

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

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

Official School Name James A. Montgomery Elementary School (As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 4000 Simsbrook Drive (If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Houston TX 77045-5628 City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (713) 434-5640 Fax (713) 434-5643

Website/URL Email bmorgan@houstonisd.com

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 Dr. Kaye Stripling (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Houston Independent School District Tel. (713) 892-6300

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. Kevin H. Hoffman, President (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: 211 Elementary schools
 49 Middle schools
 _____ Junior high schools
 36 High schools
 296 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 5,291
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 4,929

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. 9 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	47	57	104	7			
1	52	62	114	8			
2	50	70	120	9			
3	63	75	138	10			
4	67	57	124	11			
5	68	62	130	12			
6				Other-PK	41	47	88
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							818

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>.6</u> | % White |
| <u>48.2</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>50.9</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>.2</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>.1</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 18.6%

(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 <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	99
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	122
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	221
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	813
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.27
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	28

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 35.0 %
286 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 1
 Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 93.3 %
763 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: 5.9 %
48 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>1</u> Autism	<u>2</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u>4</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>22</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>31</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>6</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

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u>35</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>11</u>	<u> </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff	<u>3</u>	<u> </u>
Total number	<u>64</u>	<u>1</u>

12. Student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 22:1

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	1997-1998
Daily student attendance	<u>95.6</u>	<u>95.3</u>	<u>95.8</u>		
Daily teacher attendance	<u>97</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>95</u>		
Teacher turnover rate					
Student dropout rate*					
Student drop-off rate*					

PART III – SUMMARY

James Arlie Montgomery Elementary School is located in a neighborhood in the south area of the Houston Independent School District (HISD) at 4000 Simsbrook Street, Houston, Texas, 77045. Montgomery Elementary is a part of the South District Administrative Unit, the Madison Feeder Pattern, and School Board District IX. Montgomery Elementary endeavors to provide a quality integrated program of instruction to currently 753 students in grades Pre-K through 5. The school opened in the fall of 1960 and has remained a neighborhood school throughout the years.

The goal of Montgomery Elementary is to provide and promote a positive, creative, innovative, futuristic and challenging learning environment for all students through the strong support of all staff, parents, and community members. To fulfill this mission, we must:

1. Put children first.
2. Respect all people involved.
3. Communicate effectively at all times.
4. Motivate and monitor academic achievement.
5. Make available the necessary materials, supplies, and equipment in an organized and efficient working area.

Our school mission and philosophy focus on the creation of learning environments that encourage the development of each child's learning potential. At Montgomery, we provide an academic environment in which all children can succeed and feel good about themselves. Administration provides creative leadership and promotes innovative teaching that encourages open communication among all stakeholders. Such creative instructional programs and curriculum encourage parents to become more involved in the educational process. Our aim at Montgomery is to prepare students to become productive, technologically-minded citizens, and develop marketable skills to meet the challenges in a global society. We establish educational programs that develop the total child through varied academic, physical, and cultural experiences which will ultimately lead to 'No Child Being Left Behind.' All of our educational programs lead to the achievement of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) in all learning areas, National Standards in all subject areas, and objectives of Project Clear using research-based instruction and accountability for results.

Our school follows the Shared Decision-Making (SDM) model which includes the School Steering Council and five standing committees: Parental Involvement, Staffing, Instructions, Human Relations, and Attendance. Quality Circles are utilized to facilitate the problem-solving process. Members of the faculty, staff, parents, and students are involved along with members of the Standing Committees and Quality Circles. Newsletters and calendars are disseminated to parents monthly, and SDMC (Shared Decision-Making Committee) minutes are posted in the school foyer monthly for public review. The SDMC frequently monitors the School Improvement Plan.

Parental involvement and community partnerships are on the rise. Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) membership enrollment figures, Volunteers In Public Schools (VIPS) logs, and sign-in sheets for Open House, Grandparents' Day, assemblies and programs, Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meetings, and Parent workshops and classes provide documentation which indicate a significant increase in the collaboration among students, parents, community, and school.

The ethnic makeup of the student body reflects a population of 47% Black, 52% Hispanic, and 1% White. Eighty-nine (89%) of the student population participates in the free and reduced lunch program, thereby rendering the school eligible for School-Wide Title I status. Approximately 6% of the student population is serviced through Special Education resources. Approximately 32% of the student population has Limited English Proficiency. Montgomery currently has an attendance rate of 95.6% and mobility rate of 18.6% due to economic and social problems that have plagued the school community. We opened the 2002-2003 school year with approximately 49 multi-ethnic staff members: 6% White, 20% Hispanic, and 74% Black. Approximately 88% of the staff members are female and 12% of the staff members are male. Eighteen percent (18%) of the certified staff hold advanced degrees.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Show assessment results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics for at least the last 3 years using the criteria determined by the CSSO for the state accountability system.

