

**2003-2004 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program
Cover Sheet**

Name of Principal Orquidia M. Acosta-Hathaway
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

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

School Mailing Address 23882 Landisview Avenue
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Lake Forest California 92630-5152
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (949) 837-2260 Fax (949) 837-5013

Website/URL www.svusd.k12.ca.us E-mail hathawayo@svusd.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.

(on original print) Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Jerry C. Gross
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Saddleback Valley Unified School District Tel. (949) 586-1234

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.

(on original print) Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson _____ Mrs. Ginny Fay Aitkens
(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.

(on original print) Date _____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

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

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

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.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. 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 the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. 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.
8. 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

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:

<u>26</u>	Elementary schools
<u>0</u>	Middle schools
<u>4</u>	Junior high schools
<u>5</u>	High schools
<u>1</u>	Other (Severely Handicapped Site)
<u>36</u>	TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,428
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$7,239

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. 5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
N/A 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	59	58	117		7			
1	66	64	130		8			
2	46	68	114		9			
3	54	50	104		10			
4	67	76	143		11			
5	54	54	108		12			
6	55	55	110		Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →								826

*2003-2004 data

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school: 2003-2004 data
- | |
|--|
| <u>17</u> % White |
| <u>11</u> % Black or African American |
| <u>68</u> % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>4</u> % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>less> 1</u> % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% Total |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 14.8 %

(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.	57
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	67
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	124
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	833
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	0.148
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	14.8

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 46 %
387 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 6
 Specify languages: Arabic, Farsi, Romanian, Tagalog, and Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 59.3 %
494 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce 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: 5.5 %
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> </u> Autism	<u> </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u> 1 </u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u> 6 </u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u> 39 </u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u> </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>	<u> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u> 34 </u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u> 5 </u>	<u> </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u> 1 </u>	<u> 6 </u>
Support staff	<u> 3 </u>	<u> 11 </u>
Total number	<u> 44 </u>	<u> 17 </u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 20:1 (grades 1 and 2)
32:1 (K, and grades 3-6)

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. 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 rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	96.6	96.2	96.0	96.0	96.0
Daily teacher attendance	98	96	98	96	96
Teacher turnover rate	16	5	5	15	10
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Higher teacher turnover rates are due to retirement and reduction in force (RIF due to loss of 20:1 in K and 3rd grade in 2003)

PART III - SUMMARY

Ralph A. Gates Elementary School is a dependent charter school in Saddleback Valley Unified School District in Lake Forest, Orange County, California. The school was built in 1965 and was modernized four years ago. It houses 33 classrooms for K-6, and 2 classrooms for community preschool programs. As a Title I school, we are unique in our population and programs within the district. We are 72% Hispanic, 22% White/Non-Hispanic, and 6% other ethnicities. We serve 850 students; 46% are English language learners. Additionally, 59.3% of our population qualifies for free and reduced-fee lunch. The average parent educational level is below high school.

We customize our curriculum and schedules to ensure academic success for our diverse population. We evaluate and refocus programs annually to ensure that all our students in grades K-6 learn and succeed according to California standards. Fifty-two percent of students participate in the regular district K-6 core curriculum, and 48% of students are in the two-way Spanish-English language immersion program (by parent choice). We provide research-based flexible grouping instructional strategies for mathematics and reading so that students in grades 2-6 benefit regardless of achievement level. Our successful programs have earned our school the California Association of Bilingual Educators (CABE) Award of Excellence in 1998, the California Distinguished Schools Award in 2002, the Title I Achieving Schools Award in 2003, and the California Schools Board Association Golden Bell Award in 2003.

Our teachers meet or exceed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) criteria for “highly qualified” staff and hold Cross-cultural (CLAD) or Bilingual Cross-cultural (BCLAD) Language and Academic Development, or the equivalent certification to teach second-language learners. All staff hold, or are in the process of attaining, California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) certification. A significant number of teachers and staff are bilingual and provide primary language support for students and families as appropriate. Content area English language development methodology and instruction are integral strategies in every classroom. Gates has attracted a staff that excels in expertise and enthusiasm for teaching second language learners and at-risk students.

We encourage our parents to be active partners in the education of their children by providing resources that empower them. Parents develop skills to become proactive members of the school community in our 9-12 week Parent Academy. We collaborate with the adult education department to provide adult English second language computer-based classes in our two computer labs. We provide Spanish literacy classes for our Spanish-speaking parents who are illiterate, and Spanish foreign language classes to our English-speaking parents whose children are in our two-way program.

