

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

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

Official School Name William Mendenhall Middle School (As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1701 El Padro Drive (If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Livermore California 94550-6215 City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (925) 606-4731 Fax (925) 606-4737

Website/URL MMSCHOOL.ORG E-mail lgoldring@livermore.k12.ca.us

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

(Principal's Signature) [Signature] Date 1-13-04

Name of Superintendent* Ms. Brenda Miller (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Livermore Valley Joint Unified Tel. (925) 606-3200

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) [Signature] Date 1-13-04

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mrs. Anne White (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) [Signature] Date 1-13-04

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

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.

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

DISTRICT

1. Number of schools in the district: 12 Elementary schools
 4 Middle schools
 Junior high schools
 2 High schools
 2 Other (Briefly explain) 1 continuation high school
 1 elementary home school
 20 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,905
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$7,688

SCHOOL

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.
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				7	157	144	301
1				8	145	151	296
2				9			
3				10			
4				11			
5				12			
6	134	173	307	Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							904

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>85.1</u> | % White |
| <u>1.2</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>9.7</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>3.4</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>.6</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100 | % Total |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: **3%**

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	34
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	25
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	59
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	859
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.07
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	6.87

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: **3%**
31 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: **13**
 Specify languages: **Armenian, Cantonese, English, Farsi, Filipino, Hindi, Ilocano, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese**

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: **5%**
44 Total Number Students Who Qualify

10. Students receiving special education services: **13%**
120 Total Number of Students Served

Number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

<u> </u> Autism	<u> </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> 3 </u> Deafness	<u> </u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u> </u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u> </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)	2	
Classroom teachers	31	3
Special resource teachers/specialists	4	3
Paraprofessionals		2
Support staff	13	8
Total number	50	16

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: **30:1**

13. Attendance patterns of teachers and students by percentage:

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	92	85	92	90	94
Daily teacher attendance	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8
Teacher turnover rate *	24	11	.03	8	0
Student dropout rate	0	0	0	0	0
Student drop-off rate	Does	Not	Apply		

* Turnover rate factors: retirement, layoff of temporary teachers

PART III - SUMMARY

William Mendenhall Middle School is strategically located on the southwest side of Livermore. Like the fine blending from our local vineyards, the campus offers a collegial campus rich in tradition that serves children of Bay Area commuters, vintners, and physicists. The office staff, described as “like a family,” greets you. A secretary concentrates on preparing the Principal’s Honor Roll Tea, while running off certificates for current Students of the Week. These students, recognized for their positive contribution to our school community, are recognized in classes and on the school website.

Classroom practices and campus modernization adhere to the philosophy in *Taking Center Stage*. Classroom organization, facility use, and landscaping are informed by current brain research on learning, curricular standards, and the social needs of developing adolescents. Mendenhall’s Single Plan is founded on high expectations for student achievement clarified in the state content standards. Thirty-one percent of students qualify for GATE services, which drives a commitment to differentiate instruction. Ninety-eight percent of Special Day students are mainstreamed in regular education classes. A culture of mutual respect flows seamlessly through the school informed by a curriculum-infused *Interdependence* program focusing on personal integrity and social skills. Community-building abounds in Leadership class and activities, student tutoring and mentoring, Challenge Days, the conflict management program, and discipline procedures that include students as problem solvers.

The positive environment is supported by a collaboratively written vision statement and tenets created by teachers and administrators: ***Our future starts today. Together we are engaged learners, respecting ourselves, our community, and our environment.***

Tenets:

- 1. We believe that honesty, good communication and trust are essential for quality decision-making, and therefore must be practiced continuously.***
- 2. We believe that our enriched program focuses on challenging academic opportunities while it supports the social development of our students.***
- 3. We believe that our diverse program meets the unique needs of our student population.***
- 4. We believe that our strength reflects mutual cooperation among parents, staff, students, and community members.***
- 5. We believe that a safe environment requires honor, respect, and responsibility from all of our members.***
- 6. We believe that leadership qualities acquired by our students will make them productive members of their community.***

