

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

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

Official School Name Kashmere Gardens Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 4901 Lockwood Drive
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Houston Texas 77026-2942
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (713) 671-4160 Fax (713) 671-4163

Website/URL http://www.houstonisd.org Email emackie@houstonisd.org

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 ISD Tel. (713) 892-6000

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 Hoffman
(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 I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct. [Include this page in the application as page 2.]

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12.
2. The school has been in existence for five full years.
3. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
4. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
5. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
6. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

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. 4 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
EE	39	31	70	PPCD	4	1	5
K	27	34	61	7			
1	41	29	70	8			
2	36	34	70	9			
3	51	36	87	10			
4	30	37	67	11			
5	43	40	83	12			
6	13	21	34	Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							547

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- 0 % White
 - 96.9 % Black or African American
 - 3.1 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Asian/Pacific Islander
 - 0 % American Indian/Alaskan Native

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 21.9%

(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.	77
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	111
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	188
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	539
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	35
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	35%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 2.19%
12 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages: 1
Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 97.4%

515 Total Number Students Who Qualify

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

10. Students receiving special education services: 8.4%
46 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>0</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>0</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>0</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>22</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>24</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</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>1</u>	_____
Classroom teachers	<u>26</u>	_____
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>3</u>	_____
Paraprofessionals	<u>12</u>	_____
Support staff	<u>13</u>	_____
Total number	<u>55</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	97.2%	97.1%	96.4%	97.5%	97.1%
Daily teacher attendance	94%	91.0%	95.0%	93.0%	96.0%
Teacher turnover rate	4.4%	2.1%	8.8%	2%	1.78%

PART III - SUMMARY

Kashmere Gardens Elementary School, a school-wide Title I campus, is located in Northeast Houston, Texas in the heart of Kashmere Gardens, an inner city neighborhood. We are surrounded and supported by businesses, clinics, a library, and a community service center. The majority of the 547 students, grades pre-kindergarten through sixth, who attend Kashmere Gardens Elementary live in low-income apartments, duplex homes, and single family homes that border the school. Our student population is predominantly African American and economically disadvantaged.

The mission of Kashmere Gardens Elementary is to “interlace a concentrated curriculum with a unified effort of teachers, parents, and community to provide an instructional program that prepares students to excel as contributors to a global society”. Because our school’s population is 96.9% free and reduced lunch and 38% at-risk, the classes include regular education, learning disabled, and gifted/talented students. The administration, faculty, and support staff provide a variety of services to meet the needs of our varied student population.

The staff at Kashmere Gardens Elementary realizes that the success of the students is dependent upon the integration of curriculum objectives, relentless instruction, and accurate assessment. Our curriculum is Project CLEAR (Clarifying Learning to Enhance Achievement Results), a Houston-based curriculum which is aligned to the state mandated Texas Essentials Knowledge and Skills. Our instruction is tailored to provide high expectations and academic excellence in compliance with the “No Child Left Behind Act” of 2001. To ensure this, we provide departmentalized instruction, flexible grouping, teacher looping, and tutorials (seventh-hour, after-school, Saturday). Our assessment process is ongoing in order to monitor student progress and adjust instruction.

To address the needs of the whole child, a variety of extra-curricular activities are available for our students. The school service activities include Safety Patrol, Student Council, Announcers’ Guild, and Health Club. The Fine Arts Department offers chorus, keyboard, recorder, dance, and drama. Library Club, Science Club, and Computer Club are academically based, while basketball and cheerleading enhance physical fitness. Finally, Girl/Boy Scouts and Charmers are community-based clubs. Thus, we provide opportunities to identify and develop the individual talents and interests of all students.

Staff members are required to attend periodic staff development opportunities from various venues, including our own weekly staff development. These sessions include grade level collaboration, vertical alignment of skills, department teaming, and teacher training. Our administrative leadership emphasizes the utilization of campus-based expertise, as well as outside consultants.

Project Reconnect, designed to reconnect the community with the schools, provides a Parent Center coordinated by a Parent Educator. Our Parent Educator is available daily to encourage parent participation in school and provide educational opportunities, such as English as a Second Language, GED preparation, computer literacy, and self-improvement classes for the community. Our business partners (Travelers’ Property Casualty Insurance, Carousel, and Women Working Together) support us by providing incentives and supplies to encourage academic excellence and to help assure every child an equal start.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. The following information pertains to 96.9% African American, 3.1% Hispanic, and 97.4% economically disadvantaged students.