The mission of the Gates School community is to meet the needs of the whole child so that every child can be a successful individual and a contributing member of society. We believe that setting high academic standards and expectations for all students in an environment of academic excellence, mutual respect, positive reinforcement, and opportunities to build good character helps our students develop positive self-concepts. This self-esteem is the vehicle by which students become responsible citizens and learn the skills necessary to adapt and contribute to a constantly changing society. As a staff we hold high expectations for ourselves and constantly reexamine and reformulate our mission and goals. We are proud of our all-inclusive practices and embrace the strengths of our multilingual, multicultural community.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. *Describe the meaning of the school's assessment results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics in such a way that someone not intimately familiar with the tests can easily understand them.*

At the beginning of each school year, our staff analyzes test data from standards-aligned district assessments and benchmarks, Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) test data for grades 2-6, including the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education (SABE/2), and California English Language Development Test (CELDT) test data. Test scores are disaggregated by subgroups, including students who are English-only, English learners, and language learners who have been re-designated as fluent in English, all of whom participate in the regular program, two-way language program, Special Education, and/or Socioeconomically Disadvantaged. This analysis, in addition to the data from Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and State Academic Performance Index (API) reports, becomes the basis for our annual single plan for student achievement. Our School Site Council (SSC), comprised of parents and teachers, studies this data and makes decisions regarding program improvement, program focus, and program budget allocations.

For the past four years, student scores have shown positive evidence of the effectiveness of our flexible grouping instructional model and our standards-aligned materials. Our API score, set by the state for measuring our academic growth compared to essentially similar schools in California, was 689 and was targeted by the state to be raised 6 points for 2001. We changed the way we delivered reading instruction and created a research-based flexible grouping strategy that empowered student subgroups to make significant gains above the target set by the state, raising our API by 32 points to 731. In 2001-2002, we applied similar changes to our mathematics programs based on test data from 2001. This flexible grouping strategy allows us to create smaller classes and deliver the mathematics curriculum at each group's instructional level. Our annual growth API score increased from 689 in 2000 to 746 in 2003. This is in spite of significant growth in the numbers of English learners and socio-economically disadvantaged populations. Additionally, our program has increased the number of students re-designated to fluency.

We monitor our students' progress every 4-5 weeks and reassess the placements in mathematics and reading groups. We utilize a variety of standardized and criterion referenced tests and district benchmarks to identify students performing below grade level and students who have mastered skills and are ready to move to a different instructional group. Students change groups in reading and mathematics according to progress made in achieving California grade-level standards. Students in the two-way language immersion program and the English immersion program are integrated in the flexible groups in grades 4-6 for reading and mathematics. Teachers work together across grades 2-6 to ensure that all students receive standards-based instruction for their respective grade, regardless of instructional level, and are prepared for the State STAR assessments in the spring. All students, including language learners and Special Education, are mainstreamed and served within the school day through the flexible grouping in reading and mathematics. Three resource teachers and two non-classroom-based certificated teachers assist in reducing the student-to-teacher ratio for both reading and mathematics in grades 2-6. Instructional assistants, parents and community volunteers work with students within the classroom to provide targeted assistance in reading and mathematics.

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

The SSC uses student achievement data to shape programs and form school-wide goals in its annual plan. Progress measured by standards-aligned state and district assessments helps the committee identify student needs and allocate resources to ensure equity and success for all. Through the evaluation process we developed our flexible grouping strategies model for reading and math. We also determined that non-classroom-based credentialed teachers best serve our students as part of reading and math rotations during the regular day. The rigorous evaluation process enables us to build on our successes and keep our program dynamic.

Teachers use standardized test scores, rubrics, computerized assessments, and curriculum-based tests to identify student needs every month, assess placements in groups, and regroup students accordingly. They design lessons and choose materials at the students' instructional levels monthly. Teachers use computer-generated lexile scores to help choose the appropriate level books for instructional and student recreational reading. The Home Language Survey and the CELDT results identify English learners and provide specialized instruction in the classroom and via the newcomers' class. Teacher assessment led to our starting new English classes for English learners before and after school. We use assessment data for students at every level, including for Gifted And Talented Education (GATE) identified students and students with individual instructional plans, to ensure appropriate materials, methods, and placement for continuing student success.