The enclosed charts and tables report the scores from our state criterion-referenced (TAAS/English and Spanish) in reading and math for grades 3-5 and reading and math assessments referenced against national norms (Stanford 9/Aprenda) for grades 1 - 5. Third, fourth and fifth grade scores reflect a dramatic decrease in the number of students not passing (at or above basic) between 1999 and 2002 for reading and math. There was a significant increase in the number of students who passed (at or above proficient) between the same time period, in reading and math.

Reading subgroup results between 1999 and 2002 for grades 3-5 are as follows: African American - students not passing decreased from 17% to 8%; whereas, students passing increased from 8% to 25%. Hispanic - students not passing decreased dramatically from 3% to all students being successful; whereas, students passing increased from 18% to 29%. Economically disadvantaged - the number of students not passing decreased from 27% to 14%; whereas, students passing increased from 14% to 27%.

Math subgroup results between 1999 and 2002 for grades 3-5 are as follows: African American - students not passing decreased significantly from 33% to 12%, whereas, students passing increased from 12% to 33%. Hispanic - students not passing decreased dramatically from 14% to 24%; which resulted in 100% passing in 2001-2002. Economically disadvantaged - the number of students not passing decreased from 22% to 12%; whereas, students passing increased from 12% to 22%.

Our students' academic process can be attributed to an increase in the number of certified teachers and vertical team planners. The teachers take advantage of teacher training and staff development opportunities such as: Modelnetic Leadership Training, Project CLEAR, Model Lessons, Execu-Train, Algebra Initiative, Reading/Language Arts, Math Lead Teacher Training and Reading Academy Training. Our teachers are continuing their education through advanced degrees. Tools provided by the district have enhanced the teachers' instructional abilities. Tools most frequently used are: Profile of Academic Student Success (PASS) which allows the teacher to view through technology (laptop) the academic history of our students, On-line Project CLEAR (District Curriculum), and Snapshots developed by the district to prepare the students for the state test (TAKS). Many and varied academic experiences help our students achieve success. Our students' learning activities include hands-on-math and science instruction, the use of technology and manipulatives, and cooperative learning. Thematic Units, Scholastic News, Accelerated Reading, and Core Knowledge are just a few programs that enrich our students' academic learning. The RITE Program (Rodeo Institute for Teacher Excellence), a direct instruction reading program, combines phonics and comprehension for grades Pre-K – 2 and has greatly prepared our students entering third grade. Enrichment and extra curricular activities support our academic programs. It also helps develop and maintain the students' self-esteem which affects student achievement. Through Science Fair, History Fair, Black History Bowl, Science Counts, Hispanic Heritage Programs, field trips, Spelling Bees, Cheerleading, Choir and art classes, our students develop social skills and an appreciation for diverse cultures in our society. Parental involvement plays a major role in our students' success. Parents participate in Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meetings, Parent Workshops, Parent/Teacher Conferences, and as chaperones. Parents learn with their students through hands-on activities on Math and Science Night. Our limited English parents receive instruction in English in classrooms next to their children. Their presence and participation are positive influences on our students. Business and community partners provide instructional support, materials and training. A few of our partners are: H&L Trophies, General Electric Educational Foundation, Hu-Linc Initiative, University Interscholastic League (UIL), YMCA, SERVE Houston, Keep Houston Beautiful, DARE, and the Texas Institute for Arts in Education.

2. Show how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.

Montgomery Elementary utilizes the extensive student assessment data provided by the district's Research, Assessment and Evaluation Department (normed and performance-based testing) and compiled by our principal and Title I Coordinator to analyze students' strengths, needs, and academic performance. Information from assessments facilitates staff when making revisions to the School Improvement Plan and planning for necessary staff development and instructional adjustments. Nationally norm-referenced tests show us how our groups of students compare with students at the same grade level across the nation.

Each year as the students in grades 1-5 participate in the Stanford 9 assessments, we look for indications of extremely good and poor scores to further assess needs of the school, classroom, and students. We use these extremes to screen for gifted and/or special needs. We also use the Stanford 9 aggregated task analysis information for each grade level to show the overall scores on specific academic skills. Analyzing this data helps us develop a consistent scope and sequence of skills and information taught, tested, and mastered at each grade level. The newly developed TAKS state assessment (previously TAAS) is given each year to students in grades 3-5 in the areas of reading, math, and writing.

