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

Name of Principal Dr. Cassandra Morris-Surles
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Glen Park Elementary
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 3601 Pecos
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Fort Worth Texas 76119-4951
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (817) 531-6460 Fax (817) 531-7738

Website/URL fortworthisd.org E-mail Csurl@Ftworthisd.tenet.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* Dr. Thomas S. Tocco
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Fort Worth Independent School District Tel. (817) 871-2730

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 Ms. Lynne Manny
(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 _____

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

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 79 Elementary schools
 24 Middle Schools
 0 Junior High Schools
 13 High Schools
 14 Other (Briefly explain)
- Alternative Schools
- Adolescent Child Bearer
 - Immigrants
 - Dropout recovery – high school
 - Disciplinary AEP (assigned by central office)
 - Severely handicapped
- 130 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 4,724.20
- Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 4,675.00

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- [x] 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. 3 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
K	59	55	114	7			
1	64	40	104	8			
2	56	59	115	9			
3	58	49	107	10			
4	60	45	105	11			
5	55	40	95	12			
6				Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							640

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | |
|--|
| <u>6</u> % White |
| <u>20</u> % Black or African American |
| <u>73</u> % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>.5</u> % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>.5</u> % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% Total |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 29 %

(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.)

2002-2003		
(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	112
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	100
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	212
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	743
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.2853
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	28.5%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 54 %
400 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 2
 Specify languages: English and Spanis

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 88 %
650 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 5 %
34 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Autism | <input type="checkbox"/> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deafness | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Health Impaired |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deaf-Blindness | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specific Learning Disability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hearing Impairment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Retardation | <input type="checkbox"/> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |

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

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u> 2 </u>	_____
Classroom teachers	<u> 39 </u>	_____
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u> 2 </u>	_____
Paraprofessionals	<u> 12 </u>	_____
2 Special Education Teachers		
10.30 Health/Teacher Assistants		
Support staff	<u> 5 </u>	_____
Total number	<u> 60 </u>	_____

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 22.1

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	95.7%	96.1%	95.9%	96.1%	95.9%
Daily teacher attendance	95.4%	94.7%	95.2%	94.4%	94%
Teacher turnover rate	5	4	7	5	8
Student dropout rate	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Student drop-off rate	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

14. **(High Schools Only)** Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2003 are doing as of September 2003.

Graduating class size	_____
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____ %
Enrolled in a community college	_____ %
Enrolled in vocational training	_____ %
Found employment	_____ %
Military service	_____ %
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	_____ %
Unknown	_____ %
Total	100 %

PART III - SUMMARY

Glen Park Elementary School was built in 1953 when a new housing subdivision was constructed. The school's enrollment steadily increased over the years until 2002 when a new school opened and approximately fifty African American students were transferred to the new school. Over the last five years the community demographics changed dramatically: African American membership dropped from 37% in 1999 to 20% in 2003; White student membership dropped from 11% in 1999 to 6% in 2003; Hispanic student membership increased from 51% in 1999 to 73% in 2003, with a Limited English Speaking population of 54%. At the same time, the number of economically disadvantaged students increased from 76% to 88%. Currently, the student attendance rate is 96%, and the mobility rate is 19.8%.

In fall 2000, a new principal, Cassandra Morris-Surles, was assigned to Glen Park in part reflecting the necessity of having a Spanish-speaking principal. (Dr. Surles is a Spanish speaking African American). The previous principal was transferred to the new school along with the students noted above and five teachers. With major changes in demographics and administrative structure, little support by families and the community, and a large influx of new teachers, most of them part of the Alternative Certification Program (ACP), the school faced many challenges. Chief among these was to build a unified team of staff, parents, and community, ready for change and committed to the same vision of excellence for Glen Park.

Approaching this challenge, the principal and entire staff conducted a comprehensive review of school demographics, assessment data, testing standards, attendance, student behavior, and parent/community involvement. The problems identified seemed huge, but recognizing that other schools were succeeding within the same context, they committed themselves to finding solutions. Adopting this mission: "All children are challenged to succeed to their full potential; all educators are empowered to utilize their skills to facilitate learning; and all parents are welcomed into the partnership to benefit the education of their children." They organized goals and objectives into three areas: 1) student achievement, 2) parental involvement, and 3) classroom management.

To achieve these goals, the principal defined expectations and purpose and, together with the assistant principal and newly appointed instructional specialist, formed the administrative team. Newly appointed grade level chairpersons (PreK-5) became the school's core planning team. Together, this group spearheaded the school's comprehensive needs assessment initiative, collected input from all staff to develop each year's CEIP, reviewed incremental assessment data, and conducted vertical articulation meetings to discuss curriculum and student achievement and to prevent duplication of services. Grade level chairpersons met regularly with their grade level peers, the instructional specialist, and principal to review student achievement, plan interventions as needed, and coordinate grade level activities. Ideas and issues were then brought forward for the core planning team.

The principal worked with the office staff to overcome parents' negative perceptions of the school. The responsibilities of the Parent-School Liaison were re-prioritized to focus on removing barriers and increasing parents' presence in the school for the betterment of their children. Since the school community comprises a significant number of low income households, a school staff member was designated to help parents access community resources such as the Salvation Army, children's closet, Food Bank, Women's Haven for abused/battered wives, the community children's hospital, and person/family counseling services. The school now has an active PTO with organizational leaders and two community business members who serve on the SBDM.

These combined efforts have met with great success. Because of the new test program, Texas did not rate schools in 2003, but based on prior standards, Glen Park Elementary would have been advanced to recognized status.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

IV 1 - Test Score Analysis

The five-year testing span from 1999 – 2003 encompasses the last four years of the TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) and the first year of the TAKS (Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills). Significantly, in 1999 the TAAS became TEKS based, meaning that all content was derived from the grade level Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (the state curriculum) and in 2003 the TAKS expanded the amount of curriculum covered and increased the rigor of the format. This means that for the first time we have a five-year period that truly can assess progress in the required core curriculum.

To summarize, during this period Glen Park Elementary consistently, often dramatically, improved its passing rates in both reading and mathematics. Even more important, the school steadily improved its achievement relative to the state average, from being considerably below the state in 1999 to being considerably above it by 2003 in all areas but third grade math. (The charts which follow detail this growth.) It is also important to remember that this growth was achieved during a period of great demographic change. The Hispanic population grew from 20-30%, depending on grade level, resulting in a great increase in second-language learners, and the economically disadvantaged rate increased by an average 10% (up to 89% in early grades).

Specifically, even in third grade math there was a 20% passing-rate gain from 1999 – 2003 (61% - 81%), with a 13% gain between 2002 and 2003 after the new math program described in this proposal was functional. In reading the five-year gain was 24%, resulting in a 94% passing rate that was well above the state average 89%. During this same period the percent of students tested grew more than ten percent. 1

In fourth grade reading there was growth every year, totaling 19% and reaching a final passing rate of 94%. The 11% gain from 2002 to 2003 is especially important since the state declined 7% during this period for an average 85% passing rate. Fourth grade math improved by 35% -- 10% from 2002 to 2003 -- so that in 2003, 100% of Glen Park students, including all sub-populations, passed the TAKS! The state experienced a 6% drop from 2002 to 2003 and posted an average of 88%. The percent of students tested grew and average of 13% during this time.

Fifth grade reading showed a growth of 15% during this period, but like the state, experienced a 7% drop with the institution of the TAKS in 2003. The rounded score of 84% was 1% below the state average (the only place Glen Park did not surpass the state), and while not statistically very significant represents a challenge Glen Park has accepted. Fifth grade math also showed a 15% gain during this time. The 2003 passing rate of 89% was a 1% gain over the 2002 score, especially gratifying since during this period the state dropped 10% to an average of 86%. If students taking the SDAA (special education test) are counted as testing (done with state averages), there was a 15% gain in the number of students tested.

