

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

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

Official School Name: Momilani Elementary School  
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address: 2130 Hookiekie St.  
Pearl City HI 96782-1425

Tel. ( 808 ) 453-6444 Fax ( 808 ) 453-6444  
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Website/URL: http://power2.k12.hi.us/index.cfm?siteID=150  
http://k12.hi.us/~momilani E-mail dhiga@k12.hi.us

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Superintendent\* Ms. Patricia Hamamoto  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Hawaii State Department of Education Tel. (808) 586-3310

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

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

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:
- |       |                         |
|-------|-------------------------|
| 174   | Elementary schools      |
| 37    | Middle schools          |
| _____ | Junior high schools     |
| 35    | High schools            |
| 35    | Other (Briefly explain) |
| 281   | TOTAL                   |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$8,375
- Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$8,375

**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. 14.5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
- If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
<b>K</b>	28	32	<b>60</b>	<b>7</b>			
<b>1</b>	28	31	<b>59</b>	<b>8</b>			
<b>2</b>	32	28	<b>60</b>	<b>9</b>			
<b>3</b>	31	32	<b>63</b>	<b>10</b>			
<b>4</b>	29	30	<b>59</b>	<b>11</b>			
<b>5</b>	31	28	<b>59</b>	<b>12</b>			
<b>6</b>	30	31	<b>61</b>	Other			
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b>							<b>421</b>

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- |       |                                    |
|-------|------------------------------------|
| _____ | 4 % White                          |
| _____ | 0 % Black or African American      |
| _____ | 2 % Hispanic or Latino             |
| _____ | 94 % Asian/Pacific Islander        |
| _____ | 0 % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
|       | <b>100% Total</b>                  |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: **4.5 %**

(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.)

<b>(1)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	14
<b>(2)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	5
<b>(3)</b>	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	19
<b>(4)</b>	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	416
<b>(5)</b>	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.045
<b>(6)</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4.5

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: **0.47 %**  
**2** Total Number Limited English Proficient  
 Number of languages represented: **1**  
 Specify languages: **Tagalog**

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: **10 %**

**43** 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 %  
17 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>  1  </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>    </u> Deafness	<u>  1  </u> Other Health Impaired
<u>    </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u> 14 </u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>    </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>    </u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>  1  </u> Mental Retardation	<u>    </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>    </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>    </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness

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

**Number of Staff**

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>  1  </u>	<u>    </u>
Classroom teachers	<u> 17 </u>	<u>    </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>  6  </u>	<u>  2  </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>    </u>	<u>  2  </u>
Support staff	<u>  9  </u>	<u>    </u>
Total number	<u> 33 </u>	<u>  4  </u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 421/17 = 24.7:1
13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	*96%	*96%	*97%	99%	99.9%
Teacher turnover rate	0	0	5%	0	0
Student dropout rate					
Student drop-off rate					

\* **Child Care/Family Leave**

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

“Quality education in a safe, caring environment” reflects Momilani’s commitment to excellence in all aspects of the teaching and learning process. Believing all children can learn, the staff continually strives to improve the instructional strategies and curriculum to challenge every child—including academically talented, disabled, and at-risk students. Learning occurs in a secure, orderly, nurturing, inclusive, and drug-free environment where all staff members have high expectations for student achievement. Addressing different learning styles and multiple intelligences strengthens the learning process and helps students to develop to their fullest potential. Consistent school wide practices through our effective teaching strategies enhance unity and continuity in our academic program. Strong parent/community/business support and involvement increase our resources and support for providing an enriching comprehensive curriculum. Teachers, students and parents demonstrate their commitment to education through continuous renewal of the teaching and learning process. Finally, collaboration, teamwork, shared vision and shared leadership are the driving forces behind our effective research-based (standard implementation design) school improvement process where “Learning for all”—high student achievement of State Standards is our goal.