The aggregated test scores are reviewed by the faculty to identify continuous progress and improvement of the taught curriculum. HISD administers Snapshot tests throughout the year to determine students' strengths and needs. Constantly assessing and evaluating data provide our administrators and teachers with immediate feedback on mastery and non-mastery of specific skills. Each January, a "School Report Card" of assessment data is presented to the media and is sent home to all parents detailing the schools' accountability rating and test results for our school along with invitations to contact the school counselor to assist them with an interpretation of the scores. Every nine weeks, teachers send home a report card of grades. Parents are encouraged to compare their child's report card grades with the achievement test reports and discuss this information at parent teacher conferences. When a child is experiencing difficulty, teachers call the parents to arrange more frequent meetings to focus on the child's specific needs and to discuss what can be done at home to assist the child. Teachers make the evaluation system meaningful to students by providing them with standards for success in daily lessons, monitoring student work, adapting, reviewing, or accelerating the lesson based on the students' needs.

3. Describe how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.

Student grades and the results of assessment data from the District Assessment Plan, Stanford 9/Appendix, and TAKS are communicated to parents in a variety of ways: quarterly report cards, mid-quarter progress reports, Fall and Spring parent conferences, and the year-end school report card provided by the State of Texas. With the assistance of the district's research and assessment department, the state "report card" displays school results. Clear, consistent and timely information is disseminated to parents and community members also at PTA meetings so all stakeholders can understand how the school goals are aligned with the Texas Standard and how students are progressing toward mastery.

In the spring and fall, Promotion Standards are disseminated, and teachers explain them at Open House and during parent conferences. Teachers clarify any questions regarding students' progress and discuss ways both parents and teachers can work together to provide additional support. Our principal's regular home communications include information about our school-wide plans for elevating student achievement and suggestions for home involvement. In monthly SDMC and PTA meetings, our principal and staff members make pertinent presentations that clarify assessment results and highlight our school intervention plans. District newsletters further complement our school's efforts.

4. Describe how the school will share its successes with other schools.

Montgomery Elementary School shares its successes with other schools in a variety of ways such as national, state, and city teacher conferences, share-a-thons, workshops, special guest speakers, and student competitions. At the present time, Montgomery Elementary collaborates with other schools by sharing curriculum ideas through e-mail on the Internet and Marco Polo Internet site.

At Montgomery, we continue to foster multiple curriculum experiences for our teachers with our feeder pattern schools. Curriculum ideas are shared in grades 3-5 through workshops presented in the areas of reading, math, and writing. The Texas Institute Arts in Education Training provides our teachers with integration of the curriculum through the Fine Arts. Many of our teachers provide professional development to our staff through the Core Knowledge integrated curriculum presentations. Our Lead Teachers present Model Lessons to our staff in all content areas. Montgomery Elementary School staff members have presented at the “Schools of Excellence Conference” to the teachers across the Houston area on “How to Build a Science Program,” and “Hands-on Math Activities.” At the National Science Teachers’ Conference (NSTA), developed lessons were presented in the area of Earth Science. During a local share-a-thon, teachers presented great ideas that they learned from NSTA and NCTM. A network of Science Lead teachers through the Hu-Linc initiative continually collaborate and share science lessons. Through district, state, and nationwide student competitions with other schools, Montgomery Elementary School shows the success of our students’ capabilities in different curriculum areas such as the History Fair, Science Fair, Spelling Bee, University Interscholastic League (UIL) competitions, Rainbow Math District competition, and Black History Bowl. Other opportunities to share our success with the community and parents are through PAC parent workshops, PTA meetings, and the Parent Outreach (ESL – Title I) programs to help parents assist their children.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Describe the school's curriculum, including foreign, and show how all students are engaged with significant content, based on high standards.

The goal of Montgomery Elementary is to provide and promote a positive, creative, innovative, futuristic and challenging learning environment for all students. To fulfill this mission, we implement our district's curriculum, Project CLEAR - Clarifying Learning to Enhance Achievement Results. Our curriculum has clearly defined objectives stating what is to be taught and assessed for all subject/content areas. It is an instructional tool for teachers. It is aligned to national/state standards and district exit outcomes. This curricula provides positive opportunities for academic success that no child is left behind.

As our teachers plan for instruction, they use model lessons as provided by Project CLEAR. The model lessons contain a variety of challenging strategies and activities. During grade level and vertical team planning, teachers review and present the lessons, discuss various methods of instruction, combine resources, and suggest how to implement the school's inclusion model and incorporate technology in instruction.

Our curriculum, even with its structure, allows the teachers the creative liberties to present the lessons in a way to meet the diverse needs of the learners. This includes team teaching, small and whole group instruction, individual instruction, the implementation of cooperative learning groups, and differentiated instruction.