Parents are prominent members of our community, spearheading award-winning programs, serving on decision-making bodies such as School Site Council, and providing classroom support as Parent Teacher and Student Association (PTSA) officers and volunteers. Whether attending the regional and state MathCounts competition, accompanying a student to the national Spelling Bee championship, serving on the English Language Advisory Committee, cheering participants in the Academic Olympics, or enjoying the district Solo Ensemble Music Festival, all of the focus is on providing opportunity and encouragement to young adults during a critical transition period.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Data

Teachers and administrators at Mendenhall use every level of data to assess student achievement, organize curriculum and testing, and provide intervention. Four levels of assessment help us to plan for students. The first level of analysis considers the progress of all students. Our data confirms that all students and our one identified subgroup are functioning at a high level with yearly progress. We attribute this to curriculum tightly aligned with the content standards, high expectations for both knowledge and higher order thinking skill attainment, and support of social and personal development for adolescents

Total reading and math scores for each grade are reviewed by components to notice strengths, weaknesses, and identify patterns. For example, flat scores in writing conventions (i.e. 2000-2002 scores of 6th- 60, 7th- 61, 8th- 60) and lowered 8th grade scores in word analysis and vocabulary resulted in articulated 6-8 programs for grammar, and root words. Scores from 2003 show a positive result of consistency in all testing areas. This level of assessment also identifies remarkable strength in Mathematics across general math, prealgebra and algebra assessments.

Grade level data from the California Standards Test (CST) is reviewed during department meetings for strengths, weaknesses, and patterns. Two years of data allow teachers to reflect on curriculum, teaching strategies and lesson planning. Teachers discuss areas in texts that refer to each specific testing area, and how reteaching may support comprehension. For example, scores in Quantitative Relationships and Statistics at the 7th grade level indicated to teachers a need to reteach these concepts through successive curriculum units. Teachers agree that current scores do not reflect the total potential of our students, who require further challenge. One of the goals for Math is to enroll more students in high school Geometry classes as a way to provide a challenging curriculum.

Data from the 7th grade state writing assessment is used to plan both school and district-wide writing assessments. Classroom instruction is aligned with the writing genres identified by the state Department of Education. Since adopting the state writing genres, Mendenhall's teachers have noted improved scores for site and district writing assessments. Representative teachers from each middle school site meet annually to select prompts in each genre area and prepare sample papers to calibrate rubric scoring across the district.

Lesson plans are informed by a site-prepared data base, composed of students whose state testing scores were below the 40th percentile for CAT-6, and/or Basic, Below Basic, or Far Below Basic on the California Standards Test. Students at the 8th grade level with low scores are invited to enroll in Reading or Math Intervention classes outside of the school day. These students and their parents complete a contract with the principal and teachers to clarify a plan for academic success. Reading comprehension goals are aligned with suggested reading levels provided with state testing results, utilizing technology such as the Accelerated Reader program, or through personal choice reading for book reports. Students are also evaluated for modified instruction of the core curriculum.

2. Academic Success

Student data drives the cycle of inquiry for teachers, administrators, parents and students

to improve student achievement. This focus is consistent from the macro level where a common vision statement, beliefs, and single plan epitomize the culture and goals of Mendenhall Middle School, to the micro level of student self-reflection and goal setting in classrooms.

The results of nationally normed and state content standard assessments are reviewed annually in reference to our goals to improve student performance and educational practices. Teachers begin lesson planning for the year with databases. One set of data include all student test scores. A second set of data highlights the gaps of students with low performance scores. Lesson planning and teaching techniques reflect attention to these gaps. At the end of the first quarter, site reports for Language Arts and Mathematics content standards are reviewed as a formative evaluation of the curriculum, teaching materials and strategies, and appropriate adjustments are made.