The Glen Park community feels great pride in the achievement reflected by these scores. It represents many hours of hard work and a shared commitment by staff, students and family. This commitment continues for the future.

1 Because Texas rules for testing/exempting special education and limited English proficient students have changed almost yearly, comparing rates of students tested is tenuous. Still, this gain seems sufficient to have statistical significance.

Part IV 2 - Use of Assessment Data

Glen Park uses a variety of assessment instruments, including the TAKS criterion referenced test, TPRI primary reading inventory, RTPE reading test for bilingual, Stanford 10, Tejas Lee, District benchmarks, math and reading program assessments, and teacher made quick assessments. A comprehensive data analysis formed Glen Park's initial plan for change and success and continues to do so in many ways:

- **To develop the Campus Education Improvement Plan which guides all campus activity.**
- **To determine campus curriculum strengths and weaknesses and serve as an instructional resource for teaching staff and campus teacher leaders.**
Teachers and administrators have been trained to interpret placement tests, assessment reports, and other reports provided by TEA, the District, or the AEISIT system. This allows them to plan appropriate instructional strategies and curricular adjustments to address deficiencies before deficiencies become deficits and to intervene before students become habituated to failure.
- **To monitor student progress and implementation of curriculum.**
Data analysis enables District Reading and Math Coaches to assist teachers in grouping and regrouping students and making adjustments in curriculum and instruction.
- **To provide clear, comprehensive, prescriptive feedback to students and their families.**
Student data analysis that is clear and objective builds understanding and trust, the basis for good working relationships.
- **To access educational resources and programs.**
Data analysis clarifies campus eligibility for district, state, and federal resources. This has led to inclusion in two grants (reading and mathematics), special programs, direct personnel assistance, and enrichment experiences for students.

IV 3 - Communicates student performance

Student performance is communicated to parents, students, and community in a variety of formal and informal ways. Among them:

- Monthly parent newsletters in both English and Spanish.
- Open House -- The principal presented the school's overall academic performance and grade level results, emphasizing the part played by every grade and person.
- Grade level parent nights. Family activities are focused on specific objectives/skills, prerequisite to advanced skills.
- Individual conferences by teachers with students and/or parents after benchmark results, when student progress is not at the expected level, and at the request of a parent or student.
- Grade level assemblies. At the beginning of the year the principal informed students of her goals for the year and what was expected of them. Parents are welcome.
- RPTE. Bilingual education teachers conduct conferences with both students and parents about the results and progress toward the advanced level for exiting the bilingual program.
- TPRI. Results for each administration are communicated as with other tests.
- The parent liaison makes home visits for students with attendance and/or tardy problems, follows up with phone calls, and often serves as a translator in parent conferences.
- Parent leaders in the PTO and community members of the SBDM are encouraged to communicate with their peers regarding school goals and activities.
- Daily announcements keep students informed and focused.
- An informed, friendly staff, committed to reaching out to the entire Glen Park community is the best source of communication.

IV 4 - Share Student Successes

Glen Park will share its successes through several venues:

District

- FWISD has special meetings of administrators where promising interventions could be shared, leading to partnering with like schools and to mentoring struggling schools.
- FWISD schools are organized into pyramids which offer an appropriate setting for collaboration and sharing with administrators, teaching staff, and support personnel.
- FWISD math cadre meetings and reading mentor meetings are an ideal format for sharing.
- FWISD Super Saturday Math events for teachers will allow Glen Park cadre member and campus teachers to work with a presenter and share initiatives.
- FWISD Instructional Support Team meetings regularly include an agenda item of promising teacher leaders and promising practices; an opportunity for Glen Park.
- Information on successful strategies and programs will be added to the FWISD website.
- Glen Park will adopt an “open door” policy for educators who want to visit and observe.

Regional Service Center

- The region service center system in Texas provides many opportunities for sharing.

Conferences

- All members of the school community will pursue opportunities to make presentations at local, regional, state, and national conferences.

Other

- A significant number of successful teachers at Glen Park were participants in the state Alternative Certification Program. Sharing at training sessions for newcomers to the program would be beneficial to all concerned.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Part V 1. School Curriculum

Glen Park Elementary School serves students in grades PreK - 5. The PreK program focuses on language and mathematical development, culture, and physical development. The primary grades, with 50% limited English speaking, also provide a bilingual program which will extend to an additional grade every year. The kindergarten - grade 5 curriculum expands to specifically address reading, writing, oral language, mathematics, science, social studies, technology, art, and physical education. Integration of these areas is a priority. Grade 4 is a good example of integration, with thematic and cultural units which involve two or more academic disciplines and frequently incorporate on-site learning experiences at Fort Worth museums.

The school's written curriculum guides, *Pathways to Excellence*, are provided by the District, and are aligned with state required standards and District expectations. The elementary program places great emphasis on language arts and mathematics. Each of these curriculum areas clearly identifies learning objectives which support the expectations and ensure that all students have sufficient opportunity to achieve. These involve special reading programs and materials for students who are not on grade level and also include materials for a 4-week extended year program offered to selected students in June. More advanced students are provided with a more challenging program, with special emphasis on science. Academic contests within the school are opportunities for students to demonstrate their skills.

Instructional technology is incorporated regularly into language arts and mathematics. The twice-weekly Compass Lab learning experiences for students in grades 2-5 are more than "drill and practice" activities. Curricula are planned to enhance and improve student learning, with specific content selected to develop critical thinking skills. Learning experiences in the lab are planned and coordinated with individual teachers. Lightspan playstations, issued for home use for students in grades 4 and 5, are popular with both parents and students as homework. At a specified point in each Saxon Math Program unit, a customized disk for the playstation that is aligned to the units' objectives is sent home for use as reinforcement practice of both skills and problem solving.

The school's library supports and is integrated into the school's curriculum and instruction. Classroom libraries, classroom resource centers, special event centers in the library, and lessons from big books for special skill instruction have proved popular and helpful. All of the school's students (PreK-5) have a scheduled 30-minute library lesson and open reading time once per week. For these sessions, the librarian selects books which incorporate culturally relevant curriculum. The library is open before and after school; parents can check out books to read to their children at home, and students can pursue special interests and check out books for reading in free time.

Further enrichment of the academic curriculum and the arts is provided to students through field trips to the Kennedy Center-sponsored Imagination Celebration events, performances at the Bass Hall, outdoor learning experiences, and the zoo. Such experiences are especially vital to the development of Glen Park students' lives and learning because they have little exposure to such events outside of school. The FW After-School-Program also includes opportunities for participation in drama, music, and sports.

In all curriculum areas, teachers serve as collaborative leaders to ensure that learning is cohesive and continuous. Interacting both vertically and horizontally, they identify successful strategies, share effective materials and program implementations, and make revisions as necessary. Formative evaluations and assessments of both instruction and student achievement ensure that the school as a whole meets its goals for maximum growth and continued success.

Part V 2. - Reading Curriculum

Reading Mastery was chosen because research showed it was highly successful with a student population similar to Glen Park's. The program is a direct instruction model emphasizing decoding, comprehension, and literary skills at the level appropriate for each student. Lesson formats include whole class, collaborative learning, small group, and individual instruction. Glen Park ESL students who have been integrated into the English-speaking community for at least one-half year have accelerated their reading skills through the Reading Mastery program.