Project CLEAR addresses the needs of our diverse learners. It includes modifications for Special Education and ESL. Lesson extensions and projects for Gifted/Talented students are also components of our curricula.

Our curriculum provides standardized test objectives. This careful alignment of instruction prepares our students to be successful on the state mandated Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test, as well as the normed Stanford 9 Achievement and Aprenda Tests.

Project CLEAR provides a sequence of instruction, strategies, activities, and ideas in content areas such as:

LANGUAGE ARTS (ENGLISH)

The Language Arts curricula covers 4 areas: Listening and Speaking, Reading, Writing, Viewing and Representing with critical thinking skills embedded within the 4 areas. These areas are effective in developing oral and written communication. Classroom and school activities such as Journal Writing, Daily Oral Language Program, Spelling Bees, Quarterly Assemblies and Programs, Spanish Essay Writing Contest, Writers in the Classroom-Anthology Project, and Poetry Writing Contests develop communication through speaking, writing, and listening. Thematic units are implemented through Core Knowledge, as well as differentiated learning activities and projects.

Students are active learners during Language Arts instruction. They partner read, work in cooperative groups, and on projects, peer-edit, and write the KONFIDENT KIDS summer school newspaper. To understand mood, students listen to different types of music and draw pictures of what they feel, and write scripts to accompany the music from Louis Armstrong's, "What a Wonderful World."

MATHEMATICS

Varied math programs are available to foster our students' mathematical success. Grade K-1 use Distar Math, a direct instruction to math program with opportunities for hands-on learning. The EXCEL Math (grades 1 - 5) provides practice and maintenance of multiple math skills. Harcourt Brace Math Program (grades 1-5) covers math objectives with student practice, manipulatives, and assessments. Technology for Young Learners Grant increases skills in math through the use of technology. Plato (grades 3-5) provides math practice, maintenance, assessment using technology, and computer generated manipulatives. Project CLEAR model lessons encourage the use of manipulatives, student practice and assessments. We are fortunate to have a Math Lab for grades 3-5 in which students learn problem-solving, mastering math facts, and mathematical reasoning from hands-on activities. Project CLEAR is aligned to our state mandated Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test, as well as

Stanford 9/Aprenda, HISD, and Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) Objectives.

SOCIAL STUDIES

The primary purpose of Social Studies is to prepare our learners to be active, productive participating citizens in a democratic and culturally diverse society. This purpose is achieved through instruction and activities on citizenship, the nature and documents of democracy, rights and responsibilities, and democratic principles. Extension of Social Studies Curriculum comes through the History Fair, Career Day, Field Trips, Guest Performances, Black History Bowl and Program, Hispanic Heritage Program, Virtual Field Trips, and appreciating Diverse Cultures through the Core Knowledge Program.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

To further prepare our students for success in society, we provide Spanish instruction to our English-speaking students in grades 1-5. ESL and Bilingual instruction are available for our Spanish-speaking students. Our school is primarily composed of English and Spanish. Our students communicate with each other, and they unknowingly learn a second language from each other.

2. Describe in the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.

The ability to read and comprehend is the foundation to a child's academic and life long success. Our school's Reading Curriculum includes, first and foremost, Project CLEAR - supported by two additional programs. They are as follows:

The HISD Philosophy of Reading is A Balanced Approach to Reading, comprised of six components (Reading Practice, Phonological Awareness, Alphabetic Awareness, Print Awareness, Orthographic Awareness, Reading Comprehension) which provides a comprehensive balanced reading program that is research based. The district's reading philosophy combines the development of phonological awareness skills and literature rich activities. This philosophy was generated from the PEER Report on Reading in 1996, due to the efforts of the PEER committee consisting of experts in the field of reading, community leaders, parents, district administrators, and teachers.

The Rodeo Institute for Teachers Excellence (RITE) is a reading intervention program for Pre-K through Second grade that targets at-risk students. The Reading Curriculum for the RITE Program is Reading Mastery - SRA/McGraw Hill-Direct Instruction. The RITE Program consists of phonics and comprehension and provides teachers with hands-on method and curriculum materials to teach reading. Training of teachers and support by RITE Master Teachers are assets to the program. Most importantly, students receive intensive personal Direct Instruction in reading daily. The RITE Program was selected because of its success at teaching at-risk students to read. The program 2001-2002 evaluation results reveal: (1) At-risk children, who begin the RITE Program in kindergarten and continue through second grade, perform significantly better than their peers who do not use RITE. The RITE students show improved test scores above national norms by the end of first grade. (2) By the third grade, a significantly higher percentage of RITE-educated students pass the TAAS/TAKS test compared to their peers, who did not use the RITE method.