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

Gates' SSC and English Language Advisory Council (ELAC), comprised of parents, staff, administrators, and community members, meet regularly to review student achievement data, identify needs, review and create parent surveys, and formulate action plans to improve our school. They collaborate with the Rotary Club, senior groups (City of Laguna Woods), Mission Hospital Family Resource Center, and county programs. The two committees produce an annual report, including goals, available to everyone in the community. We communicate academic expectations and test results through the state standards reports for parents, district standards brochures, school accountability report card, Title I program information, and the site's parent handbook. This information is explained at Back to School Night, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) and Advocates for Language Learners (ALL) meetings, and is reviewed during our Parent Academy classes. Our discipline brochure explains our expectations, rewards and consequences, dress code, and rules. Our parent-teacher-student compact defines the responsibilities of each in order to ensure a successful year.

We provide every written form and announcement in Spanish and English, and assistance in other languages using on-site and district translators as needed. Our *Gator Communicator*, a monthly student newsletter, updates our community about academics, activities, and other issues. Struggling students and their parents meet with teachers to create and maintain academic and behavior contracts. The daily agenda for grades 2-6 students states expectations and provides additional opportunities for communication between school and home.

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

Staff and administrators at Gates eagerly share our successes by collaborating with universities, participating in leadership forums, and presenting our programs to educators at formal and informal meetings. Gates teachers mentor student teachers, interns, and observers from Concordia, Chapman, Cal State Fullerton, and UC Irvine universities. Aspiring teachers seek placements with the highly trained teachers at Gates who have demonstrated continuing success with language learners and other special-needs students. Gates is the subject of a five-year forward research study to observe and track language learners and the methods used in our programs. Envoys of teachers recently visited from Mexico and China to observe our curriculum, methods, and facilities. At district-sponsored principal leadership meetings, our principal shares information about our programs and advises administrators facing challenges similar to those at Gates. The Orange County Department of Education hosts a Title I Principals' Forum at which our principal shares information. Teachers and administrators attended ceremonies for the CAFE, California Distinguished Schools, Title I Achieving Schools, and Golden Bell awards and made presentations describing our programs. Administrators from all over California contact Gates for advice and information. We are seeking a charter school dissemination grant that will enable us to collaborate with a similarly populated school and nurture its success in building specialized programs. Our exemplary programs have been chosen to feature in a case study for an upcoming US Department of Education Charter Schools publication.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. ***Describe the school's curriculum. Outline in several sentences the core of each curriculum area and show how all students are engaged with significant content based on high standards. Include art and foreign languages in the descriptions.***

Our programs are innovative in that our research-based flexible grouping model has replaced the traditional, static model of one teacher directing one group of students throughout the day. Students homogeneously group at each grade level for directed reading, writing, and math instruction for part of their weekly instructional minutes. The rest of these minutes are spent heterogeneously grouped with their homeroom teacher. Certificated non-classroom-based teachers work simultaneously with the classroom teachers to improve the student-teacher ratio. The flexibility of our grouping model enables us to meet the needs of the whole child by allowing us to place students in the most supportive and challenging groups, thus encouraging growth, confidence, and achievement. We are in the process of adopting a new standards-based language arts series for both programs: English immersion and Spanish/English two-way language immersion. The rest of the curriculum materials are already California standards-based. Teachers use thematic units and state-approved materials, such as software, interactive instructional programs, videos, CDs and DVDs, to strengthen texts. We provide a newcomer program for grades 3-6; *Language for Learning* (SRA) for grades K-2; *Into English* (Hampton Brown) for grades K-6; and core curriculum English Language Development (ELD) modifications as needed. Students functioning below grade level in reading and writing attend skills-based summer school for literacy development.

Teachers and paraprofessionals work with the district to receive training, and create pacing guides and supplementary materials in mathematics (K - McGraw-Hill; 1-5 - Houghton Mifflin; 6 - McDougal Littell). Students receive targeted instruction in their flexible groups, and students at or below the 36th percentile are automatically enrolled in intensive basic skills mathematics summer school. We use innovative science (Harcourt Brace) materials. The core curriculum comes alive with additional programs such as science camp (grade 6), Jet Propulsion Laboratories competitions (5-6), field trips, and Family Science Night. Our students receive technology instruction, keyboarding and other computer skills, in our state-of-the-art computer lab from teachers and highly qualified media lab staff. Every classroom contains additional computers for student use across the curriculum, with CD ROM libraries available by grade level and curricular area. Our social studies (Harcourt Brace) series is augmented by teacher and district-created materials. Gates' PTA sponsors the *Meet the Masters* art seminar and lesson series for all students. Classroom teachers in K-3 use *Share the Music* (McGraw Hill) for introductory music instruction. Music specialists teach performing arts music (4-6) and instrumental music (5-6). Teachers use a formal curriculum (K-3) and District provides specialists in grades 4-6 to deliver Physical Education (PE).