Our commitment to excellence is evident in the following key initiatives:

1. Momilani’s Standards Implementation Design (SID) Plan is guided by Effective Schools Research, and state/national goals, standards, initiatives. We continue to incorporate the following seven correlates of effective schools: a safe and orderly environment; a shared leadership where teachers are empowered; a climate of high expectations for success; frequent monitoring of student progress; a clear and focused mission--learning for all (equity for all); opportunity to learn with student time on task; and home-school relations where parents are in true partnership. State/national goals, standards and initiatives (e.g. the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) program, and the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards) are the framework/principles within which our SID operates.
2. Through a standards-based technology enabled environment, we implement an intellectually challenging and engaging curriculum through the development of thematic interdisciplinary units where teachers and students focus on connecting curricular knowledge to universal concepts/wisdoms in order to provide meaningful, connected learning opportunities, to encourage critical/creative thinking skills; to promote self-directed learning (goal-setting, perseverance, decision-making, reflection/evaluation); to prepare students for responsible citizenship (collaboration, character development) and productive employment (authentic/active learning; developing basic skills and processes through meaningful practice; career awareness); and to reach all students by building on and developing their strengths (multiple intelligences).
3. Early intervention reading (based on successful strategies of the Reading Recovery Program) and math programs as well as tutorials for the at-risk are provided for our students. Before-/after-school, character education, and self-esteem support programs provide for physical and emotional security and to encourage every student to feel that Momilani is their home away from home.
4. The school’s master schedule is modified to allow for teacher articulation and planning time within the instructional day for the improvement of standards-based curriculum and instruction. Resource teachers support every classroom teacher collaboratively by focusing on planning, implementation, assessment and realignment of standards-based curriculum and instruction with state/national goals, standards and initiatives. Opportunities for teachers to work as partners are provided through team teaching in order to strengthen the teaching and learning process.
5. School resources, fiscal and personnel, are committed to support standards-based school improvement goals. Ongoing professional development focuses on achieving these goals. Home, school, community and business partnerships (strengthened through authentic outreach, involvement and support programs) provide significant support.

Momilani’s commitment to excellence bears fruit at all levels of school operations. Finally, our statewide test results validate student achievement of Hawaii Content and Performance Standards.

## PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### **1. School Reading and Mathematics Assessment Results**

In 2000, the decision was made to move our statewide assessment from a norm-referenced test (SAT9) to a standards-based criterion referenced assessment to measure student performance in the content areas of Language Arts and Mathematics. This was based on the premise that a norm-referenced exam did not reflect the uniqueness, nor the breadth and depth of the Hawaii Content and Performance Expectations for Language Arts and Mathematics. The Hawaii State Assessment (2001) has four proficiency levels.

**Level 1: “Well Below Proficiency”** means that the assessment results indicate that this student has demonstrated little or no knowledge and skills for the content standard for this grade.

**Level 2: “Approaches Proficiency”** means that the student has demonstrated some knowledge and skills in the content standards for this grade. With more support and effort, the student should be able to reach the proficient level.

**Level 3: “Meets Proficiency”** means that the assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills required standards for this grade. The student is ready to work on higher levels of this content area.

**Level 4: “Exceeds Proficiency”** means that the assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills that exceed the content standards for this grade. The student is ready for more advanced work in the content area.

Scaled Scores based on the initial administration of the Hawaii State Assessment were developed during Spring 2002. The scaled scores have been derived from the raw scores in order to create a score scale with meaningful interpretations. For instance, a “300” means that the student has met the standard. Scaled Scores can be used to compare student performance across different administrations of the assessment sessions within a particular content area.

Hawaii State Assessment (HAS) Test results (measures the progress of all children in attaining the level of performance specified in our content standards) indicate Momilani’s significant movement to the achievement of Hawaii State Standards and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) goals. Over the two year period, our students in Grade 3 exceeded State Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) benchmarks by 47% and Grade 5 by 41% in Reading. In the area of Math, our students in Grade 3 exceeded the State AYP benchmarks by 48% and Grade 5 by 44%. These results validate our emphasis on higher-order literacy (reading and writing) proficiencies. Exemplary teacher studies support our findings that high achievement is linked to turning over to the students themselves much of the evaluation of their writing.

This new HAS assessment fosters changes in our instruction—primarily a shift toward more thoughtful teaching and learning where teacher observation of literacy development is essential.