Corrective Reading is independent of Reading Mastery but shares a similar instructional system. A structured, repetitive program which also provides assessments and a management system to monitor student progress, it was implemented in 1999 when assessment data showed that students were so far behind that remediation was vital. The program has proved especially effective with students traditionally identified as learning disabled, educationally handicapped, or perceptually handicapped. School-wide implementation of this two-level reading program has enabled a team approach from lower to upper grades and provided a ready accountability system. Teachers like the direct and unambiguous instructional model where tasks and activities are specified in detail. The assessments provided are comprehensive and include observations, formal assessments, pre- and post-tests, unit tests, comprehension assessment, self-assessment, and writing portfolio assessment.

Bilingual Program. Students served in the K-1 full bilingual program use the *Lectura*, Scott Foresman, a program which has a direct correlation with the reading programs used in the regular classrooms and includes appropriate assessments to measure progress at regular intervals. Direct instruction in phonics, comprehension, and vocabulary development is supported with writing and cross-curricular activities.

Advanced Students use another Scott Foresman program, aligned with the District's G/T program and chosen because of its emphasis on upper level reading, numerous and varied texts, and higher order questioning strategies, and correlated writing lessons.

V 3. - Other Curriculum Area: Mathematics

The Glen Park math program was chosen by the District's Math Department because research showed it to be highly effective when low-performing students were combined with new or inexperienced teachers. A state-funded Academics 2000 grant provided the school with the complete Saxon Math Program, along with a host of materials and training, the assistance of a Math Mastery Coach, and a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system. Vendor personnel created homework disks for 4th and 5th grade students to use with Lightspan Playstations that were aligned to unit skills and objectives.

The Saxon Math Program is similar in teaching and learning philosophy to the Reading Mastery program. Students enjoy features like the spiraling review, consistent format, hands-on learning, and daily opportunities to verbalize thinking. ACP and other inexperienced teachers find security in the scripted, direct instruction model with structured lessons, regular review of previous concepts, pacing guide, opportunities for observations and feedback, and monitoring system. With so much planning and development provided, instructional time was maximized.

Daily problem solving lessons and extensions from the Silver Burdett math textbook were an important supplement. The "think aloud" approach provides an excellent practice and learning method for students with limited command of English. Supplemental resources were also aligned with TAKS objectives. Combined into a comprehensive program, these elements have produced dramatic improvement in mathematics teaching and learning.

Advanced students used the District's G/T program curriculum which included Saxon Math, Silver Burdett, advanced level math problem solving materials which required higher order thinking strategies, and articulation through narrative writing.

Part V 4. Instructional Methods

Teaching the reading and mathematics curricular areas require a variety of research based instructional strategies and approaches to accommodate students' different learning styles and backgrounds. Glen Park teachers utilize direct instruction, pre-assessments, scaffolded instruction, repetition, modeling and guided practice, hands-on activities, and higher order questioning strategies. Lesson formats include whole class, small groups, peer pairs, and one-to-one. Choices vary with subject area as well as grade level. For example, instructional strategies for social studies and science often include shared inquiry, discovery, lesson outlines, graphic organizers (mind maps), and guided notes, while demonstrations and discovery techniques prove effective in the arts. With Reading Mastery and the comprehensive math program, both teachers and students learn a variety of strategies and approaches. Where possible, field trips and site-based learning are excellent culminating events for units.

Instructional technology has proven to be a great instructional aid for many students at Glen Park. The Compass Learning Lab, the Lightspan program, and computers in the library are used for remediation, additional practice, extension, and acceleration.

Training parents to help their children learn benefits both parties. Family math nights, "make and take" sessions, and teacher conferences have all been successful in helping parents learn varied techniques for helping their children, and perhaps themselves, gain essential new knowledge.

Incentives and rewards have proven very important to motivating Glen Park students. These include stickers and stars for bonus work, certificates for achievement/improvement, medals for excellence, attendance awards, and honor rolls. Special opportunities for leadership and citizenship include the safety patrol and school ambassadorships. Achievements are posted in the halls of the school and noted in the school's monthly newsletter to parents.

Part V 5. Professional Development

Glen Park's professional development experiences focused on areas of high student need:

Reading: In years 1 and 2 (1999 and 2000) of the Accelerated Reading Intervention (ARI) grant, each teacher had 30-40+ hours of training, with 20-30 hours in years 3 & 4. This training most often occurred after school with food and stipends provided; occasionally, teachers went to another teacher's classroom to observe instruction and receive training. The District reading department supported this training with frequent on-campus technical assistance from a Reading Coach. Glen Park's 5 campus teacher mentors received additional training after school hours on how to coordinate reading program activities and advance their teaching skills; teacher mentors then helped the other teachers on their campus.

Mathematics: The publisher provided both awareness and implementation training before school began, and the District Mastery Math Coach conducted ongoing technical assistance, modeling lessons in teachers' classrooms, observing and providing feedback, and demonstrating how to quickly identify students' instructional needs and adjust teaching strategies. Stipends were provided for teachers to attend the FWISD Super Saturday Math workshops.

Writing: All 3rd and 4th grade teachers were trained in the 6 Traits writing modules.

Curriculum and Instruction: Pyramid staff development for administrators and teachers provided both training and sharing, focusing on best practices, accelerating student learning, lesson extensions, and analyzing assessments to accommodate students' needs.

Diversity Training: Principals received initial training at the District level, with follow-up on campus.

Sexual Harassment Training: Principals received initial training at the District level, with follow-up on campus.

Instructional Strategies: All teachers who work with ESL students, teach bilingual education, or work with G/T students are certified in their respective area(s). 90% of Glen Park staff now have ESL certification, and several are enrolled in District training for G/T certification.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade Reading

Test TAAS (1994-2002) TAKS (2003)

Edition/publication year Updated Yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

1999 – 119 students

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

2003 – 106 students

1999 – 91 students

Number of students who took the test

2003 – 93 students

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took and appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

Number excluded _____ Percent excluded _____

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. If the state does not report scores using the categories of basic, proficient, and advanced, use the state's categories and report data for each category. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficient and advanced cutpoints. For example, 100% of students are at "basic," 69% are at "proficient," and 42% are at "advanced."

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced (or the relevant state categories), and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS (1994 – 2002) – TAKS (2003)
Grade 3 Reading – Tested in English**