Implementing the RITE Program has proven to be successful for our students as shown by our Stanford 9 scores:

Year	2000	Our percentile score	26
	2001	Our percentile score	55
	2002	Our percentile score	71

Our growth in Reading Achievement since the beginning of RITE is 45%.

3. Describe 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.

The mission of our school is to follow the Houston Independent School District's Project Clear Guide for Science objectives with suggested lessons which are aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills and National Standards in the area of Science. Monthly and bi-weekly teacher-made, district science snapshots, and commercial tests are given to measure the accomplishments of Stanford 9 and TAKS objectives.

In 1994, the Science Lab was donated to Montgomery Elementary School by Madison High School and was dedicated by the famous African American astronaut, Guion Bluford. Our science program has grown in leaps and bounds due to many wonderful hands-on and field experiences, which coincides with the Project Clear objectives. The Galveston Bay Project developed by Nanda Kirkpatrick, Rice University Program Director, funded part of our pond habitat with matching funds from the Montgomery PTA. We were able to do ocean studies with our ocean tanks from this Project. Students were able to compare differences and similarities between ponds, oceans, and fresh water living organisms.

The Houston Arboretum gave nature classes, and we received a Greenworks Grant to continue to develop a habitat garden around the pond, in which our students created a butterfly, bird, and desert garden. Our third graders went to the Friends of Hermann Park to learn how to do pond studies and to implement those techniques with our pond. Students learned how to classify pond organisms. They also dug up *Lugustrum* to plant around our habitat that the Friends of Hermann Park donated to Montgomery Elementary School. Students have field experiences with testing water from the Galena Creek. Guest speakers from HSPCA, Water Purification Plant, Water Wise Conservation, and Friends of Hermann Park are invited to talk to Kindergarten through fifth grade students about different aspects of the importance of science in connection with the community. The students join the Discovery Lion's Science Club to increase their knowledge about life, earth, and physical science and experiments.

4. Describe the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

To ensure excellence and equity for our students, we must consider our State and District Standards and Goals, District Exit Outcomes, and School Improvement Plan to provide quality academic instruction to meet our student diversity and the needs of our entire student population. Those needs are identified from a combination of recommendations from our SDMC, program instruction and professional development needs assessments, student survey, after-school tutorial program, PASS, and data analyses from tests, including the TAAS, TAKS, Stanford 9, Apenda, publisher textbook, teacher-made, quarterly Snapshots, and our monthly assessments in Reading, Language, Math, and Science. Due to the desire to create environments conducive for exploratory and discovery learning, various instructional methods are employed so that learning is student-centered, and instruction is geared to students' learning styles and multiple intelligences. As a result, teachers act as facilitators, integrate learning and writing throughout the curriculum through the use of units, develop teaching practices which promote student-initiated learning and problem solving, and give students a purpose for learning. Teachers have high expectations and allow students to express themselves, provide constant modeling, create learning experiences that help students feel good about themselves, and involve students in real-life situation learning experiences that are relevant and meaningful. Teachers tailor instruction and provide positive learning environments which affirm that all students can learn. As a result, cooperative learning and small group interactions occur to require students to assume responsibility in completing group learning tasks and promote group interactions. Students work on group projects, peer edit, peer tutor at all grade levels, select topics for reports, develop Science and History Fair projects, learn standards for rubric scoring, assign rubrics to student work, select free-choice activities, take Accelerated Reader tests or work on PLATO activities (computer-generated lessons), create e-books and scrapbooks, echo-read, work with buddies, or work at learning centers. Fourth grade students create costumes and authentic artifacts, construct cave drawings of the early settlers in Texas, recreate the life and times of the Medieval Era by dressing up and having a Feast, and research and reenact the first Thanksgiving. Other methods include the use of the whole language teaching approach, along with developing prior knowledge so students can make connections; immersion of language throughout all subject areas; reading to students, using classroom libraries, novels,

and units; and posing higher order thinking skills questioning techniques to further develop students' oral development and critical thinking skills. Whole-class sharing and reading of novels minimizes fear; maximizes motivation and learning; builds fluency, confidence, and ability to read with inflection and expression; and builds vocabulary and understanding of literary concepts. Everyone reads together which gives students opportunities to practice reading skills, develop high level literary skills, and help students discover more effective strategies. Other methods include teacher-led whole group discussion whereby students brainstorm, contribute to the planning of lessons, exchange ideas, record and write in journals, and save work in portfolios. Instruction strategies are a combination of lecture, discussion, demonstrating, and modeling, brainstorming, role playing, some drill and practice, use of manipulatives and graphic organizers, discovery, and individualized one-on-one tutoring.