We recognize the need for students to become proficient in English, Spanish, and other languages. A Foreign Language Assistance Grant (FLAP) for after-school programs enables us to provide language classes. It funds English and Spanish second language classes for parents, Spanish and French for students, and clubs for Performing Arts, Visual Arts, Computers, Homework, Math, English, and Science. Targeted instruction by highly qualified staff, before and after school, supports the core curriculum. Kindergarten students performing below grade level standards participate in a Kindergarten Wrap program, extending the school day.

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

We structure reading instruction in the regular and two-way immersion programs to meet the needs of our diverse students: language learners, at-risk students with multiple challenges, grade-level and above achievers, GATE, and special needs students. Students reading at or below the 36th percentile are in smaller classes with additional teachers. When appropriate, English learners are grouped in English development clusters. College tutors, instructional aides, and District-trained Language Arts Assistance Program (LAAP) paraprofessionals contribute to the success of reading rotations by providing specialized instructional support. The Resource Special Education teacher is part of the grouping strategies structure, allowing her to collaborate with the classroom teachers to include identified special needs students in the reading rotations. Our reading instruction model provides challenges in complexity and pacing for high achievers and GATE students. Constant assessment and regrouping ensures flexibility as students achieve.

We use standards-based materials, and are in the process of adopting a new state-approved language arts series. Additional language and literacy development materials include *Language for Learners* in K-1, *Reading Mastery* for 2-3, *Corrective Reading* for grades 3-6 (all by SRA), *Phonics and Friends*, and *Avenues* materials (by Hampton-Brown). Reading comprehension assessment can be accomplished through the computer-delivered *Reading Counts* tests (Scholastic).

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. (Mathematics)

Pursuing our mission to maintain high academic expectations for all students and an environment of academic excellence, we structured our math program after our successful flexible reading group model. It would be impossible to meet our students' needs and accomplish our mission via the traditional classroom model. We use standardized test results and district and teacher-generated assessments to group students in grades 2-6 at their optimum instructional level. Flexibility is built into the model to regroup students frequently as appropriate. Additional certificated teachers assist classroom teachers, improving the student-teacher ratio and creating the environment for achieving success.

We adopted new math texts in 2002 that are explicitly aligned with California standards (K - McGraw-Hill; 1-5 - Houghton Mifflin; 6 – McDougal Littell). Additionally, we use district-created academic reinforcement lessons to strengthen skills for students who perform below grade level. Standards-based materials such as practice books, CD ROMs, tutorial kits, test generators, and level-specific manipulatives round out our math materials. All students take the district pre- and post-assessments. Grades 2-6 take the California Achievement Test (CAT/6) and California Standards Test (CST) assessments, and grades 2-6 in the two-way program take the SABE/2. This data provides valuable information for our staff to modify curriculum to match each student's instructional level. Our mathematics instructional materials also reflect our quest for a balanced, well-articulated, standards-based curriculum accessible to all students.

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

All teachers at Gates hold CLAD, BCLAD or equivalent certification to ensure that steps of language acquisition are respected and incorporated into the curriculum through modified and specialized instructional methods. Content English Language Development (ELD) and a variety of research-based ELD strategies are incorporated in lessons in every subject. Teachers are assigned according to credential and area of expertise and use a variety of methodologies to instruct; including direct instruction, guided reading groups for comprehension, targeted instruction for at-risk students; and homogeneous grouping for mathematics, reading, and ELD. Credentialed teachers assist in grades 2-6 to implement our “accordion” model of instruction—flexing through homogenous and heterogeneous groupings—through which we continue to improve individual achievement and overall site test scores.

Teachers use curriculum mapping to integrate standards into thematic units and maximize instructional minutes. This detailed information helps teachers integrate science with writing and social studies with visual and performing arts, for example. Teacher teams develop rubrics to assess student work and clarify expectations. Students receive training in using rubrics, and improve their own work using these skills. Classroom instruction is supported by before and after-school English development and literacy classes, and after-school homework, science, and computer clubs where students receive more academic support from credentialed teachers. Our staff meets regularly to examine programs and student progress. This sharing of information allows teachers to use a prescriptive approach to target individual student needs. It also allows for flexibility to regroup students as goals are met or when intervention becomes necessary.