Individual student data, including district and school-wide writing exams, optional national and state subject exams, and classroom assessments provide information to teachers, students and parents. Teachers reflect on assessment to adjust teaching strategies, reteach, and plan future tests. Students are asked to reflect on their tests, identify strengths and weaknesses, and create an improvement plan. Each level of reflection is intended to support student achievement. Students with low state test scores are identified for optional intervention classes. These scores are combined with classroom assessments during parent conferences. This information is also useful for Special Education IEP meetings.

3. Sharing Student Assessment Data

The current level of student performance for Mendenhall is expressed at the state level in a single API score. This figure is displayed in the School Accountability Report Card, and is available from the district and state websites as well as published in local newspapers and on the school marquee. Parents are informed of progress for this score during Back to School night, where they receive information concerning state content standards. Real estate developers publish this result to perspective homebuyers. Student Study Team members and teachers review individual student scores.

Quarterly report cards coupled with progress reports for students receiving D or F grades inform parents on a continuous basis. Computer generated grade printout sheets provide detailed information concerning student progress in mastering content standards. Students with consistent failing grades, or whose state test scores indicate low skill level meet with administrators and teachers to create a Student Support Plan and Agreement that may include enrollment in an Intervention class, private tutoring, weekly teacher tutorials, and a plan to complete and turn in homework.

Community members actively involved with students also monitor student achievement. The Livermore Rotary Club, whose members actively participate with students in the Science department, has adopted Mendenhall for services. Volunteers from the Lawrence Livermore and Sandia labs track student math scores as they support the MathCounts program. Parents and community members are also able to enjoy many examples of applied principles during Open House, when Science experiments, Applied Art and Art projects, among others, are on display. Students who perform in the Solo Ensemble Festival, Band and Orchestra concerts, Talent Show, Musical, and participate on co-curricular teams also demonstrate their skills to the community. Student projects are featured on the school website, which is maintained by parent volunteers

4. Sharing Success with Other Schools

The staff of Mendenhall Middle School assumes that all students have the potential to succeed. Our vision statement identifies that, with our students, parents and community members, we form a community of lifelong learners. As such, we eagerly enter into dialogue with other schools concerning our primary goal of increasing student achievement.

A national publication is currently reviewing a submission regarding the importance of aligning a vision statement and social skill training program to maintain a focus on both learning and mutual respect. This may allow us to share our findings regarding the Interdependence program with our larger educational community. We are already having discussions about sharing the development and use of this curriculum through the California League of Middle Schools.

Within our district, middle school teachers regularly articulate with elementary and high school teachers to align curriculum and provide a smooth transition for students. There is also alignment with high school programs in mathematics, Language Arts, and Special Education.

Principals within the state band of similar schools, identified as achieving at similar levels, are also in discussion regarding successful strategies to support student achievement. This initial discussion will allow us to share the practices used by teachers, administrators and support staff that have increased student achievement

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. . School Curriculum

Mendenhall is organized as a 6-8 middle school. The curriculum is anchored in department areas, and is sustained by cooperative teaching strategies with a common focus on reading comprehension, writing, and social skills. Students in each curricular area receive instruction that focuses on essential learning as outlined in a set of Essential Standards created by site teachers. Common instructional strategies across the curriculum include differentiating instruction in relation to learning styles and intelligences, problem-solving, shaping responses through repetition and polishing, retrieving information from valid print and digital sources, real life experience and application, and varying work through individual, dyad, and group participation.

Language Arts, Reading and Social Studies instruction is provided in Core classes. For sixth grade students, this occupies three periods or half of the instructional day. A two-period model is used for 7th and 8th grades. Qualifying students may enroll in Honors classes at the 7th and 8th grades. Instruction aligned with the state content standards is provided through newly adopted basal texts that emphasize the process of learning, and are enhanced by novels that extend the social studies curriculum. The core curriculum also includes the opportunity to complete a full year of high school Spanish in Spanish 1A and 1B classes.