In school years 1998-1999 and 1999-2000, Momilani’s third and fifth graders were assessed with the Stanford Achievement Test, ninth edition. Scores are reported in terms of the national percentiles. Any slight decrease in test scores may be attributed to a significant increase in special education students who were part of the testing group. In addition, entries of new students to Momilani greatly affect the group scores of the small number of students being tested.

Momilani’s SAT results provide our staff with one sort of information for monitoring the general reading and math development (by identifying basic reading comprehension and math problem solving achievement patterns) in our school.

## **2. Understanding Assessment Data To Improve Student And School Performance**

The school regards assessment as integral to the educational process rather than a response to outside demands. A variety of assessment systems are in place, and assessment that involves all staff is a continuing activity at the school. Qualitative and quantitative data are also used to understand students' experience of school.

Formal and informal data on student achievement, including analysis of student products, tests, observations, and interactive means provide information and insights which help the staff to align the school's curriculum, improve areas of weakness, and evaluate the outcomes of 1) program materials, 2) teaching strategies, 3) learning activities, 4) curriculum content, 5) master schedule, and 6) classroom management. Teachers and the administrator use this information to develop goals for teaching, as the subject for observations, discussions, and collegial feedback (including feedback from students).

Students also conduct their own assessments, which, when combined with other assessments, lead to sustained achievement and excellence and provide a basis for evaluation and modifications of students' personal learning plans.

Teachers incorporate assessment tasks into instruction in order to stimulate thinking, including students' ability to analyze, organize, interpret, explain, synthesize, evaluate, and communicate important experiences or ideas.

The principal and staff spend time analyzing evaluative data (national/state/school assessments) as the basis for interventions and allocating resources for improvement. Collectively and collaboratively they work to identify weaknesses and brainstorm how to appropriate assistance remediation efforts. They seek professional development activities that focus on the identified areas that are in need of improvement. They also capitalize on the findings of current research in making curriculum decisions.

## **3. Communicating Student Performance To Parents, Students, And The Community.**

There are strong links between data analysis and our school's vision for expected school-wide learning results. Accessible, comprehensive, and accurate information regarding student achievement at all grade levels is available to all members of the school community, helping them to assess the instructional program against established benchmarks and other programs, and stimulating innovative teaching practices affecting all students.

These analyses form the basis of school and community discussions as well as subsequent recommendations for improving programs and services. They also guide future resource allocations.

Data are disaggregated and are transparent to everyone

Important to ensuring student success, student performance is communicated with parents in a timely manner via oral/written means or through conferencing. Teachers begin the new school year by sharing with parents/guardians/student a comprehensive mid-first quarter report that indicates the student's progress based on both qualitative and quantitative data. Planning for next steps happens together.

The greater community is informed of student performance through the Department of Education and other organizations' press releases.

The principal and staff understand the community's values and goals and what it desires the curriculum to achieve. They operate with a dual vision of where the school is now and what they envision it becoming in the future. Their vision includes establishing school as a viable base of security for students to develop to their full potential in a society where there are so many obstacles for optimum student achievement. Through skillful articulation, they share their vision with students, parents, and community. They concentrate their efforts towards narrowing the gap between the present realities and the future possibilities.

#### **4. Sharing Successes With Other Schools**

Momilani Elementary School shares its effective schooling practices focusing on student achievement of the State standards with other schools through presentations, school visitations, professional development activities, and articulation groups. This process engages both the instructional and support staff with other schools' faculty.

Following State and National recognition awards, the principal shared the strengths of Momilani's effective schooling practices at conferences, meetings and workshops. Another effective venue of sharing Momilani's practices is through school visitations from teachers of neighboring schools. During school visitations, guest teachers gain a first-hand experience of Momilani's educational programming, instructional strategies, and teacher-student interaction that data or school reports cannot completely portray.

One of the most effective means of sharing Momilani's success is through K-12 articulation groups. These are held at both the school and complex levels. At K-12 articulation groups, faculty from district elementary, middle, and high schools meet to discuss large issues (e.g. instructional strategies, addressing "at-risk" student needs, challenging accelerated students). After discussing these large issues, the general assembly breaks into smaller groups based on the issues at stake, to formulate more specific solutions to these problems. The emphasis on K-12 articulation groups is facilitating discussion of breadth and depth throughout the district. The ultimate goal is to collectively formulate solutions to problems faced by individual schools.