5. Describe the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

Montgomery's long-term plan for professional development continues to emphasize and support the Best Practices, which will positively impact and improve student achievement. Staff development each year starts with focusing on goals for learning previously identified at the May staff retreat and School Improvement Plan. After analysis of data, effective teaching strategies, as identified in Part V Question 4, are used to develop curriculum and instruction to maximize student learning; therefore, teachers collaborate and provide support for one another. Support is also provided from the principal, assistant principal, Title I Coordinator, peers, mentor teachers, and supervisors from the Alternative Certification Program (ACP). New teachers attend orientation at the district and our school. Inservices for teachers and staff include classroom management techniques; lesson planning; media and technology; instructional methods to address our students with disabilities and special needs, inclusion models, modifications and accommodations, bilingual, gifted and talented, differentiated instruction, and instruction to facilitate language acquisition and transition for bilingual students; effective teaching strategies; assessments; and Project Clear for all subject areas. Teachers look at the scope and sequence, learning prerequisites, instructional considerations and align content specifications, strategies, activities, and ideas for effective instruction. Training follows 'Best Practices' that have proven successful in improving student achievement. Teachers are trained as mentor teachers, lead teachers, model trainers in all subject areas and act as resource personnel and trainers. To accommodate the various needs of our student population, staff members work collaboratively to analyze student data and programs to provide appropriate instructional strategies and methods to improve student learning and remain current with educational trends, research, programs, and policy impacting education; therefore, flexible scheduling and release time is granted. Mentors guide and support new teachers during the first three years of teaching. Most staff development is provided on-site during Professional Staff Development Days, Faculty Meetings, Grade Level Meetings, and Early Dismissal Days, which provide opportunities for grade level and vertical teams among our feeder patterns schools to meet. Montgomery's staff is unique in that most on-site training is provided by our own staff members. Other training is provided by district personnel, community partnership experts such as Waste in Place/Keep Houston Beautiful partnership and Texas Institute for Arts in Education (TIAE), or contracted area specialists. Participation in off-site training is also encouraged, as well as training through Execu-Train and Classroom Connect. Teachers attend and network at state and professional conferences, including the World Wide Web. Grade level teams meet weekly to evaluate data, assess students' needs, and plan effectively. Our rising student achievement data indicates we are fulfilling our mission to create a caring, creative learning environment to reach all children.

Our SIP addresses the components for the school-wide Title I program using instruction methods based on scientifically research-based strategies:

- to strengthen the core academic program (with emphasis on Reading, Writing, and Math);
- increase time-on-task for student learning in an enriched and accelerated curriculum;
- increase strategies for serving historically under-served populations;
- including strategies for low-achieving and at-risk students, and those not meeting the State's standards.

We have highly trained teachers and quality ongoing professional development to positively impact all children and lead them to meeting the State's standards. Goals of Professional Development are to train school staff, parents, and community leaders. Such training sessions are also conducted at PAC meetings and on Early Dismissal Days. Workshops include assistance with homework, ways to help students at home, Project CLEAR, and English to our Spanish-speaking parents.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - READING

Grade 3

Test TAAS - Reading

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **Students identified as having severe disabilities and were ARD/IEP recommended were excluded from testing. They were assessed by Checklist and Portfolio.**

Year	Number Excluded	Percent Excluded
2001-2002	13	10
2000-2001	10	9
1999-2000	9	7

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Reading

Third Grade - TAAS

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	16	22	36		
At or Above Proficient	84	78	64		
At Advanced	42	53	40		
Number of students tested	98	100	128		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	13	10	9		
Percent of students excluded	10	9	7		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic	23	27	40		
At or Above Proficient	77	73	60		
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	0	9	25		
At or Above Proficient	100	91	75		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	14	22	41		
At or Above Proficient	86	78	59		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	13	13	12		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	87	87	88		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - MATHEMATICS

Grade 4

Test TAAS - Reading

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **Students identified as needing Special Education Services and were ARD/IEP recommended were excluded from testing. They were assessed by the TAAS Release Test, Checklist, Portfolio, and/or SDAA.**

Year	Number Excluded	Percent Excluded
2001-2002	10	10
2000-2001	8	7
1999-2000	5	5

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Reading

Fourth Grade - TAAS

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	10	16	34		
At or Above Proficient	90	84	66		
At Advanced	33	30	25		
Number of students tested	88	106	96		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	10	8	5		
Percent of students excluded	10	7	5		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic	6	11	14		
At or Above Proficient	94	89	86		
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	0	9	18		
At or Above Proficient	100	91	82		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	4	11	18		
At or Above Proficient	96	89	82		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	8	11	12		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	92	89	88		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - READING