The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) was administered to all students in grades 3-6 with the exception of those who were ARDed into Special Education classes and their Individual Educational Plan exempt them from parts or all of TAAS. Those students who were exempt from TAAS because of a diagnosed disability took the State Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA) which was not part of our accountability rating. The percentage of students receiving Special Education services over the past four years has ranged from 6-9%, thus limiting the number of students excluded from TAAS testing. Our Special Education population is very small because we firmly believe our students with learning disabilities should work in the least restrictive environment.

Assessment results in both reading and mathematics have indicated a steady increase in student performance over the past three years. To illustrate this, in the spring of 2000, the students passing the reading portion of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) test were 68% third grade, 71% fourth grade, 77% fifth grade, and 71% sixth grade. This was a vast improvement from our spring 1999 reading scores which were 54% third grade, 35% fourth grade, 54% fifth grade, and 77% sixth grade. The 2000 reading scores helped to raise our rating from low-performing to acceptable. In the spring of 2001, 62% of our third grade students passed reading, which was a slight decrease from 2000. However, the passing rates for the other grades were 80% fourth grade, 79% fifth grade, and 87% sixth grade. Although, we maintained an acceptable rating, we made outstanding progress. Then, in the spring of 2002, 85% of third grade students passed reading, 96% fourth grade, 95% fifth grade, and 84% sixth grade. .

Math was more of a problem area for us than reading. In fact, math was the culprit that yielded us the rating of low-performance in the spring of 1999 with a passing rate of 20% third grade, 22% fourth grade, 53% fifth grade, and 53% sixth grade. For the past three years, our math passing rate has improved tremendously. For example, in spring of 2000, math subtest scores were 39% third grade, 59% fourth grade, 75% fifth grade, and 67% sixth grade. Spring 2001 indicated an even greater improvement with a passing rate of 64% third grade, 92% fourth grade, 96% fifth grade, and 100% sixth grade. Finally, in 2002, 72% third grade, 96% fourth grade, 95% fifth grade, and 100% sixth grade students passed the math subtest. In sum, our school's total math scores have dramatically increased in excess of 50% since 1999.

Fourth grade writing has been on a steady incline since spring 1999 with 53% of students passing. In the spring of 2000, 75% of students passed the writing sub-test which was an increase of 22% from the previous year. Although the results of spring 2001 writing sub-test (77%) indicated only a 2% improvement, progress was made. Subsequently, spring 2002, 92% of our students passed the writing subtest. These writing scores coupled with our performance on the reading and math subtests resulted in the accountability rating of Recognized.

PART IV (cont.)

2. The school uses formative and summative assessment data to understand, monitor, and improve student performance. To meet students' various requirements, we have organized our assessment toolkits around three broad types of assessments: screening, formative, and summative. In fact, ongoing assessment has been the key to our success. Each teacher administers informal and formal assessments as all essential knowledge and skills are taught. The students' performance on these evaluations is the force that defines our specific focus of instruction. Benchmark assessments are used as a tool to measure growth and to monitor performance. End of the school year summative assessment data is analyzed in order to target students' strengths and weaknesses. It provides us with data about existing accomplishments and is useful for planning the next segment of instruction for students. It also provides programmatic information for student subgroups such as at-risk, English Language Learners, African Americans, Hispanic, male/female, and economically disadvantaged. Data gathered allows us to focus on the various needs of all student groups. Constant assessment of students' progress allows us to strategically tailor instruction to meet their identified needs. Diagnostic assessments are administered as a screening tool for students suspected of having difficulty or learning disabilities. If a student is diagnosed with disabilities, he is then placed in an appropriate setting to help ensure he is not left behind. Additionally, we seek to identify our gifted and talented students in order to provide a challenging and differentiated curriculum, which will both stimulate and motivate even the most reluctant students.