The Science department provides curriculum in earth, life and physical sciences. Through a partnership with the Lawrence Livermore and Sandia labs, teachers are able to procure enrichment materials and receive ongoing professional development. A retired Livermore Lab scientist joins us weekly as a Teaching Opportunities for Partners in Science (TOPS) partner, providing instruction to students and additional learning opportunities. Students involved in lab projects enter the district Science Odyssey competition and go on to a regional Science Fair, where they are critiqued by practicing scientists.

An ungraded approach, which removes grade specific requirements for Math classes, allows students to advance or remediate in response to their individual development and talent. Students may choose from five different math classes, four of which address Algebra standards. These classes vary in pacing and breadth of content, to accommodate the development and educational needs of all students. All students may participate in weekly MathCounts sessions that offer challenging problems, run by parent volunteers and Math teachers. A competitive team represents Mendenhall at the regional and state level annually.

Enrichment is included as part of the regular curriculum, including instruction in, Career, 3-D and Advanced Art, Applied Arts, Yearbook and Technology. Students who enjoy music are involved in Intermediate and Advanced Band and Orchestra, Choir, or Music Drama. These selections are offered during and outside of the regular school day in order to maximize student participation.

2. English Language Curriculum

The English language curriculum is embedded in an interdisciplinary Core class for each grade level. Sixth grade students orienting to middle school are enrolled in a 3-period class where instruction in English, Reading, and Social Studies occupies half of the school day. Core classes in 7th and 8th grades span two periods. Students at this level may also qualify for Honors Core, which challenges students to develop and extend higher order thinking skills.

A standards-based curriculum approach at all levels is provided in classrooms informed by recent findings in brain research and child development. Students receive remediation as a component of regular instruction in addition to Intervention classes held outside of the school day. Daily writing and grammar practice refine student skills through reteaching. Students may take adaptive or challenge type spelling tests. A new literature anthology that reflects the state content standards is used in conjunction with core historical novels. All students participate in a schoolwide focus on root words; these skills are reinforced in Core class through the text and writing exercises. Teaching strategies that support reading comprehension include: preteaching essential vocabulary, use of CD text versions with chapter summaries, and pursuing personal reading goals selected by students to meet and challenge their current reading level.

Students frequently write in all genres emphasized. This allows them to respond to literature, summarize, compare, or examine cause and effect in either literature or Social Studies. Students realize the application of their work through simulations and hands-on activities that make use of their personal experience, talent, and learning style. Graphic organizers help to organize information and underscore aspects of reading comprehension. Writing projects have the support of technology for research and organizing.

3. Science Curriculum

The Science curriculum is organized to support understanding of the specialized vocabulary and skills of earth and life science. A standards based textbook is enhanced with text CDs that can be played in class, or checked out for use in Resource class and at home. Textbooks and enrichment materials offer both authentic and virtual lab experiments aligned with the state content standards. Students receive support for reading comprehension through a directed reading workbook companion to the texts. Root words are reviewed for their applications to science vocabulary.

Students receive support from a strong partnership with Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia Laboratory. A retired scientist regularly offers classroom support,

enhanced equipment to explore scientific concepts (such as a Star Lab and weather station) and assists students during classroom labs. Students enrolled in Science classes participate in weekly MathCounts tutoring with lab volunteers.

Students may enter classroom labs, such as the Rube Goldberg project, or other entries in the district Science Odyssey or regional Science Fair. These two events are judged by local scientists and allow students to explore concepts in depth.

4. Different Instructional Methods

Three different aspects support the instructional methods used to improve student learning. The first aspect concerns direct organization of the curriculum. Student instruction is tightly aligned to the state content standards in all subject areas, and is supported by a list of essential standards in core content areas. Daily class instruction in each subject area is offered in single or multiple class periods, offering an integrated thematic program. Teachers utilize backward lesson planning to guide instruction and assessment. Instruction is altered based on a review of assessment, and indicates area for review and reteaching. Reading instruction is addressed across content areas through a root word program that teaches word attack skills, and teaching strategies focused on building comprehension in each content area. This is also the focus of curriculum organization such as guided reading. Instruction and grading may be modified for student learning disabilities, such as nonverbal learning disorder, or to accommodate a student with attention deficits.

The second aspect of support has to do with organizing students. First, students identify their dominant learning styles and multiple intelligences. These can then be used as active tools whether working individually, in dyads, or grouped in project or cross-age teams. Students may be grouped by ability level for skill training, or participate in teams that reflect multiple learning styles. Special Day students are mainstreamed in regular instruction according to their IEP goals. Core classes provide flexible scheduling for instruction.

The third aspect of support for instruction is in the broad area of assistance. Technology provides clear instruction and support through the use of personal microphones for teachers, a homework website updated daily, Accelerated Reader assessments, word and data processing software, and journals. Students receive tutorial support and test preparation through weekly shortened instructional days, and high school tutors who assist during classroom instruction. Hands-on activities provide a real life context to instruction in Math and Science. Students record assignments in Organizers, and use a study buddy to check assignments. Test taking anxiety is addressed in evening workshops, and test-taking skills provided during classroom instruction prepare students for a variety of assessments linked with distinct types of information.

Student Study Team and Learning Study Team referrals support the accurate placement of students in regular and Special Education. Students have the opportunity to participate in Academic Olympics, MathCounts, the Spelling Bee, as well as cocurricular activities such as sports teams.

5. Professional Development

The site Single Plan for Improvement includes five goal areas to improve student performance and educational practices: 1 Provide curriculum aligned to the state content standards; 2. Differentiate instruction to address the learning styles and multiple intelligences of all students; 3. Provide reading comprehension instruction to teachers and students to support student achievement; 4. Increase student achievement in Math through ungraded instruction; 5. Support student connection and commitment to their community by demonstrating positive

character traits.

Staff development days are aligned with these goals to provide opportunities for instruction, analysis and collaboration. The emphasis is on building continuous skills through professional development, and just-in-time training during staff, department, and leadership meetings. Presentations by national speakers on brain-compatible learning, literacy instruction from CSU Hayward instructors, and teacher demonstration lessons provide research-based applications for staff members.

With a growing number of English language learning students, teachers are also instructed and use SDAIE strategies such as prereading, directed reading, and double entry diaries. In order to address the needs of all students, staff training also addresses learning disabilities for regular and Special Education settings, attention deficit, and strategies to encourage low achieving or frustrated students.

The combination of these five goals supports increased student achievement at Mendenhall as measured by state assessment, nationally normed tests, and district and site writing assessments.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Mendenhall Middle School performs within the top ten percent of California middle schools, as measured by state standards tests in reading and mathematics. Students have demonstrated consistent improvement over a five year-period, according to nationally-normed and state standard criterion-referenced assessments.

Statistically Significant Subgroups

The results found in the Appendix provide disaggregated data for the subgroup of White students at Mendenhall Middle School. This is the only group that is of statistical significance for this campus. Students in this subgroup have been achieving at a high level for the previous three years.

Groups Excluded from Testing

There are no groups that are excluded from state testing at this school. Individual students may refrain from taking one or more tests, according to their Individual Education Plan (IEP) goals or written parent request.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Grade **6** Test **California Standards Test 9 (English Language Arts)**
 Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **302**
 Number of students who took the test **302**
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**
 Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES	363.7	354.9			
% At or Above Basic	91	91	93		
% At or Above Proficient	62	57	62		
% At Advanced	28	19	22		
Number of students tested	302	270	262		
Percent of total students tested	100	97	91		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Students w/ disabilities (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	62	N/A	67		
% At or Above Proficient	18	N/A	42		
% At Advanced	7	N/A	25		
Number of students tested	45	4	12		
2. Economic Disadvantaged (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	71	N/A	N/A		
% At or Above Proficient	21	N/A	N/A		
% At Advanced	0	N/A	N/A		
Number of students tested	14	9	8		
STATE SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	71	66	67		
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	36	30	31		
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	13	9	8		
State Mean Score	332.2	323.0			

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **6** Test **California Standards Test (English Language Arts)**

Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **302**

Number of students who took the test **302**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **None**

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	363.7	354.9			
Number of students tested	302	270	262		
Percent of total students tested	100	97	91		
Number of students excluded	0	8	24		
	0	3	8		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Students w/Disabilities (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	45	4	12		
2. Economic Disadvantages (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	14	9	8		
3. English Learners(specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	13	7	3		
4. English Learners less than 12 months (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	3	0	0		

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **7** Test **California Standards Test 9 (English Language Arts)**
 Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **287**
 Number of students who took the test **286**
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**
 Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES	363.8	351.6			
% At or Above Basic	92	84	89		
% At or Above Proficient	65	52	59		
% At Advanced	23	15	19		
Number of students tested	287	272	237		
Percent of total students tested	100	93	83		
Number of students excluded	0	19	40		
Percent of students excluded	0	7	14		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Students w/ disabilities (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	63	28	35		
% At or Above Proficient	35	N/A	5		
% At Advanced	7	N/A	5		
Number of students tested	29	25	20		
2. From disadvantaged (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	90	N/A	N/A		
% At or Above Proficient	50	N/A	N/A		
% At Advanced	20	N/A	N/A		
Number of students tested	10	5	6		
STATE SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	69	65	65		
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	36	33	32		
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	10	7	9		
State Mean Score	329.5	322.8			

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **7** Test **California Standards Test (English Language Arts)**

Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **287**

Number of students who took the test **286**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **None**

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April			
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	363.8				
Number of students tested	286	272			
Percent of total students tested	100	93			
Number of students excluded	0	19			
Percent of students excluded	0	7			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.Students w/Disabilities (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	29	28			
2. Economic Disadvantages (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	10	5			
3.English Learners(specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	8	3			
4.English Learners less than 12 months (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	8	1			

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **8** Test **California Standards Test 9 (English Language Arts)**
 Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **290**
 Number of students who took the test **285**
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**
 Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES	354.8	356.6			
% At or Above Basic	84	91	94		
% At or Above Proficient	56	59	63		
% At Advanced	21	21	24		
Number of students tested	285	243	271		
Percent of total students tested	98	97	100		
Number of students excluded	0	7	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	3	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Students w/ disabilities (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	91	31	53		
% At or Above Proficient	62	0	15		
% At Advanced	24	0	10		
Number of students tested	35	16	21		
2. Economic Disadvantaged (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	17	N/A	N/A		
% At or Above Proficient	17	N/A	N/A		
% At Advanced	0	N/A	N/A		
Number of students tested	6	7	7		
STATE SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	64	66	67		
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	30	32	32		
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	8	10	9		
State Mean Score	324.4	323.3			

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **8** Test **California Standards Test (English Language Arts)**

Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **290**

Number of students who took the test **285**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **None**

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	354.8	356.6			
Number of students tested	285	243	271		
Percent of total students tested	98	97	100		
Number of students excluded	0	7	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	3	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.Students w/Disabilities (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	35	16	21		
2. Economic Disadvantages (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	6	7	7		
3.English Learners (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	9	1	6		
4.English Learners less than 12 months (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	0	1	0		

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **6** Test **California Standards Test (Mathematics)**
 Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **302**
 Number of students who took the test **301**
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**
 Number excluded _____ Percent excluded _____