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

District-sponsored staff development provides relevant ongoing training in core curriculum areas and for specialty areas such as First Aid/CPR, Spanish for instructors, CTAP levels I, II, and III, other technology training, and support for implementing recent textbook adoptions. We have on-site resource teachers that train staff. We fund training sessions, release time for teachers to observe veterans, and use administrative resources for training. When we train staff, we also provide extensive training for instructional assistants and office staff. Teachers attend workshops for reading, English language development, and mathematics. They attend seminars for CAFE, Title I, PE, science and social studies workshops, Lions-Quest Skills for Growing, and Asset-Building workshops. For the first two years, our district has a support program for teachers to receive special training and work with district mentors. New teachers join the district-supported Beginning Teacher State Assistance program. Articulation is ongoing among grades and instructional levels to provide relevant instruction and materials and review student grouping placements as needed. All teachers and instructional aides are “highly qualified” in accordance with *NCLB* criteria for teachers. Four teachers hold Administrative certifications and most hold post-graduate degrees. Eight teachers received Masonic Student Assistance Program (MSAP) training to develop and implement a two-tier student study team to improve the student referral process. The teachers’ specialized training empowers them to assess and identify student needs, customize instructional methods and materials, and monitor and regroup for progress. The impact of highly qualified staff and techniques is evident from the test scores, and from the increasing numbers of students entering accelerated classes in junior high school.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS (Public Schools)

In a letter to the U.S. Secretary of Education accompanying the list of nominated schools, the CSSO of each state certifies that the schools have all met the minimum requirements established by the CSSO for “dramatically improved” and achieving at “high levels” or for being in the top 10 percent of schools in the state. The letter from the CSSO to the Secretary explains the criteria used by the state to nominate the schools. States must rely on the state accountability system to identify schools for submission to the Secretary.

Based on state data, the CSSO certifies that the submitted schools meet one of two criteria: 1) dramatic improvement in test scores to high levels in the past three years in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics for schools that draw at least 40 percent of their students from disadvantaged backgrounds, or 2) regardless of a school’s demographics, achievement in the top 10 percent of schools in the state as measured by state tests of reading (language arts or English) and mathematics or in the top 10 percent in the state on assessments referenced against national norms in at least the last grade tested.

“Dramatically improved” is defined by the CSSO of each state based on the state’s definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP). All student groups, including disadvantaged students, must show dramatic improvement as shown by disaggregated data. “High levels” is defined by the CSSO of each state, but at a minimum includes student achievement at least at the 55th percentile on state assessments in the highest grade tested even if the school makes AYP.

A student from a “disadvantaged background” is defined as one who is eligible for free or reduced-priced meals at the school, is limited English proficient, is a migrant student, or is a student receiving services under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Each nominated school must show results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics for at least the last three years using the criteria determined by the CSSO using the state accountability system. If the state uses only assessments referenced against national norms at a particular grade, the school should explain how these tests measure the depth and breadth of the state’s academic content standards. For formatting, if possible use or adapt the sample tables (no charts or graphs) at the end of this application.

If the state allows the use of the PSAT, PLAN, SAT, or ACT as part of its accountability system, at least 90 percent of the students in the appropriate classes must take the tests. For these tests, schools must use national norms. The national school norms for the 90th and 55th percentiles can be found on the U.S. Department of Education’s Web site. If fewer than 90 percent take a particular test, do not report the data. If the PSAT, PLAN, SAT, or ACT are not an official part of the state accountability system, schools should not report the data.

The school must disaggregate the data for socioeconomic groups that comprise sufficient numbers to be a part of the state’s assessment reports. If it is not possible to disaggregate by socioeconomic level, the school should disaggregate by ethnic/racial groups if they comprise sufficient numbers to be statistically significant. Show how all subgroups of students achieved at high levels or improved dramatically in achievement for at least three years. Explain any disparity among subgroups.

The school must specify which groups, if any, are excluded from a test, the reasons for the exclusion, as well as the number and percentage of students excluded. Describe how these students are assessed and attach all tables that show test data to the end of this application.

LANGUAGE ARTS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 2

Test California Standards Test, Language Arts

Edition/publication year 2001, 2002 and 2003 Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{131}{2002}$, $\frac{128}{2001}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{124}{2002}$, $\frac{127}{2001}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{7}{2002}$, $\frac{1}{2001}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{5}{2002}$, $\frac{1}{2001}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	66	65	63
% At or Above Proficient	25	19	32
% At Advanced	4	2	9
Number of students tested	122	124	127
Percent of total students tested	100	95	99
Number of students excluded	0	7	1
Percent of students excluded	0	5	1
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
% At or Above Basic	60	47	39
% At or Above Proficient	18	5	5
% At Advanced	2	0	2
Number of students tested	50	59	59
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Basic	55	55	55
% At or Above Proficient	13	8	24
% At Advanced	3	0	5
Number of students tested	77	79	83
STATE SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	68	63	61
% At or Above Proficient	36	32	32
% At Advanced	12	9	10