Grade 5

Test TAAS - Reading

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **Students identified as needing Special Education Services and were ARD/IEP recommended were excluded from testing. They were assessed by the TAAS Release Test, Checklist, Portfolio, and/or SDAA.**

Year	Number Excluded	Percent Excluded
2001-2002	5	5
2000-2001	8	7
1999-2000	11	10

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Reading

Fifth Grade - TAAS

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	10	23	26		
At or Above Proficient	90	77	74		
At Advanced	33	22	24		
Number of students tested	100	103	101		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	5	8	11		
Percent of students excluded	5	7	10		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic	5	3	17		
At or Above Proficient	95	97	83		
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	3	22	32		
At or Above Proficient	97	78	68		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	4	10	24		
At or Above Proficient	96	90	76		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	8	13	8		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	92	87	92		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - MATHEMATICS

Grade 3

Test TAAS - Mathematics

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **Students identified as needing Special Education Services and were ARD/IEP recommended were excluded from testing. They were assessed by the TAAS Release Test, Checklist, Portfolio, and/or SDAA.**

Year	Number Excluded	Percent Excluded
2001-2002	11	9
2000-2001	8	6
1999-2000	9	6

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Mathematics

Third Grade - TAAS

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	25	34	55		
At or Above Proficient	75	66	45		
At Advanced	9	16	11		
Number of students tested	103	121	132		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	11	8	9		
Percent of students excluded	9	6	6		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic	8	34	41		
At or Above Proficient	82	66	59		
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	0	9	17		
At or Above Proficient	100	91	83		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	12	27	33		
At or Above Proficient	88	73	67		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	13	20	18		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	87	80	82		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - MATHEMATICS

Grade 4

Test TAAS - Mathematics

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **Students identified as needing Special Education Services and were ARD/IEP recommended were excluded from testing. They were assessed by the TAAS Release Test, Checklist, Portfolio, and/or SDAA.**

Year	Number Excluded	Percent Excluded
2001-2002	6	6
2000-2001	6	5
1999-2000	4	4

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Mathematics

Fourth Grade - TAAS

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	3	14	30		
At or Above Proficient	97	86	70		
At Advanced					
Number of students tested	91	106	97		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	6	6	4		
Percent of students excluded	6	5	4		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic	12	17	32		
At or Above Proficient	88	83	68		
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	0	9	24		
At or Above Proficient	100	91	76		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	8	15	30		
At or Above Proficient	92	85	70		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	6	13	20		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	94	87	80		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - MATHEMATICS

Grade 5

Test TAAS - Mathematics

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Students identified as needing Special Education Services and were ARD/IEP recommended were excluded from testing. They were assessed by the TAAS Release Test, Checklist, Portfolio, and/or SDAA.

Year	Number Excluded	Percent Excluded
2001-2002	4	4
2000-2001	12	10
1999-2000	7	6

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

**Data Display Table for Mathematics
Fifth Grade - TAAS**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	6	15	23		
At or Above Proficient	94	85	73		
At Advanced	17	28	11		
Number of students tested	101	105	103		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	4	12	7		
Percent of students excluded	4	10	6		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic	3	8	15		
At or Above Proficient	97	92	85		
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	0	3	14		
At or Above Proficient	100	97	86		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	2	7	14		
At or Above Proficient	98	93	86		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	4	8	8		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	96	92	92		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - READING - SPANISH

Grade 3

Test TAAS - Reading - Spanish

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed No students were excluded.

Number excluded 0

Percent excluded 0

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Reading

Third Grade - TAAS - Spanish

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	0	0	0		
At or Above Proficient	100	100	100		
At Advanced	28	68	89		
Number of students tested	25	19	18		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American *					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	0	0	0		
At or Above Proficient	100	100	100		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	0	0	0		
At or Above Proficient	100	100	100		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	23	24	25		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	77	76	76		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

*Not applicable.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - READING - SPANISH

Grade 4

Test TAAS - Reading - SPANISH

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed No students were excluded.

Number excluded 0

Percent excluded 0

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Reading

Fourth Grade - TAAS - Spanish

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000*	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	19	0			
At or Above Proficient	81	100			
At Advanced	29	13			
Number of students tested	21	24			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American **					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	19	0			
At or Above Proficient	81	100			
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	19	0			
At or Above Proficient	81	100			
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	27	29			
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	73	71			
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

*No data reported.

**Not applicable.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - READING - SPANISH

Grade 5

Test TAAS - Reading - Spanish

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed No students were excluded.

