
At Advanced	11%		
Number of students tested	133		
Percent of total students tested	95%		
Number of students excluded	7		
Percent of total students excluded	5%		
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	74%		
At or Above Proficient	30%		
At Advanced	4%		
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	75%		
At or Above Proficient	47%		
At Advanced	16%		
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	88%		

At or Above Proficient	40%		
At Advanced	7%		
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	85%		
At or Above Proficient	39%		
At Advanced	8%		
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	79%		
At or Above Proficient	46%		
At Advanced	13%		

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	78%		
At or Above Proficient	48%		
At Advanced	15%		

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	59%		
At or Above Proficient	29%		
At Advanced	7%		

Mathematics: Grade 6	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	April/May 2002	April/May 2001	April/May 2000
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL			
At or Above Basic	71%		
At or Above Proficient	40%		
At Advanced	10%		
Number of students tested	123		
Percent of total students tested	96%		
Number of students excluded	5		
Percent of total students excluded	4%		
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1.ENGLISH LEARNERS			
At or Above Basic	47%		
At or Above Proficient	15%		
At Advanced	0%		
2.MALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	67%		
At or Above Proficient	38%		
At Advanced	11%		
3.FEMALE STUDENTS			
At or Above Basic	74%		
At or Above Proficient	41%		
At Advanced	8%		
4.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			

At or Above Basic	66%		
At or Above Proficient	35%		
At Advanced	2%		
5. NON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED			
At or Above Basic	76%		
At or Above Proficient	45%		
At Advanced	18%		

DISTRICT SCORES			
At or Above Basic	80%		
At or Above Proficient	53%		
At Advanced	23%		

STATE SCORES			
At or Above Basic	62%		
At or Above Proficient	32%		
At Advanced	10%		