Momilani also actively shares student evidences of learning with two sister schools in Japan.

# PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

## **1. Challenging Curriculum**

Language Arts encompasses reading comprehension and critical thinking skills, word recognition skills, literature studies, writing, and composition (including spelling and grammar), and speaking and listening skills. Our efforts at content improvement focus on the implementation of an early intervention program for at-risk students based on successful strategies of the Reading Recovery Program.

Mathematics is comprised of the following skill areas: number sense/numeration, number operations, computation, estimation, measurement, geometry, statistics/probability, patterns/relationships and algebra. Math is integrated in the content areas through writing, creating word problems, art, solving real-life problems, compiling and presenting data in science, social studies, and other content areas. The unique features of our math curriculum include a hands-on developmental approach to learning, and using the variety of strategies to help all students learn. The course that best exemplifies our efforts at content improvement is problem solving. Through the development of critical thinking processes and solving real-life problems, students' skills with word problems are enhanced.

Science essential components are: science as inquiry, habits of mind, living organisms, matter and its interactions, forces of nature, motion, energy, forces that shape Earth, ecology, space and astronomy, and technology. The unique feature of our science curriculum is an activity-based program, which provides many hands-on explorations, enabling our students to construct science concepts through inquiry and investigation. Our program emphasizes science thinking processes such as observing, measuring, classifying, interpreting data, experimenting, controlling variables, hypothesizing, and drawing conclusions; as well as critical thinking processes involved in concept formation, decision making, research/inquiry, and problem solving. Students utilize the step-by-step scientific process approach to problem solving, which consists of the following: statement of problem, hypothesis, materials needed, procedure, results, and conclusion. Major themes connect science concepts together. These concepts are also linked to curricular areas--literature, math, social studies, music/art, and health. Students participate actively in science projects, invention convention, and interactive distance-learning technology programs. Our best efforts at content improvement are the focus on student-generated projects, which have been, strengthened through science and curriculum fairs.

Social Studies' interdisciplinary and inquiry approach to learning in a collaborative environment supports our best efforts to improve teaching and foster active learning. By using the interdisciplinary approach, we can more easily incorporate the multiple intelligences into our curriculum. Current research on the nature of human intelligence supports brain compatible learning by addressing the multiple intelligences. Research also substantiates the intellectual stimulation, high level of motivation, active involvement, and meaningfulness of an inquiry-based approach. Our collaborative learning environment is supported by research--partnership and group work can increase students' academic achievement, foster more active involvement in the learning task and develop critical thinking skills.

The Arts include exploration of varied art forms--music, drama, theater, puppetry, and visual arts, and their uses to express ideas and feelings. The fine arts are integrated in all the content areas, especially in language arts, math, and social studies. Our best efforts toward improving content in the arts curriculum is the contracting of services from professional artists in the community, as well as, seeking voluntary expertise (parents, teachers, community resources).

Foreign Language - Our Hawaiian Studies language program encompasses cultural awareness and appreciation, comprehension (listening and reading), and production (speaking).

## **2. School's Approach To Reading.**

The unique feature of our reading program is a school-wide effort to consistently apply the system of learning strategies which include the following: the mature reader process, visualization, retelling/paraphrasing, integrating learning and doing/using, making the process visible, and balancing the word recognition strategies. Reading skills are learned through teacher modeling/demonstrations, direct

instruction of word recognition strategies, and providing sustained periods for reading. Teachers model the reading process by reading aloud to children (demonstrating the mature reader process), sharing stories/poems/letters, and engaging in reading when children can observe during sustained silent reading periods. The mature reader process involves specific strategies: 1) before reading: observing, predicting, and connecting, 2) during reading: confirming/rejecting predictions, documenting, visualizing, questioning, clarifying ideas, and 3) after reading: retelling, organizing, structuring, applying, or evaluating. Teachers also demonstrate the complex mental processes of reading by “thinking out loud” for students to gain a clearer understanding of the process. Word recognition strategies are taught directly in an integrated context, always focusing on meaning first. These strategies include semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic cues. Sustained periods for reading are included within the school day to provide opportunities for students to orchestrate the skills and strategies crucial to good comprehension, to develop proficiency in reading as well as foster the enjoyment of reading.