LANGUAGE ARTS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 3

Test California Standards Test, Language Arts

Edition/publication year 2001, 2002 and 2003 Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{131}{2002}$, $\frac{118}{2001}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{129}{2002}$, $\frac{115}{2001}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{2}{2002}$, $\frac{3}{2001}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{2}{2002}$, $\frac{3}{2001}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	69	65	68
% At or Above Proficient	34	40	30
% At Advanced	10	9	8
Number of students tested	131	129	115
Percent of total students tested	96	98	97
Number of students excluded	5	2	3
Percent of students excluded	5	2	3
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
% At or Above Basic	54	49	43
% At or Above Proficient	9	18	15
% At Advanced	2	2	0
Number of students tested	46	62	40
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Basic	59	57	59
% At or Above Proficient	15	27	21
% At Advanced	4	3	2
Number of students tested	84	86	53
STATE SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	63	62	59
% At or Above Proficient	33	34	30
% At Advanced	10	11	9

LANGUAGE ARTS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 4

Test California Standards Test, Language Arts

Edition/publication year 2001, 2002 and 2003 Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{110}{2002}$, $\frac{107}{2001}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{121}{2003}$, $\frac{106}{2002}$, $\frac{103}{2001}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{1}{2003}$, $\frac{4}{2002}$, $\frac{4}{2001}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{1}{2003}$, $\frac{4}{2002}$, $\frac{4}{2001}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	Mai	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	80	74	70
% At or Above Proficient	45	32	40
% At Advanced	17	21	10
Number of students tested	121	106	109
Percent of total students tested	99	96	96
Number of students excluded	1	4	4
Percent of students excluded	1	4	4
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
% At or Above Basic	65	60	38
% At or Above Proficient	19	17	5
% At Advanced	3	3	0
Number of students tested	37	37	39
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Basic	74	65	59
% At or Above Proficient	28	18	21
% At Advanced	8	0	2
Number of students tested	80	66	53
STATE SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	74	71	66
% At or Above Proficient	39	36	33
% At Advanced	15	14	11

LANGUAGE ARTS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 5

Test California Standards Test, Language Arts

Edition/publication year 2001, 2002 and 2003 Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{102}{2002}$, $\frac{111}{2001}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{98}{2002}$, $\frac{109}{2001}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{4}{2002}$, $\frac{2}{2001}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{4}{2002}$, $\frac{2}{2001}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	78	64	75
% At or Above Proficient	35	26	27
% At Advanced	8	6	3
Number of students tested	113	98	109
Percent of total students tested	100	96	98
Number of students excluded	0	4	2
Percent of students excluded	0	4	2
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
% At or Above Basic	50	44	45
% At or Above Proficient	5	3	0
% At Advanced	0	0	0
Number of students tested	20	37	38
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Basic	71	54	69
% At or Above Proficient	20	9	13
% At Advanced	0	2	0
Number of students tested	69	54	70
STATE SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	72	71	66
% At or Above Proficient	36	31	29
% At Advanced	10	9	7

LANGUAGE ARTS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 6

Test California Standards Test, Language Arts

Edition/publication year 2001, 2002 and 2003 Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{104}{2002}$, $\frac{86}{2001}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{102}{2002}$, $\frac{81}{2001}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{2}{2002}$, $\frac{5}{2001}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{2}{2002}$, $\frac{6}{2001}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	75	79	85
% At or Above Proficient	38	30	36
% At Advanced	17	6	4
Number of students tested	87	102	81
Percent of total students tested	98	98	94
Number of students excluded	2	2	5
Percent of students excluded	2	2	6
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
% At or Above Basic	47	61	73
% At or Above Proficient	5	8	5
% At Advanced	0	0	0
Number of students tested	19	38	22
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
% At or Above Basic	61	77	80
% At or Above Proficient	24	15	16
% At Advanced	7	0	2
Number of students tested	46	68	42
STATE SCORES			
% At or Above Basic	71	66	67
% At or Above Proficient	36	30	31
% At Advanced	13	9	8

MATHEMATICS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 2

Test California Standards Test, Mathematics

Edition/publication year 2002 and 2003

Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{131}{2002}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{125}{2002}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{6}{2002}$