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	3-4 / 03	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	94%	71%	81%	80%	70%
Below Basic Level	6 st. – 6%	31 st. – 29%	22 st. – 19%	19 st. – 20%	27 st. – 30%
Basic Level	42 st. – 45%	30 st. – 26%	50 st. – 43%	28 st. – 29%	23 st. – 25%
Proficient Level	37 st. – 35%	34 st. – 31%	36 st. – 31%	33 st. – 34%	31 st. – 34%
Advanced Level	8 st. – 9%	13 st. – 12%	9 st. – 8%	16 st. – 17%	10 st. – 11%
Number of students tested in English	93 /106	108 /116	117 /131	96 /130	91 /119
Percent of total students tested	88%	93%	89%	74%	76%
Percent of students excluded¹	12%	7%	11%	26%	24%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American – number of students	16 /21 tested	35 /37 tested	40 /49 tested	33 /44 tested	44 /55 tested
% African American	20%	32%	37%	34%	46%
Total Passing	14 st. – 88%	23 st. – 66%	31 st. – 78%	26 st. – 79%	30 st. – 68%
Below Basic Level	2 st. – 13%	12 st. – 34%	9 st. – 23%	7 st. – 21%	14 st. – 32%
Basic Level	5 st. – 31%	11 st. – 31%	15 st. – 38%	8 st. – 24%	12 st. – 27%
Proficient Level	6 st. – 38%	8 st. – 23%	13 st. – 33%	13 st. – 39%	13 st. – 30%
Advanced Level	3 st. – 19%	4 st. – 11%	3 st. – 8%	5 st. – 15%	5 st. – 11%
2. Hispanic -- number of students	72 /79	67 /73 tested	63 /65 tested	54 /72 tested	38 /53 tested
% Hispanic	75%	63%	50%	55%	45%
Total Passing	68 st. – 94%	50 st. – 75%	50 st. – 79%	42 st. – 78%	27 st. – 71%
Below Basic Level	4 st. – 6%	17 st. – 25%	13 st. – 21%	12 st. – 22%	11 st. – 29%
Basic Level	34 st. – 47%	18 st. – 27%	27 st. – 43%	15 st. – 28%	8 st. – 21%
Proficient Level	30 st. – 42%	24 st. – 36%	20 st. – 32%	18 st. – 33%	15 st. – 39%
Advanced Level	4 st. – 6%	8 st. – 12%	3 st. – 5%	9 st. – 17%	4 st. – 10%
3. White -- number of students²	5 /5 tested	5 /5 tested	11 /14 tested	10 /15 tested	9 /11 tested
% White	5%	4%	11%	12%	9%
Total Passing	5 st. – 100%	3 st. – 60%	11 st. – 100%	42 st. 78%	27 st. – 71%
Below Basic Level	-----	2 st. – 40%	-----	1 st. – 10%	2 st. – 22%
Basic Level	3 st. – 60%	1 st. – 20%	6 st. – 55%	5 st. – 50%	3 st. – 33%
Proficient Level	1 st. – 20%	1 st. – 20%	3 st. – 27%	2 st. – 20%	3 st. – 33%
Advanced Level	1 st. – 20%	1 st. – 20%	2 st. – 18%	2 st. – 20	1 st. – 11%
4. Economic. Disadvantaged -#Student	82 /92 tested	89 /95 tested	99 /109 tested	79 /108 tested	72 /94 tested
% Economic Disadvantaged	87%	82%	83%	83%	79%
Total Passing	76 st. – 93%	60 st. – 67%	79 st. – 80%	61 st. – 77%	52 st. – 72%
Below Basic Level	6 st. – 7%	29 st. – 33%	20 st. – 20%	18 st. – 23%	20 st. – 28%
Basic Level	36 st. – 44%	22 st. – 25%	40 st. – 40%	22 st. – 28%	21 st. – 29%
Proficient Level	32 st. – 2%	29 st. – 33%	33 st. – 33%	29 st. – 37%	23 st. – 32%
Advanced Level	8 st. – 10%	9 st. – 10%	6 st. – 6%	10 st. – 13%	8 st. – 11%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	89% ¹	87%	86%	87%	88%
1. African American Passing	82%	80%	77%	79%	76%
2. Hispanic Passing	85%	83%	82%	83%	84%
3. White Passing	96%	94%	93%	93%	93%
4. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	84%	81%	80%	81%	81%
Percent of students tested	90%	97%	98%	92%	89%

¹ In 1999, 15 were ARD exempt, 11 were LEP exempt, and 2 were absent. In 2000, 25 were ARD; 6 were LEP; 2 were No Score; and 1, absent. In 2001, 7 took the SDAA; 2, the Spanish test; and 5 were absent. In 2002, 6 were absent and 2, LEP. In 2003, 11 took the SDAA and 2 were LEP.

² Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 members; we have included some borderline populations because of concern with ethnic gaps.

- Texas gave the Grade 3 Reading TAKS three times to allow students the greatest opportunity possible to pass this “high stakes” promotion test. To make the vertical data charted as valid as possible, we will count as passing only those students who passed in the March or April administrations (TAAS was routinely given in April or May). In the summer, an additional student passed.
- Texas neither established categories like *Basic*, *Proficient*, and *Advanced* nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test and this has also not been done for the initial year of the TAKS (2003). To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:
Basic: meeting the “cut” scores for passing (has varied yearly during the TAAS-TAKS cycle, from roughly 50 – 70 percent) up to 84% (may vary with rounding).
Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent
Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade Mathematics

Test TAAS (1999-2002) – TAKS (2003)

Edition/publication year <u>Updated Yearly</u>	Publisher <u>Texas Education Agency</u>
	<u>1999 – 119 students</u>
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered	<u>2003 – 94 students</u>
	<u>1999 – 92 students</u>
Number of students who took the test	<u>2003 - 91 students</u>

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took and appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

Number excluded _____ Percent excluded _____

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. If the state does not report scores using the categories of basic, proficient, and advanced, use the state’s categories and report data for each category. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficient and advanced cutpoints. For example, 100% of students are at “basic,” 69% are at “proficient,” and 42% are at “advanced.”

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced (or the relevant state categories), and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS (1999-2002) – TAKS (2003)
Grade 3 Mathematics – Tested in English**

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	4 / 03	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	81%	68%	74%	72%	61%
Below Basic Level	17 st. – 19%	35 st. – 32%	31 st. – 26%	27 st. – 28%	36 st. – 39%
Basic Level	52 st. – 57%	55 st. – 51%	70 st. – 60%	35 st. – 36%	31 st. – 34%
Proficient Level	20 st. – 22%	17 st. – 16%	14 st. – 12%	29 st. – 30%	21 st. – 23%
Advanced Level	2 st. – 2%	1 st. – 1%	2st. – 2%	6 st. – 6%	4 st. – 4%
Number of students tested in English	91 /94	108 /116	117 /131	97 /130	92 /119
Percent of total students tested	97%	93%	89%	75%	77%
Percent of students excluded¹	3%	7%	11%	25%	23%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American – number of students	16 /16 tested	33 /37 tested	42 /49 tested	34 /44 tested	46 /55 tested
% African American	17%	32%	37%	34%	46%
Total Passing	13 – 81%	23 – 62%	27 – 64%	22 – 65%	29 – 63%
Below Basic Level	3 st. – 19%	10 st. – 30%	15 st. – 36%	12 st. – 35%	17 st. – 37%
Basic Level	11 st. – 69%	17 st. – 52%	22 st. – 52%	14 st. – 41%	17 st. – 37%
Proficient Level	2 st. – 13%	6 st. – 18%	5 st. – 12%	5 st. – 15%	11 st. – 24%
Advanced Level	-----	-----	-----	3 st. – 9%	1 -- 2%
2. Hispanic -- number of students	70 /73 tested	69 /73 tested	62 / 65 tested	54 /72 tested	37 /53 tested
% Hispanic	78%	63%	50%	55%	45%
Total Passing	56 – 80%	44 – 64%	48 – 77%	42 – 78%	23 – 62%
Below Basic Level	14 st. – 20%	25 st. – 36%	14 st. – 23%	12 st. – 22%	14 st. – 38%
Basic Level	38 st. – 54%	32 st. – 46%	40 st. – 65%	20 st. – 37%	11 st. – 30%
Proficient Level	17 st. – 24%	11 st. – 16%	6 st. – 10%	21 st. – 39%	9 st. – 24%
Advanced Level	1 st. – 1%	1 st. – 1%	2 st. – 3%	1 st. – 2%	3 st. – 8%
3. White -- number of students²	5 /5 tested	5 /5 tested	10 /14 tested	9 /14 tested	9 /11 tested
% White	5%	4%	11%	11%	9%
Total Passing	5 – 100%	5 – 100%	9 – 90%	6 – 67%	4 – 44%
Below Basic Level	-----	-----	1 st. – 10%	3 st. – 33%	5 st. – 55%
Basic Level	3 st. – 60%	5 st. – 100%	7 st. – 70%	1 st. – 11%	3 st. – 33%
Proficient Level	1 – 20%	-----	2 st. – 20%	3 st. – 33%	1 st. – 11%
Advanced Level	1 – 20%	-----	-----	2 st. – 22%	-----
4. Economic. Disadvantaged # students	81 /84 tested	87 /93 tested	97 /109 tested	79 /107tested	73 /94 tested
% Economic Disadvantaged	89%	80%	83%	82%	79%
Total Passing	65 – 80%	55 – 63%	73 – 75%	59 – 75%	49 – 67%
Below Basic Level	16 st. – 20%	32 st. – 37%	24 st. – 25%	20 st. – 25%	24 st. – 33%
Basic Level	44 st. – 54%	39 st. – 45%	61 st. – 63%	31 st. – 39%	28 st. – 38%
Proficient Level	19 st. – 23%	15 st. – 17%	10 st. – 10%	24 st. – 30%	17 st. – 23%
Advanced Level	2 st. -- 2%	1 st. – 1%	2 st. – 2%	4 st. – 5%	4 st. – 5%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	90%	87%	82%	80%	82%
1. African American	81%	76%	69%	65%	65%
2. Hispanic Passing	88%	83%	78%	75%	79%
3. White Passing	96%	93%	90%	88%	90%
4. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	86%	81%	75%	72%	75%
Percent of students tested	98%	97%	98%	92%	89%