The complex process involving knowledge, experience, thinking, and teaching is acknowledged in our model for comprehension, which includes the following eight critical factors that affect comprehension: experience, visualization, content concepts, thinking, attitude, language, integration, and style. In working with our students, all of these factors are considered, examined, and applied to improve the comprehension process. If students do not have the prior experiences to understand a concept, teachers provide enriching experiences firsthand or vicariously. Developing positive attitudes towards reading and incorporating a variety of strategies to address differences in learning styles (multiple intelligences) are key elements.

According to current research, reading must be both meaningful and functional. Strategies for reading skills are always taught in a meaningful context. Reading is also related to authentic, daily functions such as reading letters, messages, grocery lists, newspapers, and signs. Another important factor in effective learning is the social, interactive aspect, which allows students access to each other’s thinking processes. Students engage in guided reading groups, shared reading activities, buddy reading, literature groups, and many other collaborative experiences

### **3. Curriculum Related To Essential Skills And Knowledge Based On The School’s Mission**

Our interdisciplinary Safety/Drug Abuse Prevention Program plays a vital role in supporting our curriculum as well as the National Education Goals of having “every school in America free of drugs, alcohol, and violence” and “to offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.”

Working under the framework of the Effective Schools Research (by Lawrence W. Lezotte), where a safe and orderly environment conducive to teaching and learning is the number one correlate, Momilani establishes safety as a high priority in our curriculum. Our safety curricula includes an awareness of school safety rules and consequences; a monitoring system by all school personnel; annual staff training; an assessment program by the State School Inspection Team and the Fire Department; and the following curricula: Project Charlie’s Safe Curriculum, Project Wisdom, and the Peaceful Partners Violence Prevention Program. Safety is integrated in all curriculum areas throughout the entire school day. A unique feature of our safety programming is the initiation of the Peaceful Partners Violence Prevention Program, which teaches children how to resolve conflicts, cooperate with one another, prevent harassment and bullying, and learn the importance of celebrating diversity by including everyone.

Drug prevention programming encompasses a wide range of dynamic experiences for all students: a drug abuse prevention curriculum, Project Charlie (which promotes a “no use” message with appropriate refusal skills, teaches self-awareness, relationship, and decision-making skills as well as information about chemical use); guest speakers/role models from the community; and a special culminating drug-free event at the end of the year. In addition, our sixth graders participate in the D.A.R.E. (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) Program sponsored by the Honolulu Police Department.

Our drug abuse prevention programming is integrated in the curriculum through art, music, science, social studies, literature, and math. The unique feature of our drug abuse prevention programming is the culminating drug-free event which involves the entire student body, faculty and staff members, parents and a wide range of supporting agencies from the community--city and county, state, federal, and private.

#### **4. Using Different Instructional Methods To Improve Student Learning**

To help students achieve at higher levels of understanding, our major curriculum emphasis and development is the integration of content areas into interdisciplinary units where teachers and students focus on connecting knowledge to universal concepts/wisdom explanations. Making personal connections to these universal concepts/wisdom is an important feature and these understandings are linked to character values/traits. The school-wide attention to universal concepts and character values for a year are: Universal Concepts (Unity/Diversity, Systems/Interdependence, Limitations/Interactions, Change/Continuity) Character Values (Compassion/Respect, Responsibility/Sharing, Cooperation/Friendship, Perseverance/Self-Discipline)

By using a thematic interdisciplinary approach, students are offered a wider range of learning experiences. Learning becomes more meaningful as students see patterns and relationships. An interdisciplinary curriculum supports brain compatible learning by addressing the multiple intelligences. The mind also retains information better when that information is placed in a larger context or framework. The emphasis is on the learning process--with students actively engaged in seeking answers to their own questions, discovering relationships, solving problems, and developing skills through meaningful practice. Students become critical thinkers and problem-solvers, learn to work cooperatively with each other and are encouraged to explore different viewpoints. Moreover, students use a variety of resources to gain information necessary for learning rather than a single textbook. By using this approach, we are encouraging our students to take risks, experiment, investigate, ask and seek answers to their questions, assess their learning processes and strategies, and become independent learners. A sample Grade 1 lesson in persuasive writing included a short history lesson in which the events of the past 50 years in England and the United States were briefly discussed. These included the bombing of London during World War II and the destruction of the World Trade Center in New York in 2001. The students were then asked to write a persuasive paper supporting their stand on where the original "Winnie the Pooh" artifacts should be housed.