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES	367.4	368.5			
% At or Above Basic	86	89	83		
% At or Above Proficient	57	58	53		
% At Advanced	24	22	20		
Number of students tested	301	272	284		
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98		
Number of students excluded	0	5	6		
Percent of students excluded	0	2	2		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Students w/ disabilities (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	51	N/A	N/A		
% At or Above Proficient	15	N/A	N/A		
% At Advanced	4	N/A	N/A		
Number of students tested	45	4	29		
2. From Economic disadvantaged (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	58	N/A	N/A		
% At or Above Proficient	29	N/A	N/A		
% At Advanced	0	N/A	N/A		
Number of students tested	14	9	10		
STATE SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	64	62			
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	34	32			
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	10	10			
State Mean Score	331.1	328.3			

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **6** Test **California Standards Test (Mathematics)**

Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **302**

Number of students who took the test **301**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **None**

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	367.4	368.5			
Number of students tested	301	272	284		
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98		
Number of students excluded	0	5	6		
Percent of students excluded	0	2	2		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.Students w/Disabilities (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	45	4	29		
2.Economic Disadvantages (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	14	9	10		
3.English Learners (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	13	3	7		
4.English Learners less than 12 months (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	3	0	0		

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **7** Test **California Standards Test (Mathematics)**
 Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **287**
 Number of students who took the test **285**
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**
 Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES	360.4	358.0			
% At or Above Basic	86	81	87		
% At or Above Proficient	54	53	55		
% At Advanced	18	19	15		
Number of students tested	285	281	250		
Percent of total students tested	99	96	96		
Number of students excluded	0	6	10		
Percent of students excluded	0	2	4		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Students w/ disabilities (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	50	18	N/A		
% At or Above Proficient	29	0	N/A		
% At Advanced	4	0	N/A		
Number of students tested	28	28	20		
2. From Economic disadvantaged (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	90	N/A	N/A		
% At or Above Proficient	30	N/A	N/A		
% At Advanced	0	N/A	N/A		
Number of students tested	10	7	6		
STATE SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	62	61			
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	30	30			
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	7	6			
State Mean Score	324.7	320.1			

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **7** Test **California Standards Test (Mathematics)**
 Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **287**
 Number of students who took the test **285**
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **None**
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	360.4	358.0			
Number of students tested	285	281	250		
Percent of total students tested	99	96	98		
Number of students excluded	0	6	10		
Percent of students excluded	0	2	4		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.Students w/Disabilities (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	28	28	20		
2.Economic Disadvantages (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	10	7	6		
3.English Learners (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	8	0	4		
4.English Learners less than 12 months (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	0	0	1		

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **8** Test **California Standards Test (Mathematics) Algebra 1**

Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **209**

Number of students who took the test **64**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **None**

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April	April		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	446.2	441.7			
Number of students tested	64	60	56		
Percent of total students tested	22	24	21		
Number of students excluded	0	0	0		
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.Students w/Disabilities (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	0	0	1		
2.Economic Disadvantages (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	0	1	0		
3.English Learners (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	0	0	0		
4.English Learners less than 12 months (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	0	0	0		

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **8** Test **California Standards Test (Mathematics) General Math**
 Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**
 Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **290**
 Number of students who took the test **218**
 What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**
 Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April			
SCHOOL SCORES	356.3	352.6			
% At or Above Basic	84	90			
% At or Above Proficient	58	58			
% At Advanced	10	7			
Number of students tested	218	180			
Percent of total students tested	75	72			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Students w/ disabilities (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	48	77			
% At or Above Proficient	11	0			
% At Advanced	0	0			
Number of students tested	35	13			
2. From Economic disadvantaged (specify subgroup)					
% At or Above Basic	50	N/A			
% At or Above Proficient	17	N/A			
% At Advanced	0	N/A			
Number of students tested	6	9			
		6			
STATE SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	56	54			
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	24	20			
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	3	2			
State Mean Score	311.2	307.4			

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS, con't.