¹ In 1999, 11 were LEP exempt, 13 were ARD exempt, and 3 were absent. In 2000, 6 were LEP exempt, 23 were ARD exempt, and 4 were absent. In 2001, 6 were absent, 6 took the SDAA (special ed. test), and 2 took the Spanish test. In 2002, 8 were absent. In 2003, 1 was absent and two were LEP exempt.

² Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 students, we have included white students because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

Note: Texas neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test, and this was also not done for the initial year of TAKS. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” scores for passing (has varied yearly during the TAAS-TAKS cycle, from roughly 50-70 percent) up to 84% (may vary with rounding).

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

Note that in 1999 the TAAS test was adapted to reflect the new Texas curriculum (the TEKS), creating some increase in difficulty. The transition to the TAKS test in 2003 further increased the rigor of the test.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 4th Grade Reading

Test TAAS (1999-2002) – TAKS (2003)

Edition/publication year Updated Yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

1999- 138 students

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

2003 – 84 students

1999 – 108 students

Number of students who took the test

2003 - 77 students

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

Number excluded _____ Percent excluded _____

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. If the state does not report scores using the categories of basic, proficient, and advanced, use the state's categories and report data for each category. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficient and advanced cutpoints. For example, 100% of students are at "basic," 69% are at "proficient," and 42% are at "advanced."

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced (or the relevant state categories), and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS (1994 – 2002) to TAKS (2003)
Grade 4 Reading – Tested in English**

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	4 / 03	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	94%	83%	79%	76%	75%
Below Basic Level	5 st. -- 6%	19 st. – 17%	20 st. – 21%	23 st. – 24%	27 st. – 25%
Basic Level	40 st. – 52%	51 st. – 45%	29 st. – 31%	34 st. – 35%	33 st. – 31%
Proficient Level	25 st. – 32%	33 st. – 29%	29 st. – 31%	23 st. – 24%	33 st. – 31%
Advanced Level	7 st. – 9%	11 st. – 10%	16 st. – 17%	17 st. – 18%	15 st. – 14%
Number of students tested in English	77 / 84	114 / 119	94 / 101	97 / 114	108 / 138
Percent of total students tested	92%	96%	93%	85%	78%
Percent of students excluded¹	8%	4%	7%	15%	22%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American -- number of students	17 / 18 tested	44 / 47 tested	30 / 31 tested	45 / 56 tested	53 / 62 tested
% African American	21%	39%	31%	49%	45%
Total Passing	16 st. – 94%	35 st. – 80%	22 st. – 73%	36 st. – 80%	37 st. – 70%
Below Basic Level	1 st. – 6%	9 st. – 20%	8 st. – 27%	9 st. – 20%	13 st. – 25%
Basic Level	8 st. – 10%	21 st. – 48%	13 st. – 43%	18 st. – 40%	17 st. – 32%
Proficient Level	7 st. – 9%	11 st. – 25%	8 st. -- 27%	13 st. – 29%	18 st. – 34%
Advanced Level	1 st. – 6%	3 st. – 7%	1 st. – 3%	5 st. – 11%	5 st. -- 9%
2. Hispanic -- number of students	55 / 61 tested	62 / 64 tested	57 / 62 tested	45 / 49 tested	47 / 65 tested
% Hispanic	88%	54%	61%	43%	47%
Total Passing	52 st. – 95%	53 st. – 85%	46 st. – 81%	32 st. -- 71%	37 st. – 79%
Below Basic Level	3 st. – 5%	9 st. – 15%	11 st. – 19%	13 st. – 29%	10 st. – 21%
Basic Level	28 st. – 51%	26 st. – 42%	13 st. – 23%	16 st. – 36%	15 st. – 32%
Proficient Level	18 st. – 33%	20 st. – 32%	20 st. – 35%	7 st. – 16%	13 st. – 28%
Advanced Level	6 st. – 11%	7 st. – 11%	13 st. – 35%	9 st. – 20%	9 st. – 19%
3. White -- number of students²	5 / 5 tested	7 / 7 tested	7 / 7 tested	7 / 9 tested	8 / 11 tested
% White	6%	6%	7%	8%	1%
Total Passing	4 st. -- 80%	6 st. – 86%	6 st. -- 86%	6 st. – 86%	4 st. – 50%
Below Basic Level	1 st. – 20%	1 st. – 14%	1 st. – 14%	1 st. – 14%	4 st. – 50%
Basic Level	4 st. – 80%	4 st. – 57%	3 st. – 43%	-----	1 st. – 13%
Proficient Level	-----	1 st. – 14%	1 st. – 14%	3 st. – 43%	2 st. – 25%
Advanced Level	-----	1 st. – 14%	2 st. – 29%	3 st. – 43%	1 st. – 13%
4. Economic. Disadvantaged -- # students	68 / 74 tested	88 / 92 tested	76 / 81 tested	75 / 87 tested	87 / 107 tested
% Economically Disadvantaged	88%	77%	80%	76%	78%
Total Passing	64 st. – 94%	72 st. – 82%	57 st. – 75%	56 st. – 75%	65 st. 75%
Below Basic Level	4 st. – 6%	16 st. – 18%	19 st. – 25%	19 st. – 25%	22 st. – 25%
Basic Level	34 st. – 50%	41 st. – 47%	21 st. – 28%	30 st. – 40%	27 st. – 31%
Proficient Level	24 st. – 35%	25 st. – 28%	24 st. – 32%	13 st. – 17%	26 st. – 30%
Advanced Level	6st. -- 9%	6 st. – 7%	12 st. – 16%	13 st. – 17%	12 st. – 14%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	85%	92%	90%	89%	88%
1. African American	76%	86%	83%	82%	79%
2. Hispanic Passing	80%	89%	87%	85%	84%
3. White Passing	93%	96%	95%	95%	94%
4. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	79%	88%	85%	84%	84%
Percent of students tested	98%	96%	96%	89%	87%

1 In 1999, 13 students were ARD exempt, 11 were LEP exempt, 1 was absent, and 5 were No Scores. In 2000, 11 were ARD exempt, 3, LEP exempt, 2, absent, and 1 was a No Score. In 2001, there were 5 LEP exempt, 1 taking SDAA, and 1 No Score. In 2002, 1 LEP, 3 absent, and 1 No Score. In 2003, 1 LEP, 4 absent, and 2 No Scores.