Percent excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{5}{2002}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	82	67
% At or Above Proficient	61	46
% At Advanced	23	15
Number of students tested	122	125
Percent of total students tested	100	95
Number of students excluded	0	6
Percent of students excluded	0	5
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. English Language Learners		
% At or Above Basic	82	47
% At or Above Proficient	57	27
% At Advanced	15	7
Number of students tested	50	60
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged		
% At or Above Basic	76	56
% At or Above Proficient	52	36
% At Advanced	12	10
Number of students tested	77	81
STATE SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	76	68
% At or Above Proficient	53	43
% At Advanced	24	16

MATHEMATICS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 3

Test California Standards Test, Mathematics

Edition/publication year 2002 and 2003

Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{136}{2003}$, $\frac{131}{2002}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{131}{2003}$, $\frac{129}{2002}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{5}{2003}$, $\frac{2}{2002}$

Percent excluded: $\frac{4}{2003}$, $\frac{2}{2002}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	80	77
% At or Above Proficient	56	49
% At Advanced	19	16
Number of students tested	131	129
Percent of total students tested	96	98
Number of students excluded	5	2
Percent of students excluded	4	2
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. English Language Learners		
% At or Above Basic	61	62
% At or Above Proficient	37	30
% At Advanced	9	6
Number of students tested	61	62
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged		
% At or Above Basic	74	71
% At or Above Proficient	48	40
% At Advanced	13	10
Number of students tested	84	86
STATE SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	71	65
% At or Above Proficient	46	38
% At Advanced	19	12

MATHEMATICS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 4

Test California Standards Test, Mathematics

Edition/publication year 2002 and 2003

Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{122}{2003}$, $\frac{110}{2002}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{120}{2003}$, $\frac{107}{2002}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{2}{2003}$, $\frac{3}{2002}$

Percent excluded: $\frac{2}{2003}$, $\frac{3}{2002}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	82	68
% At or Above Proficient	54	34
% At Advanced	15	13
Number of students tested	120	107
Percent of total students tested	98	97
Number of students excluded	1	3
Percent of students excluded	2	3
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. English Language Learners		
% At or Above Basic	78	55
% At or Above Proficient	32	18
% At Advanced	5	5
Number of students tested	37	38
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged		
% At or Above Basic	81	59
% At or Above Proficient	46	20
% At Advanced	8	4
Number of students tested	79	67
STATE SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	72	67
% At or Above Proficient	45	37
% At Advanced	18	13

MATHEMATICS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 5

Test California Standards Test, Mathematics

Edition/publication year 2002 and 2003

Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{113}{2003}$, $\frac{102}{2002}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{113}{2003}$, $\frac{98}{2002}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{4}{2002}$

Percent excluded: $\frac{0}{2003}$, $\frac{4}{2002}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	57	59
% At or Above Proficient	23	29
% At Advanced	4	7
Number of students tested	113	98
Percent of total students tested	100	96
Number of students excluded	0	4
Percent of students excluded	0	4
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. English Language Learners (lg. Influx of new non-English students in 2003)		
% At or Above Basic	16	45
% At or Above Proficient	5	15
% At Advanced	0	0
Number of students tested	20	27
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (lg. Influx of new non-English students in 2003)		
% At or Above Basic	40	53
% At or Above Proficient	11	23
% At Advanced	1	4
Number of students tested	69	54
STATE SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	61	59
% At or Above Proficient	35	29
% At Advanced	10	7

MATHEMATICS CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (State Criterion-Referenced Test)

Grade 6

Test California Standards Test, Mathematics

Edition/publication year 2002 and 2003

Publisher California Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{89}{2003}$, $\frac{104}{2002}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{87}{2003}$, $\frac{103}{2002}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{2}{2003}$, $\frac{1}{2002}$

Percent excluded: $\frac{2}{2003}$, $\frac{1}{2002}$

Display Table:

	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	76	70
% At or Above Proficient	42	32
% At Advanced	16	11
Number of students tested	87	103
Percent of total students tested	98	99
Number of students excluded	2	1
Percent of students excluded	2	1
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. English Language Learners		
% At or Above Basic	53	51
% At or Above Proficient	11	19
% At Advanced	0	3
Number of students tested	19	31
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged		
% At or Above Basic	N/A	65
% At or Above Proficient	26	26
% At Advanced	N/A	7
Number of students tested	46	69
STATE SCORES		
% At or Above Basic	64	62
% At or Above Proficient	34	32
% At Advanced	10	10

MATHEMATICS STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST/9 (SAT/9) (Norm-referenced)

