

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

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

Official School Name Tom Matsumoto Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 4121 Mackin Woods Lane
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

San Jose California 95135 - 1159
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (408) 223-4873 Fax (408) 223-4883

Website/URL www.eesd.org/Matsumoto/matsumoto.html E-mail mcavallo@eesd.org

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

(Principal's Signature) Date February 2, 2004

Name of Superintendent* Mr. Thomas E. Andrade
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Evergreen Elementary School District Tel. (408) 270-6800

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date February 2, 2004

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mrs. Kathy Bowers
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

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

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date February 2, 2004

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 – 2002-2003

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 14 Elementary schools
 3 Middle schools
 _____ Junior high schools
 _____ High schools
 _____ Other (Briefly explain)
- 17 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ \$ 6,037 _____
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ \$ 6,719 _____

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural area
 Rural
4. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 5 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	91	57	148	7			
1	90	103	193	8			
2	62	58	120	9			
3	83	77	160	10			
4	70	67	137	11			
5	71	70	141	12			
6				Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							899

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | | |
|-------------------|------|----------------------------------|
| _____ | 9.2 | % White |
| _____ | 1.9 | % Black or African American |
| _____ | 7.7 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| _____ | 80.5 | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| _____ | 0.7 | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% Total | | |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 10.7 %

(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
10	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	39
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	96
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	890
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.107
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	10.7

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 26.74 %
238 Total Number Limited English

Proficient

Number of languages represented: 16

Specify languages:

Vietnamese, Mandarin, Cantonese, Spanish, Korean, Punjabi, Urdu, Filipino, Japanese, Hindi, Khmer, Farsi, French, Indonesian, Rumanian, Other Non-English

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 4.9 %
44 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: 4 %
36 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> </u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>15</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>14</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>7</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>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>36</u>	<u>4</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>
Support staff	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Total number	<u>44</u>	<u>21</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 24 : 1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	96.71%	97.68%	97.41%	97.29%	97.68%
Daily teacher attendance	96.88%	97.03%	97.63%	97.21%	98.73%
Teacher turnover rate	14%	26%	10%	12%	New school
Student dropout rate	0	0	0	0	0
Student drop-off rate	0	0	0	0	0

PART III – SUMMARY – Tom Matsumoto School

Tom Matsumoto School, built in 1998, is a highly modern and fully wired 21st Century school. It is named after the longest standing member of the Evergreen School District Board of Trustees (36 years). Mr. Matsumoto symbolizes excellence in education by maintaining a continued focus on rigorous academic standards, respect and expectations from our growing diverse population, and providing state of the art facilities as students are “**Creating the Future**” (our school motto). The Tom Matsumoto School Community shares and reflects these visions by adhering to a commitment of strong academic standards, strength in social/emotional development and continuous parent involvement in all aspects of the school experience. To achieve this commitment, we believe all students must:

- be provided a rigorous, challenging and aggressive standards based curriculum
- be life-long learners
- be empowered as contributing members of our society
- have a strong self concept.

Nestled in the east San Jose foothills, Matsumoto School serves an economically and ethnically diverse population in the heart of the rapidly expanding technological Silicon Valley. Our current population of 899 students represents an ethnic diversity of 75% Asian (Indian, Vietnamese, Chinese, Cambodian, Pakastini, Japanese), 9% White, 8% Hispanic, 6% Filipino, 2% African American, 1% Pacific Islander. Sixteen languages are spoken and currently 27 % of our student body have limited proficiency in English. Homes range from very expensive in neighborhoods of great affluence to several families residing together in a single dwelling and qualified as economically disadvantaged. The fluidity of the local employment market and housing developments resulted in a 37% overall mobility rate last year, mostly from newly enrolling students. The challenges of addressing such a rapidly changing community are met with the commitment and dedication of our staff and community. Utilizing the California Academic Performance Index of 831 in 1999, Matsumoto’s commitment to excellence has raised the API to 919 in 2003, demonstrating continued academic growth closely aligned to state standards.

All students participate in an academically challenging program at their grade levels. Within each class, students are expected to acquire a base of rigorous core curriculum knowledge and apply this knowledge to comprehensive performances, in-depth investigations, and practical demonstrations of solving real world complex problems. A comprehensive assessment program including norm referenced testing, district performance assessments, classroom portfolios, schoolwide assessments, and regular grade reporting serves to drive instruction and is the basis for analyzing the success of our students and programs. Results are reported proudly to our parents and community.

School doesn’t stop when the last bell rings. Soccer Club, Chess Club, Math Club, and our performing arts group all meet after school. In the last several years, our spring musical **Annie Jr.** and **School House Rock Jr.** have been sell outs. Additionally, formal classes for intervention (at-risk in language arts and math) and extension (Great Books discussion groups) are held after school. There is an annual comprehensive summer school program. The YMCA has an on-site facility to provide extended care to families in need.

Our parents play a key role in our school’s success. Walk across the forum and see the fabulous Hogwart’s castle created by parents who also constructed backdrops for the spring play and a tree house and submarine for reading programs in the library. We expect that all parents will participate in their child’s education and they do! Through decision-making bodies (DAC, EGAC, ELAC, PAC, PTA, SSC, etc.), student/parent workshops such as ‘*Family Math Night*’, parent/teacher conferences, ‘*Stargazing Night*’, and frequent relevant communications (weekly newsletter, student/parent handbook, the parent series from The Parent Institute) our parents are full partners in our important mission. We are especially proud of our connection to the business community. Partnerships with many Silicon Valley companies as well as local businesses have supported our Science Fair, staff development, our spring musical, the library and much more. Our entire learning community holds to a singular focus that all students can and must succeed as we aspire to develop life long learners who are “**Creating the Future**”.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Describe in 1 page the meaning of the school's assessment results in reading and mathematics.

Matsumoto School has used both norm referenced testing data and performance based testing data to drive curriculum decisions, modify instructional strategies, textbook selection, and target students (individual and groups) for intervention assistance. State and local test data, in conjunction with the State of California's Academic Performance Index (API), have provided a roadmap for continued improvement over the years and validated progress made to this date.

Matsumoto's API (California's Academic Performance Index, a multiple measure index) in 1998 was 831 (scores range from 200-1000), with California designating that 800 and above as high achieving schools. The school community has continued its quest for educational improvement and excellence, achieving an API in 2003 of 919. The results of these varied instruments have provided guidance and validation to the improvement over time of our academic excellence. It should be noted that while achieving an overall growth of over 10% in the past five years, Matsumoto has also more than doubled its student population growing an average of 20+% per year.

Consistently, students have demonstrated higher achievement scores for mathematics than for language arts. Through careful analysis, it has been determined that the major cause for this is the large number of students (27%) that have demonstrated limited English proficiency in our English Language Development Program. These students, though usually proficient in verbal communication, develop their reading and writing skills at a slower pace. This results in curricular challenges in language arts, and in language based activities in mathematics.

In language arts, content clusters have indicated that our students excel at textual and recreational reading but is in the average range in critical analysis and inference skills. This resulted in professional development in classroom strategies including graphic organizers, cooperative groupings, discussion groups, differentiated instruction and SDAIE (Specifically Designed Academic Instruction in English) strategies.

In mathematics, content clusters have indicated that our students excel in most areas of computation. Students are also strong in algebraic strands. Scores dip fractionally in problem solving where English becomes a factor. Therefore, in addition to those strategies employed in language arts, we have also emphasized math manipulatives.

We have also looked extensively at our ethnic sub-groups. Historically, White and Asian have been the only significant statistical ethnic subgroups and both do exceptionally well. Though the Hispanic and lower socio-economically sub-groups are not numerically significant to provide group data, we have examined individual scores. An achievement gap in 5th and 6th grade Hispanic males and across grade levels for lower socio-economic students was discovered. As a result, teachers have made a commitment to supplement teaching strategies in after hours tutoring time and through a San Jose city funded Homework Center to assist these students. They have been prioritized for intensive after school and summer school intervention classes. Teachers have made a commitment to become individual mentors to at-risk students, providing them with positive role models, a personal interest in their private lives and maintaining constant contact with parents establishing a unique partnership with the home. Subgroup analysis has also indicated that our male/female populations achieve at an equitable level and our Gifted and Talented population achieves in the top 5% of the school population.

Our English language acquisition subgroup is one of statistical significance and is addressed at all levels of the school. Research supports that these students require extra learning time and strategies. Consequently, teachers have been trained and actively use SDAIE teaching strategies in the acquisition of English. Differentiated instruction is a cornerstone used to assist in the acquisition of core content.

As a result, our scores reflect that we, as an educational community, have felt we have done well. However, we have never felt that we have reached our pinnacle, so we continue the quest for furthering the development of excellence in education for all students.

2. Show in one-half page (approximately 200 words) how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.

Assessment data is used both in the classroom for individual student assessment and schoolwide to drive the school improvement process. In the classroom, Matsumoto teachers use assessment (normed tests, performance based tests, and curriculum rubrics) to establish flexible groupings, differentiated instruction, measure mastery and communicate with parents. Our standards based report card, in reading and math, outlines progress toward district grade level standards. Differentiated instruction is a key to meeting the varying needs of our student population and relies on assessment for placement and to evaluate mastery. For example: A fourth grade class is working on three place multiplication. Four students have yet to memorize their multiplication facts; therefore, they use multiplication tables to assist in their problem solving allowing them to keep up with the concepts delivered in the class while remediating number fact recall. Pre-testing in math, as well as analysis of SAT 9/CAT 6 sub tests and Noyce math performance assessments, assist teachers in tailoring math curriculum to individual student needs. Differentiated instruction allows all students to progress toward state, district, and school standards. Extensive assessment in the area of reading is inherent with the techniques developed by CRLP (California Reading and Literacy Project) which is utilized throughout the school. Reading, phonics and phonemic awareness levels, writing development stages, and oral language developmental levels are all assessed and utilized to tailor the language arts program to individual students. Grade level teams, under the direction of grade level facilitators and support providers, reach consensus regarding type and scope of assessments in all curricular areas. In all grades, guided reading is integral to the reading program. Join a first grade class as a flexible guided reading group is reading with fluency at a third grade level book while another group is working on consonant vowel consonant words. Developmental rubrics with aligned benchmark assessments and teacher observation create a roadmap for classroom programs, student self analysis and home support. Rubrics (based on state standards) are an integral part of the language arts and math curriculum, leading teachers into the establishment of flexible groups targeting specific learning skills. Schoolwide analysis for individual classrooms, subgroups, and grade levels is utilized in the development of our School Site Council's Single School Plan, our schoolwide goals and grade level goals.

3. Describe in one-half page how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.

Students know their progress towards standards. Students regularly rate themselves on rubrics for work study skills, writing, reading, and math. *“I like grading myself then seeing how close I am to her score. This last time I matched hers,”* bragged one third grade student. With rubrics and anchor papers to model exemplary performance, students are able to visualize their progress which in turn communicates progress toward standards to parents and teachers. Individual student conferences prior to report cards allows students to dialog with teachers regarding progress toward standards (identifying strengths and weaknesses) and rate themselves on their own social, emotional, and physical development. Independence, self-discipline, and a strong self-concept are fostered and encouraged at Matsumoto. From their very first day at school, students are taught to self-monitor and evaluate their own learning as they progress through our grades and curriculum. This assessment philosophy is described and discussed with parents during our Curriculum Night, a parent forum to introduce parents to expectations and goals for the school year, parent conferences, and through regular parent/teacher interactions throughout the year.

Student progress toward state adopted performance standards is regularly reported to parents through progress reports, standards based report cards, weekly grade print out for some grade levels, conferences, notes, e-mails, and phone calls. Fall parent teacher conferencing is based on rubric analysis of student work. Portfolio data (SAT , CAT, STAR, writing proficiencies, math prompts, and final report cards) and information on how to read the data are sent via mail to all parents. Support for identified at-risk students is provided through tutoring, after school intervention programs, the Homework Center and cross-aged tutors. District and school information is available in Spanish and Vietnamese and is translated into other languages upon request. Translators are also available for parent-teacher conferences as needed. We have focused our English Language Acquisition parent group on parent education to help parents assist their students with progress toward standards, understanding our report card, and homework hints. The community is appraised of student progress through our web-site, the School Accountability Report Card, the School Plan, our local Evergreen Times and the city’s newspaper, the San Jose Mercury News.

4. Describe in one-half page how the school will share its successes with other schools.

Tom Matsumoto School takes pride in its achievements and practices and willingly shares with others within the school district, with local area schools, our community and beyond. Our intent is to continue many of the practices that have linked us to other schools in the district, county and state. Regularly scheduled visitation sessions for community members provide an opportunity to observe classrooms in operation and avail the community an unusual opportunity to see 'school in action'. Each grade level team leader is a master teacher, guiding new teachers and assisting in maintaining a cohesive teaching cadre. Numerous principals within our district send struggling teachers to us to observe positive effective teaching practices. Our teachers participate in varied staff development activities as participants, sharing our techniques and practices with others. They also act as staff development presentors for the site, district, county and state levels, thereby sharing our educational vision to others in the field of education. Weekly staff development opportunities through regularly scheduled Thursday minimum days provide an unprecedented access to others within the district across schools and across grade levels. Curriculum Nights and Open Houses continue to provide venues to see culminating activities for the entire community. Local universities place many student teachers at our site, and through these students our vision spreads into the university arena. Local businesses are solicited to support and advertise various performing arts productions. Visit our school web site and see a snapshot of the school with links to individual classrooms. Additionally, our Blue Ribbon application will be on the U.S. Department of Education web site for dissemination to other schools, opening our doors to a vast assortment of schools. These have and will provide extensive outreach to the world.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Describe in one page the school's curriculum.

All Matsumoto students have access to a rigorous balanced core curriculum delineated through the district developed Standards of Achievement which are based on the state frameworks and standards in the areas of English Language Arts, Math, Science, and History/Social Studies. This is supported by standards based state adopted texts. Additionally, curriculum in Visual and Performing Arts, Health, Physical Education, decision making and character education is provided. The Standards of Achievement outline specific goals for all curriculum areas per grade level and provide an examples for clarity. In September, grade levels formulate a year matrix designed to ensure that all critical curriculum components are addressed and assist in pacing throughout the year. Weekly grade level planning, under the direction of a grade level facilitator utilizes the various Standards of Achievement and current research on best practices in education such as differentiated and assessment driven instruction to organize and develop weekly lessons ensuring continuity within the grade level, alignment with the state standards and access to the core curriculum for all students.

For example, one third grade language arts standard states that students recognize the similarities of sounds in words (onomatopoeia, alliteration) and rhythmical patterns in a selection. Students read the story **Storm in the Night**, review horns honking, tires swishing, and sirens wailing and are asked to draw a conclusion regarding where the story takes place. A fourth grade standard asks students to write clear and coherent sentences and paragraphs to communicate ideas or information using the strategies of the writing process. Consequently, fourth graders work through the components of reports on the missions of California, outlining content, writing drafts of their multi-paragraph report, editing their work, and finally completing a finished computer published work. A sixth grade standard asks students to infer the meaning of common unknown words by using root words, prefixes and suffixes which leads to extensive discussions on word manipulation of how Latin, Greek, and the French languages influence words in their current literature selection, **Tuck Everlasting**. In mathematics, students are systematically exposed to the seven strands of mathematics through the technique of differentiated instruction requiring small, flexible groupings of students. Social studies is based on grade level themes, (home, community, city, region, state, the United States and finally ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome). Inquiry based research is practiced in science classes, utilizing strategies where students build on previous knowledge while researching information to satisfy their own curiosities. Student learning is consistently facilitated by the teacher, maintaining a student centered focus while providing assistance to those in need. All curriculum areas have district developed Standards of Achievement with similar specific, concise, and progressive goals for each grade level aligned to state standards.

Concurrently, grade level teams design thematic units of study during regular planning sessions. Integral to these units are real life learning experiences and service learning opportunities. Examples include first grade study of holidays around the world, third grade study of peace, fourth grade study of the gold rush and fifth grade study of fantasy. In the gold rush unit, language arts and art assignments involve creating newspaper articles specific to the era. Math is used to calculate money earned from gold rush tailings, weights and balances. Science addresses the impact of hydraulic mining in the Sierra Nevada and students actually pan for gold. Social studies looks into the influence of Chinese immigrants in California and their social impact on generations to come as well as try their hand at some basics of the Chinese language. The curriculum is further enhanced with 'extended family instructors' which provide links to our community. The *Theater of All Possibilities* brought their production of **California or Bust** to culminate the unit. All activities are aligned with the goals outlined in the curricular Standards of Achievement.

Opportunities for whole group direct instruction, targeted small group instruction, and independent practice are seen daily as students and staff work together to promote our community of learners. Within the classroom, a wide range of student abilities is accommodated through the use of assessment driven

instruction, differentiation, direct teaching, inquiry and cooperative grouping. Enrichment activities are offered in all curricular areas through differentiated instruction for students seeking additional challenges such as library research projects or multimedia presentations. Classroom projects extend learning through Bloom's Taxonomy.

2. (Elementary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.

Matsumoto's reading curriculum is based on considerable current research by Hallie Yopp, Marilyn Adams, Carol Ann Tomlinson, Grant Wiggins and, most recently, Marzano's work. We have also utilized intensive training (CRLP) at the state level, and discussions with all stakeholders in the school community. This has resulted in a multifaceted reading program, aimed at our diverse population both in need and ability. Based on the research, the school uses the state adopted Houghton Mifflin reading series for grades K through 6. This program supports four distinct instructional models used in all classrooms. 1) Large group instruction, shared reading, utilizes the talents of the teacher to stretch the students knowledge, vocabulary ability and comprehension skills. Teachers model excellent reading in this technique and base their discussions on the higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. Shared reading is an excellent venue of introduction to the multitude of reading genre available. 2) Small group instruction (guided reading) is used for homogenous (3-4) groups of students. These groups read from their assessed instructional level targeting very specific building block needs for students. The lessons are structured starting with picture walks, speculating on the events of the story, vocabulary development, reading of the story several times individually and with a buddy and culminating with comprehension discussions (recall, cause and effect, evaluation, literary meaning and analysis) and a mini-language lesson that was highlighted in the story (eg: forming plurals with works ending in -y). 3) Literature circles allow students to discuss longer literature selections with fellow students under the direction and guidance of the classroom teacher. 4) Independent reading allows students to read at their reading level through our school hub, the library. Utilizing computer assisted assessment (Renaissance Learning's STAR / Accelerated Reader program), students are assessed and assigned a 'reading range' for their individual ability. Our library is organized in such a way that students can locate (electronically) those books in their particular reading range and in their interest area. Upon completion of the reading assignment, a computer assisted evaluation is made determining the success of the reading. Scores are kept and students work toward a personalized goal. Accelerated Reader awards are given at the end of the year to students reaching their individual goals. Together, these four techniques complete our reading curriculum palette and serve as the cornerstone to the reading program. They have proven to be exceptionally successful for all levels of student ability.

3. Describe in one-half page one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

The selection of Scott Foresman's math text is based on powerful and frequent diagnostic assessment, alignment with state standards, varied instructional methodology including on-line intervention capability. Math instruction at all grade levels centers on the seven strands of mathematics (number sense, measurement, geometry, estimation, problem solving, patterns & functions, algebra, statistics & probability). These strands are addressed beginning at kindergarten and spiral through all grades. They are delineated through our own *Evergreen School District's Standards of Achievement*, based on state standards, and are systematically addressed by teachers first in yearly planning sessions, then weekly grade level cohort lesson planning and finally lessons are delivered in all classrooms. Emphasis is placed not only on the solving of algorithms but in their application to real world problems through deductive and inductive reasoning. This approach, coupled with extensive use of differentiated instruction, allows all students to receive a complete continuum of instruction, at their own ability level, with an intensity that allows them to succeed to their potential by providing a rigorous, challenging and aggressive curriculum while empowering students to be life-long learners.

For example: A first grade standard of using number sense to solve problems leads to discussion and use of +, -, and = as well as establishing an unknown as a missing variable. A third grade strategy of solving problems and justifying student reasoning uses a variety of strategies, skills and concepts as addressed through our weekly math journals. Students not only find more than one way to solve a problem, but are also required to justify what and how they discovered their answer. A sixth grade standard asking students to write verbal expressions and sentences as algebraic expressions, evaluate these expressions, solve simple linear equations, and graph/interpret the results leads to collaboration and then finished products using one unknown in a linear equation and plotting on the x / y axis the solutions, formulating a solid line to show proper resolution of the problem.

The study of mathematics at Matsumoto provides a rigorous, challenging and aggressive standards based curriculum empowering students to achieve as life long learners while reinforcing a strong self concept supported through a strong home/school connection.

4. Describe in one-half page the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

As a school community, we strive to have students extend their scope of learning beyond recall of fact and delve into the world of thinking, understanding cause and effect, analyzing situations, evaluating events and drawing conclusions based on multiple inputs. It is critical to our mission to have students *think* and develop plans of action based on a thoughtful study of all data. The questions why?, how come?, what would cause this?, are commonplace. Teachers frequently use the inquiry method to develop students' thinking. For example: In a first grade guided reading group students would speculate as to the story content after just a picture walk. In fourth grade, students would not only learn how the Chinese played a tremendous part in the building of the state and the railroads that opened the state to the east, they would also discuss and analyze the type of life the Chinese led at the time and draw parallels through cause and effect to the current influx of immigrants to the state. Peer sharing and cooperative grouping is an instructional method that develops thinking and engages the learner. In sixth grade math, students would compute an algorithm for a story problem in cooperative groups and then share out to the class the different ways they went about solving the problem and why they chose that avenue to explore.

These types of learning experiences are seen in a variety of instructional settings. *Individual instruction* is usually tutorial in nature. *Small groups* target specific skill building. *Large group* settings are used for direct instruction and modeling. (see part V #2, p.13) *Cooperative groups* allow each student to participant with a specific role within the group to assist in the completion of a specific task or project. *Role playing* during such times as *Reader's Theater* bringing the joy of performing arts into the classroom used to better understand human relationships and why things happen as they do. Also incorporated are *SDAIE* strategies specifically targeting our English learners. Independent learning opportunities frequently utilize technology for skills and to connect to the larger world. Through all strategies, differentiated instruction (tailoring instruction to individual needs) is woven throughout.

Additionally, strategies are at work outside the regular classroom. Many students participate in tutorial programs after hours by their teachers. An intervention program, after school hours, is in place to strategically address academic needs in the areas of reading and math. The Great Books program is also in place to extend learning opportunities for those students who excel in their regular studies. Overall, we look to match the instructional strategy to the needs of the student, concentrating on multiple modalities of instruction to address individual learning styles.

5. Describe in one-half page the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

Professional development is ongoing and integral to Matsumoto's success. There is a pervasive belief that if students are to achieve their maximum, they must be taught by highly skilled, contemporary professionals modeling life-long learning. A comprehensive staff development plan is based on the district's long range plan, reflected in the teacher evaluation process and enhanced by site opportunities. All beginning teachers attend 'boot camp', a week long opportunity to understand the expectations and culture of the district and to connect with their two year support provider. This is followed by a two year induction program where the support providers use the BTSA model. District and site minimum days, site staff meetings, grade level trainings and individual staff development opportunities all contribute to the overall staff development program for new and experienced teachers. The current language arts program is an example of this multilayered staff development, a five year process. Year one was used to research current educational trends and realign standards with the state standards and frameworks. Teacher, administrator, and parent teams worked through this process. Year two brought extensive staff development incorporating full release days, district inservices and bi-monthly site inservice minimum days allowing teachers to internalize the standards and become familiar with shared reading and guided reading. Year three, state adopted materials were purchased, staff development was continued in all venues to address assessment for guided reading. Additionally, teachers on special assignment were available to teach model lessons in classrooms demonstrating how to adjust to the varied needs of learners. These teachers were then available to observe and guide each teacher's development as needed. Reading and writing rubrics were developed and teachers were trained on their implementation. Primary teachers were trained in CRLP techniques. Year four expanded training into the use of Accelerated Reader (AR) an independent reading tool utilizing technology. Year five brought complete implementation and the establishment of individual work groups where small cadres of teachers could pursue professional development of particular interest. This style of plan has been implemented in all core curriculum areas. Most of our teachers have also participated in the district TAG (Technology Advancement Group) training. This training has allowed the development of a high level of expertise in the use of technology as an instructional tool. Students publish their written work and many have expanded their learning and project development with reports utilizing computer presentations. Teachers job share on minimum day planning sessions with their grade level cohorts and have available multiple after school opportunities for staff development thorough our mentor program. Many of our teachers continue to develop professionally through our local colleges and universities. The success of this multi-layered approach to staff development is seen in a steadily increasing API while our student population rapidly increases and new teachers become a part of Matsumoto.

Data Information for **CST (California Standards Test, a criterion reference test):**

California's reporting of performance standards is addressed in five levels ranging from Far Below Basic to Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, then Advanced.

Performance standards are based on scaled scores. Scaled scores take into account differences in the difficulty of test forms and are used for reporting changes over time. A scaled score of 350 (Proficient) in 2002 is comparable to a scaled score of 350 in 2003, even though the number of correct responses needed to get a scaled score of 350 may be different.

n/a = Indicates subgroup is not of sufficient size to provide valid data/scores.

CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS

YEAR 2002-2003 **Language Arts & Mathematics**

Grade 2 Test CST (California Standards Test)
Edition/publication year 2003 Publisher ETS (Educational Testing Services)
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 154
Number of students who took the test 154
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2001-2002 **Language Arts & Mathematics**

Grade 2 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2002 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 114
Number of students who took the test 114
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2000-2001 **Language Arts**

Grade 2 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2001 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 93
Number of students who took the test 93
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1999-2000 **Language Arts**

Grade 2 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2000 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 80
Number of students who took the test 80
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1998-1999 **Language Arts**

Grade 2 Test CST
Edition/publication year 1999 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 60
Number of students who took the test 60
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
No proficiency levels were available, the state provided percent correct only.

YEAR 2002-2003

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 3 Test CST (California Standards Test)
Edition/publication year 2003 Publisher ETS (Educational Testing Services)
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 129
Number of students who took the test 129
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2001-2002

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 3 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2002 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 115
Number of students who took the test 115
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2000-2001

Language Arts

Grade 3 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2001 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 92
Number of students who took the test 92
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1999-2000

Language Arts

Grade 3 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2000 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 72
Number of students who took the test 72
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1998-1999

Language Arts

Grade 3 Test CST
Edition/publication year 1999 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 62
Number of students who took the test 62
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
No proficiency levels were available, the state provided percent correct only.

YEAR 2002-2003

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 4 Test CST (California Standards Test)
Edition/publication year 2003 Publisher ETS (Educational Testing Services)
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 133
Number of students who took the test 133
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2001-2002

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 4 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2002 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 106
Number of students who took the test 106
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2000-2001

Language Arts

Grade 4 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2001 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 84
Number of students who took the test 82
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 2 Parent excluded 2
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1999-2000

Language Arts

Grade 4 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2000 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 74
Number of students who took the test 74
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1998-1999

Language Arts

Grade 4 Test CST
Edition/publication year 1999 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 58
Number of students who took the test 58
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
No proficiency levels were available, the state provided percent correct only.

YEAR 2002-2003

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 5 Test CST (California Standards Test)
Edition/publication year 2003 Publisher ETS (Educational Testing Services)
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 119
Number of students who took the test 119
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2001-2002

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 5 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2002 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 93
Number of students who took the test 93
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2000-2001

Language Arts

Grade 5 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2001 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 89
Number of students who took the test 89
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1999-2000

Language Arts

Grade 5 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2000 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 70
Number of students who took the test 70
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1998-1999

Language Arts

Grade 5 Test CST
Edition/publication year 1999 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 63
Number of students who took the test 63
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
No proficiency levels were available, the state provided percent correct only.

YEAR 2002-2003

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 6 Test CST (California Standards Test)
Edition/publication year 2003 Publisher ETS (Educational Testing Services)
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 103
Number of students who took the test 103
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2001-2002

Language Arts & Mathematics

Grade 6 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2002 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 89
Number of students who took the test 89
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 2000-2001

Language Arts

Grade 6 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2001 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 77
Number of students who took the test 77
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1999-2000

Language Arts

Grade 6 Test CST
Edition/publication year 2000 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 71
Number of students who took the test 71
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
Cut points: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, Far Below Basic

YEAR 1998-1999

Language Arts

Grade 6 Test CST
Edition/publication year 1999 Publisher ETS
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 40
Number of students who took the test 40
Number excluded 0 Parent excluded 0
No proficiency levels were available, the state provided percent correct only.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 2 – MATHEMATICS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES			81%	64%	75%
% At or Above Basic	97	93			
% At or Above Proficient	91	88			
% At Advanced	70	61			
Number of students tested	154	114	93	80	60
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	94	98			
% At or Above Proficient	84	93			
% At Advanced	67	66			
Number of students tested	58	44			
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	96	94			
% At or Above Proficient	92	94			
% At Advanced	73	69			
Number of students tested	113	77			
STATE SCORES			43%	38%	27%
% At or Above Basic	76	68			
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	53	43			
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	24	16			
State Mean Score					

1998-2001 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 3 – MATHEMATICS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES			85%	73%	74%
% At or Above Basic	95	92			
% At or Above Proficient	88	84			
% At Advanced	65	61			
Number of students tested	129	117	92	72	62
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	94	90			
% At or Above Proficient	92	67			
% At Advanced	62	31			
Number of students tested	47	39			
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	96	93			
% At or Above Proficient	92	93			
% At Advanced	77	64			
Number of students tested	92	76			
STATE SCORES			42%	37%	27%
% At or Above Basic	71	65			
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	46	38			
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	19	12			
State Mean Score					

1998-2001 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 4 – MATHEMATICS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES			80%	76%	54%
% At or Above Basic	97	100			
% At or Above Proficient	89	91			
% At Advanced	59	56			
Number of students tested	133	106	82	74	58
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	97	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	100	100			
% At or Above Proficient	90	83			
% At Advanced	58	44			
Number of students tested	31	18			
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	99	100			
% At or Above Proficient	93	94			
% At Advanced	68	67			
Number of students tested	85	66			
STATE SCORES			39%	35%	23%
% At or Above Basic	72	67			
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	45	37			
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	18	13			
State Mean Score					

1998-2001 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 5 – MATHEMATICS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES			67%	58%	59%
% At or Above Basic	96	93			
% At or Above Proficient	91	74			
% At Advanced	54	23			
Number of students tested	119	94	89	70	63
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	80				
% At or Above Proficient	70				
% At Advanced	10				
Number of students tested	10				
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	97	98			
% At or Above Proficient	93	87			
% At Advanced	64	34			
Number of students tested	78	59			
STATE SCORES			35%	29%	21%
% At or Above Basic	61	59			
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	35	29			
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	10	7			
State Mean Score					

1998-2001 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 6 – MATHEMATICS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES			59%	62%	60%
% At or Above Basic	95	95			
% At or Above Proficient	77	80			
% At Advanced	36	45			
Number of students tested	103	89	77	71	40
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	100	83			
% At or Above Proficient	60	59			
% At Advanced	20	17			
Number of students tested	5	12			
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)			n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	100	98			
% At or Above Proficient	89	91			
% At Advanced	48	58			
Number of students tested	66	57			
STATE SCORES			35%	31%	22%
% 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					

1998-2001 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 2 – LANGUAGE ARTS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				68%	74%
% At or Above Basic	96	91	89	91	
% At or Above Proficient	82	72	72	64	
% At Advanced	42	34	33	32	
Number of students tested	154	114	93	80	60
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	91	98	94		
% At or Above Proficient	70	66	64		
% At Advanced	29	27	16		
Number of students tested	58	44	31		
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	97	94	97		
% At or Above Proficient	83	78	77		
% At Advanced	43	38	37		
Number of students tested	113	77	60		
STATE SCORES				43%	41%
% At or Above Basic	68	63	61		
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	36	32	32		
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	12	9	10		
State Mean Score					

1998-1999 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 3 – LANGUAGE ARTS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				75%	75%
% At or Above Basic	95	91	98	88	
% At or Above Proficient	77	75	72	69	
% At Advanced	43	43	36	25	
Number of students tested	129	115	92	72	62
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	91	90	95		
% At or Above Proficient	70	67	48		
% At Advanced	36	31	32		
Number of students tested	47	39	19		
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	93	93	96		
% At or Above Proficient	80	82	74		
% At Advanced	51	49	42		
Number of students tested	92	75	53		
STATE SCORES				43%	41%
% At or Above Basic	63	62	59		
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	33	34	30		
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	10	11	9		
State Mean Score					

1998-1999 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 4- LANGUAGE ARTS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				73%	58%
% At or Above Basic	96	99	93	95	
% At or Above Proficient	77	85	79	71	
% At Advanced	51	52	31	33	
Number of students tested	133	105	82	74	58
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	97	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	97	100	82		
% At or Above Proficient	58	82	54		
% At Advanced	19	41	9		
Number of students tested	38	17	11		
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	97	100	96		
% At or Above Proficient	81	86	82		
% At Advanced	56	60	39		
Number of students tested	85	65	49		
STATE SCORES				47%	45%
% At or Above Basic	74	71	66		
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	39	36	33		
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	15	14	11		
State Mean Score					

1998-1999 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels..

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 5 – LANGUAGE ARTS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				69%	69%
% At or Above Basic	97	94	96	93	
% At or Above Proficient	82	67	68	62	
% At Advanced	48	23	28	23	
Number of students tested	119	94	89	70	63
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)		n/a		n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	90		84		
% At or Above Proficient	60		46		
% At Advanced	10		0		
Number of students tested	10		13		
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	98	97	98		
% At or Above Proficient	83	75	76		
% At Advanced	56	29	33		
Number of students tested	78	59	54		
STATE SCORES				47%	46%
% At or Above Basic	72	71	66		
State Mean Score					
% At or Above Proficient	36	31	28		
State Mean Score					
% At Advanced	10	9	7		
State Mean Score					

1998-1999 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST
 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST (CST)
GRADE 6 – LANGUAGE ARTS

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES				70%	69%
% At or Above Basic	97	98	90	93	
% At or Above Proficient	77	72	67	58	
% At Advanced	39	37	38	26	
Number of students tested	103	87	77	71	40
<i>Percent of total students tested</i>	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. _____ LEP _____ (specify subgroup)		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	80				
% At or Above Proficient	20				
% At Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	5				
2. _____ Asian _____ (specify subgroup)				n/a	n/a
% At or Above Basic	99	98	98		
% At or Above Proficient	79	79	78		
% At Advanced	47	45	38		
Number of students tested	66	56	48		
STATE SCORES				47%	48%
% 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					

1998-1999 On California Standards Test – Department of Education reported % of test correct without indicators of proficiency levels.

NORM REFERENCED TEST DATA

YEAR 2002-2003

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 2 Test CAT - 6 (NEW)
Edition/publication year 6th - 2000 Publisher CTB
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 154
Number of students who took the test 154
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2001-2002

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 2 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt, Inc.
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 114
Number of students who took the test 114
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2000-2001

Reading Arts & Mathematics

Grade 2 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 93
Number of students who took the test 93
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1999-2000

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 2 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 80
Number of students who took the test 80
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1998-1999

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 2 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 60
Number of students who took the test 60
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2002-2003

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 3 Test CAT - 6 (NEW)
Edition/publication year 6th - 2000 Publisher CTB
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 129
Number of students who took the test 129
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

YEAR 2001-2002

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 3 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt, Inc.
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 115
Number of students who took the test 115
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

YEAR 2000-2001

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 3 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 92
Number of students who took the test 92
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

YEAR 1999-2000

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 3 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 72
Number of students who took the test 72
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

YEAR 1998-1999

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 3 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 63
Number of students who took the test 62
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X

YEAR 2002-2003

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 4 Test CAT - 6 (NEW)
Edition/publication year 6th - 2000 Publisher CTB
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 133
Number of students who took the test 133
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2001-2002

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 4 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt, Inc.
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 106
Number of students who took the test 106
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2000-2001

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 4 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 84
Number of students who took the test 82
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1999-2000

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 4 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 74
Number of students who took the test 74
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1998-1999

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 4 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 58
Number of students who took the test 58
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2002-2003

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 5 Test CAT - 6 (NEW)
Edition/publication year 6th - 2000 Publisher CTB
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 119
Number of students who took the test 119
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2001-2002

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 5 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt, Inc.
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 93
Number of students who took the test 93
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2000-2001

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 5 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 89
Number of students who took the test 89
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1999-2000

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 5 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 70
Number of students who took the test 70
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1998-1999

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 5 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 63
Number of students who took the test 63
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2002-2003

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 6 Test CAT - 6 (NEW)
Edition/publication year 6th - 2000 Publisher CTB
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 103
Number of students who took the test 103
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2001-2002

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 6 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt, Inc.
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 89
Number of students who took the test 89
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 2000-2001

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 6 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 77
Number of students who took the test 77
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1999-2000

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 6 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 71
Number of students who took the test 71
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

YEAR 1998-1999

Reading & Mathematics

Grade 6 Test Stanford - 9
Edition/publication year 9th - 1996 Publisher Harcourt
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 40
Number of students who took the test 40
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? none
Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 2 – MATHEMATICS

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	92	90	90	88	80
Number of students tested	154	114	93	80	60
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	86	91	90	n/a	81
Number of students tested	58	43	31	10	15
2. <u>R -FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	92	93	93	89	87
Number of students tested	113	76	59	43	28
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	91	90	87	89	n/a
Number of students tested	16	12	17	17	10

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 3 – MATHEMATICS

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	92	94	92	86	87
Number of students tested	129	115	92	72	62
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	98
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	91	91	89	n/a	80
Number of students tested	47	39	19	10	13
2. <u>R -FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	0	6	0	0	10
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	94	95	94	92	92
Number of students tested	94	76	52	37	34
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	84	59	88	77	n/a
Number of students tested	12	18	18	14	10

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 4 – MATHEMATICS

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	90	90	85	87	58
Number of students tested	133	106	82	74	58
Percent of total students tested	100	100	97	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	2	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	3	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	78	87	81	n/a	33
Number of students tested	13	17	11	8	14
2. <u>R - FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	94	n/a	n/a	94	n/a
Number of students tested	13	10	10	12	8
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	93	91	88	93	70
Number of students tested	85	65	49	40	29
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	78	86	79	87	n/a
Number of students tested	23	17	13	12	7

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 5 – MATHEMATICS

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	90	86	87	80	79
Number of students tested	119	93	89	70	63
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	78	n/a	80	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	15	10	13	7	8
2. <u>R - FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	95	92	88	85	96
Number of students tested	15	19	19	7	11
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	93	91	92	86	87
Number of students tested	78	59	54	41	26
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	90	78	88	n/a	78
Number of students tested	76	15	13	9	14

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 6 – MATHEMATICS

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	80	91	88	81	87
Number of students tested	103	89	77	71	40
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	71	81	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	18	12	9	9	9
2. <u>R - FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	87	93	91	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	18	24	17	8	3
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	89	95	92	86	90
Number of students tested	67	57	48	31	20
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	59	90	n/a	80	n/a
Number of students tested	18	13	7	15	7

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 2 – READING

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	73	81	80	77	74
Number of students tested	154	114	93	80	60
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. LEP (specify subgroup)	62	79	75	n/a	75
Number of students tested	58	44	31	10	15
2. R - FEP (specify subgroup)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
3. Asian (specify subgroup)	73	85	80	78	80
Number of students tested	113	77	59	44	28
4. White (specify subgroup)	84	83	84	80	71
Number of students tested	16	12	17	17	11

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 3 – READING

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	71	85	78	73	70
Number of students tested	129	115	92	72	62
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. LEP (specify subgroup)	63	64	67	n/a	49
Number of students tested	47	39	19	10	13
2. R - FEP (specify subgroup)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	0	6	0	0	10
3. Asian (specify subgroup)	73	77	78	77	75
Number of students tested	94	76	53	37	34
4. White (specify subgroup)	80	82	83	71	n/a
Number of students tested	12	18	18	14	10

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 4 – READING

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	75	74	76	79	55
Number of students tested	133	106	82	74	58
Percent of total students tested	100	100	97	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	2	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	3	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	67	76	54	n/a	36
Number of students tested	13	17	11	8	14
2. <u>R - FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	79	82	n/a	84	n/a
Number of students tested	13	11	10	12	8
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	78	86	78	85	65
Number of students tested	85	65	49	40	29
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	77	86	69	80	n/a
Number of students tested	23	17	13	14	7

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 5 – READING

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	78	74	77	69	74
Number of students tested	119	93	89	70	63
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	72	n/a	54	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	15	10	13	7	8
2. <u>R - FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	85	73	82	73	n/a
Number of students tested	15	19	19	14	5
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	81	77	81	75	80
Number of students tested	78	57	54	41	26
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	84	73	85	n/a	71
Number of students tested	16	15	13	9	14

NORM-REFERENCED TEST
SAT 9 (1999-2002) / CAT 6 (2003)
GRADE 6 – READING

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

	02-03 CAT 6	01-02 SAT 9	00-01 SAT 9	99-00 SAT 9	98-99 SAT 9
Testing month	May	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	65	83	76	74	72
Number of students tested	103	89	77	71	40
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>LEP</u> (specify subgroup)	62	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	18	10	9	9	9
2. <u>R - FEP</u> (specify subgroup)	71	86	80	n/a	n/a
Number of students tested	18	24	17	8	3
3. <u>Asian</u> (specify subgroup)	72	86	83	80	69
Number of students tested	67	56	48	30	20
4. <u>White</u> (specify subgroup)	59	84	n/a	75	n/a
Number of students tested	18	13	7	16	7