Number excluded 0

Percent excluded 0

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

No fifth grade students were tested at this level. Therefore, no scores were reported for 1999 - 2002.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Reading

Fifth Grade - TAAS - Spanish*

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
Number of students tested					
Percent of total students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic					
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient					
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

*No data reported.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - MATHEMATICS - SPANISH

Grade 3

Test TAAS - Mathematics - Spanish

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed No students were excluded.

Number excluded 0

Percent excluded 0

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Mathematics

Third Grade - TAAS - Spanish

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	0	0	6		
At or Above Proficient	100	100	94		
At Advanced	20	5	39		
Number of students tested	25	19	18		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American *					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	0	0	6		
At or Above Proficient	100	100	94		
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	0	0	6		
At or Above Proficient	100	100	94		
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	13	17	25		
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	87	83	75		
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

*Not applicable.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - MATHEMATICS

Grade 4

Test **TAAS - Mathematics - Spanish**

Publisher **Texas Education Agency**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **No students were excluded.**

Number excluded 0

Percent excluded 0

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Mathematics

Fourth Grade - TAAS - Spanish

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000*	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	5	0			
At or Above Proficient	95	100			
At Advanced	5	23			
Number of students tested	21	22			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American**					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic	5	0			
At or Above Proficient	95	100			
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic	5	0			
At or Above Proficient	95	100			
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic	8	34			
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient	92	66			
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

*No data reported.

**Not applicable.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS - MATHEMATICS - SPANISH

Grade 5

Test TAAS - Mathematics - Spanish

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Number excluded 0

Percent excluded 0

The standards for basic and proficient are: "At or above basic - did not meet minimum expectations" and "at or above proficient - met minimum expectations." The cutoff for "at or above basic" is less than 70%, whereas, the cutoff for "at or above proficient" is 70% and above, as defined by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Summary Report. The test results show 3 years of data and show a decrease in disparity among subgroups. Total group performance was identified by grade levels, subject areas, subgroups (African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) and total number of students tested.

No fifth grade students were tested at this level. Therefore, no scores were reported for 1999 - 2002.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, Continued

Data Display Table for Mathematics

Fifth Grade - TAAS - Spanish*

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
Number of students tested					
Percent of total students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
2. Hispanic					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
3. Economically Disadvantaged					
At or Above Basic					
At or Above Proficient					
At Advanced					
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
At or Above Basic					
State Mean Score					
At or Above Proficient					
State Mean Score					
At Advanced					
State Mean Score					

*No data reported.

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 1

Test **Stanford - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	64	57	59		
Number of students tested	71	94	103		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 2

Test **Stanford - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	53	49	46		
Number of students tested	74	95	89		
Percent of total students tested	0	0	0		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 3

Test Stanford - Reading

Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	51	42	42		
Number of students tested	97	99	118		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 4

Test **Stanford - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	51	42	37		
Number of students tested	84	105	93		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 5

Test **Stanford - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	45	35	27		
Number of students tested	103	98	105		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 1

Test **Stanford - Mathematics**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	51	42	47		
Number of students tested	70	95	105		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 2

Test **Stanford - Mathematics**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	58	46	47		
Number of students tested	74	95	89		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 3

Test Stanford - Mathematics

Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	66	65	54		
Number of students tested	97	99	118		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 4

Test **Stanford - Mathematics**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	70	58	52		
Number of students tested	84	104	93		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 5

Test **Stanford - Mathematics**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	65	53	42		
Number of students tested	103	98	104		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2001	1996	1996		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 1

Test **Aprenda - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	85	72	51		
Number of students tested	35	42	34		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 2

Test **Appendix - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	68	82	76		
Number of students tested	37	35	28		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 3

Test **Aprenda - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	57	75	81		
Number of students tested	25	19	20		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 4

Test **Aprenda - Reading**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	62	48	17		
Number of students tested	21	22	2		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 5

Test Aprenda - Reading

Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.				
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	59				
Number of students tested	18				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students excluded	0				
Percent of students excluded	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002				

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 1

Test Apreda - Mathematics

Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	59	59	51		
Number of students tested	35	42	34		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

READING

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 2

Test **Aprenda - Mathematics**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	85	95	81		
Number of students tested	37	35	28		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 3

Test Apreda - Mathematics

Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled scores ___ Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	77	78	74		
Number of students tested	25	19	20		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 4

Test **Aprenda - Mathematics**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles **X**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.	Mar.	Mar.		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	53	52	35		
Number of students tested	21	22	2		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002	1997	1997		

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

MATHEMATICS

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Grade 5

Test **Aprenda - Mathematics**

Publisher **Harcourt Brace**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **No students were excluded.**

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	Feb.				
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	42				
Number of students tested	18				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students excluded	0				
Percent of students excluded	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Publication Year	2002				

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					