Grade 2

Test Stanford Achievement Test/9

Edition/publication year 1995

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{131}{2002}$, $\frac{128}{2001}$, $\frac{104}{2000}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{125}{2002}$, $\frac{128}{2001}$, $\frac{99}{2000}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{6}{2002}$, $\frac{0}{2001}$, $\frac{5}{2000}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{4}{2002}$, $\frac{0}{2001}$, $\frac{5}{2000}$

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

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	72	65	65
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	45	32	35
Number of students tested	125	128	99
Percent of total students tested	96	100	95
Number of students excluded	6	0	5
Percent of students excluded	4	0	5
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	60	51	55
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	25	14	21
Number of students tested	60	59	38
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	65	60	57
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	34	24	27
Number of students tested	80	84	56
STATE SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	62	51	57
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	37	25	33

MATHEMATICS STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST/9 (SAT/9) (Norm-referenced)

Grade 3

Test Stanford Achievement Test/9

Edition/publication year 1995

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{131}{2002}$, $\frac{118}{2001}$, $\frac{109}{2000}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{128}{2002}$, $\frac{113}{2001}$, $\frac{104}{2000}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{3}{2002}$, $\frac{5}{2001}$, $\frac{5}{2000}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{2}{2002}$, $\frac{4}{2001}$, $\frac{5}{2000}$

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

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	73	68	56
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	45	35	27
Number of students tested	128	113	104
Percent of total students tested	98	96	95
Number of students excluded	3	5	5
Percent of students excluded	2	4	5
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	61	46	28
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	27	21	8
Number of students tested	62	39	39
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	72	59	38
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	35	24	16
Number of students tested	85	68	55
STATE SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	62	51	51
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	36	25	29

MATHEMATICS STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST/9 (SAT/9) (Norm-referenced)

Grade 4

Test Stanford Achievement Test/9

Edition/publication year 1995

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 110, 107, 115
2002 2001 2000

Number of students who took the test: 106, 103, 110
2002 2001 2000

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: 4, 4, 5 Percent excluded: 4, 4, 5
2002 2001 2000 2002 2001 2000

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

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	62	65	60
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	38	37	30
Number of students tested	106	103	110
Percent of total students tested	96	96	95
Number of students excluded	4	4	5
Percent of students excluded	4	4	5
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	45	36	35
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	18	8	10
Number of students tested	38	39	40
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	48	55	51
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	23	25	19
Number of students tested	66	53	67
STATE SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	58	54	51
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	35	32	29

MATHEMATICS STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST/9 (SAT/9) (Norm-referenced)

Grade 5

Test Stanford Achievement Test/9

Edition/publication year 1995

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{102}{2002}$, $\frac{111}{2001}$, $\frac{91}{2000}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{98}{2002}$, $\frac{111}{2001}$, $\frac{90}{2000}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{4}{2002}$, $\frac{0}{2001}$, $\frac{1}{2000}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{4}{2002}$, $\frac{100}{2001}$, $\frac{1}{2000}$

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

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	60	56	49
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	34	28	22
Number of students tested	98	111	90
Percent of total students tested	98	100	99
Number of students excluded	4	0	1
Percent of students excluded	4	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	37	20	59
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	8	5	15
Number of students tested	38	40	27
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	52	44	28
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	24	18	6
Number of students tested	54	72	36
STATE SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	57	54	50
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	32	30	27

MATHEMATICS STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST/9 (SAT/9) (Norm-referenced)

Grade 6

Test Stanford Achievement Test/9

Edition/publication year 1995

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered: $\frac{104}{2002}$, $\frac{86}{2001}$, $\frac{107}{2000}$

Number of students who took the test: $\frac{103}{2002}$, $\frac{81}{2001}$, $\frac{103}{2000}$

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?

Parent waiver. Assessed with California standards-based pre/post benchmark tests

Number excluded: $\frac{1}{2002}$, $\frac{5}{2001}$, $\frac{4}{2000}$ Percent excluded: $\frac{1}{2002}$, $\frac{6}{2001}$, $\frac{4}{2000}$

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

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	71	74	80
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	43	42	54
Number of students tested	103	81	103
Percent of total students tested	99	94	96
Number of students excluded	1	5	4
Percent of students excluded	1	6	4
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. English Language Learners			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	44	59	56
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	21	23	15
Number of students tested	39	22	39
2. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	62	62	68
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	22	24	39
Number of students tested	68	42	44
STATE SCORES			
Total Score (above (scoring above 50 th percentile)	60	57	55
Total Score (above (scoring above 75 th percentile)	38	35	32