Grade **8** Test **California Standards Test (Mathematics) General Math**

Edition/publication year **2003** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **290**

Number of students who took the test **218**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? **None**

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	April	April			
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	356.3	352.6			
Number of students tested	218	180			
Percent of total students tested	75	72			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.Students w/Disabilities (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	35	13			
2.Economic Disadvantages (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	6	6			
3.English Learners (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	9	0			
4.English Learners less than 12 months (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested	0	0	0		

2004 NCLB BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS PROGRAM DATA- GRADE 8 MATH 2002-3

GRADE 8 MATH ONLY							
Row	Year: 2002	General Math	Algebra	Geometry	Integrated Math I	Integrated Math II	Totals
a	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced	58	96	N/A	N/A	N/A	75
b	Number of Students Tested (from STAR website)	180	60	N/A	N/A	N/A	271
c	Number of Student Proficient and Above (a x b)	104	58	N/A	N/A	N/A	203
d							

GRADE 8 MATH ONLY							
Row	Year: 2003	General Math	Algebra	Geometry	Integrated Math I	Integrated Math II	Totals
a	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced	54	97	N/A	N/A	N/A	75*
b	Number of Students Tested (from STAR website)	285	64	N/A	N/A	N/A	349
c	Number of Student Proficient and Above (a x b)	154	62	N/A	N/A	N/A	216
d							

* Total score reflects average of General Math, Algebra Proficient/Advanced Percent

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, 9th EDITION

Grade **6** Test **Stanford Achievement Test – 9th Edition - Reading**

Edition/publication year **1998-2002** Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **275**

Number of students who took the test **275**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above 90 th % NPR	NR	76	75	NR	NR
% At or Above 75 th % NPR	NR	71	69	43	37
% At or Above 50 th % NPR	83	64	61	73	65
% Above 25 th % NPR	NR	56	52	91	84
Number of students tested	278	285	246	276	279
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	99	99
Number of students excluded					0
Percent of students excluded					0

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, 9th EDITION, con't.

Grade **8**

Test **Stanford Achievement Test – 9th Edition - Reading**

Edition/publication year **1998-2002**

Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **258**

Number of students who took the test **258**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above 90 th % NPR	NR	78	77	NR	NR
% At or Above 75 th % NPR	NR	74	73	45	41
% At or Above 50 th % NPR	83	69	67	76	70
% Above 25 th % NPR	NR	62	60	91	88
Number of students tested	250	271	269	263	301
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	99	99
Number of students excluded					0
Percent of students excluded					0

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, 9th EDITION, con't.

Grade **6**

Test **Stanford Achievement Series –9th Edition - Math**

Edition/publication year **1998-2002**

Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **275**

Number of students who took the test **275**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above 90 th % NPR	NR	73	75	NR	NR
% At or Above 75 th % NPR	NR	68	70	44	43
% At or Above 50 th % NPR	89	59	62	72	66
% Above 25 th % NPR	NR	48	52	91	82
Number of students tested	278	285	246	276	279
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	99	99
Number of students excluded					0
Percent of students excluded					0

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, 9th EDITION, con't.

Grade **7**

Test **Stanford Achievement Series = 9th Edition - Math**

Edition/publication year **1998-2002**

Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **277**

Number of students who took the test **277**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above 90 th % NPR	NR	73	76	NR	NR
% At or Above 75 th % NPR	NR	67	73	40	41
% At or Above 50 th % NPR	84	56	67	72	68
% Above 25 th % NPR	NR	43	58	88	83
Number of students tested	294	260	271	280	273
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	99	99
Number of students excluded					0
Percent of students excluded					0

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, 9th EDITION, con't.

Grade **8**

Test **Stanford Achievement Test – 9th Edition - Math**

Edition/publication year **1998-2002**

Publisher **Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered **258**

Number of students who took the test **258**

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed **None**

Number excluded 0 Percent excluded 0

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above 90 th % NPR	NR	75;	77	NR	NR
% At or Above 75 th % NPR	NR	68	74	40	45
% At or Above 50 th % NPR	82	57	68	72	69
% Above 25 th % NPR	NR	46	60	88	86
Number of students tested	294	271	269	263	301
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	99	99
Number of students excluded					0
Percent of students excluded					0