3. The school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community via many sources. First, the State of Texas provides each school with a report card per year. The report provides accountability rating as well as student performance by subject, grade, and sub-groups. Texas schools are required to share this information with parents and the entire community. We share our success by displaying it on the school marquee. Further, every school's performance in the Houston Independent School District (HISD) on the annual criterion-referenced test is published in the local newspaper. Information regarding each school's performance is also posted on HISD's website, as well as the Texas Education Agency's website. In addition, the district compiles a book profiling each school's performance on the annual norm and criterion-referenced tests. This information is made available to the public. Another instrument utilized to communicate student performance is progress reports. Each student receives a progress report informing both parents and students of their progress at midway intervals between report card due dates. The student and the parent are required to sign the report and return it to the student's teacher. Additionally, immediate feedback regarding performance is given to students after all assessments. Assessment data is disseminated also during Parent Teacher Organization meetings and monthly newsletters. Further, our campus has a Parent Educator who works closely with Title I to devise numerous parent activities designed to unite school, home, and community. Moreover, parents are always welcome to come and discuss their child's performance during a teacher's conference period. Parents and community are an integral part of school and our success can be attributed to our close-knit relationship.

PART IV cont.

4. The school will share its success with other schools in numerous ways and on frequent occasions. One way to accomplish sharing is to host scheduled campus visits for other schools to gain first-hand knowledge of our different programs and to see them in operation. This allows visitors the opportunity to ask questions and share any concerns they might have about the school and its programs. Observation lessons conducted by the teachers will give others a chance to see our teachers in action using successful teaching strategies incorporated into their lessons. The principal will share our successful strategies with other principals during meetings throughout the district. In-house, as well as district-wide professional development workshops will be conducted to disseminate information on how we were able to move from a low-performing school to recognized status over a three year period. The same types of workshops will be conducted at professional development conferences across the country, such as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the International Reading Association. We are very proud of our accomplishments and want others to know that all students can and will be successful with the appropriate resources, time on-task and prescription teaching. Finally, we will offer to serve as a mentor school to any school desiring our services. The Kashmere Gardens community of educators seeks to expand its horizons by spreading the seeds to success.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Houston ISD provides a well-balanced, challenging curriculum that specifies what should be taught at each grade level to meet the state guidelines, prepare for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), and support student achievement. The HISD Project CLEAR (Clarifying Learning to Enhance Achievement Results) clearly defines the expectations for student learning district-wide. The required curriculum is divided into two areas: foundation curriculum and enrichment curriculum. Foundation curriculum consists of reading, other language arts (writing, listening and speaking, viewing and representing), mathematics, science, and social studies. Enrichment curriculum consists of languages other than English, health, physical education, fine arts, and economics.

All students are engaged in significant content based upon high standards since Project CLEAR curriculum builds a proper foundation for increasingly complex learning as students move from grade level to grade level and ensures all students access to this essential learning. All courses offered at the elementary level have Project CLEAR required objective and correlation documents and/or syllabus document designed to provide the basic curriculum (a listing of content objectives) and to correlate state standards (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills or TEKS) to district-wide testing initiatives. These documents encompass all requirements and are the foundation for the planning of instruction. The required objectives and correlation documents also provide for flexibility in the planning of instruction in order to meet the needs of individual learners.

The Project Clear syllabus provides a plan for instruction. It models how objectives are bundled together to create units of instruction. It also provides a built-in spiraling TAKS review as well as outlined units of study with a suggested timeline. Students with special needs such as those in Special Education, Bilingual/ESL, and Advanced Academics require modified instruction as mandated by federal and state law. All objectives listed in the required objectives and correlation documents and/or syllabus document should be taught within the given school year.

Project Clear provides teachers with the information needed to develop teaching plans that actively engage students in the learning process. It is a powerful instructional planning tool that not only defines what should be taught, but it also leaves the delivery to the teacher's discretion. Since students think and learn in different ways, good instructional delivery includes a variety of strategies based upon current research, best practices, and the teachers' own experiences in capitalizing upon different types of intelligences. Learning is enhanced when it is integrated rather than fragmented; therefore, teachers are encouraged to implement a unit approach in which students learn skills and concepts within a context relevant to their own lives. To integrate learning across as well as within content areas, teachers are encouraged to plan for interdisciplinary instruction supported through collaboration among teachers with different content area specialization. Hands-on, experiential learning where students take an active role and assume increasing responsibility for their own work is highly recommended. Project CLEAR, as well as other district-approved resources, provides substantial support for the planning and implementation of effective instruction.

PART V cont.

2. The school's reading curriculum is outlined in the district's Project CLEAR curriculum document. Project CLEAR provides teachers with a detailed explanation of content specifications, necessary prerequisite skills, instructional considerations, assessment considerations, and linkages to other objectives.

We chose the Open Court Reading series as our basal because of the program's strengths. First, it is good for new teachers, giving step by step instructions. Next, it lends itself toward developing a fertile foundation for beginning readers and is rich with strong oral language development content at the primary levels.