2 Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 members; we have included some borderline populations because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

Note: Texas neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test, and this was also not done for the initial year of TAKS. To make these scores more comprehensible, we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” scores for passing (has varied yearly during the TAAS-TAKS cycle, from roughly 50 – 70 percent) up to 84% (may vary with rounding)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

In 1999 the TAAS test was adapted to reflect the new Texas curriculum (the TEKS), creating some increase in difficulty, more significant in math than in reading. The transition to the TAKS test in 2003 further increased the rigor of the test (note the 7% drop in the state passing scores). This makes the 11% gain shown by Glen Park even more significant.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 4th Grade Mathematics

Test TAAS (1999-2002) – TAKS (2003)

Edition/publication year Updated Yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

1999 – 138 students

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

2003 - 84 students

1999 – 108 students

Number of students who took the test

2003 - 77 students

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

Number excluded _____ Percent excluded _____

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. If the state does not report scores using the categories of basic, proficient, and advanced, use the state's categories and report data for each category. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficient and advanced cutpoints. For example, 100% of students are at "basic," 69% are at "proficient," and 42% are at "advanced."

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced (or the relevant state categories), and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS (1999 – 2002) – TAKS (2003)
Grade 4 Mathematics – Tested in English**

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	4 / 03	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	100%	90%	75%	65%	65%
Below Basic Level	-----	12 st. – 10%	23 st. – 25%	34 st. – 35%	38 st. – 35%
Basic Level	54 st. – 70%	90 st. – 77%	54 st. – 59%	28 st. – 29%	27 st. – 25%
Proficient Level	18 st. – 23%	12 st. – 10%	15 st. – 16%	23 st. – 23%	35 st. – 32%
Advanced Level	5 st. – 6%	3 st. – 3%	-----	13 st. – 13%	10 st. – 9%
Number of students tested in English	77 / 82	117 / 121	92 / 101	98 / 114	110 / 138
Percent of total students tested	93%	97%	91%	86%	80%
Percent of students excluded¹	7%	3%	9%	14%	20%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American-- # of students	17 / 18	47 / 49 tested	28 / 31 tested	45 / 56 tested	55 / 62 tested
% African American	22%	40%	31%	49%	45%
Total Passing	17 -- 100%	42 – 89%	17 – 61%	27 – 60%	32 – 58%
Below Basic Level	-----	5 st. – 11 %	11 st. – 39%	18 st. – 40%	23 st. – 42%
Basic Level	11 st. – 65%	36 st. – 77%	16 st. – 57%	15 st. – 33%	14 st. – 25%
Proficient Level	5 st. – 29%	6 st. – 13%	1 st. – 4%	11 st. – 24%	16 st. – 29%
Advanced Level	1 st. – 5%	-----	-----	1 st. – 2%	2 st. – 4%
2. Hispanic -- number of students	55 / 59 tested	62 / 64 tested	57 / 62 tested	46 / 49 tested	47 / 65 tested
% Hispanic	72%	53%	61%	43%	47%
Total Passing	55 – 100%	55 – 89%	46 – 81%	32 – 70%	34 – 72%
Below Basic Level	-----	7 st. – 11%	11 st. – 19%	14 st – 30%	13 st. – 28%
Basic Level	38 st. – 69%	47 st. – 76%	35 st. – 61%	12 st. – 26%	11 st. – 23%
Proficient Level	13 st. – 24%	5 st. – 8%	11 st. – 19%	10 st. – 22%	16 st. – 34%
Advanced Level	4 st. – 7%	3 st. – 5%	-----	10 st. – 22%	7 st. – 15%
3. White -- number of students²	5 / 5 tested	7 / 7 tested	7 / 7 tested	7 / 9 tested	8 / 11 tested
% White	6%	6%	7%	8%	8%
Total Passing	5 -- 100%	7 -- 100%	6 – 86%	5 – 71%	6 – 75%
Below Basic Level	-----	-----	1 st. – 14%	2 st. – 29%	2st. – 25%
Basic Level	5 st. – 100%	6 st. – 86%	3 st. – 43%	1 st. – 14 %	2 st. – 25%
Proficient Level	-----	1 st. – 14%	3 st. – 43%	2 st. – 29%	3 st. – 38%
Advanced Level	-----	-----	-----	2 st. – 29%	1 st. – 13%
4. Economic. Disadvantaged - # students	68 / 72	89 / 92 tested	73 / 80 tested	73 / 87 tested	89 / 107 tested
% Economic Disadvantaged	88%	76%	72%	76%	78%
Total Passing	68 -- 100%	77 – 87%	53 -- 73%	49 – 67%	55 – 62%
Below Basic Level	-----	12 st. – 13%	20 st. – 27%	24 st. – 33%	34 st. – 38%
Basic Level	47 st. – 69%	67 st. – 75%	44 st. – 60%	22 st. – 30%	22 st. – 25%
Proficient Level	17 st. – 25%	7 st. – 8%	9 st. – 12%	18 st. – 25%	27 st. – 30%
Advanced Level	4 st. -- 6%	3 st. – 3%	-----	9 st. – 12%	6 st. – 7%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	88%	94%	91%	87%	87%
1. African American Passing	78%	88%	82%	75%	73%
2. Hispanic Passing	83%	92%	82%	83%	84%
3. White Passing	94%	97%	89%	93%	93%
4. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	82%	91%	87%	80%	81%
Percent of students tested	98%	96%	96%	89%	97%

1 In 1999, 11 students were LEP exempt, 11 were ARD exempt, 5 were No Scores, and 1 was absent. In 2000, 2 students were LEP exempt, 10 were ARD exempt, 1 was a NO Score, and 3 were absent. In 2001, 4 were LEP exempt, 1 took the SDAA, 3 were No Scores, and 1 was absent. In 2002, 1 was LEP exempt, 1 took the SDAA, and 2 were absent. In 2003, 1 was LEP exempt and 4 were absent.

2 Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 students, we have included some small populations because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

Note: Texas neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test, and this was also not done for the initial year of TAKS. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (has varied yearly during the TAAS-TAKS cycle, from roughly 50-70 percent) up to 84% (may vary with rounding).

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

Note that in 1999 the TAAS test was adapted to reflect the new Texas curriculum (the TEKS), creating some increase in difficulty. The transition to the TAKS test in 2003 further increased the rigor of the test (note the 6% drop in the state passing scores), which makes the gains shown by Glen Park even more significant.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 5th Grade Reading

Test TAAS (1999-2002) – TAKS (2003)

Edition/publication year Updated Yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

1999 – 112 students

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

2003 - 95 students

1999 - 86 students

Number of students who took the test

2003 - 76 students

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took and appropriate alternative test.

Number excluded _____ Percent excluded _____

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. If the state does not report scores using the categories of basic, proficient, and advanced, use the state's categories and report data for each category. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficient and advanced cutpoints. For example, 100% of students are at "basic," 69% are at "proficient," and 42% are at "advanced."

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced (or the relevant state categories), and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS (1994 – 2002) – TAKS (2003)
Grade 5 Reading – Tested in English**

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	4 / 03	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	84%	91%	79%	71%	69%
Below Basic Level	12 st. -- 16%	8 st. -- 9%	20 st. -- 21%	29 st. -- 29%	29 st. -- 34%
Basic Level	19 st. -- 25%	35 st. -- 41%	24 st. -- 25%	31 st. -- 31%	30 st. -- 35%
Proficient Level	33 st. -- 43%	24 st. -- 28%	36 st. -- 38%	28 st. -- 28%	24 st. -- 28%
Advanced Level	12 st. -- 16%	19 st. -- 22%	15 st. -- 16%	13 st. -- 13%	5 st. -- 6%
Number of students tested in English	76 /95	86 /98	95 /104	101 /125	86 /112
Percent of total students tested¹	802%	88%	91%	81%	77%
Percent of students excluded²	20%	12%	9%	19%	23%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American -- number of students	20 /26	24 /29 tested	42 /49 tested	44 /54 tested	33 /42 tested
% African American	27%	30%	47%	43%	38%
Total Passing	18 st. -- 90%	20 st. -- 83%	33 st. -- 79%	32 st. -- 73%	17 st. -- 52%
Below Basic Level	2 st. -- 10%	4 st. -- 17%	9 st. -- 21%	12 st. -- 27%	16 st. -- 48%
Basic Level	6 st. -- 30%	8 st. -- 33%	11 st. -- 26%	12 st. -- 27%	9 st. -- 27%
Proficient Level	9 st. -- 45%	4 st. -- 17%	15 st. -- 36%	16 st. -- 36%	6 st. -- 18%
Advanced Level	3 st. -- 15%	8 st. -- 33%	7 st. -- 17%	4 st. -- 9%	2 st. -- 6%
2. Hispanic -- number of students	49 /60 tested	59 /64 tested	46 /48 tested	51 /58%	38 /50 tested
% Hispanic	63%	65%	46%	46%	45%
Total Passing	41 st. -- 84%	55 st. -- 93%	37 st. -- 80%	36 st. -- 71%	28 st. -- 74%
Below Basic Level	8 st. -- 16%	4 st. -- 7%	9 st. -- 20%	15 st. -- 29%	10 st. -- 26%
Basic Level	12 st. -- 24%	24 st. -- 41%	12 st. -- 26%	17st. -- 33%	18 st. -- 47%
Proficient Level	21 st. -- 43%	20 st. -- 34%	19 st. -- 41%	12 st. -- 24%	9 st. -- 24%
Advanced Level	8 st. -- 16%	11 st. -- 19%	6 st. -- 13%	7 st. -- 14%	1 st. -- 3%
3. White -- number of students³	6 /8 tested	2 /4 tested	5 /5 tested	6 /13 tested	16 /19 tested
% White	8%	4%	5%	10%	22%
Total Passing	5 st. -- 83%	2 st. -- 50%	4 st. -- 80%	4 st. -- 67%	13 st. -- 81%
Below Basic Level	1 st. -- 17%	-----	1 st. -- 20%	2 st. -- 33%	3 st. -- 19%
Basic Level	1 st. -- 17%	2 st. 100%	1 st. -- 20%	2 st. -- 33%	2 st. -- 13%
Proficient Level	3 st. -- 50%	-----	1 st. -- 20%	-----	9 st. -- 56%
Advanced Level	1 st. -- 17%	-----	2 st. -- 40%	2 st. -- 33%	2 st. -- 13%
4. Economic. Disadvantaged - # students	64 /79 tested	64 /73 tested	67 / 73 tested	75 /94 tested	61 /80 tested
% Economically Disadvantaged	83%	74%	70%	75%	71%
Total Passing	53 st. -- 83%	58 st. -- 91%	51 st. -- 76%	52 st. -- 69%	41 st. -- 67%
Below Basic Level	11 st. -- 17%	6 st. -- 9%	16 st. -- 24%	23 st. -- 31%	20 st. -- 33%
Basic Level	16 st. -- 25%	29 st. -- 45%	16 st. -- 24%	20 st. -- 27%	22 st. -- 36%
Proficient Level	30 st. -- 47%	17 st. -- 27%	25 st. -- 37%	23 st. -- 31%	17 st. -- 28%
Advanced Level	7 st. -- 11%	12 st. -- 19%	10 st. -- 15%	9 st. -- 12%	2 st. -- 3%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	85%	92%	90%	87%	86%
1. African American	76%	87%	83%	79%	76%
2. Hispanic Passing	80%	90%	86%	82%	79%
3. White Passing	93%	96%	95%	94%	93%
4. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	79%	88%	84%	81%	78%
Percent of students tested	98%	97%	97%	90%	88%

1 If SDAA is counted as testing, percent goes to 92%.

2 In 1999, 20 were ARD exempt, 2 LEP exempt, and 2 absent. In 2000, 19 exemptions were ARDS, 2 LEP, and 3 absent. In 2001, 2 LEP, 1 absent, and 6 taking SDAA. In 2002, 3LEP, 6 absent, and 3 No Scores. In 2003, 4 absent. 4 No Score, and 11 taking SDAA.

3 Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 members; we have included borderline populations because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

Note: Texas neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with nationally normed test, and this was also not done for the first year of TAKS. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (has varied yearly during the TAAS-TAKS cycle, from roughly 50 – 70 percent) up to 84% (may vary with rounding)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

In 1999 the TAAS test was adapted to reflect the new Texas curriculum (the TEKS), creating some increase in difficulty, more significant in math than in reading. The transition to the TAKS test in 2003 further increased the rigor of the test, largely explaining the 7% drop in 5th grade reading scores for the state as well as for Glen Park.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 5th Grade Mathematics

Test TAAS (1999-2002 – TAKS (2003))

Edition/publication year	<u>Updated Yearly</u>	Publisher	<u>Texas Education Agency</u>
			<u>1999 – 112 students</u>
Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered			<u>2003 - 95 students</u>
			<u>1999 - 94 students</u>
Number of students who took the test			<u>2003 - 80 students</u>

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

Number excluded _____ Percent excluded _____

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. If the state does not report scores using the categories of basic, proficient, and advanced, use the state's categories and report data for each category. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficient and advanced cutpoints. For example, 100% of students are at "basic," 69% are at "proficient," and 42% are at "advanced."

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced (or the relevant state categories), and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS (1999 – 2002) – TAKS (2003)
Grade 5 Mathematics – Tested in English**