#### **5. Professional Development Program And Its Impact On Improving Student Achievement**

Staff development is vital to accomplishing our school's mission. Professional growth is promoted and supported by our school/community members and leaders. Professional development is primarily on-site, job embedded, collaborative, intensive, and team driven.

Literacy instructional resource augmentation personnel support each teacher several times a week by modeling lessons, providing guidance in curriculum development, assessing student needs, adding resources, and initiating projects. The teachers and resource personnel strive earnestly to implement the school's Standards Implementation Design (SID) Plan.

Through School/Community-Based Management or PTSA mini-grants teachers have attended one or more workshops or taken University of Hawaii Continuing Education courses that were linked directly to Momilani's Standards Implementation Design Plan. The professional improvement classes included Helping At-Risk Children Develop Literacy, Guided Reading, Direct Instruction, "Step Up To Writing", and Differentiated Instruction. Staff development allocations, library funding, and technology allotments have provided additional inservicing for addressing standards-based learning, training in technology, math problem solving, science, and drug education.

The principal and instructional staff meet regularly to analyze assessment data and to improve our school's delivery of service (modify curriculum or identify the need for further staff development). Formal/informal meetings are held to discuss items such as current practice, student performance and other significant school issues. Teachers also articulate weekly to analyze instruction and data to further plan for effective instruction.

Always learning and growing, the staff models a willingness to "try", to field test new instructional strategies, materials, texts, and possibly adopt/adapt different strategies. Foci are on best teaching and learning practices. There is careful preparation for successful implementation and/or change. The principal's leadership ensures confidence and support for effective schooling improvement. Our staff evidences a commitment to providing "quality, caring education".

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Momilani

Grade  3  Test  Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year  9<sup>th</sup> Ed./1997  Publisher  Harcourt Brace & Co.

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

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	<b>Reading Comp.</b>	<b>Reading Comp.</b>
Total Score	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	59.29	69.97
Number of students tested			0	58	58
Percent of total students tested				100	98.31
Number of students excluded				0	1
Percent of students excluded				0	1.69
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
1.Asian/Pacific Islander				59.92	69.08
Number of students tested				51	52
<b>STATE SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
State Mean Score				50.35	44.49

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students.

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (“HSA”), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm -referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
<b>NATIONAL MEAN SCORE</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	50	50
<b>NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	N/A	N/A

**ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Momilani**

Grade   3   Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9<sup>th</sup> Ed./1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace & Co.

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

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	<b>Math</b>	<b>Math</b>
Total Score	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	62.74	71.37
Number of students tested			0	58	58
Percent of total students tested				100	98.31
Number of students excluded				0	1
Percent of students excluded				0	1.69
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
1.Asian/Pacific Islander				63.67	73.52
Number of students tested				51	52
<b>STATE SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
State Mean Score				54.72	48.16

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (“HSA”), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm -referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
<b>NATIONAL MEAN SCORE</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	50	50
<b>NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	N/A	N/A

**ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Momilani**

Grade   5   Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9<sup>th</sup> Ed./1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace & Co.

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

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	<b>Reading Comp.</b>	<b>Reading Comp.</b>
Total Score	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	64.45	61.83
Number of students tested			0	51	59
Percent of total students tested				94.55	98.33
Number of students excluded				4	1
Percent of students excluded				5.45	1.67
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
1.Asian/Pacific Islander				64.45	61.62
Number of students tested				51	53
<b>STATE SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
State Mean Score				49.50	46.74

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (“HSA”), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm -referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
<b>NATIONAL MEAN SCORE</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	50	50
<b>NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	N/A	N/A

**ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS: Momilani**

Grade   5   Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year 9<sup>th</sup> Ed./1997 Publisher Harcourt Brace & Co.