The Open Court series is a commercially published elementary reading and writing program that uses a balanced approach to reading, including systematic direct instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics, grade-appropriate decodable text, and a variety of language materials. Open Court provides our young scholars with a workable, balanced approach to reading instruction based upon the need for both direct instruction in basic skills and literature-based instruction that can help build background knowledge and improve student comprehension. The program extends through grade six to encompass instruction in challenging and engaging children's literature, including many classics as well as a large number of multicultural selections.

In order to have a well-balanced reading program, a myriad of other resources and materials are used as well as the textbook. These resources include Neuhaus (a multi-sensory approach to reading), best practice teaching methods, computer software programs, teacher-made and commercially purchased reading materials, various interactive computer and television games, graphic organizers, classroom reading libraries, and other reference materials. We attribute our progress in reading to this balanced approach.

3. Kashmere's choice of curriculum to describe is science. Because our mission is to prepare students to excel as contributors to a global society, we encourage them to explore and to approach learning with an open mind and a relentless determination, regardless of economic circumstances. Since Project CLEAR is our required curriculum and is aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, science is taught at every grade level and reinforced with hands-on activities in our science lab. The instructional model we have implemented includes engagement, exploration, explanation, elaboration, and evaluation. Our science lab coordinator has established units of study according to the scope and sequence of science objectives. Classes are scheduled and rotated into the lab for experiments, observations, and discovery learning. In conjunction with laboratory studies, we have computer software to enhance student learning. Further, teachers are encouraged not only to vary teaching modes, but also to be creative in the planning and presentation of lessons. An example of creative instruction is a unit on the interdependency among organisms and the environment. A third grade interdisciplinary unit required the creation of a pond, a wetland ecosystem, and a garden to show interdependency. This interconnection and co-habitation of organism allows the teacher to scaffold students' prior knowledge, thus bridging the gap to new information. Therefore, skills and objectives are layered in a progressive and organic method. Enhanced analytical processes are encouraged through the use of close math-science connections that allow students to gain valuable research skills. The lessons afford students the chance to make real world connections and applications of the objectives learned.

PART V (cont.)

4. Kashmere Gardens uses numerous instructional methods to improve student learning to accommodate students' varied learning styles. We utilize a direct and explicit teaching approach, which builds upon students' prior knowledge of content. Our primary teachers incorporate kinesthetic, visual, and auditory activities during lesson presentations. For example, students manipulate sounds, letters, words, and sentences using concrete resources such as magnetic alphabets, alphabet charts, and reading rods as they move from sound symbol correspondence to actual reading. Each child is totally immersed into the learning process. On the intermediate level, teachers are departmentalized according to their area of expertise, which fosters content specialization. Further, vertical teams are formed from pre-kindergarten to sixth grade to allow teachers to collaborate on instruction and to examine the development of objectives through the grade levels. Our children are grouped homogeneously within the grade levels; however, when necessary within the classroom setting, they are heterogeneously grouped according to needs. Utilizing Bloom's Taxonomy of learning, emphasis is placed upon teaching above the knowledge and comprehension levels. Inquiry-based instruction supports and cultivates higher level thinking skills and is therefore incorporated into daily lessons. Cooperative learning strategies and peer tutoring are utilized with the teacher as the facilitator of learning. Technological interactive modes of instruction are employed in the classrooms, computer lab, and library. A vast array of instructional methods is implemented to improve students' learning and to create an academic foundation for growth.

5. Professional development is data-driven and directly aligned to our needs assessment. Thus, it has been a crucial ingredient and has dramatically impacted student achievement. Staff development activities include those required by law (training in technology, conflict resolution, discipline strategies, classroom management, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) training, district discipline policies), as well as curricular and instructional issues relative to analyzing student data. After carefully analyzing students' performance and reflecting upon means of increasing student achievement, a professional development plan was initiated and supported by our local district specialists. A staff development calendar was devised by the principal and SDMC (Sight Based Decision-Making Committee) based upon the needs assessment. Lead teachers and grade level chairpersons provide weekly in-services at the building level on various topics that strengthened the effectiveness of teaching strategies, assessment methods and classroom materials. Even our support staff and parent volunteers have been involved in our quest for academic excellence. Also, opportunities were made available for staff members to engage in vertical and horizontal team planning, mentoring/coaching, inquiry/action research, and study groups. These professional strategies have created a continuum of student growth on and across the grade levels, thus promoting achievement in spite of economic and social adversity.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency GRADE LEVEL-3 RD GRADE SUBJECT-READING	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills			
	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	83.3%	61.2%	69.6%	55.7%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	223	224	225	220
BASIC-	15%	38%	32%	46%
PROFICIENT-	85%	62%	68%	54%
ADVANCED-	35%	23%	29%	25%
Number of 3 rd Gr. Students Tested	72	71	77	63
Percent Tested	100%	88.75%	85.5%	76.8%
Number Excluded	0	9	13	19
Percent Excluded	0%	11.25%	14.5%	23.2%
 Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	15.6%	38.8%	30.9%	45%
PROFICIENT-	84.4%	61.2%	69.1%	55%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	16.7%	40%	28.3%	43.1%
PROFICIENT-	83.3%	60%	71.7%	56.9%
STATE SCORES	88%	86.8%	87.9%	88%

BASIC-Did not meet standards
PROFICIENT-Met standards
ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency GRADE LEVEL-3 RD GRADE SUBJECT-MATHEMATICS	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills			
	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	69.8%	63.2%	41%	21%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	219	226	239	222
BASIC-	28%	36%	61%	80%
PROFICIENT-	72%	64%	39%	20%
ADVANCED-	12%	6%	11%	6%
Number of 3 rd Gr. Students Tested	69	72	84	64
Percent Tested	95.8%	90%	93.3%	78%
Number Excluded	3	8	6	18
Percent Excluded	4.2%	10%	6.7%	22%
 Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	29.5%	36.8%	60%	78.7%
PROFICIENT-	70.5%	63.2%	40%	21.3%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	30.2%	36.4%	58.6%	81.4%
PROFICIENT-	69.8%	63.6%	41.4%	18.6%
STATE SCORES	89.8%	89.2%	90.3%	88.4%

BASIC-Did not meet standards
PROFICIENT-Met standards
ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency GRADE LEVEL- 4 TH GRADE SUBJECT-READING	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills			
	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	95.5%	80.6%	69.8%	35.1%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	223	224	225	220
BASIC-	4%	20%	29%	65%
PROFICIENT-	96%	80%	71%	35%
ADVANCED-	16%	26%	15%	10%
Number of 4 th Gr. Students Tested	69	70	55	80
Percent Tested	82.1%	87.5%	80.9%	98.8%
Number Excluded	15	10	13	1
Percent Excluded	17.9%	12.5%	9.1%	1.2%
 Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	1.9%	20%	31.4%	64.5%
PROFICIENT-	98.1%	80%	68.6%	35.5%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	1.9%	19.7%	30%	67.7%
PROFICIENT-	98.1%	80.3%	70%	32.3%
STATE SCORES	92.5%	90.8%	89.9%	88.8%

BASIC-Did not meet standards
PROFICIENT-Met standards
ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency
 GRADE LEVEL- 4TH GRADE
 SUBJECT-MATHEMATICS

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	95.5%	92.8%	58.9%	21.8%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	219	226	239	222
BASIC-	4%	8%	41%	78%
PROFICIENT-	96%	92%	59%	22%
ADVANCED-	4%	4%	10%	1%
Number of 4 th Gr. Students Tested	69	72	58	81
Percent Tested	82.1%	90%	85.3%	100%
Number Excluded	15	8	10	0
Percent Excluded	17.9%	10%	14.7%	0%
Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	5.8%	7.5%	41.8%	77.9%
PROFICIENT-	94.2%	92.5%	58.2%	22.1%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	5.8%	7.4%	42.6%	78.8%
PROFICIENT-	94.2%	92.6%	57.4%	21.2%
STATE SCORES	94.1%	91.3%	87.1%	87.6%

BASIC-Did not meet standards

PROFICIENT-Met standards

ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency GRADE LEVEL- 4 TH GRADE SUBJECT-WRITING	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills			
	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	90.8%	78.6%	76.8%	52.8%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	66	73	57	73
BASIC-	8%	23%	25%	47%
PROFICIENT-	92%	77%	75%	53%
ADVANCED-	33%	10%	18%	8%
Number of 4 th Gr. Students Tested	66	73	57	73
Percent Tested	78.6%	91.2%	83.8%	90.1%
Number Excluded	18	7	11	8
Percent Excluded	11.4%	8.8%	16.2%	9.9%
 Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	9.4%	22.1%	21.8%	46.5%
PROFICIENT-	90.6%	77.9%	78.2%	53.5%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	8.5%	20.3%	24.1%	51.6%
PROFICIENT-	91.5%	79.7%	75.9%	48.4%
STATE SCORES	89.8%	89.2%	90.3%	88.4%

BASIC-Did not meet standards
PROFICIENT-Met standards
ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency
 GRADE LEVEL- 5TH GRADE
 SUBJECT-READING

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	98.1%	80%	76.9%	55.6%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	223	224	225	220
BASIC-	2%	21%	23%	46%
PROFICIENT-	98%	79%	77%	54%
ADVANCED-	70%	28%	25%	15%
Number of 5 th Gr. Students Tested	57	53	65	46
Percent Tested	80.3%	82.8%	79.3%	83.6%
Number Excluded	14	11	17	9
Percent Excluded	19.7%	17.2%	20.7%	16.4%
Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	1.9%	20.4%	23.1%	44.4%
PROFICIENT-	98.1%	79.6%	76.9%	55.6%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	1.9%	19.1%	23%	51.4%
PROFICIENT-	98.1%	80.9%	77%	48.6%
STATE SCORES	92.7%	90.2%	87.8%	86.4%

BASIC-Did not meet standards

PROFICIENT-Met standards

ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency GRADE LEVEL-5 TH GRADE SUBJECT-MATTHEMATICS	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills			
	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	94.3%	98%	74.6%	54.5%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	219	226	239	222
BASIC-	5%	4%	25%	47%
PROFICIENT-	95%	96%	75%	53%
ADVANCED-	39%	12%	19%	2%
Number of 5 th Gr. Students Tested	57	52	67	45
Percent Tested	80.3%	81.3%	81.7%	81.8%
Number Excluded	19	12	15	10
Percent Excluded	19.7%	18.7%	18.3%	18.2%
 Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	5.8%	2.2%	25.4%	45.5%
PROFICIENT-	94.2%	97.8%	74.6%	54.5%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	5.8%	2.2%	25.4%	50%
PROFICIENT-	94.2%	97.8%	73%	50%
STATE SCORES	96.2%	94.6%	92.1%	90%

BASIC-Did not meet standards
PROFICIENT-Met standards
ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency GRADE LEVEL-6 TH GRADE SUBJECT-READING	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills			
	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	84%	86%	71.4%	77.4%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	223	224	225	220
BASIC-	16%	13%	29%	23%
PROFICIENT-	84%	87%	71%	77%
ADVANCED-	40%	37%	29%	13%
Number of 6 th Gr. Students Tested	25	30	28	31
Percent Tested	67.6%	96.8%	93.3%	88.6%
Number Excluded	12	1	2	4
Percent Excluded	32.4%	3.2%	6.7%	11.4%
 Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	16.7%	13.3%	28.6%	22.6%
PROFICIENT-	83.3%	86.7%	71.4%	77.4%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	16.7%	11.5%	28.6%	26.1%
PROFICIENT-	83.3%	88.5%	71.4%	73.9%
STATE SCORES	88.2%	85.6%	86%	84.1%

BASIC-Did not meet standards
PROFICIENT-Met standards
ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives

STATE-CRITERION REFERENCE TEST RESULTS

Publisher-Texas Education Agency
 GRADE LEVEL-6TH GRADE
 SUBJECT- MATHEMEATICS

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES	84%	86.7%	66.7%	77.4%
TOTAL NUMBER TAKING TEST	219	226	239	222
BASIC-	0%	0%	33%	47%
PROFICIENT-	100%	100%	67%	53%
ADVANCED-	58%	17%	7%	3%
Number of 6 th Gr. Students Tested	24	30	30	32
Percent Tested	64.9%	97.8%	100%	91.4%
Number Excluded	13	1	0	3
Percent Excluded	35.1%	2.2%	0%	8.6%
Results				
1. African American				
BASIC-	0%	0%	33.3%	46.9%
PROFICIENT-	100%	100%	66.7%	53.1%
2. Economically Disadvantaged				
BASIC-	0%	0%	33.3%	47.8%
PROFICIENT-	100%	100%	66.7%	52.2%
STATE SCORES	93.8%	91.4%	88.5%	86.9%

BASIC-Did not meet standards
PROFICIENT-Met standards
ADVANCED-Mastered all objectives