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	4 / 03	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	89%	88%	78%	80%	76%
Below Basic Level	9 st. -- 11%	11 st. – 12%	22 st. – 22%	21 st. – 20%	23 st. – 24%
Basic Level	47 st. – 59%	30 st. – 33%	53 st. – 52%	34st. – 33%	37 st. – 39%
Proficient Level	15 st. – 19%	30 st. – 33%	22 st. – 22%	28 st. – 27%	25 st. – 27%
Advanced Level	9 st. – 11%	19 st. – 21%	4 st. – 4%	20 st. – 19%	9 st. – 10%
Number of students tested in English	80 /95	90 /98	101 /104	103 /125	94 /112
Percent of total students tested	84%	92%	97%	82%	84%
Percent of students excluded¹	16%	8%	3%	18%	16%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American -- # of students	21 /26 tested	25 /29 tested	46 /49 tested	44 /54 tested	35 /42 tested
% African American	27%	30%	47%	43%	38%
Total Passing	10 -- 90%	22 -- 88%	34 – 74%	33 – 75%	21 – 60%
Below Basic Level	2 st. – 10%	3 st. – 12%	12 st. – 26%	11 st. – 25%	13 st. – 37%
Basic Level	12 st. – 57%	10 st. – 40%	25 st. – 54%	12 st. – 27%	13 st. – 37%
Proficient Level	4 st. – 19%	6 st. – 24%	9 st. – 20%	13 st. – 30%	8 st. – 23%
Advanced Level	3 st. – 14%	6 st. – 24%	-----	8 st. – 18%	1 st. – 3%
2. Hispanic -- # of students	52 /60 tested	61 /64 tested	48 /48 tested	53 /58 tested	42 /50 tested
% Hispanic	63%	65%	46%	46%	45%
Total Passing	46 – 88%	53 – 87%	39 – 81%	43 – 81%	34 – 81%
Below Basic Level	6 st. – 12%	8 st. – 13%	9 st. – 19%	10 st – 19%	8 st. – 19%
Basic Level	31 st. – 60%	18 st. – 30%	23 st. – 48%	19 st. – 36%	17 st. – 40%
Proficient Level	9 st. – 17%	22 st. – 36%	12 st. – 25%	13 st. – 25%	13 st. – 31%
Advanced Level	6 st. – 12%	13 st. – 21%	4 st. – 8%	11 st. – 21%	4 st. – 10%
3. White -- # of students 2	6 /8 tested	3 /4 tested	5 /5 tested	6 /13 tested	16 /19 tested
% White	8%	4%	5%	10%	18%
Total Passing	5 – 83%	3 -- 100	4 – 80%	6 – 100%	15 – 94%
Below Basic Level	1 st. – 17%	-----	1 st. – 20%	-----	1 st. – 7%
Basic Level	3 st. – 50%	1 st. – 33%	3 st. – 60%	3 st. – 50%	7 st. – 47%
Proficient Level	2 st. – 33%	2 st. – 67%	1 st. – 20%	2 st. – 33%	4 st. – 27%
Advanced Level	-----	-----	-----	1 st. – 17%	4 st. – 27%
4. Economic. Disadvantaged - # students	65 /78 tested	67 /72 tested	71 /73 tested	77 /94 tested	64 /81 tested
% Economically Disadvantaged	82%	73%	70%	75%	72%
Total Passing	58 – 89%	57 – 85%	56 – 79%	61 – 79%	50 st. – 78%
Below Basic Level	7 st. – 11 %	10 st. – 15%	15 st. – 21%	16 st. – 21%	14 st. – 22%
Basic Level	40 st. – 62%	23 st. – 34%	37 st. – 52%	27 st. – 35%	26 st. – 41%
Proficient Level	12 st. – 18%	22 st. – 33%	15 st. – 21%	20 st. – 26%	19 st. – 30%
Advanced Level	6 st. – 9%	12 st. – 18%	4 st. – 6%	14 st. – 18%	5 st. – 8%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	86%	96%	94%	92%	90%
1. African American	74%	92%	89%	83%	78%
2. Hispanic Passing	82%	95%	93%	89%	87%
3. White Passing	93%	98%	97%	96%	95%
4. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	80%	94%	91%	88%	84%
Percent of students tested	93%	97%	97%	90%	88%

1 In 1999, 17 students were ARD exempt and 1 was LEP exempt. In 2000, 16 were ARD exempt, 2 were LEP exempt, 3 were absent, and 1 was a No Score. In 2001, 1 was absent and 2 took the SDAA. In 2002, 6 were absent and 2 took the SDAA. In 2003, 1 was absent, 3 were No Scores, and 11 took the SDAA.

2 Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 students, and occasionally we have omitted a population with only one student; we have included the small white population because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

Note: Texas neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test, and this was also not done for the initial year of TAKS. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” scores for passing (has varied yearly during the TAAS-TAKS cycle, from roughly 50 – 70 percent) up to 84% (may vary with rounding)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

Note that in 1999 the TAAS test was adapted to reflect the new Texas curriculum (the TEKS), creating some increase in difficulty. The transition to the TAKS test in 2003 further increased the rigor of the test (note the 10% drop in the state passing scores), which makes the gain shown by Glen Park even more significant.

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page.

Grade 3rd Grade-Reading Test Stanford 9 ; Form S (1995) Stanford 9 Form T (1995)

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 125 ave. 5 yr.

Number of students who took the test 120 ave. 5 yr.

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

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

	Form T 2002-2003	Form S 2001-2002	Form S 2000-2001	Form S 1999-2000	Form S 1998-1999
Testing month	September	September	September	September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	39.2	42.7	43.2	38.0	37.1
Number of students tested	106	119	133	124	116
Percent of total students tested	100%	45%	100%	98%	86%
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded	0	5%	0	2%	14%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American (specify subgroup)	34.6	41.0	41.8	37.7	38.0
Number of students tested	18	37	49	43	66
2. Hispanic (specify subgroup)	39.5	42.6	42.2	36.0	34.6
Number of students tested	76	70	66	60	55
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students.

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
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

¹ March testing only. Cumulative data over the three testing is not available.

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page.

Grade 3rd Grade Math Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 125 ave. 5 yr.

Number of students who took the test 120 ave. 5 yr.

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	September	September	September	September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	35.5	41.7	38.4	33.6	32.1
Number of students tested	100%	95%	100%	98%	86%
Percent of total students tested	106	119	133	124	116
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded	0	5%	0	2%	14%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>African American</u> (specify subgroup)	32.3	41.3	37.0	33.4	33.4
Number of students tested	18	37	49	43	66
2. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	34.9	40.7	39.3	33.1	30.3
Number of students tested	76	70	66	60	55
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students.

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
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page.

Grade 4th Reading Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 122 ave. 5 yr.

Number of students who took the test 116 ave. 5 yr.

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	September	September	September	September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	39.3	37.4	35.6	32.3	37.8
Number of students tested	105	123	122	106	120
Percent of total students tested	100%	95%	100%	96%	83%
Number of students excluded	0	7	0	4	25
Percent of students excluded	0%	5%	0%	4%	17%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American (specify subgroup)	36.9	38.0	34.5	30.0	39.6
Number of students tested	30	42	36	49	65
2. Hispanic (specify subgroup)	39.1	35.5	35.8	34.4	35.5
Number of students tested	66	66	74	42	67
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students.

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
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page.

Grade 4th Grade Math Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 145 ave. 5 yr.

Number of students who took the test 120 ave. 5 yr.

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	September	September	September	September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	42.2	44.8	42.3	38.8	39.9
Number of students tested	105	123	122	106	120
Percent of total students tested	100%	95%	100%	96%	83%
Number of students excluded	0	7	0	4	25
Percent of students excluded	0%	5%	0%	4%	17%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>African American</u> (specify subgroup)	36.9	38.0	34.5	30.0	39.6
Number of students tested	30	42	36	49	65
2. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	39.1	35.5	35.8	34.4	35.5
Number of students tested	66	66	74	42	67
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students.

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
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page.

Grade 5th Grade Reading Test Stanford 9; Form S (admin. 1999-2002)Form T(admin.2003)

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 119 ave. 5 yr.

Number of students who took the test 106 ave. 5 yr.

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

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

	Form T 2002-2003	form S 2001-2002	Form S 2000-2001	Form S 1999-2000	Form S 1998-1999
Testing month	September	September	September	September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	34.4	36.1	33.5	32.8	33.7
Number of students tested	95	110	106	118	101
Percent of total students tested	95%	91%	96%	94%	86%
Number of students excluded	5	11	4	8	33
Percent of students excluded	5%	9%	4%	6%	14%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American (specify subgroup)	30.2	33.6	32.5	33.0	28.0
Number of students tested	26	31	49	51	54
2. Hispanic (specify subgroup)	36.0	37.7	32.4	33.4	34.1
Number of students tested	47	73	49	49	56
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students.

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
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page.

Grade 5th Grade Math Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered 119 ave. 5 yr.

Number of students who took the test 106 ave. 5 yr.

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month	September	September	September	September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	40.3	36.3	40.2	38.0	37.7
Number of students tested	95	110	106	118	101
Percent of total students tested	95%	91%	96%	94%	86%
Number of students excluded	5	11	4	8	33
Percent of students excluded	5%	9%	4%	6%	14%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>African American</u> (specify subgroup)	37.0	33.9	35.9	37.5	30.7
Number of students tested	26	31	49	51	54
2. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	42.0	41.8	43.0	40.1	39.9
Number of students tested	47	73	49	49	56
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
Number of students tested					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students.

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
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					