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

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	<b>Math</b>	<b>Math</b>
Total Score	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	64.57	64.85
Number of students tested			0	51	59
Percent of total students tested				94.55	98.33
Number of students excluded				4	1
Percent of students excluded				5.45	1.67
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
1.Asian/Pacific Islander				64.57	64.06
Number of students tested				51	53
<b>STATE SCORES</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE		
State Mean Score				55.53	50.83

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (“HSA”), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm -referenced Stanford Achievement Test.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
<b>NATIONAL MEAN SCORE</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	50	50
<b>NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION</b>	N/A HSA	N/A HSA	NONE	N.A	N.A.

**STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS: Momilani**

Grade 3

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1<sup>st</sup>/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Reading</b>	NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	96.8	98.4			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	69.3	75.8			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	4.8	1.6			
Number of students tested	62	62	0		
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup)			NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	96.5	98.2			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	69.7	75.8			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	3.6	1.7			
Number of students tested	56	58			
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
State scaled mean score	172.35	171.09			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	90.3	91			
State scaled mean score	256.16	254.29			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	42.8	43.4			
State scaled mean score	340.27	337.82			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	1.2	2.1			
State scaled mean score	448.92	436.62			

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion-referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.

**STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS: Momilani**

Grade 3

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1<sup>st</sup>/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Math</b>	NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	95.2	91.9			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	50	56.4			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	11.3	3.2			
Number of students tested	62	62			
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup)			NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	96.4	93			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	51.8	56.8			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	10.7	3.4			
Number of students tested	56	58			
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
State scaled mean score	159.43	159.99			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	81.1	77.9			
State scaled mean score	252.78	249.67			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	24.4	20.4			
State scaled mean score	326.77	323.07			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	2.2	1.6			
State scaled mean score	395.29	387.38			

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion-referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.

**STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS: Momilani**

Grade 5

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1<sup>st</sup>/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Reading</b>	NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	98.4	100			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	85.7	71.2			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	7.9	15.4			
Number of students tested	63	52			
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup)			NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	85.5	69.5			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	9.1	15.2			
Number of students tested	55	46			
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
State scaled mean score	179.61	168.36			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	84.8	87.6			
State scaled mean score	257.72	253.60			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	41.6	42.3			
State scaled mean score	343.80	337.97			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	1.1	1.3			
State scaled mean score	455.91	448.35			

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion-referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.

**STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST: Momilani**

Grade 5

Test Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/publication year 1<sup>st</sup>/2001

Publisher Hawaii Department of Education

	2002-2003****	2001-2002****	2000-2001***	1999-2000**	1998-1999*
Testing month	March	April	Tchr Strike	May	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Math</b>	NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	97.6	93.8			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	63.7	53.4			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	9.7	15.4			
Number of students tested	63	52			
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%			
Number of students excluded	0	0			
Percent of students excluded	0	0			
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. <u>Asian/Pacific Islander</u> (specify subgroup)			NONE	N/A	N/A
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	100	95.7			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	65.5	52.2			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	9.1	17.4			
Number of students tested	55	46			
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
% At or above Well Below Proficiency	100	100			
State scaled mean score	168.24	160.36			
% At or above Approaches Proficiency	76.3	75			
State scaled mean score	251.77	248.79			
% At or above Meets Proficiency	19.8	21.1			
State scaled mean score	329.37	325.90			
% At or above Exceeds Proficiency	1.4	1.8			
State scaled mean score	414.60	403.43			

\* The State used the Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1998-1999 for the large scale assessment. The SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the SAT9 to the current Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

\*\* The State used the abbreviated Stanford Achievement Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (1997) during school year 1999-2000 for the large scale assessment. The abbreviated SAT9 is not a criterion-referenced test and we cannot psychometrically compare the abbreviated SAT9 to the current HSA.

\*\*\* There was a state-wide teacher strike during the school year 2000-2001 which precluded any administration of the state large scale assessment to our students

\*\*\*\*The Hawaii State Assessment (2001), a standards based assessment, was given as the large scale assessment during the 2001-2002 and the 2002-2003 school years. This standards based assessment has no applicable norm-referenced scores and portions of the criterion-referenced HSA cannot be used psychometrically to equate to the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests.