

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

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

Official School Name A. D. Henderson University School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 777 Glades Road, Florida Atlantic University
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Boca Raton, Florida 33431-0991
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (561) 297-3970 Fax (561) 297-3939

Website/URL www.adhus.fau.edu E-mail mlee@fau.edu

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 _____

Name of Superintendent* Mr. Glenn Thomas, Director and Designee for Dr Gregory F. Aloia, Dean College of Education Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Henderson, Florida Atlantic University, District#72 Tel. (561) 297-3970

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board Dr. John Pisapia, Chair (Unavailable) Mr. Fidencio Platt, Vice Chair
President/Chairperson _____
(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) (Vice Chairperson) Date _____

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

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: _____ Elementary schools
 _____ Middle schools
 _____ Junior high schools
 _____ High schools
 1 Other (Briefly explain) **Grades k-8 School**
 _____ TOTAL
 1 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$ 4387 (State FEFP, Final calculation 2002-03)
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$5194 (Average State FEFP, Final calculation 2002-03)

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. 1.5 Number of years the principal has been in her position at this school (**As of December, 2003**)
 5.0 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:
 School Year 2002-03 **October, 2002 data**

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	26	24	50	7	25	28	53
1	26	29	55	8	26	24	50
2	29	27	56	9			0
3	26	30	56	10			0
4	33	26	59	11			0
5	29	28	57	12			0
6	27	30	57	Other			0
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							493

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| <u>50.5</u> | % White |
| <u>22.8</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>18.3</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>8.0</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander/ Mixed |
| <u>.4</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% Total | |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 4% %

(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.	11
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	11
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	22
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2002	495
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.04
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 1.0 %
4 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 3
 Specify languages: **Spanish, Creole, and Russian**

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 14 % October, 2002/ 21%October, 2003
68 Total Number Students Who Qualify/Oct., 2002

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 %

21 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> X </u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u> </u> Hearing Impairment | <u> X </u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u> </u> Mental Retardation | <u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u> </u> Multiple Disabilities | <u> </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u> 1 </u>	<u> 1 </u>
Classroom teachers	<u> 23 </u>	<u> 1 </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u> 2 </u>	<u> 2 </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u> 9 </u>	<u> 0 </u>
Support staff	<u> 6 </u>	<u> 3 </u>
Total number	<u> 41 </u>	<u> 7 </u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 1:21.5

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	97%	98%	98%	98%	98%
Daily teacher attendance*	96%	*	*	*	*
Teacher turnover rate	30%	0%	19%	8%	4%
Student dropout rate **	**	**		**Student drop-off rate **	**

* The state university system (and the State of Florida’s) payroll system does not sum these data by year. It is maintained cumulatively by individual employee, so the data cannot be disaggregated prior to 2002-03 when the school began to keep manual records.

** Students who leave the school are remanded to their home school district schools.

PART III - SUMMARY

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 475 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement.

School Mission and Strategic Goals

A. D. Henderson University School (ADHUS) is configured as public school district (#72) administered through the College of Education (COE) of Florida Atlantic University (FAU). Its mandate is to provide excellent instruction to approximately 500 students in grades k-8 that are representative of the state's student demographics, support the university's mission and further the state's educational reforms. Students admitted to the school are chosen from a demographically representative lottery process. The school has 26 full-time faculty and administrators, 15 paraprofessional and support staff, and several part time positions. ADHUS actively supports FAU's teacher education instruction, research and service efforts, providing the university a competitive advantage. Its support of the teacher preparation function of the COE and College of Arts and Letters (CAL) is historic and important, as is its research relationship with the Department of Psychology, College of Science (COS). Grant activity during 2002-03 has been limited but submissions for the 2003-04 year look promising (particularly those integrating the activities of the various colleges around grades k-12 issues). Local, state, national and international dissemination, leadership and service activities core to the FAU, COE and ADHUS missions continue to expand. ADHUS is an "A" rated school by the state. The school's Strategic Goals (2002-07) are:

- I. Improve student performance for a diverse student body grades K-8 and university undergraduate and graduate education using traditional public school fiscal resources, but employing innovative instructional and organizational approaches**
- II. Promote teacher development and retention initiatives in concert with the COE and others locally, regionally and statewide; internally and externally**
- III. Extend important research efforts and impact practice through broad collaboration and dissemination across university and other educational or business partners, including the addition of a model high school program**
- IV. Expand grant awards and external funding using the school to extend the university's role in state and national educational reform, including curriculum content and design, instructional methodologies, assessment, child development, emerging technologies, organizational efficiencies, family linkages, informal education, safety and community/business partnerships**

Progress toward Goals (2002-03)

School year 2002-03 was built on the past successes of the A.D. Henderson University School (ADHUS); however it also brought a renewed sense of commitment to mission centered on two constructs: 1. to extend research and service components, and 2. to initiate programs to better serve ALL children. The dean and the board strongly committed to providing better connections between the college and school. The school redoubled its efforts to reach out to researchers across the college and university. During 2002-03, Henderson shared nursing, school resource and emergency planning personnel with Slattery Early Childhood Center for the first time as well as

providing temporary summer space while an extensive renovation occurred. The board also instituted policy approval and fiscal oversight policies. Included in new board policy actions were major changes to the Pupil Progression Plan, Student Code of Conduct and Activity Fees. More rigorous baselines were established for school indicators in the areas of finance, research and service.

Instructionally, the school's faculty and students once again achieved an "A" rating from the state. The best news about these data is the fact that all ADHUS subpopulations of students performed much better than their comparable peers in other university schools as well as other school districts statewide. ADHUS continues to improve its percentage of free and reduced students, from 14% at the October FTE count of the 2002-03 school year to 21% at the October FTE count in 2003-04. This student demographic should approximate 40%. Documentation of a demographically representative student academic ability dimension is needed since the measured academic ability of the school's students should approximate a bell-shaped curve across each race and socio-economic category and grade level. In 2004-05, testing will begin to document normal distribution of academic ability. Additionally, an innovative classroom extension will be completed to meet class size reduction mandates and a unique intensive dual enrollment high school model will be initiated.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

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

The school as a public school is funded and is expected to be accountable to the state in the same manner as any other public school. The school's students take the state Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) at grades 3-8, like other public schools and supplement those results with the SAT-9 at grades k-2. Students are assessed in reading, writing, mathematics and this year, in science. Assessment data are reported across these dimensions as individual student data, as grouped data by classroom teacher, as grade level results, as whole school data and as demographically disaggregated data. The focus becomes the number and type of students that assess at level 3 and above in reading, writing and mathematics where each number category (ie.1, 2, 3, etc.) represent a range of scaled scores. Low performing schools would have significant numbers of students performing at the levels 1 and 2; high performing schools would have few students at levels 1 and 2, but also exhibit that pattern across all student demographics and grade levels. If schools were at the top of the scale, to achieve and "A" would still require progress, perhaps with the lower performing student segments. The scores necessary to achieve the various levels continue to be raised as the scores around the state continue to improve. The intent will be to employ improved methodologies to examine student growth over the years of Florida's 2.5 million k-12 children through reported "gain scores" to better target teacher staff development and student performance. FCAT assessment items and performances are drawn directly from the constructs and processes of the well-publicized and easily available Florida's Sunshine State Standards, state-developed appropriate grade level expectations for each content area and authentic tasks with well established rubrics representing the application of requisite skills and knowledge. Although the FCAT debuted several years ago as only representing some grade levels and subjects, over the past few years it has become increasing inclusive and comprehensive. The state analysis and district/school reporting has also become much more comprehensive, targeted, usable and useful for instructional improvement for all kinds and levels of children.

The state department assigns the scale of 1-6 for writing samples, where 1 and 2 is not proficient, 3 is proficient, and 6 is outstanding. Math and reading scores are similarly expressed in levels 1-5

where 1 and 2 indicate deficiency, 3 is “at level” and 4 and 5 are higher performing. The state granted Henderson School a top “A” rating from the state in 2002-03. This grade is assigned by a state formula that looks at the relative scores of children in grades 3-8; the total average scores by grade level, the disaggregated performance of the lowest students, the performance of targeted groups and overall growth of each student. The percentage of students and types of student tested is also recorded and is used to calculate the school’s grade. The best news about the results is the fact that all of Henderson subpopulations of students performed much better than their comparable peers in other university school districts, other public school districts statewide and was comparable with the best individual schools across the state.

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

Each year as the results are published, the school’s administrative and faculty leadership team examines the disaggregated data to look for current year successes and deficiencies. These are then compared to prior year’s data and examined in the light of new programs, materials, training, resources and faculty assignments. Internal school and classroom data (grades of students, discipline, access to technology, effect of professional development, frequency and extent of library programming, counseling interventions, effect of electives, instructional time, after school programming, mentors and tutorial effects, etc. are then aligned to gauge effectiveness. School climate survey and other external data are then overlaid to provide a 360% view of the data and its messages for school improvement. Planning for the next year is conducted based on the data and options for addressing deficiencies while continuing to support positive practices. This planning is extensive and leads to a formal set of goals, strategies and measures presented in a School Improvement Plan. This plan is then thoroughly reviewed and approved in open meetings by the school personnel, School (Improvement) Advisory Committee (SAC) and accepted by the board. The council is awarded \$10 per student to oversee, support and assess the implementation of the plan each year. It may allocate its budget for materials, training, technology or other categories to further the plan. The plan provides a blueprint for the expenditure of the school’s instructional, staff development and instructional materials funds. It may also drive related activities of the parent teacher organization, school volunteers and after school programming.

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

Parents and students receive individual student results in printed form with descriptions of the test and the scoring included. Counselors, administrators and teachers are available to assist parents with the interpretation of the results and applicability to future learning strategies. Parents, students and the community receive a copy of the school’s annual report which includes not only the extensive state data, but also data related to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)/Adequate Yearly Progress model, fiscal data and research activities. The annual report is also posted on the school’s website. Comparable data are available through the Florida Department of Education’s website and the School Reports website. As the results of the state assessment are made available to the public, the public media prints and airs stories with charts detailing the scores of the various schools, districts and sub-populations. Such stories may highlight particularly promising programs or clear weaknesses. Schools receiving an “A” also qualify for a state incentive bonus which can be used to reward teachers, purchase additional materials, provide staff development experiences or acquire other resources acceptable to administration and faculty, the SAC and the board.

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

A. D. Henderson School has a statutory mandate to develop and disseminate best practices both directly and indirectly to schools around Florida. Directly the school is active in the region’s

reform efforts including district staff in a six county region, a Professional Development Schools Partnership with the Village Academy (a deregulated school), advisory committees for the state's 250 charter schools, and relationships with individual schools as appropriate. Indirectly, the school is a preparation venue for some 200 undergraduate and graduate students from the College of Education each year most of whom will become teachers in Florida. Additionally the school hosts a number of researchers each year studying everything from bullying behaviors to early childhood social development. The work of these researchers benefits the Henderson programs, but its potential to assist the success of other schools is outstanding. The school provides information about these efforts in conference presentations and printed materials. The school also has developed a network of school district contacts (5 surrounding county school districts) and community college contacts (3 community colleges) for communication and shared project efforts.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Describe in one page the school's curriculum. Outline in several sentences the core of each curriculum area and show how all students are engaged with significant content based on high standards. Include art and foreign languages in the descriptions (foreign language instruction as a part of the regular curriculum is an eligibility requirement for middle, junior high, high schools, and elementary schools in grades seven and higher).

The school's core curriculum assures student mastery of Florida's Sunshine State Standards as expanded by the grade level expectancies and the national standards of the various levels and disciplines. This standards-based approach uses flexible and creative instructional methods, ongoing varied assessments, and multiple supportive resources to differentiate and enliven instruction for all children. The intent is to diversify, enrich and extend the standards' constructs within a curricular and assessment structure that requires innovation but also demands superior performance against the clear standards measured by the FCAT. Teachers analyze their students' past performance on specific types of FCAT items to develop indications of individual student's learning issues, their own teaching approach and possible resources to be leveraged. These reviews provide a plan for student remediation and reinforcement as well as for teacher development. The focus across all grades is reading and reading in the content area. Students are actively engaged at each grade level as described below (2. following) in the reading process.

Best use of instructional time is also safeguarded. Subjects are integrated as opportunities arise to reinforce and extend student contact with the concepts and processes of the standards. This includes for example, the integration of reading and mathematics in art and history products and activities. Most instructional time is focused in the morning blocks, with special curricular areas and support activities in the afternoon. Special areas are important to give children new experiences and to personalize their creativity. These areas also provide opportunities to find different ways of promoting learning; including appealing to children's varied learning modalities and integration of the physical and theoretical. For example, the school employs the total physical response method for teaching Spanish in grades k-8, with 8th grade Spanish taught for regular high school credit. All students are provided with music instruction and middle school students have regular performance level chorus and band. Upper elementary students have chorus and optional school-based violin instruction. All students have physical education regularly with instruction in water safety and swimming. The school also benefits from its relationship with the university and community partners. The university art and music programs have provided excellent shared opportunities through exhibitions and shared faculty. For example all Henderson elementary students have programming provided annually through the Pine Jog Environmental Center (FAU) and on request access to the Gumbo Limbo research facility, supporting student mastery of related science and mathematics standards.

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.

Each elementary student in grades k-5 has a 90 minute reading /language arts time block for reading instruction. Reading lessons focus on the 5 components of research-based reading instruction as provided in *Reading is Rocket Science* and in Florida's statewide initiative "*Just Read, Florida!*": 1. Phonemic Awareness, 2. Phonics, 3. vocabulary, 4. Fluency, and 5. Comprehension. The Put Reading First concepts and descriptions are useful introductions for the teachers of the k-3 students. These constructs and the methodologies necessary to generate instructional strategies are reinforced through administrative focus, teacher attendance at state and national conferences and an on-site reading coach to assist teachers and to work with particularly struggling students. Teachers employ a wide variety of reading materials and technologies in their instruction. Volunteer parents, middle school students and university students tutor struggling readers. Additionally the school employs its most skilled teachers in reading to conduct after school sessions with students needing additional reading instruction. On an ongoing basis, all teachers are engaged in professional development study groups focused on *Regie Routman's, Reading Essentials*. These study groups meet regularly over the course of the year to discuss what they are reading, trying and learning first hand. Informally, group members discuss frequently things that are working and issues that have arisen. These sustained collegial conversations which may often engage the reading coach has been a very powerful tool in the reading program's extension and innovation to teach each child to read at or above the standard's levels. Teachers also use specific strategies to teach reading in the content areas. In these settings, prior student experience and a coherent frame of reference are as important as precursors to successful comprehension and concept development. Graphic organizers and a robust vocabulary are other examples of techniques taught to students by content area teachers to support better understanding from reading.

(Secondary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's English language curriculum, including efforts the school makes to improve the reading skills of students who read below grade level. Teachers of the middle school are also members of the collegial study groups attend conferences and have direct access to the reading coach. Much of these teachers focus is on strategies to support better reading in the content areas using the kinds of techniques described generally above. Direct connections between activities or experiences before encountering reading material on the same concept is very powerful particularly with math and science constructs. Textbook passages without prior knowledge are not very effective in introducing major new concepts. Students in grades 6-8 at the school who are not proficient readers (scoring Level 2 or 1) are required to be enrolled in a reading course in addition to their regular language arts class. All 6th graders must take a reading course and demonstrate proficiency or receive additional tutorial support. The middle school English curriculum stresses the development of writing and reading skills. Students are required to write from prompts, grade their work using standard rubrics of good writing, rewrite and group assess peer's work. Teachers then regrade to establish student understanding of the rubrics and improve reliability. The teacher also provides detailed feedback on the writing product, use of correct grammar, creativity, etc. Writing and writing related instruction consume about 45% of the middle school language arts curriculum, with the remainder involving literature development, reading and creative expression (poetry, multimedia, etc.).

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 school is heavily dependent upon instructional and administrative technologies to accomplish its mission. Instructionally, teachers use technologies to differentiate instruction in the classrooms, provide research information, create learning products, write papers, communicate with parents,

communicate with other teachers and professionals, generate classroom presentations, record administrative and grading information, and communicate assignments to students. They use a variety of hardware including SmartBoards, scanners, digital cameras, laptops, personal data assistants, etc. Teachers are trained and use River Deep instructional software, Pinnacle grade books/attendance, Homework Hero and FCAT Explorer school wide. Many other packages are provided for individual teachers or grade groupings to provide reading and subject area support. All students in grades K-8 spend some portion of every week in the computer lab developing specific skills, but also in their individual classrooms on the five or more computers in each classroom. Students not only consume the information electronically available to them, but also assist in the installation and support of new hardware or repair of the old. Students design websites, load new software, provide training support to teachers and develop fluency with the WORD Office suite. One of the more popular courses for middle school students is Robotics which merges math, science, computing and technology as students design unique machines to solve problems and then program, test and refine them until they perform.

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

The school employs instructional technology across all curricular areas, direct instruction, learning centers, volunteer and expert tutors from the university as well as parents, cooperative learning, after school homework support coordinated through an Aftercare program, and ongoing communication with parents through Friday Folders. The school also employs whole school reading strategies, whole school writing strategies (*FLORIDA WRITES!*), articulated math sequencing, and integration of reading and math in the special areas of PE, art, music, media, Spanish, and technology to ensure that students recognize the impact and influence of reading, math and technology throughout the various activities of their lives. Classroom experiences include individual as well as group activities or projects and lots of hands-on opportunities to apply conceptual learning into applied learning. Services for students in Exceptional Student Education are based on an inclusion model with the support teachers going into the classroom to co-teach with the classroom teacher. With this integrated approach to learning and support for all students, No Child is Left Behind.

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

The professional development program at the A.D. Henderson School is the pivot point for the faculty's professional growth. A well-trained and supported faculty is the core reason that the students' performance is excellent on state and national measures. The decisions made by the school's professional development committee for school wide programming are based on student performance data, the School Improvement Plan, the surveyed needs of the general faculty, and the administration's input. The members of the committee take great pride and responsibility for teacher growth and monitor the success of the various activities closely. They convene at least monthly to review progress and make corrections. Another important committee which supports teacher's professional growth is the joint College of Education (COE)-Henderson Research Committee. This committee has responsibility for reviewing research projects, coordinating teachers and researchers, reviewing and approving draft research guidelines, proposing new research, supporting action research, promoting joint faculty papers/articles, collaborating on conference presentations and encouraging joint projects and grant proposals. The committee may also recommend teacher training, collaboratives, readings and research findings that have direct relationship to the staff development programming of the entire school or individual faculty interests. Individual faculty's needs are also recognized by the school's principal as a formal part of the appraisal process. Each faculty member at the school discusses professional goals, strengths and weakness with the principal. Instructional data are available as are observations by the

principal. Agreements about individual staff development experiences are agreed upon and recorded for the following year. These may include university coursework (6 hours per semester at no charge), conferences, action research projects, joint authorship of a study or other professional experiences mutually agreed upon. Each year, as the appraisal process unfolds the progress of each teacher is reviewed and staff developing for the next year is initiated on both the school wide and individual levels...

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Alexander D. Henderson University School

Participation in Testing

Schools must have tested at least 95 percent of students in each subgroup where 30 or more students are enrolled.

Writing Proficiency

Students demonstrate writing proficiency by scoring 3 or higher (on a scale score of 1 to 6) on the FCAT Writing examination, or, for LEP students and students with disabilities, by attaining a proficient score on an alternate assessment.

Reading Proficiency and Math Proficiency

Students attain proficiency in reading and mathematics by scoring at Level 3 or higher (on a range from 1 to 5) on FCAT Reading and FCAT Mathematics, or, for LEP students and students with disabilities, by scoring at proficient levels at alternative assessments for reading and math.

AYP Status, 2002-03

The table below shows the AYP status of the school, district, and state for the 2002-03 school year. Data used to calculate AYP 2002-03 includes FCAT data for 2002-03 and 2001-02, graduation rate data for 2001-02 and 2000-01, and the school performance grade assigned in 2003.

School AYP Status	District AYP Status	State AYP Status
Henderson 1	72 FAU-Henderson 1	N/A

Key:

0= "Did not make AYP"

1= "Made AYP"

2= "AYP not applicable"

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

The FCAT measures student performance in writing, reading, and mathematics. The FCAT has two main parts: one part consisting of tests that measure skills prescribed by the Sunshine State Standards, and the other part consisting of norm-referenced tests that rank student

performance on a percentile basis.

Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities

Alternate assessments for students with disabilities are given for writing/communication, reading, and math.

Alternate Assessments for Students who are Limited English Proficient

Alternate assessments for LEP students are given for writing, reading, and math.

FCAT Sunshine State Standards Tests

The FCAT Sunshine State Standards (SSS) tests measure student performance on selected benchmarks defined by the Sunshine State Standards. Students who take an alternate assessment have their results reported in categorical classifications that include the designation of “Proficient”, so that their performance is counted with those of other students.

Note: Assessment results on the following tables reflect FCAT Sunshine State Standards data combined with alternate assessment data. Results show proficiency attainment for students who were in attendance during both semesters of the school year.

Writing Assessment

For this assessment, students are given 45 minutes to read their assigned topic, plan what to write, and then write their responses. Scores range from 1.0 (lowest) to 6.0 (highest). Alternate assessments have been merged with the FCAT scores for reporting purposes.

**Writing Assessment Results
(FCAT Sunshine State Standards and Alternate Assessments)
Percent of Students Scoring 3 and Above**

	School %		District %		State %	
	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02
All Students	99	96	99	96	88	86
White	100	96	100	96	92	89
Black	95	89	95	89	83	80
Hispanic	100	100	100	100	86	82
Asian	100	100	100	100	93	92
Am. Indian	N	N	N	N	89	86
Multiracial*	100	100	100	100	93	89
Disabled	100	N	100	N	58	54
Economically Disadvantaged	94	100	94	100	83	78
LEP	N	N	N	N	66	60
Migrant*	N	N	N	N	74	72
Female*	98	94	98	94	92	90
Male*	100	98	100	98	85	81

*Indicates subgroups not included as separate sub-populations in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation.

Note: An “N” indicates that no test results were reported.

Reading and Mathematics Assessments

On the FCAT SSS reading and mathematics tests, students can attain one of five possible achievement levels, ranging from Level 1 (lowest) to Level 5 (highest).

Student Achievement Level Descriptions

Level 5: Performance at this level indicates that the student has success with the most challenging content of the Sunshine State Standards. A Level 5 student answers most of the test questions correctly, including the most challenging questions.

Level 4: Performance at this level indicates that the student has success with the challenging content of the Sunshine State Standards. A Level 4 student answers most of the test questions correctly, but may only have some success with questions that reflect the most challenging content.

Level 3: Performance at this level indicates that the student has partial success with the challenging content of the Sunshine State Standards, but performance is inconsistent. A Level 3 student answers many of the test questions correctly, but is generally less successful with questions that are most challenging.

Level 2: Performance at this level indicates that the student has limited success with the challenging content of the Sunshine State Standards.

Level 1: Performance at this level indicates that the student has little success with the challenging content of the Sunshine State Standards.

Results of alternate assessments have been merged with the FCAT scores for reporting purposes.

Mathematics Assessment Results FCAT Sunshine State Standards and Alternate Assessments) Percent of Students Scoring 3 and Above

	School % 2002-03 Results	State Objective	% Not Tested	District % 2002- 03 Results	% State Objective	% Not Tested	State % 2002-03 Results	State Objective	% Not Tested
All Students	89	38	1	89	38	1	54	38	6
White	90	38	1	90	38	1	66	38	5
Black	82	38	4	82	38	4	30	38	7
Hispanic	88	38	0	88	38	0	46	38	6
Asian	100	38	0	100	38	0	76	38	3
Am. Indian	N	38	N	N	38	N	59	38	6
Multiracial*	100	38	0	100	38	0	62	38	4
Disabled	83	38	25	83	38	25	20	38	10
Economically Disadvantaged	85	38	0	85	38	0	38	38	6
LEP	N	38	N	N	38	N	25	38	7
Migrant*	N	38	N	N	38	N	30	38	6

Female*	87	38	1	87	38	1	53	38	5
Male*	90	38	2	90	38	2	54	38	6

*Indicates subgroups not included as separate sub-populations in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation.

Note: An “N” indicates that no test results were reported.

**Reading Assessment Results
(FCAT Sunshine State Standards and Alternate Assessments)
Percent of Students Scoring 3 and Above**

	School % 2002-03 Results	State Objective	% Not Tested	District % 2002-03 Results	% State Objective	% Not Tested	State % 2002-03 Results	State Objective	% Not Tested
All Students	91	31	1	91	31	1	50	31	6
White	91	31	1	91	31	1	62	31	5
Black	92	31	4	92	31	4	30	31	7
Hispanic	91	31	0	91	31	0	40	31	6
Asian	100	31	0	100	31	0	64	31	3
Am. Indian	N	31	N	N	31	N	54	31	6
Multiracial*	89	31	0	89	31	0	63	31	4
Disabled	83	31	25	83	31	25	18	31	10
Economically Disadvantaged	93	31	0	93	31	0	36	31	6
LEP	N	31	N	N	31	N	14	31	7
Migrant*	N	31	N	N	31	N	23	31	6
Female*	93	31	1	93	31	1	52	31	5
Male*	89	31	2	89	31	2	48	31	6

*Indicates subgroups not included as separate sub-populations in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation.

**Assessment Results by Grade: Percent Scoring at Level 3 or Above
(FCAT Sunshine State Standards and Alternate Assessments)***

School	Reading			Math		
	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Grade 3	93	83	-	83	85	-
Grade 4	82	83	79	82	79	-
Grade 5	96	85	-	88	94	90
Grade 6	87	94	-	85	94	-

Grade 7	96	88	-	94	100	-
Grade 8	94	90	78	100	100	97
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

District	Reading			Math		
	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Grade 3	93	83	-	83	85	-
Grade 4	82	83	-	82	79	-
Grade 5	96	85	-	88	94	-
Grade 6	87	94	-	85	94	-
Grade 7	96	88	-	94	100	-
Grade 8	94	90	-	100	100	-
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

State Totals	Reading			Math		
	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Grade 3	63	60	-	63	60	-
Grade 4	60	56	63	55	51	-
Grade 5	58	54	-	51	49	48
Grade 6	54	52	-	47	43	-
Grade 7	52	50	-	48	47	-
Grade 8	49	45	53	56	53	55
Grade 9	30	29	-	51	47	-
Grade 10	36	35	-	6	60	-

Note: An “N” indicates that no test results were reported.

FCAT Norm-Referenced Test (NRT)

The FCAT NRT measures student achievement on a test that was given to a national sample of students. Percentile scores on a norm-referenced test show a student’s performance in relation to the performance of students in the national sample. For example, a score in the 60th percentile means the student has scored higher than 60% of the students in the national sample.

NRT Reading, Mathematics

The median national percentile rank (NPR) represents the middle percentile score of the students for whom results are presented. A median NPR of 50 equals the national average.

NRT Results

Subject (Grade)	Number Tested* School	Median National Percentile Rank School	Median National Percentile Rank District	Median National Percentile Rank State
Reading (Gr .3)	55	76	76	61
Mathematics (Gr .3)	55	83	83	66
Reading (Gr .4)	59	75	75	58
Mathematics (Gr .4)	59	81	81	64
Reading (Gr .5)	55	77	77	55
Mathematics (Gr .5)	55	84	84	63
Reading (Gr .6)	*	*	19	53
Mathematics (Gr. 6)	*	*	26	64
Reading (Gr. 7)	52	85	85	57
Mathematics (Gr. 7)	52	96	96	66
Reading (Gr. 8)	53	89	89	58
Mathematics (Gr. 8)	53	96	96	65
Reading (Gr. 9)	N/A	N/A	16	44
Mathematics (Gr. 9)	N/A	N/A	30	66
Reading (Gr. 10)	N/A	N/A	19	46
Mathematics(Gr.10)	N/A	N/A	43	66

*Data not provided by the state

Grade 3 Reading

	2002- 2003	2001- 2002	2000- 2001	1999- 2000	1998- 1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	100%	98%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	93%	82%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	37%	49%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	11%	9%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	55	57	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	77%	73%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	62%	59%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	29%	27%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	4%	4%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	188,107	188,387	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 3 Math

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	100%	96%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	84%	84%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	46%	56%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	13%	12%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	55	57	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	81%	79%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	62%	59%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	28%	25%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	6%	5%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	188,487	188,606	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 4 Reading

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	90%	94%	91%	93%	85%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	83%	83%	79%	75%	75%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	46%	44%	42%	46%	44%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	12%	16%	5%	10%	6%
Number of students tested	59	54	57	56	52
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subgroup Scores					
1. White					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2. Hispanic					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. African American					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
State Scores					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	75%	70%	69%	67%	69%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	60%	55%	53%	51%	52%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	29%	27%	25%	22%	21%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	6%	6%	7%	3%	3%
Number of students tested	193,391	191,866	188,696	183,733	154,945
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 4 Math

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	93%	98%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	83%	79%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	44%	33%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	5%	11%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	59	54	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	78%	74%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	55%	50%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	21%	18%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	5%	3%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	193,503	192,366	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 4 Writing

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	98%	94%	91%	84%	75%
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	46%	61%	48%	38%	33%
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	10%	27%	32%	8%	2%
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content	4%	3%	0%	4%	0%
Number of students tested	59	54	57	56	53
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subgroup Scores					
1. Low Income					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content					
2. Hispanic					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content					
3. African American					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content					
State Scores					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	98%	96%	96%	95%	95%
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	91%	82%	84%	78%	73%
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	49%	40%	41%	28%	23%
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	9%	10%	11%	5%	2%
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content	2%	1%	2%	0%	0%
Number of students tested	191,744	191,264	187,927	184,568	155,148
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 5 Reading

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	98%	96%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	95%	85%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	45%	46%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	7%	10%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	60	56	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	75%	72%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	57%	54%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	24%	24%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	3%	5%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	192,881	192,604	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 5 Math

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	98%	98%	96%	98%	94%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	88%	93%	93%	79%	67%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	51%	72%	65%	57%	34%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	19%	31%	23%	16%	3%
Number of students tested	60	56	55	54	51
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subgroup Scores					
1. Low Income					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2. Hispanic					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. African American					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
State Scores					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	77%	75%	73%	74%	72%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	51%	48%	48%	45%	47%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	27%	25%	26%	21%	24%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	6%	6%	6%	4%	6%
Number of students tested	192,692	192,472	187,623	182,300	150,526
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 6 Reading

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	96%	98%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	87%	91%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	64%	64%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	20%	24%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	57	55	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	72%	70%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	54%	52%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	24%	24%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	6%	6%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	196,333	194,125	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 6 Math

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	96%	98%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	85%	91%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	55%	66%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	22%	31%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	57	55	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	69%	65%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	47%	43%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	20%	18%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	6%	5%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	196,134	193,948	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 7 Reading

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	96%	89%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	56%	57%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	27%	24%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	52%	54%	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	72%	71%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	51%	50%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	22%	21%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	5%	5%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	197,417	191,991	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 7 Math

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	94%	100%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	81%	81%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	43%	48%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	52	54	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Subgroup Scores			-	-	-
1. Low Income			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
2. Hispanic			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
3. African American			-	-	-
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
State Scores			-	-	-
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	-	-	-
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	69%	67%	-	-	-
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	48%	46%	-	-	-
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	22%	20%	-	-	-
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	7%	6%	-	-	-
Number of students tested	197,161	191,786	-	-	-
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	-	-	-

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 8 Reading

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total – Percent of student					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	10%	100%	95%	100%	100%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	94%	90%	79%	90%	91%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	73%	63%	40%	66%	52%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	15%	31%	19%	9%	9%
Number of students tested	53	41	38	42	46
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subgroup Scores					
1. White					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2. Hispanic					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. African American					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
State Scores					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	74%	71%	70%	68%	78%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	48%	45%	43%	39%	49%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	18%	17%	17%	12%	15%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	2%	3%	4%	1%	2%
Number of students tested	192,116	184,483	174,016	170,139	142,125
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

n/a – Data not available

- No test administered

Grade 8 Math

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	100%	20%	97%	100%	98%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	87%	80%	79%	93%	68%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	59%	48%	45%	53%	44%
Number of students tested	53	41	38	42	46
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subgroup Scores					
1. Low Income					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2. Hispanic					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. African American					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
State Scores					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Limited Success with challenging content	78%	75%	76%	71%	73%
Level 3 – Partial Success with challenging content	56%	53%	55%	51%	49%
Level 4 – Success with challenging content	24%	22%	24%	23%	19%
Level 5 – High Success with challenging content	10%	8%	10%	10%	7%
Number of students tested	191,656	184,379	174,067	170,287	141,361
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

n/a – Data not available
- No test administered

Grade 8 Writing

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month – March					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	50%	86%	95%	93%	46%
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	29%	47%	40%	43%	12%
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content	5%	8%	3%	0%	1%
Number of students tested	53	41	38	42	45
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subgroup Scores					
1. Low Income					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content					
2. Hispanic					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content					
3. African American					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content					
State Scores					
Total– Percent of students...					
Level 1 – No Success with challenging content	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level 2 – Little Success with challenging content	98%	97%	97%	98%	98%
Level 3 – Limited Success with challenging content	91%	88%	88%	90%	87%
Level 4 – Partial Success with challenging content	58%	59%	54%	54%	34%
Level 5 – Success with challenging content	17%	14%	16%	11%	4%
Level 6 – High Success with challenging content	2%	10%	2%	1%	1%
Number of students tested	190,399	183,453	174,155	170,865	143,558
Percent of total students tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percent of students excluded	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

n/a – Data not available

- **No test administered**